CHARLES PASSAGLIA
MEMBER OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS

THEOLOGICAL COMMENTARIES

PART THREE

ON THE DIVISION OF THE DIVINE WILL INTO FIRST AND SECOND AND ON THE UNIVERSAL EXTENT OF THE RESTORED ORDER

ROME
FROM THE PRINTING HOUSE OF THE FINE ARTS
1851

TO ANGELO MAI
A MOST EMINENT MAN
PREFECT OF THE SACRED COUNCIL FOR INTERPRETING
THE TRIDENTINE DECREES
THE MOST ILLUSTRIOUS POLYMATH OF OUR AGE

BY WHOSE LEARNING AND PUBLISHED BOOKS
THE MONUMENTS OF SACRED AND PROFANE
ERUDITION
HAVE BEEN WONDERFULLY AUGMENTED AND
ILLUMINATED

CHARLES PASSAGLIA
A MEMBER OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS
A DECURIAL DOCTOR AT THE ROMAN COLLEGE

DEDICATED
THE THEOLOGICAL COMMENTARIES
TO THE PATRON OF HIS STUDIES

Editorial Note

In this English edition, internal references to Passaglia's numbered sections are clickable. References to divisions within cited external works (for example, *Catech.* XIII, § I) are intentionally not linked. A corollary number such as Corollary IV is the serial label of that corollary, not a reference to § IV; the accompanying section number (for example, CCIX) is its internal destination.

When I reflected within my mind upon the long-standing and entangled questions concerning the salvific will of God, concerning the reparation accomplished by the merits of Christ, concerning the amplitude of grace, concerning election to glory, and concerning the everlasting reprobation of many men, I could not but diligently inquire within myself how it had come about that, with so many and such great studies applied and labors expended, truth seemed to have been obscured rather than illuminated. Nor did the reflection come to nothing; for I seemed to myself to have found three principal causes which until now had prevented limpid truth from shining forth after the darkness had been driven away. And in very truth, let those works which down to our own age have appeared concerning these most weighty heads of doctrine, and which have been disputed no less by Catholics than by Protestants and Jansenists, be compared with one another as diligently as can be done; this will at once appear: nearly all of them are polemical, separated from universal ideas and notions, and adjusted and expressed according to some one part rather than according to the integral sum of the Scriptures and Tradition. But no one can fail to know that a manner of treatment of this sort is by its very nature so constituted that you would promise yourself the attainment of truth from it without warrant. For this is the fruit not of combat and contentions, but of tranquility and peace; and it is the fruit of an investigation not disjointed and imperfect, but complete and fitly and skillfully deduced from its own principles.

We have therefore taken pains that, with quarrels and disputes set aside, while omitting nothing of those things which Christian Tradition and the divine writings comprise, we should at the same time press forward in mind and spirit toward those things which ought to stand before the eyes in the manner of a norm and rule. Whether these things have succeeded for us according to our desire, let the judgment rest with those who do not utterly disdain what is ours, and who are mindful of those words with which Theodoret concludes the prologue to the *Discourses on the Cure of the Greek Affections*, saying: "But whoever may come upon the lucubrations of others, I would ask them that, if indeed all the things written are sound, they praise God who gave the faculty of writing well, and moreover wish well to the writers themselves; but if some things appear to be lacking, they should not on account of these condemn the whole, but rather procure benefit for themselves from those things which they have recognized as rightly written."

COMMENTARY

ON THE DIVISION OF THE DIVINE WILL

INTO FIRST AND SECOND

AND ON THE UNIVERSAL EXTENT OF THE RESTORED ORDER

ARGUMENT

The subject matter of the treatment I: - Chrysostom's doctrine concerning the division of the divine will into first and second II-XIV: - the names, origin, and attributes of the first will IV-VIII: - the names, origin, and attributes of the second will, and the relation of the latter to the first VIII-X: - the universal amplitude of the first will XII-XIII: the heads of doctrine which are elicited by this division XV: - the concordant opinion and manner of speaking of John Damascene XVII-XXI: - the testimonies of Theophylact pertaining to the same matter XXI-XXIV: - what is intended by the difference between the appellations by which each will is distinguished XXII: - concerning the heavenly gifts of which God is the principal and sole cause, and of which he is the principal cause in such a way as to require subordinate causes XXIII: - the formulas and rationale by which Oecumenius sets forth and explains the same division of the divine will XXIV: - what the Latin writers thought concerning it XXV-XXXIV: - and what in particular Anselm of Canterbury thought XXV-XXVIII: - Anselm of Laon XXVIII: - Rupert of Deutz XXIX: - and Bernard XXX-XXXII: - a comparison of the formulas which the Greeks and Latins employed XXXII: - a most similar, indeed the same, doctrine, although in different formulas, handed down by both XXXII: - the principal heads of this doctrine XXXII-XXXIV.

These things are confirmed by the suffrage of other witnesses XXXIV: - and first of Atto of Vercelli XXXIV: - then indeed of Hincmar of Reims XXXV-XXXVIII: - of Paschasius Radbertus XXXVIII: - of Paulinus of Aquileia XXXIX: - of Venantius Fortunatus XL: - of Salvian XLI: - of the author of the *Praedestinatus* XLI: - of Gennadius of Marseilles XLI: - of Avitus of Vienne XLII: - of Isidore of Seville XLII: - of Cassiodorus XLIII-XLVI: - of Fastidius XLVI: - of Gaudentius of Brescia XLVI.

The doctrine of the author of *On the Calling of All Nations* is examined more accurately XLVII-LXII: - he sets down in order that it must be believed that God wills all men without exception to be saved XLVII-XLIX: - that Christ died for all XLIX-LI: - and that the helps of grace necessary for attaining salvation have always been present to all men LI-LIII: - Quesnel's opinion that the Anonymous establishes no universal grace other than external grace LIII: - it is refuted, and first the hypotheses upon which it rests are refuted LIV: - then the thesis itself is refuted LV-LXII: and the connection by which interior gifts are joined with exterior gifts is established LVIII-LX: whence it is inferred that the belief and doctrine of the Anonymous come to this: that there is in God a universal and fruitful salvific will, from which the universal order of reparation must be derived LXI.

Prosper's agreement in the same sense LXII-LXXII: - according to him, it must most sincerely be professed that God wills all men to be saved LXII-LXIV: - it must then be professed that this salvific will flows from the fountain of merciful benignity, that it is efficacious, and that it is the supreme cause of universal reparation through Christ LXIV-LXX: - which reparation nevertheless can rightly be called circumscribed and particular if it is considered passively, not actively, and is referred not to the will of saving, but to the purpose of fulfilling this will LXX-LXXII.

The opinion of the Alexandrian Church concerning the salvific will of God and the universal order of reparation is confirmed by the testimonies of Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Didymus, Athanasius, both Macarii, Paphnutius, Isidore, Synesius, Cyril, Theophilus, Serapion, Orisiesius, Antony, Peter, Theonas, and Phileas LXXII-XCIX: - it comes to this: that there is in God a universal and fruitful salvific will; that the necessary helps of grace are granted to all; that the threefold order, natural, preternatural, and supernatural, is so tempered by God that each is directed toward the salvation of men; that even the order of temporal punishments is referred to this salvation; and that all men are situated in the state of nature raised up and restored through Christ, in the same place.

There is the concordant suffrage of the African Church, whose witnesses are Tertullian, Cyprian, Minucius Felix, Arnobius, Lactantius, Marius Victorinus, Optatus, Facundus, and Primasius XCIX-CXII: - by this suffrage we are

taught that universal reparation through the second Adam succeeded universal ruin through the first Adam; that the principal cause of this universal reparation consists in God's innate benevolence toward the human race; that from this benevolence there has always flowed, and continues to flow, an extraordinary abundance of graces by which men, recreated, can and ought to strive from the most wretched condition of children of wrath toward the dignity of adoptive filiation and obtain it; and that consequently no others are conquered by sins and deprived of everlasting beatitude except those who have despised heavenly mercy and rejected the salvation offered to them, in the same place.

The Churches of Spain support all these things, as is established by the wholly explicit words of Dracontius, Orosius, Marius Mercator, Prudentius, and Pacian CXIII-CXVI.

The Churches of Gaul also support them; their faith is exhibited by Irenaeus, Hilary, Phoebadius, Sedulius, Caesarius, Valerian, Apollinaris, Avitus, Salvian, and both the Council of Orange and the Council of Arles CXVII-CXXXIII: - the principal heads of this faith are that punishments are decreed from eternity for no one, and that punishments destined never to cease are inflicted upon no one at his final hour unless God has foreknown him as a despiser of mercy and he has in fact despised mercy even to the end; that both the everlasting decree of punishment and its temporal execution pertain to that will which has foreknowledge as its companion and which is called the second will; that the order of mercy and reward pertains to the first and antecedent will; and that no others fall away from this order except those who, contrary to the benevolent will of God, have by their free action constructed destruction and ruin for themselves, in the same place.

The Fathers of Italy follow: Hippolytus, Ambrose, Zeno, Jerome, Chromatius, and Paulinus, whose voice is this: those are greatly deceived who teach that the primeval stain was so fatal that it introduced the necessity of perishing; who teach that the blood of the Lamb who takes away the sin of the world has not always profited all men; who teach that so great a destruction flowed into the human race from its original separation from God that there have been those who thereafter could not aspire to divine fellowship; who teach that there was some time at which God neglected the care of the human race and did not provide with paternal piety for the wounds inflicted upon it; and who, finally, teach that at some time there have existed, or that even now there exist, some for whom the kingdom of heaven must be considered closed by a supernal and absolute destination CXXXV-CLVI.

The Roman pontiffs Clement, Innocent, Celestine, and Leo agree; according to these authors, it must be held that the state of the human race, which, if the works of men were considered, would be a state of ruin and damnation, is, through the intervention of God's clemency and goodness, a state of reparation

and salvation, and indeed of a reparation that is altogether universal and active CLVI-CLXV.

The doctors of the Patriarchate of Antioch hand down things most similar: Barnabas, Ignatius, Theophilus, Titus of Bostra, Jacob of Nisibis, Ephrem, Isaac, Nemesius, Eustathius, Basil of Seleucia, Theodoret, and Anastasius, whose undoubted opinion is this: that, as far as the matter itself is concerned, the divine plan concerning the salvation of men was not one thing before the transgression of humanity and another after it; for just as God willed the salvation of men before the transgression, so after the transgression he willed that not even one should perish; that nevertheless this difference intervened between the two divine plans: before the transgression the plan was one of goodness, but after the transgression it was one of benign and just mercy in Christ; that Christ came, satisfied justice by the blood poured out for all, again united with God in himself man who had been torn away from God, and recalled dead humanity to both kinds of life, that of the soul and that of the body CLXV-CLXXXI.

Nor do the most noble lights of the Churches of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace determine otherwise: Polycarp, the author of the Epistle to Diognetus, Athenagoras, Gregory of Neocaesarea, Amphilochius, Caesarius, both Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa, Basil, and Photius. From their works which still survive we understand that, corresponding to the twofold stage of human life, a twofold order of providence must be distinguished, the one of mercy and piety, the other of severity and justice; that the order of mercy and piety pertains to the stage of the present mortality, while the order of severity and justice pertains to the stage of eternity; that the cause of this distinction must be derived from the fact that God, moved by his goodness, most sincerely wills that the power of attaining heavenly beatitude be present to absolutely all men for as long as they live their mortal life; that by this will of goodness God selected for the present life the order of mercy and salvation, and sent the Only-begotten, who would bring back what had gone astray and fashion anew what had been corrupted and depraved; and that he would fashion it anew by a manifold operation and by various helps of grace, with which individual men, enriched according to necessity and opportunity, might dispel ignorance, overcome infirmity, recover the lost likeness of God, and again be joined in a most blessed fellowship with supreme truth, supreme goodness, and supreme beauty CLXXXII-CXCVIII.

Those who illustrated the Churches of Palestine by their wisdom close the column: Justin, Tatian, Methodius, Eusebius, Cyril, and Aeneas of Gaza. They unanimously profess that the salvific will of God and the reparation accomplished by the merits of Christ are universal and fruitful in those gifts by which a ready faculty of attaining salvation is bestowed upon all CXCVIII-CCV.

The corollaries connected with the things which we have laid down thus far CCV: - first, those by which the way is made level CCVI-CCXIV: - then those in which the sum of the doctrine is contained CCXIV-CCLIX: - and finally those by which perverse and absurd opinions are refuted CCLIX-CCLXXV: - a difficulty raised against the universal amplitude of the restored order from the fact that very many infants have always met their last day before the means of reparation could be conferred upon them CCLXXV: - a manifold response and seven hypotheses in all, by which a fact of this kind is not ill reconciled with the thesis which we have demonstrated CCLXXVI-CCLXXIX.

Concerning the principal testimony of the Scriptures in which the doctrine of Tradition set forth concerning the first and second will and universal reparation is contained CCLXXIX: - it is found at I Tim. II. 1-7 CCLXXX: - it is recited and its true reading is established CCLXXX: - by internal and external arguments it is established that this testimony must be regarded as principal CCLXXXI: - the connection by which its clauses cohere is explained CCLXXXII: - the interpretation of the first clause, from which it follows that prayer must be made for the salvation of absolutely all men CCLXXXII-CCLXXXV: - an illustration of the interpretation from a similar saying of Christ CCLXXXV: - concerning the second clause and the bond by which it is joined with the preceding one CCLXXXVI-CCLXXXVIII: - Grotius's opinion concerning the relation between the third clause and the preceding clauses CCLXXXVIII: - it is refuted by suitable arguments CCLXXXVIII-CCXC: - what is intended by the expression, τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ, "of God our Savior," CCXC-CCXCII: - those things which contribute to the exposition of the proposition, ὃς πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι, καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν, "who wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth," are examined CCXCII-CCXCV: - there is added a parallel passage from II Pet. III. 9, CCXCV-CCXCVII: - this is followed by another found at Ezech. XVIII. 23 and XXXIII. 11, CCXCVII: - the origin of the salvific will is disclosed, and its infinite amplitude and singular power are shown CCXCIX: - the same things are confirmed by Paul's words from the Epistle to the Romans II. 4-6, in the same place: - there follows the clause, εἷς γὰρ θεός, εἷς καὶ μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, "for there is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus," which is explained article by article CCC-CCCVI: - the universal scope of the salvific will is established CCCVI: - it is established that its principal origin is nothing other than the merciful love of God the Father through Jesus Christ, the common mediator and intermediary of all CCCVI-CCCVIII: - concerning the final clause, ὁ δοὺς ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, "who gave a ransom for all," CCCVIII: - the force of τοῦ ἀντιλύτρου, "ransom," is defined, in the same place: - and the extension of the words ὑπὲρ πάντων, "for all," is likewise defined CCCIX: - this

extension is shown to be altogether universal both by other names and by the harmony and concord of the Scriptures, in the same place: - that not all are saved cannot be derived from the fact that the faculty of attaining salvation is denied to some, but from the fact that not all make use, as would be fitting, of the faculty divinely received CCCX.

I.

Although the divine will is most simple and of one kind, so that it may more fittingly be called θέλησις than θέλημα, and differs not at all from the very substance of God, as Cyril of Alexandria [1] says, and as Junilius, the African bishop [2], together with Cyril, and the other ecclesiastical writers [3] testify; nevertheless, it has been received by the usage of the Fathers and of absolutely all theologians that, according to the manifold manner in which it can be considered, it may also be distinguished in a manifold way. For those things which are indeed simple, but at the same time of infinite power and excellence, since they are equivalent to many things, likewise present several aspects and, as it were, faces, and are subjected to several notions and divisions.

But among the divisions of the divine will, that one is distinguished above the rest and celebrated in the speech of all by which the divine will is so distributed that one is called first and antecedent, the other second and consequent. I undertake to explain this division; I proceed to define the force inherent in it; I disclose the fountain from which it flows; I demonstrate, by the suffrage of Tradition, the nature and amplitude of the restored order; and, on account of the most intimate kinship of the questions, I propose to inquire into the true and sincere interpretation of the words which Paul writes to Timothy [4].

II.

And as regards the aforesaid distribution, I would have no one placed before John Chrysostom, who both treats of it in many places and most diligently explains absolutely everything that conduces to its right understanding. For, after citing the words of Paul [5], καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς [6] κόσμου,

[1] In *Dialogue* V, p. 554.

[2] *On the Parts of the Divine Law*, book I, chap. XIX.

[3] Petavius relates and examines their testimonies in *On God*, book V, chaps. IV following.

[4] I Tim. II. 1-7.

[5] Ephes. I. 4.

[6] "Excellently," says Chrysostom, "he called constitution καταβολή, ὡς ἀπό τινος ὕψους καταβεβλημένον μεγάλου αὐτὸν δεικνύς, 'showing it (the world) as though cast down from some

εἶναι ἡμᾶς [1] ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ, προορίσας ἡμᾶς, "as he (God) chose us in him (Christ) before the constitution of the world, that we should be (1) holy and immaculate in his sight in charity, who predestined us," he immediately [2] adds:

> Οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ πόνων, οὐδὲ κατορθωμάτων τοῦτο γίνεται, ἀλλ᾽ ἀπὸ ἀγάπης, οὔτε ἀπὸ ἀγάπης μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀρετῆς· εἰ γὰρ δὴ ἀπὸ ἀγάπης μόνης, ἐχρῆν ἅπαντας σωθῆναι· εἰ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀρετῆς πάλιν μόνης, περιττὴ ἡ παρουσία αὐτοῦ, καὶ πάντα τὰ οἰκονομηθέντα, ἀλλ᾽ οὔτε ἀπὸ ἀγάπης μόνης, οὔτε ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀρετῆς, ἀλλ᾽ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων. Ἐξελέξατο γὰρ ἡμᾶς, φησίν. Ὁ δὲ ἐκλεγόμενος, οἶδεν ὅπερ ἐκλέγεται. Ἐν ἀγάπῃ, φησί, προορίσας [3] ἡμᾶς. Οὐδένα γὰρ ἂν ἔσωσεν ἡ ἀρετή, τῆς ἀγάπης μὴ οὔσης· εἰπὲ γάρ μοι, τί Παῦλος ἂν ὠφελήθη, τί δὲ ἂν ἐπεδείξατο, εἰ μὴ καὶ ἄνωθεν αὐτὸν ἐκάλεσε, καὶ ἀγαπήσας εἵλκυσε πρὸς ἑαυτόν; Ἄλλως δὲ, καὶ τὸ τοσούτων ἀξιῶσαι, ἀγάπης ἦν, οὐ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀρετῆς· τὸ γὰρ ἐναρέτους γενέσθαι, καὶ πιστεῦσαι, καὶ προσελθεῖν, καὶ τοῦτο μὲν αὐτοῦ ἦν τοῦ καλέσαντος· πλὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμέτερον· τὸ δὲ προσελθόντας τοσούτων ἀξιῶσαι τιμῶν, ὥστε εὐθέως ἀπὸ ἔχθρας εἰς υἱοθεσίαν ἀγαγεῖν, ὑπερβαλλούσης ὄντως ἀγάπης.
>
> For (predestination) is not obtained by labors and right deeds, but by charity; nor by charity alone, but also by our virtue. For if it were obtained by charity alone, all would have to be saved. But if, again, by our virtue alone, Christ's advent would have been superfluous, and all the things which he accomplished in his economy would have been superfluous. But it is obtained neither by charity alone nor by our virtue alone, but by both. For he chose us, he says; but he who chooses knows what he chooses. In charity, he says, he predestined

great height.' For the height of God is great and cannot be expressed, not in place, but because his nature is raised above, καὶ πολὺ τὸ μέσον κτίσματος καὶ κτιστοῦ, 'and great is the interval between the created thing and the Creator.' " But much more simply, πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, according to the manner of speaking of the Alexandrian interpreters and the Hebrew expression ,מני־קדם is rendered "before the beginnings of the world."

[1] "Lest therefore," writes Chrysostom, "upon hearing that God chose, τὴν πίστιν ἀρκεῖν νομίσῃς μόνον, καὶ τὸν βίον προστίθησι, 'you should think faith alone sufficient, he adds life also'…. Καὶ τὸ ἐκλεγῆναι δὲ, καὶ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίας τεκμήριον, καὶ τῆς αὐτῶν ἀρετῆς. 'Being chosen is also an indication both of the benignity and clemency of God and, at the same time, of the virtue of the men themselves.' "

[2] In the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, homily I, no. 2.

[3] Chrysostom separates the words ἐν ἀγάπῃ from the preceding κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ and joins them to the following προορίσας ἡμᾶς. Theodoret, Theophylact, and Jerome likewise followed this mode of connection, and Bengel, Griesbach, and Koppe approved it.

> us [1]. For virtue would have saved no one unless charity were present. For tell me, what would Paul have profited, and what would he have effected, if he had not called him from above and, having loved him, drawn him to himself? Moreover, that he deemed him worthy of so many things belonged to charity, not to our virtue. For that we became virtuous, believed, and approached was indeed the work of him who called, but also ours. But that, when we had approached, he deemed us worthy of so many honors that he immediately advanced us from enmity to the adoption of sons, is in very truth the work of surpassing charity.

III.

But lest what he had affirmed should seem entangled and obscure to anyone - "εἰ γὰρ δὴ ἀπὸ ἀγάπης μόνης, ἐχρῆν ἅπαντας σωθῆναι, for if the salvation and election of men depended upon divine charity alone, all would have to be saved" - he opens the whole matter when, having advanced to the following words [2] of Paul, ἐν ἀγάπῃ προορίσας ἡμᾶς εἰς υἱοθεσίαν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς αὐτόν, κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, "in charity he predestined us unto the adoption of sons through Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the good pleasure of his will," he adds [3]:

> Κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ. Τουτέστιν, διὰ τὸ σφοδρῶς θελῆσαι· ἡ ἐπιθυμία αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἄν τις εἴποι, αὕτη ἐστί· πανταχοῦ γὰρ εὐδοκία τὸ θέλημά ἐστι τὸ προηγούμενον. Ἔστι γὰρ καὶ ἄλλο θέλημα· οἷον, θέλημα πρῶτον, τὸ μὴ ἀπολέσθαι ἡμαρτηκότας· θέλημα δεύτερον, τὸ γενομένους κακοὺς ἀπολέσθαι· οὐ γὰρ δὴ ἀνάγκη αὐτοὺς κολάζει, ἀλλὰ θέλημα. Τοιοῦτον καὶ ἐπὶ Παύλου ἔστιν ἰδεῖν, οἷον ὡς ὅταν λέγῃ· θέλω πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι, ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτόν. Καὶ πάλιν, θέλω νεωτέρας γαμεῖν, τεκνογονεῖν. Εὐδοκίαν οὖν τὸ πρῶτον θέλημα φησί, τὸ σφοδρὸν θέλημα, τὸ μετ᾽ ἐπιθυμίας θέλημα, τὸ πεῖσμα. Οὐ γὰρ παραιτήσομαι καὶ κοινοτέρᾳ λέξει χρήσασθαι σαφηνείας ἕνεκεν τῶν ἀφελεστέρων. Οὕτω γὰρ καὶ ἡμεῖς τὴν ἐπίτασιν τοῦ θελήματος δηλοῦντες, κατὰ τὸ πεῖσμα ἡμῶν λέγομεν. Ὃ οὖν λέγει, τοῦτό ἐστι· σφόδρα ἐφίεται, σφόδρα ἐπιθυμεῖ τῆς σωτηρίας τῆς ἡμετέρας. Τίνος οὖν ἕνεκεν οὕτως ἡμᾶς ἀγαπᾷ, καὶ πόθεν οὕτω φιλεῖ; Ἀπὸ

[1] One of the Coislinian codices has προορίσας ἡμᾶς. καλῶς· οὐδένα γὰρ κ.τ.λ., a reading which Montfaucon judges ought by no means to be disdained.

[2] Ephes. I. 5.

[3] In the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, homily I, no. 2.

ἀγαθότητος μόνης· ἡ γὰρ χάρις ἀγαθότητός ἐστι. Διὰ τοῦτο, φησίν, εἰς υἱοθεσίαν ἡμᾶς προώρισε θέλων, καὶ σφόδρα τοῦτο βουλόμενος, ἵνα ἡ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ δόξα δειχθῇ.

According to the good pleasure [1] of his will. That is, because he wills it greatly. This, so to speak, is his desire [2]. For everywhere εὐδοκία [3] - for Paul employs this word here - is the principal will and that which precedes; for there is also another will. For example, the first will is that those who have sinned should not perish; the second will is that those who have become evil should perish. For it is not necessity, but will, that punishes them. Such a thing can also be seen in Paul, as when he says [1], "I will all men to be as I myself am." And again [2], "I will younger women to marry and to beget children." Therefore he calls the first will εὐδοκία: the vehement will, the will that is accompanied by desire, the will that consists in a firm purpose. For I will not refuse to employ a more common expression, so that the matter may be clearer to the more simple. For thus do we also say, when indicating the intensity of the will, κατὰ τὸ πεῖσμα ἡμῶν, "according to our persuasion" [3]. This, therefore, is

[1] For illustrating the meaning of εὐδοκία, the following words from the *Etymologicum Magnum* contribute: εὐδοκία· ἡ ἀρίστη καὶ καλλίστη τοῦ Θεοῦ ἑκούσιος θέλησις, "εὐδοκία: the best and most beautiful voluntary will of God"; likewise these words of Phavorinus: εὐδοκία· τὸ ἐπ᾽ ἀγαθοποιΐᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ θέλημα παρὰ τὸ καλῶς δεδοχθαι, "εὐδοκία: the will of God directed toward doing good, from its having been well resolved"; he soon adds: εὐδοκίαν τὴν ἐπ᾽ εὐεργεσίᾳ βούλησιν ἔθος τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ καλεῖν, "Divine Scripture is accustomed to call the will directed toward beneficence εὐδοκία." Suidas agrees, writing in his *Lexicon*: Εὐδοκία· τὸ ἀγαθὸν θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς ὅπλῳ εὐδοκίας ἐστεφάνωσας ἡμᾶς. καὶ ὁ Ἀπόστολος· κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ. "Εὐδοκία: the good will of God. You (Ps. V. 15) have crowned us as with the shield of your benevolence. And the Apostle (Ephes. I. 5): according to the good pleasure of his will." If you desire more, consult Budaeus under this word; he also observes that Jerome thought εὐδοκία to be a new word devised by the Alexandrian interpreters.

[2] Although, from the definition of the Stoics, as may be seen in Suidas and Budaeus, there is this difference between βούλησις and ἐπιθυμία: βούλησις is called εὔλογος ὄρεξις, "rational appetite," whereas ἐπιθυμία is ὄρεξις ἄλογος, "irrational appetite"; nevertheless, it has been received in usage that any desire and any will, even if most honorable and especially conformed to the prescription of reason, is called ἐπιθυμία. Whence Phavorinus says, ἐπιθυμίᾳ δηλοῦσιν ὁρμὴν ψυχῆς καὶ κίνησιν ἐπί τι, "by ἐπιθυμία they signify an impulse and motion of the soul toward something."

[3] Appositely Theodoret, in his commentary on this passage, says: Εὐδοκίαν γὰρ τὴν ἐπ᾽ εὐεργεσίᾳ βούλησιν ἔθος τῇ θείᾳ καλεῖν γραφῇ. "For it is the custom of Divine Scripture to call the will proceeding from beneficence εὐδοκία." He immediately confirms this with examples.

[1] I Cor. VII. 7.

[2] I Tim. III. 14.

[3] Stephanus treats of the derivation of this word and of its power of signification in the *Thesaurus* under the word πείθομαι. Isaac Habert also treats of it in book II of *The Theology of the Greek Fathers on Grace*, chap. VIII, § III, saying: "It is certain that the word πεῖσμα is taken for a vehement and firm persuasion and purpose; in this sense it is also employed among the Fathers, as by Clement of

> what he means: he earnestly wishes and earnestly desires our salvation. Why, then, does he love us thus? Whence does he cherish us thus? This proceeds from goodness alone. For grace is from goodness. Therefore, he says, he predestined us unto the adoption of sons, willing it, and willing it exceedingly, so that the glory of his grace might be manifested.

IV.

Chrysostom, indeed, so divides the most simple will of God that one is and is called θέλημα πρῶτον, the first will, while the other is θέλημα δεύτερον, the second will. He then declares in three ways altogether what sort of will the first will is: first, when he teaches that it is referred to the will which in the Scriptures is called εὐδοκία; then, when by circumlocutions and accumulated appositions he demonstrates its force and nature; and finally, when he discloses and lays open its origin and native fountain.

And in the clearest words he hands down that it is referred to the will which is customarily called εὐδοκία in the Scriptures, saying: πανταχοῦ εὐδοκία τὸ θέλημά ἐστι τὸ προηγούμενον, "everywhere in the Scriptures εὐδοκία is the principal will and that which precedes." And again he hands this down, adding: εὐδοκίαν οὖν τὸ πρῶτον θέλημα φησί, "therefore he (Paul) calls the first will good pleasure." But εὐδοκία is not the sign and shadow of a will, but a true and intimate will and, as the School says, a formal will, and the sincere and benign inclination of the mind. Such, therefore, is also τὸ πρῶτον καὶ προηγούμενον θέλημα, the first and antecedent will; nor can it be understood either of a sign of the will or of a metaphorical will [1], without most shamefully perverting the words of Chrysostom.

V.

This appears much more splendidly from the circumlocutions employed by him and the appositions by which he explains and illustrates τὸ πρῶτον θέλημα, the first will. For what is τὸ πρῶτον θέλημα, the first will, according to him? Namely, I. it is εὐδοκία, a benign and inclined will; ἡ ἀρίστη καὶ καλλίστη τοῦ Θεοῦ

Alexandria, who for this reason calls it βεβαιότατον πεῖσμα, 'the most steadfast persuasion,' in the seventh book of the *Stromata*. In his *Protrepticus* that universal and antecedent will by which God wills all men to be saved is also called τὸ προκείμενον, as though you were to say, 'the will lying before.' "

[1] This is done not only by Calvinists and Jansenists, but is also attempted by not a few of those who favor more severe doctrines concerning the amplitude of the divine reparative providence.

ἑκούσιος θέλησις, "the best and most beautiful will of God, prompted not from without"; τὸ ἀγαθὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ θέλημα, "the good will of God" [2]; πολλὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ περὶ ἡμᾶς φιλοστοργία τε καὶ ἀγάπη, "the greatest paternal affection and love of God toward us" [3]; and likewise ἐπ᾽ εὐεργεσίᾳ βούλησις, "a will arisen from the intention of doing good" [4]. These are so many circumlocutions of τῆς εὐδοκίας, most frequent among ecclesiastical writers.

It is II. θέλημα προηγούμενον, the will which precedes in the order of origin [5], which of itself occupies the very mind of God and spontaneously springs forth from him of whom John [1] writes, ὁ Θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστί, "God is charity."

It is III. τὸ σφοδρὸν θέλημα, not a remiss but an intense and inflamed will; τὸ μετ᾽ ἐπιθυμίας θέλημα, a desirous will joined with the desire of doing good; ἡ ἐπιθυμία Θεοῦ, the very desire of God; and finally τὸ πεῖσμα, the most firm determination of mind.

But there is no one who does not understand and, as it were, perceive with his own eyes that by these expressions there is set forth not a sign and a feigned appearance of a will, but a true and interior will; not a sluggish and inert will, but one especially solicitous and efficacious [2]; not a will sterile in effects and works, but fruitful, as being the germ of a love which [3] cannot lie idle in the mind of one who loves.

---

[2]These are the words of Theodoret on Ps. V.

[3]By these words Theodoret continues in the same place to explain the force and rationale of τῆς εὐδοκίας.

[4]This is the description of Oecumenius in his commentary on this passage.

[5]Isaac Habert, Bishop of Vabres, writes concerning Chrysostom's circumlocution, by which he interprets εὐδοκίαν as τὸ προηγούμενον θέλημα, in book II of *The Theology of the Greek Fathers on Grace*, chap. VIII, § III: "It is called τὸ προηγούμενον θέλημα, that is, either the antecedent or even the excellent, principal, or preeminent will, in this sense: because it is the first act of the will which is conceived in God with respect to the creatures whom he decrees to create, not for destruction - for God did not make death, Wis. I - but for salvation. It is also called by Chrysostom the principal will because it regards the good insofar as it is good absolutely and simply, without any circumstances determining it. And as for what he adds, that πρῶτον θέλημα σφοδρότερον, that first will, is more vehement, it is true in this sense: because that first or antecedent volition occupies the divine will, as it were, first of itself, and applies it to willing the good of the creature; then, because it is most agreeable to the divine goodness and more nearly attains its εὐεργετικήν, beneficent, nature, as Dionysius discusses at length in chap. IV of *The Divine Names*, and Chrysostom at chap. II of the *Epistle to the Romans*. Nevertheless, in another sense the second or consequent will can be called σφοδροτέρα, more vehement, by reason of the absolute decree and final efficacy."

[1]I John IV. 8-16.

[2]I call it efficacious not in the meaning received in the Schools, but in that meaning which alone obtains among Latin writers, by which that is called efficacious which has power for acting and which effects much. In this meaning Pliny mentions an herb most efficacious against poisons; Seneca, a reason efficacious for repressing by shame the depraved desires of men; and Horace, Hercules efficacious.

[3]For what Augustine affirms in the *Tractate on Psalm CXXI* is undoubted: "Every love has its own force, nor can love lie idle in the soul of the one who loves."

VI.

And very opportunely indeed have we recalled the divine love toward men, which Chrysostom confirms once and again to be the origin and native fountain of the first and antecedent will. He certainly confirms it when he writes that θέλημα πρῶτον καὶ εὐδοκίαν is the very desire of God, saying: ἡ ἐπιθυμία αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἄν τις εἴποι, αὕτη ἐστί, "this, as one might say, is his desire." He confirms it both when he teaches that θέλημα πρῶτον is the same as σφόδρα ἐφίεται, σφόδρα ἐπιθυμεῖ τῆς σωτηρίας τῆς ἡμετέρας, "God earnestly wishes, earnestly desires our salvation," and when he immediately adds: τίνος οὖν ἕνεκεν οὕτως ἡμᾶς ἀγαπᾷ, καὶ πόθεν οὕτω φιλεῖ; ἀπὸ ἀγαθότητος μόνης, "for what reason, then, does he love us thus? Why does he cherish us thus? Moved by goodness alone." For nothing is more evident than that the cause of the first and antecedent will is shown to be situated in God's love and benevolence, while the origin and principle of love and of the divine benevolence toward men is derived from the goodness of God alone.

For because God is good and is goodness itself [1], because, as Cyril of Alexandria [2] says, he is ἡμερότητος πηγὴ καὶ γένεσις, "the fountain and origin of benignity," he therefore has mercy upon all [3], loves all things that are, hates nothing of the things which he has made, spares all because all things are his, and is himself φιλόψυχος καὶ φιλάνθρωπος, "a lover of souls and a lover of men." Whence the Scriptures attribute to him [4] σπλάγχνα ἐλέους, "the bowels of mercy"; call him [5] τὸν πατέρα τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν καὶ Θεὸν πάσης παρακλήσεως, "the Father of mercies and the God of all consolation"; teach that his nature [6] is ἀγάπην, charity itself; and testify that τὸν κόσμον, the totality of men, is most sincerely loved by him [7].

VII.

With these things explained as was fitting, it will not be difficult to recount in a certain compendium the interior attributes and properties of the first and antecedent will. It is, namely, a true and sincere will, intimate to God, sponta-

[1] Hence it was customary among the ancient philosophers no less than among theologians to call God, in an eminent and proper sense, τἀγαθόν, "the Good," as Petavius shows at length in *On God*, book VI, chap. I.

[2] In the commentary on Hosea II. 8-9.

[3] Wis. XI. 24-27.

[4] Zach. I. 78.

[5] II Cor. I. 3.

[6] I John IV. 8.

[7] John III. 16, compared with Rom. V. 8.

neously blossoming from the divine goodness itself, full of benignity and desirous love, and therefore efficacious and profuse in doing good.

But with these there is joined another and most noble property, which pertains to knowing the amplitude of the first will and shows that there is no man who is excluded from its scope and whom it does not embrace and cherish in its bosom and lap. Concerning this amplitude and extension, restricted by no limits, Chrysostom is a witness, saying: θέλημα πρῶτον, τὸ μὴ ἀπολέσθαι ἡμαρτηκότας, "the first will is that those who have sinned should not perish." Which ones? Or how many? All without limit who have sinned.

He is a witness when he interprets the apostolic phrase, κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, "according to the good pleasure of his will," as: σφόδρα ἐφίεται, σφόδρα ἐπιθυμεῖ τῆς σωτηρίας τῆς ἡμετέρας, "he earnestly wishes, he earnestly desires our salvation." For the pronoun "our," which he employs, is indefinite; it extends to all men, and there is none among them who is not signified.

Oecumenius observed this and, moreover, wrote according to the mind and opinion of Chrysostom [1]:

> Ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἐποίησεν εἰς ἡμᾶς, δι᾽ ἄλλο μὲν οὐδέν, πλὴν ὅτι ἠβουλήθη καὶ σφόδρα ἐπεθύμησε χάριτι σῶσαι τοὺς ἐπὶ γῆς, πρὸς τὸ ἐκ τούτου ἐπαινεῖσθαι καὶ δοξάζεσθαι τὴν ἁγίαν αὐτοῦ δόξαν τῆς χάριτος.
>
> He performed all these things toward us for no other reason than that he willed and earnestly desired to save by grace those who are upon the earth, so that from this the holy glory of his grace might be praised and glorified.

Those, namely, who are expressed by the pronouns "us" and "our" are the same whom Oecumenius calls τοὺς ἐπὶ γῆς, "those who are upon the earth." But who from the whole human race is not comprehended within the scope of this phrase? The first and principal will of God is therefore universal.

I know not whether this can be demonstrated more evidently by any other argument than by disclosing its origin. For whence does it flow and arise? From nowhere other than ἀπὸ ἀγαθότητος μόνης, "from goodness alone." But God is of himself good, not to these or those, but to all and each; this we both understand by reason and are taught by the authority of the Scriptures, in which we read [1]: יהוה טוב לכל, χρηστὸς Κύριος τοῖς σύμπασι, "the Lord is good to all." Concerning these words Chrysostom asks [2], τί ἐστι τοῖς σύμπασι; "What does that expression 'to all' mean?" And he replies: καὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτωλοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἐν παρανομίαις

[1] In the commentary on Ephes. I. 5.

[1] Ps. CXLIV. 9.

[2] In the commentary on Ps. CXLIV. 9.

ζῶσιν, οὐχὶ τῷ Ἄβελ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ Κάϊν· πάντα γὰρ ἀπὸ φιλανθρωπίας ἔργα, "both to sinners and to those living in iniquity, not only to Abel but also to Cain; for all his works proceed from the love by which he is borne toward men." Therefore he did not hesitate in any way to affirm that, if election and salvation depended ἀπὸ ἀγάπης μόνης, "upon the charity of God alone," ἐχρῆν ἅπαντας σωθῆναι, "it would be necessary that absolutely all be saved."

VIII.

The inherent attributes and properties of the first and principal will are therefore these: I. that in scope and amplitude it is universal; and II. that in character and nature it is interior, sincere, fruitful, and efficacious, just as the love from which it spontaneously flows is efficacious [3], and as the divine φιλανθρωπία, which Paul [1] extols and by which God, best and greatest, pursues the whole human race, is efficacious.

When these things have been perceived, both the distinction of the first will from the second and the attributes and properties of the latter are deduced without difficulty. For the relation which exists between the two wills clearly demonstrates: I. that τὸ θέλημα δεύτερον, the second will, whether it be that by which God bestows a reward or that by which he inflicts punishments, is particular in extension and amplitude, and is circumscribed either to those who have satisfied the conditions of the divine covenant or to those who have violated them even unto impenitence; and II. that in character and nature it is not inherent in God and arisen spontaneously from him, but is, as it were, adventitious and provoked either by the crimes and wickedness of men or by their merits and good works. Wherefore we understand that this difference exists between the two wills:

[3] God's benevolent affection toward men and benign will is more than once signified in the divine writings by the name of love, as may be seen at John III. 16; Rom. V. 8; and Ephes. II. 4-5. This very love, whose immense force Paul sketches when at Ephes. III. 13 he advises them to look upon its τὸ πλάτος, καὶ μῆκος, καὶ βάθος, καὶ ὕψος, "breadth and length and depth and height," is distinguished by various and diverse appellations according to the manifold manner in which it can be regarded. At Ephes. I. 6 it is called χάρις, grace, because it is borne toward men in whom there is no merit and no worthiness of love; hence both the formula by which at Ephes. II. 7 ὑπερβάλλων πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος, "the surpassing riches of grace," is earnestly commended, and that other formula by which at Rom. IV. 4-5 and XI. 6 grace and debt are opposed. At Ephes. II. 7, compared with Tit. III. 5, it is called χρηστότης, benignity, because it heaps benefits upon men. At Tit. III. 4 it is called φιλανθρωπία, humanity, because with extraordinary zeal it imparts to men the things which are useful and pleasing to them. At Rom. II. 4, compared with II Pet. III. 15, it is called ἀνοχὴ καὶ μακροθυμία, patience and longanimity, because it sustains wicked men and postpones punishments. Finally, it is called ἔλεος, mercy, because it restores and cherishes men overwhelmed by a certain immense mass of miseries; whence God is called at Ephes. II. 4 πλούσιος ἐν ἐλέει, "rich in mercy," and at Luke I. 78 τὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους Θεοῦ, "the bowels of the mercy of God," are celebrated.

[1] Tit. III. 4.

a) θέλημα πρῶτον, the first will, is and is called ἀπὸ ἀγαθότητος μόνης, "a will proceeding from goodness alone," and requires from men no condition of merit and worthiness; but the second will, θέλημα δεύτερον, is and is called the will of justice and is referred separately to those who either [2], τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ, "holding the truth in injustice," render themselves ἀναπολογήτους, "inexcusable," or, the faith having been holily kept [3], are worthy of having the crown of glory repaid to them;
b) θέλημα πρῶτον, the first will, since it is the germ and fruit of goodness alone, is universal and extends to all men whatsoever; but θέλημα δεύτερον, the second will, since it is commanded by justice, is particular and regards each according to his own merit, namely, those who have either despised the gifts of the first will or complied with them;
c) θέλημα πρῶτον, the first will, is self-consistent, of one color, and solely intent upon doing good; but θέλημα δεύτερον, the second will, is various, lies open in two directions, and no less distributes rewards than inflicts punishments;
d) finally, θέλημα πρῶτον, the first will, tends to this: that it may nourish the hope of men and restore their spirits; but θέλημα δεύτερον, the second will, pertains to this [1]: that each one, with God going before, may work out his salvation μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου, "with fear and trembling."

IX.

Chrysostom elsewhere also hands down and confirms these heads of doctrine, by which both the twofold will of God is distinguished and the force and rationale of each is laid open, if not with greater fullness of explanation, certainly with no less perspicuity. For, expounding the words which are found in the Psalms [2] and are repeated by Paul [3], *Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not*; *If thou hadst willed sacrifice, I would surely have given it*, he infers [4]: ἄρα οὖν οὐχ αἱ θυσίαι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ᾽ ἡ τῶν θυσιῶν ἀναίρεσις, "therefore the sacrifices are not the will of God, but the abolition of the sacrifices"; and he joins the inference with these words: *For who required these* (sacrifices) *from your hands?* Then he objects to himself: πῶς οὖν αὐτὸς ἐπέταξε; "How, then, did he himself command them?" And he replies:

[2] Rom. I. 18-20.
[3] II Tim. IV. 8.
[1] Phil. II. 12.
[2] Ps. XXXIX, compared with Ps. L. 17.
[3] Heb. X. 5 ff.
[4] In the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, Homily XVIII, no. 1.

συγκαταβαίνων, ὥσπερ ὁ Παῦλος φαίνεται λέγων, θέλω πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτὸν ἐν ἐγκρατείᾳ· καὶ πάλιν παραινῶν ἀλλαχοῦ φησί, βούλομαι νεωτέρας γαμεῖν, τεκνογονεῖν· δύο θελήματα τίθησιν, ἀλλ᾽ οὐ τὰ δύο αὐτοῦ ἐστίν, εἰ καὶ ἐπιτάττει· ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν αὐτοῦ, διὸ καὶ χωρὶς αἰτίας τίθησιν, ἐκεῖνο δὲ οὐκ αὐτοῦ, εἰ καὶ βούλεται, διὸ καὶ μετὰ αἰτίας πρόσκειται· πρότερον γὰρ κατηγορήσας αὐτῶν, ὅτι κατεστρηνίασαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τότε φησί, βούλομαι νεωτέρας γαμεῖν, τεκνογονεῖν· οὕτω
δὴ καὶ ἐνταῦθα συγκαταβαίνων οἰκονομεῖ· οὐκ αὐτοῦ θέλημα ἦν προηγούμενον τὸ τὰς θυσίας γίνεσθαι· οὕτω καὶ περὶ τοῦ θανάτου λέγων, οὐ βούλομαι τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ, ὡς τὸ ἐπιστρέψαι αὐτὸν καὶ ζῆν αὐτόν· καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ λέγει, ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἠβουλήθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπεθύμησε τοῦτο· καίτοιγε ἐναντία ταῦτα ἀλλήλοις· ἐπιθυμία γὰρ ἐπιτεταμένη ἡ βούλησίς ἐστι· πῶς οὖν οὐ θέλων, ἀλλαχοῦ ἐπιθυμεῖς, ὃ τοῦ σφόδρα θέλειν ἐστὶ σημεῖον; τοῦτο δὴ καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν,

accommodating himself to them and lowering himself to their circumstances. As Paul says [1], "I will that all men be continent like myself." And again he says [2], "I will the younger women to marry, to bear children." He sets down two wills, but both are not his, even if he commands; the former indeed is his, and therefore he sets it down with no cause adduced, whereas the latter is not his, even if he wills it, and therefore it is proposed not without an added cause. For when he had first accused them because they had grown wanton against Christ, he then added, "I will the younger women to marry, to bear children." In no other manner does God here administer the matter, accommodating and indulging. It was not his principal [3] will that sacrifices should be made. Thus also concerning death [4] he says, "I will not the death of the sinner, but that he return to his senses and live." And in another place [5] he says that he not only willed this, but even desired it, although these things seem mutually opposed.

[1] I Cor. VII. 7.

[2] I Tim. V. 14.

[3] Mutianus, the ancient translator, renders the words of Chrysostom, οὐκ αὐτοῦ θέλημα ἦν προηγούμενον, in Latin: "It was not his antecedent will."

[4] Ezek. XXXIII. 11, and by no means, as it stands in Montfaucon, Ezek. XXVIII. 23. While he thus interprets the words of Chrysostom: "Just as he also says that he does not will the death of the sinner, but that he himself be converted and live. But elsewhere he says that he not only willed, but also desired: although these things are contrary; for desire is an intense will. How, therefore, not willing, do you elsewhere desire, which indeed is a sign that you will greatly? Thus here also"; he neither consults perspicuity nor, as would be fitting, preserves the force of the sentences.

[5] Montfaucon judges that he has regard to the things which are read at Ezek. XVIII.

> For desire is an intense will. How, therefore, do you elsewhere desire that which you do not will, a thing which is an indication of vehement will? This, however, is what must be repeated here also.

Namely, God did not will sacrifices by that will which Christ [1] signified when he said, ἰδοὺ ἥκω τοῦ ποιῆσαι, ὁ Θεός, τὸ θέλημά σου, "Behold, I come, O God, to do thy will."

X.

In this truly excellent testimony of Chrysostom, and one most apt for elucidating the question which we are treating, two or three matters worthy above the rest of consideration occur. And first of all this: that the twofold will of God is fittingly distinguished and so marked by its proper names that the one is called ἁπλῶς, simply, θέλημα αὐτοῦ, his will, θέλημα προηγούμενον, the principal and antecedent will, and θέλημα χωρὶς αἰτίας, a will which takes neither its cause nor its occasion from without; but the other is called a will κατά τι, in a certain respect, and therefore θέλημα οὐκ αὐτοῦ, a will which is not his, θέλημα κατὰ συγκατάβασιν, a will proceeding from condescension [2] and lowering, and θέλημα μετὰ αἰτίας, a will with a cause, which God does not have except on the occasion of those things which men do.

Then this: that between each will there exists that relation, and that σχέσιν, which existed between the will of God commanding bloody sacrifices of animals for the Israelites [3] and the will of Paul exhorting the younger women to marry, and between the will of the same God by which he willed the sacrifice of the immaculate Lamb, Christ Jesus, and the will of the same Paul which he signified when he said: "I will that all men be continent like myself."

Finally this: that the decree by which God decreed τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ, "the death of the sinner," pertains to the will which is called such in a certain respect, which is the will κατὰ συγκατάβασιν, from condescension,

[1] Heb. X. 9.

[2] The word συγκατάβασις is very frequent among ecclesiastical writers and properly signifies, according to Theodore Gaza as translator, condescension, a lowering, by which one who is superior and more sublime, stronger and more robust, accommodates and adapts himself to the manners, sense, and capacity of those who are inferior and weaker. One may read with profit what Rittershusius, on letter LXVIII of book IV of Isidore of Pelusium, and Suicer, in the *Thesaurus* at the words συγκαταβαίνω, συγκατάβασις, advise concerning the same matter.

[3] What sort of will that was by which God commanded bloody sacrifices for the Israelites Chrysostom explains somewhat more copiously in the first homily *Against the Jews*, the eighteenth homily *On Genesis*, and on Ps. XLIX, saying: Θεὸς καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀλόγων ἀποστῆναι σφαγῆς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους κατὰ μικρὸν ἐθέλων, ἐχρήσατο τῇ συγκαταβάσει ταύτῃ, καὶ συνεχώρησε θυσίας, ἵνα ἀνέλῃ θυσίας, "when God willed gradually to turn the Jews away from the slaughtering of brute animals, he employed this condescension and permitted sacrifices in order that he might take away sacrifices."

the will μετὰ αἰτίας, with a cause; and therefore, as a consequence, that to the will which is called θέλημα αὐτοῦ, his own will, κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν, by excellence, which is θέλημα προηγούμενον, the antecedent will, θέλημα χωρὶς αἰτίας, the will without a cause, there pertains that εὐδοκίαν, benevolence and implanted benignity, by which he wills that the sinner return to better conduct and live.

XI.

These things, moreover, agree excellently both with what precedes [1] and with those things which Chrysostom [3] notes concerning the words [2] of the Psalm, μεγάλα τὰ ἔργα Κυρίου, ἐξεζητημένα εἰς πάντα τὰ θελήματα αὐτοῦ, "great are the works of the Lord, sought out according to all his wills," when he writes:

> What, then, is ἐξεζητημένα εἰς πάντα τὰ θελήματα αὐτοῦ, "sought out according to all his wills"? ἠκριβωμένα φησί, καθάπερ καὶ ἕτερος ἑρμηνευτὴς εἶπε, παρασκευασμένα, ἀπηρτισμένα, γεγενημένα, πεπληρωμένα, ἀρκοῦντα τὰ θελήματα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, ἱκανὰ μαρτυρεῖν τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ, οὐ χωλεύοντα, οὐδὲ ἐνδεῶς ἔχοντα εἰς τὸ ἀνύσαι αὐτοῦ τὰ ἐπιτάγματα, "accurate," he says, "as also another interpreter [4] says; prepared, perfected, completed, fulfilled, fitted to do his wills, sufficient to testify to his power, neither limping nor defective for accomplishing his commands."

And, a few words having intervened:

> "Sought out according to all his wills." Εἰς τὰ προστάγματα αὐτοῦ, φησίν, εἰς τὰ ἐπιτάγματα αὐτοῦ, οὐ μόνον δὲ εἰς τὰ ἐπιτάγματα αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὸ γινώσκεσθαι αὐτὸν παρὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅπερ καὶ προηγούμενον αὐτοῦ θέλημα, καὶ διὸ μάλιστα ταῦτα ἐποίησεν, "to his precepts," he says, "to his commands: they are sought out not only for his precepts, but also that he may be known [1] by men, which indeed is his principal will and on account of which he chiefly made these things."

Therefore, what the prophet says is of this sort: so perfect are the works of God that, for those who attend and understand, ἀκριβεστάτην καὶ σαφῆ καὶ τρανοτάτην τὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ γνῶσιν ἐντιθέναι τῇ διανοίᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, "they bring the most accurate, most open, and most evident knowledge of him to the

[1] §§ 2 ff.

[3] *Exposition on Ps. CX*, no. 2.

[2] Ps. CX. 2.

[4] Cf. the scholia of Nobilius.

[1] Hence that saying of Paul at Rom. I. 19: διότι τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς· ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς αὐτοῖς ἐφανέρωσε.

mind of men." Καὶ γὰρ καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο μάλιστα τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ἐξ ἀρχῆς αὐτὰ κατεσκεύασε, "for on account of this will above all he constituted them from the beginning" [2], that by magnitude, beauty, . . . , and all other things he might move the soul of the beholder and rouse his mind and understanding to seek God, the maker and most excellent artificer, and to adore him who made them, καὶ ἀντὶ βιβλίων καὶ γραμμάτων γενέσθαι ἅπαν τὸ σῶμα τῆς κτίσεως, "and that the universe of creatures might be to him [3] in the place of books and letters."

There is, therefore, in God a twofold will toward the human race, θέλημα προηγούμενον καὶ θέλημα δεύτερον, the antecedent will and the second and consequent will, the first of which Chrysostom mentions in express words, while he merely indicates the other. Moreover, of θελήματος προηγουμένου, the antecedent will, four endowments and properties above the rest must both be considered in the mind and diligently weighed.

For, according to Chrysostom, θέλημα προηγούμενον, the antecedent will, is I. universal in amplitude and embraces all men. For on account of this will μάλιστα, chiefly, he ordered ἅπαν τὸ σῶμα τῆς κτίσεως, the whole system of creatures, not that one or another, but that all who possess senses and reason might be stirred to seek and adore God, the maker and most excellent artificer.

It is II. coeval with men themselves, so that even in those times which Scripture [1] calls τοὺς χρόνους τῆς ἀγνοίας, "the times of ignorance," God neither suffered himself [2] to be ἀμάρτυρον, without testimony, nor in any way neglected the solicitous care of men by which he might show himself Best and Greatest.

---

[2]What Chrysostom writes, ἐξ ἀρχῆς, may be regarded as a commentary upon these words of Paul at Rom. I. 20: ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου, "from the very creation of the world."

[3]Twin to these are the things which he writes in Homily V on I Corinthians: ἔδωκεν ἀντὶ βίβλου τὸν κόσμον, "God gave the world to men in place of a book." To the same point pertain the things which each Gregory, of Nyssa and of Nazianzus, teaches: the former, when in Oration II on the words *Let us make man* he calls the world βιβλίον ἔγγραφον, "an inscribed book"; the latter, when in Oration XLIII he calls the same world a great and admirable τῆς μεγαλειότητος τοῦ Θεοῦ, "herald of the divine majesty."

[1]Acts XVII. 30, compared with Wis. XIV. 22, where ἄγνοια is placed ἐν τῷ πλανᾶσθαι περὶ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ γνῶσιν, "in erring concerning the knowledge of God."

[2]This word is ἅπαξ λεγομένη, "used once," in the New Testament and occurs at Acts XIV. 17. Now the other Fathers speak in the same manner as Chrysostom, and even those who contended for Catholic doctrine against the Pelagians and Semipelagians. Outstanding on this matter, and on the aid prepared for all through the universe of things, are the testimonies of Augustine in book X of the *Confessions*, chap. VI, and in Bede's commentary on Rom. I; likewise those of Prosper in the book *Against the Conferencer*, chap. XIV, and of the author of the books *On the Calling of All Nations*, book II, chaps. IV-V and XXV. But no one ought to be troubled because aid of this kind seems only external. For the Fathers were always persuaded that internal aids of God calling and drawing are connected no less with the external and supernatural revelation of the Gospel preached than with the external and natural revelation which shines forth in the book of creatures. Joseph Tricassinus demonstrates the truth of this theorem at greater length in the work of the highest value, *On Grace Necessary for Salvation Given to All and Each*, part II, section II, § III.

For πρὸς τοῦτο μάλιστα τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ἐξ ἀρχῆς αὐτὰ κατεσκεύασε, "on account of this will above all he constituted from the beginning" those things which would lead men to him.

It is III. active and fruitful in works and gifts, since, stirred by this will, God so ordered ἅπαν τὸ σῶμα τῆς κτίσεως, the universe of things, that it might be ἀντὶ βιβλίων καὶ γραμμάτων, in place of books and letters, for men.

Finally, it is IV. of such a kind that by its gifts and munificence it indeed calls men, aids them, and converts them to God himself, but not in such a way as to take away from them the power and capacity by which they can both spurn the benevolence of the Creator and the benignity of the Savior. Namely, it is not free from every condition, but embraces this condition: that it procure life and salvation for men, provided, however, that men neither fail themselves nor, carried aside by the vanity of their thoughts [1], neglect the duties to be rendered to the God whom they have known, or change τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου Θεοῦ, "the glory of the incorruptible God," ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνος φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου, "into the likeness of an image of corruptible man."

XII.

This last head of doctrine, supremely necessary for holding, as is needful, the genuine and sincere rationale of the antecedent will, Chrysostom explains nowhere else more splendidly and evidently than when, concerning these words [2] of John, ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, "it was the true light, which illuminates every man coming into this world," he writes [3]:

> If it illuminates every man coming into this world, πῶς ἀφώτιστοι μεμενήκασι τοσοῦτοι, "how do so many men remain unilluminated?" For not all recognize the religion of Christ; πῶς οὖν φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον, "how, therefore, does it illuminate every man?" Τό γε εἰς αὐτὸν ἦκον, "as much as lies in him." But if any, of their own accord closing the eyes of the mind, are unwilling to receive the rays of this light, οὐ παρὰ τὴν τοῦ φωτὸς φύσιν ἡ σκότωσις ἐκείνοις, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὴν κακουργίαν τῶν ἑκόντι ἀποστερούντων ἑαυτοὺς τῆς δωρεᾶς, "it does not come from the nature of the light that they remain in darkness, but from the wickedness of those who voluntarily deprive themselves of this gift." For grace has been poured out εἰς πάντας, "upon all"; it turns away neither Jew, nor

[1] Rom. I. 21-24.
[2] John I. 9.
[3] In John, Homily VIII, otherwise VII, no. 1.

> Greek, nor barbarian, nor Scythian, nor free man, nor slave, nor man, nor woman, nor youth; πάντας δὲ ὁμοίως προσιεμένη καὶ μετὰ τῆς ἴσης καλοῦσα τιμῆς, "but it similarly admits all and calls them with equal honor."

But those who do not will to enjoy this gift ought to ascribe this blindness to themselves. For when the entrance lies open to all and is barred by no one, ἐθελοκακοῦντές τινες ἔξω μένωσι, παρ᾽ οὐδένα ἕτερον, ἀλλ᾽ ἢ παρὰ τὴν οἰκείαν πονηρίαν ἀπόλλυνται μόνον, "some remain outside through voluntary wickedness; they perish from no other cause, but solely through their own vice."

XIII.

But lest any suspect that these things are said too ambitiously, and that the amplitude of the divine φιλανθρωπία, benignity toward men, is not in fact judged by Chrysostom to be so great that it extends to all and each, let them first hear the same Chrysostom [1] speaking thus concerning the most ruined people of the Jews:

> When Paul says [2], "whose are the adoption and the glory and the giving of the law and the worship and the promises," οὐδὲν ἄλλο φησίν, ἢ ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς μὲν αὐτοὺς ἐβούλετο σωθῆναι, he says nothing else than that God willed to save them, and that he declared this through those things which he had previously done, from the fact that Christ arose from them, and through those things which he promised to the fathers; αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐξ οἰκείας ἀγνωμοσύνης ἀπεκρούσαντο τὴν εὐεργεσίαν, but they, from their own ungrateful disposition, repelled the benefit. Therefore Paul recounts only those things which are proofs of the gifts of God, not encomia of them. For the adoption proceeded from his grace, as did also the glory, the promises, and the law; ἅπερ ἅπαντα ἐννοήσας, καὶ λογισάμενος, πόσην ὁ Θεὸς μετὰ τοῦ Παιδὸς ἐποιήσατο τὴν σπουδὴν σῶσαι αὐτούς, ἀνεβόησε μέγα, καὶ εἶπεν, ὃς ἐστιν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν, all of which Paul, embracing them in his mind and considering within himself how great a care God together with the Son had taken to save them, cried out with a loud voice and said: "Who is blessed forever, amen," rendering thanks to the Only-begotten of God for all these things. "For what," he says, "if others blaspheme? But we, who have seen his mysteries, his ineffable wisdom, καὶ τὴν πρόνοιαν τὴν πολλήν,

[1] In the *Epistle to the Romans*, Homily XVI, no. 3.
[2] Rom. IX. 4.

> and his great providence, clearly understand that he is worthy not to be blasphemed, but to be glorified."

Then let them hear the same Chrysostom [1] discoursing thus concerning Pharaoh:

> Pharaoh was a vessel of wrath, τουτέστιν, ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν ὀργὴν ἀνάπτων διὰ τῆς οἰκείας σκληρότητος, that is, a man who by his own hardness kindled the wrath of God. For, having experienced his long patience, οὐκ ἐγένετο βελτίων, ἀλλ᾽ ἀδιόρθωτος ἔμεινε, he did not become better [2], but remained incorrigible. Therefore he called him not only σκεῦος ὀργῆς, a vessel of wrath, ἀλλὰ κατηρτισμένον εἰς ἀπώλειαν· τουτέστι, τὸν ἀπηρτισμένον, οἴκοθεν μέντοι καὶ παρ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ, but prepared for destruction, that is, made ready, namely, by himself and by his own works. Οὔτε γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἐνέλιπέ τι τῶν εἰς τὴν διόρθωσιν εἰκόντων τὴν ἐκείνου, οὔτε αὐτὸς ἐνέλιπέ τι τῶν ἀπολλύντων αὐτόν, καὶ πάσης ἀποστερούντων συγγνώμης, for neither did God omit anything of those things which would conduce to his amendment, nor did he omit anything of those things which would destroy him and deprive him of every pardon. Yet although God knew these things, ἤνεγκεν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ, βουλόμενος αὐτὸν εἰς μετάνοιαν ἀγαγεῖν, he bore with him in much patience, desiring to bring him to repentance. For if he had not willed this [3], he would not have employed such long patience. But because he was unwilling to use the divine patience for repentance, ἀλλ᾽ ἀπηρτίσεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς ὀργήν, ἐχρήσατο αὐτῷ εἰς τὴν ἑτέρων διόρθωσιν διὰ τῆς εἰς ἐκεῖνον κολάσεως ἑτέρους σπουδαιοτέρους ποιῶν, καὶ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ ταύτῃ δεικνύς, but he prepared himself for wrath, God used him for the amendment of others, through his punishment rendering others more earnest and thus showing his power. For that God does not will οὕτως, in this manner and through inflicted punishments, to make his power known,

[1] Homily cited, no. 8.

[2] Chrysostom has regard to those things which Paul has at Rom. II. 4-5.

[3] Charles du Plessis d'Argentré shows at length in the *Historical Commentary on Predestination to Glory and on Reprobation*, chaps. I-II, that this manner of interpreting was common to the Greek Fathers, and likewise to the Latins who became distinguished before Augustine. And indeed that it pleased Origen, and after Origen Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus, is manifest from chapter XXI of the *Philocalia*, which is entitled thus: περὶ αὐτεξουσίου καὶ τῶν δοκούντων ἀναιρεῖν τοῦτο γραφικῶν ῥητῶν λύσις καὶ ἑρμηνεία, "concerning freedom of choice, and the solution and interpretation of sayings of Scripture which seem to take it away"; and in which Basil and Gregory collected those things which seemed most useful to the studious, as can be seen from the latter's letter LXXXVIII to Theodore, Bishop of Tyana.

> ἀλλ᾽ ἑτέρως δι᾽ ὧν εὐεργετεῖ, δι᾽ ὧν εὖ ποιεῖ, but in another manner, through benefits and through liberality, Paul has already declared above in every way. For if he himself wishes to be seen powerful οὐχ οὕτω, not in this way and through punishments: "For not that we may appear approved," he says [1], "but that you may do good"; πολλῷ μᾶλλον ὁ Θεός, "much more God." But because he was long-suffering in order to bring Pharaoh to repentance, and he did not repent, ἤνεγκεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον, ὁμοῦ μὲν τὴν αὐτοῦ χρηστότητα ἐπιδεικνύμενος, ὁμοῦ δὲ καὶ τὴν δύναμιν, εἴ μὴ βουληθείη τι κερδᾶναι ἐκεῖνος ἀπὸ τῆς πολλῆς ταύτης μακροθυμίας· ὥσπερ οὖν τοῦτον ἀδιόρθωτον μείναντα κολάσας ἔδειξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν δύναμιν· οὕτω τοὺς πολλὰ ἁμαρτήσαντας καὶ μετανοήσαντας ἐλεήσας, ἐδήλωσεν αὐτοῦ τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν, he bore with him for a long time, showing at once his benignity and his power, if perchance he were willing to gain some profit from so great a patience. Similarly, when he punished him remaining hardened in his perversity, he showed his power; and in the same way, having mercy on those who had sinned much indeed but had repented, he disclosed his benignity toward men.

Then, if these things are not sufficient, let them hear what Chrysostom replies [2] to one objecting: εἰ οὖν πάντες ἥμαρτον, πῶς οἱ μὲν ἐσώθηντο, οἱ δὲ ἀπώλοντο; "If, therefore, all sinned, why were some saved while others perished?" He replies, namely: ὅτι μὴ πάντες προσελθεῖν ἠβουλήθησαν· ὡς τό γε αὐτοῦ μέρος, διεσώθηντο ἅπαντες· καὶ γὰρ ἐκλήθησαν ἅπαντες, "Because not all willed to approach. For, as far as concerns him (God), all were saved, since all were called."

Finally, let them hear what, according to Chrysostom, is the cause and origin of such profuse benignity. He had premised [3] that God is not brought to the point of demonstrating his power by punishing before he has made it illustrious by showing mercy and by exhibiting all the offices of τῆς φιλανθρωπίας, benignity toward men. But, not content with these things, he immediately added [4]: ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ εἶπε τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν,

> ἀλλὰ τὴν δόξαν, δεικνὺς ὅτι τοῦτο μάλιστα δόξα Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦτο πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων ἐσπούδακεν, "but Paul did not say [1] benignity, but glory, in order to show that this," namely, having mercy, "is especially the glory of God and is cared for by God above all other things."

[1] II Cor. XIII. 7.
[2] Homily cited, no. 5.
[3] Ibid., no. 8.
[4] Ibid., no. 9.
[1] Rom. IX. 13.

Whence he explained by this commentary the words of the Apostle [2], σκεύη ἐλέους, ἃ προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν, "vessels of mercy, which he prepared unto glory": οὐ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ πᾶν εἶναί φησιν· ἐπεὶ εἰ τοῦτο ἦν, οὐδὲν ἐκώλυσεν ἅπαντας σώζεσθαι, "he says that the whole," that is, what is signified by the attainment of glory, "is not God's. For if this were so," and God were not only the principal but also the sole cause of glory, "nothing would prevent all from being saved."

XIV.

So great, therefore, is the amplitude of the divine salvific will that, circumscribed by no limits, it extends itself to absolutely all men, rejects no one, turns away from no one however utterly ruined, and passes over no one wholly empty of its benefits. Wherefore, when the things which we have thus far gathered from the works of Chrysostom have been compared with one another, and the things which pertain to ὀνοματολογίαν, the rationale of speaking, have been accurately distinguished from those which are referred to πραγματολογίαν, the matter itself, it is easy to place before the eyes his entire doctrine comprehended within a brief circuit.

And indeed, as regards ὀνοματολογίαν, Chrysostom first distinguishes [3] a twofold divine will, θέλημα πρῶτον, the first will, and θέλημα δεύτερον, the second will. He does not always set forth and signify the former in one and the same manner, but by several and diverse formulas of speech. I shall recount the more important, among which those stand out by which he calls it θέλημα προηγούμενον, the principal and antecedent will, εὐδοκίαν, good pleasure, τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν αὐτοῦ, God's own desire,

τὸ σφοδρὸν θέλημα, the intense and vehement will; τὸ μετ᾽ ἐπιθυμίας θέλημα, the desirous will joined with the desire of doing good; τὸ πεῖσμα, the most firm determination of mind; θέλημα αὐτοῦ, the will which is properly his, which is native to him and flows spontaneously from him; θέλημα ἀπὸ ἀγαθότητος μόνης, the will proceeding from the goodness of God alone; and therefore θέλημα χωρὶς αἰτίας, the will which, for lavishing its gifts, requires from men no cause and no condition.

But corresponding ἀναλόγως, analogously, to these are the formulas and appellations by which Chrysostom expresses the second will. Such are: θέλημα οὐκ αὐτοῦ, the will which is not his simply but only in a certain respect, inasmuch as it does not flow spontaneously from the very nature of God, but is provoked ἔξωθεν, from without; θέλημα κατὰ συγκατάβασιν, the will from condescension,

[2] Homily cited, no. 9.

[3] Nos. 3 ff.

to which, an occasion having been taken from men, God lowers and almost casts himself down; whence θέλημα μετὰ αἰτίας, a will with a cause, and that an external one, which men furnish either by their evil deeds or by deeds rightly done.

XV.

There follows πραγματολογία, the matter itself which is contained in this distinction and variety of formulas. And at the outset it is contained therein that each will, the first and the second, is ἀληθῶς, truly, in God, and embraces not the name and appearance alone but the very force and rationale of an intimate will. Since all profess this concerning the second will, they will profess it no less concerning the first will, provided that they consider within themselves the phrases and circumlocutions which Chrysostom employs for declaring and explaining it.

It is contained, secondly, that the fountain of the second will is other than and altogether diverse from that from which the first will flows. For the first proceeds ἀπὸ ἀγαθότητος μόνης, from the goodness of God alone, and is and is called a will χωρὶς αἰτίας, without a cause derived from men; but the second is and is called the will of justice, θέλημα κατὰ συγκατάβασιν, the will to which

God descends when provoked, and therefore θέλημα μετὰ αἰτίας, a will not separated from a cause which men have furnished.

It is contained, thirdly, that the first will differs from the second in nature and character: for the former is native to God, spontaneously occupies God himself, and is not separated from his φιλανθρωπία, extraordinary benignity toward men, whence it is called ἁπλῶς, simply, θέλημα αὐτοῦ, his will; but the latter comes, as it were, to God, is a will μετὰ αἰτίας, cohering with a cause, of which men themselves are the authors, and therefore is θέλημα οὐκ αὐτοῦ, a will which can be called and judged his only in a certain respect.

It is contained, fourthly, that the first will is occupied about men in one way and the second will in another. For the parts of the latter, as its very name also demonstrates, are second; the former, by its own right, claims for itself the first and principal parts. For justice does not go before and love follow after, but love anticipates and justice succeeds; nor does God first demonstrate his justice and afterward his goodness, but he does not show himself just μετὰ αἰτίας, on account of an external cause, before he has disclosed his love χωρὶς αἰτίας, without an external cause, and ἀπὸ ἀγαθότητος μόνης, stirred by goodness alone; nor does God act first by that will which is called his will only in a certain respect before he has manifested himself by that will which is called simply his will, his desire, καὶ πεῖσμα, and his most firm determination of mind; nor does he first undertake those things which are proper to the will κατὰ συγκατάβασιν, which lowers itself, before he has accomplished those things which τὸ θέλημα σφοδρόν,

his intense will, τὸ μετ᾽ ἐπιθυμίας θέλημα, his desirous will, and his implanted desire demand and require; nor does he pursue his own glory through works of justice before he has sought it through the poured-out gifts of his goodness.

It is contained, fifthly, that the antecedent will is both perpetual in time and universal in amplitude; and it is indeed perpetual in time because it began ἐξ ἀρχῆς, from the very beginnings of the human race, has always accompanied the human race, and still accompanies it; but it is universal in amplitude because it has never excluded anyone, and has enriched by the gifts of its benevolence even those who are called vessels of wrath κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν, prepared for destruction.

It is contained, sixthly, that the same antecedent will is not sluggish and sterile but active, efficacious, intent upon and solicitous for procuring the salvation of men.

It is contained, seventhly, that God omits nothing, τό γε εἰς αὐτὸν ἦκον, as much as lies in him, and ὡς τό γε αὐτοῦ μέρος, as far as concerns him, of those things which can be useful and salutary for men; and therefore it comes to pass only παρὰ τὴν κακουργίαν, from their own wickedness, and παρὰ τὴν οἰκείαν πονηρίαν, from voluntary iniquity and an ungrateful disposition, that all do not obtain salvation and everlasting felicity.

For rightly understanding these things, it will conduce not a little to distinguish the salvific will, and the manifold providence cohering with it, from the very conferral of salvation and beatitude. For the latter is not a gift of God to such a degree that it is not at the same time a recompense, a reward, and a crown of justice. For just as it is written [1], τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιος ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, "but the grace of God is life everlasting in Christ Jesus our Lord"; so in like manner we read it written [2], ἀπόκειταί μοι ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος, ὃν ἀποδώσει μοι ὁ Κύριος ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὁ δίκαιος κριτής, "there is laid up for me a crown of justice, which the Lord, the just judge, will render to me on that day." Wherefore, for obtaining and attaining everlasting felicity, just as God must be present, who as the principal cause may go before and prepare men by the gifts of his mercy, so men must be present who, as subordinate causes, freely cooperate with God going before and preparing. But if this were not necessary according to the pre-established order of divine providence, and the attainment of beatitude were to be expected from God alone, οὐδὲν ἐκώλυσεν ἅπαντας σώζεσθαι, "nothing would prevent all from being saved," Chrysostom says [3]; indeed, if so great a good depended upon divine charity alone, ἐχρῆν ἅπαντας σωθῆναι, "all would have to be saved."

[1] Rom. VI. 23.
[2] II Tim. IV. 8.
[3] Nos. 2, 14.

But the salvific will and the manifold providence toward men, of which that will is the fountain and principle, since they depend upon the benignity of God alone and are fruits of that benevolence by which God strives most earnestly for the salvation of men, are not only universal and except no one at all, but also demand no incitement from men themselves and no condition of deserving well. This can be expressed much more briefly in this manner by formulas received in the usage of the School: that God is not only the principal but also the sole and adequate cause of the salvific will and of the manifold providence flowing from it; but that God is indeed the principal cause of salvation itself, yet not likewise its sole and adequate cause: οὐ γὰρ τοῦ Θεοῦ πᾶν, "for," Chrysostom writes, "the whole is not God's."

Whence, finally, it is manifest that Chrysostom's doctrine also contains that which contributes especially to illustrating the present question: that those err grievously who either estimate and define the amplitude of the salvific will from the amplitude of those who obtain salvation, or teach that no true and sincere will of God concerning the salvation of men can be admitted and approved except one which is conjoined with the effect of salvation itself having been obtained. For the salvific will is much broader than the number of those who are saved, since the former extends as far as God's love, benignity, and extraordinary benevolence toward men extend themselves, while the latter extends only to those who obey God and do not spurn the divine gifts. And therefore a sincere will fruitful in those things which are required for procuring salvation is also much broader than the will by which salvation itself is conferred: for the former is a will of mercy and goodness; but the latter pertains not only to the goodness by which God crowns his own gifts, but also to the justice by which he crowns our merits.

XVI.

Now if those who are not strangers to the monuments of history know, as is fitting, both how tenacious Chrysostom was of ancient and sincere doctrine, and with how many encomia of praise Isidore of Pelusium [1], Sozomen [2], Palladius and [3] Theodore, George [4], Bishop of Alexandria, Photius [5], Leo [6], surnamed the Wise, Suidas [7], and Philotheus [8], Patriarch of Constantinople, celebrated his

[1] Book II, letter XLII.
[2] *Ecclesiastical History*, book VIII, chap. II.
[3] *Dialogue on the Life of John Chrysostom*.
[4] *Life of Chrysostom*, in Savile, vol. VIII.
[5] Codex CLXXII.
[6] Panegyric Oration on Chrysostom, in Savile, vol. VIII.
[7] At the word Ἰωάννης.
[8] Oration on Saints Basil, Gregory, and Chrysostom.

ὀρθοδοξίαν, right opinion concerning religion, his excellent skill in the Scriptures, and his incredible eloquence, they, I doubt not, will descend unanimously to this opinion with me: that it could in no way have happened that ecclesiastical writers who flourished before or after Chrysostom judged otherwise than he judged, repeated, and inculcated concerning the division of the divine will into the first and the second, and concerning the nature and splendid endowments of the former. That this may be held most firmly not by a mere anticipation of mind, but also by the experiment itself, I shall take care to bring forward the more notable testimonies of the ancients, first those by which the doctrine of Chrysostom, bound to fixed formulas, is confirmed, and then those by which, although more loosely, the same doctrine is nevertheless set forth no less clearly.

XVII.

Among those who employed fixed and established formulas, first of all there comes to mind John Damascene, most distinguished among the Greek theologians, who in the eighth century arranged Christian wisdom, previously diffused and scattered through almost innumerable books, into one system and harmonious body [9] with such dexterity that he showed to the doctors who followed the way and method of an ordered treatment.

Therefore, in the work which he entitled ἔκδοσις ἀκριβὴς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως, *An Accurate Exposition of the Orthodox Faith* [1], when he had advanced to the discussion περὶ προνοίας, on providence [2], after observing under the guidance of Nemesius [3] that all the works of providence are so fittingly divided that some are judged to be administered κατ᾽ εὐδοκίαν, according to good pleasure, and others κατὰ συγχώρησιν, according to permission, and that to the first kind belong the things which ἀναντιρρήτως εἰσὶν ἀγαθά, are good beyond controversy, but that τῆς δὲ συγχωρήσεως, of permission, there are πολλὰ εἴδη, many modes and many species, he continues:

> Χρὴ δὲ εἰδέναι, ὡς ὁ Θεὸς προηγουμένως θέλει πάντας σωθῆναι, καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ τυχεῖν· οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸ κολάσαι ἔπλασεν ἡμᾶς, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ μετασχεῖν τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἀγαθός· ἁμαρτάνοντας δὲ θέλει κολάζεσθαι, ὡς δίκαιος. Λέγεται οὖν, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον, προηγούμενον θέλημα, καὶ εὐδοκία, ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὄν·

[9] Cf. Michael Lequien's preface to the works of Damascene.

[1] This exposition of Damascene is compared with no little advantage with that epitome of the divine dogmas which Theodoret published in the fifth century and whose order, to be retained and expressed, Damascene seems to have proposed to himself.

[2] *On the Orthodox Faith*, book II, chap. XXIX.

[3] *On the Nature of Man*, chap. XLIV.

τὸ δὲ δεύτερον, ἐπόμενον θέλημα, καὶ παραχώρησις, ἐξ ἡμετέρας αἰτίας· καὶ αὕτη διττή, ἡ μὲν οἰκονομικὴ καὶ παιδευτικὴ πρὸς σωτηρίαν, ἡ δὲ ἀπογνωστικὴ πρὸς τελείαν κόλασιν, ὡς εἰρήκαμεν. Ταῦτα δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν οὐκ ἐφ᾽ ἡμῖν. Τῶν δὲ ἐφ᾽ ἡμῖν, τὰ μὲν ἀγαθὰ, προηγουμένως θέλει καὶ εὐδοκεῖ· τὰ δὲ πονηρὰ καὶ ὄντως κακὰ, οὔτε προηγουμένως, οὔτε ἑπομένως θέλει, παραχωρεῖ δὲ τῷ αὐτεξουσίῳ. Τὸ γὰρ κατὰ βίαν γινόμενον, οὐ λογικόν, οὐδὲ ἀρετή. Προνοεῖ ὁ Θεὸς πάσης τῆς κτίσεως, καὶ διὰ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως εὐεργετῶν καὶ παιδεύων, καὶ δι᾽ αὐτῶν πολλάκις τῶν δαιμόνων, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰὼβ, καὶ τῶν χοίρων.

This likewise ought to be known: that God first and antecedently wills all to be saved and to become partakers of his kingdom. For he did not create us in order to punish us, but, because he is good, that we might be partakers of his goodness. But he wills sinners to be punished because he is just. Therefore [4] the first will is called antecedent and good pleasure, of which God himself is the cause; but the second is called consequent and permission, of which we are the cause. The latter is twofold: one which is contained in dispensation and issues in salvation, and another which proceeds from reprobation [1] and regards the final punishment, as we have said. And these

[4] "The sense of Damascene," Lequien writes in the appended annotation, "is approved by St. Thomas, I, q. XIX, a. VI; and neither of them indicates or thought that only the state of innocence pertains to the antecedent will, as neither did the other Greeks. Now most of the Fathers, and especially the Orientals, teach with one consent that God, since he is supremely good and φιλόψυχος, a lover of souls, wills with a propense affection that absolutely all men be saved. See Cyril of Alexandria, book I, *On Adoration in Spirit*. Wherefore, lest the system of Augustinian doctrine concerning divine grace seem to some to be defective in this head, St. Prosper and the author of the book *On the Calling of the Nations* undertook to defend this good will of God." Yet I. Augustine had likewise defended it, not only before undertaking the episcopate, but also when he was already a bishop and was contending and gaining triumphs for the Catholic cause against the Pelagians and the Massilians. But II. in what sense that which Lequien affirms concerning the agreement between Damascene and Thomas both can and ought to be received will become evident in its place below.

[1] Lequien indeed renders the adjective ἀπογνωστική in this way, but perhaps Billius somewhat more suitably, who translates it "from desperation." For properly ἀπόγνοια and ἀπόγνωσις are desperation, ἀπογνώστης, one who despairs; whence ἀπογνωστικόν, proceeding from desperation. This also agrees well with those things which precede: Τῆς δὲ ἐγκαταλείψεως εἰσὶν εἴδη δύο· ἔστι γὰρ ἐγκατάλειψις οἰκονομικὴ καὶ παιδευτική, καὶ ἔστιν ἐγκατάλειψις τελεία ἀπογνωστική· οἰκονομικὴ μὲν καὶ παιδευτική, ἡ πρὸς διόρθωσιν καὶ σωτηρίαν καὶ δόξαν τοῦ πάσχοντος γινομένη, ἢ καὶ πρὸς ἄλλων ζῆλον καὶ μίμησιν, ἢ καὶ πρὸς δόξαν Θεοῦ· ἡ δὲ τελεία ἐγκατάλειψις, ὅτε τοῦ Θεοῦ πάντα τὰ πρὸς σωτηρίαν πεποιηκότος, ἀνεπαίσθητος καὶ ἀνιάτρευτος, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνίατος, ἐξ οἰκείας προθέσεως διαμείνῃ ὁ ἄνθρωπος· τότε παραδίδοται εἰς τελείαν ἀπώλειαν, ὡς ὁ Ἰούδας, "Moreover, there are two kinds of abandonment. For there is a certain abandonment which occurs according to a definite counsel and dispensation and for our instruction. There is again another which proceeds from complete desperation. That which occurs according to a definite counsel is that which exists for the amendment and salvation and glory of the one who suffers, or also for inflaming others to

> are occupied with those things which are not in our power. But of the things which are situated in us, God wills the good things primarily and from good pleasure; but the evil things which are truly such he wills neither primarily nor consequently, but permits to free choice. For that which is produced by force is neither consonant with reason nor merits the name of virtue. God provides for all creatures, and through the whole creation does good and instructs, frequently even through the demons themselves, as may be seen in Job and the swine.

XVIII.

But I would by no means wish those things to be separated from these by which, in the dialogue κατὰ Μανιχαίων, *Against the Manichaeans*, after Basil [1], he settles the notable question whether God ought to be regarded as the author of punishments. For he writes [2]:

> Ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ αἱ τιμωρίαι ἡμῶν τὸν Θεὸν ἔχουσιν αἴτιον, οὐ γὰρ ὁ κριτὴς ἐστι τῆς τιμωρίας τοῦ πονηροῦ αἴτιος, εἰ καὶ αὐτὸς θέλων κρίνει· ἀλλ᾽ αἴτιος μὲν ἐστιν ὁ πταίσας τῆς ἑαυτοῦ τιμωρίας, ὁ δὲ κριτὴς, τῆς δικαιοσύνης αἴτιος· ἀγαθὸν δὲ ἡ δικαιοσύνη· εἰ γὰρ θέλων κρίνει, ἀλλ᾽ οὐ κατὰ προηγούμενον θέλημα, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ ἑπόμενον· προηγούμενον μὲν ἐστι θέλημα, ὅπερ τις ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ θέλει, ἑπόμενον δέ, ὅπερ ἐκ τῆς τῶν γινομένων αἰτίας· προηγουμένως γὰρ ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ θέλει ὁ Θεὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους σωθῆναι, καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν· ἁμαρτανόντων δὲ ἡμῶν, θέλει παιδεύεσθαι ἡμᾶς πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον· καὶ τὸ μὲν προηγούμενον θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, τῆς ἀγαθότητός ἐστι, τὸ δὲ ἑπόμενον, τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ,
>
> But not even our punishments have God as their author. For the judge is not the author of the wicked man's suffering punishment, even if he himself willingly passes sentence; rather, the one who committed the crime brought the punishment upon himself, while the judge is the cause of justice, which is a good thing. For although he judges willingly, he does so not by the antecedent will but by the consequent. Thus the antecedent will concerns that which one wills

zeal and imitation, or finally for the glory of God. But complete abandonment takes place only then, when, no kind of salutary remedy having been omitted by God, a man nevertheless remains insensible and uncured, or, to speak more correctly, incurable, through the determination of his own mind; and then he is handed over to final destruction, as was Judas."

[1] Homily *That God Is Not the Cause of Evils*.

[2] *Dialogue Against the Manichaeans*, § LXXIX.

> from himself, but the consequent concerns that which one wills only because of the things which have been done. For God [3] antecedently, from himself, wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth. But when we sin, for the sake of our utility he wills us to be chastised. For the antecedent will of God belongs to his goodness; but the consequent to justice.

XIX.

These things are so arranged that in words as well as in opinions they agree most excellently with those things which we have brought forward from the works of Chrysostom [1]. And first they agree in words. For just as Chrysostom divides the divine will into the first and the second, so Damascene distributes the same into the first and antecedent will, and θέλημα δεύτερον καὶ ἑπόμενον, the second and consequent will.

Just as Chrysostom calls the first will εὐδοκίαν, good pleasure, so Damascene calls that same will εὐδοκίαν, good pleasure and benignity implanted in God.

Just as the former marks the first will by no other name than that of the will which is God's proper will and native to him, so Damascene defines the antecedent will as ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὄν, that which is from God himself and flows spontaneously from him.

Just as, according to Chrysostom, the first will is χωρὶς αἰτίας, and has no external cause, so, according to Damascene, the antecedent will is defined: ὅπερ τις ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ θέλει, that which God wills from himself and to the willing of which he is moved interiorly.

Just as Chrysostom teaches that the first will flows ἀπ᾽ ἀγάπης μόνης, from the charity of God alone, so Damascene hands down that it is θέλημα τῆς ἀγαθότητος, the will of implanted and connatural goodness.

Just as Chrysostom calls the second will θέλημα κατὰ συγκατάβασιν, the will from condescension, and θέλημα μετὰ αἰτίας, the will which borrows its cause from us, so Damascene calls it θέλημα ἐξ ἡμετέρας αἰτίας, the will of which we are the cause, θέλημα κατὰ παραχώρησιν, the will from permission, and θέλημα, ὅπερ ἐκ τῆς τῶν γινομένων αἰτίας, the will which is to be derived from those things which are done by us.

Just as, finally, for Chrysostom the second will is second in order, and God does not assume it before men are understood to have despised the gifts of the antecedent will, so for Damascene the second will is θέλημα ἑπόμενον, the consequent will, and is called absolutely θέλημα τῆς δικαιοσύνης, the will of justice.

[3] I Tim. II. 4.

[1] Nos. 3 ff.

XX.

But this agreement of formulas and expressions is followed by a harmony of things and opinions no less clear and no less adapted to producing faith. For what, according to Chrysostom [1], is the origin, what the fountain, of the antecedent will? Namely, the divine φιλανθρωπία καὶ ἀγαθότης, benevolence and goodness toward men. But Damascene [2], in turn, derives the principle of the first will from the fact that God is good. "For just as," he says [3], τὸ φῶς ἐκ τοῦ ἡλίου ὁρίζεται, οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, "light arises from the sun, so good arises from God." And [4] ὁ Θεὸς οὐ δύναται μὴ παρέχειν τὰ ἀγαθά, ἀγαθὸς ὤν, "God, since he is good, cannot fail to bestow good things."

Furthermore, if we hear Chrysostom, just as the amplitude of the divine benignity toward men is universal, so the good pleasure of the antecedent will rejects no one and embraces all. Nor does Damascene speak otherwise, for he inculcates and repeats this very thing, whether when he denies that men are created by God in order that he may visit punishments upon them, or when he affirms that the antecedent will of God pertains to this: that absolutely all men be saved. But if all are not saved, this does not happen, according to Chrysostom, either because the benignity of God, which is abundantly available to all, is lacking to some, or because God, as far as lies in himself, does not solicitously impart all those things which are necessary for attaining salvation, for he pours forth his riches abundantly upon all; but because he has established this law and pre-appointed this order: that all and only those be saved who have complied with the divine benignity going before and preparing.

Damascene does not recede from these things by even a nail's breadth, for this is his certain and established opinion [1]: that God, ὅπερ αὐτοῦ ἐστι, as far as lies in him, enriches all with his benefits, and therefore, ὅπερ μόνου Θεοῦ ἐστι, so far as it depends upon him alone, καὶ θελόντων καὶ μὴ θελόντων ἡμῶν αὐτὸς δίδωσιν, ὡς ἀγαθός, ἵνα κἂν ποσῶς ᾖ ἐν ἡμῖν τὸ ἀγαθόν, whether we will or do not will, he himself, inasmuch as he is good, bestows his gifts upon us, so that the good may be in us in some measure at least; and that not all arrive at salvation for this one reason: because God does not will men to be saved κατὰ βίαν, by necessity, but on the contrary wills [2] τὸ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι ἐκ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐξ ἡμῶν, that it ought to be both his and ours that we are good; or, as he explains elsewhere [3],

[1] Nos. 5 ff.
[2] No. 18.
[3] *Dialogue Against the Manichaeans*, § XXXVIII.
[4] Ibid., § LXX.
[1] *Dialogue Against the Manichaeans*, § LXX.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid., § XXXII.

because he wills it to be οὐ τοῦ Θεοῦ μόνου, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοῦ, not God's alone, but also man's own, that he attain τὸ καλόν, that which is good and excellent: τὸ γὰρ βίᾳ γινόμενον, οὐ καλόν, οὐδὲ ἀρετή, "for that which is produced by force merits neither the name nor the dignity of goodness or virtue."

XXI.

A third witness and defender and champion of the same doctrine follows. He is indeed later, since he flourished no earlier than the eleventh century [4], yet learned, and, what is chiefly important, most thoroughly versed in the theology received in the Greek and Eastern Church. This is Theophylact, who, comparing together several texts which are read in the Bible concerning the sacrifices of the law, writes these things among others [1]:

> Τί οὖν; αἱ κατὰ νόμον θυσίαι οὐκ ἦσαν θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ; θέλημα μὲν, ἀλλ᾽ ἡ τοῦ θελήματος σημασία διττή. Θέλει γάρ τις τόδε τι προηγουμένως, ὡς ὁ Παῦλος, θέλω πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι ὡς ἐμαυτόν, τουτέστιν, ἀγάμους. Θέλει τις καὶ συγκαταβατικῶς, ὡς ὁ αὐτὸς Παῦλος· βούλομαι νεωτέρας χήρας γαμεῖν· τοῦτο συγκαταβατικὸν θέλημα, ἵνα γὰρ μὴ καταστρηνιάσωσι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, διὰ τοῦτο συγκατέβη· οὕτω καὶ ὁ Θεὸς προηγουμένως μὲν οὐκ ἤθελε κνίσσας καὶ αἵματα. ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἑώρα, ὡς οἱ Ἑβραῖοι θύοντες δαίμοσι, σφόδρα αὐτῶν δὴ τῶν θυσιῶν περιέχονται, συγκατέβη αὐτοῖς. ἵνα εἰς τιμὴν αὐτῷ τὴν θυσίαν προσάγωσι,
>
> What then? Were the sacrifices according to the law not the will of God? They were indeed his will; but the signification of will is twofold. For one wills something first and chiefly, as Paul [2] says: "I will all men to be as I myself am," that is, celibate. One also wills something by condescension, as when the same Paul [3] says: "I will the younger widows to marry." This is a will proceeding from condescension. For, lest they grow wanton against Christ, he makes this concession to them. In a similar manner God did not first and chiefly will fumes and blood; but because he saw that the Hebrews offered sacrifices to demons and were vehemently occupied with

[4] There have been those who wrote that Theophylact flourished in the ninth century; but Bernard de Rubeis excellently refutes them in the preliminary dissertation prefixed to the works of Theophylact, §§ I-III, and shows that he lived at the close of the eleventh century and the beginning of the twelfth.

[1] On the Epistle to the Hebrews, X. 8.

[2] I Cor. VII. 7.

[3] I Tim. V.14.

> those very sacrifices, he made a concession to them, that they might offer sacrifice to his honor and not to idols.

Behold, you have the division of the divine will and the origin and nature of each part well explained. You have the division, since Theophylact distributes the will into that which he calls θέλημα προηγούμενον, the first and chief will, and that which he calls θέλημα συγκαταβατικόν, the will from condescension.

You have the origin of each, for the former arises spontaneously from God himself and lacks an external cause; but the latter comes to God ἔξωθεν, from without, and derives its cause from men.

You have also the nature, since θέλημα προηγούμενον, the first will, antecedently precedes and goes before in order, while θέλημα συγκαταβατικόν, the will from condescension, follows and succeeds in order.

XXII.

And he sets these things forth much more clearly when, upon the words of Paul [1], κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, "according to the good pleasure of his will, unto the praise of the glory of his grace" [2], he writes thus [3]:

> "He predestined us unto the adoption of sons," θέλων καὶ σφόδρα βουλόμενος καὶ ἐπιθυμῶν, willing, and vehemently willing and desiring, τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ εὐδοκία, for this is good pleasure…. Εὐδοκία οὖν ἐστι τὸ προηγούμενον θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ· οἷον· θέλημα πρῶτον τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ μηδένα ἀπολέσθαι· θέλημα δεύτερον, τὸ γενομένους κακοὺς ἀπολέσθαι· οὐ γὰρ ἀνάγκῃ κολάζει, ἀλλὰ θέλων· ἡ τοίνυν εὐδοκία, τὸ προηγούμενόν ἐστι θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, good pleasure, therefore, is the antecedent will of God. For example, the first will of God is that no one perish; the second will is that those who are evil perish. For God punishes not by necessity, but willingly. Wherefore good pleasure is the preceding will of God.

Namely, a twofold will of God must be distinguished: θέλημα πρῶτον καὶ προηγούμενον, the first and antecedent will, and θέλημα δεύτερον, the second will.

---

[1] Eph. I. 6.

[2] Just as εἰς ἔπαινον is employed for εἰς τὸ ἐπαινεῖσθαι, so δόξα τῆς χάριτος is χάρις ἔνδοξος, from that manner of speaking received among the Hebrews, by which nouns of glory and splendor are joined to nouns of virtues, in order that the magnitude and excellence of the latter may be signified. Cf. Is. II. 10; Ps. CXLV. 12; Esth. I. 4; and II Thess. I. 9.

[3] On the Epistle to the Ephesians, I. 6.

Moreover, θέλημα πρῶτον καὶ προηγούμενον, the first and antecedent will, is will properly so called, εὐδοκία, good pleasure, θέλημα σφοδρόν, an earnest and vehement will, ἐπιθυμία, desire; but the second will is θέλημα συγκαταβατικόν, a condescending will, a will which accrues to God, as Theophylact affirms in so many words when writing of Christ [4]:

> προηγουμένως ἐπὶ τὸ σῶσαι τὸν κόσμον ἦλθε· καὶ τοῦτο σκοπὸς ἦν αὐτῷ· κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς δὲ κρίνει τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας,
> He came first and chiefly to save the world, and this was his purpose; but by accident he judges those who have not believed.

Nor is it obscure why each will is signified by such diverse appellations. For the first and antecedent will is called εὐδοκία, θέλημα σφοδρόν, ἐπιθυμία, good pleasure, intense will, and desire, because it derives its origin from the benignity of God; but the second and consequent will is therefore called will κατὰ συγκατάβασιν, from condescension, and κατὰ συμβεβηκός, by accident, because it is assumed by God only on account of men hardened in their impiety.

This diversity, proceeding from their origin, is followed by another which concerns the object and amplitude of each will. For the object of the will by accident is the punishments themselves by which God punishes perverse and wicked men. But the object of the antecedent will is the salvation of men itself, which Theophylact declares with no less evidence than brevity when he writes [1]: θέλημα Θεοῦ ἡ τῶν ἀνθρώπων σωτηρία, "the will of God is the salvation of men."

But as regards amplitude, the will by accident regards only those who put no limit upon their sins and persevere in impiety even to the end. But the first and principal will, by benefits poured forth, goes before all, draws all toward the highest good, and with singular benignity strives that they may become partakers of it. Theophylact proposes and establishes this amplitude both by denying and by affirming: first by denying, when he writes that by this principal will God intends τὸ μηδένα ἀπολέσθαι, that no one perish; then by affirming, when, on the occasion [2] of Christ's words, πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσι κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί, "for many are called, but few are chosen."

---

[4] On John III. 17: οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σωθῇ (Chrysostom: σώσῃ τὸν κόσμον) ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ, "for God did not send his Son into the world that he might condemn the world, but that the world might be saved (another reading: that he might save the world) through him."

[1] On John IV. 34: ἐμὸν βρῶμά ἐστιν, ἵνα ποιῶ (another reading: ποιήσω) τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με καὶ τελειώσω αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔργον, "my food is that I may do the will of him who sent me and may perfect his work."

[2] Matt. XXII. 14.

He says [1]: χάριτι γὰρ μόνῃ πάντες ἐκλήθημεν ἀγαθοί τε καὶ πονηροί, "for by grace alone we have all been called, both good and evil." And again [2]: πολλοὺς γὰρ καλεῖ ὁ Θεός, μᾶλλον δὲ πάντας· ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί, ὀλίγοι καὶ οἱ σωζόμενοι καὶ ἄξιοι τοῦ ἐκλεγῆναι παρὰ Θεοῦ· ὥστε τοῦ μὲν Θεοῦ τὸ καλεῖν, τὸ δὲ ἐκλεκτοὺς γενέσθαι ἢ μή, ἡμέτερόν ἐστι, "for God calls many, or rather, more correctly, all; but few are chosen. For few are those who are saved and who are worthy [3] to be chosen by God; so that it is indeed God's part to call, but ours to become chosen or not."

XXIII.

In these is contained the rationale for resolving the question how it happens that so many fall away from the attainment of salvation, although the preceding salvific will of God extends itself to all and anticipates all with internal and external benefits. Evidently the knot cannot be untied unless the divine benefits with which men are endowed are accurately divided into two classes. The first of these consists of those which are owed χάριτι μόνῃ, to grace alone, flow ἀπὸ ἀγαθότητος μόνης, from benignity alone, and of which God is not only the principal cause but also the sole and adequate cause. But to the second are referred those of which God is indeed the principal cause, but not likewise the sole and adequate cause, since men themselves must also be joined as subordinate causes. For just as both the universal salvific will and the internal and external gifts which are poured forth most abundantly upon the whole race of men belong to the former class, so to the latter belongs the very attainment of salvation and eternal beatitude, which is conferred only upon those who, after God and with God, have rendered themselves not unworthy of so excellent a good.

And to this tends what Theophylact taught in the last words [1]; to this also tends what he writes [3] when considering the words of John [2], ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, "that was the true light which enlightens every man coming into the world":

[1] Commentary on the passage cited.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Lest these words be taken improperly, it will be useful to compare those rules which the most learned men Sixtus of Siena, in *Bibliotheca Sancta*, book VI, annotation CCLI; Denis Petau, *On Predestination*, book IX, chaps. III-IV-V; Louis Thomassin, book IX, *On God and the Properties of God*; and Bernard de Rubeis, in the dissertation prefixed to the works of Theophylact, § XXII, proposed so that the expressions of the Greek Fathers concerning grace and predestination may be understood as is fitting.

[1] No. 22.

[3] In the commentary on John I. 9.

[2] John I. 9.

> Καὶ πῶς, φησί, φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον, ὅπου γε βλέπομεν τινὰς ἐσκοτισμένους; ὅσον τὸ ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτῷ πάντας φωτίζει· εἰπὲ γάρ μοι, οὐ πάντες λογικοί; οὐ πάντες φύσει γινώσκοντες τὸ καλὸν καὶ τοὐναντίον; οὐκ ἔχοντες δύναμιν ἐννοῆσαι ἀπὸ τῶν κτισμάτων τὸν κτίστην, ὥστε ὁ λόγος ὁ δοθεὶς ἡμῖν, καὶ παιδαγωγῶν ἡμᾶς φύσει, ὃς καὶ φυσικὸς νόμος καλεῖται, οὗτος ἂν κληθείη φῶς, τὸ δοθὲν ἡμῖν παρὰ Θεοῦ· εἰ δέ τινες κακῶς τῷ λόγῳ ἐχρήσαντο, ἑαυτοὺς ἐσκότισαν,
>
> And how, he says, does he enlighten every man, when we see so many darkened? As far as concerns himself, he enlightens all. For tell me, I pray, are not all rational? Do not all by nature know good and evil? Do not all possess the power to know the Creator from creatures? Thus reason, given to us and instructing us by nature [4], which is also called the natural law, may be called the light granted to us by God. But if some have used reason perversely, they have darkened themselves.

Therefore the divine light goes before all, assists all, and invites all to fellowship in the supreme truth; but only those walk in the light, after the darkness

[4]With these may very suitably be compared the things which the martyr Justin has: whether when, in *Apology* II, no. 8, he mentions τὸ ἔμφυτον παντὶ γένει ἀνθρώπων σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου, "the seed of the Word implanted in the whole human race"; or when in the same place he praises, now κατὰ λόγον βιοῦν σπουδάζοντας, "those who take pains to order their life according to the rule of the Word," and then τοὺς οὐ κατὰ σπερματικοῦ λόγου μέρος (βιοῦν σπουδάζοντας), ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ παντὸς λόγου, ὅ ἐστι Χριστοῦ, γνῶσιν καὶ θεωρίαν, "those who endeavor to institute their life not according to some part of the disseminated Word, but according to the knowledge and contemplation of the whole Word, that is, of Christ"; or when at no. 10 he writes, ὅσα καλῶς ἀεὶ ἐφθέγξαντο καὶ εὗρον οἱ φιλοσοφήσαντες ἢ νομοθετήσαντες, κατὰ λόγου μέρος εὑρέσεως καὶ θεωρίας ἐστὶ πονηθέντα αὐτοῖς, "whatever things philosophers or legislators ever said or devised excellently, they elaborated by discovering and considering the Word in some part"; or when he adds concerning Socrates that Christ was known to him ἀπὸ μέρους, in some part, λόγος γὰρ ἦν καὶ ἔστιν ὁ ἐν παντὶ ὤν, καὶ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν προειπὼν τὰ μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι, καὶ δι᾽ ἑαυτοῦ ὁμοιοπαθοῦς γενομένου καὶ διδάξαντος ταῦτα, "for he was and is that Word who is in all things, who both foretold through the prophets the things that were to come to pass, and taught these things through himself when he had assumed our nature"; or when at no. 13 he establishes, ἕκαστός τις ἀπὸ μέρους τοῦ σπερματικοῦ θείου λόγου τὸ συγγενὲς ὁρῶν καλῶς ἐφθέγξατο, "whoever contemplates some part of the disseminated divine Word connatural to himself has spoken excellently"; or when he infers, ὅσα οὖν παρὰ πᾶσι καλῶς εἴρηται, ἡμῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐστι, "whatever things, therefore, have been said excellently among all others belong to us Christians"; or when, in *Apology* I, no. 46, he publishes this profession of his faith: τὸν Χριστὸν πρωτότοκον τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι ἐδιδάχθημεν, καὶ προεμηνύσαμεν λόγον ὄντα, οὗ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων μετέσχε· καὶ οἱ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες, Χριστιανοί εἰσι, κἂν ἄθεοι ἐνομίσθησαν, "we have learned that Christ is the firstborn of God and have declared above (nos. 5-10-12-23-32) that he is that Word of whom the whole race of men is a participant, so that those who have lived according to the rule of the Word are Christians, although they were considered atheists." Clement of Alexandria, in the first and sixth books of the *Stromata*, in the *Protreptic Discourse*, and Tertullian, in the *Apologeticum*, chaps. XXIII-XLV, confirm this altogether distinguished doctrine with not a few testimonies.

has been shaken off and dispelled, and enjoy the sweetness of truth, who neither desert God as he goes before them nor ungratefully reject the benefits offered, being no less hostile to themselves than to God. This they seem to have had before their eyes who, as the same Theophylact reports [1], were accustomed to resolve τὴν ἔνστασιν ταύτην, the proposed difficulty, in this manner:

> φωτίζει, φησίν, ὁ Κύριος πάντα ἄνθρωπον τὸν ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἤτοι εἰς τάξιν βελτίονα, καὶ σπουδάζοντα κοσμῆσαι τὴν οἰκείαν ψυχήν, καὶ μὴ ἐᾶσαι ἄκοσμόν τε καὶ ἀκαλλῆ,
> The Lord, they say, enlightens every man coming into the world, that is, those who aspire to a better state [2] and expend effort to adorn their own soul and do not permit it to be unadorned and ugly.

XXIV.

Most similar to these is both the division of the divine will and its explanation which Oecumenius hands down, who [1], on account of his subtle and articulated commentaries, has customarily been called the Scholiast of the New Testament. For, considering the words of Christ in Paul [2], τοῦ ποιῆσαι ὁ Θεὸς τὸ θέλημά σου, "that I may do, O God, your will," he writes:

> τί οὖν; αἱ κατὰ νόμον θυσίαι οὐκ ἦσαν θελήματι Θεοῦ; ἦσαν μέν, ἀλλ᾽ ἀναγκαστῶς.
> What then? Were the sacrifices according to the law not from the will of God? They were indeed, but by a certain necessity and almost under compulsion. For the Lord said simply to the Jews: bloody victims are altogether hateful to me on account of their blood; but when you have a desire to sacrifice, sacrifice indeed to me and not to idols, ὅπερ οὐκ ἦν καθαροῦ καὶ πρωτοτύπου θελήματος, which was not of the pure and principal will.

Therefore that which in the other Greek writers is the second will, the consequent will, the will from condescension and permission, the will provoked by us, is in Oecumenius the will as though elicited by necessity, not arising spontaneously from God, a mixed will, not simple and pure. But that which in them is

[1] In the commentary on John I. 9.

[2] Isaac Habert discusses excellently, in the second book of *The Theology of the Greek Fathers on Grace*, formulas of speaking akin to this one, which occur not infrequently among the Greek Fathers and writers.

[1] There have not been lacking those who believed Oecumenius to be later than Theophylact, which Montfaucon demonstrated to be false in *Bibliotheca Coisliniana*, pp. 82-277. But William Cave, in *Historia Literaria* at the year 990, and Albert Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, vol. XIII, p. 845, diligently recount the things which pertain to him.

[2] Heb. X. 7.

the first, principal, spontaneous will, the will of benignity and love, is in Oecumenius the pure will, namely, separated from all those things of which men are the cause, the archetypal will, in which alone the activity of divine charity, never growing faint, shines forth.

That this pure and archetypal will is salvific, universal in amplitude, and cherishes all in its bosom, Oecumenius declares in the place [3] where, upon the words of Paul [4], ὃς πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι, "who [God] wills all men to be saved," he appends this commentary:

> εἰ αὐτός, φησί, θέλει πάντας σωθῆναι ὁ καὶ σώζων Κύριος, τίς χρεία ἐμῶν εὐχῶν; ναί· αὐτούς τε γὰρ ἐκείνους εἰς ἀγάπην ἕλκεις, καὶ τὸ φιλόστοργον δεικνύεις, μιμοῦ, φησί, τὸν σκοπὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ· αὐτὸς γὰρ πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι, καὶ σὺ ὑπὲρ πάντων εὔχου ἀνθρώπων,
>
> If he himself, you will object, who is the Lord that saves, wills all to be saved, to what purpose are our prayers? They are indeed fitting, for you both draw those very persons into charity and demonstrate benevolence. Imitate, Paul says, the purpose of God; for since he himself wills all men to be saved, do you in turn pray for all men.

Then he adds: εἰ οὖν θέλει ὁ Θεός, "if therefore God wills, why is that which he wills not done?" It is not done, ὅτι ἐκεῖνοι οὐ θέλουσιν, οὐδὲν γὰρ πρὸς ἀνάγκην ποιεῖ ὁ Θεός, "because they do not will. For God extorts nothing from us by imposing necessity."

Therefore all men belong to the object of charity, whether of that charity by which we ought mutually to embrace one another, or of that by which God pursues all men. But if many fall away from salvation and come upon everlasting destruction, this cannot be ascribed to divine charity as though it did not fulfill its parts; rather, it must be imputed as a fault to those who stubbornly resist divine charity.

XXV.

The divisions and explanations of the divine will which we know to have been customary and received among the Greek Fathers and writers occur also among the Latin doctors of the Church themselves, although turned somewhat differently and, according to each one's genius and ability, either more elegantly proposed or more obscurely declared. For the felicity of the Greeks in distinctly perceiving and clearly expressing the matters brought into question is more than once very considerably lacking in the Latin writers of the Middle Ages.

[3] On the First Epistle to Timothy, chap. IV.

[4] I Tim. II. 4.

Thus blessed Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, who in an ancient epitaph [1] is called "bright in intellect, a profound knower of Scripture," when, in the little book which he entitled *On the Will*, he comes to those divisions of the will which he had promised [1] to explain in the work *On the Harmony of Foreknowledge, Predestination, and Grace with Free Choice*, writes these things among others [2]:

> One will can be called efficient, another approving, another permitting. I call that efficient which effects what it wills, and which would effect it if it could; approving, however, that which approves what exists, and which would approve it if it existed; and permitting, that which permits that to exist which it is said to will if it exists, and which would permit it if it existed. The efficient is indeed also approving and permitting; the approving, moreover, is also permitting; but the merely permitting can rightly be called neither efficient nor approving. According to the efficient will it was said [3]: "The Lord has done all things whatsoever he willed." But according to the approving will it is said [4] that God wills every man to be saved. For God approves, and it pleases him concerning all the just, because they are just, that they be saved; and it would nevertheless please him concerning the unjust, if they were just, that they be saved. For what was said is such as if it were said: God makes no one unjust, but each one has from himself the injustice whereby he is condemned; and therefore it cannot be said to displease God if he is just and is saved, nor can God be said to oppose the salvation of anyone, but to approve if there is one who is saved. But according to the permitting will it is said [5] that he hardens whom he wills, because he permits him to be hardened; for what was premised [6], "he has mercy upon whom he wills," was said according to the efficient will.

This more subtle disputation of Anselm, when duly compared with the things which we have reported from the Greek writers, demonstrates not obscurely that the efficient and permitting will in Anselm corresponds to the will which the latter call the second, consequent, from condescension, by accident, mixed, and almost compelled; but that the approving will in Anselm corresponds to the will which the same writers name good pleasure, first, archetypal, pure, and antecedent.

---

[1] It is reported by Gerberon before the works of Anselm, which he himself edited more accurately.

[1] *On the Harmony*, q. III, chap. XI, another reading: XXI.

[2] *On the Will*, p. 116, Paris ed., 1721.

[3] Ps. CXIII. 3.

[4] I Tim. II. 4.

[5] Rom. IX. 18.

[6] Ibid.

He himself mentions these endowments of that approving will and enumerates its ornaments: I. that it is a true will properly inhering in God; II. that it is universal in amplitude and embraces no less those who are condemned because they persevere in impiety than those who are endowed with beatitude because they are just; III. that it is an efficacious and active will, since it opposes the salvation of no one and frees all from the necessity of perishing. Men, however, would be subject to this most miserable necessity unless they were prepared and raised up by the benefits of the approving divine will and were made such as could aspire to the liberty of the sons of God.

XXVI.

Consonant with these are the things which Anselm writes in the book *On the Will of God*, where, after he has admonished [1] that the will of God is taken in many ways, he immediately continues [2]:

> The will of God, therefore, is sometimes taken in the Scriptures as equivalent to his omnipotent foreknowledge and to the ordinance which sagaciously disposes all things. Whence it is said [3]: "The Lord has done all things whatsoever he willed"; that is, whatever God ordained from eternity that he would do, he has left nothing unfulfilled. The will of God is also taken according to a certain affection of the mercy of God, as in that place [4]: "God wills all to be saved"; which is to say, he causes [5] the saints to will that all be saved, which nevertheless he himself wills, that is, he himself has ordained it; but he causes the saints to will it by inspiring love of God and neighbor, by which love prayers are fittingly made in the Church by the saints for schismatics and heretics, and also for Jews and gentiles.
>
> A divine institution is not improperly called the will of God. But the institution of God can be divided into two: into the precepts of the divine Scriptures and into the natural law. Whatever is natural

[1] *On the Will of God*, chap. II, p. 151.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ps. CXIII. 3.

[4] I Tim. II. 4.

[5] Although it is not foreign to the usage of speech that words signifying action should also be employed concerning those who either confer the power of acting or command and procure the action itself, as Glassius shows at greater length in *Sacred Philology*, book I, tract III, canon XXII; nevertheless there is no appearance of truth by which it is recommended that in this passage of Paul *for God to will* is the same as *for God to effect that the saints will*.

> is implanted in man, which [1] is: "What you would not have done to yourself, do not do to another." Whoever opposes this does not observe the will of God. The precepts also of the divine Scriptures and the right observances of the Churches are not undeservedly called the will of God; whoever does not obediently acquiesce in them is said to deviate entirely from the will of God, although he is nevertheless in no way able to stray from the order of his foreknowledge.

Whence he concludes [2]:

> Behold, the will of God is taken in four ways by the learned doctors, namely: for the knowledge of God; for the will of the saints, who charitably will even the unjust to be saved; for human reason; and fourth, for the divine precepts.

Then, to confirm the things which he had premised, after transcribing these words of Augustine [3], "Therefore the works of the Lord are great, sought out according to all his wills, so that in a wonderful and ineffable manner nothing is done apart from his will, even that which is done against his will; which would not be done if he did not permit it, nor indeed does he permit it unwillingly, but willingly; nor would he, being good, permit evil to be done, unless, being omnipotent, he could make good from evil," he immediately adds [4]:

> There is also another division of this will. For one can be called efficient, another approving, another conceding, and another permitting. The efficient will in God does whatever it wills; the efficient in man does in act what man both can and wills. The approving is that which approves something, and this pertains both to man and to God. The approving in God is that which wills all to be saved, since, as far as concerns himself, he hinders no one from being saved; indeed, if anyone labors toward this, he approves it. It is evident what the approving will is in man. The conceding is that which concedes that something be done. By a conceding will, moreover, God wills that the man who has not proposed something better should marry a wife.
>
> The permitting will is that which permits something to be done, even though it sometimes displeases. And in this way God is said to will the evils which he permits to be done. Whence it is said [1]: "He hardens whom he wills, and upon whom he wills he has mercy."

---

[1] Tob. IV.
[2] *On the Will of God*, chap. III, p. 151.
[3] *Enchiridion*, chap. C.
[4] *On the Will of God*, chap. V, p. 152.
[1] Rom. IX. 18.

XXVII.

Therefore, setting aside those things which pertain less to the present treatment, it is evident in the highest degree that both the origin of the approving will and its force and amplitude are proposed by Anselm in no other manner than that in which the Greek doctors disclosed the origin, force, and scope of the preceding will.

For I. what is the origin of the first and antecedent will according to the latter? It is none other than the goodness of God, his mercy, and his benignity poured forth upon men. But Anselm teaches that this very thing is the origin of the approving will, which he writes to be in God according to a certain affection of mercy. Now God is merciful [2] because he saves the wretched and spares sinners; and he is not merciful because he is affected by no compassion for misery. He is merciful [3] because he is wholly and supremely good. Whence nothing remains but to exclaim [4]:

> O height of your goodness, O God! It is seen whence you are merciful, and it is not thoroughly seen. It is discerned whence the river flows, and the fountain whence it springs is not perceived. For it is from the fullness of goodness that you are kind to your sinners; and in the height of your goodness lies hidden the reason why this is so. For although from goodness you repay good things to the good and evil things to the evil, nevertheless the reason of justice seems to demand this. But when you bestow good things upon the evil, it is known that, being supremely good, you willed to do this, and it is marvelous why, being supremely just, you could will it. O mercy, from what rich sweetness and sweet abundance do you flow forth to us!

To these things, II. what force do the Greeks establish the preceding will to have? Namely, one full of benevolence, which by its light dispels the darkness of men and by its heat inflames and burns their cooling breasts. But Anselm represents the force and efficacy of the approving will no otherwise: by it God, as far as concerns himself, hinders no one from being saved, but indeed approves if anyone labors toward this; by it he himself also wills all men to be saved and inspires the saints to pray charitably for all; and because of it each man ought to express his grateful mind toward God in these or similar words [1]:

> O immensity of the goodness of God, with what affection are you to be loved by sinners? For you save the just with justice accompa-

[2] *Proslogion*, chap. VIII, p. 31.
[3] Ibid., chap. IX, p. 31.
[4] Ibid.; and *Meditation* VI, pp. 212-213.
[1] *Proslogion*, chap. IX, p. 32.

> nying; but these you deliver with justice ruling. The former, with merits assisting; the latter, with merits resisting. The former, by recognizing the good things which you gave; the latter, by forgiving the evil things which you hate. O immense goodness, who thus exceed every understanding, may that mercy which proceeds from so great an abundance of yours come upon me. May that which flows forth from you flow into me. Spare through clemency, lest you take vengeance through justice.

Finally, III. the voice of the Greeks is one, and their opinion one and concordant: that the amplitude of the first and preceding salvific will is universal, and that the order of reparation chosen by God is not particular but universal and extends as widely as the race of men itself extends. But what does Anselm say? First he denies that God, as far as concerns himself, hinders even one from being saved; then he affirms that God wills that all men be saved. Thus, both by denying and by affirming, he testifies that there are no limits which circumscribe the amplitude of the salvific will.

XXVIII.

The other Anselm, scholastic and dean of the Church of Laon [2], agrees, if indeed he himself is the author of those commentaries on Matthew [1] which for a long time it was customary to attribute to Anselm of Canterbury. For, discussing the words of the Lord's Prayer [2], "Thy will be done," he has these things [3], most apposite to the present matter:

> There are two wills in God: one of mercy, which is not coercive and takes nothing away from free choice, by which [4] he wills all men to be saved, which nevertheless is placed in their free will. There is

[2] Although he was valued most highly by all and was regarded in the twelfth century as an oracle, nevertheless he could not prevent himself from being ill-treated by Abelard, a man of shameless disposition who had been among his disciples, in these words in chapter III of the *History of His Calamities*: "I approached this old man, for whom long practice rather than intellect or memory had procured a name. If anyone, uncertain about some question, approached to knock concerning it, he returned more uncertain. He was indeed marvelous in the eyes of his hearers, but nothing in the sight of those who questioned him. His use of words was marvelous, but contemptible in sense and empty of reason. When he kindled a fire, he filled his house with smoke; he did not illuminate it with light. His tree appeared to those looking from afar to be conspicuous, wholly in leaves; but to those drawing near and looking more diligently it was found fruitless."

[1] For Raynaud, works, vol. XII, p. 90, thinks that the true author of these commentaries is Peter Babion, an Englishman.

[2] Matt. VI. 10.

[3] In the commentary on Matt. VI. 10.

[4] I Tim. II. 4.

> another which is of the effects of things, of which it is said [5]: "He has done all things whatsoever he willed"; no one can resist this, of which it is said [6]: "Who resists his will?" This always accords with providence, but the other does not always. For if through mercy he should will concerning some wicked man that he be just and should confer his grace upon him, and nevertheless that man through free choice should contradict him and not consent to the grace of God, this will of God does not accord with providence, because, although through sweetness he confers grace, nevertheless he knows that the man will not consent. But that will which is of the effects is one permitting, another approving. The permitting is that by which he effects evil whenever he wills. But the approving is that by which he makes good whenever he wills, and each is from justice. Therefore men resist the will of mercy and do not resist the will of justice.

From these both the distribution of the divine will and the sincere character and rationale of each part become excellently known. First the distribution becomes known, since one is and is called the will of mercy and sweetness, the other the efficient will and that of justice. Then the sincere rationale of each becomes known, since their origin, their mutual relation, their relation to human liberty, and their amplitude are clearly explained.

For the origin of the efficient will is justice, but that of the other is mercy, the most sweet nature of God and the propensity for doing good which is implanted in him.

They are so related to one another that the will of mercy goes before and the will of justice follows; the former first fulfills its parts, and the latter then discharges its office.

Wherefore by the will of justice God executes in men and does concerning men what he foreknew that he would effect in them and concerning them, whether they themselves will or do not will. But by the will of mercy he passes by no one whom he does not anticipate with benefits and does not suffuse with the graces of his sweetness; yet he leaves it intact for each whether to repay love to the divine love which goes before or ungratefully and proudly to despise it. Hence those who cannot resist the will of justice very frequently resist the will of mercy, with the greatest crime and to their own greatest harm. Arnold of Chartres, Abbot of Bonneval, writes excellently [1]:

> In original sin the corruption of nature had deserved to be cast away and exterminated; but because the will was not in fault, God pro-

[5] Ps. CXIII. 3.

[6] Rom. IX. 19.

[1] Sermon *On the Washing of the Feet*, p. 79, Fell ed., 1700.

> vided a remedy for the general condemnation and tempered the sentence of his justice, removing the hereditary burden from the offspring and mercifully purging away the leaven of primitive corruption by washing and medicinal anointing. But indignation and anger not undeservedly return upon those who, after the grace of this indulgence, have voluntarily wandered through sins, who abuse their own choice and are led by will, not necessity. Nor does any gain remain for them in the death of Christ, but the benefits they have despised most justly condemn them. Now God does not immediately avenge their contempt, nor does the anger of the judge run through each offense, nor has he closed the doors and manifold channels of the fountain of his mercy; but he meets those who flee and compels the desperate to return, showing them the way of repentance, than which none broader is found; and to those who return he grants that the sacraments they have injured may again be able to profit them, and if repentance were not present in those men, they could in no way thereafter experience the effect of those sacraments.

God, namely, assigned the first parts to mercy and provided for lost men by that established order of reparation, so that only those should experience the vengeance of justice who had despised the gifts of mercy with an ungrateful and hardened mind.

XXIX.

Rupert, Abbot of Deutz, both repeats and explains all these things in the book *On the Omnipotence of God* [1], writing:

> The omnipotence of God does not carry out its acts with only one hand, but with two, namely, those of mercy and judgment; by this law, namely, that it first endeavors to operate with the hand of mercy, and when with that hand, pride resisting it, it has been unable to perform that mighty work, then at length, extending the other hand,

[1] Chap. XI. William Cave has these things concerning Rupert in the *Literary History* at the twelfth century: "What his opinion concerning the Eucharist was, Baronius himself explains at the year 1111. He fell incautiously, he says, into the error by which he asserted that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist the whole body and blood of Christ is truly present in such a way that the very substance of the bread and wine also remains whole. This error was condemned in the Lateran Council under Pope Innocent IV. Or, as Bellarmine perhaps explains Rupert's opinion more clearly in *On Ecclesiastical Writers*, under Rupert: Rupert's error is situated in this, that he thought the bread is not converted into the body of Christ when the Eucharist is confected, but is assumed by the divine Word in the manner in which humanity was assumed." But Gabriel Gerberon, in the *Apology for Rupert, Abbot of Deutz*, published at Paris in 1669, examined Rupert's doctrine much more diligently and learnedly and subtly vindicated it from every mark of error.

> the hand of judgment, it breaks like vessels of the potter those whom it could not soften.

Therefore God rules men with a twofold hand and pursues them with a twofold will, the will of mercy and the will of judgment; yet these two wills are not coordinated with one another, but are mutually subordinated.

For the will of mercy precedes, by which God embraces absolutely all men, anticipates all with his benefits, and honors them with gifts; nor does the will of judgment follow before men by their contumacy have rendered vain the activity of mercy and deprived the indulgence of the merciful Deity of its desired fruits.

Augustine had anticipated this much earlier and had signified it in express words [1], saying:

> He who, when called, does not come, just as he had no merit of reward that he should be called, so begins to have the merit of punishment when, after being called, he has neglected to come. Thus there will be those two things: "Mercy and judgment I will sing to you, O Lord." The calling pertains to mercy; the punishment of those who have neglected to come pertains to judgment.

XXX.

Nor did Bernard, mellifluous among the doctors [2] and the last among the Fathers [3], judge otherwise concerning the divine will, the order and manner of reparation, and that providence by which God has always provided, and continues to provide, for the human race. For, explaining in a commentary the words of the Apostle [4], "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and the God of all consolation," he observes at the beginning [5]:

> In that God is called the Father of mercies, who does not see the Son designated as if [6] by a proper name? And he is well called the Father of mercies, whose property it is always to have mercy and to spare.

Then he continues [7]:

---

[1] *On Eighty-three Questions*, q. LXIII.

[2] Cf. the singular little work of Théophile Raynaud entitled *The Gallican Bee*, in which the title Mellifluous Doctor is asserted for Bernard.

[3] On this matter read Mabillon's discussion in the preface to the works of Bernard, § II, nos. 25 ff.

[4] II Cor. I. 3.

[5] *On the Nativity of the Lord*, Sermon V, no. 2, p. 792, Paris ed., 1719.

[6] The adverb *as if* is skillfully added, for the Father is mercy, and the Son is mercy, and the Holy Spirit is mercy; and these three are nothing but one mercy, just as they are one essence, one wisdom, one divinity, one majesty.

[7] Ibid., no. 3, pp. 792-793.

> But perhaps someone may say: how is it proper to him to have mercy, whose judgments [8] are a great abyss? For it is not said [9], "All his ways are mercy alone," but "mercy and truth." He is no less just than merciful, to whom [1] mercy and judgment are sung.

He replies:

> That indeed is true: "He has mercy upon whom he wills [2], and whom he wills he hardens"; but that he has mercy is proper to him. For he takes the material and, as it were, a certain seedbed of having mercy from himself. For that he judges and condemns, we in some manner compel him, so that mercy appears to proceed from his heart in a far different way than punishment does. Hear him himself saying [3]: "Is the death of the impious my will, says the Lord, and not rather that he be converted and live?" Rightly, therefore, he is not called the father of judgments or punishments, but the Father of mercies, not only because a father appears to have mercy rather than to be indignant, but all the more because he takes the cause and origin of having mercy from what is his own, but that of judging or punishing rather from what is ours.

When I read these things and turn them over with myself in my mind, I seem to myself to hear Chrysostom again [4], to hear Damascene [5], and to hear the other Greeks and Latins [6] whose testimonies and opinions I have collected thus far. For what does Bernard hand down concerning the divine will toward men? Namely, that it is twofold, the one of mercy, the other of truth and judgment. But are they separated and divided from one another by no distinction? Rather, by one varied and manifold.

For if we give credence to Bernard, first there exists between the two a distinction of origin, since the will of mercy is implanted in God and flows spontaneously from his heart; but the will of judgment ought rather to be attributed to us who sin than to God himself who judges.

Then there exists a distinction of order, since the former begins and the latter follows; the former claims primacy for itself, and the latter succeeds only in the second place.

---

[8] Ps. XXXV. 6.
[9] Ps. XXIV. 10.
[1] Ps. C. 1.
[2] Rom. IX. 18.
[3] Ezek. XVIII. 23.
[4] Nos. 2 ff.
[5] Nos. 17 ff.
[6] Nos. 21 ff.

Finally, there exists a distinction of amplitude, since the former extends as widely as the mercy of him who is properly called the Father of mercies extends; but the latter is referred only to those who in some manner compel God to punish them with the severity of a judge.

XXXI.

These heads of doctrine had put down such deep roots in Bernard's mind and soul that they are found repeated and inculcated a second and third time in his works. For Bernard repeats them [1] when, speaking of the threefold mercy of God, he says:

> Mercy is in the midst of the temple, not in a corner [2] or a lodging place, because there is no acceptance of persons with God. It is placed in common, is offered to all, and no one is without it except him who refuses it. Your waters are conducted abroad, O Lord God; nevertheless your fountain is proper to you.

And he repeats them yet again [3] when, explaining the similitude expressed in these words of the Song of Songs [4], "My beloved is like unto a roe and a fawn of harts," he says:

> It was assuredly fitting that the likeness should be taken not only from the fawn but also from the roe, in order that by the former the desire of the one saving might be expressed, and by the latter the judgment of the one choosing. For Christ is just and merciful, Savior and Judge; and because he loves, he wills [5] all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth; and because he judges, he knows [6] who are his, and he himself knows whom he chose from the beginning.

What sort, therefore, is the order by which provision is divinely made for the salvation of men? It is bipartite, just as the will of God by which it was first instituted and is continually administered is bipartite. For one is the order of mercy, which corresponds to the will of mercy; and another is the order of justice, which is referred to the will of judgment.

But are these orders parallel, or is one subject and subordinate to the other? They are related to one another by that relation which intervenes between the two

[1] On the Purification of the Blessed Mary, Sermon I, no. 2, p. 966.
[2] He has regard to the words of Ps. XLVII. 10.
[3] *On the Song of Songs*, Sermon LV, no. 1, p. 1459.
[4] Song II. 9.
[5] I Tim. II. 4.
[6] John XIII. 18.

wills of mercy and justice. The will of mercy goes before and makes way for the will of justice only when it has been despised. Therefore the order of mercy is antecedent, and the order of justice follows it when it has been neglected and scorned.

Wherefore all men whatsoever pertain *per se* and primarily to the order of mercy, nor, excluded from it, do they fall into the order of justice before they have rejected the salvific will of the merciful and loving God.

XXXII.

And behold to what the division which we have undertaken to expound and illustrate amounts; behold what truths of the highest moment and altogether the gravest weight are contained in it. The rationale is indeed manifold, and the formulas by which Greek and Latin writers express and depict each will are diverse; but the thing which all have before their eyes, which they teach, and which they confirm is one and the same.

The formulas are diverse, since that will of God which Chrysostom, Damascene, Oecumenius, and Theophylact call θέλημα πρῶτον, προηγούμενον, εὐδοκίαν, ἐπιθυμίαν, θέλημα σφοδρόν, πεῖσμα, θέλημα χωρὶς αἰτίας, θέλημα ἀπὸ ἀγάπης μόνης, θέλημα ἀγαθότητος, θέλημα ὅπερ Θεὸς ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ θέλει, θέλημα ἐκ Θεοῦ ὄν, θέλημα καθαρὸν καὶ πρωτότυπον, the first, principal, and preceding will; good pleasure; desire; the intense will; the firm determination of mind; the will without an extrinsic cause; the will proceeding from charity alone; the will of benignity; the will which comes forth and bursts forth spontaneously from God; the pure and archetypal will; each Anselm, of Canterbury and of Laon, and Rupert and Bernard call that very same will the approving will, the will of mercy, the will of love, the will implanted in God and proper to him and flowing spontaneously from his heart.

The formulas are diverse, since the will which among the Greeks is θέλημα δεύτερον, θέλημα ἑπόμενον, θέλημα κατὰ συγκατάβασιν, θέλημα μετ᾽ αἰτίας, θέλημα ἐξ ἡμετέρας αἰτίας, θέλημα κατὰ παραχώρησιν, θέλημα κατὰ συμβεβηκός, θέλημα κατ᾽ ἀνάγκην, the second will, the consequent will, the will from condescension, the will not without a cause, indeed the will which derives its cause from us, the will of permission, the will which accrues to God and is as it were forced from him by necessity, is called and is among the Latins the efficient will, the permitting will, the will of judgment and justice, the will which follows in the second place, the will which takes its cause and origin from us.

Yet under this diversity of expressions and formulas there is one head of doctrine which is handed down, one complex truth which is taught. The parts and,

I would almost say, the elements of this complex truth are held to be these: I. there is in God a universal salvific will which excepts no one and comprehends absolutely all men within its scope; II. this will, entirely gratuitous and proceeding from the fountain of divine mercy and benignity, is not sterile and unfruitful but efficacious and active, and by it God so solicitously assists men with internal and external aids that nothing is lacking to them which may appear necessary or opportune for attaining salvation; III. the benevolence of this salvific will is so great that if the attainment of salvation depended upon it alone, without doubt all men would be saved; but IV. not all are therefore saved, and many perish, because it is indeed the first and principal cause, but not likewise the sole and adequate cause; for V. to the very attainment of salvation it is required in addition that men not fail themselves, that they not fail the divine benefits [1] by which they are anticipated, and that they not neglect the condition divinely established, by which it has been provided that among men possessed of their own right and masters of themselves only those enjoy the end of the eudaemonic order who have not despised the prescription of the moral order; but if any VI. have despised it, God decrees punishments against them by his second and consequent will and punishes them with the decreed penalties; whence VII. divine providence toward men is administered by a twofold order and almost a twofold hand,

administered by the order and hand of mercy and charity, and administered by the order and hand of severity and justice. Yet it is not administered in the same manner, but first by the order of mercy and charity, which precedes, and then by the order of severity and justice, which follows and regards only those who, voluntarily straying from the prior order [1], despise the riches τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς, καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας, "of his goodness and patience and long-suffering," and according to [2] their hardness and hardened mind treasure up for themselves ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς, καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ Θεοῦ, "wrath in the day of wrath and of the revelation and just judgment of God," and render themselves [3] σκεύη ὀργῆς, κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν, "vessels of wrath fitted for destruction."

[1] To this pertain the things which Augustine writes in *On the Gift of Perseverance* (another reading: *On the Good of Perseverance*), chap. XIV.

[1] Rom. II. 4.

[2] Ibid., v. 5.

[3] Rom. IX. 22, where Theodoret says: σκεύη δὲ ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν καλεῖ τοὺς αὐθαιρέτῳ γνώμῃ τοῦτο γεγενημένους, "he calls those vessels of wrath prepared for destruction who have become such by their own will." He illustrates this commentary by the things which are found in II Tim. II. 20 and I Cor. III. 12.

XXXIII.

And here I must take up a question which offers itself of its own accord and is intimately connected with the things which I have discussed thus far: namely, what ought to be thought concerning the present head of doctrine, and in what class it should be reckoned; whether among those doctrines which are merely probable, or rather among those which are held certainly and firmly; whether among those which have pleased only a few ecclesiastical writers, or rather among those which have been received by common consent; whether among those which pertain to the deposit of revelation, or rather among those which wander beyond the bounds of revelation. Here anyone easily perceives both that the question is most grave and that no care, however solicitous, can be expended which may not appear to be employed with the highest right.

Therefore, to begin with, I separate from the doctrine itself the formulas by which it is expressed, and I distinguish the garment and habit from the body itself.

Then I admonish that one judgment and estimation must plainly be made concerning the formulas and garment, and another concerning the thing itself and the body.

And as regards the formulas, they can be considered in three ways: grammatically, logically, and theologically. Grammatically, indeed, they are neither unsuitable nor unusual; logically, they are especially conducive to distinguishing and unfolding notions; but theologically, they borrow no small measure of worth and dignity from those ecclesiastical writers who frequently employed them.

But concerning the thing itself and the sum of the doctrine, which comes to this—that the human race is so divinely ruled and administered that it does not experience the severity of justice before it has received the benefits of mercy and benignity and has contumaciously repelled them—I affirm two things in order, and first this: it appears altogether probable, even if only those things which we have thus far reported are considered. For Melchior Cano most truly wrote [1]:

> The authority of one or two saints, even in those things which pertain to Sacred Scripture and the doctrine of faith, can indeed furnish a probable argument, but not a firm one. Thus, to despise it and account it as nothing will be the part of an impudent man; to embrace it and hold it as certain will be the part of an altogether imprudent man.

Nor less truly did Denis Petau, having made a distinction between two kinds of arguments, of which one is necessary and ἀποδεικτικόν, demonstrative, and has a certain firmness of conclusion which compels assent, while the other is only

[1] *Theological Places*, book VII, chap. III.

probable, observe [2] that this latter kind is gathered especially from the authority of the Fathers and doctors of the Church disputing individually about divine matters outside synodal assemblies. The more numerous and more excellent those who concur in the same opinion, the more strength and weight they add to it. But not merely one or two, but eighteen, and these eminent and illustrious, with no one at all opposing them, profess that doctrine which we have reported in summary form. It would therefore be the part of an impudent man to contemn it and expunge it from the number of those things which are judged probable.

Then I affirm that this same doctrine is indubitable and is proved by a certain and necessary argument.

For, Petau continues [1], whatever is of such a kind that all the Fathers and doctors of the Church agree among themselves concerning it either possesses the firmness of a Catholic decree or certainly approaches it as closely as possible, because so great a consensus among them contains an argument for an ancient tradition derived from on high, which Catholic piety acknowledges as one of the rules of faith. But I would venture to say that scarcely any other head of doctrine can be brought forward which the Fathers handed down with fuller consensus. For we read that always [2], everywhere, and by all it was handed down that God does not betake himself to the order of justice before he has fulfilled the offices of mercy toward men; nor does he show himself wrathful by inflicting everlasting punishments before he has manifested himself good and merciful by imparting benefits.

[2] *Theological Dogmas*, Prolegomena, chap. II, § II.

[1] Ibid. To this pertain the words of Leontius of Byzantium in the first book *Against Nestorius and Eutyches*: "After the apostles and prophets, God placed doctors in the Church, according to the incomprehensible providence of the Holy Spirit, for the work of the ministry, unto the edification of the body of Christ. Wherefore he who does not receive those Fathers who are illustrious and celebrated in the Church plainly resists the ordination and constitution of God."

[2] I have before my eyes the canon which Vincent of Lérins expresses in the *Commonitorium*, § III, in these words: "In the Catholic Church itself great care must be taken that we hold that which has been believed everywhere, always, and by all. For this is truly and properly Catholic, as the force and rationale of the name itself declares, because it comprehends almost all things universally. But this will be done only if we follow universality, antiquity, and consensus. We shall follow universality in this manner: if we confess that one faith to be true which the whole Church throughout the world confesses; antiquity, however, in this manner: if we in no way depart from those senses which it is manifest that our holy ancestors and Fathers celebrated; and consensus likewise: if in antiquity itself we follow the definitions and opinions of all, or certainly of almost all, priests and doctors alike."

XXXIV.

Indeed, that I may begin to enumerate witnesses and adduce testimonies—if not all of them, at least those which I have at hand—Atto, Bishop of Vercelli, who flourished in the tenth century and

whose works have always been held in the highest esteem by learned and erudite theologians [1], writes [3] upon the words [2] of Paul, "who wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth":

> If God indeed, who is called omnipotent, wills all men to be saved, why is his will not fulfilled? But in every utterance a sense and condition lie hidden. Whence the Apostle Peter says [4]: "Every Scripture requires interpretation." For God wills all to be saved, but if they approach him. For he does not so will that the unwilling be saved; but he wills them to be saved if they themselves also will. For indeed, he who gave the law to all excepted no one from salvation. Does not a physician therefore set himself forth publicly, in order to show that he wills to save all, provided nevertheless that he is sought by the sick? For salvation is not true if it is bestowed upon one unwilling; nor can he rejoice in the salvation received who unwillingly—if this can nevertheless occur—receives the medicine; not to mention that the medicine cannot have its effect unless the sick man applies his mind to it. For this medicine is not corporeal but spiritual, and it profits neither the doubtful nor the envious. For it is faith which gives salvation; unless the mind receives it with its whole will, it will not only profit nothing but will even do harm. For the grace of faith has this power: that it infuses divine healing into those devoted to it, but confers upon the undevout a disease through which the old man perishes.

But the things which immediately follow [5], "For there is one God, one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus," he explains with this commentary [6]:

> He signifies that the will of God and of Christ is one in saving men; whence he confesses that God the Father, because from him is all

[1] Cf. the preface of Carlo Burontius to the works of Atto, published at Vercelli in the year 1768.

[3] In the commentary at this place, p. 137.

[2] I Tim. II. 4.

[4] II Pet. I. 20, where the Vulgate reads: "No prophecy of Scripture is made by private interpretation."

[5] I Tim. II. 5.

[6] In the commentary at this place, p. 137.

> [7] authority, is one, and that there is one mediator of God and men, Christ Jesus.
>
> For, being sent by the Father and made an arbiter, he reconciled God and men by reforming them unto the knowledge of him. For because the Father and the Son are one, not in person but in undiffering nature, the Son of God, in order that he might be the arbiter of God and men, assumed flesh and was born man, so that the man Christ Jesus might be mediator of God and men—that is, not without divinity, because man was in God and God in man—and so that he might be mediator from both and reconcile both, he first effected this in himself. For, while preserving the unity of God, he could not be called mediator of God and men as though he were another God who should recall dissenting man into favor with God; but as man, who did not transgress the law given, he was made arbiter between him who sinned and him who knows not how to sin, so that the latter might forgive and man might thereafter remain in the faith of God.

Therefore the salvific will of God the Father and of his Christ is one: one by ontological unity, because the Father and Christ are one God; one by moral unity, because Christ is God in such a manner that he is at the same time man, who never failed to prefer the human will conformed to the paternal will.

But this one salvific will of the Father and of Christ embraces all men and excludes no one. It is indeed universal, and also especially efficacious and active. The signs and arguments of its efficacy are both the laws enacted for all and the universal economy of the Mediator, and then the power given to all of obtaining salvation, if they will.

By this manner of thinking and speaking we are taught that the salvific will ought to be and to be called neither simply absolute nor simply affected by a condition, but partly absolute and partly hypothetical. It is absolute and free from condition in its origin, since it is native to God and flows from his innate

benignity; it is again absolute and free from condition with respect to those benefits which are pure gifts and of which God is the sole and adequate cause; but, conversely, hypothetical and affected by a condition with respect to those benefits which are gifts in such a manner that they are at the same time wages

[7] Hilary also employs the name *authority* of the Father in preference to the Son in the ninth book *On the Trinity*, as does the author of the *Questions of Both Testaments*,

whom it was customary to ascribe to Augustine, q. CXXII. By this name *authority*, moreover, the Latins signified what Basil among the Greeks expressed in book III *Against Eunomius*, saying: ὁ υἱὸς τάξει μὲν δεύτερος τοῦ πατρός, ὅτι ἀπ᾽ ἐκείνου· καὶ ἀξιώματι, ὅτι ἀρχὴ καὶ αἰτία τοῦ εἶναι αὐτοῦ ὁ πατήρ, "the Son is indeed second in order from the Father, because he is from him; and in dignity, because the Father is the principle and cause that he himself exists." Cf. George Bull, *Defense of the Nicene Faith*, sect. IV, chap. II.

and reward, and of which God is therefore not the sole and adequate cause, but the principal and supreme cause.

This economy of the salvific will is such that it alone befits God, alone corresponds to the realities, and alone is suited to men.

It alone befits God, since it depicts to the life his infinite φιλανθρωπίαν, love of mankind, and ascribes and vindicates to him the primacy in the order of salvation.

It alone accords with the realities; for men could not emerge from darkness, put off their former weakness, and strive with their whole mind toward that beatitude which is God unless God made the beginning, prepared them, and advanced those prepared to a certain new life.

It alone is suited to men, whose hope it no more raises than it inflames their diligence, and whose desire of felicity it no more sharpens than it persuades them of the necessity of observing their duties. For by this economy of the salvific will it is brought about that both the moral and the eudaemonic orders are recalled to harmony, and that the σκοπός, scope and supreme end, of the latter is shown to be the reward and crown of the former.

XXXV.

But Hincmar, Bishop of Reims, treated these things much more copiously in that defense which he undertook [1] of the third of the capitula of Quierzy [2], which was contained in these words: God almighty

wills all men without exception to be saved, although not all are saved. That some, however, are saved is the gift of him who saves; that some perish, however, is the merit of those who perish.

Having set down this lemma [1], he immediately appeals [2] to the Decretal of Celestine given to Venerius and the other bishops of Gaul, after stating that it must be tested by the writings of the orthodox, and especially by the faith of the holy, Catholic, and apostolic Roman Church, which is the first mother of all the churches in the whole world, so that, once agreement or disagreement has been compared, it may be approved or disapproved; and he teaches that from it must be drawn what we ought to believe, hold, and preach in a Catholic manner.

[1] Hincmar composed two works against the predestinarians. One, containing three books, was in defense of the capitula of Quierzy against Gottschalk, which the men of Lyons had attacked in their writings. The other was not divided into books but into thirty-eight chapters, when the men of Lyons again rose against Hincmar. This latter still survives; but of the former only the letter or preface to King Charles remains in Flodoard.

[2] Concerning these capitula, read Petau's discussion in *On the Incarnation*, book XIII, chap. VIII.

[1] *On Predestination*, chap. XXIV, p. 150, Paris ed., 1645.

[2] Ibid., p. 152.

Now, he continues, we read these things in it: "Let us regard the sacraments of priestly supplications which, handed down by the apostles, are celebrated uniformly throughout the whole world and in every Catholic church, so that the law of supplication may establish the law of believing." Then he proceeds:

> What the law of supplication is, moreover, he himself explains in the same chapter, and the Church, as though especially on the day of the crucifixion of our Lord Jesus Christ showing for whom he was crucified and whom he wills to be saved, demonstrates by supplicating and groaning together, praying for all men, and individually and distinctly for all orders, for all ranks, for all dignities, for schismatics and heretics, for Jews and pagans, so that no one may be believed excepted, pleading before the divine clemency the cause of the whole human race. Whence it also says to the point: "O God, who savest all and willest no one to perish," although some perish by their own iniquity and obduracy; for it is the Truth who said [3]: "As I live, says the Lord God, I will not the death of the impious, but that the impious should return from his way and live. Turn from your most evil ways; and why will you die, O house of Israel? Do I willingly desire the death of the wicked? says the Lord God." The Lord swears lest anyone despair under the mass of his crimes, because he does not will the death of the impious, but that he should return from his way and live; but the predestinarians [1] perjure themselves, because they say that it is utterly not the will of the Lord that those who are not saved should be saved. And again the Lord says in the Gospel [2]: "I say to you, there is joy before the angels of God in heaven over one sinner doing penance." And if the angels rejoice over one who repents, will not the holy angels rejoice much more if all do penance and believe, who see in him that from which they rejoice? Namely, from the joy of him from whom they received everlasting joy.
>
> Therefore, as Saint Celestine commands, let the law of supplication establish for us the law of believing, so that, because supplication is made to God by the whole Catholic Church for all, we may believe that God wills all men to be saved, although not all are saved; and that some are saved is the gift of him who saves, while that some perish is the merit of those who perish.

Lest any should distrust this conclusion, he adds in continuous discourse [3]:

---

[3] Ezek. XXXIII. 11.

[1] On these, read Sirmond's dissertation.

[2] Luke XV. 7.

[3] *On Predestination*, chap. XXIV, pp. 152–153. Here it will be pertinent to note the excellent agreement which exists between two most noble bishops of Gaul, Irenaeus of Lyons and Hincmar

> For the pious, the devout, and Catholics this can and ought to suffice: that the holy, Catholic, and apostolic Roman Church, the mother of all churches, teaches it. For she, as mother, begot us unto Christ, nourished us in religion, instructed us in doctrine;
> as the firm rock received us from Christ in Saint Peter, she appointed doctors; and having nourished us with Catholic milk and brought us to the perfect man, she formed us to teach others, saying through Paul [1] that Christ Jesus came into this world to save sinners.

XXXVI.

Nevertheless, lest anything should be lacking—if not for faith, certainly as regards the understanding of faith—and lest even the more captious should have anything which they might allege or anywhere to which they might retreat, he both explains the difficulty by which the predestinarians seemed to be more vehemently moved, and demonstrates by witnesses adduced by name the consensus of the Catholic name with the Roman faith.

He meets the difficulty when, to one asking [2] why not all are saved if God, as Paul [3] speaks, wills all men to be saved, and if, as Peter [4] writes, he wills no one to perish but all to be converted to penance, he responds that the Truth himself, through John the Evangelist, removed every doubt from the midst. "This is the judgment," he says [5], "because the light came into the world, and men loved darkness more than the light; for their works were evil." Whence Saint Augustine says [6]:

> How did some do a good work, that they might come to the light, that is, to Christ; and how did some love darkness? If he found all

---

of Reims. For that which Irenaeus writes concerning the Roman Church in *Against Heresies*, book III, chap. III, n. 3, in an altogether identical cause—"By this ordination and succession, the tradition which is from the apostles in the Church and the preaching of the truth have come down even to us. And this is a most complete demonstration that there is one and the same life-giving faith, which has been preserved in the Church from the apostles even until now and handed down in truth"—Hincmar expresses identically on p. 152, saying: "For the pious, the devout, and Catholics this can and ought to suffice." And that which in Irenaeus is n. 2, "For to this Church, on account of its more powerful principality, every church must convene, that is, the faithful who are from every place," Hincmar expresses on p. 151 in these words: "Not from man nor through man, but through the Lord Jesus Christ, just as Peter and Paul merited the apostolate, so this holy See merited the principality of all cities"; and on p. 153: "For she, as mother, begot us unto Christ, nourished us in religion," etc.

[1] I Tim. I. 15.

[2] *On Predestination*, chap. XXIV, p. 153.

[3] I Tim. II. 4.

[4] II Pet. III. 9.

[5] John III. 19.

[6] *On John*, Tractate XII.

> sinners and heals all from sin, and that serpent in which the death of the Lord was figured heals those who had been bitten, and the serpent was raised up on account of the serpent's bites—that is, the death of the Lord on account of mortal men whom he found unjust—how is this understood: "This is the judgment, because the light came into the world, and men loved darkness more than the light; for their works were evil"? What is this? For whose works were evil? Did you not come to justify the impious? But, he says, they loved darkness more than the light. There he placed the force. For many loved their sins; because he who confesses his sins and accuses his sins already acts with God. God accuses your sins; if you also accuse them, you are joined to God. There are, as it were, two things: man and sinner. What you hear as *man*, God made; what you hear as *sinner*, man himself made. Destroy what you made, so that God may save what he made.

The difficulty having been leveled, he proceeds to the witnesses and, having transcribed their very words, demonstrates that the doctrine and profession of the Catholic name did not differ even in the least from the faith of the Roman Church concerning the salvific will of God and the order of universal reparation. Above the rest he commends these witnesses [1]: Dionysius, whom blessed Gregory calls the Areopagite, an ancient and venerable Father; Cyprian, a wondrous doctor and magnificent martyr; blessed Hilary, a Catholic doctor who, on account of his excellent doctrine, is called the lucifer of the Romans; Saint Athanasius of Alexandria; Saint Ambrose, whose judgments are the firmest columns of faith and the Church and of all virtues; Saint John, Bishop of Constantinople, who, on account of the sweetness of his salutary and savorous eloquence, was most worthily called by the Greeks Chrysostomos, that is, Golden Mouth; Saint Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria; Saint Jerome, most skilled in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin languages, who, as is said, breaking the nut close to the kernel, merited, by investigating, to penetrate the marrow and the very entrails of Sacred Scripture under the inspiration of the Lord; Saint Cyril of Alexandria; Saint Augustine, a most sagacious and also most learned man; Prosper, a most learned and most religious man; Saint Celestine; Saint Leo, a most religious and learned man, and very copious in the eloquence of most honorable speech; Pope Saint Felix; Saint Gregory; the venerable priest Bede; and lastly Cassiodorus.

From this most ample number of witnesses it is pleasing to report the words of Ambrose alone, which Hincmar himself also used and from which

[1] *On Predestination*, chap. XXV, pp. 161–204.

the mind and doctrine of the others may very easily be understood. Ambrose, therefore, wrote upon these words [1] of the Psalmist, "Thou hast dealt in goodness with thy servant, O Lord, according to thy word":

> How good is the God of Israel to those who are upright of heart! Therefore he is good to all, because he wills all to be upright of heart. But he who turns aside his heart turns the grace of the divine goodness away from himself. God is always good, and therefore Paul says [2]: "Behold, therefore, the goodness and severity of God." For goodness is toward all; severity, toward the few. Finally the same Apostle added: "Toward those indeed who have fallen, severity; but toward thee, goodness." For if they had not fallen, they too would surely enjoy the goodness of God. For he is also good to thee because thou remainest. But if thou dost not remain in goodness, thou also shalt be cut off. Therefore God does not on that account cease to be good because thou hast fallen and hast need of severity, provided that, in order that the severity of God may return unto goodness, each one who has been chastised withdraw his foot from sins and return to the path of virtues and good conduct. Finally the Apostle teaches concerning those who have fallen that, if they do not remain in unbelief, they shall be grafted in. For God is able to graft them in again, so that, just as abandoned shoots, so also men, grafted as it were into certain trunks of virtue, may be able to bear the fruits of good merits.

Nor did he less express the common doctrine when he subjoined to these words [3] of the same hymn, "Those who persecute me have drawn near to iniquity":

> God, therefore, penetrates the soul and illumines it as though with the splendor of eternal light. But although by his power he is diffused through all, and in all, and above all, because he was born of the Virgin for all, both good and evil, just as he also commands his sun to rise upon the good and the evil, yet he cherishes him who draws near to himself. For just as he who closes the windows of his house and chooses a dark place in which to dwell excludes from himself the splendor of the sun, so he who turns himself away from the sun of justice cannot behold its brilliance, because he walks in darkness and, amid the light of all, is himself the cause

[1] Ps. CXVIII. 69.
[2] Rom. XI. 22.
[3] Ps. CXVIII. 150.

> of his own blindness. Open, therefore, thy windows, so that thy whole house may shine with the radiance of the true sun. Open thine eyes, that thou mayest see the sun of justice rising for thee. The Word of God knocks at thy door: "If anyone opens to me," he says [1], "I will enter." If anyone, therefore, does not open, is the fault that of him who does not enter, and not rather of him who does not open? … Indeed, he does not hold back those who flee, does not compel the unwilling, but neither does he spurn those who draw near. And indeed his power, his Word, God, is near to all …; but sins separate very many from him, concerning whom it is said [2]: "Behold, those who remove themselves far from thee shall perish" … For, supplying vital grace to all, he is present to all by the gift of his goodness; but he is nearer to those who are of a contrite heart.

XXXVII.

Since, therefore, divine providence toward men is exercised by a twofold office, that of goodness and justice, of mercy and wrath, the rationale of each is nevertheless diverse and is not of one kind.

It is diverse in origin, since God fulfills the parts of mercy and goodness of his own accord, but approaches the parts of wrath and justice only when provoked. Hence that saying [3] of Peter Damian: men are quick to wrath, slow to mercy; but God is both slow to wrath and quick to pity. He immediately adds that this also must be considered in the mercy of him who has mercy: that men of the world forgive once or twice, or at most seven or ten times; but God forgives a thousand times in a day, if it could happen, the things which we commit, and this as long as we live, as long as we sojourn away from him.

It is diverse in time, since he does not become wrathful and punish before he has anticipated men with benefits and heaped gifts upon them. Peter Damian writes aptly [4]:

> Behold, he sees and is silent; he sees and does not reveal; he sees and does not judge; he sees and does not avenge; he sees
> and dissimulates that he sees; he calls and thou dost not hear; he promises and thou dost contemn; he threatens and thou dost not fear, and thou treasurest up for thyself wrath in the day of wrath. Since, therefore, he is a just and mighty judge, he is greatly patient and is

[1] Apoc. III. 20.
[2] Ps. LXXII. 27.
[3] Sermon LVI, *On Saint Martin, Bishop and Confessor*, p. 143, Paris ed., 1743.
[4] Ibid., p. 142.

> not angry on every day. Behold, he contains wrath, represses fury, turns away his eyes, spares those who sin; and they, guilty of all, gather all these things unto their own judgment. Will he who has thus been quiet and silent always be silent in this manner? Or hast thou not read that he will come to judgment, casting aside patience, knowing not humility, ignorant of mercy?

It is diverse in amplitude, since God embraces all by his goodness, but visits with the severity of justice only those who have resisted his goodness. Its force is so great and its abundance so remarkable that Chrysostom represented it by this truly most forceful image [1]: φιλάνθρωπος γάρ ἐστι, καὶ καθάπερ ἡ ὠδίνουσα ἐπιθυμεῖ τεκεῖν, οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπιθυμεῖ τὸν ἔλεον τὸν αὐτοῦ ἐκχεῖν, "for God is benign, and just as a woman seized by the pains of childbirth desires to give birth, so also he desires to pour forth his mercy."

From these things it follows: I. that the principle of the salvific will is implanted in God by nature, but that the cause and incitement of the will by which he inflicts punishments comes to him from without; II. that the salvific will is first, antecedent, and universal, but that the will of punishing is second, consequent, and particular; III. that divine providence toward men is so administered by mercy and justice that mercy precedes, but the order of justice and severity follows; and therefore IV. that not all obtain the fruits of mercy, nor do all arrive at salvation, because God established this law: that men themselves also, in order to attain so great a good, solicitously contribute their own labor after the grace by which they are anticipated and with the grace by which they are assisted [2].

An Anonymous author excellently explained this [3] upon these words of Scripture [1],

"Wash me yet more from my iniquity," saying:

> Attend carefully, I pray, to the things which I shall say, and strain the sinews of thy mind. Ὁ ἔλεος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄφατος, ἀνερμήνευτος, καταληφθῆναι μὴ δυνάμενος, ὑπερβαίνων νοῦν, νικῶν λογισμόν.

---

[1] Discourse upon the saying, *To approach the sacred table negligently brings the gravest punishment*, n. III, p. 143, in Gallandi, vol. XIV, in the appendix.

[2] II Pet. I. 10.

[3] Among the *Works of Chrysostom*, vol. V, p. 587. Concerning this homily and the preceding one, Montfaucon writes thus in the prefixed observation, p. 570:

"For a long time there has been a question among the learned whether the following two homilies are true and genuine works of Chrysostom or not. Savile doubts περὶ γνησιότητος, 'concerning their genuineness,' as he indicates in the catalogue placed at the beginning of the first volume. But in the notes to vol. VIII, p. 113, he sufficiently intimates that he had been induced by the authority of illustrious men not to cast upon them the vote of νοθείας, 'spuriousness.' Fronto Ducaeus, however, published them outside the number of genuine homilies, without adducing any reason for adjudging that they were not Chrysostom's. But I consider it altogether certain that Ducaeus acted advisedly. For I judge that these two homilies are without doubt spurious."

[1] Ps. L. 4.

> ἀλλ᾽ εἰ καὶ τοιοῦτός ἐστιν ὁ ἔλεος τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα μὴ οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἄχρηστοι γένωνται ἐλεούμενοι, χρείαν ἔχει καὶ τῶν παρ᾽ ἡμῶν. πρόσχες ὃ λέγω. ὁ Θεὸς ἐλεεῖ, ἀλλ᾽ οὐχ ἁπλῶς ἐλεεῖ, ἀλλὰ λέγει· δὸς καὶ σύ. τί ποτέ; οἷόν τι λέγει. μυρία ἔχεις ἁμαρτήματα φορτία, ἔχεις πλημμελήματα πολλά· θέλω αὐτὰ κουφίσαι. δὸς καὶ σὺ χεῖρα· οὐκ ἐπειδὴ ἐγώ σου χρείαν ἔχω, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπειδὴ βούλομαι καὶ σέ τι συνεισενέγκασθαι εἰς τὴν σαυτοῦ σωτηρίαν. The mercy of God, indeed, is so great that it can be explained by no discourse and comprehended by no thought, but exceeds the mind and surpasses reason. Yet, even though the mercy of God is such, it nevertheless desires our parts also, lest men, having obtained mercy, should become useless. Attend to what I shall say: God imparts mercy, but not simply; rather, he says: "Do thou also give something." What? For example, thou art oppressed by infinite burdens of sins, thou hast many offenses; I will wash them away. Do thou also extend thy hand—not because I have need of thee, but because I will that thou also contribute something toward thine own salvation.

Whence V. it is evident that those are most greatly deceived who estimate and define the scope and amplitude of the divine salvific will from the number of those who are saved. For the latter number embraces no others than those who offer an obedient will to God, obey him when he calls, and follow him as he goes before; but the former has the same bounds as the goodness and mercy of God, which is entirely infinite and altogether universal.

XXXVIII.

In the same century as Hincmar, Paschasius Radbertus shone by the fame of his learning and exquisite wisdom [1], being both the author of other works [2] and of an extensive commentary on Matthew, in which he has the following [4] upon the words [3] of the Savior, "Thy will be done":

> For there is no one who can resist or contradict God so that his will should not be done, especially since it is written [5]: "All things what-

[1] See the verses of Bishop Engelmodus to Abbot Radbertus prefixed to the latter's works, published at Paris in 1618.

[2] Among these is preeminent the work which he entitled *On the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ*, and in which, according to Sirmond, he was the first so to explain the genuine sense of the Catholic Church that he opened the way for the others who afterward wrote much upon the same argument.

[4] *On Matthew*, book IV, cols. 325–326.

[3] Matt. VI. 10.

[5] Ps. CXXXIV. 6.

> soever the Lord willed, he has done in heaven and on earth." But we pray this: that through grace we may join the liberty of our choice to his will, so that he who lives may now live not for himself, but that the will of God may freely be fulfilled in all. Concerning this will, indeed, the holy Apostle testifies [6], saying: "The will of God is your sanctification, that you abstain from carnal desires." And elsewhere [7] the Lord says: "This is the will of my Father, that everyone who sees the Son and believes in him may have eternal life" … When, therefore, we say, "Thy will be done," it must be considered with what faith or with what charity we say it, because no one who hesitates concerning the will of the Father ever prays rightly. Therefore it is great faith, great devotion, great security concerning the immutable goodness of the Lord, to know that he wills nothing evil; indeed, according to the Apostle [8], "he wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth." No one, therefore, can say these things from the heart unless he has believed for certain that God dispenses all things which are seen or which are not seen, prosperous or adverse, for our advantages. For it is necessary to believe with devout faith that he is more provident for our salvation without any intermission, and dispensatively solicitous, than we ourselves are for ourselves. Whence, if anyone holds these things with a deliberate or fixed mind, he always depends upon his will, presuming nothing concerning himself, and continually implores by day and night that his will be done in us—a will which can never be deceived, never be changed, and never be depraved by any affections. For his will is the salvation of all.

Namely, I. there is in God a salvific will, and it is universal, efficacious, provident without any intermission, and dispensatively solicitous; moved by it, he himself so moderates and tempers all things that they conduce to the advantage and felicity of men. Gildas, surnamed the Wise, explains this in many words [1] and finally concludes [2]:

> God [3] with us has magnified his mercy, willing all men to be saved and [4] calling sinners no less than those who think themselves just; in the time of persecution, by the aforesaid gratuitous gift, as we know,

[6] I Thess. IV.
[7] John VI. 40.
[8] I Tim. II. 4.
[1] *On the Ruin of Britain*, a plaintive book, part I, §§ III–VII, in Gallandi, vol. XII, p. 194.
[2] Ibid., § VIII.
[3] *God with us*, that is, Emmanuel, which in Matt. I. 23 is interpreted "God with us."
[4] Matt. IX. 13, compared with Mark II. 17 and Luke V. 32.

> he kindled for us the most brilliant lamps of the holy martyrs, lest Britain be overspread by the dense gloom of a black night. If the sepulchers of their bodies and the places of their passions were not now taken from the citizens by the mournful separation caused by the barbarians, on account of our very many sins, they would instill no small ardor of divine charity into the minds of those who behold them.

But it is II. of the highest moment, every hesitation having been utterly repelled, to rest in this salvific will of God with great faith, great devotion, and great security, and to promise oneself all things from the goodness of God. For if any with wavering mind distrust the divine benignity, they will indeed be able to say with mouth and words, "Thy will be done," but they will not be able to say it with heart and affection. Therefore, that which Ratherius of Verona inculcates [5] must be held fixed by all: that God does not abandon the souls of men by a just judgment before they themselves abandon him, although he has by no means abandoned even innumerable souls who abandon

him, but this more from mercy than from justice.

But whence does it arise, III. that the salvific will of God is so often defrauded of its effect, since no one can resist it, no one can contradict it, especially since it is written, "All things whatsoever the Lord willed, he has done in heaven and on earth"? Does it arise from this, that it is sterile? On the contrary, it must be believed with devout faith that God is more provident for our salvation without any intermission, and dispensatively solicitous, than we ourselves are for ourselves. Or does it arise from this, that it is not universal? On the contrary, the will of God is the salvation of all. Therefore it arises from this alone: that God wills men to obtain salvation under this condition, if they themselves also join the liberty of choice prepared by divine grace to his will, so that he who lives may now live not for himself, but that the will of God may freely be fulfilled in all.

Wherefore, unless men resisted him by their own will—concerning which, according to the report [1] of Dorotheus, ὁ ἀββᾶς Ποιμὴν ἔλεγεν, ὅτι τὸ θέλημα τεῖχός ἐστι χαλκοῦν ἀνάμεσον ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, "Abba Pastor was accustomed to say that the will is a brazen wall between God and man"—there would not be even one who would not be eternally blessed.

---

[5] Sermon I, otherwise II, *On Lent*, n. 2, col. 579, Verona ed., 1765.

[1] Dorotheus the Archimandrite flourished toward the end of the sixth century, as the Bollandists prove in *Acta Sanctorum*, June, vol. I, p. 592; Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, vol. VI, p. 145, and vol. X, p. 160; and Gallandi, vol. XII, Prolegomena, chap. XVIII, § I. He reported the excellent saying of Pastor in the work Διδασκαλίαι ψυχωφελεῖς διάφοροι, "Various Teachings Very Profitable to Souls," Teaching V, § II, in Gallandi, vol. XII, p. 398.

XXXIX.

From this opinion there is no disagreement at all in the things which Paulinus, Bishop of Aquileia and one of the most noble writers at the close of the eighth and beginning of the ninth century [2], teaches when, commending beneficence toward all by the example of God and Christ Jesus [3], he says:

> The Lord is merciful and bestows mercy upon those who hope in him.
>
> He who had no sin, who made the angels and placed the archangels over them, had no need of mercy; but that we might obtain mercy from him, he gave alms [1]. Alms were not necessary to him to whom belong all the kingdoms of heaven, who established Dominations, Principalities, Virtues, and Powers; but he did this that by our alms he might make us participants in the kingdom of heaven. The Lord is patient and peaceable, that by his patience and peace he might reconcile to God the whole world which had been placed in the evil one. And let us be patient and peaceable, without wrath and contention, if we wish to arrive at God. And let us do good to all men—to all, I say, not by parts, not to one or to two or to three, but to all men. For Christ suffered not only for the saints, but for sinners and the impious and the wicked he ascended the cross, and by his passion recalled us all to life. God gave the sun and moon and rain and all that springs from the earth and all the fruits which arise upon the lands not only to the saints, but [2] gave them in common to all men, he who [3] makes his sun rise upon the good and the evil and rains upon the just and the unjust. Therefore he gave those things in common to all men, that our good, and our alms, and our charity, and our patience, and our humility might be distributed in common to all men. As long as we are in this world, let us [4] do good to all, but especially to those who are of the household of faith; and let us pray for our enemies and return good for evil.

Thus far Paulinus, in whose words this sum of doctrine is chiefly contained: I. the merciful will of God toward men is the exemplar of our charity, and is open

[2] Compare what the most illustrious man Francesco Madrisio writes concerning Paulinus, Patriarch of Aquileia, in the general preface to his works, published at Venice in the year 1737.

[3] *Book of Exhortation to Henry, Duke of Friuli*, chap. XLVI, p. 48.

[1] That is, as Madrisio explains the ambiguous phrase, "that we might obtain mercy from him, he gave alms"—namely, he commanded almsgiving, that by our alms he might make us participants in the kingdom of heaven.

[2] By this means he shows himself the universal provider.

[3] Matt. V. 45.

[4] Gal. VI. 10.

no less widely than our charity toward those same men ought to extend. But our charity, lest it degenerate and put off its nature,

permits no limits and extends itself to all men—to all, I say, not by parts, to one or to two or three, but to all men. For whoever is a man is at once our neighbor, since, as Augustine [1] admonishes, neighbors are to be reckoned not by nearness of blood but by the fellowship of reason, by which fellowship all men are comprehended. Hence also that comic poet [2], when he composed these words as spoken by one old man to another, "Hast thou so much leisure from thine own affairs that thou shouldst attend to another's—things which pertain nothing to thee?" gave this answer through the other: "I am a man; I think nothing human foreign to me." They relate that entire theaters, filled even with the foolish and unlearned, applauded this opinion. For the fellowship of human friends so naturally touched the affection of all that no man was present who did not perceive himself to be neighbor to any man whatsoever. Therefore there is no man who either ought or can be judged alien to the merciful will of God. Wherefore it is universal.

Nor II. is it universal only, but also efficacious and fruitful in benefits. It is fruitful within the scope of the natural order, whose goods it imparts in common to all men. "Does not God," Arnobius exclaims [3], "supply equally to all the generative heat of the sun, the night and seasons, winds, rains, and crops—to the good, the evil, the just, the unjust, the freeborn, slaves, the poor, and the rich?" Prudentius [4], Ambrose [5], Eucherius [6], and Seneca himself [7] write things most similar to these, the latter saying: "If thou imitatest the gods, give benefits even to the ungrateful. For the sun rises even for the wicked, and the seas lie open to pirates." It is fruitful within the bounds of the supernatural order, since the patient and peaceable Lord applied himself to this: that by his patience and peace he might reconcile to God the whole world which had been placed in the evil one; and Christ suffered not only for the saints,

but for sinners and the impious and the wicked he ascended the cross, and by his passion recalled us all to life.

To this fruitfulness III. divine patience must be referred. Hence blessed Benedict excellently writes [1]: "For the amendment of evils, the days of this life are

[1] Epistle CLV, n. 14.

[2] This is Terence, whose distinguished saying is repeated by Stobaeus, Sermon XXXVII, and Aulus Gellius, *Attic Nights*, book IX, chap. II.

[3] *Against the Nations*, book III.

[4] *Against Symmachus*, book II.

[5] Book V, on Luke VI.

[6] *Paraenesis to Valerian*.

[7] *On Benefits*, book IV, chap. XXVI.

[1] In the prologue of the Rule, p. 298, in Gallandi, vol. XI.

extended to us as a respite, as the Apostle says [2]: 'Knowest thou not that the patience of God leads thee to penance?' For the loving Lord says [3]: 'I will not the death of the sinner, but that he be converted and live.'"

But if IV. not all sinners are converted and live, but many die with everlasting death, this occurs because, as Caesarius of Arles observes [4]:

> There are three things concerning which we both can and ought to think profitably and faithfully. And we frequently recognize with bodily eyes that these three things occur also in human life. For there are a physician, a sick man, and a disease. If the sick man joins himself to the physician, there are two, and the disease is conquered. For if he consented to the physician, the sick man would escape when the disease perished, because it could in no way conquer two fighting against it. Attend diligently to why I have set down this similitude. The physician is God; the sick man is man; sin is the disease. If the sinner joins himself to God, who is the true physician, the disease at once perishes. But if the unhappy sinner loves his disease, so that he wills to join himself to his sins as to deadly diseases rather than to adhere to the heavenly physician, he not only refuses to accuse his disease, that is, his sin, but even strives to defend it with a most shameless brow. While he wills to join himself to his sins, he seems as it were to conquer the heavenly physician. But by this unhappy victory, as though by the broad and spacious way, he descends into Gehenna; because, if he had willed to consent to the physician, when sin had perished as a most cruel disease, he would have merited to ascend to heaven by the narrow and strait way.

XL.

Venantius Fortunatus, not the least among the writers of the sixth century [1], supports this doctrine with equal evidence when, in expounding [2] the Lord's Prayer, he asks in what sense we petition that "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," and responds that this is not asked

> because anyone could resist the will of God, so that the Almighty would at any time fail to do what he willed; nor because anything

[2] Rom. II. 4.

[3] Ezek. XXXIII. 11.

[4] Homily XIII, p. 20, in Gallandi, vol. XI.

[1] Concerning the excellence and learning of Venantius Fortunatus, Michelangelo Luchi has excellent things in the preface to his works, published at Rome in the year 1786.

[2] Works, part I, book X, chap. I, pp. 333–334.

> can impede him, but that his will may be fulfilled and operate in us, since, because the adversary resists, we cannot fulfill his will unless we are fortified by his protection. But if it is asked what the will of God is, thou hast the Ten Commandments, which were promulgated through Moses by the will of God; thou hast the Son of God, who, knowing the will of the Father, disclosed the things which were hidden and poured into the light those things which were overshadowed. Therefore the will of God is known; excuse will bring no aid. For he who descended from heaven to the earth, what else did he will to be believed to belong to his will except to save? By the redemption he would teach us to follow the ornaments of charity and humility, since he himself also deigned to do this with such charity, with exceeding humility, sincerely … Therefore we must pray that, if we will not to perish, his will may operate in us, according to the Apostle [3], who says: "He who works in you both to will and to accomplish, according to the good will."

Therefore the will which belongs to God first and of himself is the antecedent will of saving, which never appeared more splendidly than when the Son of God descended from heaven to the earth.

But this salvific will neither formerly omitted nor now omits anything among those things which appear necessary and opportune for procuring salvation for men. He gave them a law by which they might be freed from the darkness of ignorance;

he disclosed the hidden things of God that they might become participants in heavenly light; and for them the Only-begotten chose a temple for himself in the Virgin, furnished mercy, and loosed offenses by indulgence, lest any should despair of obtaining salvation. Wherefore he gave power to all that they might avoid everlasting destruction, if they willed. But if some do not avoid it, but fall most miserably into it, this ought to be imputed as a fault to those men themselves, who do not permit the divine will to be fulfilled in themselves and God to work in themselves both to will and to accomplish, according to the good will.

XLI.

All these things, both collectively and individually, Salvian, the anonymous author of the *Predestinatus*, Isidore of Seville, Avitus, Arnobius the Younger, and Gennadius of Marseilles lucidly confirm, each by his own authority. First of all,

[3] Phil. II. 13.

Salvian [1], most gravely assailing those who imagined that God must be relieved of care for the things which he had made, adds:

> If, therefore, God inserted into even the least living creatures this affection for their own work, did he alone deprive himself of love for his creatures, especially since every love of good things in us has descended from his good love? For he himself is the fountain and origin of all; and because, as it is written [2], "in him we live and move and are," from him certainly we have received every affection by which we love our prosperity. For the whole world and the whole human race are a pledge of their Creator. And therefore, from that very affection by which he made us love our pledges, he willed us to understand how much he himself loved his pledges. For just as, according as we read [3], "the invisible things of him are beheld, being understood through the things that are made," so he willed his love toward us to be understood through the love which he gave us toward our own. And just as, according as it is written [4], he willed every paternity in heaven and on earth to be named from himself, so he willed the affection of a father in himself to be acknowledged by us. And why do I say *of a father*? Rather, more than of a father. For the voice of the Savior in the Gospel proves this when he says [1]: "For God so loved this world that he gave his only Son for the life of the world." But the Apostle also says [2]: "God spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all. How has he not also given us all things with him?"

Then he proceeds [3]:

> This, therefore, is what I said above: that God loves us more than a father loves his son. For the matter is evident, that God loves us beyond the affection for sons, since for our sake he did not spare his own Son. And what more? I add: and this a just Son, and this an only-begotten Son, and this a Son who is God. And what more can be said? And this for us, that is, for the evil, for the unjust, for the most impious. Who can estimate this love of God toward us?

From this divine love it follows [4]

---

[1] *On the Governance of God*, book IV, § IX, p. 22, in Gallandi, vol. X.
[2] Acts XVII. 28.
[3] Rom. I. 20.
[4] Eph. III. 15.
[1] John III. 16.
[2] Rom. VIII. 32.
[3] Ibid., § X, pp. 22–23.
[4] *On the Governance of God*, book VIII, § I, p. 49.

that whenever we endure evils, that prophetic saying [5] can also be said to us: "Go into the flame of the fire which you have kindled." And by this, according to the sacred judgment [6], each sinner prepares for himself what he suffers. Therefore there is nothing which we can impute to God for our calamities. We are the authors of our calamities. For God is loving and merciful, and, as it is written [7], wills no one to perish or to be harmed. We therefore do all things against ourselves. Nothing, then, nothing is more cruel against us than we ourselves: we, I say, we torment ourselves even against the will of God.

For as regards God, says [8] the author of the *Predestinatus*, these words [9] of the Apostle are most true:

"The same God is rich in all of you."

And again [1]: "The grace of God has appeared to all men, instructing and teaching us, that [2] every man may be perfect in Christ." And because Paul knew that the Son of God was born for all and suffered for all, therefore he cries out [3], saying: "This is pleasing before God our Savior, who wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth." Whence also the Lord himself cries out to us daily in his Gospels [4], saying: "Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened, and I will cause you to rest." Whence, to teach that he repels no man from his largess—ready, liberal, abounding, never doing less—he speaks in his Gospels [5], saying: "Everyone who asks receives, and he who seeks finds, and to him who knocks it is opened." For the Scripture of the Old Testament also, inviting all nations to hear [6], said: "Hear these things, all you who inhabit the world, you earthborn and sons of men, rich and poor together as one." And therefore the same Apostle, seeing that God wills all men, but not all men will God, recalling the future judgment [7], cries out, saying: "We must all be manifested before the tribunal of Christ,

[5] Isa. L. 11.
[6] Ps. VII.
[7] II Pet. III. 9.
[8] *Against the Heresy of the Predestinarians*, book III, p. 383, in Gallandi, vol. X.
[9] Rom. X. 12.
[1] Titus II. 11.
[2] II Tim. III. 17.
[3] I Tim. II. 3–4.
[4] Matt. XI. 28.
[5] Matt. VII. 8.
[6] Ps. XLVIII. 3.
[7] II Cor. V. 10.

> that each one may receive the things proper to the body, according as he has done, whether good or evil." Whence also [8] the Apostle Peter says: "The grace of God is over all and in all of you." All the prophets call, all the apostles call, Christ calls all, throughout the whole world innumerable priests of God call all to the grace and mercy of God and to indulgence. Only two or three [9] petty men, having a blind heart, go forth with these apostatic books; feigning themselves to be Catholic men, they wound the whole world. Introducing through them a new kind of blasphemy, they say
> that God does not will all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth; and, suffering the obscurity of one passage [1], they will to bring the darkness of their shadows upon so great a light and so immense a splendor.

Lest this should turn out according to their wish, Arnobius the Younger wrote thus [2]:

> He loved the curse of Adam, which is taken away through Christ, and it will come upon him; and he willed not the blessing which is brought through Christ, and it will surely be removed far from him. Note that it came about from choice that he did not will it, on account of the heresy which says: God predestined some to blessing, others to cursing. For thus he is proved to have the curse from his own love and not to have the reward of blessing from his own unwillingness.

And much more fully elsewhere [3]:

> Act vigilantly and not calumniously, and thou seest the general grace of God poured out upon the whole race of men. Grace, diffused with

[8] These very words are lacking in the epistles of Peter.

[9] Compare Sirmond's history of the predestinarians, concerning which Noris judged that the following must be maintained in *History of Pelagianism*, book II, chap. IV: "The things which Sirmond discussed concerning the predestinarian heresy he wrote at an exhausted age, when more than eighty years old. In them he departed so far from the truth that his history was called a fable as a term of reproach by Gilbert Mauguin, a most illustrious man, counselor to the King of France and most versed in sacred and profane history. This writer, moreover, so solidly and vigorously refutes the first three chapters of Sirmond's history concerning the predestinarians that Louis Cellot, in the history of Gottschalk in which he undertook to refute Mauguin, book II, chap. II, where he treats the predestinarians, was unable to answer even a word to Mauguin on behalf of his Sirmond." Thus far Noris, both excessive in praising Mauguin's proscribed work and harsher in disparaging Sirmond's predestinarian history; which Raimondo Capizucchi shows above the rest in the dissertation *On the Predestinarian Heretics*, which he dedicated to Innocent XI.

[1] Vincent of Lérins excellently shows in the *Commonitorium*, § XI, that this is customary among those who contrive to fabricate a heresy under another's name.

[2] Commentary on Ps. CVIII.

[3] Commentary on Ps. CXLVII, p. 400, in Gallandi, vol. X.

> manifold largess, precedes all. God descended from heaven when man did not will it; he taught by example and word when man did not ask; he wrought many signs and powers to manifest himself when man was ignorant; he was mocked, crucified, died among murderers, was buried, rose again, and ascended into the heavens. Christ wrought all these things for man's salvation, for man's redemption, for man's glory.
>
> Mark, O Predestinarian, what I say to thee. Christ's grace precedes generally the good will of all … if indeed he was born for all, if indeed he suffered for all, if thou dost not deny that he died for all, if with the Apostle [1] thou affirmest that he wills all men to be saved. Come now, withdraw thyself from general grace, approach special grace, and similarly cry out with the Apostle: not every man generally will be saved, but [2] "every man whosoever shall invoke the name of the Lord, he shall be saved." Go, therefore, to the office of the physician, who came of his own accord to the city, certainly without our asking. The physician came upon us all, opened his shop, and sent forth a voice by which, crying out as a herald [3], he said: "Come to me, all." Now, after this voice, will precedes grace. "For if you will," he says [4], "and will hear me, you shall eat the good things of the land; but if you will not, the sword shall devour you."

And again [5]:

> Now perhaps let him who teaches predestination and breaks down the choice of men hear me; let him suppose that I exclude the liberty of choice in such a manner that I think those who sin do so from rejection by God. That we sin will be shown to belong to our choice, we who contemn grace. See how great is the liberty of thy choice. The Lord is denied by his servant, so that man may say to God: "I will not believe thee," and may make for himself a temple where he worships an idol, or a synagogue where he denies his Savior. Therefore, whatever evil we do, we incur through liberty, because the just Lord does not deign to accept compelled services. But if we do anything good, it will be imputed to the Giver, who furnishes all good things to those who flee to him, according to that which he himself deigned to promise again [6]: "Everyone who asks receives, and he

[1] I Tim. II. 4.
[2] Rom. X. 13.
[3] Matt. XI. 28.
[4] Isa. I. 19.
[5] Commentary on Ps. CXVIII, p. 400, in Gallandi, vol. X.
[6] Matt. VII. 8.

> who seeks finds, and to him who knocks it shall be opened." Let us therefore knock, and with the prophet let us sing in this Psalm [7]: "Open to me the gates of justice; having entered them, I will confess to the Lord." We cry out these things with divine supports and aids.

From these things, moreover, those which Gennadius of Marseilles has [1] in these words must in no way be torn away:

> The predestinarians are those who say that God does not create all for this purpose, that all may be saved, but that the world may be adorned by the multitude of men. Although by a general preaching [2] he says, "Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you," nevertheless he does not call all with that will that all may follow him who calls. Nor are all those who, by his inspiration, obey the call said to receive perseverance in carrying out a good work; but after many labors and fruits of justice, if they are not of the number of those to be saved, the powers of acting are to be withdrawn from them, lest they endure in good. And, on the contrary, those who are predestined to eternal life, even if for a long time they wallow in unbelief or every kind of sin, will receive an occasion by which they may both believe in God and live according to the precept of God, that they may possess the fellowship of the saints. By such a definition they strive to teach that God accepts the persons of men; that he draws some, even unwilling, to salvation after many evil works; and that he rejects others after good works and compels them into evil, whereby they perish eternally.

XLII.

Suppose, therefore, I. that it comes into controversy what kind of native disposition and what kind of primary and antecedent relation intervenes between God and men. Unless thou utterly withdrawest faith from the things which we have adduced, this and no other can be the answer: it is a disposition and relation of goodness and paternal mercy, by which God embraces men with the affection of a father in Christ and through Christ.

But which men II.? Absolutely all, as is made known by a fourfold argument and sign. For it is made known by the argument and sign of the solicitous affection which God, the Creator and Author of nature,

[7] Ps. CXVII. 19.

[1] In the book *On Heresies*.

[2] Matt. XI. 28.

implanted in all parents toward their offspring. It is made known by the argument and sign of the universal redemption which he accomplished through the Son. It is made known by the argument and sign of universal grace, of which he deprives no one and which he pours forth abundantly upon all. Finally, it is made known by the argument and sign of the universal revealed will [1], such as appears most lucidly in the Scriptures of both Testaments and in the preaching of the whole Church, which is instructed by the divine Spirit.

Nor III. ought anyone to think it open to him either wholly to deny or to call into doubt this universal benevolence of God toward the human race. For if any have assumed such boldness for themselves, we know that they were marked with the most shameful brand of heresy; for the predestinarians are those who say that God does not create all for this purpose, that all may be saved.

To this IV. universal benevolence must be reckoned as received benefits: a) that the injury inflicted by the fault of Adam was repaired by the redemption of Christ; b) that by the grace of the same Christ, choice, cast down into the servitude of sin, was vindicated into its former liberty; and c) that hope of obtaining salvation was given to all and the occasion of despair removed. These things are no less evident from those which we have reported than they are manifest from those which Avitus of Vienne and Isidore of Seville testify.

For the former, considering these words of Solomon, "As a sour grape is harmful to the teeth," writes [2]:

> Adam tasted within Paradise, unto his and our destruction, not the wine but the poison of this grape, still rough and green; and because the parents had eaten the sour grape, the teeth of the sons were set on edge. But Ezekiel, foreseeing that the original debt would be canceled when Christ paid it,
> says thus [1]: "As I live, says the Lord, this proverb shall no longer be in Jerusalem: 'The fathers ate the sour grape, and the teeth of the sons shall be set on edge.' Whatever Adam was, what he proudly coveted, what he unlawfully presumed, what he incautiously desired, now harms thee not. Fear for thyself the setting on edge of thy teeth from thine own eating; restrain the touch of appetite from useless avidity."

[1] The distinction between the revealed and the secret will is gathered not obscurely from these testimonies of Scripture: John VI. 40; Eph. I. 13; Ps. XXXVI. 7; and Rom. XI. 33. But what Calvin in the *Institutes*, book I, chap. XVII, § II, book III, chap. XX, § XLIII; Beza, part II, response to the acts of the conference, p. 173; and the Calvinists everywhere maintain can in no way be tolerated: that the revealed will of God in those things which pertain to the salvation of men is not only separate but also not infrequently different from the secret will and opposed to it.

[2] Sermon for Tuesday in the Rogation Days, p. 798, in Gallandi, vol. X.

[1] Ezek. XVIII. 3.

But Isidore [2], contending at once both that the wounds were inflicted through Adam and that the medicine was effected through Christ, says:

> Finally, through the grace of God, free choice is restored to man, which the first man [3] had lost. For he had the free choice of beginning good, which nevertheless would be perfected by the help of God. But we receive both the beginning of free choice and its perfection from the grace of God. For from him we have both to begin and to perfect good, from whom both the gift of grace was given and free choice was restored in us.

And upon the words of Genesis, "And God called Adam: Where art thou?" he says:

> Here he shows that if any fall from faith or good works into their falsehoods and desires, God does not despise them; but still calls them that they may return [4] to penance, because he wills not the death of the sinner, but that he be converted and live. Therefore no sinners whatsoever are to despair, since even the impious themselves are summoned to the hope of indulgence.

But if, nevertheless, V. many both despair and perish, this must not be derived from the fact that either God does not will all to be saved or the order of mercy does not anticipate all; but a) because not all will God; b) because men themselves are cruel toward themselves; c) because, having neglected mercy, they kindle against themselves the fury of indignation; and d) because they repel the healing hand of the Savior. For the judgment of God through the prophet [5] cannot be fallacious: "Destruction is thine own, O Israel; thy help is only in me."

"As though he were saying," Isidore adds [1], "that thou shouldst perish is from thy merit; that thou shouldst be saved is by my aid." Yet with thee freely cooperating:

> For the good which we do is of God, on account of prevenient and subsequent grace; but it is ours, on account of the obedient will of free choice. For if it were not of God, why do we give thanks to him? And if it is not ours, why do we expect the recompense of good works? Therefore, in that we are anticipated by grace, it is of God; but in that, by working well, we follow prevenient grace, it is ours [2].

---

[2] *Differences*, book II, difference XXXII, n. 116, p. 101, vol. V of the works published at Rome in the year 1802.

[3] These things are taken from Augustine's *Enchiridion*, chap. XXX.

[4] On Genesis, chap. V, n. 3, pp. 274–275, vol. V.

[5] Hos. XIII. 9.

[1] *Sentences*, book II, chap. V, n. 4, p. 196, vol. VI.

[2] *Differences*, loc. cit., n. 117, p. 101, vol. V.

XLIII.

And all of us, however many men we are, are anticipated by the grace of God, nor do we experience the effects of justice before we have neglected the riches and treasures of goodness and mercy. For this is the rationale of the divine governance: that mercy and goodness vindicate to themselves the first parts, and only the second are assigned to justice and severity.

Cassiodorus writes excellently when, expounding the words [3] of the Psalm, "Mercy and judgment I will sing; to thee, O Lord, I will sing," he writes [4]:

> The power of the Lord always either has mercy or judges. But neither is his mercy found without judgment nor his judgment without mercy; for each is joined to the other by mutual fellowship, nor does any deed of his come forth which is not perceived to be full of all virtues. For just as he said here "mercy and judgment," elsewhere he speaks in place of these two names of "justice and peace"; and again, "mercy and truth"; or, "justice and judgment are the preparation of thy throne"; so that everywhere he may demonstrate God to be loving and just. There is no doubt that this manner of speech can be numbered among the distinctive properties of divine Scripture. For also in that time of his glorious advent, he exercises mercy in the first place when he says [5]: "Come, blessed of my Father," and so forth; but not without equity,
>
> because he renders to his faithful the things promised to them. But afterward judgment follows, when he says [1] to the impious: "Depart from me, accursed, into everlasting fire"; which nevertheless is not without loving-kindness, because he is known to bring forth vengeance after much patience. Thou seest, therefore, both that these two are consonant with one another and that, placed in their own orders, they shine forth. Let sinners, therefore, who wickedly despair of their salvation hear the merciful Lord; let the proud, who do not judge their evil to be deserving of punishment, understand the Judge. Thus the whole is sung here compendiously and most fully, because in these two expressions both all the works of the Lord and the edification of the whole Church are shown to have been narrated.

Elsewhere [2], upon the words of the Psalm, "He loves mercy and judgment; the earth is full of the mercy of the Lord," he confirms this, saying:

---

[3] Ps. C. 1.

[4] Commentary at this place, p. 332, Rouen ed., 1679.

[5] Matt. XXV. 34.

[1] Ibid., v. 41.

[2] Ps. XXXII. 5, p. 107.

> In this and the following verses, by the third species of definition, which in Greek is called ποιότης and in Latin *qualitative*, he declares the Lord by narrating the things which he has done or which he does daily. For we are said to love those things which we do more often. Thus it is sung here to the Lord, "He loves mercy and judgment," as though he did not also love prudence and temperance. But because he frequently grants this to us, he is said altogether to love it. In this world, therefore, he loves mercy, where he disseminates it far and wide; namely, where he sustains sinners, where he patiently awaits blasphemers, where he furnishes life to the unworthy, and like things, which it is evident must in every way be applied to the supernal loving-kindness. He loves judgment also, when he separates the pious from the impious and discerns their merits by the quality of equity. It follows where he bestows that mercy of which he spoke above, when "the earth is full of the mercy of the Lord." This earth, surely, which contains the wretched, where we labor under the assault of the devil, where by the weakness of the flesh we are drawn away from the heavenly commandments. For then what mercy can we ask, when we are no longer burdened by any necessities? Here, therefore, let us seek mercy, with which the whole earth has been filled.

XLIV.

Nor ought it to occasion wonder that the divine economy toward men, so long as they dwell in this mortality, is of such a kind: for God is generally good; he exhibits a universal remedy; and he so fulfills toward us the offices of father and mother that he himself abundantly repairs what our first parents lost for all and each. Cassiodorus indeed confirms all these things by explicit testimonies.

He confirms the first when, upon the words [1] of the Psalm, "He hath not dealt with us according to our sins, nor rewarded us according to our iniquities," he writes:

> The sentence is general, because there is no one who does not have his grace gratuitously, since the law encloses all things under sin; as the Apostle testifies [2], "God hath concluded all in unbelief, that he might have mercy on all." Yet he gives the spirit in common to the good and the evil, grants health, removes necessities, and is generally good.

[1] On Ps. CII. 10, p. 344.

[2] Rom. XI. 32.

He confirms the second when he concludes [3] the exposition of Psalm XLIX with these words:

> Why, O Jews, do you still act foolishly? Why do you not fear your destruction? Hear the Synagogue proclaiming the incarnation of the Lord and the future judgment. Believe now the one who has been seen, who was foretold to come. The remedies of loving-kindness are not far away, if you hasten to the benefits of penance. Why do you separate yourselves from the general remedy? That which frees us saves them also. Let us say in common: "Have mercy on me, O God, according to thy great mercy." Seek baptism; receive the flesh which you crucified; drink the blood which you shed. A pious confession is able to absolve that which it is evident impious vows committed.

He confirms the third also when, upon the words [4], "For my father and my mother have forsaken me, but the Lord hath taken me up," he subjoins this commentary:

> He calls Adam, the first man, his father, and his wife Eve, from whom human generation descended, his mother.
>
> They, therefore, forsook us by the condition of mortality and could not nourish us when they were removed from this light. There follows: "But the Lord hath taken me up," namely, in the place of a true parent. He is a father because he founded us, because he rules us; a mother because he cherishes us, because he nurses the weak and the little.

XLV.

Of all these things neither another origin nor another cause can be assigned than the inexhaustible mercy of God [1], which, after the manner of an immense river, is poured forth upon all and at all times; and it is therefore poured forth so abundantly because it is God's proper will to succor sinners, and because it is native to him to have mercy upon all.

And to the inexhaustible mercy of God, according to the teaching [2] of Cassiodorus, belong the words [3] of David: "Have mercy on me, O God, according

[3] Conclusion of Psalm XLIX, p. 168.

[4] On Ps. XXVII. 15, p. 90.

[1] Cassiodorus teaches, on Ps. LVIII. 18, p. 198, that by this name *mercy* are expressed all the benefits which God pours forth upon men.

[2] On Ps. L, p. 169.

[3] Ps. L. 1–2.

to thy great mercy; and according to the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my iniquity." For by these words:

> He was asking for a mercy which he could not define; yet he perceived in every way that it was greater than his sins. For who could suffice to narrate how great it is, as the most holy Fathers [4] have said: that it brought the Creator of the world down from heaven and clothed the Founder with an earthly body; that it made him who remains equal to the Father in eternity equal to mortality, and for our sake imposed the form of a servant upon the Lord of the world; so that bread itself should hunger, the fountain of life should thirst, strength should be weakened, almighty life
> should die? This was that great mercy of the Lord which the holy man could not explain; but he readily believed that he could be absolved through that mercy through which he knew even then that the human race could be liberated.

For the mercy of the Lord is well compared to a most full river, as the same author [2] writes on the occasion of the words [1], "The river of God is filled with waters":

> For it cannot be diminished by any drought, since it knows not how to be expended by frequent drinkings. The water of the world either receives an increase from rains or a decrease from drought; but the river of God is always full, always equal. Of it [3] it was said: "The stream of the river maketh the city of God joyful"; and the Lord himself says in the Gospel [4]: "He who shall drink of the water which I give him shall never thirst; but it shall become in him a fountain of water springing up unto everlasting life."

From this fountain salutary waters have never ceased to burst forth, as Cassiodorus [5] declares when, after relating the words, "But the mercy of the Lord is from the age," he adds:

> Now he intimates the hope which ought to console the faithful; because, although through ourselves we are fragile and perishable,

[4] Perhaps he understands Origen, Cyprian, Athanasius, Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, Didymus, Cyril, Leo, Facundus, Primasius, and Sedulius, whom he proposed to excerpt and follow in expounding the Psalms. Whence the venerable Bede wrote of him: "In the exposition of the Psalms which Cassiodorus composed excellently, he was diligently intent upon what Ambrose, what Augustine, what Cyril, what John, and what the other Fathers had said." Compare John Garet's preface to the works of Cassiodorus, p. VII.

[2] In the commentary on this passage, p. 212.

[1] Ps. LXIV. 12.

[3] Ps. XLV. 5.

[4] John IV. 13.

[5] On Ps. CII, p. 315.

> through the mercy of the Lord we are rendered absolutely everlasting; so that we ought both to consider how fragile we are and to be able to hear what we obtain through the grace of the Lord. And note that he said, "from the age," that is, when the world began to be administered and the diverse creatures came forth by the gift of their Author. Whence it seems to me fitting to observe here that Adam also, as many of the Fathers have said, was recalled by the grace of the Lord, since he himself was the first in the age, just as were also Abel, Noah, Abraham, and the other Fathers, who nevertheless were in the age, but were not from the age.

For the proper will of God is directed to this: that he succor sinners; because [6], "according to the height of heaven above the earth, the Lord hath strengthened his mercy toward them that fear him."

That is, according to the interpretation [1] of Cassiodorus:

> He says that the mercy of the Lord which he renders to his faithful is as much greater than their merits as the summit of heaven can be raised above the earth. By this comparison is also signified that, just as heaven covers the lands and gives fitting benefits to man in their seasons—now by pouring forth rains, now by tempering the very air with most healthful winds—so also the mercy of the Lord is known to furnish diverse things to our fragility: for he sustains that he may correct; he scourges that he may instruct; and through diverse works of benefits there is one will to succor sinners.

This salutary will is implanted in God and native to him; whence of him [2] we read: "The Lord is merciful and compassionate, patient and plenteous in mercy."

> "He is merciful," says [3] Cassiodorus, "who is shown by his nature to be most clement. He is compassionate when he bestows the gifts of his mercy. But none except the Lord can be found naturally merciful and compassionate. Here, however, *merciful* was put first so that thou mightest recognize the Lord as compassionate not for a time but continually…. There follows, 'and plenteous in mercy.' Truly plenteous in mercy is he who, hearing utterly blasphemous voices, [4] makes his sun rise upon the good and the evil and rains upon the just and the impious; who with great loving-kindness bestows the vital spirit; who awaits those who err, that they may condemn the things which they have perversely committed."

---

[6] Ps. CII. 11.

[1] In the commentary on this passage, p. 344.

[2] Ps. CII. 8.

[3] In the commentary on this passage, p. 344.

[4] Matt. V. 45.

And [5] again:

> We have the Lord both loving by nature and most liberal through the gifts of his mercies. Who doubts to ask of him who is offended if he is not asked?

But elsewhere [6], treating of the same words, "The Lord is merciful and compassionate," he adds:

> That he is called merciful is a virtue of his very nature; that he is compassionate is a cause of salvation for our fragility. For he is merciful when he creates, because he is provoked by no benefits to bestow, but by the disposition of his clemency he causes all things to come into existence. He is also compassionate when by his loving-kindness he reconstructs things that are falling,
> so that those who fall through fault may be raised up through grace. For who by his own acts merits the gifts of the Lord Savior, since it is read absolutely [1]: "All have sinned and need the glory of God"?

XLVI.

But so great and so abundant a mercy brings it about that God is patient, invites all to penance, and awaits the repentance of all; that he pursues men with a more earnest benevolence than they love themselves; to such a degree that those who perish must be judged to perish against the will of God.

Fastidius [2], not the least among the bishops of Britain who flourished in the fifth century, excellently establishes these things when, inquiring into the causes [3] on account of which God does not immediately punish sinners, he says:

> The miserable and ungrateful, improvident concerning their own salvation, impute even this to God, that their destruction is deferred; not knowing that by the providence of God they are preserved for a twofold reason: both that provision may be made for the human race by his long patience, and lest he be judged impatient if he should will immediately to condemn those who sin. For if he were not so patient, the origin of the human race would long since have ceased;

[5] In the conclusion to Ps. CII, p. 346.

[6] On Ps. CXLIV. 8, p. 488.

[1] Rom. III. 23.

[2] Fastidius flourished about the year 430. Concerning him, Ussher, *Antiquities of the British Churches*, chap. XI; Possinus, in the admonition to the Roman edition of Fastidius; Noris, *History of Pelagianism*, book I, chap. XIX; Tillemont, vol. XV, pp. 16–18 and p. 837; Pagi, at the year 420, § XXIX; the Ballerini, in the observations on the works of Noris, vol. IV, pp. 884, 923, 926; and Gallandi, in the prolegomena to vol. IX, chap. XV, have many things not unworthy of being known.

[3] *On the Christian Life*, chap. II, pp. 481–482, in Gallandi, vol. IX.

nor would we have just men from sinners if God willed at once to punish those who sin. For we know and read of not a few who previously, deceived either by the blindness of ignorance, or by reason of unbelief, or by the vanity of youth, were held liable by manifold and diverse kinds of sins, and who afterward, through the most clement patience of God sustaining them, were converted from error and performed works of justice yet greater than the sins they had previously committed. For God does not pardon sins, but defers their punishment; nor does he free from death a sinner who perseveres,

but patiently awaits that he may be converted even late and live; as the blessed Apostle Peter says [1]: "The Lord delayeth not his promises, but dealeth patiently for your sake, not willing that any should perish, but that all should be converted to penance." For, as loving, benign, and clement, he does not strike thee immediately precisely so that thou mayest recognize how great his loving-kindness toward thee is, how great his clemency, since he prefers to await thee as a sinner and an impious man and to save thee when converted, rather than to punish thee when sinning; as the Lord himself speaks through the prophet [2], and by the benignity of his own voice expresses how much mercy and loving-kindness he wills to bestow upon man, saying: "And if the wicked man turn himself away from all his iniquities which he hath wrought, and keep my commandments, and do judgment and justice and mercy, living he shall live, and shall not die; all his transgressions, whatsoever he hath wrought, shall not be remembered; in his justice which he hath wrought he shall live." And [3]: "Is it by my will that I will the death of the unjust man, saith the Lord Adonai, rather than that he turn himself from his evil way, and that I cause him to live?" And elsewhere [4]: "The iniquity of the wicked shall not harm him on whatever day he shall turn himself away from his iniquity." And [5] again: "Return, O children who are returning, and I will heal your contrition."

Behold how God admonishes and provokes thee that thou mayest be converted from thy sins even late and be able to be saved. Behold in what manner he exhorts one already liable to death that he may live; how gently, how clemently he invites him, so that he does not deny a father's loving-kindness even to sinners. And he still calls those

[1] II Pet. III. 9.
[2] Ezek. XVIII. 21–22.
[3] Ibid., v. 23.
[4] Ezek. XXXIII. 12.
[5] Jer. III. 22.

> children who by sinning lost God as Father, just as in another place [6], with a mournful voice and a kind of lamentation, he himself testifies that he has lost sinners, saying: "I have become without children; I have lost my people because of their sins."
>
> From this, therefore, recognize how God loves thee, whom he prefers to live rather than to perish. And dost thou contemn and despise him who loves thee more than thou thyself dost, who wills thee, though desiring to die,
>
> to live? "I will not," says [1] the Lord, "the death of sinners, but that they be converted and live." Thou, therefore, didst will to die by sinning; he wills thee to live by converting. O foolish, irreverent, and ungrateful man, who not even in this dost consent to God, who wills to have mercy upon thee; who prefers to save thee by his loving-kindness rather than that thou perish by thy sin!

Of this most benevolent charity of God, and of the incredible patience by which he sustains the impious and the wicked, Gaudentius of Brescia speaks [2] no less clearly when, concerning the cup of salvation mentioned in the Psalms, he writes:

> "But the sinners of the earth," he says [3], "shall drink this cup." Rightly, according to this understanding [4], he says that "the sinners of the earth shall drink"; because the sinners of heaven—the angels who became demons—do not merit to drink the cup of salvation, but the sinners of the earth shall receive the cup [5] of salvation against the poisons of demons and the diseases of vices, and shall invoke the name of the Lord. For [6] "everyone whosoever shall

[6] Jer. XV. 7.

[1] Ezek. XVIII. 32.

[2] In the response to Paul the deacon concerning that which the Lord Jesus said to the Apostles, that "the Father is greater than I," pp. 365–367, Brescia edition of 1738.

[3] Ps. LXXIV.

[4] A little before, he had given another understanding of the same words in favor of the liberty of faith and in accordance with that rule which, in the treatise *On the Steward*, p. 337, he had expressed in these words: "I now come to that which thou didst so earnestly require of me, and I shall relate as briefly as I can what I think concerning it, prejudicing no one as to how he may will to interpret it, provided that his explanation does not infringe the tradition of the apostolic faith." From this rule for expounding Scripture that which Augustine hands down in *On Christian Doctrine*, book I, chap. XXXVI, differs in no way, when he writes: "Whoever seems to himself to have understood the divine Scriptures, or any part of them, in such a way that by that understanding he does not build up the twofold charity of God and neighbor, has not yet understood. But whoever shall have drawn from them such an opinion as is useful for building up this charity, and nevertheless has not said that which the author whom he reads is shown to have understood in that passage, is not deceived perniciously, nor does he lie at all."

[5] Ps. CXV.

[6] Rom. X.

> invoke the name of the Lord shall be saved." This cup is given to sinners to drink because [7] "they that are in health need not a physician, but they that are ill." "I came not," he says [8], "to call the just, but sinners
> to penance." For the Wisdom of God invites such men to this bowl of the salutary mixture when she exhorts them with a sublime voice and [1] says: "Whosoever is foolish, let him turn aside to me." And to those who lack understanding she says: "Come, eat of my breads, and drink the wine which I have mingled for you." The foolish man is therefore invited by the Wisdom of God that he may become wise, and the sinner that he may be converted and live.
> We are all generally called to this cup of divine mercy; for all have sinned, as the Apostle says [2], and need the glory of God. But if all have sinned and need the glory of God—for his majesty is assuredly the remedy—whom, then, shall we call healthy, for whom the office of a physician is not necessary, unless perhaps those who, already healed by him, no longer need medicine?

Marcus the Hermit [3] commends this universal mercy of God the Savior in a distinguished manner when he writes: καὶ ὄντως ἐχθροὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσιν οἱ πονηροὶ λογισμοί, οἱ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι διακωλύοντες· εἴπερ ὁ μὲν θέλει πάντας ἀνθρώπους σωθῆναι, καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν· ἐκεῖνοι δὲ διὰ προσπαθείας ἡμᾶς πλανῶσι, καὶ τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμᾶς ἀπείργουσι, "and truly evil thoughts are enemies of God, preventing his will from being done. For he wills [4] all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth; but they, through attachment, lead us astray and exclude us from salvation."

Whence it is easy to answer one who asks how it comes about that, although God of himself wills and desires the salvation of all, so many nevertheless fall headlong into everlasting destruction. It comes about, namely, because the attainment of salvation is a gift in such a way that it is at the same time a recompense and a crown, and consequently a mixed work: first, the work of God who prevents, excites, and assists; then, the work of man, who adds his own diligence and freely joins his own consent. But there are very many who, to their great-

[7] Matt. IX.

[8] Ibid.

[1] Prov. IX.

[2] Rom. III. Jerome, on Isaiah, book VI, chap. XVI, and Augustine, *On the Merits of Sins*, book I, chap. XXVII, read: "All need the grace of God."

[3] Opuscule IV, whose title is Ἀπόκρισις πρὸς τοὺς ἀποροῦντας περὶ τοῦ θείου βαπτίσματος, *A Response to Those Who Were in Doubt Concerning Divine Baptism*, p. 43, in Gallandi, vol. VIII.

[4] I Tim. II. 4.

est harm, freely will not that which they could and which they ought, and freely choose in turn that from which they are deterred and which they ought not.

Let Cassiodorus [1] be heard in his commentary upon these words of the Psalm [2], "The Lord is sweet to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works," when he writes:

> What is more magnificent than to be sweet to all? What again is more magnificent than to expend tender mercies upon all his works, which glory in him as their Author? Someone may say: Why, therefore, are sinners to be condemned, whom it is not doubtful are his creature? But observe that he says that tender mercies are to be conferred upon the works of the Lord. For he crowns that which prevenient grace bestows in us by a hidden judgment; he condemns that which is constructed by the machination of the devil. For the force placed in the words resolves the question most completely. The works of the Lord are always chosen; our works or those of the devil are without doubt condemned.

XLVII.

But that God is present to all so that he may find in them works which he may choose and, having chosen, crown, neither do the preceding things permit us to doubt nor does the author [3] of the distinguished work *On the Calling of All Nations* suffer us to bring into controversy.

For he begins his work in precisely these words [4]:

> Among the defenders of free choice and the preachers of the grace of God, a great and difficult question has long been debated. For it is asked whether God wills all men to be saved; and because this cannot be denied,
> it is inquired why the will of the Almighty is not fulfilled. And when this is said to come about according to the will of men, grace seems

[1] On Ps. CXLIV, p. 488.

[2] Ps. CXLIV. 9.

[3] Concerning the name of this author, compare above the rest Quesnel, dissertation II, concerning the author of the books *On the Calling of All Nations*; Antelmi, in the work entitled *Critical Dissertations on Various Works of the Holy Fathers Leo the Great and Prosper of Aquitaine*; and the Ballerini brothers, in the observations on Quesnel's dissertation II, pp. 662 ff., vol. II of the works of St. Leo, Venice edition of 1756. This is undisputed among all: that the author was most worthy to be saluted as a doctor of the Church by Pope Gelasius in the treatise against the Pelagians, p. 374, vol. V of the Venice edition of the Councils.

[4] *On the Calling of All Nations*, book I, chap. I, col. 167.

> [1] to be excluded; and if grace is rendered to merits, it is evident that it is not a gift but a debt. Whence it is again asked why this gift, without which no one is saved, is not conferred upon all by him who wills all to be saved. And thus no end is found to contrary disputations, so long as that which is manifest is not distinguished from that which is hidden.

Among the things which are manifest he reckons that God wills all men to be saved, since this is a truth which cannot be denied. Whence, after a lengthy disputation [2] concerning nature and grace, he thus [3] proceeds:

> All contentions having been removed and rejected which the contentiousness of intemperate disputations generates, it is manifest that there are three things to which adherence ought to be given in this question, concerning which we begin the second volume. One: that it must be professed that God wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth. Another: that it must not be doubted that each man arrives at that very knowledge of the truth and reception of salvation not by his own merits but by the aid and operation of divine grace. The third: that it must be confessed that the depth of the judgments of God cannot be penetrable to human understanding, and that it ought not to be inquired why he does not save all men who wills all men to be saved; because, if that which cannot be known is not sought, no cause of strife will remain between the first and second definitions, but both will be preached and both believed with a secure and tranquil faith. For God, with [4] whom there is no iniquity and all of whose ways are mercy and truth, is the good Creator and the just Orderer of all men; condemning no one undeservedly, liberating no one deservedly; punishing our things when he punishes the guilty, bestowing his own when he makes men just; so that [5] the mouth of those who speak iniquities may be stopped, and God may be justified
>
> in his words and may prevail when he is judged. For neither is the complaint of the condemned just, nor the arrogance of the justified true, whether the former says that he did not merit punishment or the latter asserts that he merited grace.

Therefore, the article by which we profess that God wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth belongs to Christian faith and Christian

[1] Compare Augustine, *On the Spirit and the Letter*, chap. XXXIII.
[2] Which is contained in book I, chaps. II ff.
[3] Book II, chap. I, col. 211.
[4] Rom. IX. 14, compared with II Chron. XIX. 7.
[5] Ps. LXII. 12, compared with Ps. L. 6.

preaching; and that it is beyond controversy either that no one arrives at that very knowledge of the truth and reception of salvation by his own merits but by the aid and operation of divine grace, or that not all are saved by him who wills all men to be saved, is in no way opposed to this article.

For it is one thing to know well what thou believest, and another to possess the way and rationale by which thou mayest mutually compose and bring into harmony the individual heads of doctrine which thou professest. The former is proper to the believer; the latter surpasses the force and faculty of human understanding, to which the depth of the judgments of God cannot be penetrable. Yet this darkness ought not to prevent that which is certain from being believed most firmly and God from being held to be the good Creator and just Orderer of all men: the good Creator because he wills all men to be saved; the just Orderer because he condemns no one undeservedly [1], and no less punishes our things when he punishes the guilty than he bestows his own when he makes men just.

XLVIII.

For establishing and vindicating these things the Anonymous author uses a manifold argument, and first of all that which the Apostle [2], speaking of God, furnishes in these words: "Who wills all men to be saved." Concerning this testimony he writes at the beginning [3]:

> We receive this clause of the Apostle's words so integrally and fully that we subtract from it nothing of the preceding or subsequent things which pertain to it. For, to set aside the other testimonies of the divine eloquences, this passage suffices to render void that which they calumniously object and to defend that which they impiously deny.

Then he relates the entire sequence of the discourse, which is as follows [1]:

> I beseech, therefore, first of all, that supplications, petitions, and thanksgivings be made for all men, and for kings and all who are in high station, that we may lead a quiet and tranquil life in all piety and chastity. For this is good and acceptable before God our Savior, who wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a redemption for all.

[1] For he condemns solely those, as he writes in book II, chap. VIII, who have neglected mercy and benevolence.

[2] I Tim. II. 4.

[3] *On the Calling of All Nations*, book I, chap. XII, cols. 185–186.

[1] I Tim. II. 1–7.

Having set these things forth, he immediately infers:

> Concerning this rule of apostolic doctrine, therefore, with which the universal Church is imbued, lest we wander away by our own judgment [2] into a diverse understanding, let us inquire what the universal Church itself thinks; because there can be nothing doubtful in the precept if obedience agrees in practice. Therefore the Apostle—indeed, through the Apostle the Lord, who was speaking in the Apostle—commanded that supplications, petitions, and thanksgivings be made for all men, for kings and for those who are in high station. The devotion of all priests and all the faithful concordantly holds this law of supplication in such a manner that there is no part of the world in which prayers of this kind are not celebrated by Christian peoples. Therefore the Church everywhere supplicates God not only for the saints and those already regenerated in Christ, but also for all unbelievers and enemies of the cross of Christ; for all worshipers of idols; for all who persecute Christ in his members; for the Jews, upon whose blindness the light of the Gospel does not shine;
>
> for heretics and schismatics, who are estranged from the unity of faith and charity. But what does she ask for these except that, having abandoned their errors, they be converted to God, receive faith, receive charity, and, liberated from the darkness of ignorance, come to the knowledge of the truth? Because they cannot furnish this for themselves—oppressed by the weight of evil custom and bound by the chains of the devil—nor are they able to overcome their deceptions, to which they have adhered so pertinaciously that they love falsehood as much as truth is to be loved, the merciful and just Lord wills that supplication be made to him for all men; so that, when we see innumerable men rescued from such profound evils, we may not doubt that God has furnished that which he was entreated to furnish; and, giving thanks for those who have been saved, we may hope that even those who have not yet been illuminated [1] are, by

[2] Irenaeus, Polycarp, the Church of Smyrna, Clement of Alexandria, Athanasius, Basil, both Gregories—of Nyssa and Nazianzus—Cyril of Jerusalem, and Epiphanius handed down the same rule with the same purpose; Thomassin relates and diligently weighs their testimonies in the *Theological Prolegomena*, chaps. XVIII–XIX. From these it appears whence the Fathers of Trent in Session IV drew their decree, by which they pronounced anathema upon those who twist Sacred Scripture to their own meanings, contrary to that meaning which holy Mother Church has held and holds.

[1] It will be helpful to notice the distinction which Petau subtly notes in *On God*, book X, chap. III, § III, as existing between these forms of speech: that God wills all men to be saved, and that all are justified, or all are illuminated through Christ. "For these very things—to be justified, to be

the same operation of divine grace, to be taken out of the power of darkness
and to be transferred into the kingdom of God before they depart from this life.

This is the sum of that most excellent disputation: for expounders of the Scriptures, lest they be carried about by every wind [1] of doctrine, nothing ought to be preferred, nothing regarded as prior, to seeking and discovering, concerning the testimony before their hands, the opinion and faith of the Catholic Church, and, having discovered it, following it. For the Church is ruled by the same Spirit who is the principal Author of the Scriptures; whence those who follow the Church follow that very Spirit by whose [2] inspiration the holy men of God spoke. But the Catholic Church, by her prayers solemnly poured forth to God, has demonstrated most openly that it is known and certain to her that by the apostolic words is signified the universal salvific will of God, which passes over no one and assists all. Therefore it is neither lawful to subject the apostolic words to another power of signification nor to call into doubt the universal amplitude of the divine salvific will.

---

illuminated, and similar things—God does not effect by himself alone, nor do they depend upon his will alone, as matters stand and as he himself decreed that they should be done, who determined to bring no one to his grace except one spontaneously willing and consenting. Therefore, when we read that all are justified by Christ, we can interpret this only of those who are willing. The same judgment would apply if he had said not that he wills all to be saved, but that he saves all. For he determined not to execute this without us. But it is evident that not all are justified nor all saved, not because the will of God is wanting to them, but because they themselves are wanting to the divine will. Therefore, when it is said thus, 'God wills all to be saved,' insofar as he is said to will, that is said which is placed in his will alone. For that he may will, he does not derive it from the will of men, but from his goodness alone.

"Wherefore, when he wills all to be saved, he excepts no one, because no cause for making an exception is sought outside himself. For he wills because thus it pleases him. But when he justifies, illuminates, and saves, he employs συνεργούς, that is, cooperators, and συναιτίους, joint causes; and if they resist, that which God willed does not come to pass. For it was not falsely said: 'How often I willed, and thou wouldst not.'" Nor did the great Leo write falsely, Sermon XXXV, otherwise XXXIV, col. 130: "Let us therefore consider the ineffable generosity of the divine gifts toward us; let us be cooperators with the grace of God operating in us. For the kingdom of heaven does not come to those who sleep, nor is the beatitude of eternity thrust upon those who are torpid in leisure and sloth; but because, as the Apostle says, 'If we suffer together, we shall also be glorified together,' that way must be run by us which the Lord himself testified that he is; who, though no merits of works supported us, provided for us both by sacrament and

example: that by the former he might advance those called to adoption unto salvation, and by the latter instruct them unto labor."

[1] Eph. IV. 14.

[2] II Pet. I. 21.

XLIX.

What he then establishes he confirms by a second argument, in which there is both an equal force for persuading and a most similar splendor for illuminating. He deduces it from the universal redemption through Christ [3], writing:

> There is no reason for doubting that Jesus Christ our Lord died for the impious and sinners. If anyone was found free from their number, Christ did not die for all; but Christ died absolutely for all; therefore, before the reconciliation which was made through the blood of Christ, there was no one among all men who was not either a sinner or impious.

This he shows continuously from the oracles of the Scriptures [4], then proceeds:

> Therefore, whether circumcision or uncircumcision, all were universally enclosed under sin, and one guilt had bound all; and among the more or less impious there was no one who could be saved without the redemption of Christ. This redemption presented itself to the whole world and became known indiscriminately to all men, since on the fiftieth day after that Pasch on which the true Lamb had offered himself as a victim to God, when the Apostles and those who were with them in one mind, filled with the Holy Spirit, spoke in the tongues of all nations, a multitude of diverse kinds of men assembled in consequence of the miracle, so that the whole world might hear the Gospel of Christ in those who were present. For there had come together, as it is written [1], Parthians and Medes and Elamites, and inhabitants of Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the parts of Libya which are about Cyrene, and Roman sojourners, Jews also and proselytes, Cretans and Arabians, all hearing the great things of God preached in their own tongues; and their testimony would run far and wide even to those nations which are more remote.
>
> We believe that, for the accomplishment of this matter, the breadth of the Roman Empire [2] was prepared by the providence of God, so

[3] *On the Calling of All Nations*, book II, chap. XVI, col. 228.

[4] Rom. V. 6 ff.; II Cor. V. 14; I Tim. I. 15.

[1] Acts II. 9.

[2] Most similar to these are the things Leo has in Sermon I on Saints Peter and Paul, chap. I: "So that thou, a holy nation, a chosen people, a priestly and royal city, made the head of the world through the sacred See of blessed Peter, mightest preside more widely by divine religion than by earthly domination. For although, enlarged by many victories, thou hast extended the right of thine empire by land and sea, nevertheless that which martial labor subjected to thee is less than that which Christian peace subjected…. But that the effect of this ineffable grace might be diffused throughout the whole

> that the nations to be called to the unity of the body of Christ might first be joined together by the law of one empire; although Christian grace is not content to have the same limits as Rome, and has now subjected to the scepter of the cross of Christ many peoples whom Rome did not subdue by her arms.
>
> Nevertheless, through the primacy of the apostolic priesthood, Rome was made more extensive by the citadel of religion than by the throne of power.

Assuredly, the amplitude of the divine salvific will can be defined by no other rationale more fittingly than by the ascertained amplitude of that redemption which the true Lamb, Christ the Lord, offered to the Father. For [1] he both came into the world and was made flesh, and, [2] having assumed the form of a servant, emptied himself even unto the death of the cross, that he might fulfill the will [3], not his own, but that of the Father who sent him. But Christ died absolutely for all and appeased the Father for all upon the altar of the cross. Therefore God both willed and wills the salvation of all, who for this reason, as Peter Chrysologus [4] is witness, through Christ recalled the human race to obedience to the Creator, to the grace of the Father, and to the free servitude of the one good Lord; through him [5] covered that nakedness which the first Adam had introduced; and through him, merciful and sweet, absolved the sin of the whole world. Truly sweet [6] through the mercy by which alone he deigned to remove the most bitter sentence of the whole world.

Nor will those judge otherwise concerning the merciful and benevolent will of God who consider with themselves to whom God through Christ exhibited the salutary protection of the Gospel. For to whom did he exhibit it? To some only, or rather to all? Indiscriminately to all; and of this will embracing all he gave this sign: that the Apostles, filled with the Holy Spirit, spoke in the tongues of all nations.

---

world, divine providence prepared the Roman Empire, whose growth was brought to those limits by which the universality of all nations was near and contiguous. For it was most fitting for the work divinely arranged that many kingdoms should be confederated in one empire, and that the general preaching should quickly have access to the peoples whom the governance of one city held."

[1] John I. 10, 14.

[2] Phil. II. 6 ff.

[3] John V. 30, compared with VI. 38 and Heb. X. 7–9.

[4] Sermon VI, p. 10, Augsburg edition of 1758.

[5] Sermon XXIII, p. 40.

[6] Sermon VI, p. 11.

L.

This argument indeed he explains much more fully elsewhere [7], saying:

> Just as those things which are brought forth from the divine eloquences for the manifestation of grace cannot be violated by any art of disputation, so that opinions clear and consonant in so great a number should be drawn into some uncertainty of perverse interpretation; so also that which is found in the same body of the Scriptures concerning the salvation of all men must not be rashly violated by any contrary argumentation, so that, by as much as this very thing is grasped with a more difficult understanding, by so much may it be believed with a more praiseworthy faith. For great is the strength of an assent for which authority suffices in following the truth, even when the rationale lies hidden. Let us therefore consider vigilantly what is commanded by the Lord to the preachers of the Gospel.
>
> For according to Matthew he says thus [1]: "All power is given to me in heaven and on earth. Going, therefore, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the age." But according to Mark it is thus said [2] to the same Apostles: "Go into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature; and he who shall believe and shall be baptized shall be saved, but he who shall not believe shall be condemned."
>
> Was any distinction among nations or among men made in this precept? He excepted no one by merit, separated no one by race, distinguished no one by condition. The Gospel of the cross of Christ was sent absolutely to all men. And lest the ministries of those who preach should appear to be carried out by human operation alone, he says [3]: "Behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the age"; that is: when you shall enter as sheep into the midst of wolves, do not tremble on account of your weakness, but trust in my power, for I shall not abandon you in all this work even unto the consummation of the age; not so that you may suffer nothing, but, what is much greater, that you may be overcome by no cruelty of

[7] *On the Calling of All Nations*, book II, chap. II, cols. 212–213.
[1] Matt. XXVIII. 18–20.
[2] Mark XVI. 15.
[3] Matt. XXVIII. 20.

> those who rage. For in my power you shall preach, and through me [4] it shall come about that among
> those who contradict and those who rage, sons of Abraham may be raised up from stones…. "The grace, therefore, of God our Savior," as the Apostle [1] says, "hath appeared to all men"; and nevertheless the ministers of grace were hated by all men. And although there were some who hated and others who were oppressed by the hatreds of persecutors, nevertheless neither part was deprived of the designation *all men*: the rebellious portion indeed sustaining the loss of its salvation, but the dignity of the faithful obtaining the reckoning of fullness.

It might almost be said: to the revealed will of God, which discloses itself outwardly, there corresponds the hidden will which lies concealed within God, in such a manner that the former is a sign of the latter and the latter can be estimated and judged from the former. But nothing is more evident than that the revealed salvific will is universal, by which God commanded that the Gospel and the promises of the Gospel should be announced not to these or those, but to all men, to every creature, to all nations. Therefore there is in God an intimate will, a hidden will, by which he pursues the salvation of all men with the most sincere love.

If many fall away from this salvation and experience God as the author not of reward but of punishment, not of felicity but of destruction, this must be ascribed not to him, on the ground that he withdrew outward and inward mercy, but to those very ones who perish, on the ground that they rebelled against his prevenient mercy. Excellently does Fulgentius say [2]:

> Principally, every Scripture divinely inspired preaches that the one true and only God, namely that Trinity—that is, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit—is no less merciful than just. For to him it is said from the person of the Church [3]: "Mercy and judgment I will sing to thee, O Lord." Of him also it is sung [4]: "The Lord is merciful and just, and our God will have mercy." In another place also [5]: "For the Lord is just and hath loved justices; his countenance hath beheld equity." Again [6] it is said: "All the ways of the Lord

[4] By these words it is intimated that God, who gives the increase, is present by his divine power to those who plant and water.

[1] Titus II. 11.

[2] *On the Remission of Sins*, book I, chap. VIII, p. 364, Paris edition of 1684.

[3] Ps. C. 1.

[4] Ps. CXIV. 5.

[5] Ps. X. 8.

[6] Ps. XXIV. 10.

> are mercy and truth." And [1] again: "For the Lord loveth mercy and truth." Through Isaiah also [2] the Lord commemorates his mercy and justice, saying: "I am God, and there is none other besides me, a just God and a Savior; there is none besides me. Turn to me and you shall be saved."
>
> By these, therefore, [3] and innumerable testimonies of this kind, by which the Lord our God is preached as merciful and just, it is shown how greatly his mercy is to be loved and how greatly his justice is to be feared. For the Lord, merciful and compassionate, patient and plenteous in mercy and true, just as he knows how to remove punishment from him who is converted, so in him who has refused to be converted he in no way permits sin to remain unavenged. Hence it is that by the divine eloquences the evil are ceaselessly and salutarily admonished not to remain in the servitude of sin, but to seek the mercy of the just God while they are in this life.

Therefore, although the divine economy toward men is administered especially by a twofold work, that of mercy and that of justice, this distinction exists between the two: that the former precedes, while the latter follows; nor does it come about that men possessed of reason and previously under their own jurisdiction encounter punishments inflicted by justice before they have contemned the benefits of mercy. "Accordingly," Fulgentius writes [4] elsewhere:

> In all his works God is worthy of eternal praise, because he gratuitously remits iniquity to all whom he calls according to purpose [5] and justifies; but in all whom he punishes he retains irreprehensible equity.

He immediately subjoins this cause of that opinion: that men, having received the faculty of using reason, reject or neglect the salutary remedy of regeneration, without which they not only

> will be able to obtain the kingdom, but will also be subject to more grievous punishments. For such men [1], "contemning the benignity of God, according to their hardness and impenitent heart treasure up to themselves wrath against the day of wrath and of the revelation

[1] Ps. LXXXIII. 12.

[2] Isa. XLV. 21.

[3] Ibid., chap. VIII, p. 365.

[4] *On the Truth of Predestination and Grace*, book I, chap. XIV, p. 449.

[5] The expression κατὰ πρόθεσιν, "according to purpose," is customary in Paul, Rom. VIII. 28; IX. 11; Eph. I. 11; III. 11; II Tim. I. 9, and it signifies εὐδοκίαν, "good pleasure," and ἀγάπην, "love," by which God is moved to act beneficently toward men. Hesychius renders πρόθεσιν by προαίρεσιν; Suidas, however, by βουλήν, γνώμην. Compare Ernesti's *Philological and Critical Opuscules*, p. 248.

[1] Rom. II. 5–6.

> of the just judgment of God, who will render to each one according to his works"; so that they are tormented so much the more severely not only for original sin … but also for their own evil will, by as much as they add more of their own iniquity.

Hence, lest we turn the riches of the mercy of God into a treasure of wrath, Peter Chrysologus exhorted us [2], writing:

> Great are the works of the Lord, but the greatness of mercy excels their greatness. For when the prophet had said [3], "Great are the works of the Lord," he added [4] elsewhere: "His tender mercies are over all his works." Mercy, brethren, fills heaven and replenishes the earth. "O Lord," he says [5], "thy mercy is in heaven." And [6] he likewise says: "The earth is full of the mercy of the Lord." And truly, brethren, all that God had made would have perished if mercy had not come to its aid…. This is the great, ample, sole mercy of Christ, which reserved every judgment for one day and assigned the whole time to man as a respite for penance: so that old age at least may correct that which infancy takes up from vices, adolescence seizes, and youth invades; and that he may repent of sin even then when he perceives that he can no longer sin; and at least then abandon guilt when guilt has already abandoned him; that he may make a virtue of necessity; that he who lived his whole life in crime may die innocent.

Whence elsewhere [7] he says:

> Let penance run, lest the sentence run ahead; for the Lord, in that he has not yet come, in that he still waits, in that he makes delays, desires that we return to him, not that we perish—we whom he has always [8] addressed with such loving-kindness: "I will not the death of the sinner, but that the impious man return from his way and live."

LI.

The author of the work *On the Calling of All Nations* completes in these words [1] the demonstration which he began and perfected in parts:

[2] Sermon XLII, p. 68.
[3] Ps. CX.
[4] Ps. CXLIV.
[5] Ps. XXXV.
[6] Ps. XXXII.
[7] Sermon CLXVII, p. 232.
[8] Ezek. XXXIII.
[1] *On the Calling of All Nations*, book II, chap. XIX, cols. 232–233.

> By these and other testimonies of the Scriptures it is shown without doubt that this most rich, most powerful, most benign grace, by which in the last time of the world all nations are called into the kingdom of Christ, was hidden in the counsel of God in preceding ages; and that no knowledge can comprehend, no understanding penetrate, why it was not previously revealed by that manifestation by which it is now made known to all nations. Nevertheless, that which is most piously believed concerning the goodness of God, that he [2] wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth, ought to be understood as nothing other than perpetual and eternal, according to those measures by which God knows how to heap special gifts upon general gifts; so that both those who have been without grace may be convicted of their own wickedness, and those who have shone by its light may glory not in their own merit but in the Lord.

And [3] again he writes somewhat more clearly:

> Whether, therefore, we contemplate the last ages, the first, or the middle, it is rationally and piously believed that God wills all men to be saved and has always willed it; and this is shown from no other source than from those benefits which the providence of God expends commonly and indiscriminately upon all generations. For gifts of this kind were and are so general that by their testimony men could be assisted in seeking the true God; and upon these gifts, which throughout all ages proclaim their Author [4], the largess of special grace has been poured forth.
>
> Although it is furnished more copiously now than before, nevertheless the Lord has retained the causes of its distributions within his own knowledge and hidden them within the secret of his most powerful will; and if these gifts flowed uniformly upon all, they would not be hidden. And just as there is no ambiguity concerning general benignity, so concerning special mercy nothing would exist which was to be wondered at; and consequently the one would be grace and the other would not. But it pleased God both to bestow the one upon many and to remove the other from no one, so that from both it may appear that what was conferred upon a portion was not denied

[2] I Tim. II. 4.

[3] *On the Calling of All Nations*, book II, chap. XXV, cols. 237–238.

[4] Thou hast parallel passages in book II, chaps. IV, V, X, XVII; book I, chaps. V, XXI; and in Leo, Sermons VII–VIII on the Fast of the Tenth Month; Sermon VI on the Fast of the Seventh Month; Sermon VI in Lent, chap. I; and Sermons V–VIII on the Epiphany.

to the universality, but that in some grace prevailed and in others nature recoiled.

With these the following words agree exactly [1]:

It has been labored, insofar as the Lord aided, that it might be proved that the grace of God was present to all men, not only in the last days but also in all past ages, indeed by an equal providence and general goodness, but by a manifold operation and in a diverse measure; because, whether secretly or manifestly, he is, as the Apostle [2] says, "the Savior of all men, especially of the faithful." If this sentence, of most subtle brevity and most powerful strength, be considered with a tranquil gaze, it decides this entire controversy of which we are treating. For by saying "who is the Savior of all men," he confirmed that the goodness of God toward all men is general; but by adding "especially of the faithful," he showed that there is a portion of the human race which, by the merit of divinely inspired faith, is advanced by special benefits to supreme and eternal salvation. This is indeed done without any iniquity on the part of the most just and most merciful God, whose judgment in these dispensations must be praised with trembling, not discussed with arrogance.

LII.

From these things reduced to one sum we gather: I.

that it is rationally [1] and piously believed that God wills all men to be saved and has always willed it, and that the things which [2] are found in the body of the Scriptures concerning the salvation of all men cannot be rashly violated by any contrary argumentation.

II. That this divine will has always been present to men, since that [3] which is most piously believed concerning the goodness of God, by which he wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth, ought to be understood as nothing other than perpetual and eternal, according to those measures by which God knows how to heap special gifts upon general gifts. For [4], as we have abundantly proved, such manifold and ineffable goodness always has provided and provides for the universality of men, so

[1] *On the Calling of All Nations*, book II, chap. XXXI, cols. 243–244.
[2] I Tim. IV. 10.
[1] *On the Calling of All Nations*, book II, chap. XXV.
[2] Ibid., book II, chap. II.
[3] Ibid., book II, chap. XIX.
[4] Ibid., book II, chap. XXIX.

that neither does any of those who perish have an excuse available on the ground that the light of truth was denied to him, nor is anyone free to glory in his own justice.

III. That it is necessary to reckon as received from this benevolent will that God so disposed both orders, the natural and the supernatural, that there should not be lacking to men that which appeared necessary and opportune for avoiding damnation and acquiring felicity. "Heaven and earth," the Anonymous author writes [5],

> and every creature which can be seen and understood, were disposed chiefly for this utility of the human race: that rational nature might be instructed in the worship and love of its Author. For although salvation is far from sinners, nevertheless nothing is empty of the presence and power of salvation itself.

And [6] again:

> Although, therefore, Scripture pronounces these and many similar things [7] of the truth, nevertheless according to that same Scripture we believe and most piously confess that the care of divine providence was never lacking to the universality of men. Although it directed to piety by special institutions a people set apart for itself, it nevertheless withdrew the gifts of its goodness from no nation of men,
>
> so that they were convicted of having received prophetic voices and legal precepts in the services and testimonies of the elements. Whence they were also made inexcusable, because they made the gifts of God into gods for themselves and venerated for worship the things which had been created for use.

Elsewhere, however, he says [1]:

> The experiences of all ages have taught the just mercy of God and his merciful justice, which have never been lacking either for nourishing the bodies of men or for teaching and assisting their minds.

---

[5] *On the Calling of All Nations*, book II, chap. IV.

[6] Ibid., book I, chap. V.

[7] He looks to those things which are read in Deut. XXXII. 8–9; Lev. XX. 26; Acts XIV. 14; and Esther XVI according to the Greek interpretation.

[1] Ibid., book II, chap. X. From these must not be separated the words of Leo from Sermon VI in Lent, chap. I: "Indeed, the earth is always full of the mercy of the Lord, and for each of the faithful the very nature of things is an instruction for worshiping God, since heaven and earth, the sea, and all things which are in them proclaim the goodness and omnipotence of their Author, and the wondrous beauty of the serving elements exacts from the intellectual creature a just giving of thanks." And Sermon LXXXII, otherwise LXXX, chap. II: "God," he adds, "good and just, has never denied his mercy to the human race, and by most abundant benefits has always instructed all mortals in common unto the knowledge of himself."

> For he has always rained upon the good and the evil; he has always made his sun rise upon the just and the unjust.

Whence [2] we see that the aid of grace was not wholly withdrawn from any men; nor [3] was that measure of general assistance, which from above has always been furnished to all men, denied even to the nations themselves. It is therefore manifest [4] that in diverse and innumerable ways God wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth; but those who come are directed by the aid of God, while those who do not come resist by their own pertinacity.

LIII.

But what grace does our author understand when he confirms that it is common and universal, and maintains that, though in various ways and in a diverse measure, it was nevertheless furnished to all men? External grace alone, or external grace indeed, but joined with interior grace that heals and elevates? Pasquier Quesnel treats this controversy at length while he weighs the opinion of Vossius [1] and Noris [2], who judged that the books *On the Calling of All Nations* must be denied to Prosper chiefly for this reason: that their doctrine did not agree exactly with the doctrine of Prosper.

For, having related the words of Noris [3], "I see that the writer of those books departed from Prosper by a diverse way. For in book II he expends very much labor to make the grace of God common to all," Quesnel adds [4]:

> This accusation strikes Leo, not only because he was the author [5] of the books *On the Calling of* [6] *Nations*, but also because there are many things in his other undisputed works or sermons which agree with that doctrine of the books *On the Calling*, so that from

[2] Ibid., book I, chap. XXI.

[3] Ibid., book II, chap. XVII.

[4] Ibid., book II, chap. XXVIII.

[1] *History of Pelagianism*, book I, chap. XX.

[2] *History of Pelagianism*, book II, chap. XIV.

[3] Noris contends by dogmatic arguments and attempts by these to decide the critical question. But how unstable this is and how full of hazard and danger can be estimated from this one fact alone: that Joseph Tricassinus, versed to an astonishing degree in the doctrine of Augustine and Prosper, in the work which he entitled *On the Grace Necessary for Salvation Given to All and Each*, showed by many arguments that Prosper is eminent among the defenders of universal grace.

[4] Dissertation II, on the author of the books *On the Calling of Nations*, § XXVIII.

[5] This indeed was not proved by Quesnel with arguments, but asserted by certain conjectures, which the Ballerini brothers, in their observations on his dissertation II, § II, nos. IX–XXVI, show to be empty and fallacious, and in no way suited to settling the matter.

[6] The genuine title of the work is *On the Calling of All Nations*, not *On the Calling of Nations*, as the Ballerini maintain by the authority of the codices in the prefixed admonition. St. Leo also wrote of the calling of all nations in Sermon XXXVI, chap. II.

> that affinity of doctrine we have deservedly taken an argument [7] for asserting these books for our Leo. We collected some passages of this kind above [8]; but before an equitable reader it is easy to clear both these and those from the accusations of Noris and others, and invincibly to prove two things. The first, indeed, is that our Leo, when he makes the grace of God common to all both in the books *On the Calling of Nations* and in his sermons,
>
> employs the name *grace* in a far different sense and a broader signification than it is taken by Prosper. But the second is that, when the same name *grace* is employed by Leo in the same sense in which it is employed by Prosper, the same doctrine concerning grace is also preached by him together with Prosper as by Augustine himself [1].

But that he may explain the first of these things more clearly, he immediately [2] proceeds:

> In these places, therefore, where he asserts that the grace of God has been given to all, by it he understands the outward and natural gifts of God, which are exposed indiscriminately to all; sometimes the documents of the Mosaic law; and sometimes also the preaching of the holy Gospel, which is denied to no condition of men.
>
> He explains this threefold class of grace both in other places and in chapter IX of book II. "Let us return," he says, "to that from which the disputation digressed: namely, to the consideration of the differences by which the operations and gifts of divine grace were varied. For the depth of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God, whose judgments are incomprehensible and whose ways are unsearchable, has always so tempered his mercy and justice that by the most secret will of his eternal counsel he did not will the measures of his gifts to be equal in all times, upon all generations, or upon all men. For he assisted in one manner those whom it was fitting to bring to knowledge of himself by the testimonies of heaven and earth; in another, those for whom he provided not only by the service of the elements, but also by the teaching of the law, the oracles of the prophets, the signs of miracles, and the cooperation of

[7] Not very skillfully, since this doctrine is proper not to one or another, but common to all the Fathers of the Church.

[8] The cited dissertation, § XX.

[1] By these words Quesnel intimates two things not obscurely: I. that interior grace, according to Augustine and Prosper, is not universal but particular; and II. that it is of such a kind that it is never separated by a dissent of the free will from the good work for the sake of which it is conferred. How greatly both things depart from the truth is not unknown to learned theologians.

[2] The cited dissertation, § XXVIII.

> angels; and in another manner much more did he declare mercy to all men when the Son of God was made the Son of man, that he might be found by those who did not seek him and might appear to those who did not ask after him."

Then, after interposing a few things, he infers:

> It remains, therefore, that our author properly called only the first kind of grace common in all times to all
> peoples and to all and each of men: I mean, the testimonies of heaven and earth, the services and ministry of the elements, and finally the beauty and adornment of the whole world. To assign the name of grace to these belongs to a writer contemplating the first state of man in integrity, not the present condition of fallen man; but to impart sufficiency for salvation to external grace of this kind belongs only to a man infected by the Pelagian plague.

LIV.

When I consider this manner of thinking and opining, I cannot sufficiently marvel at the incredible force of prejudices, nor can I prevail upon myself to believe that Quesnel—although thoroughly Jansenist, yet learned and sagacious—did not see how greatly foreign to the truth were the things concerning universal grace asserted by the author of the work *On the Calling* which he was endeavoring to persuade his readers.

For, I. to begin from the hypotheses in which he trusts and upon which he constructs the whole mass of the disputation, there are altogether two. One of them is that no universal grace except external grace was approved by Augustine and Prosper; but the other, that both taught that it is the endowment and implanted character of true and interior grace that it is never without the good work in view of which it is divinely dispensed. Quesnel urges these hypotheses and, relying upon them, contends that this one way of reconciling the author of the work *On the Calling* with Augustine and Prosper lies open: if it be said that no other universal grace was admitted by him than external grace, which is contained in the testimony of the universality of things. He then proceeds to illustrate this by bringing forward several passages of the same author [1].

But of what kind is each hypothesis: certain, probable, or, on the contrary, wholly fallacious and deviant from the truth? I shall not be lengthy, nor shall I dispute at greater length concerning the incidental question. Yet I shall observe what can suffice: that the distinguished theologians

[1] The cited dissertation, § XXVIII, where he relates what the author of *On the Calling* writes in book II, chaps. IV, X, XIV, XVII, XXXI.

Denis Petau [1], Juan Martínez de Ripalda [2], Joseph Tricassinus [3], Alphonse Le Moyne [4], Scipione Maffei [5], Bernard Desirant [6], and [7] Jean Le Porcq have proved by decisive arguments that Augustine and Prosper are eminent among the vindicators of universal interior grace, and that no head of doctrine is more abhorrent from the opinion of each than that which Quesnel ascribes to them: that every interior grace of Christ the Savior is always joined with that work toward which it moves and prepares.

Certainly the author of *On the Calling*, among other things [8], has these most lucid words [9]:

> We believe this more abundant grace to be benign in such a manner that we by no means judge it to be violent, as though whatever is done in saving men were accomplished by the will of God alone, since even to little children aid is given through the obedience of another's will. Indeed, that grace of God is principally preeminent in every justification: persuading by exhortations, admonishing by examples, terrifying by dangers, giving understanding, inspiring counsel, and illuminating the heart itself and imbuing it with the affections of faith. But the will of man also is subjoined and conjoined to it, which was excited for this by the aforesaid aids: that it might cooperate in itself with the divine operation, and begin to exercise unto merit that which it conceived from the supreme seed unto zeal; having it from its own mutability if it fails, and from the assistance of grace if it advances.
>
> This assistance is applied to all through innumerable modes, whether hidden or manifest; and that it is rejected by many belongs to their own wickedness, but that it is received by many belongs both to divine grace and to human will. Therefore, whether we consider the beginnings or the advances of the faithful, or perseverance even unto the end, there will occur no genus, no species, of any virtue which is possessed either without the gift of divine grace or without the

[1] *On God*, book X.

[2] *On the Supernatural Being*, vol. II, disputation CXI.

[3] *On the Grace Necessary for Salvation Given to All and Each*.

[4] *On the Gift of Praying, or on Grace Sufficient for Praying*, chap. II.

[5] *Theological History of Grace*, book XVI.

[6] In the work entitled *St. Augustine Vindicated against the One Hundred and One Condemned Propositions of Pasquier Quesnel*.

[7] In the work to which he gave the title *The Opinions of Saint Augustine on Grace Opposed to Those of Jansenius*.

[8] *On the Calling of All Nations*, book II, chap. XXVI, col. 238.

[9] *On the Calling of All Nations*, book II, chaps. XV, XXIII, XXVIII; which testimonies the Ballerini excellently explain in the observations on Quesnel's dissertation II, § III, nos. XXII–XXV.

> consent of our will. For grace itself, by every kind of healing and assisting, brings this about: that in him whom it calls it may first prepare for itself a will receptive of and a handmaid to its gifts. For the virtue of the unwilling is nothing; nor can faith or hope or charity be asserted to be present in those whose good consent is estranged from them.

But if this consent could not be estranged—indeed, if it were not frequently estranged—then, the author proceeds [1], no one among the faithful would ever have withdrawn from faith; concupiscence would have conquered no one; sadness would have crushed no one; irascibility would have vanquished no one; the patience of no one would have been broken; and no one would have neglected the grace conferred upon him. So great is the goodness of God toward all, and so great the aids of mercy by which he both prevents and assists all. But [2], because these things can occur on account of the implanted mutability of the will, and because the descent into consent to such temptations is all too easy and precipitous, that voice of the Lord ought never to cease sounding in the ears of the faithful which says [3] to the Apostles: "Watch and pray, lest you enter into temptation."

Therefore, since each hypothesis assumed by Quesnel departs most vehemently from the truth of the matter, it is easy to judge what must be thought of the thesis by which he teaches that the grace whose perpetual universality the author of *On the Calling* confirms is external.

LV.

In addition to these things, II. we understand, not from one or another passage but from the whole work *On the Calling*, that its author was

exceedingly hostile to the Pelagians and no less so to the Semipelagians. For no thesis of theirs can be brought forward whose antithesis he did not establish and vindicate most diligently. Let the following be by way of examples.

> There is [1] among some an unsound distinction between the will and the grace of God; they think that free choice is denied by the preaching of grace, and they do not observe that by the same rule it can be objected to them that they deny grace, since they will it to be not the leader but the companion of the human will. For the will is removed unless it is itself the origin of true virtues; grace is removed unless it is itself the cause of good merits.

[1] Ibid., chap. XXVIII, col. 240.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Matt. XXVI. 41.
[1] Ibid., book I, chap. I, col. 168.

Good [2] will is the first germ of all virtues. Resting upon its origin, it rests in that eternal and immutable will, so that it may truly be spiritual [3]; for [4] "he who adheres to God is one spirit," since through the communion of the one illuminating and the one illuminated, of the one justifying and the one justified, of the one ruling and the one subject, every action is referred to one; and that which is referred to one belongs to both, because neither can that which he gave be alienated from God, nor that which he received from man.

Therefore let not human nature [5] trust in its own powers, which did not stand even when they were unimpaired; but let it seek victory through him who alone was not conquered and who conquered for all. And if it seeks, let it not doubt that it received from him whom it seeks the affection of seeking. Nor, because it is actuated by the Spirit of God, let it therefore think that it does not have free choice, which it did not lose even then when by its will it gave itself to the devil, by whom [6] the judgment of the will was depraved, not taken away.

Mortal man [1], born carnally from an origin condemned in Adam, does not attain to the spiritual dignity of the new race unless the Holy Spirit rules him. But neither does he seek this with any desire if he has not received from God the ardor of that desire.

Neither the learned [2] nor the unlearned, of whatever stock or order, are led to God by human reason; but every man who is converted to God is first moved by the grace of God. For he is not a light to himself, nor does he kindle his heart by a ray of his own light. For if blessed John, than whom no greater among men was born, was not the light, because he did not shine by his own splendor, but had received from that [3] true light which illuminates every man coming into this world that he might be a light, who will that man be who, with the voice of a teacher sounding outwardly alone, has this much from grace—that he heard—and everything from the will—that he

[2] Ibid., chap. VI, col. 173.

[3] From this spiritual will he separates the sensual and animal condition in chapters III and IV of the same book.

[4] I Cor. VI. 17.

[5] *On the Calling of All Nations*, book I, chap. VIII, cols. 174–175.

[6] How that which Augustine writes in the *Enchiridion*, chap. XXX—"Man, using free choice badly, lost both himself and it"—coheres with these things, thou hast explained in many ways in the annotations of Jean-Baptiste Faure, which we first published entire and augmented.

[1] *On the Calling of All Nations*, book I, chap. VIII, col. 175.

[2] Ibid., col. 176.

[3] John I. 8–9.

> believed? If it were so, there would be no difference between grace and the law, nor would the spirit of indulgence give life to anyone if the letter that kills remained.
>
> For all men [4], of whatever nation and race, of whatever condition and age, the will of God is the cause of receiving grace; with it the rationale of election is hidden, their merits beginning from that grace which they received without merits.
>
> By the testimonies of the Scriptures it is most manifest [5] that every good merit of man, from the beginning of faith even to the consummation of perseverance, is a divine gift and work.
>
> Abundantly, [6] as I judge, it has been demonstrated by these testimonies that the faith by which the impious man is justified is not possessed except from the gift of God, and is bestowed for no preceding merits, but is given for this purpose: that it may be the beginning of merits; and when faith itself has been given though not requested, the other good things may now be conferred through its petitions.

Can it now readily be believed that a master of the Churches and distinguished vanquisher alike of the Pelagians and Semipelagians fell

into that very capital crime which stirred up such great odium against them from the whole Catholic name and caused those same men to be reckoned in the number of heretics? Assuredly, not only is it not easy to believe this, but it cannot be believed at all. Yet nothing is more manifest from the history [1] of each sect than that among the graver crimes contracted by them this must be commemorated: that the Pelagians no less than the Semipelagians perverted the sincere nature of grace and, having wrested its appellation from the biblical and ecclesiastical sense, signified by it manifold external doctrine and instruction necessary either for attaining salvation or for believing.

Of this matter [2] the synods celebrated in Africa and in Gaul are ample witnesses, as are the Roman Pontiffs [3] Innocent, Zosimus, Boniface, Celestine, Sixtus, Leo, and Gelasius, and then all those who in the fifth and subsequent centuries contended for the Catholic cause against each sect in published works. For

[4] Ibid., chap. XVIII, col. 193.

[5] Ibid., chap. XXIII, col. 198.

[6] Ibid., chap. XXIV, col. 201.

[1] See what Vossius relates in *History of Pelagianism*, book III, part II; Garnier, dissertation VII, *On the Origin and Growth of the Heresy Which Received Its Name from Pelagius*, at the end of the works of Marius Mercator, pp. 393 ff.; and Scipione Maffei, *Theological History of Grace*, book VII, § XI, and book VIII, § VI.

[2] Vossius describes their acts and opinions in *History of Pelagianism*, book I, chaps. XL ff.

[3] Concerning these, consult what Vossius relates in the cited work, chaps. XXVII ff., and Garnier, dissertation IV, *On the Subscriptions Exacted in the Cause of the Pelagians*.

the concordant voice and opinion of all these was that the law, doctrine, and the other external aids of God can indeed [4]

be distinguished by the most noble name of grace; indeed, that it is lawful that nature itself and free choice also be endowed with the same name [1]. Nevertheless, according to the norm of the Catholic profession, it is necessary to confess in addition that nothing pertaining to salvation can be furnished by men unless interior instruction accedes and the Spirit of God works in us even the willing. "If this grace," Augustine says [2],

> is to be called instruction, assuredly let it be so called that God may be believed to infuse it more deeply and inwardly with ineffable sweetness, not only through those who plant and water outwardly, but also through himself, who ministers his increase more secretly, so that he not only shows the truth but also imparts charity.

This indeed [3]:

> Exceeds human lowliness, exceeds angelic sublimity, and pertains absolutely to none but the Trinity who cultivates.

Which alone [4]:

> Has her chair in the heavens and teaches truth inwardly.

Wherefore [5]:

> It must be held most firmly and in no way doubted that a man whom neither ignorance of letters nor any weakness or adversity prevents can indeed either read the words of the holy law and the Gospel or hear them from the mouth of some preacher; but no one can obey the divine commandments unless divine grace has prevented him,

[4] Augustine teaches this above the rest in *On the Spirit and the Letter*, chaps. III, XXIX, XXXIV; *On the Grace of Christ*, chap. VII; *Against Two Letters of the Pelagians*, book III, chap. VII; *On Original Sin*, chap. XXII; *On Grace and Free Choice*, chaps. XI–XII; Prosper, *Against the Conferencer*, chap. XIV; and Gregory, on Ezekiel, Homily XII. Whence it is easy to infer what must be established concerning this proposition of Quesnel, which is number three: "In vain, O Lord, dost thou command if thou thyself dost not give that which thou commandest." For, Desirant adds, book III, on the third condemned proposition, chap. III: "Not in vain, but mercifully and, as far as concerns himself, usefully does the Lord command, although he does not always give that which he commands. For by commanding he admonishes thee to do what thou canst and to ask for what thou canst not, and he assists that thou mayest be able; although, because thou resistest him who admonishes and assists, God by justice abandons thee when thou abandonest him,

"and does not give that which he commands. And therefore the Apostle says in II Cor. VI. 1: 'And helping, we exhort you that you receive not the grace of God in vain.' "

[1] Jerome, in the epistle to Cyprian on the interpretation of Ps. XCIX; Augustine, on Ps. CXLIV; and the African Fathers, in the letters given to Innocent I, write that these gifts can be endowed with this name.

[2] *On the Grace of Christ*, chap. XIII.

[3] Tractate LXXX on John.

[4] *On the Teacher*, chap. XXIX.

[5] Fulgentius, *On Faith to Peter*, chap. XXXII.

> so that what he hears with the body he may also perceive with the heart, and, having received from God the will and power, may both will and be able to do the commandments of God.

For this reason it is written in John [6] concerning the Holy Spirit, "He will teach you all things," because, Thomas adds [7]:

> Whatever a man may teach outwardly, unless the Holy Spirit inwardly gives understanding, he labors in vain; because, unless the Spirit is present to the heart of the hearer, the discourse of the teacher will be idle.

What, therefore, ought to be gathered if, the hypothesis of Quesnel having been admitted, we granted that no universal grace other than external grace was admitted and defended by the author of the work *On the Calling*? It would have to be gathered either that his discourse was not concerning a grace which is necessary and sufficient for receiving faith and acquiring salvation, or that he had colluded with the Pelagians and Semipelagians in the signification assigned to the term *grace*. But no one would suspect the latter except against every appearance of probability, while the former is most lucidly refuted on every page of the work. For on every page of the work it is repeated that the discourse concerns that universal grace which God therefore always dispensed to absolutely all men because he always and most sincerely willed the salvation of absolutely all men. Therefore Quesnel's hypothesis is false, nor can it be affirmed in any way that the universal grace defended by the author of the work *On the Calling* is circumscribed by the scope of those aids which instruct only outwardly and assist only outwardly.

LVI.

And indeed, III. let the σκοπός, or purpose, of the work be considered, and let the mind be directed to that which its author proposed to himself and which he willed to be established and explained. This purpose is openly evident both [1] from the beginning of the work itself and from those things [2] with which he begins the second book, and from those things [3] which he repeats a third time, writing:

> What, therefore, we intimated at the beginning of this second volume, we now commend again: that, when the depth and height of grace are discussed, we may rely upon those three most salutary

[6] John XIV.

[7] Lecture VI on the cited passage.

[1] *On the Calling of All Nations*, book I, cols. 167–168.

[2] Ibid., book II, chap. I, col. 211.

[3] Ibid., chap. XXX, col. 243.

> and most true definitions. One of them professes that it is eternal and proper to divine goodness that it should will all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth. Another at the same time preaches that every man who is saved and who comes to the knowledge of the truth is assisted and ruled by the aid of God, and is guarded so that he may remain in the faith [4] which works through charity.
>
> But the third soberly and temperately testifies that the entire rationale of the will of God cannot be comprehended, and that many causes of divine works have been withdrawn from human understanding; so that, when certain things are known to have been done either variously or remarkably in times, in nations, in families, in little children, in those not yet born, and in twins, we may not doubt that they are among those things which the just and merciful God willed not to be known in this passing age. This indeed must be understood as having been disposed for our utility: so that, because [1] we are saved by hope—we for whom [2] God has prepared that which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man—just as we steadfastly believe that what we do not yet see is to be seen, so may we patiently await that what we do not yet understand is to be understood. If, therefore, insidious malignity should cease, if insolent presumption should become quiet, these things having been rightly treated, as I judge, no cause of contention remains for anyone, nor is it necessary any longer for us to be occupied with interminable questions.

Therefore, the grace which God constantly imparted to each age and to each man must be regarded as an effect of that will by which he himself has always willed all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth, and which derives its origin from the fact that it is proper to divine goodness. Whence the author immediately adds [3] that he had taken pains:

> Insofar as the Lord aided, that it might be proved that the grace of God was present to all men, not only in the last days but also in all past ages, indeed by an equal providence and general goodness, but by a manifold operation and in a diverse measure; because, whether secretly or manifestly, he is, as the Apostle [4] says, "the Savior of all men, especially of the faithful."

---

[4] Gal. V. 6.

[1] Rom. VIII. 24.

[2] I Cor. II. 9.

[3] *On the Calling of All Nations*, book II, chap. XXXI, cols. 243–244.

[4] I Tim. IV. 10.

Come, then, and judge within thyself whether it is lawful to suppose that from this universal salvific will and general goodness no graces proceeded unto all men except those which instructed only outwardly and furnished only outward assistance; and that from this fountain of the divine will, by which God desires and procures the salvation of all, no other waters flowed except those which irrigated outwardly but brought no inward increase.

If matters stood thus, neither would the effect correspond to the cause, nor the streams to the fountain; neither could the salvific will be judged sincere, nor could God be preached as the Savior of all men, especially of the faithful. For outward aids, although most numerous and most splendid, are nevertheless not of such a kind that they either exempt man from the necessity of perishing or give him the faculty of obtaining salvation.

We must therefore conclude that the universal grace defended by the author of the work *On the Calling*, as an effect of the salvific will and a stream flowing from the fountain of the general divine goodness, is a grace not only external but also internal, by which God illuminates the minds of all with his light and kindles the wills of all with his fire.

LVII.

The argument which [1] Quesnel abuses, and which he borrows from these [2] and similar [3] words of the author, in no way opposes the truth of this conclusion, IV.:

> Whether we contemplate the last ages, the first, or the middle, it is rationally and piously believed that God wills all men to be saved and has always willed it; and this is shown from no other source than from those benefits which the providence of God expends commonly and indiscriminately upon all generations. For gifts of this kind were and are so general that by their testimony men could be assisted in seeking the true God; and upon these gifts, which throughout all ages proclaim their Author, the largess of special grace has been poured forth. Although it is furnished more copiously now than before, nevertheless the Lord has retained the causes of its distributions within his own knowledge and hidden them within the secret of his most powerful will.

[1] Dissertation II, on the author of the books *On the Calling of All Nations*, § XXVIII.
[2] *On the Calling of All Nations*, book II, chap. XXV, cols. 237–238.
[3] Ibid., book II, chaps. IV, X.

"Behold," Quesnel adds [1], "what universal grace the author praises: that very grace which is not separated from outward divine testimonies and which Paul [2] commemorates, saying: 'And indeed he left not himself"—God—"without testimony, doing good from heaven, giving rains and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness.' " For heaven and earth, as our author [3] teaches,

> and the sea, and every creature which can be seen and understood, were disposed chiefly for this utility of the human race: that rational nature, from the contemplation of so many forms, from the experience of so many good things, and from the reception of so many gifts, might be instructed in the worship and love of its Author; the Spirit of God, in whom we live and move and are, filling all things.

But many things occur to me which I would ask of Quesnel and by which I would show that he departed greatly from the truth in expounding the opinion of the author of *On the Calling*. First, I ask whether he rightly weighed all the words which the author employs and by which he commends both the universal salvific will of God and the universal benefits which the providence of God expends commonly and indiscriminately upon all generations. I do not think so; for if he had weighed the individual words as was fitting, he would also have noted these: "upon these"—outward—"gifts, which throughout all ages proclaim their Author, the largess of special grace has been poured forth." Then he would have noted these things which immediately follow: "Although it"—special grace—"is furnished more copiously now than before, nevertheless the Lord has retained the causes of its distributions within his own knowledge." Nor would he have passed over these: "the Spirit of God, in whom we live and move and are, filling all things." He would have seen, namely, that the amplitude of outward benefits is not so asserted that the gifts of interior grace are separated from them. He would have seen this most intimate conjunction signified by the formulas by which the author hands down either that the largess of special grace had been poured forth upon outward benefits, or that special grace had always been bestowed with a lesser abundance indeed, yet with some measure of plenty,

or that the Spirit of God is so present to outward gifts that he fills them with his power and renders them salutary. He would consequently have seen it deduced from this most intimate conjunction that no less the universal outward gifts than special grace is proposed as universal and proved by arguments by the author into whose mind we are inquiring.

[1] The cited place.
[2] Acts XIV. 16.
[3] Book II, chap. IV, cols. 214–215.

LVIII.

Moreover, these are the words of the same author when he treats of the outward benefit of universal preaching [1]:

> When, therefore, the word of God is introduced into the ears of the flesh through the ministry of those who preach, the operation of divine power is mingled with the sound of the human voice; and he who incited the office of the evangelizer also strengthened [2] the disposition of the hearer. The food of the word grows sweet to the soul; the old darkness is driven away by a new light; and the inward sight is stripped of the mist of ancient error. The mind passes from will to will; and if that will which is driven away lingers with some delay, nevertheless the will which is generated claims for itself all the choicer things, so that the law of sin and the law of God may have diverse and separate dwellings in the same man; and [3], with the flesh lusting against the spirit, but the spirit resisting the lusts of the flesh, the tempter may indeed dare to lie in wait through outward things, but the mind fortified by the aid of God may prevail. For unto the great [4] utility of the faithful the matter of conflicts has been reserved, so that holiness may not grow proud while weakness is assailed.

But, discoursing [5] concerning those things which accompany the condition of the new creature, he says:

[1] Book I, chap. VIII, col. 177.

[2] This is the preferable reading to the following two: *forms*, *formed*.

[3] Gal. V. 17.

[4] These words, which the Fathers of Trent imitated, are reported by Pope Gelasius in the opuscule against the Pelagians, and indeed with this encomium: "As a certain doctor of the Church wisely taught, saying: 'For unto the great utility of the faithful,' " and what follows.

[5] Book I, chap. XXIII, col. 201.

> Therefore, the new creature has this as proper to itself through grace: that those who are the workmanship [1] of God, who are fashioned in Christ by heavenly nativity,
> may not grow torpid in idleness nor be dissolved by sloth, but may advance from virtue unto virtue by walking along the way of good works. For this is to be fashioned; this is to be made a new creature from the old; this is to be reformed from the image of the earthly man unto the image of the heavenly man. He whose husbandry, whose building, and whose workmanship we are begins, increases, and perfects this entire work, whether openly through cooperators of grace or secretly through the ministration of the Spirit.

Such, therefore, is the rationale of the order divinely instituted: that with the outward gift of evangelical preaching the operation of divine power is mingled; that with the sound introduced into the ears of the flesh there is joined a sweetness poured forth from heaven, by which the disposition is fashioned and the mind passes from will to will; and that with the outward cooperators of grace he should begin the work, he should increase it, and he should perfect it, who supplies the increase. But among the outward cooperators of grace, among the gifts of outward preaching, among the sounds introduced into the ears of the flesh for instruction, the author constantly [2] enumerates, on the one hand, heaven and earth and every creature, which was disposed chiefly for this utility of the human race,

> that rational nature might be instructed in the worship and love of its Author; and, on the other hand, the ineffable beauty of the whole world itself and the rich and ordered largess of its ineffable benefits, through which certain tablets of the eternal law were furnished to human hearts, so that the common and public doctrine of divine instruction might be read in the pages of the elements and the volumes

[1] But in what manner men become the workmanship of God the author inquires in book I, chap. VII, saying: "Here it seems necessary to treat whether, when a man begins to be of good will, that same will which was in him is corrected, or whether another will, which he did not have and which opposes the former, is implanted in him. That this may appear more evidently, let it not be irksome to inquire into it more deeply." He pursues this inquiry by describing the original stain and its propagation into universal posterity, by which it came about that man was deprived not of the will, but of the health of the will. "For the nature was good, but was made evil in quality; and that movement of the mind which can never be without some love—that is, without some will—did not lose appetite but changed affection, receiving in desire that which it ought to have rejected in judgment. Therefore, when man returns to piety—of whom it was said, 'a spirit going and not returning,' because unless God converted him he would not return—when he becomes a new workmanship and a new creature, another substance is not created in him, but that same substance which had been impaired is repaired; nor is anything taken away from him except the vice which nature did not have." These things are assuredly much more suitable than those which an Italian writer published in print in these most recent years.

[2] For thou wilt scarcely read one or another chapter in which thou dost not find this inculcated.

> of the seasons. Thus [1] all men were convicted of having received prophetic voices and legal precepts in the services and testimonies of the elements.

If not, therefore, from the very natures of things, then certainly from the established order of providence, which is the order [2] of reformation, it follows that the universal amplitude of outward gifts coheres with the universal amplitude of special grace; nor can the former be judged universal unless special grace also is deemed to have been bestowed upon all men.

From this order must also be derived that which the author writes [3]: that although salvation is far from sinners, nevertheless nothing is empty of the presence and power of salvation itself; and then that which he adds [4]: that by the testimony of outward gifts men could be assisted in seeking the true God. But [5] whoever seeks God as is fitting ought not to doubt that he received from him whom he seeks the disposition of seeking. To what, therefore, does the statement pertain that by the testimony of outward gifts men could be assisted in seeking the true God? It pertains to this: that we understand that the inward and secret testimony is joined with the outward and public testimony.

LIX.

Concerning this intimate conjunction, so many and such distinguished testimonies are read among absolutely all the Fathers that it ought to be held among the theorems which are established by the concordant testimony of tradition. Above the rest, Ripalda [1], Le Moyne [2], Tricassinus [3], and even [4] Nicolius himself collected them, although most devoted to the Jansenist faction and second to none among the Jansenists. For in the treatment which he entitled *On*

[1] Book II, chap. V.

[2] Augustine discourses excellently concerning this order, which is that of universal reformation, in the *Enchiridion*, chaps. XXVIII–XXIX, and from him Bernard Desirant in book I on the first proposition of Quesnel.

[3] Book II, chap. IV.

[4] Ibid., chap. XXV. But in chapter XVII, speaking of those nations upon whom the grace of the Savior proposed in the Gospel had not yet shone, he writes: "Nevertheless, that measure of general assistance which from above has always been furnished to all men is not denied to them; although human nature has been wounded by so bitter a wound that spontaneous contemplation is not fully able to instruct anyone in the knowledge of God unless the true light has dispelled the overshadowing of the heart, which, by an inscrutable judgment, the just and good God poured forth in past ages not in the same manner as in the last days."

[5] Ibid., book I, chap. VIII.

[1] *On the Supernatural Being*, book I, disputation XX.

[2] *On the Gift of Praying*, chap. I, §§ 9 ff.

[3] *On the Grace Necessary for Salvation Given to All and Each*, part II, section II.

[4] *Treatise on General Grace*, second part, chap. III.

General Grace, after bringing forward the clear and explicit opinions of Justin, Lactantius, Eusebius of Caesarea, Athanasius, Basil, Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, and Bernard, he concludes that, in the present order of repaired and elevated human nature, the interior aids of grace are never separated from the outward aids of gifts.

Augustine speaks to the matter [5]:

> Since he is present everywhere who in many ways calls back the man turned away through the creature serving him as Lord; who teaches the one believing, consoles the one hoping, exhorts the one loving, assists the one striving, and hears the one praying; it is not imputed to thee as a fault that thou art unwillingly ignorant, but that thou neglectest to seek what thou dost not know; nor that thou dost not gather together thy wounded members, but that thou contemnest him who wills to heal.

For he is long-suffering and plenteous in mercy,

> and therefore [6] calls from every side to amendment, calls from every side to penance, calls by the benefits of the creature, calls by imparting time for living, calls through a reader, calls through an expounder, calls through an intimate thought, calls through the scourge of correction, calls through the mercy of consolation.

For all heavenly and earthly things [7]

> tell me that I should love thee, and they do not cease telling all men, so that they may be inexcusable.

But if [1] no one comes to thee unless he is drawn, and men, in whatever manner they come, are drawn:

> The contemplation of the elements draws to thee, as does the most ordered beauty of all things which are in them; for the invisible things of God from the creation of the world are beheld, being understood through the things that are made. Knowledge of deeds draws, and the engravings of divine works inflame the mind of the hearer, narrating the praises of the Lord and his power.

Therefore outward and inward gifts are joined together, nor does God mock men; but into those to whom he gives precepts [2] outwardly he inwardly infuses grace by which they may seek the aid of him who commands; and those whom he addresses by the voices of creatures he also illuminates and kindles:

---

[5] *On Free Choice*, book III, chap. XIX.

[6] On Ps. CII.

[7] *Confessions*, book X, chap. VIII.

[1] Prosper, *Against the Conferencer*, chap. XIV.

[2] Ibid., chaps. IV, IX, and the epistle to Demetrias.

> For the voices of those who teach and the letters of pages, which serve God either for the instruction of those who hear or of those who read, are not without the power of him whom they serve; and when that which is commanded is accomplished by the one obeying, then the effect of the divine work is declared.

Hence the manner of speaking received in the Scriptures: whether that by which [3] it is said, "The law of the Lord is unspotted, converting souls"; "You are clean because of the word"; and again, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed but incorruptible, through the word of the living God who remaineth forever"; or that by which [4] it is affirmed concerning the ministers of the word that by their work many are justified and saved, and consequently that they themselves are saviors. For to what purpose are these things? Is the power of the word and of the ministers of the word so great that it can justify, convert, cleanse, and save? Nothing could be less true if they are considered from themselves and ὄντως, in reality; but nothing is more certain if they are referred to the order divinely chosen by providence.

For, considered in relation to this order, the outward aids of salvation are not empty but full of the Spirit who instituted them and commanded that they be employed. They are, as it were, sacramental symbols

which inwardly contain that which they outwardly bear forth and signify.

But Quesnel either did not perceive or dissembled this power of theirs. Having either failed to know it or dissembled it, he contends that the grace whose universal amplitude the author of the work *On the Calling* undertook with so great zeal to assert and illustrate is not internal but external. Yet there was reason for him to deduce the contrary: that with the universal amplitude of external grace a similar amplitude of special grace is coupled, and that consequently he who asserts the former must also be believed a vindicator of the latter.

LX.

Especially since, V. in the work of the Anonymous author, there are not lacking explicit testimonies which show that the universal amplitude is referred to inward and special grace. For, having premised these words [1]:

> Nor are the nations who [2], "alienated from the fellowship of Israel, having no hope and without God in this world," perished under the darkness of ignorance excusable for the reason that this abundance

[3] Ps. XVIII. 8; John XV. 3; I Pet. I. 23.

[4] Dan. XII. 3; I Tim. IV. 16; James V. 20; Acts XXVI. 18; Rom. XI. 14; Obad. 21.

[1] *On the Calling of All Nations*, book II, chap. XIV, col. 226.

[2] Eph. II. 12.

> of grace which now irrigates the whole world did not previously flow with equal largess.

He immediately [3] proceeds:

> For there was always applied to all men a certain measure of heavenly doctrine which, although it was of a more scanty and hidden grace, nevertheless sufficed, as the Lord judged, for some unto remedy and for all unto testimony; so that it might appear not doubtfully but evidently that, unless [4] where sin abounded grace also had superabounded, even now a similar impiety would blind the whole human race.

Then, discussing [5] the general grace bestowed also upon those little children who perish, he writes:

> But just as, with respect to adults, beyond that general grace which knocks more scantily and secretly upon the hearts of all men, the call of special grace is exerted by a more excellent operation, a more abundant gift,
> and a more powerful efficacy, so also with respect to innumerable little children the same election is manifested. This indeed was not lacking to those who were not regenerated, in their parents; but it was present to those who were regenerated beyond their parents.

But when he proves [1] that the goodness of God was present before the flood for instructing not only the holy but also the impious, he first says:

> The goodness of God was not lacking even to that portion which did not stand in charity and from its beginning swelled with the venom of diabolical envy. For the Lord deigned by paternal counsel to mitigate the prince of the impious race, envying the merits of his holy brother and meditating his slaughter with a parricidal heart, saying [2] to Cain….

But, after setting forth the words of the Lord, he adds:

> Therefore, when God spoke such things to Cain, is it in any way doubtful that he willed, and acted insofar as the measure of healing sufficed, that Cain should return to wisdom from that fury of impiety? But his pertinacious malice was rendered the more inexcusable from that whence it ought to have been the more corrected.

But a heavenly gift which both is and is conjointly called *heavenly doctrine*, *doctrine which renders men inexcusable*, *more scanty and hidden grace*, *grace*

[3] Ibid., chap. XV, col. 226.
[4] Rom. V. 20.
[5] Ibid., chap. XIII, col. 236.
[1] Ibid., chap. XIII, cols. 223–224.
[2] Gen. IV. 8 ff.

which more scantily and secretly knocks upon the hearts of men, *grace which suffices insofar as the measure of healing*, and *which in fact suffices for some unto remedy*, and finally *grace which Paul opposes to sin*, is an inward gift, not an outward one, which opens and illuminates the ears and eyes of the heart and not of the flesh. Yet of such a kind are the properties, and of such a kind the marks, by which the Anonymous author explains the rationale of that gift whose excellence he praises and whose efficacy he commends. Therefore he praises and commends a gift not outward but inward, by which the will is bent and the mind is suffused with heavenly light. But of this very gift he writes that it was always conferred in some measure upon all men, and therefore that, as regards time, the gift is perpetual; as regards amplitude, it is universal; and to it both the rationale and name of general grace belong. Therefore it is interior grace whose universal amplitude

and perpetuity of time the Anonymous author maintains; so that according to his opinion the words of Bernard [1] must be employed:

> One need not labor in order to arrive at the hearing of this voice; the labor is rather to close the ears lest thou hear. The voice itself, namely, offers itself, thrusts itself upon thee, and meanwhile ceases not to knock at the doors of each. Finally: "For forty years I was near to this generation, and I said: These always err in heart." He is still near to us, and perhaps there is no one who hears.

LXI.

And certainly, VI. it was not lawful to expect another and diverse doctrine from that author who had proposed to himself that the following be shown and confirmed: a) to establish the universal amplitude of the salvific will from the universal amplitude of divine gifts.

> It is rationally [2] and piously believed that God wills all men to be saved and has always willed it; and this is shown from no other source than from those benefits which the providence of God expends commonly and indiscriminately upon all generations.

b) It was settled for him to persuade his readers that the destruction and ruin of men proceed not from God, who denies his gifts, but from men themselves, who spurn them.

[1] Sermon *On Conversion to the Clergy*, chap. II.

[2] *On the Calling of All Nations*, book II, chap. XXV.

> Although these [3] benefits brought no remedy and amendment to the hardened, they nevertheless prove that their aversion was not of divine constitution but of their own will.

And [4] again:

> This assistance of grace is applied to all through innumerable modes, whether hidden or manifest; and that it is rejected by many belongs to their own wickedness, but that it is received by many belongs both to divine grace and to human will.

Then elsewhere [5], after adducing the words of Paul [6], "The invisible things of God are beheld, being understood through the things that are made," he commemorates those

> who, "not giving thanks to God nor confessing that he was the Author of this faculty for them, but saying that they were wise"—that is, glorying not in God but in themselves, as though they had approached the sight of truth by their own studies and rational powers—"became vain in their thoughts"; and they lost through blinding pride that which they had found through the illuminating grace of God, falling back from the heavenly light into their own darkness, that is, from the immutable and eternal good to mutable and corruptible nature.

c) He applied himself to this: that from universal gifts he might seek a testimony by which he would disclose both the goodness of God toward all men and the perverse will of very many men.

> A certain measure [1] of heavenly doctrine was always applied to all men which, although it was of a more scanty and hidden grace, nevertheless sufficed, as the Lord judged, for some unto remedy and for all unto testimony.

Finally, d) he had this before his eyes: that he might show that nothing was lacking of itself to general grace by which all men might be assisted in seeking and finding the true God.

> For gifts of this kind [2] were and are so general that by their testimony men could be assisted in seeking the true God; and upon these gifts, which throughout all ages proclaim their Author, the largess of special grace has been poured forth.

---

[3] Ibid., chap. XIII.
[4] Ibid., chap. XXVI.
[5] Ibid., book I, chap. IV.
[6] Rom. I. 20.
[1] Ibid., book II, chap. XV.
[2] Ibid., book II, chap. XXV.

But which one of the heads of doctrine of this kind can in any manner be composed either 1) with a particular salvific will, or 2) with gifts of internal grace which are bestowed only upon some? Not even one, since the individual heads require both the universal amplitude of the salvific will and interior grace always dispensed to all men.

Therefore, the doctrine of the Anonymous author of *On the Calling* comes to this: a) that there is in God, so great is his native goodness, a universal salvific will; b) that this will is fruitful and active, and that consequently gifts of interior and exterior grace flow from it, by which the whole race of men is assisted toward the knowledge of the true Divinity,

the sincere worship of the same, and the attainment of everlasting beatitude; whence c) nothing is more vehemently abhorrent from his mind and opinion than that the order of divine providence which reforms and repairs is circumscribed and particular.

LXII.

Nor do those things by which Prosper [1], about the year 431, vigorously defended the sincere doctrine of Catholic profession against the objections of certain calumniating Gauls [2] differ from these in any way. For when they objected [3] that from the determinations and opinions of Augustine it follows "that God does not will all men to be saved, but a certain number of the predestined," Prosper replies [4]:

> If, concerning the universality of the human race to be saved and called to the knowledge of the truth, the will of God is to be asserted as so indiscriminate through all ages that it is shown everywhere to have passed over no man, the impenetrable depth of the judgments of God is assailed. For why [5] in past ages did God permit all nations to walk in their own ways, when the Lord chose Jacob for himself and did not do in like manner to every nation and did not manifest his

[1] From this most beautiful agreement of Prosper with the Anonymous author of *On the Calling of Nations*, anyone may readily estimate with what judgment or equity Henry Noris, in *History of Pelagianism*, book II, chap. XIV, denied the books *On the Calling* to Prosper for the reason that Prosper's doctrine concerning the most ample fountain of grace differs greatly from the tenets of the Anonymous author.

[2] The Maurist editor of the works of Prosper in the admonition to Prosper's response on behalf of Augustine to the chapters of the calumniating Gauls, pp. 115–116, Venice edition of 1744, seeks by conjecture who these men were.

[3] Chapter VIII.

[4] Response to chapter VIII, pp. 121–122.

[5] Acts XIV. 16, compared with Ps. CXXXIV. 4; CXLVII. 20; I Pet. II. 10; Hos. II. 24; Rom. IX. 26 and XI. 7.

judgments to them? And why is he who was once not a people now the people of God, and does he now have mercy upon those upon whom he once did not have mercy? And where it was said, "You are not my people," why are they there called the sons of the living God? And why did Israel not attain that which it sought, while the election attained it, but the others

were blinded? It is impossible to comprehend and belongs to dangerous curiosity to inquire, although it is lawful for no one to be ignorant that there is [1] no iniquity with God; nor is it to be believed that anyone among men, whether before the law or in the time of the law, was justified by another grace or another faith than by this same grace through which our Lord Jesus Christ, according to the counsel of his will, came at the end of the ages to seek and to save [2] that which had perished. But he who refers the causes of the works and judgments of God entirely [3] to human wills and actions—which nevertheless he does not find in the adoption [4] of little children—and wills the dispensations of God to be varied according to the mutability of free choice, professes that the judgments of God are scrutable to him and his ways traceable; and that which Paul, the Doctor of the Nations, [5] did not dare to touch, he judges that he can publish as something disclosed. And, what is of no less impiety, he teaches either that the very grace by which we are saved is repaid to good merits or affirms that it is barred by evil merits.

Therefore, the whirlwind of obscure questions having been removed, let us turn to the breadth of revealed grace and say [6] with the Apostle

[1] II Chron. XIX. 7.

[2] Christ received from the Father a twofold mission: the first, that of Savior, concerning which he himself says in John XII. 47, "For I came not to judge the world, but to save the world"; the other, that of Judge, concerning which it is written in John V. 22: "For neither doth the Father judge any man, but hath given all judgment to the Son." To the first mission corresponds the universal benefit expended upon all men whom the Father gave to Christ to save; but to the other mission corresponds the benefit of the awarded crown, which is particular and pertains only to those who have not contemned the medicine of the Savior. Augustine elegantly says in Tractate LIV on John, no. 5: "Hear how the Son says, 'I do not judge him,' although he says in another place, 'The Father doth not judge any man, but hath given all judgment to the Son'; unless it must be understood: 'I do not judge him now.' Why does he not judge now? Attend to what follows: 'For I came not,' he says, 'to judge the world, but to save the world,' that is, that I might make the world safe. Now, therefore, is the time of mercy; afterward will be that of judgment, because 'Mercy and judgment I will sing to thee, O Lord.' "

[3] By these words the Pelagians and the Semipelagians alike are assailed.

[4] This is a customary argument among orthodox writers of the fifth century, by which they demonstrate that grace is gratuitous.

[5] Rom. XI. 33.

[6] I Tim. II. 4.

that God wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth.

And again let us say [1] with the Apostle: "Who is the Savior of all, especially of the faithful." And let us hear the Lord saying [2] to his Apostles: "Going, therefore, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Let us hear also the promise of God saying [3] to Abraham: "In thy seed shall all the tribes of the earth be blessed"; and [4] if we are sons of the promise, let us not waver in distrust, but with our father Abraham let us give glory to God and [5] believe most fully that what he has promised he is able also to perform. Let us hear [6] David prophesying: "All the ends of the earth shall remember and shall be converted to the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall adore in his sight." And [7] elsewhere: "All the nations whatsoever thou hast made shall come and adore before thee, O Lord, and they shall glorify thy name." Because these promises are most true and cannot waver in any part, they are fulfilled in those who are saved throughout all the ends of the earth; because [8] what God promised he is able also to perform.

Therefore, the care of all men belongs to God, and there is no one whom either evangelical preaching, or the testimony of the law, or even nature itself does not address. But [9] let us ascribe the unbelief of men to men themselves; and let us confess that the faith of men is the gift of God, without whose grace no one runs unto grace. And with the two hundred and fourteen priests whose constitution [10] against the enemies of the grace of God the whole world embraced, let us say with a true profession, as their discourse has it: "Through the grace of God through Jesus Christ the Lord,

we are assisted through each act not only for knowing justice but also for performing it, so that without that grace we are unable to think, say, or do anything of true and holy piety." Nor let us suppose that

[1] I Tim. IV. 10.
[2] Matt. XXVIII. 19.
[3] Gen. XXII. 18.
[4] Rom. IV. 20.
[5] Rom. IV. 21.
[6] Ps. XXI. 28.
[7] Ps. LXXXV. 9.
[8] Rom. IV. 21.
[9] He writes things twin to these in *Against the Conferencer*, chap. V.
[10] Compare Augustine, Epistle CCXV.

> these gifts are from God in such a manner that, because he is the Author of our nature, he appears already to have conferred them by our constitution. For he indeed gave this faculty to man from the beginning; but we all lost it in him in whom we all sinned. Whence we need to be renewed in Christ by another creation and another beginning, in whom we are a new creature and a new workmanship; and through whom it is given to us, with no good merits and many evil merits preceding, that from vessels of wrath we may become vessels of mercy.

But, compressing into brief compass [1] those things which he had explained ἀγωνιστικῶς, in the manner of one contending, so that under the simplicity of a few words it might appear more and more that it was settled for him both absolutely and freely to reject perverse things and not to deny assent to probable things, he opposes to the objection of the Gauls this opinion [2]:

> He who says that God does not will all men to be saved, but a certain number of the predestined, speaks more harshly than one ought to speak concerning the depth of the inscrutable grace of God, who [3] wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth, and fulfills the purpose [4] of his will in those whom, having foreknown, he predestined; whom, having predestined, he called; whom, having called, he justified; whom, having justified, he glorified—losing nothing from the fullness of the nations and from every seed of Israel, for whom the eternal kingdom in Christ was prepared before the constitution of the world. For out of the whole world the whole world is chosen, and out of all men all men are adopted. Nor can the promise of God waver in any manner through the unbelief and disobedience of many, which says [1] to Abraham: "In thy seed shall all nations be blessed." But [2] what God has promised he is able also to perform, so that those who are saved are saved for this reason:

[1] Prosper, in the things which he premises to the individual opinions concerning the individual chapters, p. 126.

[2] Opinion concerning chapter VIII, pp. 126–127.

[3] I Tim. II. 4.

[4] By this manner of speaking Prosper distinguishes the will of saving from the purpose of fulfilling this will, which is finally fulfilled by salvation itself having been conferred. He teaches that the former is universal and of such a kind that by it opportunity is given to all, so that, with God preventing and assisting, they can obtain salvation; but he writes that the latter is particular and circumscribed solely to those whom God foreknows will use rightly and constantly the faculty received from God. Everyone, moreover, perceives that these mutually correspond: on the one side, the will of saving and the first and antecedent will; on the other, the purpose of fulfilling it and the second and consequent will.

[1] Gen. XXII. 18.

[2] Rom. IV. 21.

> that God willed them to be saved; and those who perish perish for this reason: that they merited to perish.

LXIII.

But when he comes to examine those objections which he calls *Vincentian* [3], and which he calls *prodigious lies belonging to certain most absurd blasphemies* [4], after reporting [5] the objection that God does not will to save all, even if all will to be saved, he immediately [6] adds:

> Since the Truth [7] says, "If you, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your heavenly Father give good things to those who ask him?" how can it come about that God, who saves even those of whom it cannot be said that they will to be saved, should be unwilling to save some, even if they will to be saved—unless there are certain causes concerning which, although they are unknown to us, he nevertheless judges well, and concerning which it cannot be said that he ought to have done anything otherwise than he has done?
>
> Therefore, this distinction being removed, which divine knowledge contains within the secret of its justice, it must most sincerely be believed and professed that God wills all men to be saved. For the Apostle, whose [1] sentence this is, most earnestly commands what is most piously observed in all the churches: that supplication be made to God for all men. That many of them perish is the merit of those who perish; that many are saved is the gift of him who saves. For that the guilty man should be condemned is the blameless justice of God; but that the guilty man should be justified is the ineffable grace of God.

[3] Vossius, *History of Pelagianism*, book I, chap. IX; Noris, *History of Pelagianism*, book II, chap. XI; and Antelmius, in the critical dissertation *On the Genuine Works of the Holy Fathers Leo the Great and Prosper of Aquitaine*, think that the Vincent from whom the Vincentian objections received their name is Vincent of Lérins himself, the monk and author of the most celebrated *Commonitorium*. But Baronius saw long ago that this opinion was supported by no conjectures capable of producing belief; nor did the Maurist editor of the works of Prosper conceal this in the admonition prefixed to Saint Prosper of Aquitaine's *Responses on Behalf of Augustine's Doctrine to the Chapters of the Vincentian Objections*, pp. 130–131.

[4] Preface to the *Responses to the Chapters of the Vincentian Objections*, p. 131.

[5] Chapter II, p. 133.

[6] Response to chapter II, p. 133.

[7] Matt. VII. 11.

[1] I Tim. II. 4.

Wherefore, to the following [2] objection, that God creates the greater part of the human race for this purpose, that he may destroy it eternally, he thus [3] responds:

> God indeed is the Creator of all men, but no one was created by him for this purpose, that he should perish; because the cause of being born is one thing, and the cause of perishing another. For that men should be born is the benefit of the Creator; but that they should perish is the merit of the transgressor. In Adam [4], namely, in whom the nature of all men was preformed [5],
>
> all sinned and were bound by the same sentence which he received. Nor are they loosed from this bond, even if they lack sins of their own, unless through the Holy Spirit they are reborn in the sacrament of the death and resurrection of Christ.
>
> He, therefore, is exceedingly impious and unlearned who does not distinguish the vice of nature from the Author of nature, from whom whatsoever is to be condemned in each man is altogether alien. For he creates men that they may be men; nor does he withdraw his workmanship from the multiplying successions of generations, since, according to the counsel of his good will, he is to repair [1] in many what he himself made and to punish in many what he himself did

[2] Chapter III, p. 133.

[3] Response to chapter III, p. 133.

[4] Rom. V. 12.

[5] Human nature was expressed in our first parents according to the image of God, as is expressly read in Gen. I. 27. If, therefore, all posterity was preformed in them, in them also, so far as pertains to God, it attained the dignity of the divine image. But what and how great the dignity of this image is, both the author of Wisdom and Paul explain excellently: the former, saying in chap. II. 23, *ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἔκτισε τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ, καὶ εἰκόνα τῆς ἰδίας ἀϊδιότητος ἐποίησεν αὐτόν*—that God created man incorruptible and made him the image of his own eternity; the latter, who in Eph. IV. 24 says that the first man was *κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας*—created according to God in justice and true holiness. Therefore, if thou regardest the first and innate counsel of God, the whole posterity of men obtained this: that it should be incorruptible, should bear the image of the divine perpetuity, and should shine forth with justice and true holiness. But can this thought enter the mind: that God did not of himself pursue with sincere love his own image, which he also rendered akin to himself by the bestowal of such great gifts?

[1] Augustine distinguishes three things in the *Enchiridion*, chaps. XXVII–XXIX: the condemned mass, which is human progeny itself bound by the original stain; the reformed mass; and the repaired mass. The whole progeny of men ought to have been a condemned mass if God had chosen toward men the same order of justice as toward the transgressing angels, and if he had not decreed to manifest his unowed mercy much more evidently in the liberation rather of the unworthy. But he decreed this latter thing and reformed the whole mass, that is, exempted it from the necessity of perishing and bestowed upon it the faculty of obtaining salvation. Yet he repaired only that part concerning which he foresaw that it would rightly use the benefit of reformation. Wherefore this is the distinction between reformation and reparation: a) the former is universal, the latter particular; b) the former pertains to the will of God the Savior, while the latter is referred to the will of God the Judge.

not make. For just as [2] through the disobedience of one man many were constituted sinners, so also through the obedience of one man many are constituted just.

LXIV.

But if anyone considers these distinguished disputations of Prosper together and then endeavors to divide them into their members, he will easily perceive, as I indeed judge, that this excellent vindicator of the Catholic profession begins by applying himself partly to chastising, and partly to reproving and condemning, two classes of men. For he chastises the temerity of those who strike against the impenetrable depth of the judgments of God; who think that an indifferent will of God is to be asserted throughout all ages; and who, rather than revering them, inquire too curiously and freely into the causes of the varied and manifold providence exercised toward men. But he more bitterly convicts and most severely condemns those who refer the causes of the works and judgments of God wholly to human wills and actions; who, infected by the Pelagian or Semipelagian plague, will that the dispensations of God be varied according to the mutability of free choice; and who teach that the very grace by which we are saved is either repaid to good merits or withheld by evil ones.

The way having thus been made level and these obstacles removed from the midst, he hands down in order:

I. That those speak more harshly than one ought to speak concerning the depth of the inscrutable grace of God who say that God does not will all men to be saved, but only a fixed number of the predestined.

Indeed, II. he affirms that it must most sincerely be believed and professed that God wills all men to be saved.

III. He adds that this is therefore to be held with such great constancy because the Apostle, whose sentence this is, most earnestly commands what is most piously observed in all the churches: that supplication be made to God for all men.

But lest, IV., any place for doubt remain as to the amplitude in which, according to the author himself, the words "God wills all men to be saved" ought to be taken, he adds that the same persons are "all men" in Paul, "all nations" in Matthew, "all the tribes of the earth" in Moses, and "all the ends of the earth" and "all the families of the nations" in David. He teaches, namely, that "all men" in Paul ought to be taken so indefinitely that not even one is to be judged excepted from the salvific will of God.

[2] Rom. V. 19.

But, V., what kind of salvific will is this, and from what fountain does it flow? It flows from the fountain of divine benignity; for if men, being evil, know how to give good gifts to their children, how much more will the heavenly Father give good things to those who ask him? Whence [1] appears the great dignity of man, who was so created by God that he might know his own Author, and was esteemed so greatly that the Only-begotten of God expended his blood for his redemption.

But, VI., of itself it is such that by a manifold providence it assists men and places them upon the way [1] by which one tends toward retribution.

For God has care of all men; and there is no one whom either evangelical preaching, or the testimony of the law, or even nature itself does not address. For the mercy [2] and grace, the goodness and patience of God, are declared through all things, so that no one may despair and no one may presume. Let no one despair, because [3] the Lord raises up all who fall and lifts up all who are cast down; let no one despair, because [4] God takes away the way of correction from no one, nor despoils anyone of the possibility of good; but let no one presume, because [5], just as he is sweet in lenity, so is he just in vengeance, and nothing is lost to his long-suffering, since the converted man experiences him as benign, and the hardened man as severe.

Wherefore, VII., this is the order chosen by his merciful and salvific will: that absolutely all men who possess the use of reason should be assisted in manifold ways, should be withdrawn from the necessity of perishing, should obtain the possibility of good, and, having obtained it, should enter upon the way of correction if they will; but if [6] they spurn the will of God inviting them, they should feel the will of God avenging.

LXV.

For establishing this order of universal reformation, those things by which Prosper [7] meets this objection of the Gauls—that the Savior was not crucified for the redemption of the whole world—contribute no less. He says:

[1] Prosper, on Ps. CXLIII. 3, p. 300.
[1] On Ps. CLIV. 6–7, p. 362.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Response to Vincentian objection VIII, p. 135.
[4] Response to Vincentian objection XV, p. 137.
[5] On Ps. CXLIV. 8–9, p. 362.
[6] Response to Vincentian objection XVI, p. 137.
[7] Response to objection IX of the Gauls, pp. 122–123.

There is absolutely no one among all men whose nature was not assumed in Christ our Lord; although he was born in the likeness [8] of sinful flesh, while every other man is born in sinful flesh. Therefore God the Son of God, having been made a participant in human mortality without sin, conferred this upon sinners and mortals: that those who had become companions of his nativity might escape the bond of sin and death.

Therefore, just as it does not suffice for the renewal of men that the man Jesus Christ was born, unless they are reborn in that same Spirit from whom he himself arose; so it does not suffice for the redemption of men that the Lord Christ was crucified, unless they die together with him and are buried together with him in baptism. Otherwise, since the Savior was born in the flesh of our substance and was crucified for us all, it would not have been necessary that we be reborn and planted together [1] in the likeness of his death.

But since without this Sacrament no man obtains eternal life, he who has not been crucified in Christ has not been saved by the cross of Christ. And he who is not a member of the body of Christ has not been crucified in Christ; nor is he a member of the body of Christ who has not put on Christ through water and the Holy Spirit. He therefore entered into communion with death in our weakness, that we might have fellowship in the resurrection through his power.

Therefore, although it is most rightly said that the Savior was crucified for the redemption of the whole world, on account of the true assumption of human nature and on account of the common perdition of all in the first man, it can nevertheless be said that he was crucified only for those whom his death benefited.

For the Evangelist [2] says that Jesus was to die for the nation, and not only for the nation, but also that he might gather into one the dispersed children of God. For [3] he came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them he gave power to become the sons of God: who were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.

Therefore the lot of those who are numbered among the persons of whom it is said [4], "The world knew him not," is diverse from theirs.

[8] Rom. VIII. 3.
[1] Rom. VI. 5.
[2] John XI. 51.
[3] John I. 11.
[4] John I. 10.

> Thus it can be said in this respect: the Redeemer of the world gave his blood for the world,
> and the world was unwilling to be redeemed, because the darkness did not receive the light; yet the darkness received it in those to whom the Apostle [1] says, "You were once darkness, but now light in the Lord." But the Lord Jesus himself, who said [2] that he had come to seek and to save what was lost, says [3], "I came not except unto the sheep that were lost of the house of Israel."

LXVI.

But the sentence by which Prosper opposes the difficulty of the Gauls and embraces the orthodox faith reads thus [4]:

> He who says that the Savior was not crucified for the redemption of the whole world regards not the power of the sacrament but the portion of the unbelieving; since the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is the price of the whole world. Those are alien from this price who, either delighted with captivity, were unwilling to be redeemed, or, after redemption, returned to the same servitude. For the word of the Lord has not fallen, nor has the redemption of the world been made void. For although the world did not know God in the vessels of wrath, nevertheless the world knew God in the vessels of mercy, which God, with no good merits of theirs preceding, rescued from the power of darkness and transferred into the kingdom of the Son of his love.

But those words by which he refutes [5] the Vincentian calumny that our Lord Jesus Christ did not suffer for the salvation and redemption of all men agree well with these. He says:

> Against the wound of original sin, by which in Adam the nature of all men was corrupted and put to death, and from which the disease of all concupiscences took root, the death of the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, is the true and powerful and singular remedy. He, free from the debt of death and alone without sin, died for sinners and debtors to death.

[1] Eph. V. 8; compare John I. 5.
[2] Luke XIX. 10.
[3] Matt. XV. 24.
[4] Sentence upon chapter IX, p. 127.
[5] Response to chapter I of the Vincentian objections, pp. 132–133.

> Therefore, as regards the magnitude and power of the price, and as regards the one cause of the human race,
> the blood of Christ is the redemption of the whole world. But those who pass through this age without faith in Christ and without the sacrament of regeneration are alien from redemption.
> Therefore, since on account of the one nature of all and the one cause of all truly assumed by our Lord, all are rightly said to have been redeemed, and nevertheless not all have been rescued from captivity, the property of redemption undoubtedly belongs to those concerning whom the prince of the world has been cast out, and who are now no longer vessels of the devil but members of Christ. His death was not bestowed upon the human race in such a way that even those who were not to be regenerated would belong to his redemption; but in such a way that what was done for all through a single exemplar would be celebrated in individuals through an individual sacrament. For the cup of immortality, which was prepared from our weakness and the divine power, has indeed within itself the capacity to benefit all; but if it is not drunk, it does not heal.

LXVII.

For the explanation and vindication of these things, I judge it useful to make some observations point by point and deliberately to inculcate them. Among these, I. this ought to be recalled: that nothing was more ready to hand for the assailants [1] of Augustinian doctrine and the defenders of the Semipelagian error, whereby they might either kindle a more vehement hatred against it or display their error as more marketable, than to disseminate among the people that these two things were most closely joined with Augustine's doctrine, which was most hostile to the Semipelagian heresy: a) that God does not will all men to be saved; and therefore b) that our Lord Jesus Christ did not suffer for the salvation and redemption of all men. The Gauls employed both attacks,

and the author of the Vincentian objections repeated both. But how could it have entered their mind to trust so greatly in this attack unless, in the fifth century, it had been a most firmly established dogma in the Church both that God wills the salvation of all men and that, according to the norm of this will, Christ

[1] Fulgentius speaks of these in the first book *To Monimus*, writing: "In a past time it was objected by certain Gauls against that very illustrious work of Saint Augustine that blessed Augustine, in his assertion of divine predestination, said that sinners were predestined not only to judgment but also to sin. Because he himself was overtaken by a swift death, Prosper, a learned and holy man, rightly defended his statements in faithful and copious discourse."

underwent death for all and poured forth his blood? It is therefore established that this was truly the judgment of the Church, and that every Catholic conspired in this profession.

The force of this certainty, II., will appear the greater, the more diligently the mind is directed to Prosper's responses. For he begins the *Responses to the Chapters of the Gauls* with these words [1]:

> The doctrine which Bishop Augustine of holy memory apostolically asserted against the Pelagians, the enemies of the grace of Christ and the embellishers [2] of free choice, through many years and committed to writing, it has seemed good to some to censure either by not understanding it or by being unwilling that it should be understood; and to bring forward as a kind of compendium of knowledge for those who were led by their judgment this: that they should publish in lists of brief chapters those things which they boasted that they had found condemnable in the books of the aforesaid man; and that by such a fiction they should both obtain the detestation of him whom they attacked and turn the attention of the terrified reader away from those things which they had defamed. Therefore, lest anyone rashly receive this persuasion and think that such a meaning is contained in the writings of a Catholic doctor as those who calumniate him in vain display, I respond to the individual chapters, which they prefixed with the title of condemnation, with a brief and absolute profession, departing in nothing from the path of those definitions which are contained in the disputations of the holy man; so that an inspector even of slight diligence may easily perceive with what unjust reproaches the memory of a Catholic preacher is torn, and into what sin those fall who, moved by another's instigation, are more ready to blame a writer of the most celebrated name than to know him.

But, responding to the chapters of the Vincentian objections, he writes far more bitterly [1]:

> Certain men, forgetful of Christian and fraternal charity, strive in every way to injure our reputation to such a degree that, through their desire to harm, they do not see that they overturn their own. For they weave together and comprehend in whatever propositions they can

[1] Preface to the *Responses to the Chapters of the Gauls*, p. 117.

[2] Others read *deceivers* or *defenders*. But nothing prevents the reading received in all the editions from being retained, since the Pelagians could not unjustly have been called *embellishers of free choice*, because they were wholly occupied in adorning free choice and painting upon it an unmerited appearance.

[1] Preface to the *Responses to the Chapters of the Vincentian Objections*, p. 131.

> the prodigious lies of certain most absurd blasphemies, and carry them about publicly and privately to be displayed and thrust upon many, asserting that such things are in our meaning as are contained in a diabolical indictment. We could easily and sufficiently prove, by subscribing one anathema, that these things are falsely cast upon us to stir up odium, if the malice of those who think themselves burdened whenever we are thought well of were not going to regard the very brevity of our subscription as suspect. Therefore, lest an occasion for this complaint be found, we have believed it necessary and fitting that—whether for soothing the minds of those who calumniate, or for instructing those in whose ears something of this kind has sounded—we should, so far as it can be done with the Lord's aid, disclose fully and lucidly what we judge concerning these perverse definitions.
>
> Therefore, after the sixteen chapters have been proposed individually, under each of them we shall place the words of our meaning and of the faith which, by the authority of the Apostolic See, we defend against the Pelagians; so that those who have deigned to occupy themselves a little in reading these things may clearly recognize that no vestige of impious and profane opinions has adhered to our hearts, and may judge that the blasphemies which they perceive to be condemned by our profession ought to be punished in those who devised them.

What, therefore, does Prosper determine concerning either the chapters of the Gauls or the Vincentian objections? He determines that they advance and contain fictions devised with this counsel: that they might both obtain the detestation of Augustine, whom they attacked, and turn the attention of the terrified reader away from those things which they had defamed; calumnies which no one should rashly receive; unjust reproaches; prodigious lies belonging to certain most absurd blasphemies; a diabolical indictment; perverse definitions; impious and profane opinions; and true blasphemies.

But among the chapters of the Gauls and the Vincentian objections, these hold no insignificant place: that the Savior was not crucified for the redemption of the whole world, and that our Lord Jesus Christ did not suffer for the salvation and redemption of all men. Therefore, the marks and censures which we received heaped up by Prosper fit these statements: namely, that they are fictions, prodigious lies, perverse definitions, impious and profane opinions, and blasphemies; so that both those who erred and those who defended the orthodox profession in the fifth century conspired unanimously in this: that they detested with the

greatest execration those who affirmed that our Lord Jesus Christ did not suffer for the salvation and redemption of all men.

LXVIII.

And indeed, III., concerning the proposition which stands opposite to this and by which it is taught that our Lord Jesus Christ underwent torments and death for the salvation and redemption of all men, Prosper hands down: a) that it is most rightly said that the Savior was crucified for the redemption of the whole world; b) that the Redeemer of the world gave his blood for the world; c) that the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is the price of the whole world; d) that the Son of God died for sinners and debtors to death; e) that the blood of Christ is the redemption of the whole world; f) that all are rightly said to have been redeemed; and g) that the cup of immortality, prepared from our weakness and the divine power, has within itself the capacity to benefit all.

Nor, IV., could he believe otherwise or profess otherwise, who a) held that it must most sincerely be believed and professed that God wills all men to be saved; and who b) had resolved to depart in nothing from the path of those definitions which are contained in the disputations of Saint Augustine. For the Apostle testifies concerning Christ that he did not enter the world before he had said: "Sacrifice and oblation thou wouldst not, but a body thou hast fitted to me; holocausts and sacrifice for sin 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." Therefore, in undertaking and fulfilling the economy for the human race, Christ bore that will which was most like the Father's and was deservedly regarded as its most perfect ectypal image.

But it must most sincerely be believed and professed that God wills all men to be saved. Therefore, with the same sincerity and constancy it must be believed and professed that Christ tasted death for all men and poured forth his blood.

Cyril of Alexandria, understanding this well, did not hesitate in the third book of his *Commentaries on Isaiah* to call this universal will of Christ and the death endured for all *σκοπὸν τοῦ διασώζοντος*, "the purpose of the Savior." But Ammonius, and with him other Greek Fathers in the catenae, speaking on the occasion of the Lord's words [1], "I came not that I might judge the world, but that I might save the world," confirm *περὶ σκοποῦ τῆς παρουσίας*, concerning the purpose of the advent, that Christ therefore came and met death in order that he might provide for all and furnish the faculty of obtaining salvation.

[1] John XII. 47.

But since others [2] have collected very many things from Augustine, and not a few which I might add are available to me, I shall mention only two. First, these most explicit words of his [3]:

> The will obtains justice from the Lord and drinks it as from its own fountain. No one is prohibited from approaching this fountain, if he approaches worthily. Finally, behold thy aid. Thy silver redeemed thee from barbarians; thy money redeems thee from the first death; the blood of thy Lord redeems thee from the second death. He had blood with which to redeem us, and for this purpose he received blood, that there might be that which he would pour forth for our redemption. The blood of thy Lord, if thou willest, was given for [4] thee; if thou art unwilling, it was not given for thee. Perhaps thou sayest: My God had blood with which he might redeem me; but now, when he suffered, he gave it all. What remained to him that he might give it also for me? This is the great thing: that he gave it once, and gave it for all. The blood of Christ is salvation to the willing, punishment to the unwilling. Why then dost thou, who dost not will to die, hesitate to be liberated rather from the second death? Thou art liberated from it if thou willest to take up thy cross and follow the Lord; because he took up his own and sought his servant.

I shall next mention that Augustine did nothing else through many continuous years and in many published works than defend against the Pelagians the universal propagation of original guilt from the universal amplitude of the death of Christ. For with this argument he contended against them in the *Enchiridion* [1]; with this he renewed the battle in the books *Against Julian* [2]; upon this he insisted in the work *The City of God* [3]; nor did he depart from it in his final, unfinished work against the same Julian [4]. In order to extricate himself from this snare, Julian objected that it is known from nearly innumerable examples of the Scriptures that *all* is employed for *many*, according to that saying, "All have turned aside." But Augustine in turn reduced him to extremity thus [5]:

---

[2] Petavius, *On the Incarnation*, book XIII, chap. III; De Champs, *On the Jansenist Heresy*, book III, disputation VII; Tricassinus, *On the Predestination of Men to Glory*, part I, section VII, § II, points I ff.; and Alticotius, *Augustinian Summa*, part I, question III, article II.

[3] Sermon CCCXLIV, no. 4; otherwise XXXI among the Sirmondian sermons.

[4] So that, with Augustine as doctor, anyone can repeat the words of Paul in Gal. II. 20: "I live in the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and delivered himself for me."

[1] *Enchiridion*, chaps. XLI–XLVII; compare with these chapters what Faure most opportunely noted.

[2] *Against Julian*, book VI, chaps. IX, XV, XXIV.

[3] *The City of God*, book XX, chap. VI.

[4] *Unfinished Work*, book II, nos. 133, 134, 138, 162, 171, 172, 175.

[5] *Unfinished Work*, book II, no. 175.

Free thyself from this, if thou canst: that [6] one died for all; and dare to say that not all are dead for whom Christ died, when at once the Apostle presses thy throat and crushes thy most audacious voice, showing what follows and saying: "Therefore all are dead." Do not praise the Apostle in such a way; do not expound him in such a way that thou art unwilling to hear: "If one died for all, therefore all are dead." Whatever thou mayest argue, whatever thou mayest endeavor to overturn of the apostolic words, thou dost not show little children to be immune from the death which is in sin.

And therefore [7] thou dost not show them immune,

because the Apostle says: "Therefore all are dead, and one died for all,

so that those who live may no longer live to themselves, but to him who died for them and rose again." Therefore all are dead in sins, with no one [1] excepted, whether in original sins or also in those

[6] II Cor. V. 14.

[7] *The City of God*, book XX, chap. VI, no. 1.

[1] "It is remarkable," says Tricassinus in the work *On the Grace Necessary for Salvation Given to All and Each*, part I, section III, "that Augustine, although he spoke so often of original sin as being in all and each, nevertheless never excepted the Blessed Virgin, although in those places he often excepted Christ, and indeed said that he alone was excepted. Yet it must not therefore be certainly inferred that he was unwilling that the Blessed Virgin should also be excepted from that sin; since in book V *Against Julian*, chap. I, where he most expressly asserts that no one is excepted from original sin save Christ, he nevertheless says toward the end of that chapter that no one had original sin who afterward did not sin actually, if he survived long enough—placing as though upon an equal footing, in adults, either having both original and actual sin or having neither of them, as is evident from these words of his, where, speaking of Christ, he says thus: 'Certainly he would also have committed sin when older if he had had it when a little child; for therefore there is no man besides him who did not commit sin upon reaching a more advanced age, because there is no man besides him who did not have sin at the beginning of infancy.'

"Here thou seest that he asserts that original sin has place only in those in whom there was actual sin when they grew up.

"But in the book *On Nature and Grace*, chap. XXVI, he indicates sufficiently clearly that the Blessed Virgin never sinned actually, as is evident from these words of his: 'Except the holy Virgin Mary, concerning whom, for the honor of the Lord, I will that no question whatever be entertained when sins are treated; for thence we know that more grace was conferred upon her for conquering sin from every side, who merited to conceive and bear him whom it is certain had no sin.'

"Here he speaks only of actual sins and not also of original sin, as some wrongly interpret that passage; both because the discourse there concerned actual sins, without which Pelagius said that very many saints had lived and Augustine denied it, and also because he spoke of sins which can be conquered by the one sinning, of which kind original sins are not, but only actual sins.

"Therefore, since Augustine says here that the Blessed Virgin did not sin, and in the passage cited above said that he who has original sin has sinned actually if he reached the years of discretion, it is manifest that some inadvertence intervened in these matters, or certainly that, according to his custom, he was unwilling to decide this incidental question—namely, whether the Blessed Virgin was also exempt from that sin."

added by the will, whether by ignorance or by knowing and not doing what is just.

It was therefore necessary that Prosper, for whom it was fixed to adhere to the footsteps of Augustine and who professed that God wills the salvation of all men, should no less profess that the death of Christ extends to all, and that there is not even one for whom Christ did not offer his blood.

LXIX.

Here, V., it will contribute not a little to a fuller explanation of the whole matter to know both whence Prosper deduced the universal amplitude of the death of Christ and what effects he ascribed to it. As regards the former, I see that the death of Christ was held [1] by Prosper to be universal: a) on account of the true assumption of human nature and the one nature of all, since there is absolutely no one among all men whose nature was not assumed in Christ our Lord; b) on account of the one cause of all and the common perdition of all in the first man; and c) on account of the magnitude and power of the price. But which of these three causes is not altogether universal or does not embrace all? Each one embraces all and each, and there is not even one man who is not contained within their compass. From this, therefore, Prosper deduces the amplitude of the death of Christ, whence it clearly appears that there is no one who is excluded from its benefit.

But from what benefit? Plainly, a manifold one, just as the effects [2] which Prosper ascribes to it are manifold. For, on his authority, the following must be credited to the death of Christ: a) the reformation of human nature, which Christ therefore assumed in himself, that he might exempt it from the necessity of condemnation; b) the institution of a universal means, so that all who should be participants in it might escape the bond of sin and death; c) the faculty furnished to all, so that only those should remain in darkness and incur the second death who are unwilling to be redeemed and repel the light; d) the price paid for the whole world, from which only those are alien who,

delighted with captivity, were unwilling to be redeemed, or after redemption returned to the same servitude; e) finally, the cup which has in itself, as regards the potency of the price and its power, the capacity to benefit all, but which, if it is not drunk, does not heal.

Therefore, the death of Christ is universal in no other manner than the salvific will of God is and is believed to be universal; and just as the latter, so the former is

[1] Response to objection IX of the Gauls, pp. 122–123, and response to objection I of the Vincentians, pp. 132–133.

[2] Ibid., and the *Sentence upon Chapter IX of the Gauls*, p. 127.

fruitful, pours itself forth into various and manifold effects, and does not permit any man justly to complain either of the necessity of perishing or of a withdrawn power of obtaining salvation. The human race owes to both that it belongs to the order of reformation, not of condemnation, and to a mass not condemned but reformed. It is indeed of itself and from original guilt a condemned mass; but by the merciful will of God and by redemption through Christ it came about that it became a reformed mass and, furnished with heavenly aids, aspired to reparation and to salvation, which is the crown of persevering reparation.

LXX.

Yet, VI., this universal and active redemption in no way prevents it from being judged particular in a certain and most true sense. For just as Prosper judged it useful [1] to divide the salvific will of God in such a way that he called the will of saving and of imparting the faculty necessary for obtaining salvation universal, but the purpose of fulfilling it and of actually conferring salvation particular; so he judged it consonant with the truth if he handed down that the redemption acquired by the blood of Christ is universal in price, power, and oblation, but particular, on the contrary, if account be taken of the property and of its perfect and absolute fruit.

He mentions this division [2], saying:

> Although it is most rightly said that the Savior was crucified for the redemption of the whole world, on account of the true assumption of human nature and on account of the common perdition of all in the first man, it can nevertheless be said that he was crucified only for those whom his death benefited.

And he mentions it again [1], adding:

---

[1] *Sentence upon Chapter VIII of the Gauls*, pp. 126–127.

[2] Response to objection IX of the Gauls, p. 123.

[1] Response to objection I of the Vincentians, p. 132. Faure excellently refutes, in the notes to chaps. XLI ff. of the *Enchiridion*, the preposterous artifices of the Jansenists, by which they explain the universal sufficiency of redemption asserted by Prosper as an absolute universal sufficiency considered in itself and *ὄντως*, but by no means as the sufficiency of a price offered for all and offered with that will by which Christ sincerely willed the salvation of all. He moreover both establishes and demonstrates by arguments:

I. That the theological distinction concerning the death of Christ for all as regards the sufficiency of the price offered with a serious intention, but for the elect as regards efficacy, is handed down in other equivalent words by Augustine in chapter XLI of the *Enchiridion* and in other passages consonant with it.

II. That the same theological distinction is contained in book VI *Against Julian*, chap. XV, and that there also the doctrine of theologians concerning the death of Christ sufficient for all, efficacious for many, is not obscurely expressed.

> Since, on account of the one nature of all and the one cause of all truly assumed by our Lord, all are rightly said to have been redeemed, and nevertheless not all have been rescued from captivity, the property of redemption undoubtedly belongs to those concerning whom the prince of the world has been cast out, and who are now no longer vessels of the devil but members of Christ.

And there was certainly a reason why he employed such a distribution and inculcated it by repetition. For let the nature of the matter be considered, and then let it be asked: to what does the redemption of Christ ultimately tend, and from what do its character and property especially shine forth? It cannot seem doubtful that the supreme end proposed for redemption is the glory of God, which is procured by the adoption of men and the attainment of the everlasting inheritance; and that its character and property are demonstrated by nothing better than by the heavenly beatitude itself of those same men. For redemption consists principally in these things, is borne of its own accord toward them, is completed in them, and attains its summit in them. Therefore, the very nature of the matter demanded that the property, character, and *ἐξοχή*, or preeminence, of redemption be distinguished from its price, power, and oblation; and that they be so distinguished that the latter should be called universal and the former particular: the latter common to all, since reformation and the power of obtaining beatitude bestowed are common; the former proper to many,

since it is proper only to many to drink the cup of immortality and by that draught to obtain medicine and salvation.

What of the fact that the Scriptures themselves and the divine oracles also seemed to display this division and distribution in explicit words? Surely nothing from them is more manifest than that redemption must be called and believed universal as regards the price, the power, the oblation, and the reconciliation offered [1] to all. For this amplitude, constrained by no limits, is handed down in the Scriptures:

a) In universal words which exclude all limits. "Judging [2] this, *ὅτι εἰ εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν*, because if one died for all, *ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον*, therefore all are dead; *καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν*, and Christ died for all" [3]. "There is one [4] God, and one mediator of God and men, the man

III. That the same theological distinction concerning the death of Christ is handed down by Augustine in Epistle CLXIX, otherwise CII, to Evodius.

[1] II Cor. V. 19: "For God indeed was in Christ, *κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ, μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν*, reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their offenses to them."

[2] II Cor. V. 14.

[3] We have inserted *Χριστόν* on the authority of the Vulgate and of one or another Greek codex.

[4] I Tim. II. 5–6.

> Christ Jesus, *ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων*, who gave himself as a redemption for all." "We see [5] Jesus, on account of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor, *ὅπως χάριτι* [6]

θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσηται θανάτου, that by the grace of God he might taste death for all."

It is handed down, b), by that collective formula which comprehends the whole race of men. "Behold [1] the Lamb of God, *ἴδε* [2] *ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου*, behold him who takes away the sin of the world." "God so [3] loved *τὸν κόσμον*, the world, that he gave his Only-begotten Son, that everyone who believes in him may not perish but may have eternal life. For God did not send his Son *εἰς τὸν κόσμον*, into the world, *ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα* [4] *σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ*, that he might judge the world, but that the world might be saved through him." "We ourselves [5] have heard and know *ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου*, that this is truly the Savior of the world."

It is handed down, c), by a comparative form of speech of such a kind, by which we are taught that the remedy obtained by the death of Christ extends no less widely than the wound inflicted by the fault of Adam. "Just as [6] through

---

[5] Heb. II. 9.

[6] At the words *χάριτι θεοῦ*, Mill observes that there is another reading, and a very celebrated one, *χωρὶς θεοῦ*. Bengel, Wetstein, Griesbach, Matthaei, and Heinrich likewise note this. In order to show that it ought not to be ascribed to the Nestorians, but had crept into some Greek codices several centuries before the name of Nestorius was heard, they all allege as witnesses the Syriac interpreter, Origen, Jerome, Ambrose, and others. "Moreover," Mill adds, "a threefold meaning is attached to this reading. One, more harsh, is that of Origen, Theodoret, and the Anonymous writer in Oecumenius: namely, that Christ *χωρὶς θεοῦ*, with God alone excepted, died for all, even for angels. A second is heretical: that he who is man, not indeed he who is God or *θεοτόκος*, tasted death; this belonged to the Nestorians, who divided the persons in Christ. Consequently Theophylact and Oecumenius—who did not know that this reading had been found in the writings of the Fathers and in ancient copies long before the rise of Nestorius—thought it had been devised by them. The third is sound: that Christ underwent death as regards his human nature, but by no means as regards the divine;

in which sense among the Latins Ambrose, Vigilius, and Fulgentius take it, rightly and suitably to the mind of the author. For this indeed seems plain: that some learned man, lest the Passion be thought to have been of the Godhead—to use the words of Vigilius—noted in the margin of the book, for the sake of orthodoxy, *χωρὶς θεοῦ*, by which he signified that this suffering regarded only the assumed human nature and not the divine nature of Christ. But it is scarcely strange that scribes, especially somewhat learned ones to whom *χάριτι θεοῦ* did not seem good Greek, should have seized this scholion into the text. Yet I do not think that very many Greek codices were interpolated by this interpretation, and very few Latin ones. Certainly, whatever manuscripts, Greek and Latin, are anywhere extant today agrees with the printed editions."

[1] John I. 29.

[2] We have repeated the particle *ἴδε*, following the Vulgate.

[3] John III. 16–17.

[4] Otherwise, *ἵνα σώσῃ τὸν κόσμον*.

[5] John IV. 42.

[6] Rom. V. 18.

the offense of one, *εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους*, unto all men unto condemnation, so also through the justice of one, *εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς*, unto all men unto justification of life."

It is handed down, d), by a discourse so distributed that plainly no mortal is excluded from the benefits of redemption. "We have an advocate

with the Father [1], Jesus Christ the just: *καὶ αὐτὸς ἱλασμός ἐστι περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν· οὐ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου*, and he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world."

And finally it is handed down, e), when the benefits of redemption are said to extend even to those who will perish eternally. "Destroy not [2] with thy food him *ὑπὲρ οὗ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν*, for whom Christ died." "And through thy knowledge the weak brother shall perish [3], *δι' ὃν Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν*, for whom Christ died." "There shall be among you [4] lying teachers, who shall introduce sects of perdition, *καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι, ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινὴν ἀπώλειαν*, and denying the Lord who bought them, bringing upon themselves swift perdition."

LXXI.

But in turn it is affirmed in the same divine writings: a) that Christ laid down his life for his sheep. "As [5] the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father, *καὶ τὴν ψυχήν μου τίθημι ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων* [6] *μου*, and I lay down my life for my sheep"; b) that he sanctified himself for his disciples and for the faithful: *καὶ ὑπὲρ* [7] *αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτόν*, "and for them I sanctify myself"; c) that none of those whom he received from the Father would perish: *οὓς* [8] *δέδωκάς μοι, ἐφύλαξα, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπώλετο*, "those whom thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them [9] perished"; d) that he prayed not for the world, but for those whom

[1] I John II. 2.
[2] Rom. XIV. 15.
[3] I Cor. VIII. 11.
[4] II Pet. II. 1.
[5] John X. 15.
[6] The Vulgate has the second *μου*.
[7] John XVII. 19.
[8] Ibid., v. 12.
[9] Yet there immediately follows, *εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας*, "except the son of perdition." Whence it is evident that others besides those elected unto everlasting life were given to Christ by the Father.

the Father gave him: *ἐγὼ* [1] *περὶ αὐτῶν ἐρωτῶ· οὐ περὶ τοῦ κόσμου ἐρωτῶ, ἀλλὰ περὶ ὧν δέδωκάς μοι, ὅτι σοί εἰσι*, "I pray for them; I pray not for the world, but for those whom thou hast given me, because they are thine"; and therefore e) that he poured forth his blood for many: "This [2] is my blood of the new testament, *τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν*, which shall be poured forth [3] for many unto the remission of sins."

But by what means dost thou reconcile this *ἀντιλογία*, or apparent contradiction, and persuade thyself that it is not real but *κατὰ δόκησιν*, in appearance? Most easily, if thou callest to mind the distinction employed by Prosper and takest the first class of testimonies as concerning the price, power, and oblation of redemption and the reconciliation offered to all, but interpretest the latter as concerning the property and the full and absolute fruit of redemption; if thou referrest the first class to the antecedent salvific will and the latter to the consequent will; if thou followest the doctrine received in the schools, which Peter Lombard expresses in these words [4]:

> Christ offered himself to God for all as regards the sufficiency of the price, but for the elect alone as regards efficacy, because he effects salvation only for the predestined.

Whence Biel [5]:

> Christ sufficiently merited grace and the opening of the kingdom for Adam and all his posterity; the defect whereby he does not save all is not from the inefficacy of the merit of Christ, but from the indisposition of the subject, the cause of salvation not being duly brought near.

Nor does Scotus speak otherwise [6]:

> Christ, through his inward action and outward passion, worthily satisfied for the whole of human nature. But the merit and satisfaction of Christ has its ultimate efficacy only in those who are united to him through faith and the sacraments.

And much more fully the author [7] of the *Commentaries on the Apocalypse*, which were formerly ascribed to Thomas [1]:

---

[1] John XVII. 9.

[2] Matt. XXVI. 28.

[3] The Vulgate translates the present *τὸ ἐκχυνόμενον* no otherwise than if it had read the future *ὃ ἐκχυθήσεται*.

[4] On book III, distinction XXX.

[5] On book III, distinction XIX, question II, article II.

[6] On book III, distinction XX, conclusions II–III.

[7] Commentary on Apocalypse V.

[1] Bernard de Rubeis has more concerning these commentaries in the critical dissertations prefixed to the works of Aquinas, dissertation VII, chaps. II–III.

> The redemption accomplished through the Passion of Christ can be spoken of in two ways: either according to sufficiency, and thus the Passion redeemed all, because, so far as lies in itself, it liberated all; for it is sufficient for redeeming and saving all, even if there were infinite worlds, as Anselm says; or according to efficiency, and thus he did not redeem all through the Passion, because not all adhere to the Redeemer.

The Tridentine Fathers [2] confirmed this solemn distribution by their suffrage in these words:

> Although Christ died for all, nevertheless not all receive the benefit of his death, but only those to whom the merit of his Passion is communicated.

Here those who receive the merit of the Passion and the benefit of the death of Christ are clearly distinguished from others who are reckoned in the number of all for whom Christ died and yet do not receive the grace flowing together with the blood of Christ.

For Isaac Habert admonishes [3]:

> It must be diligently considered that redemption can be regarded in two ways: first, actively, on the part of Christ redeeming; second, passively, on the part of those redeemed. On the part of the one redeeming, it can again be regarded in two ways: first, according to the value and dignity of the price, which Saint Prosper rightly calls the power of the price; and in this manner no one doubts that that infinite price is more than sufficient for the redemption of all the damned, not only those existing but also those possible. In the other manner, it is regarded according to the will of the one redeeming in the actual payment of the price, which will we again establish as twofold: antecedent with respect to all men, concerning which blessed [4]
>
> Leo says, "As Christ found no one free from guilt, so he came to liberate all"; and consequent with respect only to the elect, which corresponds both to the divine will that is to offer efficacious grace with a view to him and also to the human will of adults who are to cooperate with this grace. And therefore, by reason of that pas-

[2] Session VI, chap. III. Hence Thomas, upon the words of Paul in Heb. II. 9, "that he might taste death for all," says: "For all can be understood in two ways: either as an accommodated distribution, namely, for all the predestined—for it has efficacy only for them; or absolutely for all as regards sufficiency—for, so far as lies in itself, it is sufficient for all. Who is the Savior of all men, especially of the faithful."

[3] *The Theology of the Greek Fathers on Grace*, book II, chap. IX, § V.

[4] Sermon I.

> sive redemption which embraces the ultimate effect of redemption, Christ is the Redeemer only of the predestined; but by reason of the price paid by him for the whole human race, he is the Redeemer of all. And in this sense [1] he gave himself as a redemption for all; and as soon as he paid this price, which, so far as lies in itself, was to benefit all from that general will—blotting out the handwriting [2] which was against us and fastening it to the cross—all are judged redeemed, all liberated, although there are in reality those who are unwilling to enjoy the benefit and fruit of redemption.

LXXII.

Moreover, that the will of God and Christ toward men is such as we have thus far outlined, and that the order of reformation and salvation proceeded from it, we proceed to confirm by that argument than which we judge none stronger and none more efficacious for producing persuasion can be employed. For we have resolved to imitate the most learned Emmanuel Schelstratius, to traverse the patriarchal and more distinguished churches in geographical order, and to bring forward their universal and constant tradition. Once this has been ascertained, it will be permissible for us to repeat the sentence of Vincent of Lérins celebrated in the mouth of all:

> What all equally, with one and the same consent, openly, frequently, and perseveringly held, wrote, and taught, each man will understand without doubt must be believed by him.

But that we may execute in deed the counsel undertaken, we shall take our beginning from the Alexandrian patriarchate and shall investigate as diligently as we can what those men thought and what they handed down who, from the most ancient times even to the sixth century, shone there above the rest in reputation for piety and learning.

To this end we believe it useful to embrace their fixed and established doctrine in several propositions and then to append the witnesses who defend it by their suffrage and authority.

Therefore, I., it was as a principle for the Alexandrian doctors that God is good by his own nature, inclined of himself and by an innate weight toward doing good, a lover of men and truly *φιλάνθρωπος*, and that he is compelled only unwillingly

[1] I Tim. II. 6.
[2] Col. II. 14.

and almost by force to proceed against them with punishments. "The instrument of God [1]," says Clement of Alexandria,

> *φιλάνθρωπον*, loves the human race: the Lord has mercy, chastises, exhorts, admonishes, preserves, guards, *καὶ μισθὸν ἡμῖν τῆς μαθήσεως ἐκ περιουσίας, βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν, ἐπαγγέλλεται· τοῦτο μόνον ἀπολαύων ἡμῶν, ὅτι σωζόμεθα*, and as a recompense for instruction, as though out of abundance, he promises us the kingdom of heaven, receiving no other fruit from us than that we are saved. *Κακία μὲν γὰρ τὴν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιβόσκεται φθοράν· ἡ δὲ ἀλήθεια, ὥσπερ ἡ μέλιττα, λυμαινομένη τῶν ὄντων οὐδέν, ἐπὶ μόνης τῆς ἀνθρώπων ἀγάλλεται σωτηρίας.* For vice feeds upon the destruction of men; but Truth, which like a bee settles harmlessly upon things, rejoices only in their salvation [2]. Thou hast what he promises; *ἔχεις τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν· φιλανθρωπίαν τῆς χάριτος μεταλάμβανε*, thou hast with how great an affection he loves the human race: do thou participate in the grace of this love.

For [3]:

> That Father of ours, *ὁ ὄντως πατήρ*, who truly is Father and loves us exceedingly, never ceases to exhort, admonish, correct, and love; *οὐδὲ γὰρ σώζων παύεται*;
>
> for he does not cease to save, but gives the best [1] counsel: "Be made just," says the Lord. "You who thirst, go to the water; and you who have no money, go and buy and drink without money." *Ἐπὶ τὸ λουτρόν, ἐπὶ τὴν σωτηρίαν, ἐπὶ τὸν φωτισμὸν παρακαλεῖ*, he exhorts unto expiation through the laver, unto salvation, unto [2] illumination, almost openly crying: "I give thee, O son, earth and sea and heaven and the things which are in them; I lavish upon thee all living things. Do thou only, O son, thirst for the Father; God will be manifested to thee without price, for Truth is not sold."

---

[1] *Exhortation to the Gentiles*, § I, p. 5, Venice edition, 1757. Here *τὸ ὄργανον τοῦ θεοῦ*, "the instrument of God," according to Clement's own interpretation, is *σοφία ὑπερκόσμιος, οὐράνιος λόγος*, supramundane wisdom, the heavenly Word, which therefore receives the name *τοῦ ὀργάνου*, because all things were made through him and he is *δύναμις θεοῦ*, the power of God.

[2] In the same sense he writes in *Stromata* VII, p. 707, that neither sacrifices nor anything else is now expected from us except that we dedicate ourselves to God: *μόνῃ γὰρ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ σωτηρίᾳ ὁ θεὸς ἥδεται*, "for God delights in our salvation alone."

[3] *Exhortation to the Gentiles*, § X, pp. 75–76.

[1] Isa. LIV. 17; compare LV. 1.

[2] By the appellation *φωτισμός*, "illumination," the Fathers everywhere signify baptism and the grace conferred upon the baptized, instructed, unless I am mistaken, by Paul's words in Heb. VI. 4: *ἀδύνατον γὰρ τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας, γευσαμένους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου, καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου*, etc.

For [3] *φιλάνθρωπος ὁ Παιδαγωγός*, the Pedagogue [4] loves men:

> In all things the Lord benefits and in all things assists, *καὶ ὡς ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ὡς θεός*, both as man and as God: forgiving sins as God, but, that we may not sin, instructing after the manner of a Pedagogue as man. *Εἰκότως ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῷ θεῷ, ἐπεὶ καὶ πλάσμα αὐτοῦ ἐστι· καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα κελεύων μόνον πεποίηκεν, τὸν δὲ ἄνθρωπον δι' αὐτοῦ ἐχειρούργησεν, καὶ αὐτῷ ἴδιον ἐνεφύσησεν.* Rightly, therefore, is man dear to God, since man is his formation; and other things indeed he made by command alone, but man he fashioned by his own hand and breathed into him something proper to himself.

From this singular excellence of man, he first gathers that man is on his own account *αἱρετὸν τῷ θεῷ*, to be chosen by God; then he infers [5]:

> Therefore, the man whom God made, *δι' αὐτὸν αἱρετόν ἐστιν*, is a thing to be chosen for its own sake [6]. But a thing which is to be chosen for its own sake is joined to him by whom it is to be chosen for its own sake. Moreover, that thing is to be desired and loved. But it cannot come about that something should be lovable and yet not be loved by him: *φιλεῖται ἄρα*
> *πρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἄνθρωπος*, therefore man is loved by God. For how can he not be loved for whom the Only-begotten is sent down from the bosom of the Father? … The Lord himself openly confesses it and says [1]: "For the Father himself loveth you, because you have loved me"; and again [2]: "And thou hast loved them as thou hast loved me."

LXXIII.

Hence, *πρὸς τοὺς ἡγουμένους μὴ εἶναι ἀγαθὸν τὸ δίκαιον*, against those who think that what is just is not good, he writes [3]:

---

[3] *Pedagogue*, book I, chap. III, p. 101.

[4] By the name Pedagogue Clement signifies the leader, the heavenly and divine Word, insofar as he applies himself to caring for and healing men. He himself presents this explanation of the name at the beginning of the work, chap. I, p. 98.

[5] *Pedagogue*, book I, chap. III, p. 102.

[6] By these words the heresy of the supralapsarians is utterly overthrown, for whom man is not a thing to be chosen for its own sake, but such a thing as God at his discretion either eternally punishes or eternally blesses.

[1] John XVI. 27.

[2] John XVII. 23.

[3] *Pedagogue*, book I, chap. VIII, pp. 135–136.

Here some [4] arise who say, *οὐκ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι τὸν Κύριον διὰ τὴν ῥάβδον, καὶ τὴν ἀπειλήν, καὶ τὸν φόβον*, that the Lord is not good on account of the rod and the threats and the fear struck into men; and therefore they also wrongly understand the Scripture, which reads thus [5]: "He who fears the Lord will be converted to his heart"; and they especially forget *αὐτοῦ τῆς φιλανθρωπίας*, his benignity, by which he was made man for our sake. But the Prophet entreats him more familiarly [6] in these words: "Remember us, for we are dust"; that is, have mercy on us, because thou thyself, having suffered it, hast experienced the weakness of the flesh. Therefore, for this reason, *ἄριστος καὶ ἀνεπίληπτός ἐστιν ὁ παιδαγωγὸς ὁ Κύριος, τῇ ἑκάστου τῶν ἀνθρώπων δι' ὑπερβολὴν φιλανθρωπίας συμπαθήσας φύσει*, the Pedagogue, who is also the Lord, is most excellent and subject to no reproach, since on account of his eminent benignity he sympathizes with the nature of each man. For there is nothing [7] which the Lord hates;

for he cannot hate anything and will that what he hates should exist. Nor indeed does he at once will that something should not exist and cause that to exist which he wills should not exist. But [1] neither does he will that something should not exist while it nevertheless exists. Therefore, if the Word hates anything, he wills it not to exist. But there is nothing to which God does not furnish the cause that it should exist. Therefore God hates nothing; nor does the Word: *ἓν γὰρ ἄμφω, ὁ θεός*, for both are one, namely God. But if he hates none of the things which were made by him, *λείπεται φιλεῖν αὐτό*, it remains that he loves it. Yet far more than the rest he loves man, *τὸ κάλλιστον τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δημιουργηθέντων, καὶ φιλόθεον ζῷον*, the most beautiful living being among those which were made by him, and endowed with love of God. *Φιλάνθρωπος ἄρα ὁ θεός· φιλάνθρωπος ἄρα ὁ λόγος.* Therefore God is a lover of men, and the

[4] These were the disciples of Marcion who, according to the testimony of Origen, *Commentary on Exodus*, vol. I, p. 17, asserting another God *παρὰ τὸν δημιουργόν*, besides the Maker of the world, taught that the latter was *δίκαιον*, just, *καὶ οὐκ ἀγαθόν*, but not good; foolishly indeed and impiously, since they separated justice from goodness and goodness from justice. See similar things in Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, book I, chap. VI.

[5] Ecclesiasticus XXI. 6.

[6] Ps. CII. 14.

[7] Wis. XI. 25.

[1] Ignatius in the Epistle to the Magnesians, chap. X, and Clement himself, *Stromata* VII, p. 740, have things twin to these; the latter says: "We say that God is opposed to no one and is the enemy of no one. *Πάντων γὰρ κτίστης, καὶ οὐδέν ἐστι τῶν ὑποστάντων, ὃ μὴ θέλει.* For he is the Creator of all, and there is nothing among the things which subsist which he does not will."

> Word is a lover of men. But he who loves something, *ὠφελεῖν αὐτὸ βούλεται*, wills to benefit it. And that which benefits will certainly be more excellent than that which does not benefit. But nothing is more excellent than good. Therefore that which is good benefits; *ἀγαθὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς ὁμολογεῖται· ὠφελεῖ ἄρα ὁ θεός*. But it is agreed [2] that God is good; therefore God benefits.
>
> But good, insofar as [3] it is good, does nothing other than benefit. Therefore God benefits in all things. Nor indeed does he benefit man in some respect while he does not take care of him. Nor does he take care of him while he is not solicitous for him. For that which benefits *κατὰ γνώμην*, of its own accord, is more excellent than that which does not benefit of its own accord. But nothing is more excellent than God; *καὶ οὐκ ἄλλο τί ἐστι τὸ κατὰ γνώμην ὠφελεῖν, εἰ μὴ ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· κήδεται ἄρα καὶ ἐπιμελεῖται τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁ θεός*. Nor is benefiting of one's own accord anything other than being solicitous for man; therefore God takes care of man and is solicitous for him. But he shows this *ἔργῳ*, by the deed itself, *παιδαγωγῶν αὐτὸν λόγῳ, ὅς ἐστι τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίας συναγωνιστὴς γνήσιος*, when he instructs him by the Word, who is the genuine coadjutor of the divine benevolence toward men.

But meeting those [1] who asked, *πῶς οὖν εἰ φιλάνθρωπός ἐστι καὶ ἀγαθὸς ὁ Κύριος, ὀργίζεται καὶ κολάζει;*, "How, therefore, if the Lord loves men and is good, is he angry and punishes?" after interposing many things [2], he responds: that punishments inflicted upon men while they live tend *εἰς σωτηρίαν καὶ αἴδιον ὑγείαν*, toward salvation and eternal health; that God proceeds against us not *διὰ μῖσος*, from hatred, but from love, since, although he could have destroyed us because of our own crimes, *ὁ δὲ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν καὶ πέπονθεν*, he himself even suffered for us; in sum, that when he threatens, he openly shows that he wills to do nothing evil and does not will to execute those things which he threatens, but that by striking fear he wills to repress the impulse toward sins, to manifest his benevolence toward men, and by the very delay to demonstrate what they will suffer if they remain in sin.

---

[2] Matt. XIX. 17.

[3] These words were expressed according to the tenets of the Stoics, who, according to Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Mathematicians*, book X, p. 442, defined good in this manner: *ἀγαθόν ἐστιν ὠφέλεια, ἢ οὐχ ἕτερον ὠφελείας*, "good is utility, or something not diverse from utility." Similar descriptions of good occur in the same author's *Outlines*, book III, chap. XX, and in Diogenes Laertius, book VII, section XCIV.

[1] *Pedagogue*, book I, chap. VIII, p. 136.

[2] Ibid., pp. 137–138.

LXXIV.

Nor does Origen, the disciple of Clement, speak otherwise. He explains the words [3] of the Psalm, "How good is the God of Israel to those who are right of heart," by this scholion [4]:

> *Εἰς τὸ ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ πᾶσιν ἀγαθός ἐστιν ὁ θεός· σωτὴρ γάρ ἐστι πάντων ἀνθρώπων, μάλιστα πιστῶν.* So far as lies in himself, God is good to all; for he is the Savior [5] of all men, especially of the faithful.

But because he is such, therefore [6],

> *ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀγαθοποιίαν προχειρότερός ἐστιν, εἰς δὲ τὸ κολάσαι τοὺς ἀξίους κολάσεως μελλητής*, God is prompt to do good, but slow to punish those who are worthy of punishment. For although he could in silence, without attestation beforehand, punish those whom he had once judged worthy of punishment, he never does this; but even if he has condemned, he says what it is always his purpose to say, so that those who had been condemned through transgression may be liberated from condemnation through penance.

After confirming this economy of God, distinguished by goodness, by several examples from the Scriptures [1], he adds [2]:

> God had condemned Jerusalem on account of the sins which it had committed, and this was the final sentence: that it should be left to captivity. Nevertheless, since he is a lover of men and wills no one to perish, before the time of devastation drew near he also sent this [3] Prophet so that through his discourses it might be converted to penance; he sent the same man under the second king and also sent him under the third. Why say more? Captivity was now imminent, and God was still exhorting, granting—so to speak—even one day beforehand a place for penance. Whence it is written that Jeremiah prophesied until the captivity of Jerusalem and until the fifth month. The bonds of the enemies had now constrained their hands, and nevertheless God was in a manner saying these things: *αἰχμάλωτοι γέγονατε, κἂν οὕτω μετανοήσατε*; behold, you have been made captives; even though late, do penance. Ask me, and I shall

[3] Ps. LXXII. 1.
[4] On Ps. LXXII. 1, p. 762, Works, vol. II, Paris edition, 1733.
[5] I Tim. IV. 10.
[6] On Jeremiah, Homily I, no. 1, p. 123, Works, vol. III.
[1] Jonah III. 4; Gen. XIX. 12.
[2] Ibid., no. 3, p. 126.
[3] Namely Jeremiah, of whom he speaks.

spare you; I who handed you over am able to rescue you from captivity.

From these things he infers [4]:

See how great an evil it is to sin, so that the souls of those who are abandoned by God are handed over to Satan, who takes them captive. But God does not abandon those whom he deserts without cause or judgment. For when he has sent rain upon the vineyard, and the vineyard has brought forth thorns instead of grapes, what will he do except command the clouds that they rain no shower upon it?

LXXV.

When he does this, he does it under provocation, not spontaneously; for Didymus [1] admonishes:

Ἡ κτίσις οὐ γέγραπται φιλάνθρωπος· ἴδιον γὰρ τοῦτο κυρίως μόνης τῆς ὁμοουσίου τριάδος. A creature is not called a lover of men in the Scriptures; for this properly, and in the strict sense, belongs to the one consubstantial Trinity alone. For the Father is a lover of men who [2] is not angry with us unto the end, nor remains angry forever, nor repays us according to our iniquities, according to Psalm CII; and according to [3] Solomon, who [4] says: "But thou sparest all, because all things are thine, *δέσποτα φιλόψυχε*, O Lord, lover of souls." So much so that he is also called our Lord and Father for this reason: that his paternal care and solicitude are tempered with force and power. *Τῷ θεῷ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν προσρήσεως οἰκειοτέρα τῆς πατρὸς καὶ φιλανθρώπου καὶ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ ἁγίου.* For there is no denomination more proper to God than the denomination [5] of Father, and lover of men, and good, and holy.

The Son is a lover of men, who, for our sake—we who are the works of his august and mystical hands—emptied himself [6], taking the form of a servant. The

[4] Ibid., no. 4, p. 126.

[1] *On the Trinity*, book II, chap. VI, pp. 163–166, Bologna edition, 1769.

[2] Ps. CII. 9–10.

[3] Not only here, but also in the book *On the Holy Spirit*, no. 54, Didymus attributes the Book of Wisdom to Solomon.

[4] Wis. XI. 27.

[5] In book II, chap. VI, § II, p. 149, he writes: "Therefore we rightly call God also the Father of all, *οὐκ ὄντα ἡμῶν φύσει πατέρα ὡς ἐστὶν τοῦ μονογενοῦς αὐτοῦ*, although he is not our Father by nature as he is the Father of his Only-begotten." Certainly, he is called "Father of all" in Eph. IV. 6; and Clement of Alexandria shows in the fifth book of the *Stromata*, by testimonies from Plato and the comic poet Diphilus, that he was distinguished by the same title even among the Gentiles.

[6] Phil. II. 7.

Apostle testifies to this, writing to Titus [7] in these words: *ὅτε δὲ ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ ἐπεφάνη*, "But when the goodness and love toward men of God our Savior appeared."

The Holy Spirit of God is a lover of men, according to Wisdom,

which reads thus [1]: *φιλάνθρωπον γὰρ πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ οὐκ ἀθωώσει* [2] *δίκαιον*, "For the Spirit of wisdom is a lover of men and will not liberate the just." For he did not neglect lost human nature, but came through himself, directing us in the way, teaching all truth, renewing us, and lavishly bestowing divine gifts upon us; and from the heavenly seats he assumed so great a care of him who was made according to the image of God that he also has this denomination, *ὥστε εἰς γνώρισμα τῆς ὑπερφυοῦς αὐτοῦ ἀγαθότητος*, as a token of his supernatural goodness. For the great elements are heaven, earth, and sea; great also is the rational creature of the angels and of every supermundane Power; but the Trinity willed to take a name from none of these creatures [3], while, on the contrary, from that goodness by which it pursues man, it is called *φιλάνθρωπος*.

Wherefore, weighing [4] Thomas's words, *ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου*, "My Lord and my God," he says [5]:

> *Ἠπίστατο γὰρ ὡς μόνης τῆς αὐτοκρατορικῆς ἀπειροδυνάμου καὶ ἀγαθωτάτης φύσεως ἦν· οὐ μὴν δὲ κτιστῆς τὸ μόνον οὐχ ὑπὲρ ἰδίων κτισμάτων παθεῖν· ἀλλὰ καὶ καθολικὴν ἣν φαμεν καὶ γενικὴν σωτηρίαν καὶ ταύτην αἰωνίως δωρήσασθαι.* For he knew that it was proper to a nature alone which possesses sovereign authority of itself, infinite power, and supreme goodness, and not to one which was created, not only to suffer for its creatures, but also to bestow the salvation which we call universal and general, and that eternally.

Filled with this thought of the divine and infinite goodness, he concludes the second book [7] with this prayer [6]:

> Through thee, who hast nothing which opposes itself to thee when thou dost determine to have mercy even upon us who are sinners, *ἀγαθωτάτη καὶ παναλκεστάτη τριάς, ἀφ' ἧς καὶ παρ' ἧς πᾶν ἀγαθὸν καὶ εἰς ἣν πάντων πᾶσα πάντοτε ἐλπὶς καὶ μεθ' ἣν παντελῶς οὐδέν*, O

[7] Titus III. 4.

[1] Wis. I. 6.

[2] The Greek edition has *βλάσφημον* in place of *δίκαιον*, as Didymus also reads elsewhere.

[3] As, for example, that it should be called *φιλάγγελος*, lover of angels, as it is called *φιλόψυχος καὶ φιλάνθρωπος*, lover of souls and of men.

[4] John XX. 28.

[5] *On the Trinity*, book I, chap. XXVII, p. 85.

[7] *On the Trinity*, book II, chap. XXVII, pp. 306–307.

[6] Clement of Alexandria likewise concludes the *Pedagogue* with a prayer, Hilary the first book *On the Trinity*, and Augustine the work of the same title.

> most good and omnipotent Trinity, from whom and through whom is every good, in whom every hope of all is always placed, and after whom there is nothing whatever; may we now be liberated from our sins … and when [1] thou prevailest in judging the hidden things of men; and from those who are troublesome to us in the world, and from the demon who always envies the good … and from Antichrist, the hater of what is honorable, whose time, full of grievous conflict, as events indicate, has already drawn near [2]; so that no one of those who now exist and no one of those who will then be found may perish. Thus may every evil be far removed, and may both common and private affairs be directed excellently and quietly, *κατὰ τὸ σὸν ἄφθονον καὶ φιλόψυχον θέλημα*, according to thy bountiful will and the love by which thou embracest souls; and so may all be able … vigilantly to remember thee, to make the beginning and end of every matter from thee, to bestow upon those in need according to their powers, *καὶ παρὰ σοῦ τὸ δάνειον εἰς τὸ μέλλον ἐκδέχεσθαι καὶ ἐπίμετρον ζωὴν αἰώνιον*, and to receive the loan from thee hereafter and, as an increment, to receive eternal life.

LXXVI.

For God in his goodness always looks toward this end; and although that man more than once becomes such that "as though he had dead ears he receives no advantage from admonition," as Dionysius of Alexandria writes [3], *οὐκ ἐπειδὴ μὴ δύναται, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ μὴ βούλεται*, "not because he cannot, but because he does not will," Christ nevertheless, as appeared in Judas, although he foreknew all these things,

οὐ διέλιπεν ἐξ ἀρχῆς μέχρι τέλους τὰ παρ' ἑαυτοῦ πάντα ἐπιδεικνύμενος, "did not omit from beginning to end to exhibit all things which were from himself."

For, says Athanasius [1],

> God is good, *μᾶλλον δὲ πηγὴ τῆς ἀγαθότητος ὑπάρχει· ἀγαθῷ δὲ περὶ οὐδενὸς ἂν γένοιτο φθόνος*, or rather he is the very fountain of goodness; but one who is good envies no one. Wherefore, begrudging nothing its existence, he made all things from nothing through his

[1] Ps. L.

[2] So disturbed were all things that many in the same century as Didymus suspected the advent of Antichrist to be near: Basil, Epistle CXXXIX, no. 2, to the Alexandrians; Hilary, Works, vol. II, p. 593, Verona edition; and Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechesis XV, no. 18.

[3] *On Martyrdom*, chap. XI, p. 43, Rome edition, 1796.

[1] *On the Incarnation of the Word of God*, no. 3, pp. 49–50, Works, vol. I, Paris edition, 1698.

> proper Word…. And among these, since he had pity on the human race above all the other things which exist upon earth and perceived that from the condition of their own nature they were not sufficient unto themselves to remain forever, he gave them something more. Nor did he create men simply, as he did the other living things, but made them according to his image and rendered them participants in the power of his proper Word, *ἵνα ὥσπερ σκιάς τινας ἔχοντες τοῦ λόγου, καὶ γενόμενοι λογικοί, διαμένειν ἐν μακαριότητι δυνηθῶσι, ζῶντες τὸν ἀληθινὸν καὶ ὄντως τῶν ἁγίων ἐν παραδείσῳ βίον*, so that, having as it were certain shadows of the Word and having been made rational, they might be able to persevere in beatitude and to live in paradise the true life, truly the life of the saints.

After commemorating the other benefits with which the outpoured goodness of God heaped up our first parents and indicating their transgression, he proceeds [2]:

> Because our discourse concerns the advent of our Savior unto us, it was necessary also to speak concerning the beginnings of men, *ἵνα γινώσκῃς ὅτι ἡ ἡμῶν αἰτία ἐκείνῳ γέγονε πρόφασις τῆς καθόδου, καὶ ἡ ἡμῶν παράβασις τοῦ λόγου τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν ἐξεκαλέσατο, ὥστε καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσαι καὶ φανῆναι τὸν κύριον ἐν ἀνθρώποις*, so that thou mayest know that our cause was the occasion of his descent, and that by our sin the benignity of the Word was called forth, so that he came unto us and the Lord appeared among men. For we are the cause why he assumed a body, *καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν ἐφιλανθρωπεύσατο καὶ ἐν ἀνθρωπίνῳ γενέσθαι καὶ φανῆναι σώματι*, and for our salvation he most benignly willed to be born and to appear in a human body.

Struck by this singular and altogether divine charity, he exclaims [1]:

> *Θαύμαζε τὴν τοῦ λόγου φιλανθρωπίαν, ὅτι δι' ἡμᾶς ἀτιμάζεται, ἵνα ἡμεῖς ἔντιμοι γενώμεθα.* Admire the love of the Word toward men: he is afflicted with ignominy for our sake, that he might procure glory for us.

LXXVII.

For God cannot put off his own nature, by which, as Macarius surnamed the Great [2] notes, *χρηστὸς καὶ φιλάνθρωπος*, he is benign and a lover of men, and

[2] Ibid., no. 4, p. 50.

[1] Ibid., no. 34, p. 76.

[2] *On the Elevation of the Mind*, § X, p. 192, in Galland, vol. VII.

with great patience awaits the repentance of each of those who sin, appointing the conversion of the one who repents as a heavenly feast.

> "For there is joy," he himself says [3], "in heaven over one sinner doing penance." But if anyone, observing this goodness and long-suffering of God, by which he restrains himself from immediately avenging each crime, awaiting repentance as we have said, should neglect the precept and—an unspeakable thing!—turn the goodness of God into an occasion of contempt, accumulating sins upon sins … that man surely fills the limits of sins and thereafter is found in such a fall from which it no longer falls to him to be restored to integrity, since he leans as though upon limbs crushed by the ruin, *καὶ τῷ πονηρῷ εἰς τέλος συγχωρηθείς, ἀπόλλυται*, and, yielding himself to the evil one unto the end, perishes.

He illustrates this both from elsewhere and from those things

> which happened to the Egyptians, who had impiously dared many things against God and committed many injuries against his people. The good Lord indeed long deferred the final destruction, inviting them by chastisement after chastisement to return to wisdom; but when they made no end of repeatedly resuming their iniquity, at last, while they pursued the people of the Lord, duly dismissed, and attempted to drag them back, the divine wrath smote them with utter destruction. Likewise, after the Lord had long tolerated with his customary long-suffering the Israelites, who committed many transgressions and were even guilty of the slaughter of the prophets of God, when he saw at last
>
> that they had advanced to such monstrous madness that, not reverencing the divine majesty in the Son of God sent to them, they laid bloody hands upon him, he cast them away, irreversibly condemned for all time, and cast them down; prophecy, priesthood, and religion being taken from them, which he entrusted to the nations believing in him.

Since such is the divine clemency toward men [1], Macarius adds:

> Let us run eagerly to Christ who calls us, pouring out our hearts before him, and let us not despair of our salvation. For this too is a sophism of the devil: by the recollection of previous transgressions to induce despair. But we must think thus: if the Lord, when he came into this world, was the physician and restorer to integrity of the blind, the paralytic, and the deaf; if he raised the dead who

[3] Luke XV. 10.

[1] Ibid., § XI, p. 193.

were already corrupt, how much more will he cure the blindness of the mind, the sluggishness of the soul, and the deafness of an unheeding heart? *ἐπεὶ μηδὲ ἕτερος, ἀλλ᾽ αὐτὸς ὁ τὸ σῶμα κτίσας, αὐτός ἐστι καὶ ὁ τὴν ψυχήν*, since, just as no other than he is the Creator of the body, so he himself also fashioned the soul. And if he was so benignly and clemently disposed toward flowing and mortal things, *πόσῳ μᾶλλον τῇ ἀθανάτῳ ψυχῇ κακίας νόσῳ καὶ ἀγνοίας ἁλούσῃ, ἔπειτα προσερχομένῃ τούτῳ, καὶ δεομένῃ, φιλανθρώπως θεραπευτικῶς χρήσεται;*, how much more will he benignly apply a cure to the immortal soul laboring under the disease of iniquity and ignorance, and then approaching him and praying? For this [2] is his word: "Will not my heavenly Father execute vengeance for those crying to him day and night? I say to you that he will speedily execute vengeance for them." And this [3] too is his word: "Ask, and it shall be given to you." And again [4]: "If, because he is his friend, he will not give, nevertheless because of his importunity he will arise and give him as much as he needs." By these words he exhorts us to a certain pious shamelessness in petition and to an importunate and troublesome insistence. Truly, he himself came for sinners, that he might convert them unto himself:
μόνον ἡμεῖς τῶν κακῶν προλήψεων ἀποστάντες, σχολάσωμεν τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ αὐτὸς οὐχ ὑπερορᾷ, ἀλλ᾽ ἕτοιμος ἔσται, παρέχων τὴν παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ βοήθειαν. Only let us, departing from false preoccupations, devote ourselves to the Lord, and he does not overlook us but will be ready, furnishing the aid which we need from him.

For God [1] and his angels, *ψυχὰς τὰς μὴ τροφῇ τῇ ἐπουρανίῳ χρήσασθαι δυναμένας, διὰ πολλῆς λύπης καὶ θρήνων ποιοῦνται*, pursue with great grief and lamentations souls which are no longer able to be nourished with heavenly food.

LXXVIII.

Nor indeed is this remarkable, since God is by his nature, as Paphnutius [2] speaks, *περὶ πάντων εὔσπλαγχνος*, most benign toward all, and, as Isidore of Pelusium [3] writes, altogether *φιλάνθρωπος*, a lover of men. For, on the authority of Synesius

[2] Luke XVIII. 7–8.
[3] Matt. VII. 7.
[4] Luke XI. 8.
[1] Ibid., § XII, p. 193.
[2] In the *Life of Saint Onuphrius*, § XI, p. 126, in Galland, vol. XIV.
[3] Epistles, book III, epistle LXXI, p. 283, Paris edition, 1648.

[4], *φύσις, ὡς εἰπεῖν, αὕτη θεοῦ, τὸ ἀγαθοποιεῖν· ὡς τοῦ πυρὸς τὸ θερμαίνειν, καὶ τοῦ φωτὸς τὸ φωτίζειν*, this, so to speak, is the nature of God: to do good, just as it is the nature of fire to heat and of light to shine.

For, says Cyril [5],

> Since the Maker of all is good, *πάντας ἐθέλει σωθῆναι καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν*, he wills all to be saved and to come unto the recognition of the truth. Hence, therefore, he frequently admonished through the holy Prophets the Israelites, but especially the inhabitants of Jerusalem who migrated to Samaria. But they turned without restraint to that which pleased them and, having abandoned him who is God by nature and in truth, worshiped demons and offered adoration to lifeless idols. But when they labored under such great ignorance that they refused to return to wisdom, *λοιπὸν ἐκολάζετο θεός*, at last God punished.

For he does not put his hand to the rod and to punishments unless compelled; whence, after reporting the words of the Jews in Isaiah,

"Where is the multitude of thy mercy and of thy compassions, for thou hast endured us? For thou art our Father, because Abraham knew us not, and Israel did not recognize us," he explains these words more copiously thus [1]:

> Therefore, endure us, even if we have offended many times. For thou art our Father…. They do not deny the fathers, for this contributes little toward returning to wisdom; they were not cast out because of them. *Ἀπονέμουσι δὲ μᾶλλον τῷ φιλαγάθῳ θεῷ πλεονεκτεῖν εἰς φιλοστοργίαν, καὶ τοὺς κατὰ σάρκα πατέρας*, but they attribute rather to God, the lover of good, that in affection and indulgence he surpasses even carnal fathers. *Πατὴρ γάρ ἐστι* [2] *πατέρων*, for he is the Father of fathers. We were indeed born, they say, of those men, but they did not see us. *Σύ γε μὴν οὐ διαλέλοιπας τὴν πατρὶ τῷ φιλοπαίδι πρέπουσαν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀποσώζων καὶ φειδὼ καὶ ἀγάπην.* But thou hast not ceased to preserve toward us the mercy and love worthy of a father and lover of children.

Cyril furnishes this no less excellent reason for the distinction, and one worthy of the Supreme Deity [3]:

---

[4] Epistle LVII, p. 192, Paris edition, 1633.

[5] *Commentary on Isaiah*, book II, tome III, p. 266, Works, vol. II, Paris edition, 1638.

[1] *Commentary on Isaiah*, book V, tome V, p. 884, Works, vol. II.

[2] This is the genuine reading, not the other common one, *πατὴρ πνευμάτων*, "Father of spirits," which both departs from the sequence of the discourse and without doubt crept into the text from the passage of Paul in Heb. XII. 9.

[3] *Commentary on Hosea*, chap. VII, § LXX, p. 105, and chap. XI, § CXXXII, p. 166, Works, vol. III.

> *Φύσει μὲν ἀγαθὸς ὢν, καὶ φιλοικτίρμων ὁ θεός, καὶ ἀνεθέλητον ἔχει τὸ πλήττειν ὅλως τινάς· καλεῖται δὲ καὶ ἀναγκαίως εἰς ἀγανάκτησιν ἐπιστρεπτικήν, ὅταν ἐστί τινων πέρα λόγου τε καὶ μέτρου τὰ ἐγκλήματα.* God, being good and merciful by nature and alien from inflicting any blows, is nevertheless provoked and compelled to turn to correcting indignation when the crimes of certain men have been greater than can be expressed and beyond measure.

LXXIX.

Therefore, a twofold disposition and a twofold relation between God and the human race must be distinguished: the disposition and relation of love, benignity, and mercy, according to which God is and is called *φιλόστοργος*,

φιλάνθρωπος, φιλόψυχος, πατήρ, ὄντως πατήρ, καὶ πατὴρ πατέρων, inclined toward affection, a lover of men and of souls, Father, truly Father, and Father of fathers; and then the disposition and relation of severity, justice, and punishment, according to which God is and is judged the supreme Legislator and the omnipotent guardian and avenger of the order instituted.

But what is the origin of each disposition, and what is their mutual relation? The origin of the former is again twofold: one subjective and inherent in God, and the other objective and following human nature itself of itself. But of the latter there is one sole fountain, flowing from nowhere other than the vice of men.

And in truth, let it be asked of the Alexandrian doctors why God is *φιλάνθρωπος, φιλόψυχος*, and the Parent of men. They unanimously [1] reply that this is the first cause of such a relation: that God *φύσει*, by nature, is *χρηστός, φιλάγαθος, φιλοικτίρμων, ἀγαθός, πηγὴ τῆς ἀγαθότητος καὶ περὶ πάντων εὔσπλαγχνος*, benevolent, a lover of good, merciful, good, the fountain of goodness, and one who has mercy upon all; and that he is so inclined of himself toward doing good that *ἀναλόγως*, by analogy, he is not unjustly compared either with fire, which heats spontaneously, or with light, which spontaneously illuminates by diffused rays.

Then they unanimously add that the second cause of the same relation is drawn from this: that man *φύσει*, by nature, is *τοῦ θεοῦ πλάσμα*, a formation of God, having in himself something *θεῷ ἴδιον*, proper to God, the image of God himself, *τὸ κάλλιστον* among creatures subject to the senses, the most beautiful work, *φιλόθεον ζῷον*, a living being that loves God, and therefore *δι' αὐτὸν αἱρετός*, worthy to be chosen for his own sake and, once chosen, to be loved. But noth-

[1] §§ LXXII ff.

ing is more evident from these things than that the Alexandrian doctors assign a twofold cause, both subjective and objective, of that relation which we first mentioned and which pertains to this: that a commerce of love and benignity is judged to exist between God and men.

But, on the contrary, they all assign one sole fountain of the latter relation, and that a human one, drawn from the malice and sins of men. For with them it is indubitable doctrine that God

does not proceed to punishments spontaneously, but *ἀναγκαίως*, compelled by necessity; that he is not angry with men before he has anticipated them with his mercy; and that he does not descend to the supreme sentence of condemnation before they have adhered to sins even unto the end. Indeed, with them it is indubitable doctrine that even the punishments inflicted from heaven upon men while they pass their mortal life are effects not of hatred but of love, by which God leaves nothing untried in order to break their pertinacious will and bring them to penance and salvation. To this surely tend all the testimonies of the Alexandrian writers which we have reported, by which that also is therefore effected which we contend: that there is one sole cause, and the same drawn from sinful men, from which the disposition of severity, justice, and condemnation arises between God and men.

From these things it is easy to understand what the mutual relation of the two relations is and in what order they succeed one another. For it is evident that the disposition of love precedes in origin and efficiency, but that the disposition of justice and punishment follows in a second degree, as it were. This the Alexandrians confirm partly *δυνάμει*, virtually, and partly *ῥητῶς*, in explicit words.

And first they confirm it virtually, when they hand down that the disposition of mercy and love is native and derive it from the very nature of God and of men. For that which is native and absolute also goes before and therefore precedes those things which come extrinsically and depend upon a free condition.

They then confirm it in open words, since they testify that the order of justice and the relation of punishment are effects which proceed from the neglected disposition of mercy and the spurned order of love. Therefore, of the twofold relation—of mercy and justice, of love and wrath, of reward and punishment—the former precedes, the latter follows; the former obtains the principal place, the latter the second; the former flows spontaneously from the natures of things, the latter is introduced by the faults of men.

Now the former relation differs from the antecedent will only in name, just as the latter relation is separated from the consequent will only in name. Therefore, in new formulas and by other witnesses, we have confirmed that division of the divine will into antecedent and consequent which

we expounded at the beginning [1] and afterward illustrated at greater length.

LXXX.

But so that it may be more fully established that these things correspond to one another exactly, not only in appearance but also in the reality itself, it remains to investigate whether the Alexandrians attributed to the relation of mercy and love those endowments which, by the unanimous suffrage of others, we proved to be proper to the antecedent will. But it is not lawful to doubt this agreement of judgments. For what are enumerated as the principal properties and marks of the antecedent will? Namely, that it is and is believed to be efficacious and active; and then that it is and is believed to be universal and extending to all those who are comprehended under the appellation of the human race. But there is none of these ornaments which the Alexandrians do not attribute to divine love and mercy; none which they do not teach to be proper to the commerce of mercy and love between God and men.

For these are the men who, in the testimonies adduced [2], unanimously profess: a) that love which does not benefit is empty; b) that God manifests his benevolence toward men *ἔργῳ*, by the deed itself; c) that he is always at hand for them, inwardly and outwardly exhorting, admonishing, and chastising; d) that he omits no care for their salvation; e) that for this reason he sent his Only-begotten, forgives sins, and furnishes aid; and f) that he furnishes aid not to these or those alone, but altogether to all, so far as lies in himself; since g), so far as lies in himself, he wills all men to be saved; h) he wills no one to perish, no one to fall away from the hope of obtaining salvation; whence i) he exhibits *σωτηρίαν καθολικὴν καὶ γενικήν*, universal and general salvation; and k) he abandons and condemns only those by whom he himself is first abandoned and who persevere in fault even unto the end.

But what is signified by these things, what is shown? I believe that neither efficacy

nor universal amplitude is lacking to divine love toward men and to divine mercy. I now proceed to confirm this in order by other testimonies of the same men, from which it will be evident, II., that the Alexandrian doctors held this judgment: that an incredible abundance of effects redounds from the commerce of love and mercy unto the whole human race.

[1] §§ III ff.
[2] §§ LXXII ff.

LXXXI.

Indeed, after hearing the words of Palladius, "At times, driven by want of heavenly goods, we fall into base and execrable actions," Cyril [1] immediately replies, *οὕτω φημί*, "Thus I judge." But when the other remarks that it befits the divine benignity not to permit us to fall into anything of this kind, he adds:

> It does befit God, and indeed especially, and he also wills it, Palladius: *εἴη γὰρ ἂν ἥκιστα μὲν ἀγαθός, φιλάρετος δὲ οὐ λίαν, εἰ μὴ τοῦτον ἔχοι πρὸς ἡμῶν τὸν σκοπόν*; otherwise he would be by no means good, nor indeed a lover of virtue, unless he had this disposition toward us. But that these things happen to us is our fault, who move the Lord of all to anger.

In the same way [2], those moved him to anger

> who, having been called to the wedding, answered the holy inviters negligently and remissly and through sloth were made exiles from intercourse with Christ, although honor had been offered to them by the benign and clement will of God and the Father.

For the most excellent [3] and greatest God of all

> wills all men to be saved and to come to the recognition of the truth. Hence, admonishing those who were weak and recalling those who had made their soul of no account to the right and level path, he applies every way and every discourse. For now, shaking them by threats of punishment and terrors of wrath, he leads them back to what is better; but now he entices them by promises of good things and draws them to what is useful.

He therefore employs these arts [4]

> because it is the purpose of the God who knows all things always to apply to our souls the medicine most congruent and most conducive. *Ἰατρὸς γάρ ἐστι πνευμάτων, ποτὲ μὲν τοῖς πόνοις, ποτὲ δὲ αὐτοῖς ἐξ ἡμερότητος ἀγαθοῖς τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν παθῶν κατευνάζων τὴν ἀγριότητα.* For he is the physician of spirits, sometimes lulling the savageness of the evil affections within us by labors and afflictions, and sometimes by good things offered from meekness.

And, fulfilling this office of physician, Athanasius says [1], he therefore endured the death of the cross because no other would have been conducive to us:

---

[1] *On Adoration in Spirit and Truth*, book I, p. 14, Works, vol. I.
[2] Ibid., book IV, p. 113.
[3] *Commentary on Isaiah*, book III, tome II, p. 399, Works, vol. II.
[4] *Commentary on Jonah*, chap. IV, p. 386, Works, vol. II.
[1] *On the Incarnation of the Word of God*, no. 25, p. 68, Works, vol. I.

For if he came for this reason, that he might bear the curse into which we had fallen, how otherwise would he have been made a curse unless he had undertaken the death of the curse? But that is the cross, for it is written [2]: "Cursed is he who hangs upon the tree." Then, *εἰ ὁ θάνατος τοῦ κυρίου λύτρον ἐστὶ πάντων*, if the death of the Lord is the price of all, and by his death the middle wall of enclosure is dissolved, *καὶ γίνεται τῶν ἐθνῶν ἡ κλῆσις*, and the calling of the nations is accomplished, how would he have called us together unless he had been crucified? For only on the cross can one die with hands extended. Wherefore it was fitting that the Lord should suffer this kind of death and extend his hands, that with one he might draw the ancient people and with the other the nations, and unite both in himself. For he himself also said this [3], *σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ ἔμελλε λυτροῦσθαι τοὺς πάντας*, signifying by what death he was to redeem all: "When I shall have been lifted up, I shall draw all (*πάντας*) to myself."

And he certainly draws all [4]:

Ἀνθ' ἡλίου γὰρ θεὸς ἀνατέλλει, καταυγάζων τῇ ἑκάστου ψυχῇ, for God arises in the manner of the sun, illuminating the soul of each.

And he illuminates abundantly [5]:

For Jesus scatters the seed *δαψιλῶς*, lavishly, but the abundance of the fruits exists according to the condition of the soil. For where the earth is stony, the seed easily dries up, *οὐκ ἀδυναμίᾳ τοῦ σπόρου, ἀλλὰ τῇ καχεξίᾳ τῆς γῆς*, not indeed by the impotence of the seed, but by the vice of the earth…. *Μονοειδὴς μὲν ὁ σπόρος, διάφορος δὲ ὁ καρπός· διάφοροι δὲ αἱ γνῶμαι τῶν διδασκομένων.* For the seed is like itself, but the fruit is diverse, since the judgments of those who are instructed are diverse.

LXXXII.

And indeed the Savior, in the words of Theophilus [1],

having once entered into the Holy of Holies, *ἄδειαν τοῖς βουλομένοις δέδωκεν*, imparted to each one who wills the free faculty of entering.

[2] Gal. III. 13.
[3] John XII. 32.
[4] *On the Sabbath and Circumcision*, no. 5, p. 58, Works, vol. II.
[5] Ibid., *Homily on the Sower*, no. 2, p. 61.
[1] Fragment from Paschal Epistle I, in Galland, vol. VII, p. 640.

Who, therefore, do not enter, and who remain outside? Only those, answers Dionysius of Alexandria [2], who imitate the Synagogue,

> which does not will to believe, *ἡ περιλελυμένη ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ νυμφίου, καὶ τῷ Βαραββᾷ ἑαυτὴν περιπλέξασα*, which withdrew itself from the true Bridegroom and entwined itself with Barabbas.

Only those, the same man adds [3],

> whom God [4] reproves as those who have refused to be participants in wisdom.

For God, the fountain and author of wisdom, Serapion writes [5],

> knocks, and if the mind delays and gives itself to sleep, he utters the voice [6]: "Open to me, my sister, my bride, for my head is filled with dew and my locks with the drops of the night." He says these things, *ἵνα τὴν φιλίαν δείξῃ, καὶ τὴν κηδεμονίαν σημάνῃ*, that he may declare friendship and signify provident care; and when he is outside he endures and does not depart, *ἕως ἂν τῇ συνεχείᾳ τῆς αἰτήσεως καὶ τῆς κρούσεως ὑπανοίξῃ ἑαυτὴν ἡ διάνοια, τόπον τῷ κρούοντι παρέχουσα*, until through the continuity of the petition and the knocking the mind opens itself, furnishing a place to him who knocks.

His clemency, says Orsiesius, the Tabennesiot abbot [7],

> is so great that he provokes us to salvation, and therefore sustains and delays, that we may awaken from heavy sleep and, converted to better things, may not be handed over to torments.

This is supremely dear to God; whence, according to the testimony of Anthony the Great [8],

> moved in his inward parts for us, by his own goodness he willed to convert us to that beginning without end and made a visitation of creatures, not sparing himself for the salvation of us all. For he delivered himself for our sins; and indeed our iniquities humbled him, but [1] by his bruise we have all been healed. For by the word of his power he gathered us from all regions, from the end of the earth even to the furthest part of the world, teaching that we are members of one another…. He made his Angels minister to us, commanded his own Prophets to prophesy, and also ordered his Apostles to evangelize

[2] *Against the Samosatene*, p. 275.
[3] *On Martyrdom*, chap. II, p. 19.
[4] Baruch III. 12–13.
[5] *Against the Manichaeans*, § XXVI, p. 61, in Galland, vol. V.
[6] Cant. V. 2.
[7] *Doctrine on the Institution of Monks*, §§ III–VI, XXXVIII, pp. 40–46, in Galland, vol. V.
[8] Epistle III, p. 665, in Galland, vol. IV.
[1] Isa. LIII. 5.

> us. But this is more distinguished than all the rest: that he made his Only-begotten assume the form of a servant for us.

All these things, most numerous in number and most noble in dignity, return to this [2]:

> That God continually made a visitation of his creatures, manifesting his own goodness.

For he visited them *ἐμμέσως*, mediately, when he bound by benefits [3] *τοὺς πάντων τῶν ἐν κόσμῳ κίονας*, the pillars of the whole world [4]; but he visited them, and further proceeds to visit them *ἀμέσως*, immediately, because [5] great everywhere is the mercy of God; because [6] our God and Lord Jesus Christ did not cease to manifest and enlarge his faith throughout the whole world as the one remedy of our salvation; and because it ought to remain fixed and established [7] that

> *τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐνανθρωπήσαντα δι' ἡμᾶς, ἵνα πᾶσαν μὲν ἁμαρτίαν ἐκκόψῃ, ἐφόδια δὲ τῆς εἰς αἰώνιον ζωὴν εἰσόδου ἡμῖν καταθῆται*, our Lord Jesus Christ was made man for our sake in order that he might utterly cut away all sin and prepare for us provisions for the journey of entering eternal life.

LXXXIII.

For the Lord, to use the words of Macarius the Egyptian [1],

> is borne toward men with great benignity and is touched with inward mercy if at any time we turn wholly to him, withdrawing ourselves from all things that are contrary. For although through the greatest ignorance, infancy, and an opinion preconceived from malice we turn away from the true life and place many impediments before ourselves, being in reality unwilling to return to wisdom, *ἀλλ' αὐτὸς πολὺ σπλαγχνίζεται ἐφ' ἡμᾶς μακροθυμῶν, πότε ἐπιστρέψαντες προσέλθωμεν πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ τὸν ἔσω ἡμῶν*

[2] Ibid., § VI, p. 665, and Epistle IV, §§ I–II.

[3] Alexander of Alexandria, Epistle on the Arian Heresy and the Deposition of Arius, § V, p. 444, in Galland, vol. IV.

[4] That is, the Apostles, of whom Peter and James are called pillars in the Epistle to the Galatians. Hence, in Sirmond's edition, after the words *πάντων τῶν ἐν κόσμῳ κίονας*, there follows this scholion: *τοὺς θεηγόρους φημὶ ἀποστόλους*, "I mean the Apostles who speak of God."

[5] Peter of Alexandria, *On the Fact That the Hebrews Rightly Established the Moon of the Fourteenth Day of the First Month Until the Destruction of Jerusalem*, § I, p. 110, in Galland, vol. IV.

[6] Theonas, Epistle to Lucianus, § I, p. 69, in Galland, vol. IV.

[7] Phileas, Epistle to the Thmuites, § I, in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, book VIII, chap. X, and in Galland, p. 65, vol. IV.

[1] Homily IV, §§ XVI–XVII, p. 18, in Galland, vol. VII.

ἄνθρωπον φωτισθῶμεν, ἵνα μὴ καταισχυνθῶσι τὰ πρόσωπα ἡμῶν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως, he himself nevertheless has great mercy upon us, waiting with long-suffering until, having been converted, we approach him and are illuminated as regards our inward man, lest our faces be confounded on the day of judgment.

But if this appears difficult and troublesome to us on account of the hard exercise of virtue, or rather on account of the suggestion and counsel of the adversary, *ἰδοὺ αὐτὸς σπλαγχνίζεται καὶ μακροθυμεῖ ἐκδεχόμενος τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐπιστροφήν, καὶ ἁμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν ἀνέχεται, ἀναμένων τὴν μετάνοιαν ἡμῶν, καὶ πίπτοντας ἡμᾶς οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται πάλιν δέχεσθαι, καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ προφήτης· μὴ ὁ πίπτων οὐκ ἀνίσταται, ἢ ὁ ἀποστρέφων οὐκ ἐπιστρέφει;* behold, moved by the greatest compassion, he is gentle and patient, awaiting our conversion; he tolerates us when we sin, desires our penance, and is not ashamed to receive us again when we have fallen, just as the Prophet [2] said: "Does he who falls not rise again, or does he who has turned away not return?"

But if the mercy of God toward us is of this kind [3],

how does it therefore come about that, moved by so many exhortations and promises,

we refuse to approach him wholly and to surrender ourselves wholly to him? But behold all these things, and how great a glory besides has been given! How many dispensations (*οἰκονομίαι*) have been made from the times of the Fathers and Prophets? How many promises, and how many exhortations? How great was the mercy of the Lord toward us *ἐξ ἀρχῆς*, from the beginning? But at last, even by his own advent, *τὴν ἄρρητον χρηστότητα ἐφ' ἡμᾶς διὰ τῆς σταυρώσεως ἐπεδείξατο*, he displayed his ineffable benignity toward us through the crucifixion, *ἵνα ἡμᾶς εἰς ζωὴν ἐπιστρέψαντας μετενέγκῃ*, that he might transfer us, converted, into life.

Yet we do not withdraw from our own will, the love of the world, preconceptions, and depraved customs. Wherefore it appears from this that we are endowed with either little faith or none at all. And besides all these things, *ἰδοὺ αὐτὸς χρηστεύεται, ἀοράτως φρουρῶν καὶ περιθάλπων, μὴ κατὰ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα παραδιδοὺς ἡμᾶς εἰς τέλος τῇ κακίᾳ, καὶ τῇ τοῦ κόσμου ἀπάτῃ ἀφιεὶς ἡμᾶς ἀπολέσθαι, διὰ πολλὴν χρηστότητα καὶ μακροθυμίαν ἀποσκοπῶν, πότε πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπιστρέψωμεν*, behold, he shows himself benign toward us,

[2] Jer. VIII. 4.

[3] Ibid., § XVIII, p. 18.

> invisibly protects and cherishes us, and does not, according to our sins, hand us over forever to malice or permit us to perish through the deceptions of the world; but on account of his great clemency and long-suffering looks down from above to see when we may be converted to him.

The Apostle [2] makes mention of this clemency and long-suffering [1], saying: *ἢ τοῦ πλούτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει;*, "Or dost thou contemn the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long-suffering, not knowing that the goodness of God invites thee to penance?" Whence,

> if, abusing his long-suffering, goodness, and forbearance, we add more sins and procure for ourselves a graver judgment by our negligence and contempt, that saying [3] will be fulfilled: "But according to thy hardness and impenitent heart, thou gatherest up wrath for thyself in the day of wrath and the revelation of the just judgment of God."
>
> *Πολλῇ γὰρ ἀγαθότητι ἀνεκδιηγήτῳ, καὶ μακροθυμίᾳ ἀνεκφράστῳ κέχρηται ὁ θεὸς περὶ τοῦ γένους τῶν ἀνθρώπων, μόνον εἰ ἡμεῖς ἀνανῆψαι θελήσομεν, καὶ ἐξ ὅλου ἐπιστραφῆναι πρὸς αὐτὸν σπουδάσομεν, ἵνα σωτηρίας τυχεῖν δυνηθῶμεν.* For God employs the greatest and inexpressible goodness and ineffable patience toward the human race, if only we will to return to sobriety and endeavor to be wholly converted to him, that we may be able to become participants in salvation.

Excellent testimonies concerning this patience are read in the Scriptures [1]:

> Wherefore [2], even now the good and benign God shows himself long-suffering toward each one of us, seeing how far each stumbles; and he rests, waiting until he may return to wisdom and turn away from committing sins, receiving with great love and joy the one converted from sin. For thus he says [3]: "There is joy over one sinner returning to wisdom." And again [4]: "For it is not the will of my Father that one of these least little ones should perish."

[2] Rom. II. 4.
[1] Ibid., § XIX, pp. 18–19.
[3] Rom. II. 5.
[1] Ibid., § XX, p. 19.
[2] Ibid., § XXI, p. 19.
[3] Luke XV. 10.
[4] Matt. XVIII. 14.

To these Macarius appends other things tending to the same point and expressed in nearly the same words; then elsewhere he adds [5]:

> God is just and his judgments are just, *καὶ προσωπολημψία* [6] *παρ' αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν*, and there is no respect of persons with him; but according to the measure (*κατὰ ἀναλογίαν*) of the benefits, whether bodily or spiritual, whether of knowledge or understanding—*ἃ καὶ ἐν τῇ φύσει τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὁ θεὸς διαφόρως ἐνέθηκεν*, which God variously implanted even in human nature—he will judge each one, will seek the fruits of virtue, and will render to each according to his works and dignity;
>
> [1] and the mighty shall mightily suffer torments. For the least is worthy of pardon and mercy. And the Lord [2] says: "The servant who knew the will of his lord and did not prepare himself nor act according to his will shall be beaten with many stripes. But he who did not know and did things worthy of stripes shall be beaten with few. Moreover, to whomsoever much has been given, much shall be required of him, and from him to whom they entrusted much, they shall ask the more."
>
> But understand knowledge and understanding *διαφόρως νοεῖ*, in diverse ways: *ἤτοι κατὰ χάριν καὶ δόμα ἐπουράνιον τοῦ πνεύματος, ἤτοι κατὰ φυσικὴν ἀκολουθίαν συνέσεως καὶ διακρίσεως, καὶ διὰ τῶν θείων γραφῶν παιδεύσεως*, both according to grace and the heavenly gift of the Spirit, and according to the natural progress of understanding and discretion and the instruction proceeding from the sacred writings. For the fruits of virtue will be required from each one, *κατὰ ἀναλογίαν τῶν παρὰ θεοῦ γενομένων εἰς αὐτὸν εὐεργεσιῶν, ἤτοι φυσικῶν, ἤτοι ἐκ θείας χάριτος δεδομένων*, according to the measure of the benefits conferred by God upon him, whether natural or those which are granted by divine grace. *Ἀναπολόγητος τοίνυν ἐστὶ πᾶς ἄνθρωπος παρὰ θεῷ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως· ἕκαστος γὰρ καθ' ὃ ἔγνω τοὺς καρποὺς τῆς πίστεως, καὶ ἀγάπης, καὶ πάσης ἀρετῆς τῆς πρὸς*

[5] Homily XXIX, § VI, p. 114.

[6] To the twofold Hebrew phrase פנים נשא, "to accept the face," and פנים הכיר, "to recognize the face," there likewise corresponds among the Alexandrian interpreters and the writers of the New Testament the twofold formula *λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον* and *βλέπειν εἰς πρόσωπον*. But just as from the former Hebrew phrase is derived the expression פנים נשא, "acceptance of the face," so from the former Greek formula are inflected the words *προσωποληπτέω*, James II. 9; *προσωπολήπτης*, Acts X. 34; *ἀπροσωπολήπτως*, I Pet. I. 17; and *προσωποληψία*, Rom. II. 11; Eph. VI. 9; Col. III. 25; James II. 1, in which last passage there occurs a beautiful description *τῆς προσωποληψίας*, of respect of persons.

[1] Wis. VI. 7.

[2] Luke XII. 47–48.

> *αὐτόν, ἐκ προαιρέσεως καὶ θελήματος ἀνταπόδοσιν ἀπαιτηθήσεται, ἤτοι δι' ἀκοῆς, ἤτοι μηδέποτε λόγον ἀκούσας θεοῦ.* Therefore every man is inexcusable before God on the day of judgment. For repayment will be exacted from each according as he knew, with account taken of his choice and will, of the fruits of faith and love and of every virtue granted to him, whether he perceived it by hearing or never heard the word of God.

LXXXIV.

For everyone always had that by which, if he had willed, he could have procured salvation for himself. "Fathers," Macarius concludes [3],

> who are upon earth generate children from their own nature, and instruct those who are born with every care as their own sons until they become perfect men and successors and heirs. For the whole purpose and every endeavor of fathers tends from the beginning to this: that they may generate children and have heirs; and if they do not generate, they are affected with the greatest sadness and grief, just as, on the contrary, when they have begotten children, they are filled with joy.
>
> *Τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου σωτηρίας φροντίσας, πᾶσαν οἰκονομίαν καὶ σπουδὴν ἐπετέλεσεν ἐξ ἀρχῆς διὰ πατέρων, πατριαρχῶν, διὰ νόμου καὶ προφητῶν· ἔσχατον καὶ αὐτὸς παραγενόμενος, καὶ σταυροῦ αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσας, ὑπέμεινε θάνατον· καὶ οὗτος ὅλος ὁ κάματος, καὶ ἡ σπουδὴ αὐτοῦ γέγονεν, ὅπως γεννήσῃ ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ ἐκ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ φύσεως τέκνα ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, ἄνωθεν εὐδοκήσας γεννηθῆναι ἐκ τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος· καὶ ὥσπερ οἱ πατέρες οὗτοι, ἐὰν μὴ γεννήσωσι, λυποῦνται· οὕτως καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἀγαπήσας τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὡς ἰδίαν εἰκόνα, ἠθέλησεν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σπέρματος γεννῆσαι τῆς θεότητος. Εἴ τινες οὖν μὴ θελήσωσιν εἰς τοιαύτην γέννησιν ἐλθεῖν, καὶ ἐκ τῆς γαστρὸς τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς θεότητος γεννηθῆναι, πολλὴν λύπην ὁ Χριστὸς ἀναδέχεται, παθὼν δι' αὐτοὺς καὶ ὑπομείνας, ἵνα τούτους σώσῃ.*
>
> In the same manner our Lord Jesus Christ, solicitous for the salvation of man, accomplished every dispensation and endeavor from the beginning through the ministry of the Fathers, the Patriarchs, the Law, and the Prophets; at last he himself also came and, con-

[3] Ibid., Homily XXX, §§ I–II, p. 115.

> temning the ignominy of the cross, endured death. Therefore, all that labor and his endeavor consisted in this: that he might generate from himself, from his own nature, sons from the Spirit, being well pleased that they should be born from above from his divinity. And just as these fathers are distressed by sadness and grief if they have not generated, so the Lord, loving the human race as his own image, willed to generate them from the divine seed itself. Therefore, if any are unwilling to come to such a generation and to be born from the womb of the divine Spirit, Christ undergoes the greatest grief, who suffered and endured for them that he might save them.

Wherefore nothing is more true than what another Macarius, surnamed the Alexandrian, confirms: that only those perish eternally who,

although they could, were unwilling to use the mercy of the Creator and Reformer. For, having first described [1] the condition after death of those faithful who were guilty of sins, and then proceeding to those who died before they were initiated by baptism, he adds [2]:

> But the rationale is not equal for those who did not receive holy baptism. For these unilluminated souls (*τὰς ἀφωτίστους ψυχάς*), when they have departed from the body, cruel angels receive harshly, striking and pressing upon them: "Hither, hither, impious soul; see who Christ, thy Lord and the Lord of all, is, *ὃν οὐκ ἐθέλησας γνῶναι, ἐν ἀνέσει διάγουσα ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*, whom thou wast unwilling to know while passing this life negligently. Know him at last, condemned as thou art to perpetual punishments."

LXXXV.

And that it ought to be judged entirely so is excellently confirmed by those things which Didymus writes in order to show the deity of the divine Word and the perfect governance of his own creatures. For, repeating the formulas and judgments received among the more ancient Fathers, he teaches [3]

> that he is the giver of every good, and the light endowed with goodness and effecting good things, and the mystical sun, who by the unfailing light emanating from himself illuminates the eyes of the

[1] Ibid., Sermon *On the Death of the Just and of Sinners*, § IV, p. 239. In this description, this is especially worthy of observation: that explicit mention is made of the prayers and oblations which were celebrated in the Church on the ninth and fortieth day for those who had completed life.

[2] Ibid., § V, p. 239. Compare Fabricius, *Greek Library*, vol. VII, p. 495, and *Codex of the Apocryphal New Testament*, vol. II, p. 949.

[3] *On the Trinity*, book I, chap. XXVIII, p. 86.

> wandering stars [4], and of souls capable of that same light, and grants the faculty of seeing to those which had previously been so constituted on account of sins that they could not see of themselves; and that he is moreover both healing and the inexhaustible treasury of wisdom and knowledge, and one who assists all [1].

And he certainly assists all, since he is and is called [2] *ὁ πάντων γενεσιουργὸς καὶ εὐεργέτης*, the beneficent Creator of all things, who lavishly bestows upon all [3] the kingdom of heaven and divine peace, since these are his own, *ἀβασκάνως*, without envy.

Whence it is proper to the Trinity [4]

> that it disposes for all a time for conferring benefits upon them, that it is indeed slow to anger but *εἰς εὐποιΐαν*, prompt to do good; and that it is indeed angry on account of our transgressions, but *δι' οἰκείαν φιλανθρωπίαν*, on account of its innate benignity, remits the punishment.

Indeed, the third hypostasis of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit, claims this for himself [5]:

> that, diffused everywhere, he comprehends all things and dwells in all without commingling; insinuates himself into both our thoughts and those of beings invisible to us; accurately searches all things even though he knows all things; sounds within without a voice and hears souls crying silently within; *καὶ πάσας ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἰκτείρων* [6] *ἀμελλητί*, and without delay pursues all of them in all things with mercy and strengthens them; infuses inexplicable joy into all natures everywhere; has all things beneath himself; *καὶ θεσπεσίῳ φωτίζων*

---

[4] He pursues the allegory taken from the sun and from wandering and fixed stars.

[1] According to Clement in the *Protrepticus*, Phidias carved upon the finger of the Olympian Jupiter, *Παντάρκης καλός*; here the Word is called *θησαυρὸς παντάρκης*.

[2] *On the Trinity*, book I, chap. XXVII, p. 83.

[3] Ibid., chap. XXXIV, p. 101.

[4] Ibid., book II, chap. I, p. 112.

[5] Ibid., chap. IV, p. 135.

[6] "In Thucydides," says Mingharelli, "in the first book, and in Pollux, *μελλητής* is one who delays; therefore *ἀμελλητί* will be 'without delay,' *δίχα μελλήσεως*, as Didymus speaks elsewhere. The word *ἀμελλητί* is absent from common Lexicons, and in its place, but without any example, occurs the word *ἀμελητί*. Therefore let *ἀμελλητί* be restored, and let its usage be proved by the testimonies both of Didymus and of Constantine in the oration to the Nicene Fathers, Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History*, book II, chap. XXII, and Damascene in the *Parallels*, vol. I, p. 341." Thus far he, who, while he complains of common Lexicons in which *ἀμελλητί* is wanting, I do not know what Lexicons he names, since *ἀμελλητί* is a very well-known adverb, inflected from the adjective *ἀμέλλητος*, which is from the verb *μέλλω*, "I delay, I hesitate." But what he adds concerning the adverb *ἀμελητί* in place of *ἀμελλητί* is inept; for *ἀμελητί* is proximately from the adjective *ἀμελής*, "careless," and mediately from the verb *ἀμελέω*, "I am without care and solicitude."

> *φωτὶ καὶ εὐεργετῶν τῇ ἁπλέτῳ αὐτοῦ ἐνεργείᾳ καὶ ἀγαθότητι*, and illuminates them with divine light and benefits them by his immense efficacy and goodness;
>
> leads those who have a better intention and disposition to a more perfect end; but does not deprive those whose mind and life are worse and even depraved of his own royal, concordant, and undivided governance.

For it pertains to him [1]

> to have care of all and to provide for all, not even the guilty excepted.

Indeed [2], *ἀληθῶς ἐστιν ἔργον φιλάνθρωπον τῆς πανσόφου καὶ ἀγαθωτάτης τριάδος ἡ εἰς εὐσεβῆ βίου τρίβον ἀποστολὴ καὶ ὁδηγία καὶ ἡ περὶ πάντας χρηστότης*, "It is truly a benign work of the all-wise and most good Trinity to send and guide men into the pious path of life and to pursue all with clemency." Nor does it cease from this work [3],

> but *δι' οἰκείαν εὐσπλαγχνίαν*, on account of its innate mercy, it heals the diseases into which we fall on account of our foolishness, and *πάντοτε πᾶσιν*, always brings aid to all; and it neither abandons nor turns away from those who live rightly and as though stand, nor those who have fallen in life.

LXXXVI.

For although, Origen writes [4], certain things occur in the Scriptures which seem to persuade that some are abandoned by God,

> nevertheless, those who endeavor according to their strength to prove that God provides for the immortal soul in various ways preserve piety toward God and his Christ in all things.

For, disputing [6] on the occasion of the words in Jeremiah [5], "Have I become a solitude to the house of Israel, or a late-sown land?" he says: *οὐδενὶ ἔρημός ἐστιν ὁ θεός*, "God is a solitude to no one."

He is a solitude to no one *μετὰ τὰς καθολικὰς εὐεργεσίας*, according to the general benefits,

> since he [7] makes his sun rise upon the good and the evil; to no one is he a late-sown land, since

[1] Ibid., chap. VI, p. 158.
[2] Ibid., chap. VIII, p. 224.
[3] Ibid., book III, chap. XXV, p. 418.
[4] *On First Principles*, book III, no. 17, p. 128, Works, vol. I.
[6] On Jeremiah, Homily III, nos. 1–2, p. 140, Works, vol. III.
[5] Jer. II. 31.
[7] Matt. V. 45.

> he [1] rains upon the just and the unjust. How is he a solitude, who governs the mind of each so that it may participate in reason and acquire knowledge, and so that what can be understood concerning him through the senses may be laid bare? *Ἔστιν οὖν οὐδενὶ ἔρημος ὡς πρὸς τὸν καθόλου λόγον ὁ θεός*; therefore, as regards the general reason, God is a solitude to no one.

But as regards singular benefits [2], God again of himself is a solitude to no one, and rightly employs these words:

> I indeed have not become a solitude to you, nor a wild land; but you [3] said: "We shall not be subject to the Lord, nor shall we come to thee any more."

From these things it is evident [4]

> that men abandoned the fountain of living water; the fountain of living water did not abandon men. *Καὶ γὰρ ἀπ' οὐδενὸς θεὸς μακρύνει ἑαυτόν, ἀλλ' οἱ μακρύνοντες ἑαυτοὺς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἀπολοῦνται.* For God withdraws himself from no one, but those who withdraw themselves from him shall perish. Rather, God draws near to certain persons and meets the one coming to him. Therefore, when the son who had devoured [5] his goods returned, the Father met him. And he promises through the Prophets [6], saying: "I shall draw near to them as the garment of their body." For God says: "I am a God drawing near, and not a God afar off," says the Lord…. Wherefore, *οὐ φεύγει τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, ἀλλὰ ἕκαστος ἡμῶν ἁμαρτάνων*, the water of the Holy Spirit does not flee, but each one of us, while he sins, flees lest he drink from the water of the Holy Spirit.

For God [7]

> reproves men placed in the flesh, beats, and scourges them. For he does not will [8] the death of the sinner, but that he be converted and live. And therefore, benign and merciful, he repays the sins of the fathers in their children, so that, because the fathers—that is,

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Origen expresses this by a twofold formula, saying *ἐπὶ τὰς ἰδικὰς εὐεργεσίας*, or *ὡς δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἰδικὸν λόγον*.

[3] Jer. II. 31.

[4] On Jeremiah, Homily XVIII, no. 9, p. 252, Works, vol. III.

[5] Luke XV. 20.

[6] Jer. XIII. 11; compare XXIII. 23.

[7] On Exodus, Homily VIII, no. 6, p. 161, Works, vol. II.

[8] Ezek. XXXIII. 11.

the devil and his angels—are unworthy [1] to be reproved in the present age but will receive in the future what they merit, their children—that is, those whom they have persuaded to sin and who have nevertheless been admitted by them into the fellowship and society of sin—may receive here what they have done, so that they may proceed more purified to the future age and no longer be made companions of the devil in punishment. Therefore, because the Lord is merciful and [2] wills all men to be saved, he therefore [3] says: "I shall visit their crimes with an iron rod and their sins with scourges; but I shall not remove my mercy from them."

Therefore the Lord visits souls and seeks those whom that most wicked father has begotten by the persuasion of sin, and says [4] to each of them: "Hear, daughter, and see, and incline thy ear, and forget thy people and the house of thy father." Therefore he visits thee after sin, admonishes thee, and in scourge and rod visits thee for the sin which thy father the devil suggested to thee, that he may repay it into thy bosom, that is, while thou passest thy life in the body…. For God is jealous, and the soul which he espoused to himself in faith he does not will to remain in the contamination of sin; but he wills it to be purified quickly and speedily to cast away all its uncleannesses, if by chance it has been subjected to any. But if it remains in sins and says, "We shall not hear the voice of the Lord, but in doing we shall do our wills and shall kindle a fire to the queen of heaven," as is reproached through the Prophet [5], then they too are reserved for that sentence of Wisdom [6] which says: "Because I called and you did not obey, but derided my words, therefore I also shall laugh over your perdition"; or for that which was set down for them in the Gospel [7], when the Lord says: "Depart from me into the eternal fire which God prepared for the devil and his angels."

[1] Huet explains at what time Origen thought the final punishments were to be inflicted upon the demons in *Origeniana*, book II, question V, no. 22 ff.

[2] I Tim. II. 4.

[3] Ps. LXXXVIII. 33–34.

[4] Ps. XLIV. 11.

[5] Jer. VII. 18.

[6] Prov. I. 24 ff.

[7] Matt. XXV. 41.

LXXXVII.

That men may escape this sentence, God the Word, Christ, is present to them by his power and graces. He, says Clement of Alexandria [1],

> was not only the cause that we should formerly exist—for he was then in God—but also gave us *τὸ εὖ εἶναι*, well-being, and has now lately appeared to men, who alone is both, God and man, *ἁπάντων ἡμῖν αἴτιος ἀγαθῶν*, that he might impart to us happiness in every respect. *Παρ' οὗ ζῆν ἐκδιδασκόμενοι, εἰς ἀΐδιον ζωὴν παραπεμπόμεθα.* For, taught by him to live rightly, we are transmitted to eternal life…. For he who from the beginning was Savior has now appeared: he appeared, *ὁ ἐν τῷ ὄντι ὤν*, he who is Being in Him who is, the Word who was with God and by whom all things were made. *Διδάσκαλος ἐπεφάνη*, he appeared in the habit of a teacher; and he who, *ὡς δημιουργός*, as the Maker of the world, gave us life in the first creation, *ὡς διδάσκαλος*, as teacher, taught us the manner of living well, *ἵνα τὸ ἀεὶ ζῆν ὕστερον ὡς θεὸς χορηγήσῃ*, that afterward, as God, he might lavish eternal life.
>
> But he has not now for the first time taken pity upon our error, *ἀλλ' ἄνωθεν ἀρχῆθεν*, but long ago from the beginnings of the world; but now at last, appearing, he liberated those who were to perish from the jaws of destruction. For even unto this day that malignant serpent leads the human race by his deceits into disgraceful and wretched servitude and rages against them after the manner of barbarians, who are said [2] to bind their captives to the corpses of the dead until they rot together…. The same Lord is our one helper and avenger, who from the beginning prophetically announced salvation and now openly invites us to obtain it.

Nor does he invite once or in one manner, but frequently and in many ways:

> For our Savior, Clement proceeds [3], employs various voices and tries various ways *εἰς ἀνθρώπων σωτηρίαν*,
>
> that he may save men. While he threatens, he admonishes; while he censures, he corrects; while he mourns, he has mercy…. He speaks in Isaiah; he in Elijah; he in the mouth of the Prophets…. The Lord himself speaks to thee, who [1], "although he was in the form of

[1] *Exhortation to the Gentiles*, § I, p. 7, Works, vol. I.

[2] To this pertain the things which Livy narrates in book I, those which Petrus Victorius collected in *Various Readings*, book IV, chap. XVIII, and what Virgil sang concerning Mezentius in *Aeneid* VIII: "He even joined dead bodies to the living."

[3] Ibid., p. 8.

[1] Phil. II. 6–7.

God, did not judge it robbery that he was equal to God, but emptied himself," *ὁ φιλοικτίρμων θεὸς σῶσαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον γλιχόμενος*, the merciful God desiring to save man. The Word of God himself therefore speaks openly to thee, that he may strike shame into unbelief. *Ναί φημι, ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος· ἵνα δὴ καὶ σὺ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου μάθῃς, πῇ ποτε ἄρα ἄνθρωπος γένηται θεός· εἶτ' οὐκ ἄτοπον, ὦ φίλοι, τὸν μὲν θεὸν ἀεὶ προτρέπειν ἡμᾶς ἐπ' ἀρετήν, ἡμᾶς δὲ ἀναδύεσθαι τὴν ὠφέλειαν, καὶ ἀναβάλλεσθαι τὴν σωτηρίαν;* The Word of God, I say, was made man, that thou too mightest learn from man by what art man can be made God. But how preposterous this would be, friends: that while God never ceases to exhort us to virtue, we, having spurned his benefit, should reject the salvation offered!

Especially since

the Holy Spirit, who [2] is the mouth of the Lord, utters these things [3]: "No longer, son, neglect the chastisement of the Lord, nor fail when thou art reproved by him." *Ὢ τῆς ὑπερβαλλούσης φιλανθρωπίας· οὐδ' ὡς μαθηταῖς ὁ διδάσκαλος, οὐδ' ὡς οἰκέταις ὁ κύριος, οὐδ' ὡς θεὸς ἀνθρώποις, πατὴρ δὲ ὡς ἥπιος νουθετεῖ υἱούς.* O incredible love toward men! He does not conduct himself as a master toward disciples, nor as a lord toward servants, nor as God toward men, but as a gentle father admonishes his sons [4].

Wherefore [5],

certain men are the more impious, *ὅσῳ φιλανθρωπότερος ὁ θεός*, the more benign and humane God is. For when God willed that we should be made sons from servants, *οἱ δὲ καὶ υἱοὶ γενέσθαι ὑπερηφανήκασιν*, they disdain to be assumed into the number of sons. O incredible madness! Are you ashamed of the Lord? *Ἐλευθερίαν ἐπαγγέλλεται· ὑμεῖς δὲ εἰς δουλείαν ἀποδιδράσκετε· σωτηρίαν χαρίζεται· ὑμεῖς δὲ εἰς ἀπώλειαν ὑποφέρεσθε· ζωὴν δωρεῖται αἰώνιον· ὑμεῖς δὲ τὴν κόλασιν ἀναμένετε καὶ τὸ πῦρ δὲ προσκοπεῖτε, ὃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ κύριος τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ.* He indeed promises liberty, but you flee into servitude. He

[2] Ibid., § IX, pp. 68–69.

[3] Prov. III. 11; compare Heb. XII. 5.

[4] I think this reading more suitable: *πατὴρ δὲ ὡς, ἠπίως νουθετεῖ υἱούς*, "but as a father most gently admonishes his sons." Moreover, *ἥπιος* is properly employed of parents who are gentle and benign toward their children. Thus it is taken by Homer, *Odyssey* III, v. 47, and Herodian, book II, chap. IV, no. 1; and thus it is twice employed by Paul, I Thess. II. 7 and II Tim. II. 24, where *ἥπιον εἶναι* is opposed to *τῷ μάχεσθαι*.

[5] Ibid., § IX, p. 69.

lavishes salvation, but you rush into your destruction. He grants eternal life, but you await punishment [1] and expect that fire which the Lord prepared for the devil and his angels.

LXXXVIII.

But the goodness of God is far greater than the malice of men, and therefore [2] the Lord does not relinquish care of them, but continually presses upon them by exhorting, terrifying, impelling, arousing, and admonishing; and those who have been entangled in errors he awakens and raises from the midst of darkness: "Awake," he says [3], "thou who sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ the Lord shall shine upon thee," that sun of resurrection who [4] was begotten before the morning star and furnished life by his rays. Therefore, let no one spurn the Word, lest perhaps, unawares, he be found to have contemned himself. For Scripture says somewhere [5]: "Today, if you shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts as in the provocation in the desert, where your fathers tempted me [6] *ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ*, in trial." But what is that trial? If thou desirest to learn, the Holy Spirit will explain it to thee:

"And they saw," he says [1], "my works for forty years. Wherefore I was offended with this generation, and I said: They always err in heart, but they have not known my ways. Therefore I swore in my wrath: If they shall enter into my rest." Behold the threats! Behold the exhortation! Behold the punishment! Why, therefore, even now do we make God angry with us from being clement and beneficent? Why do we not open our ears to the Word and receive God as guest with pure souls? For his promise shall be in the place of immense grace and benefit if today we hear his voice. But that *today* increases for him with each day, so long as it is named *today*. *Μέχρι δὲ συντελείας, καὶ ἡ σήμερον, καὶ ἡ μάθησις διαμένει.* For unto the final consummation of things, both the present day and the time for learning remain.

[1] Matt. XXV. 41–45.
[2] Ibid., p. 70.
[3] Eph. V. 14.
[4] Ps. CIX. 3.
[5] Ps. XCIV. 8–9.
[6] The Vulgate reading is one or the other: either *ἐδοκίμασάν με, καὶ εἶδον τὰ ἔργα μου*, or *ἐδοκίμασαν καὶ εἶδον τὰ ἔργα μου*.
[1] Ps. XCIV. 9–11.

For God vehemently [2] loves men,

and therefore sends the Paraclete, who [3] exhorts all men to recognize the truth.

Concerning him thou mayest rightly affirm [4] that he wills nothing more earnestly than *σώζεσθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον*, that man be saved. Wherefore he urges and impels him to salvation, crying [5]: "The kingdom of heaven has drawn near." Hence *οὐκ ἀπεκρύβη τινὰς ὁ λόγος· φῶς ἐστι κοινόν, ἐπιλάμπει πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις· οὐδεὶς Κιμμέριος ἐν λόγῳ*, "the Word passed over no one; the light is common, it shines [6] upon all men, and, as far as pertains to it, no one is a Cimmerian."

By promises and threats [7], *ὁ Κύριος σώζει, φόβῳ καὶ χάριτι παιδαγωγῶν τὸν ἄνθρωπον*, "the Lord leads to salvation and instructs man by fear and grace. Why do we delay? Why do we not flee punishment? Why do we not receive the gift?" Certainly [8],

> the light which cannot be extinguished is diffused everywhere, and the West has believed in the East. This indeed was signified by a new creation.
>
> For the Sun [1] of justice, *τὰ πάντα καθιππεύων*, by whom all things are ridden through [2], *ἐπίσης περιπολεῖ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, τὸν πατέρα μιμούμενος*, equally traverses the whole human race, imitating the Father, who [3] causes his sun to rise upon all men and sprinkles them with the dew of truth. He translated the West to the East and, as it were, raised death crucified into life; but the divine husbandman, having rescued man from destruction, suspended him from the heavens, transferring corruption into freedom from destruction and earth into heaven…. He lavishly bestows upon us an inheritance truly great and divine, and one which cannot be taken away: *οὐρανίῳ διδασκαλίᾳ θεοποιῶν* [4] *τὸν ἄνθρωπον, διδοὺς νόμους εἰς*

[2] Ibid., p. 71.

[3] I Tim. II. 4.

[4] Ibid., p. 72.

[5] Matt. IV. 17.

[6] John I. 9.

[7] Ibid., p. 76.

[8] Ibid., § XI, p. 88.

[1] Mal. IV. 2.

[2] The allusion to the horses of the sun is manifest.

[3] Matt. V. 45.

[4] In the works of Clement this metaphor is frequent: that men distinguished by heavenly grace are not only assimilated to God but in a certain manner transferred into the divine nature and made gods. Thus indeed he speaks in the books of the *Stromata*, book VI, p. 670; book VII, pp. 710, 732, 761; thus in the *Exhortation to the Gentiles*, pp. 76–88; and thus in the work *Pedagogue*, book I, chap. VI. He borrowed this manner of speaking partly from the divine writings, Ps. LXXXI. 6 and II Pet. I. 4, and partly from the writings of the philosophers, especially of Heraclitus and Plato, as

τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν γράφων αὐτούς, by heavenly doctrine making man God, giving laws into their mind and inscribing them upon their heart [5].

The rationale of this most benevolent providence is this [6]:

πρόκειται ἀεὶ τῷ θεῷ, τὴν ἀνθρώπων ἀγέλην σώζειν, ταύτῃ καὶ τὸν ἀγαθὸν ποιμένα ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἀπέστειλεν θεός, it is always God's purpose to save the flock of men, and therefore the good God sent the good shepherd. But the Word, having unfolded the truth, showed men the height of salvation, *ὅπως ἢ μετανοήσαντες σωθῶσιν, ἢ μὴ ὑπακούσαντες, κριθῶσιν· τοῦτο τῆς δικαιοσύνης τὸ κήρυγμα, ὑπακούουσιν εὐαγγέλιον,*

παρακουσάσῃ κριτήριον, that either, led by penance, they might obtain salvation, or, if they were unwilling to obey, they might be subject to judgment. This is the preaching of justice, which is good news to those who obey, but judgment to the disobedient.

Wherefore this exhortation [1] must be directed to all,

that they may be saved. *Τοῦτο Χριστὸς βούλεται· ἑνὶ λόγῳ, ζωὴν σοι χαρίζεται· καὶ τίς ἐστιν οὗτος; μάθε συντόμως· λόγος ἀληθείας, λόγος ἀφθαρσίας, ὁ ἀναγεννῶν τὸν ἄνθρωπον, εἰς ἀλήθειαν αὐτὸν ἀναφέρων, τὸ κέντρον τῆς σωτηρίας, ὁ ἐξελαύνων τὴν φθοράν, ὁ ἐκδιώκων τὸν θάνατον, ὁ ἐν ἀνθρώποις οἰκοδομήσας νεών, ἵνα ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἱδρύσῃ τὸν θεόν.* Christ wills this; and, to say it summarily, he lavishes life upon thee. But who is he? Receive it in few words: the Word of truth, the incorruptible Word, who regenerates man and leads him back to truth, the goad of salvation, who drives away destruction, who expels death, who built a temple among men that he might establish God within them.

LXXXIX.

But that he may drive away destruction and expel death,

the good Pedagogue, who is the Wisdom, who is the Word of the Father, who fashioned man, *ὅλου κήδεται τοῦ πλάσματος· καὶ σώμα καὶ ψυχὴν ἀκεῖται αὐτοῦ ὁ πανάρκης* [3] *τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος ἰατρός, ὁ*

can be elicited from *Pedagogue*, book III, chap. I, and *Stromata*, book IV, pp. 536–537. Nor were Fathers lacking who imitated him, as the examples which Suicer collected in the *Thesaurus* under the words *θεοποιέω* and *θεόω* prove.

[5] Heb. VIII. 10–12; compare Jer. XXXI. 33–34.

[6] Ibid., § XI, pp. 89–90.

[1] Ibid., p. 90.

[3] It would perhaps be more suitable to read *πανάκης*, healing all things, who heals all.

> *Σωτήρ*, cares for the whole creature and heals both his body and his soul, he who is the physician of humanity sufficient in every respect, the Savior [2].

For just as [4]

> there is no light which does not illuminate, nor anything moving which does not move, nor anything loving which does not love; *οὐδὲ ἀγαθόν ἐστιν ὃ μὴ ὠφελεῖ, καὶ εἰς σωτηρίαν καθοδηγεῖ*, so neither is there any good—which the Pedagogue is—which does not benefit and lead unto salvation.

All those attain this salvation [5]

> who are not enemies of truth and do not hate the Word…. For God, because of his goodness, even when he threatens, manifests *τὸ φιλάνθρωπον τὸ ἑαυτοῦ*, his benevolence toward men.

Whence [1], if any are not saved, *αἰτία ἑλομένων, θεὸς ἀναίτιος*, the fault belongs to those who choose, and can in no way be referred to God.

For [2] *τὸ σώζειν ἔργον αὐτοῦ*, it is his work to save; and therefore [3] *τοῖς ἐν σαρκὶ εὐηγγελίσατο, ἵνα μὴ καταδικασθῶσιν ἀδίκως*, he announced the Gospel to those who were in the flesh, lest they should be condemned unjustly. "For [4], since God is good, *διὰ τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν τῆς κτίσεως ἁπάσης, σώζεσθαι βουλόμενος τοῦτο, ἐπὶ τὸ ποιεῖν ἐτράπετο καὶ τὰ λοιπά*, on account of him who holds the chief place in the whole creation, since he willed him to be saved, he turned also to making the remaining things"; and he so disposed all things that there would be no one to whom the way of salvation did not lie open. Hence it came about [5]

> that God has always appeared good, *ἐξ αἰῶνος εἰς αἰῶνα σώζων διὰ υἱοῦ· κακίας δ' αὖ παντῇ πάντως ἀναίτιος· πρὸς γὰρ τὴν τοῦ ὅλου σωτηρίαν τῷ τῶν ὅλων Κυρίῳ πάντα ἐστὶ διατεταγμένα, καὶ καθόλου, καὶ ἐπὶ μέρους*, bestowing salvation from age unto age through the

---

[2] *Pedagogue*, book I, chap. II, p. 101.

[4] Ibid., chap. III, p. 103.

[5] Ibid., chap. VIII, p. 139.

[1] Clement employs this maxim in the passage which we have just cited, and again in *Stromata*, book I, pp. 271–311; book II, p. 393; book IV, p. 535; book V, p. 613; book VII, pp. 705–711. The author of the *Clementine Homilies*, homily XV, chap. VIII, Justin in the former *Apology*, Pseudo-Origen in the commentary on Job XXXVIII.7, Eusebius in *Preparation for the Gospel*, book V, Gregory Nazianzen in the former invective against Julian, and Theodoret in *On the Cure of Greek Affections*, discourse VI, also employ it. But the author of this sentence appears to have been Plato, who wrote in the tenth book of the *Republic*, *αἰτία ἑλομένου, θεὸς δ' ἀναίτιος*, the fault belongs to him who chooses; God is free of fault. Hence Lucian says in *On Salaried Posts*: *μέμνησο τοῦ σοφοῦ λέγοντος, ὡς θεὸς ἀναίτιος, αἰτία δ' ἑλομένου*.

[2] *Stromata*, book VI, § VI, p. 763.

[3] Ibid., p. 766.

[4] Ibid., § XVII, p. 819.

[5] *Stromata*, book VII, § II, p. 835.

> Son. But he is in no respect whatsoever the cause of evil; for all things, both generally and individually, have been ordered by the Lord of all unto the salvation of the whole.

XC.

Who, therefore, can doubt whether the principal will of God and his spontaneous love toward men is efficacious and manifests itself in a manifold variety of effects? No one at all from whose mind the things which we have brought forward, confirmed by the suffrages of so many and such great witnesses, have not utterly fallen away.

For in these it is a) expressly contained that all are divinely drawn, all illuminated; that opportunity and power to aspire to salvation are given to each; that the aids of the journey are denied to no one; and that God is at hand to cherish men invisibly, to open their eyes, to knock, and to insinuate himself into human thoughts.

It is contained b) that this work is especially proposed to God: that he aid men and advance their salvation by paternal cares; and that therefore the threefold order—natural, preternatural, and supernatural—is so tempered and directed by him that it conduces to the attainment of so great a good. Indeed, the penal order itself is so administered by him that, so long as men breathe and live, they are called to penance and salvation no less by other means than by the very punishments inflicted.

The Alexandrian doctors repeatedly declare this c), both affirmatively and negatively. For to this pertains what they teach: that men are visited mediately by the voices of nature, of miracles, of the prophets, of Christ, and of the apostles. To this pertains what they teach: that the same men are visited immediately by the interior light of reason, conscience, the Word, and the Holy Spirit. To this pertains what they teach concerning the ministry of angels divinely established [1],

[1] These things recall to my mind what Bernard Désirant has in book III against the third condemned proposition of Quesnel. For at the beginning, after transcribing the words of Augustine from *On the Gift of Perseverance*, chap. XX—"we have learned that each and every heresy introduced into the Church its own questions, against which divine Scripture was defended more diligently than if no such necessity compelled it"—he adds in chap. IV:

> Formerly it sufficed for the Fathers, against those who denied the general calling and the universal will of Christ intending the salvation of all, to allege the common cause and to say from the apostolic sense: In Adam all died, with no one at all excepted; and to add: But Christ died for all who died in Adam; and finally to conclude: Therefore Christ died for all, with no one at all excepted.
>
> It was a syllogism to which the adversaries did not then reply; and it remains a syllogism to which they will not reply now either. The Fathers confessed that the salutary

that they might bring their aid to men. And to this pertains what they teach: that no one dwells in darkness unless he has repelled the light, and no one goes astray unless he has voluntarily turned his eyes away from the path divinely shown beforehand.

But d), that they may represent this most inclined will to do good and the effects proceeding from it by certain images, as it were, they set forth and exhibit

---

effect is hindered by men, but that these hindrances ought not to be attributed to Christ. The Angelic Doctor embraced all things in a few words when he said in III, q. XLIX, a. II, ad 3: "But if some neglect to use this remedy, nothing is lost from the efficacy of Christ's Passion." This sufficed.

The questions of the present day, however, press upon us; and the adversaries, not content with such things, call all these general propositions vague, and say that vague propositions are empty; and they press more strongly that those things through which nothing is lost from the efficacy of Christ's Passion be specified and designated individually. They place the force upon the word *efficacy*. The name does not suffice; they demand the thing signified. We shall give it.

There are, therefore, if they do not know it, six effects of the Lord's Passion, whose efficacy, not in word alone but in very deed, reaches all and each who in any way are born from Adam, and which suffice for each one to attain salvation, if no one should neglect to use them.

The first effect is the guardianship of the angels, concerning which St. Jerome writes in book II of his commentary on Matthew XVIII—and it is the received opinion: "Great is the dignity of souls, that each one should have from the beginning of birth an angel guardian appointed for its guardianship." And St. Thomas gives the reason in I, q. CXIII, a. I: "It was necessary that angels be appointed for the guardianship of men, by whom they might be regulated and moved toward the good." Human nature would have lacked this benefit if its mass had remained condemned and had not been admitted to return. Behold, therefore, the first efficacy of Christ's Passion.

The second effect is the true and properly so-called capacity to receive baptism, by which the sins of individuals are remitted.

The third effect is that each person is born a suitable minister who can validly confer baptism upon another. Therefore, what by established law was not granted to angels has been given not only to Christians but also to Jews and pagans, so that, if they do what must be done, Christ baptizes through their hands, and they themselves, although unworthy, are nevertheless then called and are ministers of Christ in this respect.

The fourth effect is that each person, when he comes to the use of reason, becomes capable of a precept and receives the interior command and aid to turn himself to God, so that he may believe that he exists and is the rewarder of those who seek him; and that he is to be aided further if through personal sin he has not despised the gifts of God.

The fifth effect is that all and each, infants as well as adults, shall rise from the dead on the last day. This assuredly would have happened neither to fallen Adam nor to anyone born from Adam unless the Savior of all had ordained the resurrection of all.

The sixth effect is that all shall stand on the last day before the tribunal of Christ, both Savior and Judge.

God as the sun which shines upon all; as the fountain which flows down for all; as the earth which is barren for no one; as the sower who spreads his seed everywhere; as the friend who knocks at the door of the heart and utters an inviting voice; as the physician who omits no kind of medicine for overcoming illness and procuring health; and as the father who wholly devotes himself to this, that he may save his son and make him most like himself.

XCI.

But how far does this will extend, and what limits does it have? Does it embrace all men, or exclude and repel some of them? This is the third undoubted judgment of the Alexandrians: that it is universal and is confined by the same limits by which the human race is circumscribed.

Indeed, 1) they recall no other origin of it than the goodness innate in God and his paternal benevolence toward his work. But neither is God's goodness bound by limits, nor is there any man whose father God is not by creation and who does not belong to the amplitude of the divine work. Therefore, the salutary will cherishes all and extends most benignly to all.

For 2), as they add, it extends to all those to whom the designation by which God is called *φιλάνθρωπος καὶ φιλόψυχος*, a lover of man and a lover of souls, extends. But are there, or can there be, men who are not comprehended under that designation and who therefore are not men and lack a soul? This is so absurd that it cannot even be conceived in the mind. Such, therefore, is the salutary will of God, which of itself is referred to all men.

For 3) all are by nature a created image of God, and all represent the divine archetype in themselves. But the Alexandrians teach that no one who is the image of God and bears the divine archetype within himself is alien to the salutary will.

As many, therefore, as are men are comprehended by the benevolence of the salutary will.

An argument for this amplitude 4) may also be taken from the fact that, if we give faith to the Alexandrians, the salutary will extends no less widely than the benefits of the natural and supernatural order extend. But these extend so widely that they pass over no one at all; for God commands his sun to rise upon the good and the evil, and sent his Only-begotten that he might repair the whole progeny of Adam.

For of himself 5) God regards men *ἀπροσωπολήπτως* [1], without respect of persons, and deprives no one of his gifts who has not constructed destruction for himself.

Hence 6) the comparisons repeated by the Alexandrian doctors, in which they compare God with the sun and with the common father of all; and also the formulas, whether negative, by which they declare that only those perish who neglect salvation and reject the Savior, or affirmative, by which they say that salvation is *καθολικὴν καὶ γενικήν*, universal and general, that divine providence extends to all, and that the salvation of all is procured by God with a certain incredible affection of benevolence.

I would be content with these, were I not admonished by the supreme gravity of the matter to bring forward other suffrages of the same doctors which I have at hand, most suitable for proving the universal amplitude of the divine salutary will.

XCII.

Accordingly, Athanasius, whose name is an encomium, after he observed [2] that the human race would altogether have perished *εἰ μὴ ὁ πάντων δεσπότης καὶ σωτὴρ τοῦ θεοῦ υἱὸς παρεγένετο πρὸς τὸ τοῦ θανάτου τέλος*, unless the Son of God, the Lord and Savior of all, had come to bring death to an end, immediately adds [1]:

> But this truly great work *πρέπει μάλιστα τῇ ἀγαθότητι τοῦ θεοῦ*, was especially becoming to the divine goodness.
> For if an emperor by no means abandons a house or city built by himself and afterward attacked by robbers through the negligence of its citizens, but defends and protects it as his own work, regarding not the citizens' inertia but what is becoming to himself, *πολλῷ πλέον ὁ τοῦ παναγάθου θεοῦ λόγος πατρὸς εἰς φθορὰν κατερχόμενον τὸ δι' αὐτοῦ γενόμενον τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος οὐ παρεῖδεν· ἀλλὰ τὸν μὲν συμβεβηκότα θάνατον ἀπήλειψε διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος, τὴν δὲ ἀμέλειαν αὐτῶν διωρθώσατο τῇ ἑαυτοῦ διδασκαλίᾳ, πάντα τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ δυνάμεως κατορθώσας*, much more did God the Word of the all-good Father not abandon the nature

[1] We know that before the Alexandrian doctors Peter used this word, in whose I Pet. I.17 we read, *ἀπροσωπολήπτως κρίνων*, judging without respect of persons; and Clement of Rome, who in the former epistle to the Corinthians commended them because they had formerly done all things *ἀπροσωπολήπτως*, without respect of persons.

[2] *On the Incarnation of the Word of God*, no. 9, p. 55, Works, vol. I.

[1] Ibid., no. 10, p. 55.

> of men as it went into corruption through him; but by the offering of his own body he destroyed the death into which they had fallen, corrected their negligence by his instruction, and restored by his power all things that belonged to men.

Nor does he affirm these things alone, but he proceeds [2] to prove them with arguments, saying:

> Whoever has read the writings of the theologians, the disciples of the Savior, will be able to confirm these things by their authority, where they say [3]: "For the charity of Christ presses us, judging this, that if one died for all, therefore all died; and he died for all" [4], "that we might no longer live for ourselves, but for him who died for us and rose from the dead, our Lord Jesus Christ." And again [5]: "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels" [6], "crowned with glory and honor because of the suffering of death, that by the grace of God he might taste death for all."
>
> Afterward the same man gives the reason why it was fitting that no one other than God the Word should become man: "For it became him," he says [1], "for whom are all things and through whom are all things, who had brought many sons into glory, to perfect the author of their salvation through suffering." By these words he signifies that it belonged to no one other than God the Word, by whom men were created in the beginning, to recall them from the corruption which had arisen. And that the Word himself therefore took a body to himself, that it might become a victim for like bodies, they

[2] Ibid., no. 10, pp. 55–56.

[3] II Cor. V.14–16.

[4] There are Greek codices in which, just as in the Vulgate interpreter, *Χριστός* is added.

[5] Heb. II.9.

[6] The words *τὸν δὲ βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένον* are rendered thus, especially in editions of the French Calvinist version: "Thou hast made him a little lower than God." Absurdly, not to say impiously.

For 1), the clause from Ps. VIII.6 which Paul cites and which reads thus, מאלהים מעט ותחסרהו, is excellently rendered by the Vulgate, "Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels," since no one is ignorant that the name אלהים is frequently used of angels. Hence 2) the Alexandrians rendered it *ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους*. Nor 3) did Paul report it in other words. Moreover 4), the Chaldean paraphrase and the Syriac interpreter agree; the latter has מלאכא מן קליל אמכתיהי, "Thou didst lower him for a little while beneath the angels." 5) Both the Greek and Latin Fathers agree. And 6) the sequence of the discourse itself persuades the same, from which we understand that *βραχύ—מעט τι—for a little while* is a particle of time, and that by it *ἐν βραχύτητι*, for a short time, is signified; and thus the meaning subject to the words comes to this: "Thou hast lowered him for a short time," namely, that in which *διὰ τὸ πάθημα θανάτου*, because of the suffering of death, he emptied himself beneath the angels.

[1] Heb. II.10.

> also declare in this manner [2]: "Since therefore the children shared in flesh and blood, he likewise partook of the same, that through death he might destroy him who had the empire of death, that is, the devil, and deliver those who through fear of death were subject to servitude throughout their whole life." For by immolating his own body, he placed an end upon the law enacted against us and renewed for us the beginning of life, hope of rising again having been given. For since death had received its power over men from men, hence through God the Word made man came the dissolution of death and the resurrection of life, as the man full of Christ says [3]: "For since by a man came death, by a man also came the resurrection of the dead."
>
> "For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive. *Οὐκέτι γὰρ νῦν ὡς κατακρινόμενοι ἀποθνήσκομεν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐγειρόμενοι περιμένομεν τὴν κοινὴν πάντων ἀνάστασιν, ἣν καιροῖς ἰδίοις δείξει ὁ καὶ ταύτην ἐργασάμενος καὶ χαρισάμενος θεός.* For we no longer die now as those who are to be condemned, but, as those who are to be raised from the dead, we await the common resurrection of all, which God, its author and giver, will manifest in its proper times."

Whence he concludes [1]: *αἰτία μὲν δὴ πρώτη τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τοῦ σωτῆρος αὕτη*, "This, therefore, is the first cause for which the Savior assumed humanity."

XCIII.

From all these things, the following most manifestly follow before the others: a) that the human race utterly perished through the original transgression; b) that God, according to his goodness, did not permit it to lie oppressed by ruin; that therefore c) he sent his Only-begotten that he might mercifully recall the work which he had first founded to that nobility from which it had fallen by its own fault; d) that God the Word complied with the all-good Parent, and, by offering his own body, destroyed the death into which men had fallen, drove away by his instruction the darkness into which they had cast themselves, and finally restored by his power all things that pertained to them. But by e) what reparation? A particular one, circumscribed to some out of the innumerable, or rather a general one which embraces the whole family of men? Athanasius declares the amplitude of this reformation through the Word, saying that it pertains to the proper work of

[2] Ibid., v. 14.

[3] I Cor. XV.21.

[1] *On the Incarnation of the Word of God*, no. 10, p. 56.

the Word, to the human race, to all the things which belong to men, to those whose nature the Word himself assumed and who died in Adam. But these formulas are universal, and so universal that they except no one and comprehend all and each within their ambit. Universal, therefore, is the renovation through Christ; universal is the salutary will of God in Christ; and universal is the remedy offered to men; so that those who are born subject to death are refreshed by the hope of resurrection, and those who are born children of wrath obtain the opportunity and faculty of divine adoption.

Concerning this matter, the following are most excellent words which Athanasius adds [1]:

> When men had been reduced to the lot of beasts, and the fraud of demons everywhere hung over them like a shadow and obscured the knowledge of the true God, *τί τὸν θεὸν ἔδει ποιεῖν;* what ought God to have done? To pass over in silence so abominable a thing, and then to suffer that men, deceived by demons, should not know God? But what would it have profited man to have been fashioned from the beginning according to the image of God? For either he should have been created without reason, like brute animals, or certainly, having been made a participant in reason, he ought not to have lived the life of beasts. What likewise would it have profited him to have received the notion of God from the beginning? For if now [2] he is unworthy to receive it, certainly it ought not to have been given to him in the beginning either. Moreover, what utility to God the Creator, what glory, would have redounded from this, if the men whom he created did not worship him but judged others to be their makers? For thus God would appear to have created men not for himself but for others.
>
> Moreover, an emperor, although a man, does not permit cities constructed by himself to come under the dominion and servitude of others, nor to defect to others; but he admonishes the citizens by

[1] Ibid., no. 13, p. 58.

[2] That unworthiness from which mercy arises, writes Petavius, *On the Incarnation*, book II, chap. V, § VII, is estimated not so much from the disposition or merit of the sufferer as from his condition, as Basil indicates on Ps. CXIV. For thus, the more honorable anyone is, and the higher the rank in which he has been placed, or the more affluent in wealth and the conveniences of life, if he is reduced to the greatest need or the extremity of calamity and ignominy, the more pitiable and worthy of mercy he is held to be, and on this account unworthy to have fallen into so great a misery. To this also pertains that expression of intensification among the Greeks, *ἐξ οἵων εἰς οἷα*, from what a fortune into what a fortune he has fallen back—even though otherwise by his own fault he fell into that state and endures it as punishment and penalty. In this manner man was unworthy of so bitter a calamity: although he had deserved it, nevertheless it was a pitiable spectacle to see from what splendor and felicity he had fallen into what evils and hardships, especially when cast down by the envy and cunning of another.

letters, often also writes to them through friends, and, if necessity demands, meets them himself, that he may bend them by his presence, solely for this reason: lest they serve others or his work be rendered void.

Οὐ πολλῷ πλέον ὁ θεὸς τῶν ἑαυτοῦ κτισμάτων φείσεται πρὸς τὸ μὴ πλανηθῆναι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῖς οὐκ οὖσι δουλεύειν, μάλιστα ὅτι ἡ τοιαύτη πλάνη ἀπωλείας αὐτοῖς αἰτία καὶ ἀφανισμοῦ γίνεται; Will not God, therefore, much more have mercy upon his creatures, lest they wander from him and serve those things which do not exist, especially since such wandering becomes for them a cause of destruction and ruin? *Οὐκ ἔδει δὲ τὰ ἅπαξ κοινωνήσαντα τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ εἰκόνος ἀπολέσθαι*, it was by no means becoming that those who had once obtained a participation in the divine image should perish. What, therefore, was it becoming for God to undertake? Or what else ought to have been done than that likeness according to which men were made in the image of God be renewed, so that through it they might again be able to know God? But how would this be done unless the very Image of God, our Savior Jesus Christ, had come? For it could not be done through men, since they themselves also were made according to the image of God; nor even through angels, for neither are they images. *Ὅθεν ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος δι' ἑαυτοῦ παρεγένετο, ἵν' ὡς εἰκὼν ὢν τοῦ πατρὸς τὸν κατ' εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπον ἀνακτίσαι δυνηθῇ.* Wherefore the Word of God came through himself, that, as the Image of the Father, he might be able to refashion man, who had been made according to the image.

Furthermore, this could not have been done unless death and corruption were destroyed; whence he most fittingly received a mortal body, that death might be destroyed in it and men made according to the image might be fashioned anew. *Οὐκοῦν ἑτέρου πρὸς ταύτην τὴν χρείαν οὐκ ἦν, εἰ μὴ τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ πατρός.* Therefore no other was fit for this work except the Image of the Father alone.

XCIV.

He proceeds [1] to illustrate this with a suitable comparison, saying [2]:

Just as, if someone's likeness painted on some panel has been disfigured by dirt cast upon it, it is necessary that he whose likeness it

[1] *On the Incarnation of the Word of God*, no. 14, pp. 58–59.

[2] Pope Hadrian employs these words of Athanasius in the epistle to Constantine and Irene which is reported in act II of the seventh ecumenical council.

> is be present again, so that his image may be renewed in the same material; for the material itself is not cast away on account of the image impressed upon it, but the violated likeness is renewed in it. *Κατὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ πανάγιος τοῦ πατρὸς υἱός, εἰκὼν ὢν τοῦ πατρός, παρεγένετο ἐπὶ τοὺς ἡμετέρους τόπους, ἵνα τὸν κατ' αὐτὸν πεποιημένον ἄνθρωπον ἀνακαινίσῃ, καὶ ὡς ἀπολωλότα εὕρῃ διὰ τῆς τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἀφέσεως, ὅ φησι καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις· ἦλθον τὸ ἀπολωλὸς εὑρεῖν καὶ σῶσαι· ὅθεν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἔλεγεν, ἐὰν μή τις ἀναγεννηθῇ· οὐ τὴν ἐκ γυναικῶν γέννησιν σημαίνων, ὥσπερ ὑπενόουν ἐκεῖνοι, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀναγεννωμένην καὶ ἀνακτιζομένην ψυχὴν ἐν τῷ κατ' εἰκόνα δηλῶν*; so also the all-holy Son of the Father, who is the Image of the Father, came to our regions that he might fashion anew the man who had been made according to his likeness, and recover him as one lost by granting the forgiveness of sins, as he himself says in the Gospels [1]: "I came that I might find and save what had perished." Whence he also said to the Jews [2], "Unless one be born again." By these words he did not signify birth from women, as they indeed suspected, but denoted the soul regenerated and fashioned anew according to the image of God.

In this excellent disputation of Athanasius, there must be accurately distinguished, on the one hand a) what he affirms concerning the amplitude of renovation through Christ and concerning its character and nature, and on the other hand b) the arguments by which he strives to persuade and demonstrate what he has affirmed.

Now, concerning the amplitude of the reformation and renovation through Christ, he affirms that it pertains to all those whom the criminal cunning of Satan destroyed, who first received the sincere knowledge of God, who bore the divine image within themselves, and who are comprehended in the number of those creatures whom God made participants in reason. But these are all and only men. The amplitude, therefore, of reformation and renovation through Christ is of such a kind that it embraces all men and passes over no one at all.

But what is its rationale, what its character, and in what ought it chiefly to be judged to consist? Athanasius replies that by the reformation and renovation through Christ it was especially brought about

that death and corruption were conquered, that the darkness of ignorance was dispelled, that men were recalled to the true worship of God, and that the image

[1] Luke XIX.10.
[2] John III.5.

of God in them, defiled and nearly obliterated [1], was cleansed again and, having been cleansed, flourished anew.

All these things he confirms and proves partly by the authority of the Scriptures and partly by reasons drawn from the very nature of things. To this latter class pertain those which he takes from the origin of the human fall, from the primitive nobility of men, from the clemency and wisdom of God, and from the office of Creator, so that he may demonstrate that it was in no way becoming to leave the lost human race in its destruction. And you would believe that these things occurred to the mind of Thomas when, treating the question whether the punishment of original sin is privation of the divine vision, he first proposed to himself [2] this difficulty:

> That which does not attain the end for which it exists exists in vain. But man is naturally ordered to beatitude as to his ultimate end, which beatitude indeed consists in the divine vision. Therefore man exists in vain if he does not attain to the divine vision. But God, on account of original sin, did not cease to cause the generation of men, as Damascene says. Since, therefore, nothing is in vain in the works of God, it appears that man, on account of the sin which he contracts from his origin, does not incur the guilt of privation of the divine vision.

He replies:

> Man would have been made fruitlessly and vainly if he could not attain beatitude, just like any thing which cannot attain its ultimate end. Wherefore, lest man born with original sin should have been made fruitlessly and vainly, from the beginning of the human race God proposed to man a remedy by which he could be freed from this vanity, namely, the mediator himself, God and man, Jesus Christ, through faith in whom the impediment of original sin could be removed.
>
> Whence it is said in the Psalm: "Remember what my substance is; hast thou established all the sons of men in vain?" Expounding this, the Gloss says that David asks for [1] the incarnation of the Son, who

[1] Concerning this renovation of the divine image through Christ, the remaining Fathers of the Church also treat at greater length. Petavius adduces them in great number in *On the Trinity*, book VI, chap. V; book VIII, chap. V; *On the Incarnation*, book II, chap. VII. Among them Paulinus in the panegyric of Celsus speaks thus:

> That through Christ the heavenly image might return to me, Who upon the cross stripped himself of the earthly Adam.

[2] *Disputed Questions on Evil*, q. V, a. I, ad 1.

[1] The opinion is Augustine's, sermon II on Ps. LXXXVIII.

> was to assume flesh from his substance, and through whom men were to be freed from vanity.

Finally, by the authority and suffrage of the Scriptures, and expressly by these words [2], *ἦλθε ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός*, "the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost," Athanasius establishes and maintains the universal amplitude of the reparation.

XCV.

And he proceeds [3] to inculcate it, writing concerning the Word:

> Since the Word has unfolded himself everywhere—above [4] and below, in depth and in breadth: above, indeed, by the creation of things; below, by assuming human nature; in depth, when he descended into hell; and finally in breadth, insofar as he illuminated the whole world by his coming—all things assuredly have been filled with the knowledge of God. For that very reason he did not, immediately upon coming, *τὴν θυσίαν τὴν ὑπὲρ πάντων ἐπετέλει, παραδιδοὺς τὸ σῶμα τῷ θανάτῳ, καὶ ἀνιστῶν αὐτό*, offer the victim for all by handing his body over to death and then raising it from the dead; for thus he would rather have concealed himself from us. But he exhibited himself as visible through it, performed works of such a kind, and produced signs which demonstrated that he was not man but God the Word. *Ἀμφότερα γὰρ ἐφιλανθρωπεύετο ὁ σωτὴρ διὰ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως, ὅτι καὶ τὸν θάνατον ἐξ ἡμῶν ἠφάνιζε, καὶ ἀνεκαίνιζεν ἡμᾶς· καὶ ὅτι ἀφανὴς ὢν καὶ ἀόρατος, διὰ τῶν ἔργων ἐνεφαίνετο, καὶ ἐγνώριζεν ἑαυτὸν εἶναι τὸν λόγον τοῦ πατρός, τὸν τοῦ παντὸς ἡγεμόνα καὶ βασιλέα.*
>
> For by assuming humanity the Savior benignly accomplished these two things: he both drove death away from us and renewed us; and he himself, who by his own nature could neither appear nor be seen, appeared through works and openly showed himself to be the Word of the Father and the ruler and king of the universe.

[2] Luke XIX.10, compared with Matt. XVIII.11: "The Son of man came to seek and save that which was lost," that is, *lost man*, the neuter gender being employed in place of the masculine. Compare Glassius, *Philologia Sacra*, book I, tract I, *On the Noun*, canon XXI.

[3] *On the Incarnation of the Word of God*, no. 16, p. 61.

[4] He has regard to the Apostle's words in Eph. III.18, which he had cited immediately before.

Then elsewhere [1], reducing to a summary the causes *τῆς σωματικῆς ἐπιφανείας*, of the corporeal advent by which the Word appeared to men, he enumerates precisely these:

> That it belonged to no other to render incorrupt that which had been corrupted than to the Savior alone, who also in the beginning had made all things from nothing; nor did it belong to another to restore the likeness of the image according to which men were made, except to the Image of the Father; likewise, it belonged to no other to endow the mortal with immortality except our Lord Jesus Christ, who is life itself; finally, it belonged to no other to instruct men in the knowledge of the Father and overthrow the worship of idols except the Word, who both administers all things and alone is the true Only-begotten Son of the Father.
>
> *Ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ τὸ ὀφειλόμενον παρὰ πάντων ἔδει λοιπὸν ἀποδοθῆναι· ὠφείλετο γὰρ πάντας, ὡς προεῖπον, ἀποθανεῖν, δι' ὃ μάλιστα καὶ ἐπεδήμησεν· τούτου ἕνεκεν μετὰ τὰς περὶ τῆς θεότητος αὐτοῦ* [2] *ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἀποδείξεις, ἤδη λοιπὸν καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων τὴν θυσίαν ἀνέφερεν, ἀντὶ πάντων τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ναὸν εἰς θάνατον παραδιδούς, ἵνα τοὺς μὲν πάντας ἀνυπευθύνους καὶ ἐλευθέρους τῆς ἀρχαίας παραβάσεως ποιήσῃ, δείξῃ δὲ ἑαυτὸν καὶ θανάτου κρείττονα, ἀπαρχὴν τῆς τῶν ὅλων ἀναστάσεως τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα ἄφθαρτον ἐπιδεικνύμενος.* Since, moreover, what was owed by all had to be paid—for all, as I said before, owed it to die, and this was the principal cause of his coming—therefore, after he had proved his divinity by his works, he then offered the sacrifice for all, when on behalf of all he handed his own temple over to death, that he might render all free and immune from the ancient transgression, and show himself stronger than death, exhibiting his own incorrupt body as the firstfruits of the resurrection of all.

XCVI.

By these words both the manifold effects of reparation through Christ and its origin and amplitude are excellently explained. For among the effects are enumerated: to render incorrupt that which had been corrupted; to restore the likeness of the image according to which men had been formed; to endow the mortal with immortality; and finally, to imbue men with the knowledge of the Father.

[1] Ibid., no. 20, p. 64.

[2] Theodoret employs this testimony of Athanasius in the third of the *Dialogues*.

But to disclosing its origin pertains what occurs most frequently in Athanasius: that God, moved by his goodness, applied his hand to the work of reformation. That this reformation must be believed universal, the Alexandrian prelate affirms as often as he writes either that the Only-begotten offered *τὴν θυσίαν ὑπὲρ πάντων*, a sacrifice for all; or paid for all that which was owed by all; or rendered all free and immune from the primitive transgression; or that [1] the death of all was fulfilled in the Lord's body, so that death and corruption might be destroyed on account of the union of the Word; or that death had to be undergone for all, so that what all owed might be paid; or that the Word assumed for himself a body which could die, *ἵνα ὡς ἴδιον ἀντὶ πάντων αὐτὸ προσενέγκῃ*, that he might offer it as his own on behalf of all; or that he must be believed [2] *σωτῆρα πάντων*, the Savior of all.

Hence, after describing the calamity which followed the original fault, from which it must be repeated that "all things were disturbed, death prevailed from Adam [3] even unto Moses, the earth was cursed, hell was opened, paradise was closed, the heavens became hostile to us, and finally [1] man was corrupted and made like the beasts," he immediately adds [2]:

> *Τότε δὴ ὁ θεὸς φιλάνθρωπος ὢν καὶ μὴ θέλων ἀπολέσθαι τὸν κατ' εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπον, ἔλεγε· τίνα ἀποστείλω, καὶ τίς πορεύσεται;* Then God, being benign and not willing that man created according to his image should perish, said: "Whom [3] shall I send, and who shall go?" But when all were silent, the Son said [4]: "Behold, I; send me." Then the Father, saying, "Go," gave man over to the Son, *ἵνα γένηται αὐτὸς ὁ λόγος σάρξ, καὶ παραλαβὼν τὴν σάρκα κατὰ πάντα διορθώσηται*, that the Word himself might become flesh and, having assumed the flesh, might renew it wholly. For man was delivered to him as to a physician, that he might heal the bite inflicted upon him by the serpent; as to life, that he might raise the dead; as to light, that he might illuminate his darkness; as to Reason, that he might restore

[1] To this assuredly pertains that statement of Irenaeus, book III, chap. XXI: "For we could not otherwise receive incorruption and immortality unless we had been united to incorruption and immortality." Then these things from the same book, chap. XX, which Theodoret reports and proves in the second *Dialogue*: *εἰ μὴ συνηνώθη ἄνθρωπος τῷ θεῷ, οὐκ ἂν ἠδυνήθη μετασχεῖν τῆς ἀφθαρσίας*, "Unless man had been united to God, he could not have become a participant in incorruption." Thou hast similar things in Cyril of Alexandria, *On John*, book II, p. 198; book X, p. 918; and epistle I to Succensus, p. 138 ff.

[2] *On the Incarnation of the Word of God*, no. 19, p. 63.

[3] Rom. V.14.

[1] Ps. XLVIII.13.

[2] *Treatise on the Words "All Things Have Been Delivered to Me by My Father,"* no. 2, p. 104.

[3] Isa. VI.8.

[4] Ibid.

> his reason. *Ὡς γοῦν παρεδόθη αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, καὶ γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος, εὐθὺς διωρθώθη καὶ ἐτελειώθη τὰ ὅλα.* Therefore, as soon as all things were delivered to him and he himself became man, all things were immediately amended and perfected.

Certainly, the Savior himself, explaining in what manner all things were delivered to him, immediately added, as is read in Matthew [5]: "Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you"; for you have been delivered to me that I may refresh those exhausted by labor and recall the dead to life. With this also accords what John has [6]: "The Father loves the Son, and has given all things into his hand." For he gave them so that, just as all things were made through him, *οὕτως ἐν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ἀνακαινισθῆναι δυνηθῇ*, so all things might be restored in him. Indeed, all things were not delivered to him so that he might become rich from being poor; nor did he receive all things in order to obtain a power which he did not have—far be it!—*ἀλλ' ἵνα μᾶλλον, ὡς σωτήρ, τὰ πάντα διορθώσηται*, but rather that, as Savior, he might restore all things.

For it was fitting that the beginning of creation should indeed be made [1] *δι' αὐτοῦ*, through him, that things might exist; but that their restoration should be made [2] *ἐν αὐτῷ*, in him. These words assuredly differ from one another. For in the beginning all things were made through him that they might exist; but afterward, when all things had failed, the Word was made flesh and put on flesh, *ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ τὰ ὅλα κατορθωθῇ*, that in him all things might be restored…. For the Word therefore united himself to man so that the curse might no longer have any power against man. Hence those who in the seventy-first Psalm supplicate God for the human race say these things: "O God, give thy judgment to the king," so that the judgment of death pronounced against us might also be given to the Son and, dying for us, he might destroy it in himself. Signifying this, he himself says in the eighty-seventh Psalm: "Thy wrath is confirmed upon me," *τὸν γὰρ καθ' ἡμῶν θυμὸν αὐτὸς ἐβάσταζεν, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ ἑκατοστῷ τριακοστῷ ἑβδόμῳ φησί, Κύριος ἀνταποδώσει ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ*, for he himself bore the wrath owed to us, as he also says in the one-hundred-and-thirty-seventh Psalm: "The Lord will repay for me."

XCVII.

What sort, therefore, is the state in which we men find ourselves after the original fall? Is it one of condemnation, or, on the contrary, one of renovation and restora-

[5] Matt. XI.28.
[6] John III.35.
[1] John I.3.
[2] Eph. I.10.

tion? Athanasius teaches and repeatedly declares that it is one of renovation and restoration.

But what was the fountain, what the origin, of the merciful counsel by which God decreed to renew the human race in Christ? The very *φιλανθρωπία* of God and the will flourishing from his innate goodness, if we believe Athanasius.

But what have been and continue to be the effects and fruits of this renovation? Entirely excellent ones, Athanasius adds. For to it must be credited: a) the medicine by which the bite inflicted upon men by the serpent is healed; b) the life by which the debt of everlasting destruction is canceled; c) the light by which the darkness poured around them is dispelled; and finally d) the participation in divine reason by which men are recalled to the image of God.

But are these things common to all men, or proper only to some? Is the renovation general or particular? Athanasius testifies in more than one way that the benefit of renovation is general. He testifies a) when he denies that God's *φιλανθρωπία* permitted him to leave in the destruction which he had created for himself the man whom he had fashioned according to his own image; he testifies b) when he says that all those whom the serpent killed, ignorance occupied, and death subdued are comprehended by the benefit of renovation; he testifies c) when he teaches that renovation *in Christ* extends as widely as creation *through Christ*; finally, he testifies d) when he teaches that the grace of restoration is poured back into all those whose nature the Word assumed and who are consubstantial with the Word according to the flesh.

But these are altogether all men, and for this reason he everywhere [1] calls Christ *σωτῆρα καὶ βασιλέα τοῦ παντός*, the Savior and King of the universe. Moreover, inquiring into the cause for which Christ endured so many and such great things, he first denies that there is any reason for us to blush on this account, and then affirms that there is rather reason [2] for us *τὴν ἀγαθότητα καὶ τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν αὐτοῦ θαυμάζωμεν*, to admire his goodness and humanity.

> For the sin of men was very great, and an evil of this kind occupied the whole world, since the kingdom of sin prevailed in all and against all. But our Lord is immortal and incorruptible, and, as immortal and incorruptible, *οὕτως ἀγαθὸς καὶ φιλάνθρωπος*, so also good and humane. For he is the good Word of the good Father: *δι' οὐ παρεῖδεν ἀπολέσθαι* [3] *τὸ γενόμενον, οὐδ' ὑπέμεινε τῶν αὐτοῦ ποιημάτων ἄλλον γενέσθαι κύριον· ἀλλ' ὁρῶν τὸ μὲν τῆς κακίας ἀφόρητον, καὶ τὸ θνητὸν γένος οὐχ ἱκανὸν ἀντιστῆναι πρὸς τὸν*

[1] *On the Passion and Cross of the Lord*, no. 11, p. 88.
[2] Ibid., pp. 88–89.
[3] There are codices which read not *τὸ γενόμενον* but *τὸ γένος ἡμῶν*.

θάνατον, οὐδὲ τὴν τιμωρίαν τῶν κακῶν δυνατὸν ἀποδοῦναι…. ὁρῶν δὲ καὶ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀγαθότητα, ὁρῶν καὶ—
—τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἱκανότητα καὶ δύναμιν· Χριστὸς γὰρ θεοῦ δύναμις καὶ θεοῦ σοφία· κεκίνηται τῇ φιλανθρωπίᾳ, καὶ οἰκτείρας τὴν ἀσθένειαν ἡμῶν, ἐνεδύσατο ταύτην, wherefore he did not permit his workmanship to perish, nor did he endure that another should be lord of his works; but, seeing the intolerable malice and that the mortal race did not have the strength to resist death or the power to pay the punishment for its evils; seeing likewise the goodness of his Father and his own power and strength—for Christ [1] is the power of God and the wisdom of God—he was moved by his love toward men and, having pitied our weakness, put it on. For he, as the prophet says [2], took our infirmities and bore our diseases. Likewise, having pitied our mortality, he was clothed with it. For Paul says [3]: "He humbled himself unto death, even the death of the cross." And when he saw likewise that we were unequal to the payment of the penalty, he undertook it; for Christ [4] was made a curse for us. And thus, wrapped about and clothed in human things, through himself he offered to the Father those things which were ours, that, as though he himself suffered, he might render unharmed the man who was suffering and exchange small things for great.

For he descended that he might prepare an ascent for us; he experienced birth so that through him we might *τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ φιλιασώμεν*, be joined in friendship with the Unbegotten; he was made weak for us that we might be raised up in strength and say with Paul [5]: "I can do all things in him who strengthens me, Jesus Christ." He assumed a corruptible body so that the corruptible might put on incorruption; he put on the mortal so that the mortal might put on immortality. Finally, he was made man and died so that we, who as men were dying, *θεοποιησώμεν*, might be deified and no longer sustain the kingdom of death. For when he suffered, he was in no way harmed; rather, he bestowed gifts. And dying, he did not remain dead, but rather gave life to the dead; *καὶ σφαγιαζόμενος δὲ οὐκ ἀπώλλυτο, ἀλλὰ τῷ αἵματι τῆς σφαγῆς πάντας ἁπλῶς ἐλυτροῦτο, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔμενεν ἀπαθής—*

[1] I Cor. I.24.
[2] Isa. LIII.4.
[3] Phil. II.8.
[4] Gal. III.13.
[5] Phil. IV.13.

—nor did he perish when immolated, but by the blood of his immolation he redeemed all without exception, while he himself remained impassible.

And he redeemed all without exception, since [1]

he assumed for himself a body which could die, *ἵνα τοῦτο τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου μεταλαβόν, ἀντὶ πάντων ἱκανὸν γένηται τῷ θανάτῳ, καὶ διὰ τὸν ἐνοικήσαντα λόγον ἄφθαρτον διαμείνῃ*, that this body, having participated in God the Word, might be capable of undergoing death for all and, on account of the indwelling Word, might remain incorrupt.

Expounding these things more fully [2], he adds:

For the Word of God, being above all, *προσαγαγὼν ἀντίψυχον ὑπὲρ πάντων*, offering his temple and bodily instrument as a redemption in exchange for all, fulfilled the debt which was situated in death; *καὶ ὡς συνὼν δὲ διὰ τοῦ ὁμοίου τοῖς πᾶσιν, ὁ ἄφθαρτος τοῦ θεοῦ υἱός, εἰκότως τοὺς πάντας ἐνέδυσεν ἀφθαρσίαν ἐν τῇ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐπαγγελίᾳ*, and the incorruptible Son of God, as one present in all through a like body, fittingly clothed all with immortality in the promise of the resurrection; and the corruption which, according to men, follows death no longer has any place, *διὰ τὸν ἐνοικήσαντα λόγον ἐν τούτοις διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς σώματος*, on account of the Word dwelling in them, because they are one body with him.

To add splendor to these things, he employs a similitude [3], saying:

Just as when some great king enters a large city and dwells in one of its houses, the whole city is affected with great honor, nor does any enemy thereafter dare to assail it; indeed, because of the king dwelling in one of the houses, it is guarded with the greatest solicitude and distinction. The same has happened with regard to our Savior. *Ἐλθόντος γὰρ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν χώραν, καὶ οἰκήσαντος εἰς ἓν τῶν ὁμοίων σωμάτων, λοιπὸν πᾶσα κατὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπιβολὴ πέπαυται.* For when he had come into our region—

—and taken up his dwelling in a body like ours, thereafter every assault against man ceased.

[1] *Greater Discourse on Faith*, no. 5, p. 6, vol. II of the *New Collection*, by Montfaucon, Paris, 1706.

[2] Ibid., no. 6, pp. 6–7.

[3] Ibid., p. 7.

XCVIII.

There can be no doubt, therefore, what, according to Athanasius, must be believed concerning either the origin of the renewed human race, or the force and efficacy of the instituted renovation, or its ambit and amplitude. For its origin is the *ἀγαθότης καὶ φιλανθρωπία*, the goodness and humanity, of the Father and the Son, by which each, aroused and moved, did not permit his work and his image to go to ruin and be subjected to another lord—or rather, to a tyrant.

Moreover, the force and efficacy of the instituted renovation is so great that it repaired, not without increase, the losses inflicted by sin. It repaired the loss of corruption and death by the incorruption and immortality promised; it repaired infirmity by the strength supplied; it repaired the guilt of debt by the payment exhibited; it repaired enmities by men's reconciliation with God; and it repaired the contracted ignobility by the power to be deified having been given.

But in what manner did he accomplish these things, and for whom did he accomplish them? The answer, with Athanasius leading, is ready at hand. For whence, I ask, did all human evils flow as from a native fountain? From nowhere else than from the broken society of benevolence and friendship with God. Therefore, that so many and such great evils might be provided for by obstructing the fountain, God brought it about by his goodness and wisdom that in Christ the whole nature of men should be united to God much more closely and intimately and, having been united, should be advanced to its pristine dignity.

God honored not one or another with this supreme and excellent good, but altogether all those whom he first founded through his Word, whom he fashioned according to his own image, who perished in Adam, whom death occupied, and whose nature the Word assumed and vindicated into liberty.

> For it was unbecoming, writes Athanasius [1], that things endowed with reason and once made participants in the Word of God should perish and return again through corruption into nothing. For it was altogether unworthy of the divine goodness—
>
> —that things made by God should be destroyed because of the frauds by which the devil circumvented men. Most especially was it unbecoming that the art of God in men should be destroyed either because of their negligence or because of the cunning of demons. Therefore, when men were perishing and such works were falling into destruction, *τί τὸν θεὸν ἔδει ποιεῖν ἀγαθὸν ὄντα;* what ought God, who is good, to have done? To permit corruption to prevail against them and death to dominate them? But what would it have profited them to have been made in the beginning? For it was better

[1] *On the Incarnation of the Word of God*, no. 6, p. 52.

> that they should not have been made at all than, having been made, be neglected and perish. *Ἀσθένεια γὰρ μᾶλλον καὶ οὐκ ἀγαθότης ἐκ τῆς ἀμελείας γινώσκεται τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰ ποιήσας παρορᾷ φθαρῆναι τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ἔργον, ἥπερ εἰ μὴ πεποίηκε κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν τὸν ἄνθρωπον· μὴ ποιήσαντος μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἦν ὁ λογιζόμενος τὴν ἀσθένειαν· ποιήσαντος δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸ εἶναι κτίσαντος, ἀτοπώτατον ἦν ἀπόλλυσθαι τὰ ἔργα, καὶ μάλιστα ἐπ' ὄψει τοῦ πεποιηκότος· οὐκοῦν ἔδει τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μὴ ἀφιέναι φέρεσθαι τῇ φθορᾷ, διὰ τὸ ἀπρεπὲς καὶ ἀνάξιον εἶναι τοῦτο τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγαθότητος.* For such negligence would have been an argument of weakness rather than of God's goodness, if, having made his work, he permitted it to be destroyed, more than if he had not created man at all in the beginning. For if he had not created him, there would have been no one who might reflect upon the weakness; but after he made him and created him that he might exist, it would have been most absurd for the works to perish, especially before the eyes of their author. Therefore, it was foreign to God to permit men to fall into corruption, because this was unbecoming and unworthy of the divine goodness.
>
> But [1] when, transgression having gone before, men fell into the corruption owed to nature and were despoiled of the grace of the divine likeness, what else, I ask, ought to have been done? Or whose work was necessary for furnishing grace and restoration of this kind except that of the Word of God, by whom all things were first made from nothing? *Αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἦν πάλιν καὶ τὸ φθαρτὸν εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν ἐνεγκεῖν, καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων εὔλογον ἀποσῶσαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα· λόγος γὰρ ὢν τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντας ὤν, ἀκολούθως καὶ ἀνακτίσαι τὰ ὅλα μόνος ἦν δυνατός, καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων παθεῖν, καὶ πρεσβεῦσαι περὶ πάντων ἱκανὸς—*
>
> *—πρὸς τὸν πατέρα.* For it belonged to him to render incorrupt again that which was corrupt and to preserve before the Father that which was fitting on behalf of all. For since he is the Word of the Father and far excels all, therefore he alone was able to restore all things; and he alone was equal to suffering for all and interceding with the Father for all.

Since he accomplished these things most abundantly, he therefore obtained [1] the name and dignity *τοῦ κοινοῦ πάντων σωτῆρος*, of the common Savior of all.

[1] Ibid., no. 7, p. 53.
[1] Ibid., no. 21, p. 65.

XCIX.

There would be many other things of the same import at hand which I might add, but I abstain from relating them, lest I be excessive, and I come to those Fathers and writers who by their testimony represent the faith and doctrine of the African Church. From these, moreover, we obtain this above all: that among those attributes by which the supreme Deity is related to the human race, goodness excels; that the first place belongs to it, severity and justice following only in the second place; and that therefore it is proper to God that he be believed ἐξόχως, preeminently, to be the parent of men.

Tertullian speaks excellently where he addresses the soul in these words [2]:

> Nor are you ignorant of the nature of God which we preach: "God is good; God does good," is your voice. Certainly you say these things—but man, namely, is evil—reproaching obliquely and figuratively by a contrary proposition that therefore man is evil who has withdrawn from the good God. Likewise, because with God every blessing of goodness and benignity is among us the supreme [3] mystery of discipline and conduct, you pronounce "May God bless you" as readily as is necessary for a Christian.

Then, having made mention [4] of the most gentle father who received with such benignity the son who had poured himself out into every lust, he immediately adds:

> Who is that father to be understood by us? God, assuredly: no one is so much a father; no one so kind. Therefore he will receive you as his son, even though you have squandered what you received from him, even though you have returned naked, because you have returned; and he will rejoice more over your return than over the sobriety of another.

But in explaining the Lord's Prayer [1], at the beginning he admonishes that the Lord is not to be approached with an array of words for this reason: that we are certain he provides for his own of his own accord. Then he adds [2] that this prayer begins

> from the testimony of God and the merit of faith when we say, "Father who art in heaven." For we both pray to God and commend the

[2] *On the Testimony of the Soul*, chap. II, p. 81, edition of Rigaltius, 1641.

[3] Every blessing of the goodness and benignity of God is called by Tertullian the supreme mystery of Christian discipline and conduct, as though the highest and last mystery, and, so to speak, the most celebrated. In the same manner Augustine wrote that this salutation, "Thanks be to God," was in his time most celebrated in the Church.

[4] *On Penance*, chap. VIII, p. 146.

[1] *On Prayer*, chap. I, p. 149.

[2] Ibid., chap. II, pp. 149–150.

> faith whose merit is this appellation. It is written: "To those who believed in him, he gave power that they should be called sons of God." Although the Lord most frequently pronounced God to be our Father, he even commanded us not to call anyone on earth father except him whom we have in heaven. Therefore, worshiping thus, we also fulfill a precept. Blessed are they who acknowledge the Father. This is what is reproached in Israel, what the Spirit calls heaven and earth to witness: "I have begotten sons," he says, "and they have not acknowledged me."

Cyprian has things most similar to these [3]; and Minucius Felix, agreeing with both [4], writes:

> No one, unless profane, deliberates [5] whether those who do not know God are deservedly tormented as impious and unjust, since it is a crime no less to be ignorant of the Parent of all and Lord of all than to injure him.

And, after some intervening remarks [6], he proceeds:

> Therefore God both cannot fail to aid us and does not despise us, since he is both the ruler of all and the lover of his own; but in adversities he tests and examines each one; he weighs the disposition of each by dangers; even unto the final death he investigates the will of man, secure that nothing can perish for him. Therefore, just as gold is proved by fires, so we are proved by trials.

Concerning this benevolent nature of God, wholly intent upon the salvation and felicity of all, those things which Arnobius disputes against the gentiles are entirely excellent [1]. He says:

> Unless perhaps you say that aid is brought by the gods to the good, while the miseries of the evil are despised. But Christ equally succors the good and the evil; nor is anyone repulsed by him who, in difficult circumstances, sought aid against the assault and injuries of fortune. For this is proper to the true God and to royal power: to deny his benignity to no one and not to consider who deserves it or does not.

For, as Lactantius says while discoursing on the praises of divine religion [2]:

> It alone brings it about that man holds man dear and knows that the same is bound to him by the bond of brotherhood; since the same

[3] *On the Lord's Prayer*, pp. 99–102, Amsterdam edition, 1700.
[4] *Octavius*, § XXXV, p. 402, in Gallandius, vol. II.
[5] That is, no one doubts; for those who doubt deliberate what must be done.
[6] Ibid., § XXXVI, p. 402.
[1] *Disputations against the Gentiles*, book I, § XVIII, p. 142, in Gallandius, vol. IV.
[2] *Divine Institutes*, book V, chap. VI, p. 312, in Gallandius, vol. IV.

> God is Father of all, so that he shares the benefits of God, the common Father, with those who do not have them, harms no one, oppresses no one, does not close his doors to a guest nor his ear to one praying, but is bountiful, beneficent, and liberal—qualities which Tullius [3] judged to be royal praises. This assuredly is justice, and this is the golden age which was first corrupted while Jove reigned and soon, when both he and all his progeny had been consecrated and the worship of many gods undertaken, was wholly taken away.

Lest men remain any longer in this altogether most wretched condition,

> God, as the most indulgent Parent, adds Lactantius [4], when the last time drew near, sent a messenger who would restore that ancient age and justice which had been put to flight, lest the human race should be agitated by the greatest and perpetual errors.

For [5]

> God therefore demands to be worshiped and honored by man as Father, that man may possess virtue and wisdom, which alone produces immortality. For since no one else besides him can give it, because he alone possesses it, he will reward by this prize the piety by which man has honored God: that he be blessed eternally and be always with God and in the presence of God.

By this Lactantius declares what the sum of the divine counsels regards when he answers [1] in this manner the question why the world and man were created:

> For this reason the world was made: that we might be born. For this reason we are born: that we might acknowledge God, the maker of the world and of ourselves. For this reason we acknowledge him: that we might worship him. For this reason we worship him: that we might receive immortality as the recompense of our labors, since the worship of God is comprised of the greatest labors. For this reason we are affected with the reward of immortality: that, having been made like the angels, we may serve the supreme Father and Lord forever and be an eternal kingdom for God. This is the sum of things; this is the secret of God; this is the mystery of the world. From it those are alien who, following present pleasure, have devoted themselves to earthly and fragile goods and submerged in mud and mire, through death-bearing delights, souls born for heavenly things.

[3] *Oration for Deiotarus*, chap. IX.
[4] Ibid., chap. VII, p. 312.
[5] Ibid., book VII, chap. V, p. 350.
[1] Ibid., book VII, chap. VI, p. 350.

Nor is the image by which Marius Victorinus exhibits God different. For, expounding the Apostle's statement [2], "from whom every paternity in heaven and on earth is named," he speaks thus [3]:

> Namely, from God the Father and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; for he is Father, he is the first Father, and from him whoever is a father has been named father. And yet this name or power flowed down from the first God the Father as from a fountain. For Christ also is the Father of all things which were created; for through Christ all things were created.
>
> Likewise, he is Father in the mysteries [1]. And Paul is in some manner a father, since he said: "You are my sons; I begot you," he says, "in Christ Jesus through the Gospel." Finally, paternity in heaven is Christ; on earth paternity is either the apostles, or whoever evangelizes, or he who hands on the mystery. For in these ways and many others those who receive the faith are called sons, and those who hand it on are called fathers. Therefore all paternity proceeds from God the Father.

C.

Therefore, according to the testimony of Tertullian, Cyprian, Minucius, Arnobius, Lactantius, and Victorinus, no relation exists first between God and men other than that of benevolence, affection, and paternal love, by which it

[2] Eph. III.15. Not only the Vulgate but also nearly all the other Latin writers in Sabatier have the same word *paternity*, except that the author of *On the Forty Mansions* among the works of Ambrose reads, "from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named." In Greek it is thus: *ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται*. Now, according to Hesychius the interpreter, *πατριά* is *φυλή*, tribe; and by Suidas *πατριαί* are rendered *χῶραι, φυλαί, τοπαρχίαι*, regions, tribes, districts. By the name *πατριά* the Alexandrians render both the Hebrew *משפחה*, family, race, and *אב בית*, house of the father. In the New Testament the same name also occurs in Luke II.4 and Acts III.25, and in both places it bears the force and signification of family and race. Therefore, we would not depart very far from the truth of the matter if we rendered the apostolic testimony *ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται* in Latin thus: "who is the author and founder of his family throughout the universe." Compare Kypke, *Observationes Sacrae*, vol. II, p. 213.

[3] *On the Epistle to the Ephesians*, book I, p. 119, in Mai, *Veterum Scriptorum*, vol. III.

[1] For illustrating these things, what he has on Gal. IV.19 in book II, p. 37, is useful:

> Moreover, as to what he added, "My sons," since men are called sons in many ways—now by charity, now by nature, now by blood, and now also by religion, by which Paul today says "My sons"—either because through baptism, when regeneration occurs, he who perfects the baptized or receives him when perfected is called father; or because, when he renews them into Christ, he makes them his sons; for this reason he added, "whom I bring forth," that is, whom I desire to bring forth into the light and, with great pains of my soul, desire to be born unto life and salvation.

comes about that God is called and believed to be Father: the most indulgent, most gentle, supreme, and principal Father, from whom all paternity flows; and so much a father that no one is so much a father, no one so kind.

The origin and rationale of this benevolence and paternity toward men is innate in God, flows from his native goodness, and is so universal that it excepts no one and embraces all.

It is innate in God, since it is proper to the true God and to royal power to deny his benignity to no one and not to consider who deserves it or does not. It is universal, since God is the Parent of all, the ruler of all and the lover of his own, the common Father, and equally aids the good and the evil.

With both attributes there coheres a third ornament of the same benevolent and paternal will, by which it is efficacious, active—

—and pours itself forth in a manifold abundance of benefits. To this ornament pertain the things which the African Fathers unanimously attest: a) that precisely the same thing is signified when we say that God is good toward all and does good to all; b) that God of his own accord provides for men; c) that of his own accord he is so disposed that he cannot despise men; d) that no one suffers repulse from him and all are enriched by the effects of divine benignity; and finally e) that both the natural and the supernatural order are so divinely administered and directed that souls born for heavenly things may serve the supreme Father and Lord forever and be an eternal kingdom for God.

But what we have indicated, according to the judgment of the African Church, concerning the amplitude and efficacy of the paternal will of God is of such weight and such moment that it ought both to be set forth more diligently and confirmed more strongly. Tertullian, therefore, establishes as a principle that it pleased God, according to the goodness which is his, to bring aid to the fallen human race, extend a merciful hand to it, and advance it from the state of ruin and condemnation to the state of hope and reformation. And the following words are assuredly manifest [1] and fitted to persuade what we teach:

> After so many and such great offenses of human temerity, begun from Adam, the prince of the race; after man had been condemned [2] with the dowry of the age, cast out of paradise, and subjected to death; when God had again hastened to his mercy [3], from that point

[1] *On Penance*, chap. II, pp. 139–140.

[2] By "the dowry of the age," according to the interpretation of Rigaltius, he means the offenses through which man fell away from divine grace. Ludovicus de la Cerda, in his notes on this passage, and Benedictus Ferdinandus, on Gen. III, sect. 40, report other interpretations of the same phrase.

[3] For after God punished Adam by casting him out of paradise, he very quickly had recourse to his mercy. Rhenanus therefore skillfully explained Tertullian's words by this commentary: "When God had quickly betaken himself to his mercy."

> he initiated penance in himself [4], rescinding the sentence of his former wrath—
>
> —and covenanting to forgive man and his own image.

Therefore the human race dwells in a state of reformation, and God converts the wrath owed to it into the mercy with which he has pursued his image.

But from this divine purpose of reforming humanity the following can in no way be separated: a) a sincere will concerning the salvation of all men; b) a will by which God prefers the penance of men to their destruction and ruin; c) a will by which he gives to all the opportunity and power to rise from the native condition of children of wrath to the most blessed dignity of adopted sons; d) a will which denies no one the aids necessary for obtaining salvation; e) a will which does not decree punishment before men have conspired unto their own ruin and despised heavenly mercy; and therefore f) a will which has chosen that order of providence in which the first place is granted to goodness and mercy, but only the second to severity and punitive justice. It is sufficient to unfold the idea and notion of reformation into its elements, as it were, for all and each of these things to appear comprehended within them. Wherefore, if Tertullian held the opinion which we attributed to him and truly believed that the human race was divinely led from the state of wrath and condemnation to the state of mercy and salvation, there is hope that, as opportunity arose, he handed down all the things we have recalled. And indeed he did hand them down, with such evidence and such perspicuity of testimonies that scarcely anything fuller could be desired.

---

[4] As though, says Rigaltius, God repented of having made man; as though he also repented of having condemned him. But, writes de la Cerda, Tertullian's opinion is altogether different, and entirely comes to this:

> After punishing man, God, immediately taking refuge in his mercy, by that very fact initiated penance in himself, because, rescinding his former wrath, he covenanted that from supreme mercy he was prepared to forgive anyone who repents.

Therefore, *to initiate penance in himself* is nothing else here than to raise the banner of mercy in himself for the good of penitents, which could not exist before Adam sinned: God assuredly made himself an asylum for penitents. Wherefore, against Barraeus—because he refers the initiation of penance in God to those words, "It repents me that I made man"—the learned man notes that he is gravely mistaken. For Tertullian says the same thing that Athanasius says in the *Questions to Antiochus the Prince*, q. LXXXIII: *ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὁ θεός ἐστιν ὁ ταύτης πρόξενος*. That is, he says that God first opened places of hospitality for the repentance of sinners. And immediately he makes the devil the *ποιητήν*, author, of evil penance, since he brings it about that men grieve not over sins but over good works. Therefore, as the devil is the institutor of evil penance, so God is the institutor of good penance; and that penance is good by which one repents only of sins.

CI.

For what we enumerated in the first place, he handed down when, expounding [1] the Savior's words "Thy will be done," he wrote:

> According to this form we add, "Thy will be done" [2] "in heaven and on earth," not because anyone opposes the doing of God's will and we pray for the success [3] of his will; but we ask that his will be done in all. For according to the figurative interpretation of flesh and spirit [4], we are heaven and earth.—Although, even if it is to be understood simply, the sense of the petition is nevertheless the same: that God's will be done in us on earth, so that it may also be done, namely, in heaven. But what does God will except that we walk according to his discipline? Therefore we ask that he furnish us the substance and faculty of his will, that we may be saved both in heaven and on earth, because the sum [5] of his will is the salvation of those whom he has adopted…. For there is nothing evil in God's will, even if something is inflicted according to the merits of each.

Entirely excellent and most suitable for effecting what we will; for nothing is either more illustrious than the words "the sum of the divine will is the salvation of those whom he has adopted," or more suitable than the statement that God's will toward men is benevolent even when they are visited, according to their own merits, by the severity of justice.

---

[1] *On Prayer*, chap. IV, pp. 150–151.

[2] Tertullian omits the particle *as*, *ὡς*; and what is in the singular form in Greek, *ἐν οὐρανῷ*, he renders in the plural, "in heaven."

[3] Cyprian and Venantius Fortunatus repeat these things, following Tertullian, when they too explain the Lord's Prayer.

[4] Cyprian, Venantius, Gregory Nazianzen in oration I, and Florus in his exposition of the Mass are likewise authors of the same figurative interpretation. Florus says:

> We can also understand by heaven and earth the spirit and the flesh, since the spirit is known to be from heaven and the flesh from earth; but the spirit seeks heavenly things, the flesh desires earthly things, and therefore we ask that, with these two agreeing, we may do the will of God.

[5] Gregory of Nyssa agrees perfectly in discourse IV on the Lord's Prayer: *γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου· θέλημα δὲ θεοῦ ἡ σωτηρία τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐστίν*: "Thy will be done; but the will of God is the salvation of men." Nor does Cassian disagree, *Conference* IX, chap. XIX, saying:

> Or certainly it is to be understood in this manner: the will of God is the salvation of all, according to that statement of blessed Paul, "who wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth." Therefore, saying to him, "Thy will be done as in heaven and on earth," in other words we pray this to him: that just as those who are in heaven, so all who dwell on earth may likewise be saved through knowledge of thee.

Lest these words be judged to have been said concerning some alone, four things chiefly prevent it: 1) their agreement with that doctrine which was common to ecclesiastical writers; then 2) the things which precede in Tertullian; then 3) the things which follow in the same author; and finally 4) what he himself has concerning the amplitude and ambit of those effects which proceed from the salutary divine will. Indeed, let the things which we brought forward in explaining the doctrine of the Alexandrian Church [1] be recalled, and likewise let those which we have just transcribed from Gregory of Nyssa and John Cassian be recalled. It will be manifest that all these things cannot be reconciled *ἁρμονικῶς*, harmoniously, with Tertullian's words unless what he says—that the sum of the divine will is the salvation of those whom he has adopted—is understood of the will which is *ἡ σωτηρία τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, the salvation of men.

The preceding things also demand this interpretation. For, explaining [2] the words "Hallowed be thy name," he writes:

> As far as concerns our petition, when we say, "Hallowed be thy name," we ask that it be hallowed [3] in us, who are in him, and at the same time also in the others whom the grace of God still awaits; so that in this also we may obey the precept by praying [4] for all, even for our enemies. And therefore, suspending the expression and not saying "Hallowed in us," we say "in all."

Nor do the things which follow look to anything else. Concerning that part of the Lord's Prayer by which we ask "Thy kingdom come," he determines thus [1]:

> "Thy kingdom come" also pertains to what was said, "Thy will be done," namely, in us. For when does God [2] not reign, in whose hand is the heart of all kings? But whatever we desire for ourselves, we augur for him and attribute to him what we expect from him.

[1] §§ LXXII ff.

[2] *On Prayer*, chap. III, p. 150.

[3] According to Cyril of Alexandria on the second chapter of Amos, *ἁγιάζειν λέγονται τὸν θεὸν οἱ ζῶντες ὀρθῶς*, "those who live rightly are said to sanctify God." Jerome does not depart in the least from this interpretation when he writes in the third book *Against the Pelagians*: "They desire to sanctify in themselves the name of God, which is holy in itself."

[4] Venantius Fortunatus supplies a perspicuous commentary on these words, saying:

> We see that he desires his name to be sanctified not only in us but also in those who have not yet merited to attain the grace of baptism; for in the most full charity of Christ we are taught to pray even for our enemies, because he himself freed from the prison of death not friends and faithful men, but his adversaries and the guilty.

[1] *On Prayer*, chap. V, p. 151.

[2] Cyprian speaks in the same manner: "For when does God not reign? Or when does that begin with him which both always was and does not cease to be?"

> Therefore, if the manifestation of the Lord's kingdom [4] pertains to God's will and to our suspense [3], how do some ask for a certain prolongation in the age [5], when the kingdom of God whose coming we pray for tends toward the consummation of the age? We desire to reign sooner and not to serve any longer. Even if it had not been prescribed in the prayer to ask for the coming of the kingdom, of our own accord we would have uttered that expression, hastening to the embrace of our hope.

Therefore, of its own accord and by its native weight, the divine will is carried to this: that it may manifest the heavenly kingdom to all, unless those same men oppose it. For if the fullest charity is required of us, and we are commanded to pray for all that the sanctification of the divine name may shine forth in them, much fuller is the merciful benignity of God, which anticipates all, takes possession of all, and leaves altogether no one destitute of its light and heat.

CII.

For after fault he provides penance, prefers penance to death, rejoices over penance, and therefore threatens lest he rage and so that he may open for himself some entrance for forgiving; and he punishes only when men make no end of sinning.

> For all offenses, says Tertullian [1], whether committed by flesh or spirit, by deed or will, he who appointed punishment through judgment likewise promised pardon through penance, saying to the people [2]: "Repent" [3], "and I will save thee." And again: "I live, says the Lord, and I prefer penance to death." Therefore penance is life, since it is preferred to death. You, therefore, a sinner like me—rather, less than I, for I acknowledge my preeminence [4] in offenses—seize

[4] By this word, customary among African writers, that is expressed which we call the setting of a present thing before one.

[3] Venantius Fortunatus declares what kind of thing this suspense of ours is, saying: "We who plant all our hope in the possession of the future kingdom." Hence we hang in mind even unto the fruit, lest

> Fertile fields deceive by counterfeit grass.

[5] Some read *pertractum*, without, as I judge, any difference in signification.

[1] *On Penance*, chap. IV, pp. 141–142.

[2] Tertullian appears to have regard to the things which are read in Ezekiel XVIII.

[3] Although the form *poenitere*, "repent," may appear unusual, it must not therefore be judged corrupt, since the form *poenitemini*, "repent ye," occurs in Mark and in Acts.

[4] Whence in the last chapter of this little book he calls himself a sinner of every mark.

> it and embrace it just as a shipwrecked man trusts some plank [5]. It will raise you up when submerged in the waves of sins and draw you onward into the harbor of divine clemency [6]. Seize the occasion of unexpected felicity, so that you who were formerly nothing before God [7] except a drop from a bucket, dust of the threshing floor, and a potter's vessel—
>
> —may thence become that tree which is planted beside waters, remains evergreen in its leaves, and brings forth fruit in its season; which will see neither fire nor axe…. Is it good to repent, or not? Why do you turn it over in your mind? God commands it. Yet he does not command only, but also exhorts. He invites with a reward, even swearing salvation [1], saying, "I live" [2]; he desires to be believed. O blessed are we, for whose sake God swears! O most wretched, if we do not believe the Lord even when he swears!

Moreover, to the words by which we ask [3] that our debts be forgiven, he adds:

> The Lord knew that he alone was without offense; he therefore teaches us to ask that our debts be forgiven. The petition for pardon is *exomologesis*, confession, because he who seeks pardon confesses his offense. Thus also penance is shown to be acceptable to God, because he wills it more [4] than the death of the sinner.

But while he speaks almost unwillingly of a second penance, lest [5] an occasion for sinning be taken from this remaining remedy, he says at the beginning:

> Yet the spirit is not immediately to be cut down and overthrown [6] by despair if anyone has become a debtor to a second penance. Let it indeed be irksome to sin again, but not irksome to repent again; let

[5] This image is customary among ecclesiastical writers, as may be seen in Ambrose, *To a Fallen Virgin*, chap. VIII; Jerome, in the letters to Sabinianus and Salvina; and Peter of Blois, in the little book *On the Pilgrimage to Jerusalem*.

[6] *Protelabit* is the same as "will draw out and conduct onward." This acceptation of the word in that signification is frequent, as Cassian, *On the Incarnation*, book II, chap. II; book III, chap. IV; book V, chap. V; Peter Chrysologus, discourse V; Jerome, *Against Jovinian*, the fifth Council of Toledo, canon I; Aldhelm, *On Virginity*, chap. XXVIII; and Fulbert of Chartres, epistle XXXVI, bear witness.

[7] Isa. XL; Dan. II; Ps. I; Jer. IX; Matt. III.

[1] Ciaconius judged from conjecture that it should read "he invites with the reward of salvation"; but the reading reported by us, just as it is more difficult and *ἐμφατικωτέρα*, more emphatic, is also proved by the suffrage of the codices.

[2] Ezek. XXXIII.11.

[3] *On Prayer*, chap. VII, p. 152.

[4] Since ellipsis is frequent in Tertullian, after the causal particle *because* the comparative adverb *more* must be inserted.

[5] *On Penance*, chap. VIII, p. 145.

[6] To these must be joined the entirely excellent things which Cyril of Jerusalem disputes to the same effect, *Catechesis* II, §§ V ff.

> it be irksome to be imperiled again, but not to be freed again. Let no one be ashamed: for renewed health the medicine must be renewed. You will show yourself grateful toward the Lord if you do not refuse what the Lord offers you. You have offended, but you can still be reconciled. You have one to whom you may make satisfaction, and one who indeed wills it.

Then he proceeds [7]:

> If you doubt this, unfold what the Spirit says [8] to the churches. He imputes abandoned love to the Ephesians; fornication and the eating of things offered to idols to the Thyatirans—
>
> —and yet he moves all to penance, and indeed under threats. But he would not threaten the impenitent if he did not forgive the penitent. This would be doubtful if he had not also elsewhere demonstrated this profusion of his clemency. Does he not say [1], "He who has fallen shall rise, and he who has turned away shall be turned back"? He is assuredly the one, he is the one who prefers mercy to sacrifice. The heavens and the angels who are there rejoice over the penance of man. Ho, sinner, be of good spirit: you see where they rejoice over your return. What do those arguments from the Lord's similitudes mean for us [2]? A woman lost a drachma, sought it, found it, and invited her friends to rejoice: is this not an example of a restored sinner? One little sheep of the shepherd also strays; but the single flock was not dearer: that one is sought, that one is desired in place of all, and finally it is found and carried upon the shoulders of the shepherd himself, for it had wearied itself greatly by wandering. Nor will I be silent concerning that most gentle father who calls back the prodigal son and, when he repents after his poverty, willingly receives him, sacrifices the most fattened calf, and adorns his joy with a banquet. Why not? For he had found the son whom he had lost; he perceived the one whom he had gained to be dearer. Who is that father to be understood by us? God, assuredly. No one is so much a father; no one so kind.

[7] *On Penance*, chap. VIII, p. 146.

[8] Apocalypse, chaps. I–II.

[1] Jer. VIII; Hosea VI; and Matt. IX.

[2] The progression of the discourse is remarkable. For he who first exhibited the heavens and the angels rejoicing over the penance of a sinner represents, at the end, God himself rejoicing and exulting.

CIII.

And for this reason he gives to all the opportunity and power to be advanced from children of wrath to the glory and excellence of the sons of God.

> For it is written, says Tertullian [3], "To those who believed in him, he gave power that they should be called sons of God." The Lord very frequently pronounced God to be our Father. Indeed, he commanded us not to call anyone on earth father except him whom we have in heaven…. Blessed are they who—
>
> —acknowledge the Father.

But all can acknowledge him, because [1] there is no one whom God does not invite to a reward, no one [2] for whom his grace and favor are not at hand, and no one [3] whose salvation he does not eagerly will.

He never fails to manifest this benignity of will, and has demonstrated it by a manifold abundance of benefits. He manifested it toward [4] the first parents,

> deferring the destruction of the devil by the same counsel by which he ordained the restoration of man. For he gave space for the contest, so that man might crush the enemy by the same freedom of choice by which he had fallen before him, proving the fault to be his own and not God's; and thus might worthily recover salvation through victory, and the devil might be punished more bitterly, conquered by him whom he had formerly crushed; and God might be found so much the more good, awaiting man's return to paradise more glorious, now to the permission of plucking the tree of life.

He afterward manifested it toward the human race universally, and therefore [5]

> both gathered a people to himself [6] and cherished it with many largesses of his goodness; and, having so often found it most

[3] *On Prayer*, chap. II, pp. 149–150.

[1] *On Penance*, chap. IV, pp. 141–142.

[2] *On Prayer*, chap. III, p. 150.

[3] Ibid., chap. IV, p. 150.

[4] *Against Marcion*, book II, chap. X, p. 462. That Marcion himself thought no differently concerning the amplitude of the salutary will is proved by the things which Tertullian writes in book I, chap. XIV, p. 439:

> Finally, carry yourself around yourself; consider man within and without. Even this work of our God will please you, which that better god, your lord, loved: on account of which he labored to descend from the third heaven into these poor elements; for whose sake he was even crucified in this cell of the Creator.

[5] *On Penance*, chap. II, p. 140.

[6] "I do not refer this," says la Cerda, "with the interpreters solely to the age of Moses; rather, from the very sons of Adam, God chose for himself certain worshipers of virtue, beginning with Seth

> ungrateful, always exhorted it to penance; and sent forth the mouths of all the prophets to prophesy; afterward he promised the grace by which, in the extremities of the times, he would illuminate the whole world through his Spirit; and he commanded that the baptism of penance go before, so that those whom he called through grace to the promise appointed for the seed of Abraham—
>
> —he might prepare beforehand through the seal of penance.—John was not silent, saying, "Enter upon penance; for salvation has now drawn near to the nations," namely, the Lord bringing it according to God's promise. Ministering penance beforehand, he appointed it to preside over the purification of minds: so that, sweeping, scraping, and casting outside whatever ancient error had defiled, whatever ignorance had contaminated in the heart of man, penance might prepare a clean house of the breast for the Holy Spirit who was to come, into which he might willingly bring himself with heavenly goods.

If you seek the rationale of this merciful economy and investigate its intimate origin, you will discover none other than the goodness of God and the sincere purpose of saving the human race.

> For there is one title of these goods, adds Tertullian [1]: the salvation of man, with the abolition of former crimes having been sent before. This is the cause of penance; this its work: attending to the business of divine mercy. What [2] profits man serves God.

Whence nothing is more evident than that the order of divine providence is so disposed that works of clemency go before and works of severity follow; and that men do not experience God as angry before they have perceived him as the benevolent and all-good Parent.

> Therefore, says Tertullian [3], even unto the offense of man, God from the beginning was only good; thence he was Judge and severe and, as the Marcionites will, cruel…. Thus God's goodness was prior according to nature; severity was posterior according to cause. The former was unbegotten; the latter accidental; the former proper, the latter adapted; the former emitted, the latter employed. For neither

himself, the son of Adam, as may be seen in Augustine's books *On the City of God*, where he forms the city of God from Adam himself through his son Seth."

[1] *On Penance*, chap. II, p. 140.

[2] As though he said: God does not need penance, but you need it; and because your affair is being treated, it therefore yields to the service of God. Not very different from these are the words of Chrysostom, who in the second discourse *Against the Jews* speaks thus in the name of God: *Μὴ γὰρ ἐμὲ ἠδικήσατε, μὴ γὰρ ἐμοὶ ἐγένετο βλάβη, ὑμεῖς ἑαυτοὺς ἠτιμάσατε, τὴν ἐμὴν οὐκ ἠλαττώσατε δόξαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ὑμετέραν.* "You did not injure me, nor was any harm done to me; you affected yourselves with ignominy; you did not diminish my glory, but your own."

[3] *Against Marcion*, book II, chap. XI, p. 462.

> ought nature to have contained an inoperative goodness, nor ought the cause to have escaped a severity kept concealed. God furnished the one to himself, the other to the circumstance.

And shortly afterward [1]:

> By these means we show that he came forth with goodness as the author of all things, so that goodness itself must be judged unbegotten and natural to God, not adventitious, since it is found in the Lord as the arbiter of his works. But when evil afterward burst forth, and from that point God's goodness began to deal with the adversary, that same justice of God obtained another business, namely, that of directing goodness [2] according to opposition; so that [3], with the liberality by which God is good even of his own accord having been set apart, it may be weighed according to the merits of each, offered to the worthy, denied to the unworthy, taken away from the ungrateful, and consequently vindicated against all rivals. Thus this whole work of justice is the administration of goodness: that by judging it condemns, by condemning it punishes, and, as you say, it rages—assuredly it profits unto good, not unto evil. Finally, fear of judgment conduces to good, not to evil. For it did not suffice that the good should be commended by itself, now laboring under an adversary. For although commendable by itself, it was nevertheless not also capable of being preserved, since it was now capable of being conquered by the adversary, unless some force of fear went before, which would compel even the unwilling to seek and preserve the good.

To these he finally adds [4]:

> To such a degree is justice also the fullness of divinity itself, exhibiting God perfect both as Father and Lord: as Father by clemency, as Lord by discipline; as Father by gentle power, as Lord by severe power; as Father to be loved piously, as Lord to be feared necessarily; to be loved because he prefers mercy to sacrifice, and to be feared because he does not will sin; to be loved because he prefers the penance of the sinner to death, and to be feared because he does not will sinners who are now no longer penitent.

[1] Ibid., chaps. XII–XIII, p. 463.

[2] Namely, of goodness to be directed according as each one turns his disposition toward the goodness of God.

[3] These establish this sense: that, with the liberality of divine goodness, by which God is good even of his own accord, set apart, that divine goodness may now be weighed according to the merits of each.

[4] *Against Marcion*, book II, chap. XIII, p. 464.

CIV.

Moreover, Tertullian handed down no head of doctrine pertaining to the salutary will of God and the universal order of reformation [1] which the other African Fathers and writers do not approve by their own suffrage and confirm by published testimonies. Arnobius, indeed, treating the most vexed question concerning the origin of evil, posits as an axiom [2] that nothing harmful and destructive proceeds from God, the first principle. Then he adds [3]:

> This we hold; this we know; in this one truth of cognition and knowledge we stand: that nothing is done by him except what is salutary for all, what is sweet and most full of love, joy, and gladness; what has infinite and incorruptible pleasures; what each person desires with all his prayers to happen to himself and judges whatever is outside these things to be destructive and death-bearing.

But among those things salutary for all and most full of love and gladness which are done by God, this stands forth: that although the human race of its own accord fell into extreme destruction, nevertheless the heavenly journey still lies open to it, and the way by which it may attain the supreme good has not been obstructed.

> There are two ways, writes Lactantius [4], along which human life must proceed: one which bears it into heaven, the other which presses it down into hell; both poets [5] in their songs and philosophers in their disputations have introduced these.

But these ways, he proceeds [6],

> we introduce far otherwise than philosophers are accustomed to introduce them. First, because we say that over each is placed a guide, each immortal: but the one honored, who presides over virtues and good things; the other condemned, who presides over vices and evils.
>
> But they place a guide on the right-hand way alone, neither one nor perpetual; for they introduce any teacher of a good art who recalls men from idleness and teaches them to be virtuous. But they do not make any enter upon that way except boys and adolescents, evi-

[1] The ancient author of the *Dominical Discourses* excellently describes this universal order of reformation, in the eminent Mai, *Veterum Scriptorum*, vol. III, part III, pp. 136–137.

[2] *Disputations against the Gentiles*, book II, § XXVI, p. 161, in Gallandius, vol. IV.

[3] Ibid., pp. 161–162.

[4] *Divine Institutes*, book VI, chap. III, p. 326, in Gallandius, vol. IV.

[5] Xenophon in the second book of the *Memorabilia of Socrates* and Tullius in *On Duties*, book I, chap. XLIII, discourse elegantly concerning this fork and the anxious mind of Hercules when he had come to it.

[6] Ibid., p. 327.

> dently because the arts are learned at these ages. *We, however, introduce every sex, race, and age upon this heavenly journey, because God, who is the guide of this way, denies immortality to no man born.* The form of the ways themselves is also not as they thought. For what need is there [1] of the letter Y in things contrary and diverse? But that better way is turned toward the rising of the sun, and that worse one toward its setting; since he who follows truth and justice, having received the reward of immortality, will possess perpetual light; but he who, enticed by that evil guide, has preferred vices to virtues and falsehood to truth, must be borne toward sunset and darkness.

CV.

By that will through which God denies to none of mortals the benefit of immortality and is the guide of all that they may enter upon the way of life and felicity, he also sent the Only-begotten Son to taste death for all, redeem all, and withdraw all from the most wretched necessity of perishing.

Lactantius speaks excellently, who, treating expressly of the cause of the incarnate Word [1], writes among other things:

> Therefore, when God had determined to send to men a teacher of virtue [2], he commanded him to be born anew in the flesh and to be made like the man whose guide, companion, and master he was to be. Yet because God is clement and merciful [3] toward his own, he

[1] Jerome also mentions this Pythagorean letter in the epistle to Laeta, likewise to Pammachius on the death of Paulina, and on the tenth chapter of Ecclesiastes. Ausonius describes in the following verses why the Pythagoreans set it forth:

> The letter of Pythagoras, divided by a two-forked branch, Seems to bear before it the likeness of human life. For virtue's way, steep, seeks the hill upon the right, And first offers a difficult approach to those who behold it; But at the highest summit it grants rest to the weary. The broad way displays a gentle journey, but at its final bound It casts down those it has captured and rolls them over rugged rocks. For whoever through love of virtue conquers bitter trials Will prepare praise and honor for himself; But he who follows idleness and indolent luxury, While with heedless mind he flees the labors set before him, Will pass a miserable age, base and destitute together.

[1] *Divine Institutes*, book IV, chap. XI, p. 293.

[2] With altogether the same mind Augustine, speaking in epistle III concerning the end of the assumed flesh, says: "There came to men instruction and aid for entering upon everlasting salvation."

[3] Here by the name *piety* the mercy of God is signified. Antoninus was therefore called *Pius* because he was most inclined to clemency and mercy. "According to common usage," says Augustine in *The City of God*, book X, chap. I, "this name of piety is also frequently used in works of mercy; from which custom of speaking it has come about that God himself is also called pious."

> sent him to those very men whom he hated [4], lest he should close to them forever the way of salvation, but might give them the free faculty of following God, so that they might obtain the reward of life if they had followed—which very many of them do and have done—and might by their own fault incur the punishment of death if they had repudiated their King. Therefore he commanded him to be born again among them and from their seed, lest, if he had been a foreigner, they could plead as a just excuse from the law that they had not received him; and at the same time, that there might be no nation at all on earth to which the hope of immortality was denied.

Wherefore [5],

> when previously we sat in darkness like blind men and as though enclosed in the prison of foolishness, ignorant of God and truth, we were illuminated by him who adopted us by his testament [6] and, having freed us from evil bonds and led us forth into the light of wisdom, admitted us to the inheritance of the heavenly kingdom.

There is reason, therefore, for men to learn and understand [1]

> why the supreme God, when he sent his legate and messenger to instruct mortality by the precepts of his justice, willed him to be clothed in mortal flesh, afflicted by torment, and punished by death. For when there was no justice on earth, he sent a teacher as though a living law [2], that he might establish a new name and temple and sow true and pious worship throughout the whole earth by words and example.

---

[4] He means the Jews, concerning whom he writes that they made no end of resisting salutary precepts.

[5] *Divine Institutes*, book IV, chap. XX, p. 301.

[6] He has regard to the words of Jer. XXXI.31–32 and to those which he had premised, saying:

> But the whole of Scripture is divided into two testaments. That which preceded the advent and Passion of Christ, that is, the Law and the Prophets, is called the Old; but those things written after his Resurrection are named the New Testament. The Jews use the Old; we the New—
>
> —but they are nevertheless not divided, because the New is the fulfillment of the Old; and in both the same testator is Christ, who, having undergone death for us, made us heirs of the eternal kingdom, while the people of the Jews were repudiated and disinherited.

For confirming and illustrating these things, the following words from Irenaeus, book IV, chap. XXI, contribute:

> One and the same master of the household produced both testaments, the Word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, who spoke both to Abraham and to Moses and restored liberty to us in newness and multiplied the grace which is from him.

[1] *Divine Institutes*, book IV, chap. XXV, p. 303.

[2] Paul treats lucidly of this law of the spirit which brings life in Rom. VIII.

For accomplishing these things it was necessary

> that he be God and man, established as a mediator between God and man. Hence the Greeks call him *μεσίτην* [3], so that he might lead man to God, that is, to immortality; because if he had been God alone, he could not have furnished man examples of virtue; if man alone, he could not have compelled men to justice unless authority and power greater than man were added.—For since man consists of flesh and spirit, and the spirit must merit through works of justice that it become eternal, the flesh, because it is earthly and therefore mortal, draws with itself the spirit joined to it and leads it from immortality to death. Therefore flesh without spirit could in no manner be a guide to immortality for man, because flesh impedes the spirit from following God. For it is fragile and subject to sin, while sin is the nourishment [4] of death.
>
> Therefore, for this reason the Mediator came, that is, God in the flesh, so that the flesh might be able to follow him and he might rescue from death man, over whose flesh death has dominion. Therefore he clothed himself with flesh so that, after the desires of the flesh had been subdued, he might teach that sinning is not of necessity but of purpose and will. For our one great and principal combat is with the flesh, whose infinite desires press down the soul and do not permit it to retain dominion, but, enslaving it to pleasures and sweet allurements, affect it with everlasting death. That we might be able to resist these, God both opened and showed us the way of overcoming the flesh. This virtue, perfect and complete in every respect, bestows upon those who conquer the crown and the reward of immortality.

He repeats these things again and inculcates them more vehemently when, treating [1] of the cross of Jesus and the other torments, he proceeds:

> But as to the cross, there is great force and rationale in it, which I shall now attempt to show. For when God had determined to free man, he sent a master of virtue to earth, who by salutary precepts might form men unto innocence and by present works and deeds lay open the way of justice, along which man, walking and following his teacher, might come to eternal life. Therefore he was embodied

[3] Suicer illustrates the word *μεσίτην* at length in the *Thesaurus*; Epiphanius in the *Ancoratus* and Augustine in *The City of God*, book IX, chap. XV, elegantly explain what the offices of the mediator are.

[4] Namely, the food of those evils which bring forth the death of the soul.

[1] *Divine Institutes*, book IV, chap. XXVI, p. 304.

> [2] and clothed in the garment of flesh, that he might furnish to the man whom he had come to teach both examples and incentives of virtue. But when in all the duties of life he had furnished a specimen of justice, in order also to hand on to man the endurance of pain and contempt of death, by which virtue is made perfect and consummate, he came into the hands of an impious nation, although he could both have avoided it by the knowledge of the future which he possessed and repelled it by the same power by which he performed miracles. Therefore he endured torments, scourges, and thorns. Finally, he did not refuse even to undergo death, so that man, with him as guide, might triumph over death subdued and bound together with its terrors. But why the supreme Father chose especially that kind of death with which he permitted him to be affected, the rationale is this—
> —that he who had come humble, to bring aid to the humble and lowly and to show to all the hope of salvation, had to be affected by that kind of death with which the humble and lowly are accustomed to be affected, lest there be anyone at all who could not imitate him.

CVI.

And entirely consonant with these are the things which Arnobius in more than one place confirms and teaches concerning the whole economy of the Savior and the counsel of the assumed man. For, explaining [1] why Christ willed to endure so many and such great things and to undergo death itself, he adduces these causes:

> That, as master and author, he might direct his laws and statutes to the ends of fitting duties; that he might crush the haughtiness of pride; that he might extinguish the flames of lusts; that he might close the maw of greed; that he might wrest weapons from hands and cut away all seeds of every vice; and finally, that, gentle, peaceful, easy of approach, familiar in address, and not proud amid human miseries, having pitied absolutely all those afflicted by crosses and bodily evils with that one benignity, he might render and restore them to health.

Then, addressing the gentiles [2], he adds:

> For what merit, I ask, tell me, for the fault of what sin do you burn so fiercely against Christ? What was committed by him which bent

[2] Lactantius appears to have taken the verb *to be embodied* for *to assume humanity* from Tertullian, who employs it in the same way in the little book *On the Flesh of Christ*, chaps. III–VI.

[1] *Disputations against the Gentiles*, book I, § XXIV, p. 146.

[2] Ibid., § XXV, pp. 146–147.

> the tenor of rectitude and roused you to bitter hatreds with furious goads? Because he indicated that he had been sent by the King alone as the guardian of your souls? Because he persuaded you by the human assertions of a few that he brought you the immortality which you trust you possess? But even if it were certain among you that he spoke false things and promised most empty hopes, even thus I do not see that there was a cause why you ought to hate him or condemn him by hostile censure. Indeed, if your disposition had been clement and gentle, for this alone you ought to have embraced him: because he promised you desirable and prosperous things, because he was a messenger of good things, because he preached things which injured no one's disposition and indeed filled it with a more secure expectation.

He immediately illustrates this by applying a comparison [1], writing:

> If some physician had come to you from regions remote and never known to you, promising a medicine of such a kind that it would keep every kind of disease and sickness entirely from your bodies, would you not all run to him in rivalry? Would you not receive him into your familiar walls, cherished with every blandishment and honor? Would you not desire that kind of medicine to be most certain and true, which promised that you would remain immune from such innumerable afflictions of the body even unto the furthest bounds of age? And although the matter were doubtful, nevertheless you would entrust yourselves and would not hesitate to drink the unknown potion, with the hope of salvation set before you and inflamed by love of well-being. Christ shone forth and appeared, the messenger of a matter of the greatest importance, bearing a propitious omen and a salutary proclamation for believers. What is this cruelty, what so great an inhumanity—indeed, to speak more truly, what disdain and arrogance—not only to rend with curses of words the messenger and bearer [2] of so great a gift, but also to pursue him with grievous war and with every discharge and destruction of weapons? Do the things he says displease you, and are they heard by you with offense? Reckon those predictions among trifles. Does he speak the most foolish things and promise empty gifts? Laugh, as wise men, and leave his folly to wallow in its errors. What is this

[1] Ibid., § XXVI, p. 147.

[2] Nonius and Forcellini accurately explain the signification of *portitor* received among the classical authors. But Arnobius uses that name to designate a messenger. With this force the same name is employed in law 7 of the Theodosian Code, *Executors*; by Isidore, book VI, chap. VIII; and by Cassiodorus, *Epistles*, book I, epistle XLVI; book VIII, epistle VIII; and book X, epistle X.

> savagery?… What lust so executioner-like, to declare an inexpiable war upon one who has deserved nothing from you? To wish, if it be permitted, to tear him apart through his entrails, who not only inflicted no evil on anyone, but, equally benign toward enemies, declared what salvation was brought to them from God the first principle; what it was necessary to do that they might flee destruction and attain unknown immortality? And when the novelty of the things and the unheard-of promise disturbed the minds of the hearers and caused belief to hesitate, the Lord of all powers and—
>
> —the destroyer of death itself permitted his man to be killed, so that from the things which followed they might know that their hopes, which they had long before received concerning the salvation of souls, were safe, and that they could avoid the peril of death by no other rationale.

Whence he adds concerning Christ [1]:

> Even if he were not worthy that you ought to listen to and believe him, for this very thing he was not to be despised by you: that he showed you the ways to heaven and desired for you the objects of immortality, as though he had not extended the light of life to all and removed the peril of ignorance.

[1] *Disputations against the Gentiles*, book II, § I, p. 147.

Not even in the least do the things differ from these which Marius Victorinus, disputing against the Physicists [2] concerning the cause of the Lord's incarnation, embraces in precisely these words:

> But if you seek the cause of his coming, man had to appear again. Such great [3] divinity had to lie hidden, not from those who believed, but from the prince of the world, for whose overthrow he had descended, but for the sake of our liberation.
>
> He did not hold him by his own authority but by the Lord's sentence [1], because the Lord had commanded the sinner who did not repent to die. But the merciful one had to free the penitent. Justice and divine possibility demanded this: that he who held the guilty by sentence, if he seized one not guilty, passing beyond the sentence, would lose his power.
>
> But there is no one who is not guilty, since both by origin and birth they are from mortals. Yet he who was born is proved to have himself given the sentence; by which sentence he himself is not held

[2] *Against the Physicists*, § XXIII, pp. 159–160. The eminent Mai first published this little book of Victorinus in the third volume of *Veterum Scriptorum*, and speaks thus concerning it in the preface, § VIII, p. XVI:

> I have already said in its proper place, p. 147, by what reasons I was moved to judge that the little work *On the Physicists*, or rather, *Against the Physicists*, which I published from the same codices of Victorinus, must be attributed to Victorinus himself. But behold, Victorinus himself, in the commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, book II, p. 126, perhaps says that he is the parent of the aforesaid writing. "The Passion," he says, "Resurrection, and Ascension of Christ is the perfection of all things, both of those in the world which could be saved and in eternal things and above all the heavens; which mystery we have treated most fully in an explanation of a single book." These words appear to me to indicate that part of the little work *Against the Physicists* in which Victorinus treats in order of the whole life of the Savior. Moreover, that little work is written for the protection of both natural and Christian religion against those philosophers who assailed the Mosaic and then the evangelical narrative by physical arguments. Therefore the author first asserts the creation of things from nothing; the divine power of imposing a law upon created man; the just permission of another's sin on account of free choice; then the remedy fittingly supplied. From this the author advances to speak concerning the whole economy of the Lord's incarnation: that it was possible and pleasing to Christ to be born of a virgin, to dwell obscure among men, to suffer, die, and rise; and finally to transfer man safe with himself into heaven. This, namely, is the sum of the whole little work, which, for the style of Victorinus, is read not unpleasantly.

[3] He has many things entirely twin to these in the commentaries on Paul's Epistles—
—pp. 2, 6, 62, 63, 86, 87, 89, 109, 116, and 123, by which the divine person of Christ is most splendidly proved.

[1] Nothing is more illustrious than these words for refuting the preposterous opinion of Peter Abelard, which Bernard mentions in epistle CXC and which Dionysius Petavius most vigorously explodes in *On the Incarnation*, book II, chap. V.

> guilty, who, although he assumed flesh, lived among men without sin. As it is written [2]: "This is our God, and another shall not be accounted beside him. He found every way of prudence and gave it to Jacob his servant. After these things he was seen on earth and conversed with men." This is he who conversed without sin, as it is again written [3]: "Who did not commit sin, nor was guile found in his mouth." He produced this flesh without sin; the prince of this world, foreseeing it opposed to himself and not inclined to his own wills, but judging him to be only a man, dared to invade it when it permitted him. But the Lord permitted this so that the prince himself might be the cause of losing his power: for although he claimed the guilty for himself by the sentence, by usurping this one who was not guilty he went against the sentence which he held [4] and lost his power. Thus it belonged to the plan that he perform the functions of the body, so that he indeed might show it to be the same flesh which he had assumed, that which was formerly condemned; but he, seeing the functions of the flesh, would not understand the Deity, and thus, going against the sentence of God—
>
> —would lose his power, because he dared to assail one whom he perceived to be without crime.
>
> "Having freed us from death by this economy of wisdom and goodness," Victorinus adds [1], "by the Lord's Passion he led us back to the state of immortality; and us who formerly were unequal to heavenly things, he has now associated with the heavenly."

Lest this restoration and indeed elevation appear incredible to anyone, he proceeds thus [2]:

> Yet to some this appears unjust—not because God is unable, but because it seems not to agree with his justice. For when he had made the first-formed man, still free of fault and alien to crime, lord only of paradise, judging this gift of God to be suitable, now after sin and offense, when he had been recalled, although it was no small thing to return to what he had been, he also granted the heavenly kingdoms. This, however, is proved most just. For if previously by his grace, when man merited nothing by duties of devotion, he had granted man a seat in paradise, assuredly now, when he fought against the

[2] Baruch III.36 ff. On the occasion of this allegation, the eminent Mai writes: "Let us note the most ancient authority of our Victorinus for the divine prophecy of Baruch."

[3] I Pet. II.22.

[4] In some codices it reads *through which*.

[1] Work cited, § XXVII, p. 161.

[2] Ibid., pp. 161–162.

> impatience of the flesh and the desires of iniquity already aroused, against the prince of the world and his powers, after trampling upon the age, it was fitting to weigh out a heavenly reward; so that he who, imitating God, lived a divine life on earth while constituted in the body, might dwell in heaven with the same body now made immortal, earthly things having now been taken away. Then to the cause of this gift is added the fact that it is fitting to bring into heaven the flesh of man whose inhabitant God deigned to be. Nor can man appear to have been made an inhabitant of heaven beyond his merit when the Spirit who is God himself did not disdain his sheath. And it was just to place also among the heavenly things the body in which God, by dwelling, deigned to visit the earth and through which, having become a participant in our nature, he led our race to immortality. For where ought the habitation of God to be except in the kingdom of God? And where is his kingdom except in heaven?

CVII.

To these most excellent reasons this also is added: that, according to the same Victorinus, Christ, in order that he might exempt all from the necessity of perishing and give to all the opportunity and power of attaining blessed immortality, underwent death for all and poured forth his innocent and divine blood. For, expounding [1] the apostolic words, "Grace to you and peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from the present evil age, according to the will of our God and Father, to whom is glory forever and ever," he speaks thus [2]:

> Let us be mindful what the Apostle is doing in this epistle: because he rebukes the Galatians and desires to correct them, that they may have faith in Christ and from him alone expect the hope of salvation, the hope of eternity, the remission of sins; and that they may not at all believe that either the works of the Law, or sabbaths, or circumcision profit them. Therefore at the beginning he prays for peace and grace for them from God, and then added, from Christ, because in Christ are all our goods; and he proves that all things are in Christ and all things through Christ, when he says, "Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from the present evil age." Therefore by his benefit, by his grace—from God the Father indeed, but by his Passion—we are delivered from the present malignant age; and

[1] Gal. I.3–5.

[2] *On the Epistle to the Galatians*, book I, pp. 2–3.

> we are delivered through Christ, but by the power of God, namely, of the God to whom belongs glory through all eternity. If, therefore, God is eternal, his glory also is unto eternity. And by the will of God Christ, having discharged the mystery, gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us all; deliverance is from the will of God through Christ. But if it is through Christ, nothing further is to be sought, and those things which the Galatians add are vain, namely, Judaism, works of the Law, the observance of the sabbath, and circumcision.

Then, proceeding [3] to the things which immediately follow in Paul [4], "I marvel that you are so quickly transferred from him who called you into grace, unto another gospel," he continues:

> Since the Gospel which the Apostle Paul announces is certain—namely, Christ the Son of God, the power of God unto salvation [5]—
>
> —to all who believe, whether Greeks or Jews—and nothing besides; but all the hope of salvation and of the grace of God concerning us is in faith [1] concerning Christ, so that, when we believe him to be the Son of God, to have suffered for us, and to have risen, from this we too rise, with the remission of sins—which is the true Gospel that Paul announces—if anyone adds anything else, namely Judaism and circumcision and the observance of the sabbath and the rest, such a one sins and is alien to the truth. Since, therefore, the Galatians thought that Judaism was to be added to the Gospel of the Apostle, for this reason, he says, "I marvel that you are so quickly transferred." For first, it is a sin to be transferred quickly; for there is no reason when something is changed quickly. Let us see, then, from whom: "From him," he says, "who called you into grace." For Christ, who suffered for us all, called us into grace, if we believe in him; for it is not a great thing to attain his grace, provided only that we follow him, believing that by his mystery he furnished these things—and that freely, without labor and without great works.

---

[3] Ibid., pp. 3–4.

[4] Gal. I.6–8.

[5] Speaking of these commentaries of Victorinus, the eminent Mai writes in the preface—

—§ IX, p. XVII, among other things:

> Now, as to the fact that on pp. 18, 23, and elsewhere he appears to exaggerate the preeminence of faith above the merits of good works, this is easily moderated by other expressions of Victorinus.

If, however, there is need of this facility of interpretation, since everyone understands that he depreciates no other works than those which Paul opposes to grace and calls works of the Law.

[1] By these words the works of grace are not excluded; rather, that which we received from Victorinus is repeated: in Christ are all our goods.

> Since this has been furnished to us by him, to be transferred quickly from him is a great cause for wonder, since they preferred to be transferred unto another gospel, joining the discipline of Judaism to it. But there is one Gospel, and only one: to believe Christ to be the Son of God; that Christ, by his Passion and his advent in the flesh and his Resurrection and Passion, loosed all sins, conquered death, and destroyed all corruption. This alone is the Gospel. Therefore he adds, "which is not another"; for it alone is that which we said above. There is no other; neither to merit salvation from works, nor from the observance of the sabbath, nor from circumcision, is the Gospel, that is, our salvation.

But when he considers these words [2], "Not as though I had already attained—
"

—"or were already perfected; but I follow after, if by any means I may comprehend, in that I also have been comprehended by Christ," he employs this [1] commentary:

> You see that he says he is still in this life, and for that reason expressed doubt above [2]. For he still follows Christ through all his sufferings, that he may comprehend Christ, that is, that he may arrive at Christ, having been made a participant in all his sufferings. For Christ by all his sufferings freed all who follow, and in a certain manner comprehended all—but all who would follow. He who wishes to follow and comprehend Christ must follow Christ in all his sufferings, that he may comprehend Christ in that in which he also has been comprehended by Christ. For if Christ by his sufferings freed all, he comprehended all by his sufferings; in these, therefore, we are. That is, having been made a participant with Christ through his sufferings, he comprehends Christ in that in which he was comprehended by Christ.

By these testimonies, which are altogether most clear, it is signified, first, a) that God did not permit the human race to lie in that ruin into which it had fallen through the fault of our first parents, and to remain in that death which it had brought upon itself; but chose an order of reformation by which it could both rise from the fall and overcome death.

---

[2] Phil. III.12. The variation of the Latin and Greek readings may be found in Sabatier and Griesbach.

[1] *On the Epistle to the Philippians*, p. 73.

[2] He has regard to the preceding words of the Apostle, v. 11, "if by any means I may meet him," *εἴ πως καταντήσω*.

It is signified, secondly, b) that the efficient and principal cause of that same reformed order was God the Father himself [3], whom his connatural mercy and *φιλανθρωπία*, love of mankind, moved [4], that he might succor ruined men, extend his hand to them, and impart the faculty of immortality *δωρεάν*, freely and wholly gratis [5].

Then, indeed, it is signified, c) that the other efficient cause was—

—Christ, who [1], following his own love toward men and altogether most freely [2], gave himself for our sins, and therefore suffered and rose again, that he might deliver us from the present malignant age, loose all sins, conquer death, and destroy all corruption.

Of these benefits d) he desired and willed all, as far as lay in him, to be participants, and therefore comprehended all in his sufferings and denied to no one at all the opportunity of attaining immortality.

Nevertheless e) those alone attain it who do not neglect the faculty freely received, believe in him, and comprehend Christ in that in which they themselves were comprehended by Christ.

CVIII.

For confirming and establishing this doctrine, there are also witnesses from the same African Church: Optatus, bishop of Milevis, and Arnobius. Of these, the former disputes thus [3] against Parmenian, who maintained that the Church existed among the Donatists alone and accordingly was circumscribed within the narrowest limits:

> If you thus contract the Church into a narrow compass according to your will; if you withdraw all the nations, where will that be which the Son of God merited? Where will that be which the Father freely bestowed upon him, saying in the second Psalm [4]: "I will give thee the nations for thy inheritance, and the ends of the earth for thy possession"? Why do you break so great a promise, so that the breadth of kingdoms should be sent by you, as it were, into a certain prison?

---

[3] John III.16; Rom. VIII.32; and II Cor. V.21.

[4] This mercy, in the liturgical fragments edited by the eminent Mai, *Veterum Scriptorum*, vol. III, p. 247, is called "the depth of unbegotten goodness," to which depth the cause that moved God is referred back in John III.16 and Rom. V.8.

[5] By this particle, no less than by the corresponding Hebrew חנם, price, cause, or merit is excluded.

[1] John XV.13–14; compare Gal. II.20, Eph. V.2–25, and Apoc. I.5.

[2] John X.17–18; compare Gal. II.20 and Eph. V.2–25.

[3] *On the Donatist Schism*, book II, § I, p. 470, in Gallandius, vol. V.

[4] Ps. II.8.

> Why do you strive to stand in the way of so great a *pietas* [5]? Why do you wage war against the merits of the Savior? Permit the Son to possess the things granted; permit the Father—
>
> —to fulfill his promises. Why do you place boundaries? Why do you fix limits? Since the whole earth was promised by God the Father to the Savior, there is nothing in any part of the earth which appears excepted from his possession. The whole earth with the nations was given to him; the whole world is the one possession of Christ. God proves this, who says: "I will give thee the nations for thy inheritance, and the ends of the earth for thy possession." And in Psalm LXXI it is thus written [1] concerning the Savior himself: "He shall have dominion from sea even unto sea, and from the rivers even unto the ends of the earth." When the Father gives, he excepts nothing; while you, in order to concede an ounce, endeavor to take away the whole pound. And still you strive to persuade men that the Church is among you alone, taking merit away from Christ and denying what was appointed beforehand by God. O your ungrateful and foolish presumption! Christ invites you with the others into fellowship in the heavenly kingdom and exhorts you to be coheirs; and you labor to defraud him of the inheritance granted to him by the Father, when you concede a part of Africa and deny the whole world, which was given to him by the Father. Why do you wish the Holy Spirit to appear a liar, who in Psalm XLIX narrates the benevolence of almighty God, when he says [2]: "The God of gods, the Lord, has spoken and has called the earth from the rising of the sun even unto its setting"? The earth, therefore, was called [3] that it might become flesh; and, as it is read, it was made, and it ought to render praises to its Creator.

But when he censures [4] the customary formulas of the Donatists, which he calls seductions, and among which he also reckons this one, "Redeem your souls," he writes:

> What, therefore, is this which you say, "Redeem your souls"? From whom did you buy them, that you may sell them? Who is that angel,

[5] He understands divine *pietas*, by which name he signifies divine clemency. In the same sense Dracontius sang:

> Great is the *pietas* of God, who always tempers wrath.

[1] Ps. LXXI.8.

[2] Ps. XLIX.1.

[3] Just as "earth" and "flesh" are taken metaphorically, so the verb "to call" is used in the same sense as in Matt. IX.13: "I came not to call the just, but sinners."

[4] *On the Donatist Schism*, book III, § XI, p. 485.

> I know not who [5], who holds a market of souls which the devil possessed before his advent? Christ our Savior redeemed these by his blood—
>
> —the Apostle saying: "For you were bought with a great price." It is certain, therefore, that all were redeemed by the blood of Christ.

What, therefore, according to Optatus, is to be held? First of all, this: that so great was the benevolence and *pietas* of God the Father that he promised all peoples and all nations to the Son and conferred them upon him to be possessed. Then this: that the possession of Christ is the whole earth together with its nations, and that there is nothing in any part of the world which appears excepted from his possession. For this reason, thirdly, no one can be withdrawn from the inheritance of Christ, nor can anyone be erased from the number of those who are invited into fellowship in the heavenly kingdom, without denying the merit acquired by Christ, overthrowing the promises of the Father, and convicting the Holy Spirit himself, who is the Spirit of truth, of falsehood. It remains, therefore, that all are to be considered redeemed by the blood of Christ.

Concerning this universal redemption through Christ, the things Arnobius has are altogether remarkable [1], when at first he introduces the enemies of the same as disputing thus:

> But indeed he is worthy of hatred, because he expelled religions from the world, because he forbade approach to the worship of the gods.

Then he meets them in this manner [2]:

> Is it, then, because he introduced the true religion into the world [3], opened the doors of *pietas* to men who were blind and were truly passing their lives in impiety, and indicated to whom they should submit themselves?

Do you hear for whom Christ was at hand and whom he raised up by his aid? He provided for blind men and those passing their lives in impiety. If he provided for them, whom, I ask you, did he not aid, or to whom did he not open the way of salvation?

---

[5] An evil one, assuredly, since immediately afterward he is said to have possessed souls before the advent of Christ.

[1] *Disputations against the Gentiles*, book II, § II, p. 147, in Gallandius, vol. IV.

[2] Ibid., p. 147.

[3] The critics who, after introducing a correction, read "into the world," did not consider within themselves the examples of a most similar construction which Muncker gathered on Hyginus, *Fables* L–XCII, and Davies on Commodianus, *Instructions* XIII.

CIX.

Moreover, this Christian doctrine concerning universal redemption through—

—Christ was so widely disseminated among the people that the gentiles abused it against the Christians themselves. For Arnobius presents them arguing thus [1]:

> But if, they say, Christ was sent by God for this purpose, that he might free unhappy souls from the destruction of annihilation, what did former ages merit, which before his advent were consumed under the condition of mortality?

After other things, Arnobius indeed replies [2]:

> Royal compassion was imparted to them also, and divine benefits coursed equally through all: they were preserved, they were liberated, and they put away the lot and condition of mortality. By what manner, which ones, when? If arrogance, if pride, if haughtiness were absent from you, you could long ago have known this from him as authority.

But when they cry out against him and ask anew, "But if Christ, as you say, came as the preserver of the human race, why does he not free absolutely all with equal munificence?" Arnobius persists in his opinion [3] and blunts the edge of the question, saying:

> Does he not free equally, who calls all equally? Or does he repulse or despise anyone from princely indulgence, who gives to the high, the low, slaves, women, and children alike the power of coming to himself? The fountain of life, he says, lies open to all, nor is anyone prohibited or driven away from the right of drinking. If there is such great disdain in you that you reject the benefit of the gift offered—nay rather, if you are so preeminent in wisdom that you call the things offered by Christ sport and follies—in what does the one inviting you sin against you, whose sole part is to expose the fruit of his benignity under the judgment of your own right? God, Plato says, is the cause to no one of choosing the lot of life; nor can the will of another rightly be ascribed to anyone, since freedom of the will is placed in the power of the very person who wills. Or must you be begged to deign to accept from him the benefit of salvation, and, while you spurn it and flee farthest away, is the grace of divine benevolence to be poured into your bosom? Do you wish to

[1] *Disputations against the Gentiles*, book II, § XXX, p. 164.
[2] Ibid., p. 164.
[3] Ibid.

> take what is offered and convert it to your own uses? You will have consulted for yourself. Do you spurn, contemn, and—
>
> —despise it? You will have deprived yourself of the advantage of the gift. God imposes necessity upon no one; he terrifies no one with imperious fear. For our salvation is not necessary to him, so that he would suffer some gain or loss if he either made us gods or permitted us to be reduced to nothing by the dissolution of corruption.

Although these things might appear able to suffice abundantly for resolving the question, Arnobius nevertheless proposes another *ἔνστασιν*, objection [1], in these words:

> Indeed, he says, if God is powerful, merciful, a preserver, let him convert our minds for us and make us, even unwilling, believe his promises.

To this he immediately replies [2]:

> This, therefore, is violence, not grace; nor is it the liberality of God the prince, but a childish contest and striving of the mind for victory. For what is so unjust as to extort wills into the contrary from those who resist and are unwilling, to force upon their minds what they do not will and what they flee? To harm before you benefit, and, after taking away the former disposition, to transfer them into another habit and opinion? You who desire to be changed and to suffer force, so that you do unwillingly and seize by compulsion: why do you refuse to assume by will that which, once turned and changed, you desire to do? "I do not will," he says, "and I have no will." Why, therefore, do you accuse God, as though he failed you? You desire him to bring aid to you, whose gifts and favors you not only spurn and flee, but even call empty words and pursue with jocular witticisms.
>
> Therefore, if I shall not be a Christian, shall I be unable to have the hope of salvation? It is so, as you yourself propose. For he alone has it enjoined and handed down from God the Father to give the portions of salvation and to confer upon souls what is fitting and necessary to be bestowed, the remote and interior causes being so constituted. For just as particular gods among you have particular protections, permissions, and powers, and you do not ask from any of them that which is not within his power and permission, so it is the pontificate [3] of Christ alone—

[1] Ibid., § XXXI, p. 164.

[2] Ibid., p. 164.

[3] By the name "pontificate" Arnobius signifies permission and power. Compare what Gellius has in book I, chap. XIII, and Symmachus, *Epistles*, book III, epistle XVII.

—to give salvation to souls and to impart the spirit of perpetuity.

The matter, therefore, was not only most widely known, but also received by the suffrage and consent of all: that Christ came, poured forth his divine blood, and tasted death, that he might free unhappy souls from the destruction of annihilation, give them salvation, and impart to them the spirit of perpetuity. Moreover, he adorned not merely some souls, but all, with these benefits; nor only after his advent, but throughout absolutely all ages, since royal compassion was always present to all and divine benefits coursed equally through all.

Why, therefore, did not all either attain salvation formerly or attain it now? Must this be derived from the fact that God through Christ does not call all and does not impart to all the opportunity and faculty of conquering sin and obtaining beatitude? By no means, Arnobius replies. For all are called; no one is repulsed from princely indulgence; God gives to all the power of coming to him; the fountain of life lies open to all; and no one is prohibited or driven away from the right of drinking. What, then, at last is the cause on account of which not all come, nor do all extinguish their thirst by drinking from the salutary fountain? Because, according to the same Arnobius, it belongs to God to offer the benefit, but to man freely to take it and convert it to his own uses; because it belongs to God to expose his benignity to all, but to man freely to take fruit from it and enjoy the advantage of the gift.

It pleased God, indeed, to establish beforehand such a fellowship and conjunction of things that the attainment of immortal felicity should be no less a gift of mercy than an effect of free cooperation, and should be no less the grace of God anticipating and aiding than the crown of him who contends and toils. It pleased God that his gifts should pass over into our merits; and it likewise pleased him that no one in possession of himself and of reason should be blessed with the desired end of the eudaimonic order who had not fulfilled the precepts and laws of the moral order.

CX.

But since such is the constitution of human nature, and such its weakness, that it neither easily contains itself within the limits of the honorable and the just, nor is overcome by vices only with great difficulty, therefore God, that he might disclose more fully and illustriously his benevolent and merciful will toward men, decreed that even unto the very end of mortal life the medicine of penance should be available to all, and that for all there should be at hand a second plank, by seizing which they might escape the destruction of shipwreck.

There were not lacking in the third century of the Church those who imprudently treated men bound by more atrocious crimes either more leniently or more

harshly than was fitting. Cyprian refuted these with ardent zeal [1], and, among many other things, writes these also for our purpose [2]:

> Penance alone remains, which may make satisfaction. But those who take away penance for the crime close the way of satisfaction; thus it happens that, while false salvation is either promised or believed through the rashness of certain men, the hope of true salvation is taken away. But you, most beloved brethren, whose fear is readily inclined toward God and whose mind, although established amid ruin, is mindful of its evil: as penitents and those grieving over your sins, examine them; acknowledge the most grievous crime of conscience; open the eyes of the heart to an understanding of your offense, neither despairing of the mercy of the Lord nor yet now claiming pardon as your due. As much as God is always indulgent and good in the *pietas* of a father [3], so much is he to be feared in the majesty of a judge.

For this reason,

> if anyone makes prayer with his whole heart [4]; if he groans with true lamentations and tears of penance; if he inclines the Lord to pardon his offense by just and continual works, he can have mercy upon such persons, who also declared his mercy [5], saying: "When, having been converted, you shall groan, then—"
>
> "—you shall be saved, and you shall know where you were." And again [1]: "I will not the death of him who dies, says the Lord, so much as that he should return and live." And the prophet Joel, at the Lord's own admonition, declares the *pietas* of the Lord [2]: "Return to the Lord your God, because he is merciful and gracious and patient

[1] In several epistles, but most vehemently in the discourse *On the Lapsed*, which is found at pp. 87 ff., Amsterdam edition, 1700.

[2] *On the Lapsed*, pp. 97–98.

[3] Other codices read: "always clement in *pietas*, always also good."

[4] Ibid., p. 98.

[5] Isa. XXX.15. This version corresponds exactly to the Alexandrian and is praised by Jerome both in the epistle to Sabinianus and in the commentary on this passage, where he teaches—

—that "according to the anagogical sense the divine discourse exhorts all sinners, and especially heretics, to penance, because when, having returned from vices, they have groaned and done penance, they are saved, and then understand where they formerly were, and that they had hoped in vain things in vain."

[1] Ezek. XVIII.32; compare XXXIII.11.

[2] Joel II.13.

> and of much compassion, and one who [3] bends his sentence against the evils inflicted."

Since the clemency and goodness of God are of such a kind and so great, therefore

> we judge that no one is to be prevented from attaining grace by that law which has now been established [4], nor that spiritual circumcision ought to be impeded by carnal circumcision, but that absolutely everyone is to be admitted to the grace of Christ; since Peter also speaks in the Acts of the Apostles and says [5]: "The Lord has said to me that no man is to be called common and unclean." Moreover, if anything in men could impede the attainment of grace, more grievous sins could impede adults and those advanced and greater in age. But if even to the most grievous offenders [6], and those who long before sinned greatly against God, when afterward they have believed, remission of sins is granted, and no one is prohibited from baptism and grace, how much more ought an infant not to be prohibited, who, recently born, has sinned in nothing except [7] that, born carnally according to Adam, by his first nativity he contracted the contagion of ancient death?

Therefore access to penance and grace is obstructed to no one and lies open to all.

> For, says Cyprian [1], if day is born equally for all, and if the sun is poured forth upon all with an equal and like light, how much more does Christ, the true sun and day, bestow in his Church the light of eternal life with like equality? The sacrament of this equality we see celebrated in Exodus [2], when manna flowed down from heaven and, by a prefiguration of future things, exhibited the nourishment of heavenly bread and the food of Christ who was to come [3]. For there, without distinction either of sex or of age, a gomor was gath-

[3]The Alexandrians render it *μετανοῶν ἐπὶ ταῖς κακίαις*. Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, book II, chap. XXIV, reads: "And the Lord repented of the evil which he had said he would do to them, and he did it not."

[4]Epistle LXIV, otherwise LIX, to Fidus, p. 281.

[5]Acts X.28.

[6]Rigaltius judges that by "the most grievous offenders" are meant deniers, those who sacrificed, and those who obtained certificates. Fell agrees, according to whose interpretation those are called offenders by Cyprian "who abandoned and deserted the faith pledged to Christ."

[7]These words are excellent, in order that the faith concerning the propagated fault of origin may be confirmed.

[1]Epistle LXIX, otherwise LXXVI, to Magnus, p. 298.

[2]Exod. XVI.

[3]John VI.

> ered equally by each. Whence it appeared that the indulgence of Christ and heavenly grace, which was afterward to follow, are divided equally among all, without difference of sex, without distinction of years, without acceptance of person; that the gift of spiritual grace is poured forth over the whole people of God.

CXI.

Come now, and inquire of Cyprian to whom the grace of the Savior and the benefit of penance are divinely dispensed: whether to some only, or absolutely to all; and whether only to those who have contracted lesser offenses, or even to those who have imposed no measure upon their sins. This is the open and explicit reply of the most holy martyr: that concerning the amplitude both of salutary grace and of that heavenly charism by which we are called back to repentance, it can—and indeed ought—to be established from those things which a) are expressed in the divine writings *ῥητῶς*, expressly and in so many words; which b) we read in the same writings as adumbrated and expressed *τυπικῶς*, typically; and which c) are deduced by the fullest right from the analogy of other benefits whose necessity is far less. For if any do not trust these rules, or pursue other and human rules, they will put forth, not divine counsels, but the mockeries of their own mind.

Nothing, moreover, is more manifest than a) that the universal grace of the Savior and the universal charism of penance are demonstrated by obvious and explicit testimonies of Scripture;—

—than b) that the same universal amplitude is exhibited by types and images; and than c) that the mode and rationale of divine providence in those things which regard the present and bodily life are such that the universal ambit of those gifts which relate to the soul and salvation can be doubted only perversely. For it is not lawful to think that that supreme Deity, which provides so exquisitely for bodies, which illumines bodily eyes with diffused light, and which abundantly pursues the whole human race with its benefactions, is, on the contrary, more sparing in imparting those things by which the mind is cultivated, by which the soul lives, and without which no hope of obtaining immortality shines upon men.

Arnobius understood this [1], and therefore committed it to everlasting letters:

> But if absolutely all who understand themselves to be men not by the appearance of bodies but by the power of reason were willing to lend an ear for a little while to the salutary and peaceful decrees of Christ, and, through the pride and haughtiness of their enlightenment, did not trust their own senses rather than his admonitions, the whole

[1] *Disputations against the Gentiles*, book I, § IV, p. 134, in Gallandius, vol. IV.

> world, its customs long since converted to gentler works, would pass its life in the softest tranquility and would come together in salutary concord under unbroken sanctions of covenants.

But although there are men who very often present disobedient ears to interior grace and resist it, God nevertheless is of such goodness and clemency that he neither abandons them wholly nor entirely closes to them the way of recovering better fruit.

> For God, says Lactantius [2], especially desires men to be cleansed from sins, and therefore commands that penance be done [3]. But to do penance is nothing other than to profess and affirm [4] that one will sin no further.

But Victorinus, opposing those who brought the divine goodness and power into jeopardy on this account [1], that many among men give themselves over to sins and therefore incur eternal death, writes among other things [2]:

> The death of condemnation will not prejudice his power, nor does condemnation conquer the purpose of his will; but his mercy is not empty, nor is the grace of renewing without reason; for it is given to those who ask, just as those who do not ask have been condemned.

Explaining this more distinctly immediately afterward [3], he continues:

> This was the cause of not indulging the first sinners: when, by his interrogation, he called them to penance, he saw them repelling their own salvation, and condemned them. But he had mercy upon those who were born from them and fled to him. For it is just that those who are willing and penitent, fleeing to him who is able to furnish it, should obtain it; but that the ungrateful and resisting, casting the fault of their deed upon God and having constituted themselves the cause of condemnation, should be dismissed. That justice did not permit this grace to be given to the first-formed: he who condemns did not himself refuse to furnish it. He was also before what he now is and will be: he who is now good was good before; he who is now merciful was merciful before; always remaining in that which he is, immutable. When he condemned him because of fault, it is necessary to discern the fault itself.

---

[2] *Divine Institutes*, book VI, chap. XIII, p. 335, in Gallandius, vol. IV.

[3] Jer. XVIII; Ezek. XVIII; and Luke V.

[4] Compare the things most similar to these in chap. XXIV and book IV, chap. XVII.

[1] In the little book *On the Physicists*, pp. 148 ff., in Mai, *Veterum Scriptorum*, vol. III.

[2] Ibid., §§ VII–VIII, pp. 151–152.

[3] Ibid., § VIII, pp. 151–152.

CXII.

Thus, therefore, matters stand, and thus is the order of divine providence arranged: a) God has never not been good toward men, never not merciful; for he who is now good was good before; he who is now merciful was merciful before. Thus b) he has never failed to anticipate men with his gifts, and has never wholly withdrawn from them the opportunity and faculty of renewing grace; for his mercy is not empty, but fruitful and rich in gifts and benefactions. Therefore c) although men are liable to—

—sins, he has nevertheless always called them to penance, and has never permitted even one to perish for the reason that he himself was unwilling to furnish the things required for escaping so great a destruction. Yet d) he is wise in bestowing his gifts; and while he anticipates all by grace, he wills only those to be participants in the fruits of grace who have not been ungrateful and have not produced for themselves the cause of condemnation.

> For pardon, according to Facundus, bishop of Hermiane [1], has been promised to all who repent. Let no one be broken by despair. Let no one be ensnared any further by serpentine deceptions, because, just as everlasting punishment with the devil has been prepared for transgressors and those who persist with an impenitent heart, so an eternal and endless glorious reward has been reserved by the Lord God for those who keep his covenant….

And thus far indeed we have narrated the doctrine of the African Church, if not in a manner worthy of the matter, certainly according to our ability; and, by bringing forward excellent testimonies, we have established that this was the settled and ascertained opinion of that most illustrious Church: a) that universal reparation through the second Adam succeeded universal ruin through the first Adam; b) that the principal cause of this universal reparation is none other than the native goodness of God and his innate benevolence toward the human race; c) that from this benevolence, as from its own most abundant fountain, there has always flowed, and still flows, a certain incredible abundance of gifts and graces, by which men, refreshed, can and ought to cast off the servitude of sin, overcome corruption, and strive from the most wretched condition of children of wrath to the dignity of adoptive filiation and obtain it; whence d) none other lie in crimes, are subjected to sins, and are deprived of fellowship in everlasting beatitude than those who have despised divine mercy, preferred darkness to light, and rejected the salvation offered.

[1] *Epistle of the Catholic Faith in Defense of the Three Chapters*, p. 821, in Gallandius, vol. XI.

Primasius embraced all these things with no less evidence than brevity in those commentaries by which he undertook to explain Paul's First Epistle to Timothy. For he speaks precisely thus [1]:

> "I beseech, therefore, first of all, that supplications, prayers, petitions be made." Supplication is stronger than prayer. Again, in another manner: supplications are made for past or present sins; prayers for attaining the things which we hope for; petitions when we intercede for others; thanksgivings when we obtain the things which we ask, or certainly when we return thanks and praises for the immense benefits of God. "Thanksgivings." Let us give thanks to him who has made us worthy to obtain even for others. "For all men." To pray even for persecutors. "For kings and all who are in high station, that we may lead a quiet and tranquil life in all piety and chastity." That they may know God, or that they may hold the nations subject; for in their peace consists our quiet. For if they are Christians, the assault of persecution will cease. "For this is good and acceptable before God our Savior." That you also, like him, may desire all men to be saved. "Who will have all men." From this it is proved that God inflicts violence upon no one so that he may perish; but he who perishes, perishes by his own merit, and those who are saved are saved by the grace and compassion of God. For, according to the figure synecdoche, here we ought to receive "all" as the whole from a part. "To be saved." But why are not all saved? Because God is just and merciful: that many are condemned is the merit of those who perish; that many are saved is the gift of him who saves. For that the guilty should be condemned, the justice of God is blameless; that the guilty should be justified, the grace of God is ineffable, for many are hardened by benefits. "And to come to the knowledge of the truth." It is certain that God wills all good things, but men through their own fault rush headlong into evils. "For there is one God." The Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are the God of all men, and therefore he desires all whom he made to be saved. "And one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself as a redemption for all." The blood of Christ was indeed poured forth for all—

[1] Commentary on I Tim. II.1 ff., p. 237, vol. X of the *Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum*, Lyons edition, 1677.

> —but it profits believers [1], while for unbelievers it will be unto condemnation; as he himself says elsewhere: "To some we are the odor of life unto life, to others the odor of death unto death."

CXIII.

The nearness of the regions and places admonishes me not to separate the Spanish Church from the African, and not, after the doctrine of the latter has been explained and its opinion proposed, to keep silent any longer about the mind and persuasion of the former. But what these were, not to commemorate writers of the middle or even more recent age, Pacian, Prudentius, Orosius, Marius Mercator, and Dracontius signified more notably than the rest. For, to begin from that which is chief in this our treatment and which ought to be laid beneath it after the manner of a foundation, once and again Dracontius affirms that "parent" is that appellation which God prefers to the rest and in which he more vehemently delights. For, speaking concerning him [2], he sings:

> Faithful nature, akin to things and knowing not how to lie, Preserves
> faith through the *pietas* of the Parent. [1]

And again [2]:

---

[1] Whence Jerome, in his commentary on Matthew, book III, chap. XX, v. 28, appends this explanation to Christ's words, "Just as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his soul as a redemption for many":

> When he took the form of a servant, that he might pour forth his blood for the world. He did not say that he would give his soul as a redemption for all, but for many, that is, for those who would will to believe.

Therefore, according to Jerome, did Christ both pour forth his blood and undergo death, not for all, but for some only? Among other things, the words of infinite amplitude prevent us from thinking thus: "When he took the form of a servant, that he might pour forth his blood for the world." To what, therefore, does the opposition pertain: "He did not say that he would give his soul as a redemption for all, but for many"? It pertains to this: redemption was indeed offered for all, because Christ poured forth his blood for the world, but, as is also found in John III.16, it profits only those who believe. Therefore Theophylact and Euthymius, who considered the offering itself rather than the fruit of salvation received from it, following Paul in I Tim. IV.10, admonished that in Matthew *πολλοὺς ἀντὶ πάντων*, "many instead of all," is employed.

> For frequently, these are the words of Euthymius, Scripture says "many" for "all." Therefore he handed over his soul for all and redeemed all, although many of their own accord remained in servitude.

[2] *On God*, book I, vv. 80–81, p. 130, Rome edition, 1791.

[1] Marius Victor uses a similar formula, *Genesis*, book I, v. 482: "but the holy *pietas* of the Parent forbids despair"; and Hilary, *Genesis*, book I, v. 52: "to create what thou, the Begetter, wast preparing by paternal *pietas*."

[2] *On God*, book III, vv. 127–130, p. 350.

> God refuses increase or decrease; He will always be the same, never mutable with age, Who, although he is Lord, nevertheless wills himself to be Parent.

But this comes about because God is borne toward men with excellent goodness, because his clemency toward men is supreme, and even much greater in effects than justice itself; because he is accounted for them the author of hope and the fountain and perennial origin both of souls and of all goods. All these things Dracontius assuredly hands down and repeats, writing [3]:

> The Creator of the age knows That absolutely nothing besides himself is everywhere to be sought, And that unless he comes to aid, there will be no one who brings succor. Hence God is good to evil man, the author of all things: Hope, maker, lord, ruler, leader, arbiter, judge, Gracious with continual goodness, restrained in might, Good in simplicity, and loftier than every summit.

Then elsewhere [4]:

> Thou, almighty God, heavenly origin of things, Thou art held gracious and clement and a consoler, In a time of sadness the greater defense of the oppressed. Thy right hand raises those struck down, lifts those who have fallen, Cherishes the cast down, and always feeds the needy,—
> —preparing abundant cups, benignly ministers to the thirsty. [1] Unknowing of wrath, by admonitions, not slaughter, thou restrainest Sin; more clement, without slaughter [2], thou hearest the guilty Before their prayers, and aidest them with pardon; wrath does not stir Fury, so that thou wouldst command even the guilty to be slain justly. Thou art more gracious than just [3]: therefore thou dost not act

[3] *On God*, book I, vv. 430–437, p. 276.

[4] *On God*, book I, vv. 683–696, pp. 281–282.

[1] Arévalo thinks it would be more suitable to read:

> Preparing abundant cups for the thirsty, and ministering them.

[2] Paulinus, poem VI, *On Saint John the Baptist*:

> How great the *pietas* of God, and how readily entreated the Deity! To have repented is enough.

And the author of the poem *On the Praises of the Lord*, who perhaps is none other than Juvencus, writes:

> Thou, holding fast to chastity and rectitude, yet easy to bend the laws After a crime.

[3] Victorinus, *On Jesus Christ as God*: "Indulgence always pleases more than vengeance." Paulinus sings in accord in his last poem, saying:

> And yet, while correcting, he will grant one pardon to all; I shall say a new thing, nor will it repent me to have said it: He will be more gracious than just.

> severely; Thou punishest the erring, but gently correctest all, Good under *pietas*, while the scourge of punishment ceases.

With these the following agree [4]:

> Who is as gracious as befits the Almighty, And inferior in no virtue, except in the wrath And purpose of the lash; for of his own accord he is good through love of *pietas*. [5]

CXIV.

To this so excellent goodness and innate love, by which the divine nature is especially commended and excels, it must first be credited that

> for this purpose, in the words of Orosius [1], the human race was created and established from the beginning: that, living under religion, with peace and without labor, it might merit eternity by the fruit of obedience.

But when our first parents converted the excellent gifts of God to their own destruction and by their fault ruined all posterity, it must then be credited to the divine goodness that he did not indulge wrath, but raised fallen man and offered a medicine by which the mortal wound inflicted might be healed. Pacian speaks to the point [2], saying:

> After Adam sinned, when the Lord then said [3], "Thou art earth, and unto earth thou shalt go," he was condemned to death. This condemnation flowed down into the whole race. For all sinned, nature itself now compelling, as the Apostle says [4]: "Because through one man sin entered, and through the offense death, and thus it came unto all men, in whom all sinned." Sin, therefore, obtained dominion, by whose bonds we were drawn as captives unto death, namely, everlasting death. But before the times of the Law this sin was not even understood, as the Apostle says [5]: "For until the Law was established, sin was not held to be in the world," that is, it was not seen;

[4] *On God*, book I, vv. 690–694, p. 206.

[5] Marius Victor, *Genesis*, book I, vv. 462–465:

> But the holy *pietas* of the Parent Forbids despair, whose clemency—
> —may it be lawful for me to have said, may it also be lawful to have proved the things said— Exceeds justice.

[1] *History*, book VII, chap. I, p. 135, in Gallandius, vol. IX.

[2] Discourse *On Baptism*, § II, p. 274, in Gallandius, vol. VII.

[3] Gen. III.19.

[4] Rom. V.12.

[5] Rom. V.13 and VII.9.

> at the advent of the Law it revived. For it was disclosed so that it might be seen—but in vain, because almost no one observed it. For the Law said: "Thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not covet"; nevertheless, concupiscence remained with all the vices. Thus before the Law this sin killed man with a hidden sword; with the Law drawn, it killed him openly. What hope, therefore, is there for man? Without the Law he perished because he could not see sin; and—
>
> —under the Law because he fell into the very thing which he saw. For who could free him from destruction?

Immediately he both repeats and resolves this most grave question [1], writing:

> Hear the Apostle [2]: "Unhappy man that I am! Who shall free me from the body of this death? Grace," he says, "through our Lord Jesus Christ."

He proceeds to narrate in this manner how this ought to be understood [3]:

> What is grace? The remission of sin, that is, a gift. For grace is a gift. Therefore Christ, coming and assuming man, first exhibited that very man to God pure and innocent of the power of sin.

But of what utility was this to the rest and to the whole of humanity? Altogether the greatest, Pacian replies, when he treats this very controversy and sets it forth and determines it in these words [4]:

> But if he alone conquered, what did he confer upon the rest? Hear briefly. Through one man, as the Apostle says [5], the offense entered, and through the offense death; thus also it came unto all men. Therefore the justice of Christ must also pass into the race; and just as the former through sin ruined his own stock, so Christ through justice vivifies his whole race. The Apostle urges this [6], saying: "That just as through the disobedience of one many were constituted sinners, so through the obedience of one many may be constituted just; and just as the offense reigned unto death, similarly may grace also reign through justice unto eternal life."

Concerning this order of universal reparation Dracontius speaks with no less evidence [7], writing:

---

[1] Ibid., § II, p. 274.
[2] Rom. VII.24–25.
[3] Ibid., § III, p. 274.
[4] Ibid., § V, p. 274.
[5] Rom. V.12.
[6] Rom. V.19–21.
[7] *On God*, book II, vv. 492–499, p. 262.

Yet the kindly *pietas* of the Parent, Wishing to indulge swiftly [8], rather than prepared to punish—

—sent gracious Christ from the citadel of heaven through the stars [1], Who by his might would break the arts of the serpent, Devastating the enemy's cohorts by the standards of the Cross, Whom the lofty palaces of heaven, by a headlong cast, Thrust into grievous exile [2] under perpetual fault.

And again [3]:

Thou seest future things beforehand, and although with thee [4], Almighty, No things be future [5], all things appear present, Or rather, things to come for us are created as things already past [6]. Thus, holy Spirit and Author, foreseeing beforehand that men would sin, Thou didst first prepare the medicine Before thou madest man: ready indulgence anticipated guilt, And pardon precedes the iniquitous deed. For Christ was given to us, the one hope of salvation, Who graciously washes our sins here in a stream of blood; And although he himself bears our stains and crimes, Nevertheless the spotless Lamb is present, and the sole heir Of him who always lives, himself also always destined to live.

CXV.

Therefore, to speak in the words of the Apostle [7], God has not appointed us unto wrath, but unto the acquisition of salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, who is our life and the vivifier of us all. For, as excellently—

—Marius Mercator [2] disputes against Julian [1]:

---

[8] Perhaps it would be more fittingly read: "wishing to indulge, and swiftly not prepared to punish." Certainly in book I, v. 95, Dracontius had written: "He corrects the erring and does not punish suddenly with death."

[1] The Divine Word is called Christ by prolepsis.

[2] He calls the fault of the angels perpetual because there was no place of penance for them.

[3] *On God*, book II, vv. 593–605, pp. 272–274.

[4] I would prefer to read with Arévalo: "Thou seest future things beforehand; rather, for thee none are future," namely, Almighty.

[5] Compare Augustine, *Tractates on John*, tractate XCIX, n. 5.

[6] He writes similar things in vv. 732–734.

[7] I Thess. V.9 ff.

[2] In the *Commonitory*, p. 621, in Gallandius, vol. VIII.

[1] When Catholics inveighed gravely against the Pelagians because they denied that Christ was the redeemer of infants, and when this accusation, as was fitting, vehemently moved the minds of the faithful, the crafty deceivers, that they might remove so great an odium from themselves, did not shrink from employing the word "redeemer"; indeed, they confessed that infants are baptized

> Whether you will or not, Christ is the vivifier. Here I shall ask: of both soul and body? Although unwilling, you will confess it is so. I shall repeat the question: of absolutely every age? You will answer: of every age. I shall press more closely: of the infant also? You will say: even of him. But hear; I shall tell you how he also vivifies, and, so to speak, by what art. "But God," says Paul the Apostle [3], his herald and vessel of election, "who is rich in mercy, on account of the great charity with which he loved us in Christ, by whose grace we have been saved." What do you now judge? Did he number and name infants also, or are they outside that compassion and love because they are not dead in sins, and do they await you, most vain doorkeeper, that you may then admit them to mercy to be vivified when he shall have ceased from pitying sinners, so that he may vivify them otherwise than the others?

This opinion plainly underlies these words: the mercy of the benevolent divine will and the function of Christ the vivifier extend as far as death itself and the misery of men extend. But both embrace absolutely all begotten carnally from Adam, pass over no one, and invade all. Who, therefore, does not perceive that the mercy of God must also be believed universal, and the action of Christ the vivifier—

—must be believed universal? Marius Mercator proceeds to confirm this [1], adding:

> But let us pass from here, out of a desire for brevity, to another word which is thus written concerning the Savior in the Gospel [2]: "Today a Savior is born to you in the city of David." Whence he is also properly called Jesus in Greek speech; and to Zacchaeus he says [3]: "Today salvation has been wrought for this house, because he

unto the remission of sins. Nevertheless, lest they should appear to have abandoned their cause, they denied that it could be deduced from that confession that the infants who were baptized were bound by the fault of origin. Garnier proves these things in his commentary on the eighth chapter of the *Subnotations* of Marius Mercator by perspicuous testimonies of Pelagius, Caelestius, and Julian. To these this other testimony must be added from the books of Julian in Marius Mercator's *Commonitory*, p. 620, Gallandius edition, vol. VIII:

> Because we say that the grace of baptism is not to be changed according to causes, since it dispenses its gifts according to the capacity of those approaching; and therefore Christ, who is the redeemer of his own work, increases benefits toward his image with continual bounty, and those whom he made good by creating, he makes better by renewing and adopting.

[3] Eph. II.4.
[1] In the *Commonitory*, p. 621.
[2] Luke II.11.
[3] Luke XIX.9.

also is a son of Abraham." Likewise [4]: "The Son of man came to seek and to save that which had perished." Do you hear what he says? "That which had perished," he says. You, without doubt, because you pronounce that the flocks of infants have not perished, say they are not saved and are not sought. Hear this also concerning the lost sheep, sought and found [5]; and this concerning the drachma or handful which had perished [6]. Likewise the Apostle [7]: "Human is the saying [8], and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am the first." Remove from him, then, you distinguished master, the troops of infants, that they may not run to him who came to save that which had perished; who came [9] not to call the just but sinners to penance; who baptizes [10] unto the remission of sins; who seeks the sheep which strayed; who seeks the drachma, that is, the handful which had perished; who died [11] for sinners; who poured forth his blood [12] unto the remission of sins; who was handed over for the sins of men; who was wounded [13] on account of our iniquities; who bore our sins [14] in his body upon the wood;—

—who was offered [1] like a sheep for slaughter for our sins; who blotted out the handwriting of debts [2]; who, according to the Apostle Peter [3], the just suffered for the unjust that he might lead us to God; whose blood, according to John the Evangelist [4], cleanses us from every offense; who, when we were weak [5], according to the time died for the impious, as Paul the Apostle says; who in the likeness of the flesh of sin condemned sin in the flesh because of sin [6], as the

[4]Luke XIX.10.

[5]Luke XV.4–8.

[6]Mercator reads *δραγμα*, not, as is found in the commonly received codices, *δραγμην*, whence he also translates it "handful."

[7]I Tim. I.15.

[8]In Greek, *πιστός*, faithful, or certain and true.

[9]Matt. IX.13.

[10]Acts II.38.

[11]Rom. V.6.

[12]Matt. XXVI.28.

[13]Isa. LIII.5.

[14]I Pet. II.24.

[1]Isa. LIII.7.

[2]Col. II.14.

[3]I Pet. III.18.

[4]I John I.7.

[5]Rom. V.6.

[6]Rom. VIII.3.

> same Paul bears witness; who reconciled us from offense to God the Father [7], as the same Apostle again says; who gave himself for our sins [8], and one died for all, that he might rescue us from the present evil age.

Those in no way attain the force and rationale of this disputation who do not understand that Mercator defends the universal reparation acquired by the death and blood of Christ. For since it is fixed for him to demonstrate that infants themselves also, infected and ruined by the original stain, he takes his argument from the fact that Jesus is and is believed to be the Savior also of infants. For in almost this manner he attacks Julian and reduces him to extremity:

> Jesus is the Savior no more of adults than of infants. But he is the Savior only of those who have perished, who have contracted iniquity, and who are rightly numbered among sinners. Therefore infants themselves also have perished, and they too come into the light bound by iniquity and sin.

In this rationale of inferring and concluding there is assuredly nothing which does not disclose even unto evidence that no answer more fitting or more true can be given to one who asks how far the amplitude of reparation extends than this: it extends as far as destruction and sin have been diffused.

Prudentius speaks excellently [1]:

> But to bring forth the Word belongs to the Father; the remaining things belong to the Word: To bear the man assumed [2], to repair him who was destroyed, To reconcile him to the Father and place him in the seat at his right hand. The Spirit of God completes these things: God himself, ready To diffuse his charism among faithful peoples, Transfers the power both of the Father and of Christ into bodies.

And again, after he said [3]:

> The Word of the almighty Father always descends To the aid of man by saving him; in his own love he always took care To mingle mortal things with himself, That the flesh to be joined and filled with the everlasting Lord Might change by the Master's example the degenerate life which it then lived as animal, And through like members might become accustomed to behold a sharer of earthly form, And to know by sight, as by a pledge, its own participant, And little by little to approach the consanguineous Christ,

[7] Rom. V.10.

[8] Gal. I.4.

[1] Preface to the *Apotheosis*, vv. 7–12, pp. 396–397, Rome edition, 1788.

[2] Compare canon I of the Fourth Council of Toledo.

[3] *Apotheosis*, vv. 155–164, pp. 415–416.

He immediately adds [4]:

> Therefore the man once animal, now the Spirit transferred him To the nature of the seed from above, by infusing God himself, who vivifies mortal things. Now a new matter, strengthened by a breath beneath the skin, Yet nevertheless our matter, drawn from the Virgin, Cast off the corrupt beginnings of the ancient life, Receiving immortal good by its own breath.

CXVI.

Now, indeed, among the very many things which cohere with this providence concerning the repaired human race, there are some which the Spanish doctors commemorate above the rest and which I judge worth the labor to review in order. First, therefore, if we give faith to them, there coheres the purpose by which God wills no one to perish, by which he solicitously seeks the erring and the wandering, and by which he rejoices vehemently when he finds them and, having found them, holds them obedient to himself.

> Behold, Pacian writes [1], it is God himself who speaks: "I will not the death of the sinner [2], so much as that he should return and live." And again [3]: "Will not he who has fallen," he says, "rise; and will not he who has turned away be converted?" And the Apostle says [4]: "God is able to establish him." The Apocalypse also threatens the seven churches unless they do penance. Certainly it would not threaten those who do not repent unless it pardoned those who repent. For God himself says [5]: "Remember, behold, whence thou hast fallen, and do penance." And again [6]: "When, having been converted, thou shalt groan, then thou shalt be saved, and thou shalt know where thou wast." Nor should anyone so despair because of the vileness of a sinful soul as to believe himself no longer necessary to God. The Lord wills none of us to perish: even the little and the least are sought. If you do not believe, look: behold, in the Gospel the drachma is sought and, when found, shown to the neighbors. The little sheep, to be carried back upon his shoulders, is not burdensome

[4] Ibid., vv. 164–171, p. 416.
[1] *Exhortation to Penance*, § XII, p. 273, in Gallandius, vol. VII.
[2] Ezek. XVIII.23 and XXXIII.11.
[3] Jer. VIII.4.
[4] Rom. XIV.4.
[5] Apoc. II.5.
[6] Isa. XXX.15, according to the Alexandrian version.

> to the shepherd. Over one sinner doing penance the angels rejoice in heaven and the heavenly choir exults. Ho, thou sinner, do not cease to ask: thou seest where there is rejoicing over thy return.

Then there coheres the paternal care by which God is present to all with his grace, confirms all, and renders all invincible, provided only that they do not fail themselves.

> This is always my—
>
> —faithful and undoubted opinion, says Orosius [1]: God supplies his aid not only in his body, which is the Church, to which he bestows special gifts of his grace on account of the faith of believers; but also to all the nations in this world, on account of his long-suffering and eternal clemency—not, as you maintain [2] with your disciple Caelestius, for whom the hidden nature of those impious dogmas has already been crushed before the African synod, that one grace has been contributed generally to all in natural good alone and in free choice; but that he ministers it specially each day, through times, through days, through moments, through *ἀτόμους*, indivisible moments, both to all and to each.

After illustrating this with more things, he adds by inference [3]:

> You have, as I judge, even among the nations a sufficient proof of cooperating grace; receive also a manifest indication concerning that special gift which he bestows peculiarly upon the Church and his body. Paul the Apostle writes to the Corinthians [4]: "I give thanks to my God always for you, in the grace of God which is given to you in Christ Jesus; because in all things you have been made rich in him, in every word and in all knowledge, just as the testimony of Christ has been confirmed in you, so that nothing is lacking to you in any grace." And again [5]: "Being justified, therefore, by faith, let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we also have access by faith into this grace in which we stand and glory." Whence Peter the Apostle also admonishes [6], saying: "Receiving the end of your faith, the salvation of souls; concerning which salvation the prophets, who prophesied concerning the grace of God that was to be in us, inquired and searched." From this it has been most evidently declared that the aid of God is lacking to no man,

[1] *Apology concerning Freedom of Choice*, § XIX, p. 163, in Gallandius, vol. IX.
[2] He addresses Pelagius, whom he refutes.
[3] Ibid., § XXI, p. 164.
[4] I Cor. I.4–7.
[5] Rom. V.1–2.
[6] I Pet. I.9–10.

> especially since both the seducer presses upon him and weakness is within him.

Pacian agrees in the most explicit words [7], when, refuting the Novatians because they withdrew the grace of penance from those who sinned after baptism, he says:

> If spiritual wickednesses can do nothing against the baptized, if that fraud of the serpent which first overthrew man and impressed so many titles of condemnation upon his posterity can do nothing; if it has withdrawn from the world; if we have already begun to reign; if no crime creeps upon our eyes, none upon our hands, none upon our minds: let this gift of God be cast aside [1], let aid be repulsed, let no *exomologesis*, no groans, be heard; let proud justice contemn every remedy. But if the Lord has provided these things for his man; if the same one who bestowed rewards upon those standing bestowed remedies upon those fallen: cease to accuse divine *pietas*, or, under an objection of rigor, to disbelieve so many attestations of heavenly clemency, or to prohibit the gratuitous goods of the Lord with inexorable harshness. We do not bestow these things from our own. "Be converted to me," says the Lord [2], "and at the same time in fasting and weeping and mourning rend your hearts." And again [3]: "Let the impious forsake his ways, and the wicked man his thoughts, and let him be converted to the Lord, and he shall obtain mercy." Likewise the prophet cries in this manner [4]: "Because God is gracious and gentle and patient, and one who [5] turns back the sentence against the evils inflicted." Does the serpent possess venom so enduring, and does Christ not possess a medicine? Does the devil slay in the world, and can Christ not bring aid here? Let it indeed grieve one to sin, but let it not grieve one to repent. Let one be ashamed to be endangered, but not ashamed to be liberated. Who will snatch the plank from a shipwrecked man lest he escape? Who will begrudge the healing of wounds?

For God is always at hand—

---

[7] To Sympronianus, epistle I, § V, p. 258, in Gallandius, vol. VII.

[1] He understands penance, and indeed that penance which is neither divinely commanded nor undertaken by men without fruit.

[2] Joel II.12–13.

[3] Isa. LV.7.

[4] Joel II.13, according to the Alexandrian version.

[5] In the same manner as Pacian, Cyprian cites the words of Joel II.13 in the little book *On the Lapsed*, in *On the Good of Patience*, and in the epistle to Antonianus. This version is owed to the ancient interpreter, who thus rendered what we read in Greek: *καὶ μετανοῶν ἐπὶ ταῖς κακίαις*. Jerome, adhering more closely to the Hebrew exemplars, renders it: "relenting over evil."

—to furnish medicine, and always, according to Dracontius [1], brings aid by the gifts of his grace:

> Being asked without a voice, he bestows pardon for sins upon the guilty, By the affection of the heart [2], by the secret mind, by faith, by hope. Since God is everywhere, always prepared to furnish, Alas, we receive more slowly, delayed by our own heart. Gracious vows hate delays [3]; swiftly he adopts. The clement God placed all things within our choice [4]: The mind of men is free to sin or to live holily; He gave free vows, whenever we will to hope; If it pleases us to believe [5], it is easy, for we are able to obtain.

Therefore God acts patiently with men, defers punishment, does not punish before he has admonished, is clement even in wrath itself, frequently indulges, waits with long-suffering, and conducts himself thus for this reason: that he wills the life of men, not death and everlasting destruction. Let Dracontius be heard [6]:

> No one wishing to strike first admonishes that it is thereafter to be avoided; But he who terrifies loves [7]. Thus indulgence anticipates Punishment, and torments seize no guilty persons.
>
> The Almighty does not deny pardon to anyone who asks [1], Since he often denies punishment, although he threatens it To all; and the judgment of the Thunderer strikes no one Unless the vice of the sinner acts by persisting malignantly. And whomever he strikes, he moderately tempers the blows; He corrects the erring and does not punish suddenly with death, If any profane man refrains from sin-

[1] *On God*, book II, vv. 605–615, pp. 274–275.

[2] He intimates the prayer of the heart, concerning which he has excellent things in book I, vv. 367 ff.

[3] Ambrose, in the same mind, commentary on Luke, book II, chap. I, n. 19: "The grace of the Holy Spirit knows not tardy endeavors."

[4] After divine grace, concerning which Apoc. III.20 says: "Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if anyone shall hear my voice and open the door to me, I shall enter unto him." This grace, moreover, is understood always to shine forth in the present order of repaired nature, since, according to Thomas, *On Truth*, q. XIV, a. XI, ad 1, "it pertains to divine providence to provide each one with the things necessary for salvation, provided that it is not impeded on his part."

[5] Dracontius uses the verb "to merit" for "to obtain," "to receive," and by this he means that it is easy to obtain the gifts of God.

[6] *On God*, book I, vv. 87–99, pp. 131–132.

[7] Apoc. III.19; Heb. XII.6; Prov. III.11–12; Prosper, *Epigrams* LXVI; and Marius Victor, *Genesis*, book I, vv. 465 ff.

[1] Paulinus, poem VI, *On Saint John the Baptist*:

> How many steps does thy *pietas* spare? What father ever— Endures to pardon an erring son so often?… Although error has now advanced far too greatly— Let him desist and return, when he has condemned himself.— He merited to be absolved: if he repents, the fault is void.

ning for long [2]. But when man persists, always following offenses,
He will feel wrath in fury chastising with punishment.

Repeating these things elsewhere [3], he sings:

Therefore thou dost not act severe; Thou punishest the erring, but gently correctest all, Good under *pietas*, while the scourge of punishment ceases. And as often as thou shalt have been moved [4], thou standest forth most placid, Commanding nothing harsh; the sentence of heaven is light. Gracious King, thou pronouncest punishment revocable for all, So that, if sinners acknowledge their guilt in the heart And with a better mind condemn their former offenses, There may be those whom thou pardonest; but not once only dost thou relax these things: Indulging more frequently, showing the thresholds of death [5], And calling back from cruel death those whom fault oppressed, Thou leadest in forms snatched from the jaws of hell [6].

Since, therefore, the goodness of God is so great and his readiness to have mercy so great, whom, at last, shall we judge to perish? Dracontius answers [7]:

These alone perish who, it has been established, are always profane,
Willing to sin in evil without end. One boundary of crime and punishment is held once for all.

Moreover, he continues [1]:

He who commands the sun to proceed for the placid and the savage [2], And the moon and wandering stars and all the constellations,
Commands also the rains to be poured forth with no distinction. Nor is the one universal *pietas* devoid of rationale: He extends reward to the just, gifts to us unjust, That even thus we may be converted to him [3]. Enticed by gifts, he changes us, not driven by punishments;

---

[2] II Pet. III.9.

[3] *On God*, book II, vv. 693–705, pp. 282–283.

[4] Hab. III.2.

[5] I Kings II.6.

[6] Wisd. XVI.13.

[7] *On God*, book II, vv. 705–708, p. 283.

[1] Ibid., vv. 735–744, pp. 286–287.

[2] Matt. V.45; and Prudentius, *Against Symmachus*, book II, vv. 780 ff.

[3] Gregory speaks opportunely, *Morals*, book XVI, chap. XII:

> The Lord fills the houses of the evil with good things, because he does not deny his gifts even to the ungrateful, that either they may blush at the benignity of the Creator and return to goodness, or, altogether contemning return, may there be punished more gravely on account of those very gifts.

> God awaits gracious vows [4], he does not require incense; The sole victim pleasing to him is the honorableness of a purified mind [5].

From these things he finally concludes [6]:

> Whatever worthy of punishment we may do in the way of crime, fraud, and guile, The benign one defers to punish, That, if one repents, he may be more prepared to indulge; He who makes the angelic cohorts crackle with flame [7].

For indeed [8]:

> And a delay not brief is proved to be granted to the erring; And he is preserved for a long time for pardon, if the audacious man ceases To attempt illicit wickedness. For every guilty man converted [1] Gives joys to heaven.

CXVII.

We have given the things which suffice for knowing the mind and opinion of the Spanish Church, and therefore we judge that it is now open to us to proceed to those who are deservedly held to be the most abundant witnesses of that faith which the Gallican Church has professed from the most ancient times. We prefer no one to Irenaeus, who, just as he is highly commended by antiquity, renown of name, and the fact of his martyrdom, so committed to writing those things which contribute marvelously to unraveling and resolving the present question. For, first, inquiring into the cause of the fall of our first parents divinely permitted, he speaks thus [2]:

> God was magnanimous when man failed, foreseeing that the victory which would be through the Word was to be restored to him. For since power was perfected in weakness, it showed the benignity and most magnificent power of God. For just as he patiently endured Jonah to be swallowed by the whale [3], not that he might be swallowed and perish altogether, but that, having been vomited forth, he might be subjected the more to God and glorify him the more, who had given him unhoped-for salvation, and that he might

[4] Isa. XXX.18.

[5] Ps. L.18.

[6] *On God*, book II, vv. 772–776, p. 290.

[7] By these words the excellent goodness of God toward men is commended, because he invites them to penance and awaits them, although he cast the rebellious angels into eternal fire.

[8] *On God*, book II, vv. 716–720, p. 285.

[1] Luke XV.10.

[2] *Against Heresies*, book III, chap. XX, otherwise XXII, § 1, p. 213, Paris edition, 1710.

[3] Jonah II.1 ff.

bring firm penance to the Ninevites, that they might be converted to the Lord who would free them from death, having been terrified by that sign which had occurred concerning Jonah, as Scripture says of them [4]: "And each one returned from his evil way and from the injustice which was in their hands, saying: Who knows whether God will repent [5], turn his wrath away from us, and we shall not perish?" Thus also from the beginning God patiently endured man to be swallowed by—

—the great whale, which was the author of transgression—not that, having been swallowed, he might perish altogether, but constructing beforehand and preparing the discovery of salvation which was made by the Word through the sign of Jonah for those who held the same opinion concerning the Lord as Jonah and confessed and said [1]: "I am a servant of the Lord, and I worship the Lord God of heaven, who made the sea and the dry land"—so that man, receiving unhoped-for salvation from God, might rise from the dead and glorify God, and utter that voice which was prophesied by Jonah [2]: "I cried to the Lord my God in my tribulation, and he heard me from the belly of hell"; and might remain always glorifying God and without intermission returning thanks for that salvation which he obtained from him, so that no flesh might glory [3] in the sight of the Lord, nor man ever receive a contrary opinion concerning God, thinking that incorruption which was about him to be naturally his own, and, not holding the truth, might be tossed about in empty haughtiness as though he were naturally like God. For this would rather make him ungrateful to him who made him, and it obscured the love which God had toward man and blinded his sense so that he would not perceive what is worthy concerning God, comparing himself and judging himself equal to God.

Twin to these are the things which he soon adds [4], saying:

This, therefore, was [5] the magnanimity of God: that man, passing through all things and receiving the knowledge of morals, then coming to the resurrection which is from the dead, and learning by ex-

[4] Jonah III.8–9.

[5] Others read: "will be repented."

[1] Jonah I.9.

[2] Ibid., II.3.

[3] I Cor. I.29.

[4] *Against Heresies*, book III, chap. XX, § 2, pp. 213–214.

[5] The conjecture of those who think that what is "magnanimous" and "magnanimity" in the Latin interpreter was in Greek *μακρόθυμον* and *μακροθυμίαν*, "patient" and "long-suffering," "patience" and "long-suffering," is not displeasing.

> perience whence he was liberated, might always exist grateful to the Lord, having obtained from him the gift of incorruption, that he might love him more—for he to whom more is forgiven loves more—and might know himself, because he is mortal and weak; and might understand God, because he is immortal and powerful to such an extent—
>
> —that he gives both immortality to the mortal and eternity to the temporal; and that he might also understand all the other powers of God shown in himself, by which, having been taught, he may perceive concerning God how great God is. For the glory of man is God; but the operations of God [1], and the receptacle of all his wisdom and power, is man. Just as a physician is proved in those who are sick, so God also is manifested in men. Wherefore Paul also says [2]: "But God concluded all things in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all"—saying this not concerning spiritual aeons, but concerning man, who was disobedient to God and cast out from immortality, and afterward obtained mercy, receiving through the Son of God the adoption which is through him.

Therefore God permitted Adam to sin, having abused his own choice, and, by sinning, to fall from that nobility of body and soul to which he had been advanced by singular benignity; but he did not permit his work to perish altogether, nor did he allow the cause of the human race to appear wholly desperate. Indeed, such is his goodness that he seized from man's transgression and crime an occasion by which he might declare his mercy and *pietas* toward him. For he constructed beforehand and prepared for him the discovery of salvation which was made by the Word; and with exquisite wisdom brought it about that the human race should receive unhoped-for salvation, rise from the dead, return thanks without intermission for the reparation offered, and understand by experience itself that the good of human salvation is not from man but from God [3], and that man is indeed the receptacle of the operation and power of God, but in no way their origin and fountain.

The same counsel of *pietas* and mercy moved God to exclude our first parents, bound by fault, from paradise.

> Wherefore, writes Irenaeus [4], he both cast him out of paradise and transferred him far from the tree of life, not envying him the tree [5]—

[1] Perhaps, "operation."

[2] Rom. XI.32.

[3] *Against Heresies*, book III, chap. XX, § 3, p. 214.

[4] Ibid., chap. XXIII, § 6, p. 222.

[5] Theophilus of Antioch agrees in the second book *To Autolycus*; but the things handed down by Chrysostom in homily—

> —of life, as certain men dare to say, but having mercy upon him, that he might not persevere forever as a transgressor, nor sin about him be immortal and the evil endless and incurable. But he prohibited his transgression, interposing death and causing sin to cease, bringing an end to it through the dissolution of the flesh which would occur in the earth, so that man, at some time ceasing to live to sin and dying to it, might begin to live to God.

That the whole human race was called back to this life can also be learned from those things by which God pronounced his sentence upon it.

> On this account, says Irenaeus [1], even at the beginning of Adam's transgression, as Scripture narrates, he did not curse Adam himself [2], but the earth in his works, as one of the ancients says: "Because God transferred the curse to the earth, that it might not persevere in man." But man received as the condemnation of transgression weariness and earthly labor, and to eat bread in the sweat of his countenance, and to return to the earth from which he was taken; and similarly the woman received weariness and labors and groans and sorrows of childbirth and servitude, that is, that she should serve her husband: so that neither, cursed by God, should they perish altogether, nor, persevering without rebuke, should they contemn God. But the whole curse descended upon the serpent which had seduced them. "And God said," he says [3], "to the serpent: Because thou hast done this, cursed art thou among [4] all cattle and among all the beasts of the earth." The Lord says this same thing also in the Gospel to those who are found on the left [5]: "Depart, ye accursed, into the eternal—"
>
> —fire which my Father prepared [1] for the devil and his angels," signifying that eternal fire was not principally prepared for man, but for him who seduced man and caused him to offend—and, I say, who is

—XVI on Genesis, Augustine in *The City of God*, book XIV, chap. XII, and Theodoret, question XXVI on Genesis, are somewhat different.

[1] *Against Heresies*, book III, chap. XXIII, § 3, p. 221.

[2] Tertullian also observed the very same thing in the second book *Against Marcion*, saying:

> God therefore did not curse Adam himself and Eve, as candidates for restoration, as revealed by confession, just as he cursed the serpent, whose salvation was wholly despaired of.

See more in Rupert, *On the Victory of the Word of God*, book II, chap. XV.

[3] Gen. III.14.

[4] That is, among all cattle, or above all cattle.

[5] Matt. XXV.41.

[1] This likewise is the reading of the most ancient Italic version, to which these words correspond in the Cambridge codex: *ὃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ πατήρ μου*.

> the prince of apostasy, the prince of secession—and for those angels who became apostates with him; which they too shall justly receive who, like them, persevere in works of malice without penance and without return.

CXVIII.

Therefore the whole economy concerning our first parents, whether that by which God permitted their transgression, or that by which he expelled them from paradise and pronounced sentence upon them in such a way as to spare them from a curse, presents a most splendid argument by which the immense mercy of the supreme Deity toward the human race is commended and the chosen order of restoration and reparation is made known. In order that God might put this order into execution, according to the prescription of wisdom, goodness, and justice, he decreed that the eternal Word, on account of absolutely all men whom he had created, should assume flesh, come into this world, undergo death for all, recapitulate all in himself, draw all back to himself and reconcile them with God, bestow life and incorruption upon all, render all free and friends of God, embrace in himself, as in Jacob, the blessing of all, recover in himself whatever had previously been lost in Adam, sanctify every age, become man for this reason, that man might become accustomed to receive God and be joined to God, and finally fulfill the part of the gracious Samaritan and tend to the wounds of man. Irenaeus both teaches and inculcates all these things in such explicit and repeated statements that every doubt concerning his mind and faith appears altogether cut off. From the innumerable things which he has, I shall bring forward some, and these selected by way of specimen.

Accordingly, speaking of the counsel by which humanity was assumed by the Word [2], he says:

> In the last times, when the fullness of the time of liberty came—
> —the Word himself by himself washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion, washing the feet of the disciples with his own hands. For this is the end of the human race which inherits God: that just as in the beginning through the first ones we were all reduced to servitude under the debt of death, so in the end through the last one all who from the beginning are disciples, cleansed and washed from the things of death, may come into the life of God [1].

And immediately [2]:

[2] *Against Heresies*, book IV, chap. XXII, § 1, p. 259.
[1] Compare Lactantius, *Divine Institutes*, book IV, chap. XXVI.
[2] Ibid., § 2, p. 259.

> For Christ did not come on account of those alone who believed in him in the times of Tiberius Caesar; nor did the Father exercise providence on account of those men alone who now exist; but on account of absolutely all men who from the beginning, according to their capacity in their own generation, both feared and loved God, conducted themselves justly and piously toward their neighbors, and desired to see Christ and to hear his voice [3].

But he who came of himself for all and was sent for the salvation of all poured forth his blood and underwent death that he might redeem all and call all back to immortal felicity. Irenaeus establishes this excellently when, showing by various antitheses [4] that the Passion of the Lord has nothing in common and nothing akin with the fictitious passion of the Aeon, he writes:

> But neither is the Passion of Christ similar to the passion of the Aeon, nor was it wrought among similar things. For the Aeon suffered a passion of dissolution and destruction, so that the one himself who suffered was in danger; but our Lord Christ suffered a strong passion, one which did not yield: not only was he himself in no danger of being corrupted, but he also strengthened corrupted man by his own strength and called him back into incorruption. And the Aeon indeed suffered a passion while himself seeking the Father and not prevailing to find him; but the Lord suffered that he might lead those who had wandered from the Father to acknowledgment and close to him. And—
>
> —for the former, the inquiry into the magnitude of the Father became a passion of destruction; but for us the Lord, suffering and conferring acknowledgment of the Father, bestowed salvation. And the passion of the former, as they say, bore a feminine fruit, invalid and weak and formless and ineffective; but his Passion bore strength and power. And the Lord through his Passion destroyed death, loosed error, exterminated corruption, destroyed ignorance, manifested life, showed the truth, and bestowed incorruption; but when their Aeon had suffered, he established ignorance [1] and begot a formless substance from which, according to them, all material works were brought forth: death, corruption, error, and things similar to these.

[3] A comparison of both passages shows that the amplitude of reparation through Christ can be considered both universal and particular: universal, indeed, if account is taken of the divine counsel in itself, the first will, and the faculty offered; but particular if the fruit of salvation received from it and the second will are considered.

[4] *Against Heresies*, book II, chap. XX, § 3, p. 145.

[1] Others read: "sustained."

Whence, narrating in summary God's providence toward men through his Word [2], he says:

> The Word of God conversed, according to divinity and glory, with the patriarchs who were before Moses; but to those who were under the Law he presented a sacerdotal and ministerial action [3]; and afterward, having been made man for us, he sent the gift of the heavenly Spirit into the whole earth, protecting us under his wings…. And for this reason four covenants were given to the human race: one before the deluge under Adam; the second after the deluge under Noah; the third, the legislation under Moses; but the fourth, which renews man and recapitulates all things in itself, is that through the Gospel, elevating men and giving them wings unto the heavenly kingdom.

But since the clemency of God toward men has always been so great, by the very best right Irenaeus convicts the Valentinians [4],

> because they contemned the formation of God [5], contradicting—
> —their own salvation, existing as their own most bitter accusers and false witnesses.

Especially since Christ recapitulated the whole human race in himself. For, attacking those who denied that true flesh had been taken by the Word from the Virgin, Irenaeus says [1]:

> On this account Luke shows that the genealogy which is from the generation of our Lord even unto Adam contains seventy-two generations [2], joining the end to the beginning and signifying that he is the one who recapitulated in himself all the nations dispersed from Adam, all languages [3], and the generation of men together with

[2] *Against Heresies*, book III, chap. XI, § 8, p. 191.

[3] In the fragment of the Greek text which Grabe published, we read: *τοῖς δὲ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, ἱερατικὴν ... τάξιν*, "but to those who were under the Law, a sacerdotal order." Since, therefore, the ancient interpreter rendered it "action," not "order," it is conjectured that he read not *τάξιν* but *πρᾶξιν*.

[4] *Against Heresies*, book I, chap. XXII, § 1, p. 98.

[5] By the name "formation" he understands the flesh, which the heretics denied would rise. This is manifest both from the parallel passage, book V, chaps. V–VI, and from the things which Irenaeus immediately adds—

> Who indeed shall rise in the flesh, although they do not will it, that they may acknowledge the power of him who raises them from the dead.

Whence he produces an argument of this kind: if God did not permit even the body itself always to remain liable to corruption, far less, assuredly, did he allow the soul to lack a means of reparation.

[1] *Against Heresies*, book III, chap. XXII, § 3, p. 219.

[2] Let no one marvel that Irenaeus read only seventy-two generations in the Gospel of Luke; for both the Fathers and the ancient manuscript codices of the New Testament disagree not a little in enumerating them.

[3] There is no lack either of Greek Fathers or of gentile writers, in Bochart, *Phaleg*, book I, chap. XXIII, who make the number of nations and languages equal to the generations.

> Adam himself [4]. Whence Adam himself was also called by Paul a type of the one to come [5], because the Word, the maker of all things, had prefigured in himself the future disposition of the human race concerning the Son of God, God first prefiguring the animal man, namely, that he might be saved by the spiritual. For since the Savior preexisted, it was fitting that what would be saved should also be made, that the Savior might not be empty.

And he proceeds in continuous discourse [6]:

> Consequently, the Virgin Mary is also found obedient—
> —saying [1]: "Behold thy handmaid, O Lord; be it done unto me according to thy word." But Eve was disobedient, for she did not obey while she was still a virgin. Just as she, indeed having Adam as her husband but still existing as a virgin, became disobedient and was made the cause of death both to herself and to the whole human race, so Mary, having a predestined husband and yet a virgin, became obedient and was made the cause of salvation both to herself and to the whole human race [2].

Then, after some intervening remarks, he adds [3]:

> For the Lord, born the firstborn of the dead [4] and receiving the ancient fathers into his bosom, regenerated them unto the life of God, himself having been made the beginning of the living, because Adam was made the beginning of the dying. On this account Luke also, beginning the commencement of the genealogy from the Lord, carried it back to Adam, signifying that they did not regenerate him, but he regenerated them unto the Gospel of life. Thus also the knot of Eve's disobedience received its loosing through the obedience of

[4] Irenaeus manifestly has regard to the words of Paul, Eph. I.9, where what his ancient interpreter calls "to recapitulate," Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, book V, chap. XVII, and *On Monogamy*, chap. V, calls "to bring back to the beginning," "to review from the beginning," and "to bring all things back to the head, that is, to the beginning"; Ambrosiaster calls it "to restore," and the Vulgate, "to reestablish." In Greek it is expressed by the verb *ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι*, whose force Cyril declares in *On John*, book IX, p. 819, writing that "the name and thing of recapitulation have the same force as *ἀναλαβεῖν εἰς ὅπερ ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ, τὰ πρὸς ἀνόμοιον ἐκπεπτωκότα τέλος*: to recall to the former state and restore those things which had fallen away unto an altogether different end."

[5] Rom. V.14.

[6] *Against Heresies*, book III, chap. XXII, § 4, pp. 219–220.

[1] Luke I.38.

[2] Compare the observations of Feuardent on this passage, in which he embraces most similar testimonies of ecclesiastical writers.

[3] Ibid., p. 220.

[4] Col. I.18.

> Mary [5]. For what the virgin Eve bound through unbelief, this the Virgin Mary loosed through faith.

CXIX.

But nothing is either more illustrious or more fitted than this comparison and antithesis between the first and the second Adam, between Eve and Mary, for signifying the universal redemption and the restoration of the whole human race.

> Having manifestly shown, writes Irenaeus [6], that the Word, existing in the beginning with God, through whom all things were made and who was always present to the human race, was in the last times—
> —according to the time predetermined by the Father, united to his own formation and made passible man, every contradiction of those who say, "If, therefore, he was then born, Christ did not therefore exist before," has been excluded. For we have shown that the Son of God did not then begin, since he always existed with the Father; but when he was incarnate and made man, he recapitulated in himself the long exposition of men, furnishing salvation to us in compendium, so that what we had lost in Adam, that is, to be according to the image and likeness of God, we might receive in Christ Jesus [1].

Nor, assuredly, is this marvelous. For he continues [2]:

> *Διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου, τοῦ πρώτως ἐκ γῆς ἀνεργάστου πεπλασμένου, ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί, καὶ ἀπέβαλον τὴν ζωήν· οὕτως ἔδει καὶ δι' ὑπακοῆς ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου, τοῦ πρώτως ἐκ παρθένου γεγενημένου, δικαιωθῆναι πολλοὺς καὶ ἀπολαβεῖν τὴν σωτηρίαν.*
>
> Through the disobedience of one man, who was first formed from the unworked earth [3], many were made sinners and lost life; thus it was fitting also through the obedience of one man, who was first born of the Virgin, for many to be justified and receive salvation.

And indeed it was necessary, he adds [4], for man to be united to God:

---

[5] Aptly Arator in *The Acts of the Apostles*, book I:

> The evils of Eve's crime A second Virgin puts to flight: there is no injury of the sex.

[6] *Against Heresies*, book III, chap. XVIII, § 1, p. 209.

[1] Compare Petavius, *On the Incarnation*, book II, chap. VII, §§ VII ff.

[2] *Against Heresies*, book III, chap. XVIII, § 7, p. 211. We owe the Greek words to Theodoret, who relates them in dialogue I, to which he gave the title *Immutable*.

[3] Here and subsequently, "firstly" would be rendered more satisfactorily than "first," according to the norm of the Greek expression *πρώτως*.

[4] Ibid., § 7, p. 211.

> For if man had not conquered the enemy of man, the enemy would not have been justly conquered. Again, unless God had bestowed salvation, we would not possess it firmly. *Καὶ εἰ μὴ συνενώθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῷ θεῷ, οὐκ ἂν ἠδυνήθη μετασχεῖν τῆς ἀφθαρσίας· ἔδει γὰρ τὸν μεσίτην θεοῦ τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων, διὰ τῆς ἰδίας πρὸς ἑκατέρους οἰκειότητος, εἰς φιλίαν καὶ ὁμόνοιαν τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους συναγαγεῖν· καὶ θεῷ μὲν παραστῆσαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀνθρώποις δὲ γνωρίσαι τὸν θεόν.* [5] And unless man had been joined to God, he could not have become a participant in incorruptibility. For it was fitting that the mediator of God and men, through his own kinship with both, should lead both back into friendship and concord, and should—
>
> —present man to God and make God known to men [1].

Christ furnished these things most fully according to the will of the Father.

> For, according to Irenaeus [2], he recapitulated man in himself, being made visible though invisible, comprehensible though incomprehensible, passible though impassible, and the Word man, recapitulating all things in himself; so that just as the Word of God is prince in things above the heavens and spiritual and invisible, so also he might possess the principality in things visible and corporeal, assuming primacy in himself, and, setting himself as head of the Church, might draw all things to himself at the fitting time.

And he assuredly drew them [3] when the fullness of time came [4] and God sent his Son,

> who is perfect in all things [5], because the Word is powerful and true man, reasonably redeeming us by his blood, who gave himself as a redemption for those who had been led into captivity. And because apostasy ruled over us unjustly and, although we were by nature of almighty God, alienated us contrary to nature, making us its own disciples, the Word of God, powerful in all things and not failing in his justice, turned justly even against apostasy itself [6], redeeming from it the things which were his own—not with force, as apostasy ruled over us in the beginning, insatiably seizing things which were

[5] In Theodoret, dialogue II, which is called *Unconfused*.

[1] The ancient interpreter, either because he read differently or because he discharged his parts somewhat carelessly, has: "and to bring it about that both God might assume man and man give himself to God."

[2] *Against Heresies*, book III, chap. XVI, § 6, p. 206.

[3] Ibid., § 7, p. 206.

[4] Gal. IV.4.

[5] *Against Heresies*, book V, chap. I, § 1, p. 292.

[6] These things may be read explained more fully in Augustine, *On the Trinity*, book XIII, chap. XIII.

not its own, but according to persuasion, as befitted God, persuading and not inflicting force, to receive the things which he willed—so that neither would that which is just be broken nor would the ancient formation of God perish.

Wherefore [7],

the Lord redeemed us by his own blood, and gave his soul for our soul and his flesh for our flesh, and poured forth the Spirit of the Father unto the union and communion of God and man, depositing God among men through the Spirit, and again placing man upon God through his Incarnation, and firmly and truly in his advent bestowing incorruption upon us through the communion which is with him.

CXX.

Whence it came about [1]

that just as through the former generation we inherited death, so through the generation of Christ we should inherit life; … and just as in the animal one we all died, so in the spiritual one we should all be vivified.

For [2]

Christ dissolved that disobedience of man which had occurred in the tree from the beginning; … healing the disobedience which had occurred in the tree by the obedience which was in the tree.

Hence [3]

we were reconciled with God, whom we offended in the first Adam by not doing his precept, in the second Adam, being made obedient even unto death [4].

To these benefits acquired through Christ this also was added [5]:

That in past times man was indeed said to have been made according to the image of God, but it was not shown; for the Word, according to whose image he had been made, was still invisible. *Διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ τὴν ὁμοίωσιν ῥᾳδίως ἀπέβαλεν, ὁπότε δὲ σὰρξ ἐγένετο ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, τὰ ἀμφότερα ἐπεκύρωσε· καὶ γὰρ τὴν εἰκόνα ἔδειξεν ἀληθῶς, αὐτὸς τοῦτο γενόμενος, ὅπερ ἦν ἡ εἰκὼν αὐτοῦ· καὶ τὴν ὁμοίωσιν*

[7] Ibid., § 1, p. 292, from which Theodoret relates some things in Greek in dialogue III.
[1] Ibid., § 2, p. 293.
[2] Ibid., chap. XVI, § 3, p. 313.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Supply: in our head and our firstborn, Christ Jesus.
[5] Ibid., § 2, p. 313.

βεβαίως κατέστησε, συνεξομοιώσας τὸν ἄνθρωπον τῷ ἀοράτῳ πατρί.

[6] On this account—

—he also easily lost the likeness [1]. But when the Word of God was made flesh, he confirmed both: for he showed the image true [2], himself becoming that which was his image; and, firmly establishing the likeness [3], he restored it, making man similar to the invisible Father through the visible Word [4]….

Concerning this restoration of the divine likeness [5], a most beautiful type had gone before in Jacob. For just as God had declared that all peoples and all tribes would be blessed in Jacob, so by his hidden disposition he brought it about that every blessing should be contained in the visible Word. But that this blessing was bestowed in all times is lucidly shown by the fact [6]

that just as in the beginning God, not as though needing man, formed Adam, but that he might have one in whom to place his benefits, so he was constantly present to all with the manifold gift of his grace, and required service from all, that, because he is good and merciful, he might do good to those who persevered in his service.

And by the same counsel of *pietas* and mercy [7],

existing as a master, he also had the age of a master, neither rejecting nor passing beyond man, nor dissolving in himself the law of the human race, but sanctifying every age through the likeness which was to himself. For he came through himself to save all: all, I say, who through him are reborn unto God [8], infants and little ones and children and youths and older men [9]. Therefore he came through every age and—

---

[6] Halloix published these words in Greek from John Damascene's *Parallels*, in the *Life of Irenaeus*, p. 480.

[1] Irenaeus distinguishes likeness from image and teaches that the latter always remained intact, while the former was first lost and afterward restored.

[2] More precisely according to the Greek *ῥῆσιν*: "truly."

[3] More accurately: "firmly."

[4] These last words are lacking in Damascene's *Parallels*.

[5] *Against Heresies*, book IV, chap. XXII, § 3, p. 258.

[6] Ibid., chaps. XIV–XV, pp. 243–246.

[7] Ibid., book II, chap. XXII, § 4, pp. 147–148.

[8] Since the verb "to be reborn" presents the indubitable signification of spiritual birth through baptism, an excellent testimony is found here by which infant baptism is approved.

[9] These things and those which follow appear to me to intimate, not obscurely, that Irenaeus was moved by analogical and dogmatic arguments rather than historical ones to believe that Christ did not finish his life until—

—he himself had come to an age near fifty years. But see what Massuet disputes in dissertation III, article VI, §§ 70 ff.

> —having been made an infant among infants, sanctifying infants; a little one among little ones, sanctifying those who possess this very age, being made at the same time an example to them of *pietas* and justice and subjection; a youth among youths, being made an example to youths and sanctifying them to the Lord. Thus also an older man among older men, that he might be a perfect master among all, not only according to the exposition of truth but also according to age, sanctifying at the same time the older men and being made an example to them also; then he came even unto death, that he might be the firstborn from the dead [1], himself holding primacy in all things, the prince of life, first of all and preceding all.

CXXI.

But in what manner he, as prince of life, imparts life to all he explains more distinctly when, concerning the cause and end of the Spirit sent by the Father and descending [2], he says:

> He promised through the prophets [3] to pour him forth in the last times upon servants and handmaids, that they might prophesy; whence he also descended upon the Son of God made the Son of man, becoming accustomed with him to dwell in the human race and to rest in men and dwell in the formation of God, working the will of the Father in these very ones and renewing them from oldness into the newness of Christ.
>
> Conscious of and desiring this newness which was to exist, David [4] asked this Spirit [5] for the human race, saying: "And confirm me with a principal spirit." … Whence the Lord also promised [6] that he would send the Paraclete, who would fit us to God. For just as one mass cannot be made from dry wheat without moisture, nor one bread, so neither could we, being many, be made one—
>
> —in Christ Jesus without the water which is from heaven. And just as dry earth, if it does not receive moisture, does not bear fruit, so neither would we, existing first as dry wood, ever bear the fruit of life without the voluntary rain from above.

[1] Col. I.18.
[2] *Against Heresies*, book III, chap. XVII, § 1, p. 208.
[3] Joel II.28–29.
[4] *Against Heresies*, book III, chap. XVII, § 2, p. 208.
[5] Ps. L.14.
[6] John XVI.7.

This we all rightfully promise ourselves [1],

> since the Lord, receiving the gift from the Father, himself also gave it to those who participate from him, sending the Holy Spirit into the whole earth.

Concerning this universal mission, Irenaeus continues [2], that which is narrated concerning Gideon is excellent:

> For foreseeing this grace of the gift, that Israelite Gideon [3], whom God chose to save the people of Israel from the power of foreigners, changed his petition and, upon the fleece of wool on which alone the dew had first been, which was a type of the people, prophesied that there would be dryness—that is, that they would no longer have the Holy Spirit from God, as Isaiah says [4]: "And I shall command the clouds not to rain upon it"—but that upon the whole earth there would be dew, which is the Spirit of God, who descended upon the Lord [5]: the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and *pietas*, the Spirit of the fear of God. He gave this same Spirit again to the Church, sending the Paraclete from heaven into the whole earth, where also the devil was cast down like lightning, as the Lord says [6]. Wherefore the dew of God is necessary for us, that we may not be burned nor be made unfruitful, and that where we have an accuser, there also we may have a Paraclete; the Lord commending to the Holy Spirit his man who had fallen among robbers, upon whom he himself had mercy and whose wounds he bound, giving two royal denarii, that, receiving through the Spirit the image and inscription of the Father and the Son, we may make fruitful the denarius entrusted to us and number it to the Lord multiplied.

Since, therefore, the divine economy toward men has always been of this kind—

—and since God [1], who sent the Only-Begotten in the last times, never neglected the care of the human race in ages past, it is easy to conclude [2]:

> That it is not one God who judges and another, the Father, who calls to salvation; nor one who bestows eternal light and another who

[1] *Against Heresies*, book III, chap. XVII, § 2, p. 208.
[2] Ibid., § 3, p. 208.
[3] Judg. VI.37.
[4] Isa. V.6.
[5] Isa. XI.2.
[6] Luke X.18.
[1] *Against Heresies*, book IV, chap. XXXVI, pp. 277–281.
[2] Ibid., § 6, p. 280.

> commands those who do not have a wedding garment to be cast into the outer darkness; but one and the same Lord, the Father of our Lord, by whom the prophets also were sent, who calls the unworthy on account of his immense benignity, but inspects those who have been called to see whether they have a suitable garment, one congruent with the wedding of his Son, because nothing unsuitable, evil, or abominable pleases him. Just as the Lord said to him who had been healed [3]: "Behold, thou hast been made whole; now sin no more, lest something worse befall thee." For he who is good and just and pure and immaculate will sustain nothing evil, unjust, or abominable in his bridal chamber. But this is the Father of our Lord, by whose providence all things consist and by whose command all things are administered; and he freely gives to those to whom it is fitting, but according to merit distributes most worthily against the ungrateful and those who do not perceive his benignity, as the most just rewarder.

CXXII.

Therefore the rationale of divine providence is so arranged that first the immense benignity of God reveals itself and performs its parts: by it he draws the unworthy, elects the patriarchs [4], visits the Israelite people, and summons the nations. Justice then succeeds, by which God, as the most just rewarder, punishes the proud and ungrateful. In this order [5],

> men are reasonably taught to love God: God indeed furnishing magnanimity in the apostasy of man, but man—
>
> —being instructed through it, as the prophet also says [1]: "Thy secession shall correct thee"; God predetermining all things unto the perfection of man and unto the efficacy and manifestation of the dispositions, that both goodness may be shown and justice perfected.

But just as goodness is shown by this [2], that God gives good counsel to all, so justice appears in this [3],

> that he placed the power of election in man, just as also in the angels, so that those who obeyed might justly possess the good—given

[3] John V.14.
[4] *Against Heresies*, book IV, chap. XXXVI, § 8, p. 281.
[5] Ibid., chap. XXXVII, § 7, p. 283.
[1] Jer. II.19.
[2] Ibid., chap. XXXVII, § 1, p. 281.
[3] Ibid.

> indeed by God, but preserved by themselves. But those who did not obey shall justly not be found with the good, and shall receive merited punishment, because God indeed benignly gave the good, but they did not diligently guard it nor account it precious, but contemned the supereminence of goodness. Therefore all who cast aside the good and, as it were, spurn it, shall deservedly fall under the just judgment of God, as the Apostle Paul testified in the Epistle to the Romans [4]…. Therefore God gave the good, as the Apostle also testifies in the same epistle; and those who work it shall receive glory and honor, because they worked the good when they were able not to work it; but those who do not work it shall receive the just judgment of God, because they did not work the good when they were able to work it.

Therefore a) there is no one who perishes for the reason that he lacked the faculty divinely received for attaining salvation; but b) as many as perish, perish for this reason and fall into so great a destruction: that they spurned and cast aside the good received. For c) the supereminence of divine goodness solicitously anticipates and aids all; nor d) does it make way for punitive justice before it has fulfilled its own parts. But e) it fulfills these in such a way that, with the liberty of man intact, provision is made for both orders, the moral and the eudaimonic. Provision is made f) first for the moral order, whose proper and native rationale God expressed—

—when, saying [1], "How often would I have gathered thy children, and thou wouldst not," he manifestly [2]

> manifested the ancient law of human liberty. For God made him free from the beginning, possessing his own power, just as also his own soul, to use the opinion of God voluntarily and not as one compelled by God. *Βία θεῷ οὐ πρόσεστιν· ἀγαθὴ δὲ γνώμη πάντοτε συμπάρεστιν αὐτῷ.* [3] For force is not wrought by God, but a good opinion is always present to him. And on this account he gives good counsel to all, but placed the power of election in man.

Then g) provision is made for the eudaimonic order, which Irenaeus explains remarkably [4] when, meeting those who said that God ought neither to have made angels such that they could transgress nor men who would immediately be ungrateful toward him, he denies that this was in any way fitting,

---

[4] Rom. II.3 ff.

[1] Matt. XXIII.37.

[2] *Against Heresies*, book IV, chap. XXVII, § 1, p. 281.

[3] Halloix published this saying of Irenaeus, transcribed from Damascene's *Parallels*, in the *Life of Irenaeus*, p. 501.

[4] Ibid., § 4, pp. 282–283.

> because they were made rational, examining, and judicial, and not inflexible and without judgment—as irrational or inanimate things are, which can do nothing by their own will but are drawn to good by necessity and force, in which there is one sense and one custom, and which can be nothing other than what they were made. But thus the good would not be sweet to them, nor the communion of God precious, nor the good greatly to be desired, if it had come without their own proper movement and care and zeal, but were implanted spontaneously and idly, so that they would be good of no moment, because they existed as such by nature rather than will and possessed a spontaneous good, but not according to election; and on this account they would not even understand this very thing, that the good is beautiful, nor enjoy it. For what enjoyment of the good is there among those who are ignorant? What glory to those who did not strive for it? What crown to those who did not obtain it as victors in a contest?

Lest, therefore, men be deprived of so many advantages and so great a glory [5]—

> —for this reason the Lord called the kingdom of heaven violent [1], "and those who do violence," he says, "seize it"; that is, those who vigilantly and insistently seize it with force and contest…. Therefore the good contestant [2] exhorts us to the contest of incorruption, that we may be crowned and may account the crown precious, namely, that which is acquired by us through contest and did not grow together with us spontaneously. And the more it comes to us through contest, the more precious it is; but the more precious it is, the more may we always love it.

If any, therefore, inquire whence it must at last be derived that many among men obtain neither prize nor crown, with Irenaeus leading the way we shall answer partly by denying and partly by affirming: I. this can in no way be derived either from the fact that a) God is not borne toward all men by a benevolent will, or that b) all men were not reformed in Christ, or that c) the merciful benignity of God does not now instruct all with necessary and suitable aids or did not always instruct them before. But II. it must be derived from the fact that a) God joined the attainment of the end proposed to the eudaimonic order with the observance of the moral order; that b) he established beforehand that felicity should present the force and nature both of a gift and of a crown and prize; that c) in distributing rewards he imposed upon himself the person of judge and most just rewarder;

[5] Ibid., § 7, p. 283.
[1] Matt. XI.12.
[2] I Cor. IX.24 ff.

and that d) he therefore assumed this person so that it might appear that provision and counsel had been made no less for the liberty of human nature than for the perfection of the eudaimonic order.

CXXIII.

This summary of doctrine, which Irenaeus—*ὁ ἐγγὺς τῶν ἀποστόλων γενόμενος*, "who lived near the time of the apostles" [3], and a disciple of Polycarp [4]—handed down with such care—

—and inculcated with such zeal upon the churches of Gaul, the bishops and doctors of those same churches who followed retained with a certain marvelous consent of minds and words. For, not to commemorate Prosper again [1], its most abundant witnesses and defenders are Phoebadius of Agen, Hilary of Poitiers, Sedulius, Salvian, Sidonius, Valerian, Avitus, and Caesarius. Of these, Hilary speaks thus [3] on the words of the Psalm [2], "They shall pour forth the memory of the abundance of thy sweetness":

> This is chief in God; this is to be praised in the powerful one: not that he made heaven, because he is powerful; not that he founded the earth, because he is might; not that he regulated the year by the stars, because he is wise; not that he animated man, because he is life; but that he is merciful, who is just; that he has compassion, who is king; that he passes over, who is God. For upon that which was said [4], "They shall exult in thy justice," there follows, as necessary [5]: "The Lord is compassionate and merciful, patient and of much mercy. The Lord is sweet to all, and his compassions are over all his works." For that he is powerful is the might of his nature; but that he is merciful is the advancement of our salvation. And it is more not to use the things which are one's own, but to furnish to others the things which are one's own. And therefore mercy excels the other works of God, because his magnificent operation is a thing of his power, but the use of his mercy is for another.

[3] In Basil, *On the Holy Spirit*, chap. XXIX; but in Augustine, *Against Julian*, book I, chap. III, he is said to have flourished not long after the times of the apostles.

[4] As Irenaeus himself is witness in the epistle to Florinus, which Eusebius relates in *Ecclesiastical History*, book V, chap. XX.

[1] For we explained his doctrine above as much as was sufficient.

[3] *Tractate on Psalm CXLIV*, n. 15, col. 568, Paris edition, 1693.

[2] Ps. CXLIV.7.

[4] Ibid., v. 7.

[5] Ibid., vv. 8–9.

He proceeds to narrate this preeminence of mercy, both when he denies [6] that God forgets to be sweet or ceases to be so, and when [7], comparing human and divine justice, he says:

> The justice of God is not equated with human justice. For it is not subject to the law of nature, by which law nature was established, so that it has no necessity of not being good—
>
> —since it is just. The justice of God possesses the will to have mercy; yet through the will to have mercy it will not be so changed from itself that it ceases to be justice. But human justice is accustomed to come to this, that it is not merciful, and mercy so to present itself that it is not just. For mercy will not be just [1] if, for the sake of a pitiably needy slanderer, you begrudge the richer man his right; if you prefer a woman's tears to the injury of her husband; if you do not think the abuse of a blind man ought to be reproved. But, on the contrary, justice will not retain mercy if you punish the thief of one coin as the thief of a vast treasure, although he who lost it may have had a treasure in that one coin; if you torment with an inquiry of punishments an adolescent entangled in only one and the same infamous adultery, by an equal death [2], as an artificer of many adulteries, although the crime is one of death in both [3]. These and things of this kind make both human mercy and justice imperfect; but patience granted before the punishments of criminals makes the justice of God merciful. Since he does not hasten to punish according to the custom of human impatience, he has had mercy: retaining justice in the punishment, after patience with its mercy did not profit; having mercy in the punishment, by displaying justice after patience. For God does not seize the occasions of human crimes, nor, as though ignorant of our weakness and nature, does he seize upon that very moment of our error and sin for punishment [4]; but he passes it over

[6] Ibid., n. 13, col. 566.

[7] Ibid., n. 14, cols. 567–568.

[1] The course and sequence of the discourse require that "just" be understood.

[2] Just as it had been prescribed in Deut. XXII.22 that those bound by adultery should be punished with death, so this most just severity of the laws prevailed among the Romans; and not first by the authority of Constantine, as some seemed to themselves able to gather from Justinian, *Novel* CXXXIV, chap. X, but long before, as is plainly established by the things found in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, book IV, chap. XVII; Arnobius, book IV *Against the Gentiles*; Augustine, *The City of God*, book III, chap. V; and the author of the *Passion of Saint Vincent*, n. 5, in *The Sincere Acts of the Martyrs*, p. 392.

[3] Concerning these inquiries of punishments, compare the things read in the Theodosian Code, law 4, *Whose Appeals*, and in Jerome, epistle XLIX, *On the Woman Struck Seven Times*.

[4] Namely, he does not punish immediately, which he expresses thus on Psalm CXXVIII, n. 8:

> and defers, and, by delaying vengeance, awaits the consolation of penance, presenting himself sweet to all, while through the measure of mercy—
> —and justice reserves indulgence to himself for tempering severity.

CXXIV.

Concerning this relation between divine mercy and justice, the things which Hilary teaches are much more illustrious: when I. he discloses the origin of created man; when II. he investigates the causes on account of which God enacted laws for him; and when III. he teaches who, finally, those are against whom God is angry and whom he condemns eternally. For as regards the first, having established [1] the most complete beatitude of God, by which he needs no extrinsic good, nor can need it, he adds [2]:

> Therefore, from this most excellent and benevolent beatitude, through our Lord Jesus Christ, proceeded all the creations of heavenly and invisible things, and the constitutions of spiritual and corporeal things; not that he might acquire for himself some advantage from those things to which he imparted origin. For no one needs that which he bestows from himself, nor does he advance through that of which he is the author in respect of what it is. But those things which bring advantage are exterior, because the things which remedy want are alien. God, therefore, from whom all things are, needs none of those things to which he granted that they be what they are; but he created all things for the advantage of those things which would be begotten.

There is, therefore, a twofold origin both of man and of all other things which were created: first, indeed, the most perfect goodness by which God is in himself the fountain of inexhaustible beatitude; and then the connatural benignity by which God is borne toward the communication of himself and by which he loves the felicity of creatures.

From this most noble origin there differs in no respect that which moved God to govern the man procreated by him with laws enacted for him and vigilantly to contain him. "For," Hilary proceeds [3],

> He is not ready to punish amid the beginnings of human iniquity, but awaits the will of the sinner to desist from crimes, though it be late.

[1] *Tractate on Psalm II*, n. 13, col. 33.
[2] Ibid., n. 14, cols. 33–34.
[3] Ibid., n. 15, col. 34.

> he instituted man, not because he needed his service in anything, but, because he is good, he created him a participant in his beatitude—
> —and perfected the rational animal with life and sense for the enjoyment of his eternity, which he would bestow; and this is understood absolutely from his own words. For he says [1]: "And now, Israel, what does the Lord thy God ask of thee, except that thou fear the Lord thy God, and walk in all his ways, and love him, and serve the Lord thy God with thy whole heart and with thy whole soul and with thy whole strength, and keep the commandments of the Lord thy God and his justifications, which I command thee, that it may be well with thee?" God asks from us nothing except the obedience of innocence, religion, and faith. He demands to be loved by us, certainly not himself receiving, for his own sake, some fruit from our love for him, but rather because love itself will profit us, because we shall love him. For he desires to be loved and that we obey him for this reason, that it may be well with us, so that we may be judged worthy of the gift of his beatitude and goodness through the merit of love for him and obedience. But the use of goodness, like the splendor of the sun, like the light of fire, like the fragrance of sap, profits not the one who furnishes it, but the one who uses it. Therefore, that we are is our advantage rather than his who instituted us in that which we are, because God, not begrudging [2] those goods which are eternal in himself, receives us into the perception and enjoyment of his blessed goodness.

Although, moreover, both by creation and by the enactment of laws God looked to this, that men might be received into the perception and enjoyment of his blessed goodness, "nevertheless," Hilary adds [3],

> he who is perfect and good employed his goodness and beatitude toward us not without reason and measure. For he permitted to each of us freedom of life and sense, affixing no necessity toward either side, so that a law would compel each one to be good or evil by nature; but he who through benevolence had created us to enjoy his beatitude established our advance toward it through the merit of an innocent and honorable life. But what honor and reward would the necessity of goodness merit, when some force implanted in us would not permit us to be evil?—

[1] Deut. X.12–13.
[2] That is, not envious.
[3] Ibid., n. 16, cols. 34–35.

> —Goodness, therefore, was permitted to the will, so that the will of goodness might acquire a reward for itself, and there might be for us the advancement and enjoyment of this eternal beatitude from merit, not an undiscriminating necessity through law. And although he enticed us toward the will of goodness, that is, toward living well and honorably, through the hope of meriting and enjoying his goodness, he nevertheless added a penalty for goodness avoided and contemned, so that, since he had left us freedom of will for meriting goodness, because a necessity of nature would not possess merit, the terror of the penalty set forth on the contrary might daily restrain freedom itself. And thus, both through the reason of equity and justice, freedom was permitted for the merit of reward, and through the goodness of God the force of freedom was restricted by fear [1] of the constitution, so that the hope of merit might admonish one to will well, and the penalty of the vengeance set forth might persuade one not to will evil.

There is thus reason carefully to distinguish what God wills for men from himself, and in what manner he wills it for them. For God truly wills from himself for absolutely all men participation in his eternity: with this mind he created them; with this counsel he gave them laws; and with this purpose he both entices them by rewards and deters them by penalties. But he does not will this supreme and greatest good for them unless they too contribute their own labor and apply their own diligence. For this economy and order of providence seemed altogether to be demanded both a) by the very nature of man, which is free and from which it is supremely abhorrent that it be affixed by necessity toward either side; and b) by the wise goodness of God, with which nothing is more consonant than that man's beatitude should be a heavenly gift in such a way that it at the same time bears the force and character of a reward merited.

These things being understood as is fitting, it is easy to gather whom God finally punishes or deprives of everlasting felicity. Namely, Hilary says [2]:

> For those to whom, from freedom of will, malice was more pleasing, the vengeance established is believed to be the wrath of God; not because that immutable and tranquil nature of God—
>
> —grows hot with the motion of a turbulent impulse, but because he who remains in penalty through the constitution of the penalty perceives the author of this constitution to be angry with him [1]. For the penalty of the one suffering is believed to be the wrath of the

[1] If after the word "constitution" you add "of the penalty," there will be no reason why the reading should trouble us and why "of the vengeance established" should be written.

[2] Ibid., n. 17, col. 35.

[1] Augustine, epistle CXC, n. 10, defines the wrath of God as just and fixed vengeance.

> one decreeing. And thus God is angry when, through the pain of the penalty, the punished [2] perceive the wrath of the decree to be against themselves; this wrath has not been moved into anger from placability through a change of nature, but is wrath for those to be punished from the constitution of the penalty.

Where, after he accurately shows both that [3] the constitution of the penalty is called wrath in the Scriptures [4], and that [5] the nature of God, which is fixed and constant, is in no way transferred to one thing from another by anger, he adds [6]:

> Therefore, the magnanimous one is not changed into wrath, but the powerful judge has decreed a penalty for the fault. For against those who do not turn he brandished the sword [7], and bent the bow, and in it prepared vessels of death, and wrought his arrows for those who will burn. But he wrought them not from a movement of sudden wrath which, kindled suddenly through the desire of taking vengeance, but he wrought them for those who will burn, who through an impenitent will will themselves establish that they are to be burned. And against those who would not turn the sword was brandished, not to be brought forth against individuals from a change of wrath—for he who is magnanimous is not angry on each single day—but because he decreed judgment, his sword is already ready from the constitution of the penalty. But the spiritual ministries of penal judgment themselves are recalled under the sword, bow, and arrows, because they are held prepared for those who will burn. For they are not prepared from a movement of temporal wrath, but God has moderated them from the constitution of the decree by the most tempered equability of his goodness: namely, by not leaving the severity of this constitution itself concealed and unknown, and by forewarning error through its denunciations, and by delaying that very severity—
>
> —although established, by a long postponement for repentance from sin [1].

[2] "The punished," that is, those who are punished.

[3] Ibid., n. 17, col. 35.

[4] Matt. III.7, compare Rom. V.10.

[5] Ibid., n. 18, col. 35.

[6] Ibid., n. 18, cols. 35–36.

[7] Ps. VII.12 ff.

[1] From this postponement of penalty God, when he punishes, is shown both merciful and just, since, with Hilary as witness in *Tractate on Psalm CXLIV*, n. 9, he retains justice in the penalty after patience with its mercy has not profited; he possesses mercy in the penalty by displaying justice after patience.

CXXV.

Since, therefore, the penal order can be considered both in its eternal decree and in its temporal execution, it is of no small advantage to hold thoroughly what its rationale is, whether it be referred to the eternal decree or to temporal execution. But, with Hilary as witness, if a) the penal order is referred to the eternal decree, it must altogether be held that vessels of death are prepared for no others than those who through an impenitent will will themselves at some time establish that they are to be burned. But if b) the same penal order is compared with temporal execution, it ought to be undoubted: 1) that those alone are punished to whom, from freedom of will, malice was more pleasing; and that these very persons 2) are punished only after mercy and patience, that is, are punished only when the effects of mercy and patience have been rendered vain and sterile by the rebellious obstinacy of the will.

From these things it certainly follows: a) that penalties are decreed from eternity for no one, and penalties are finally inflicted in their time upon no one, except one whom God foreknows will be a contemner of mercy and who afterward in fact has contemned mercy; b) that both the eternal decree of penalty and its temporal execution pertain to that will which has foreknowledge as its companion and which is called the second will; c) that the order of mercy and reward therefore belongs to the first and antecedent will; and d) that no others fall away from this order than those who have freely constructed ruin and destruction for themselves against the benevolent will of God. Hence Hilary, explaining Christ's words in Matthew [2], "Are not two sparrows sold for a penny? And not one of them falls to the earth without the will of your Father," first indeed [1]—

—admonishes that the two sparrows can be understood of the soul and the body, and then [2] adds:

> But it must be asked how it is one [3] of them which will not fall without the will of God. The will of God is that one of them should rather fly away, but the law proceeding from the constitution of God decrees that one of them should rather fall down. But just as, if they flew away, they would be one, that is, the body would pass into the nature of the soul, and that heaviness of earthly matter would be

[2] Matt. X.29.

[1] *Commentary on Matthew*, chap. X, n. 18, col. 657.

[2] Ibid., n. 19, cols. 657–658.

[3] The "one" which Hilary mentions is referred to the unity of soul and body. For it is customary for him to teach that the soul and the body, which now are two because neither is fully and perfectly subjected to the other, will after the resurrection be one either in glory or in penalty: for either the body will follow the soul, so that, made a participant with it in spiritual subtlety, it may fly away to heaven; or the soul will be drawn to the body, so that with it it may fall to the earth and to earthly heaviness. Hilary therefore signifies this unity from body and soul by the words "one of them."

> abolished unto the advancement and substance of the soul [4], and the body would rather become spiritual; so, when they have been sold for the price of sins, the subtlety of the soul grows heavy into the nature of bodies and contracts earthly matter from the filth of vices, and it becomes one of them which is delivered [5] to the earth.

CXXVI.

These things clearly return to this: it is necessary to distinguish a twofold will in God, the one of goodness, by which God from himself wills that the souls and bodies of absolutely all men should seek heaven and be eternally blessed in that most delightful abode; the other of justice, by which he wills that those perish who have enslaved themselves to sins even unto the end. To this also pertain the things which he writes when in his commentary [1] he illustrates the events that accompanied the deed concerning the ruler's daughter raised [2] from the dead. For he writes:

> The Lord then enters the ruler's house, namely, the synagogue, for which in the songs of the Law a hymn of mourning resounded; and he is mocked by many. For they never believed God in man; rather, they laughed at the resurrection from the dead being preached. Therefore, taking by the hand [3] the girl whose death in his sight was sleep, he recalled her to life. And so that the number of the election of those believing from the Law might be understood to be small, the entire crowd was expelled: the Lord certainly would have desired it to be saved; but by mocking his words and deeds, it was not worthy of participation in the resurrection.

---

[4] "Hilary must not be thought," as Coustant warns, "to assert the abolition of corporeal matter, since he wills only that earthly heaviness and other qualities of this kind, which are naturally present in bodies and are burdensome and troublesome to souls, will be absent after the resurrection; so that the resurrection of corruptible bodies into the glory of incorruption does not destroy nature by extinction but changes it by the condition of quality. For it is not another body, although it rises into another condition, as he himself speaks in *Tractate on Psalm II*, n. 41. See more on p. 357, note 6. But that the foregoing expressions, 'the body passes into the nature of the soul' or 'is abolished into the substance of the soul,' are to be understood in a manner other than we are accustomed is clear even from what is immediately added, that the soul of sinners 'grows heavy into the nature of bodies'; to omit for the present what is read below, n. 24, that it is bestowed upon us by baptism 'that the body itself may pass into the nature of the soul, which comes from the breath of God.' "

[5] Others: "is thrust."

[1] *Commentary on Matthew*, chap. IX, n. 8, col. 650.

[2] Matt. IX.23.

[3] Matt. IX.25.

From these things we understand not only the distinction between the two wills of goodness and justice, but we also attain what is either the origin or the amplitude of each. We understand a) the distinction between the two wills, since the will of goodness is and is called by Hilary that by which Christ from himself desires all to be saved; but the will of justice is and is called by the same that by which Christ repels many from participation in the blessed resurrection. We attain b) the origin of each, since the former spontaneously emerges from Christ's innate goodness, but the latter is provoked by the rebellion and faults of men. And again we attain c) how far each extends: for the will of goodness is from itself infinite and embraces all; but the will of punishing justice is circumscribed by the number of those who are judged mockers of divine benefits.

And Hilary again lends support to this doctrine when, investigating the signification [1] of the words, "For the Lord will judge his people, and in his servants he will be consoled," he says [2]:

> To be judged and to be consoled differ; and a people and a servant differ. But consolation is in the servants, while judgment is in the people. Who does not know that Israel according to the flesh was called the people of God? But it was said by the Apostle [3]: "Those who have sinned in the Law will be judged through the Law." God, therefore, will judge his people; but in his servants he will be consoled, namely, in those concerning whom the Lord says [4]: "He who believes in me will not be judged, but will pass from death into life; but he who does not believe has already been judged." But the Lord will be consoled in his servants when Israel has been judged. For in all the faithful [5] of the earth he will have solace from his loss.

But to whom must this loss arising from the judgment and destruction of the people be attributed? Hilary immediately adds [6]:

> God would have willed that his people, whom he had chosen in their fathers Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, should not be judged: on their account he had afflicted Egypt with diverse plagues; on their account he had stood by in a pillar of fire and cloud; on their account he had divided the sea, cast water forth from the rock, sent manna from heaven, imposed the Law, granted pardon for so many sacrileges, overthrown so many kingdoms of the irreligious, sent prophets, and

[1] Ps. CXXXIV.14.

[2] *Tractate on Psalm CXXXIV*, n. 24, col. 478.

[3] Rom. II.12.

[4] John V.24.

[5] He would almost say: when the one region of the Israelite nation has been lost, God consoles the loss by acquiring the whole world, in which he has faithful servants.

[6] Ibid., n. 25, cols. 478–479.

> willed his Only-begotten to be born as man. But the people, ungrateful for so many and such benefits, and the tenant first chosen for the vineyard, laid parricidal hands in the vineyard upon the Lord himself [7], putting God to death in man, insofar as it lay in them. But servants were chosen to whom the vineyard would be delivered as they rendered its fruit: in them the Lord, when his people had been judged, would be consoled for the loss suffered by his piety. Therefore, the nations console him—
>
> —rendering to him in his martyrs and confessors and faithful the fruits of the grace committed by him to themselves.

Whom, therefore, does God finally punish, whom does he cast away and condemn? Are they those whom he himself first neglected and whom he disapproved and proscribed solely by his own nod? On the contrary, by the will of justice he punishes no one, he condemns no one, except one whom he first endeavored, insofar as it was from himself, to lead to salvation by the will of goodness. God does not first move his hand to scourges, nor does he first reject men from himself, before he has heaped every kind of benefit upon them and experienced losses to his piety. Before he approaches the supreme sentence of condemnation, as though almost compelled, he moves heaven and earth and leaves nothing untried. Therefore, 1) the effects of benignity and clemency precede justice and judgment; and 2) they so precede them as to be altogether universal; but judgment and penalty fall only upon those who, having spurned mercy, have procured wrath for themselves; whence 3) there is no one who perishes for this reason, that he could not have been saved; and therefore 4) however many men there have been, are, and will hereafter be, they have lived, live, and will live indeed in the state of fallen and ruined nature, but a nature raised and repaired by the benevolent mercy of God.

CXXVII.

Concerning this universal reparation through Christ, the things which Phoebadius of Agen has are signal. He says [1]:

> Therefore this Word, since [2] he was in the form of God, constituted by wisdom and reason and by the reason of spirit and the power of

[7] Matt. XXI.38.

[1] *Against the Arians*, § XXI, p. 256, in Gallandius, vol. V.

[2] Phil. II.6–8.

> spirit [3], that is, possessing the whole power of God, did not make himself equal to God the Father, but, taking the form of a servant, humbled himself unto death. For he had put on that which could serve and which could die: namely, man, whom, when raised, he presented to heaven, so that the second Adam might through obedience restore what the first—
>
> —had lost through transgression.

But the first Adam had through transgression lost for all both preternatural and supernatural goods: he had lost a) immortality, b) freedom from sin, and c) the means and power of obtaining salvation. The second Adam therefore restored all these things, and plainly to all, through obedience.

And he restored 1) immortality, since, with Phoebadius as witness [1]:

> When he deigned to put on man, he did not introduce a stain into eternity, so that he might change the Spirit [2] into flesh, but so that, man having been assumed, he might furnish immortality and the eternity of heavenly life. For although the Apostle says [3] that he emptied himself by taking the form of a servant, we certainly do not understand him to have been emptied in such a way that the same Spirit became something other than what he had been; but so that, setting aside for a time the honor of his majesty, he put on a human body, by the assumption of which he became the salvation of the nations. For just as when the sun is covered with a cloud its brightness is compressed, not blinded, and that light which, diffused throughout the whole world, floods all things with clear splendor, is enclosed by the very small obstacle of a cloud, not taken away; so also that man whom the Lord Jesus, our Savior, that is, God and the Son of God, put on, nevertheless did not intercept God [4] in him, but concealed him.

By the same mercy he restored 2) freedom from sin, concerning which Sedulius sings [5]:

> O ready piety! Lest a servile yoke, With sin as master, hold us, the supreme Lord Took servile members; and he who from the first ori-

---

[3] For rightly understanding these things, it will be helpful to attend to what he writes in § XX: "It is therefore apparent that one and the same came, now under the name of Spirit, now under the appellation of Wisdom."

[1] *Tractate on the Orthodox Faith*, chap. VIII, pp. 263–264.

[2] By the name "Spirit" understand *μορφὴν τοῦ θεοῦ*, "the form of God."

[3] Phil. II.7.

[4] Others: "the divinity."

[5] *Paschal Song*, book II, § III, vv. 54–59, p. 543, in Gallandius, vol. IX.

> gin Of the world clothes all things that arise with his own gifts Had coverings made of scanty swaddling-clothes.

But when he laments both Adam expelled from paradise and the most wretched lot and condition of his whole posterity, he writes that all hope—

—would have been cut off [1],

> unless that pious creator and founder of things, to whom it is proper to pour pardon upon offenses rather than to threaten them with punishment, should deign to raise more firmly again through the same stone the structure of his work, which was weak from its very foundation: namely, lest the living image which had been made according to the likeness of God should be held dissimilar because of death; and that he should bestow the gift of pardoning indulgence and ward off the fruits [2] which the fathers ate unripe and at which the teeth of the children were set on edge; and, most gentle and appeased, should grant that, from the same source whence sins had contracted death, immense piety might nourish life. And just as a sweet and most tender rose is born from thorny turf, about to harm in no way its mother, whom it obscures by the grace of its pleasantness, so from the stock of guilty Eve, Mary coming with sacred light, the virgin who followed might wash away the corruption of the first virgin; so that the nature which previously, defiled by vices, had been subjected to the condition of hard death, when Christ was born through man, might itself also as man be reborn through Christ, about to put off the deformity of the original stain by the renewal of the body.

For which reason [3] the prophet called Christ [4] "beautiful in form above the sons of men":

> And altogether rightly he defined him as "beautiful above the sons of men," because although he assumed the appearance of human incarnation and frequently called himself the Son of Man in the preaching of the Gospel, original sin had nevertheless defiled us, which he did not possess, who cleansed us by the purity of his nativity. O piety, clement and ready for salvation! Lest the yoke of long servitude oppress us by reason of the condition of sin, the Lord assumed the members of a servant.

The servitude of sin having been dissolved through Christ and freedom for justice having been made, by a new, 3) added benefit the human race obtained

[1] *Paschal Work*, book II, chap. I, p. 574.
[2] Jer. XXXI, compare Ezek. XVIII.
[3] Ibid., chap. III, p. 575.
[4] Ps. XLIV.3.

again, as though by the right of postliminy, the means and faculty of attaining salvation. "I know, dearest brethren," writes [5] Caesarius of Arles,

> that your holy charity cannot be ignorant that—
>
> —our father Adam was placed amid the delights of paradise; but, at the persuasion of the devil, contemning the commandments of God, he was cast down into the miseries of this world as from a higher place to a lower. Paradise, therefore, is above; this world is below. There is another hell, into which after death sinners and the impious are plunged. For that there are two hells the prophet clearly shows [1], saying: "O God, who hast rescued my soul from the lower hell." For he would not say "the lower hell" unless he knew that there was also an upper. But our God [2], compassionate and merciful, patient and greatly merciful, when by his just judgment he placed us in our father Adam from the height of paradise into the hell of this world, did not will, in his ineffable piety, that by our fall we should arrive at the lower hell; but he placed us in a certain manner between paradise and the lower hell, as though in the middle, so that, if we willed to do penance, we might merit to ascend to the height of our principal homeland; but if we willed continually to remain in that tyranny of pride through which, at the persuasion of the devil, we fell, we might be pressed down by the weight of sin into the depths of the lower hell, whence no return can now be possible. Therefore, dearest brethren, considering these things not in passing but with great fear and trembling, let us understand that we have been placed in this upper hell through the mercy of God, so that we may desire rather to return by the steps of good works to him who created us than to descend with him who deceived us into the depths of the lower hell. And because we have been placed as though between water and fire, as between the supreme evil, as it were, between the fall of the lower hell and the height of paradise, let us hear the Lord crying out in the Scriptures with admirable piety [3]: "I have placed thee between death and life. Choose life, that thou mayest live."

[5] Homily XIII, p. 20, in Gallandius, vol. XI.
[1] Ps. LXXXV.13.
[2] Joel II.13.
[3] Deut. XXX.19.

CXXVIII.

These things are altogether excellent, so that satisfaction may be given to those who ask—

—what the condition of the human race is and what its state ought to be judged. For 1), if you refer the human race to Adam and consider within yourself what it is by birth and what inheritance it received from its progenitors, nothing more unhappy will occur to you, and nothing more powerful for stirring mercy. For by its birth it is fallen and cast down and deprived of all the gifts by which it was rendered both immune from corruption, dear to God, and heir of everlasting beatitude. But 2), if you refer it to the benevolent and merciful disposition of God in Christ, and consider within yourself what it recovered in Christ, you will hardly contain a mind exulting with joy. For in Christ and through Christ a) men have in actuality recovered the faculty of conquering sin, of obtaining adoption, and of restoring the divine likeness; while b) in hope they have recovered felicity complete in every respect and full victory over death and corruption.

Hence nothing is truer to say or sweeter to think than that absolutely all men were vindicated into freedom through Christ; that all the losses inflicted by the crime of the earthly Adam were effaced by the aid and protection of the heavenly Adam; and that the first Adam harms only those who have ungratefully contemned the benefits of the second. "God," says [1] Valerian, bishop of Cimiez,

> not only called every man to freedom, but also established him in the highest dignity of things. But he imposes servitude upon himself who serves unwillingly. For if you adapt servitude to the will, you will find yourself to be not a servant of God, but a son. For thus says [2] the prophet in the voice of the Lord: "I shall be to you as a father, and you shall be to me as sons and daughters, says the Lord almighty."

What freedom and dignity Christ obtained for us Apollinaris Sidonius signifies when, speaking of him in his eucharistic poem to Faustus, bishop of Riez [3], he sings:

> At last thou didst approach death, but to rise again,—
> —rescuing whatever had passed into the right Of the ancient enemy through our crime, when the first woman, Breaking the command, bound us with perpetual guilt. When he assailed thee with death and found not in thee What he could convict as his own, he lost all That Eve had granted by her fall: that handwriting By which man was seized this recompense ruptured. Free of sin, thou becomest an

[1] Homily III, § II, p. 129, in Gallandius, vol. X.
[2] Jer. XXXI.9, compare II Cor. VI.16.
[3] Poem XVI, vv. 50–64, p. 605, in Gallandius, vol. X.

> ample price for sinners, And, the new Adam, in return for the debt, while thou diest, Thou snatchest the old Adam from death: thus death is dead; Thus by the snares which she herself had made she deceived herself. For while she indiscriminately assails the innocent and the guilty, She brought it about that those bound by crime could be absolved.

And certainly the means of obtaining this absolution is withdrawn from no one. "While the grape was still sour and green," writes [1] Avitus of Vienne,

> within paradise Adam tasted not wine but poison unto his own ruin and ours; and because the parents had eaten a sour grape, the teeth of the children were set on edge. But Ezekiel, foreseeing that the original debt would be made void when Christ had discharged it, says thus [2]: "As I live, says the Lord, that proverb shall no longer be in Jerusalem: The fathers ate a sour grape, and the teeth of the children shall be set on edge." Whatever Adam did no longer harms thee: what he proudly desired, what he illicitly presumed, what he incautiously sought. Fear for thyself the setting on edge of the teeth from thine own eating; restrain the touch of appetite from useless avidity.

CXXIX.

In order that all might fulfill this plainly necessary office, the Savior came into this world and drew all to himself by an immense charity. For, with Salvian as authority [3], according to the testimony of the Apostle [4], Christ therefore,

> by dying for us, willed to commend his charity to all—
>
> —so that by the example of so great a return of his own piety he might draw us to rendering piety. And just as they tell of those wondrous gems of nature which, when brought nearer to iron, suspend steel, although most hard, by an attraction that seems to breathe; so also he, that is, the supreme and most illustrious gem of the heavenly kingdoms, willed this: that when, although we were most hard, he descended from heaven and joined himself more closely to us, he might move us toward his affection as though by the hands of his love; so that, acknowledging his gifts and benefits, we might understand what it was fitting for us to do for so good a Lord, when he

[1] Sermon for Tuesday in the Rogations, p. 798, in Gallandius, vol. X.
[2] Ezek. XVIII.3.
[3] *On the Governance of God*, book IV, § X, p. 23, in Gallandius, vol. X.
[4] Rom. V.8–9.

> had done such things for evil servants; and that this might be fulfilled which the Apostle says [1], that we should be mortified by his charity all the day, and that neither tribulation, nor distress, nor persecution, nor famine, nor nakedness, nor the sword could separate us from the charity of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

But if there are some of so hardened a mind that they are not softened even by the fire of so great a charity, these, Salvian writes, certainly complain without merit that they experience God as more severe than they would wish. "Why do we complain," he cries [2],

> that God acts harshly with us? We act much more harshly with God. For we exasperate him by our impurities and draw him, unwilling, to punish us. And although the mind and majesty of God are of such a nature that he is moved by no passion of anger, nevertheless the exasperation of sins in us is so great that through us he is compelled to be angry. We offer violence, so to speak, to his piety, and in a certain manner lay hands upon his mercy. And although it belongs to his benignity that he wills continually to spare us, he is compelled by our evils to avenge the crimes which we commit. And just as those who besiege the most fortified cities or endeavor to capture and overthrow the strongest citadels of cities undoubtedly assail them with every kind both of missiles and machines, so we fight to conquer the mercy of God by every crime of monstrous sins, as though by every kind of missile; and we judge God injurious to us, when we ourselves are most injurious to God…. Why—
>
> —therefore do we complain of the bitterness of penalties? Each one of us punishes himself.

Nevertheless God is gentle and sweet to such an extent, and the blood of Christ poured out for us avails with him to such an extent, that as long as we live the present life, whether he takes somewhat more bitter notice of us or treats us more mildly and favorably, he always both desires and seeks our salvation. "So great," says [1] Salvian,

> is the mercy of God that, although he wills us to suffer some things for our offenses, he nevertheless does not will us to endure them all; because he chastises the evil, he does not return evils, and he prefers us to acknowledge our sins rather than to sustain them. Namely, so that by pious and salutary scourges he may show us what things we deserve to bear, according to that saying of the blessed Apostle by

[1] Rom. VIII.36.

[2] *On the Governance of God*, book IV, § VIII, p. 21.

[1] *On the Governance of God*, book V, § IX, p. 31.

> which [2] he says: "Knowest thou not that the goodness of God leads thee to repentance? But according to thy hardness and impenitent heart thou treasurest up wrath for thyself on the day of wrath." And truly we act as the Apostle says. For God calls us to repentance, but we treasure up wrath. God invites us to pardon, but we daily heap up offense. We offer violence to God by our iniquities; we ourselves arm the wrath of divinity against ourselves. We compel an unwilling God to avenge the enormities of our crimes. We are close to not permitting him to spare. For since no sign of injustice can ever fall upon or appear in him, we so act that, if he does not avenge the enormities of our crimes, he may seem to be unjust.

CXXX.

God looks to the same end not only by scourges, but also by temporal benefits themselves, and always has our salvation proposed. "Although we are unworthy," Salvian adds [3],

> good things are sometimes bestowed upon us, because the good Lord, as a most indulgent father, although he sometimes permits us to be humbled for our sins, nevertheless does not suffer us to be afflicted for long; and—
>
> —therefore now chastises his own with bitter circumstances for discipline, now favors them with tranquil ones for indulgence. For just as the best and most skillful physicians furnish dissimilar treatments for dissimilar diseases and assist some through sweet medicines, others through bitter; and cure some by the burning of cauteries, others by the gentleness of poultices; apply to some the hard cutting of iron, and pour upon others the soothing mildness of oil; and yet, although by most diverse treatments, the same health is sought: so also our God, if at any time he restrains us by more austere blows, cures as though by cauteries and incisions; but when he refreshes us with prosperous circumstances, he consoles as though with oil and poultices. For through the diverse aid of medicines he wills to lead us to one health.

"For since," he proceeds [1],

> all things are under sacred dominion and the nod of God moderates all things, whatever evils and penalties we daily endure is the cen-

[2] Rom. II.4–5.

[3] *On the Governance of God*, book VI, § XVI, p. 39.

[1] *On the Governance of God*, book VIII, § I, p. 49.

sure of the divine hand; and we cause this censure to grow hot and continually move it by our sins. We kindle the fire of heavenly wrath and stir up the conflagrations by which we burn. So that rightly, whenever we endure these evils, that prophetic word [2] can also be said to us: "Go into the flame of the fire which you have kindled." And through this, according to the sacred saying [3], each sinner prepares for himself what he suffers. There is therefore nothing which we can impute to God in our calamities. We are the authors of our calamities. For God is pious and merciful, and, as it is written [4], wills no one to perish or to be harmed. We therefore do all things against ourselves. Nothing, therefore, nothing is more cruel to us than ourselves: we, I say, we torment ourselves even when God is unwilling. But doubtless I seem to speak against myself, since, although above I said that we are punished by God on account of our sins, now I say that we are punished by ourselves. Both are true. For we are punished by God, but we ourselves bring it about that we are punished. But since we ourselves bring it about that we are punished,—

—who doubts that we punish ourselves by our own crimes? Because whoever supplies the cause for which he is punished punishes himself, according to that saying [1]: "Each one is bound by the cords of his own sins." Therefore, if perverse men are bound by the cords of their own sins, without doubt each sinner binds himself when he sins.

CXXXI.

Since these things are so, I judge it worthwhile to inquire singly what things can rightly be required in order that I. the salvific will of God may be believed universal, and that II. the state of the human race may be judged not to have been fallen and lost before it was raised and repaired. For when each head has been defined as is fitting, the treatment which we have in hand will shine forth more splendidly by a new accession of light.

And now, that I may begin from the first, no one except by erring will deny that the salvific will of God is rightly judged universal if a) it extends as far as the innate clemency and benignity of God extends, while b) this passes over no one,

[2] Isa. L.11.
[3] Ps. VII.
[4] I Tim. II.4.
[1] Prov. V.22.

adorns everyone with its benefits, and advances everyone toward the attainment of salvation. For either these are the indications which demonstrate its universal amplitude, or all indications and all signs from which its universality can be discovered are lacking. Moreover, the Gallican Fathers confirm with one voice a) that the salvific will proceeds from the innate benignity and clemency of God, and b) that it is contained by no other boundaries than those which circumscribe the altogether universal and infinite benignity and clemency of God. They testify, therefore, that universality is eminent among those endowments by which the salvific will of God is commended and shines.

But from this endowment of it there is gathered with plainly no difficulty what ought to be judged concerning that which we proposed for ourselves to inquire in the second place: namely, of what sort the state in which Adam's posterity and the human race are situated ought to be judged. For it ought altogether to be judged that this state is indeed from itself fallen and lost, but by the mercy of God—

—raised and repaired. For just as fall and destruction cohere with Adam's transgression, so reparation and medicine cannot be torn or separated from the universal salvific will. The Gallican Fathers unanimously teach this with such weight of sentences and such perspicuity of words that nothing stronger and nothing more evident ought to be desired.

For they teach that God, incited and moved by a merciful and salvific will, decreed that a) the Only-begotten should assume the prostrate and ruined nature of men and should free the nature assumed from the twofold servitude of sin and death. And that he should b) so free it from each servitude that he should vindicate it in turn into a twofold freedom: first, into the freedom of justice, by which Adam's posterity might possess the faculty of restoring the divine likeness which they had squandered; and then into the freedom of life, by which they might strive toward incorruption and blessed immortality. That c) that order was therefore divinely selected in which original transgression would harm only those who neglected the protections of reparation. To this assuredly return the things which Phoebadius, Hilary, Salvian, Sidonius, Valerian, Avitus, Sedulius, and Caesarius of Arles teach and confirm by testimonies of Scripture and by arguments drawn from the divine nature itself. Yet these things are such as either are wholly devoid of all sense, or most certainly convey this doctrine: that the twofold death both of body and soul, which the human race brought upon itself by a most unhappy transgression, was repaired through Christ by the intervention of divine mercy, and that men therefore exist in that state which ought to be called and believed a state of reparation and salvation.

CXXXII.

There was reason, therefore, for the Gallican bishops who, under the presidency of Caesarius [1] of Arles, assembled in the year of Christ 529 at the Second Council of Orange, fortified by the approval [2] of Boniface—

—first indeed to define [1]:

> This also we believe according to the Catholic faith: that, grace having been received through baptism, all the baptized, with Christ assisting and cooperating, can and ought to fulfill the things which pertain to the salvation of the soul, if they are willing to labor faithfully [2].

And then immediately to add [3]:

> But that some have been predestined to evil by divine power we not only do not believe, but even if there are those who will to believe so great an evil, with every detestation we say anathema to them.

For this divine predestination to evil, whether of guilt or of penalty, whether of many, of fewer, or even of one, is most vehemently abhorrent both a) from the universal salvific will of God and the order of universal reparation through Christ, and b) from that law which God most sacredly prescribed to himself to be observed in inflicting penalties.

For if the discourse concerns eternal penalties, God enacted this law for himself: that he should punish no one with so great an atrocity of penalty who has not kindled the fire for himself by impenitence prolonged even unto the end. On this matter Alcimus Avitus, answering King Gundobad, has thus [4]:

> That the repentance which you have properly called momentary [5]—

---

[1] Gennadius writes excellent things concerning him, chap. LXXXVI.

[2] Among others, Cyprian the deacon makes mention of this confirmation in the first book of the *Life of Saint Caesarius*.

[1] Second Council of Orange, canon XXV, col. 717, vol. VIII of the Councils, Florence edition, 1762.

[2] Others: "after the grace of baptism has been received," or, "but the grace of baptism having been received."

[3] Ibid., cols. 717–718.

[4] Epistle IV, p. 711, in Gallandius, vol. X.

[5] Gallandius appends this observation to these words: "Faustus also had called it 'momentary,' Paulinus 'sudden.' 'I approach,' says the questioner. 'I am involved in carnal sins; I practice all things whatsoever a criminal can. When I shall have completed the day of the human lot, I have obtained sudden repentance. I desire to know whether it excludes sin in part or entirely.' Faustus answered that this was useless. Avitus teaches that this is said falsely, and before Avitus, in the same province of Gaul, Gennadius of Marseilles had taught in chapter XLVIII of *Ecclesiastical Dogmas*: 'We believe without doubt that sins are abolished by repentance, even if one repents of the sins committed in the last breath of life and the sins are disclosed by public lamentation, because the purpose of God by which he decreed to save that which had perished stands immovable. And therefore, because his will

> —that is, received in illness as though beneath the moment of death—profits nothing or no one is a definition contrary to truth and exceedingly harsh. For before divine mercy even the humility itself of one confessing ought not to be said to lack fruit. Because, when we read that the quality of the preceding life is abolished—since it frequently happens both that the just sin and that sinners come to their senses—and that each one is judged in the way in which he is found at the time of his death, it must be believed without hesitation that even the will of correction itself is pleasing, if it is true. But everything before heavenly clemency is weighed by the quality of faith. Hence also among those laborers whom you read in the Gospel to have been hired [1], even those who came later, on account of the ardor of devotion, obtain a wage made equal to that of the first. So also the very brief repentance of the Ninevites, purchasing the whole sum of indulgence by a fervent three days, blunted by the bar of consonant satisfaction the sword impending over the necks of the sinful city, which the appointed day had already brandished by the hand of the prophet Jonah [2] for the destined stroke. But let those contradict examples of this kind whom pride sought renders swollen more truly than an inviolate conscience renders secure.

Caesarius of Arles teaches things consonant with these [3] when, explaining the manifold modes of repentance, he says:

> The second mode is that, even if anyone, for as long as he has lived, has committed not only small but perhaps even capital sins, and nevertheless has done those evils ignorantly, as though in hope of repentance, and does not for that reason relax his soul toward sins so as to reserve himself for that sudden repentance, and at his passing asks for that repentance with great humility and contrition of heart, with roaring or groaning, and most definitely resolves this in his heart: that if he escapes, for as long as he lives he will do fruitful repentance with his whole heart and all his strength, and will restore in full whatever he recognizes that he has taken wickedly—

---

is not changed, whether by amendment of life, if time is granted, or by suppliant confession, if life is immediately ended, pardon of sins is faithfully presumed from him who does not—

> —will the death of the sinner, but that he should be converted from destruction by repenting and, saved by the mercy of the Lord, should live. If anyone thinks otherwise concerning the most just piety of God, he is not a Christian but a Novatian.' "

[1] Matt. XX.9.

[2] Jonah III.10.

[3] Homily II, p. 4, in Gallandius, vol. XI.

> —so that, according to that prophetic saying, he restores plunder, and wholly forgives all his enemies from his heart, and from his substance makes one portion for Christ and for himself together with his children, and in his illness itself orders that liberal alms be distributed insofar as he is able; if he wills faithfully to fulfill these things with a humble and contrite heart, we both can and ought to believe that the Lord deigns to forgive him all his sins, according to that prophetic saying [1]: "On whatever day the sinner is converted, all his iniquities will be delivered to oblivion." And that saying: "On whatever day, having been converted, thou groanest, thou shalt be saved."

But if, as was the other member of the division, the discourse concerns those penalties which are called temporal, by these indeed God takes counsel for his justice and provides for the laws enacted by him, but he equally has proposed the amendment and salvation of those whom he punishes. For as often as, according to the affirmation of the Gallican Fathers, he takes notice of us by temporal penalties, so often, after the manner of a most loving father and most skillful physician solicitous for our salvation, he chastises that he may correct, rebukes that he may awaken, and burns that he may bless eternally.

CXXXIII.

Concerning this sincere will of God, most inclined toward the salvation of absolutely all men, those things finally ought not to be passed over in silence which the bishops of Gaul, on the occasion of the error disseminated by the presbyter Lucidus, signified by a solemn judgment [2].

[1] Ezek. XXXIII.12–16.

[2] This judgment was rendered at the Council of Arles in the year of Christ 475, when Simplicius was Roman Pontiff and Euric king of the Visigoths in Gaul. Concerning this council Philip Labbe has thus in vol. VII, col. 1012, Florence edition, 1762: "James Ussher of Armagh in Ireland, a leader of the Calvinists, in chapter XIII of the book which he published in the year 1639 concerning the antiquities of the British churches, and his diligent copyists, our Parisian Jansenists, in an apology of the Jansenian heresies published in the year 1643, attempted to censure this Council of Arles and the two epistles of Faustus, bishop of Riez, and the presbyter Lucidus. But with plainly unhappy success, as you will learn at leisure from the books concerning the Jansenian heresy deservedly proscribed by the Apostolic See, which the Reverend Father Stephen Dechamps of Bourges, with the greatest approbation of all Catholics, in the year 1654—"

> —made public. Consult, if you please, both book I, disputation VII, chapter VII, and likewise book II, disputation VII, chapter I, where you will find all the arguments of those heterodox men against the orthodox writers altogether broken and crushed." And you will likewise find them broken and crushed in Denis Petau, *On the Incarnation*, book XIII, chap. VII.

For when they themselves—and [1] by name Auxanius, Faustus, Paul, Eutropius, Pragmatius, Patiens, Euphronius, Megethius, Claudius, Leucadius, and Julian—confirmed by their authority the epistle of Faustus to Lucidus and fortified it, after it had been read again, by their subscription, nothing is more evident than that their common judgment is rightly gathered and established from it. Moreover, in it anathema is said in order [2]: a) to him who says that through the foreknowledge of God a man is pressed down into death; b) to him who says that one who perishes did not receive that whereby he could be saved, that is, concerning a baptized person, or concerning a pagan of that age who was able to believe and was unwilling; c) to him who says that a vessel of dishonor cannot rise so as to be a vessel unto honor; and likewise d) to him who says that Christ did not die for all and does not will all men to be saved.

Then in the name of all it is added [3]:

> But we, through the illumination of Christ, truly and confidently assert both that he who perishes through fault could have been saved through grace if he had not denied to grace itself the obedience of servile labor; and that he who through grace arrives at the boundaries of a good consummation by obedient service could have fallen through sloth and perished through fault.

These things are immediately [4] confirmed by the following:

> For we turn a grave odium back upon the author if we say that he was unwilling to give the possibility of embracing salvation to him who sought it—to him, that is, who can now possess freedom of choice—since we can in no way deny that he will condemn the transgressor of the commandment in the examination of his judgment. For he who is not liable concerning what he received, I do not know how he can be liable concerning what he lost. And thus, sinning against God, whose grace we asserted too incautiously in the first things, in the last things we shall appear to impugn his justice.

Thus, therefore, the order of providence by which the human race is administered and governed ought to be believed disposed: that a), with mercy giving aid, the possibility of embracing salvation is denied to no one who is in possession of reason and freedom, by which possibility it comes about that one who perished

---

[1] Because the name of Leontius, who presided over the Council of Arles, is lacking in these letters, Noris suspects in *History of Pelagianism*, book II, "that this subscription of eleven bishops does not pertain to the Council of Arles, but was made in a certain private meeting of the same men for the dedication of a basilica or for some other purpose." Compare Pagi at the year of Christ 490, n. 14.

[2] Epistle of Faustus to Lucidus, cols. 1008–1009, vol. VII of the Councils.

[3] Ibid., col. 1009.

[4] Ibid.

through fault could have been saved through grace; and then b) that, with justice distributing, no one is condemned who by his own fault did not cast away that which he divinely received as adapted to attaining salvation.

Lucidus both approved these things and professed them as so many necessary truths, whether when [1] after all the bishops he subscribed to the letter issued by Faustus, or when [2], in the suppliant little book which he offered to the most blessed lords and most reverend fathers in Christ, Bishops Leontius, Euphronius, Fonteius, Viventius, Mamertus, Patiens, Verianus [3], Auxanius, Faustus, Paul, Megethius, Graecus, Eutropius, Leontius, Claudius, Marcellus, Crocus, Basil, Claudius, Ursinus, Praetextatus, Pragmatius, Theoplastus, Leocadius, Viventius, Julian, Amicalis, John, Opilio, and Licinius, he openly condemned: a) him who says that the foreknowledge of God violently compels a man to death, or that those who perish perish by the will of God; b) him who says that some are assigned to death, others predestined to life; c) him who says that from Adam unto Christ none from the nations were saved unto the advent of Christ through the first grace of God, that is, through the law of nature; and d) him who says that Christ our Savior did not undergo death for the salvation of all.

"For all these things," he proceeds [4], "I condemn as impious and filled with sacrileges."

> But I so assert the grace of God that I always join the exertion and endeavor of man to grace, and pronounce that the freedom of the human will has not been extinguished, but attenuated and weakened——and that he who is saved is in danger, and he who perished could have been saved. I also pronounce that Christ our God and Savior, insofar as pertains to the riches of his goodness, offered the price of death for all; and because he wills no one to perish, who is the Savior of all, especially of the faithful, rich toward all who invoke him. And because in matters of such importance conscience must be satisfied, I remember that I formerly said that Christ had come only for those whom he foreknew would believe, following the dominical sayings in which he speaks thus: "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his soul as a redemption for many"; and that saying: "This is the chalice of my blood of the new testament, which shall be poured out for many unto the remission of sins"; or that saying of the Apostle: "As it is appointed for men once to die, so also Christ was once offered to exhaust the sins of many." But now, by the authority of the sacred

[1] Ibid., col. 1010.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Others: Veranius.
[4] Ibid., cols. 1010–1011.

> testimonies which are found abundantly throughout the expanses of the divine Scriptures, the reason having been disclosed from the doctrine of the elders, I gladly confess that Christ came even for the lost, because they perished when he was unwilling. For it is not lawful to confine the riches of immense goodness and the divine benefits to those alone who appear to have been saved. For if we say that Christ brought remedies only to those who were redeemed, we shall appear to absolve the unredeemed, whom it is established are to be punished for redemption contemned. I also assert that, according to the rationale and order of the ages, some were saved in the hope of Christ's advent by the law of grace, others by the law of Moses, others by the law of nature which God wrote in the hearts of all; yet from the beginning of the world they were not absolved from the original bond except by the intercession of the sacred blood.

CXXXIV.

In the controversy, therefore, which is plainly of the greatest importance concerning the order and distinction of the economy (*οἰκονομία*) of salvation, there is need lest, carried off crosswise, we fall away from that which is true and divinely revealed. And first the principal cause of salvation must be distinguished from its second and dependent cause; then, indeed, the effects which are proper to the principal cause and those which must be expected from the concurrence—

—of each cause, the principal and the dependent, must be distinguished.

For a) the principal cause of salvation is the benevolent and merciful will of God itself in Christ and through Christ; but b) the subordinate and second cause is contained in the free choice of those who attain salvation.

Moreover, c) the principal cause is from itself 1) universal both in time and in the number of those whom it embraces: it is universal in time because it neglected men in no age whatever; but it is universal in the amplitude of those to whom it extends because it never passed over anyone. And it is not only universal, but also 2) efficacious and fruitful, since it has always imparted to all the possibility of attaining salvation, and imparted it in such a way that those who perished by their own fault and with redemption contemned both could have been saved by cooperation with grace and altogether ought to have been saved according to the innate good pleasure of God.

Since such are the effects which proceed spontaneously from the principal cause of salvation and depend in no way upon human endeavors and cares, the effect, on the contrary, d) of salvation which is attained in actuality and fact must be expected from the concurrence and harmony of each cause, both the principal

and the subordinate. For God established 1) that mercy should so be present to all that all can attain salvation if they will; but equally 2) he established that through his justice he should render the crown of salvation only to those who have joined their endeavors and their diligence to prevenient grace.

Therefore, it is plainly one thing to ask how far the order and possibility of salvation extends, and another how great the number is of those who are saved. For the order and possibility of salvation e) corresponds to the amplitude of divine mercy, depends upon the principal cause alone, and is therefore thoroughly universal. But the number f) of those who are saved corresponds to distributive justice and so depends upon the principal cause that it depends equally upon the cooperation of the second and dependent cause.

Wherefore, 1) the order of salvation ought to be believed universal simply; and 2) reparation likewise ought simply to be believed universal; but 3) it is in no way lawful to measure the extension of the salvific order and the amplitude of reparation from the number of those who are saved.

CXXXV.

But the doctrine which the bishops and writers of Italy professed had such agreement with these things that the faith of Gaul and of Italy rightly and deservedly appears expressed according to the same norm. Indeed, from the apostolic age even unto the sixth century, it is not possible to find even one Italian doctor whose constant faith and settled judgment was not this: I. that God is good and benevolent by his nature and substance, and can be addressed by no name more truly than that of a most clement father; II. that by the clemency connatural to himself he is the cause of death and ruin to no one; indeed III. that he does not take notice of men by severity and justice before he has shown himself pious and merciful toward them; that therefore IV. the very severity and justice, as long as men live mortal life, are so tempered by him that each ought to be judged medicine rather than penalty, and the fruit rather of the will which loves and supplies aid than of the will which is angry and rages with wrath; that V. to this merciful will must be attributed the counsel and purpose by which he awaited the repentance of the nations even unto the advent of Christ, by which in the last times he sent his Only-begotten into this world, and by which he decreed that he who was God over all, blessed unto the ages and *ὁμοούσιος*, consubstantial, with himself, should become man and related to us by nature, put on the form of a servant, and, made in it obedient unto death, undergo the Passion of the cross and pour forth divine blood; that he should VI. pour it forth so as to heal all, wash the world, free all from darkness, recall them to the kingdom of God, repair the damages inflicted, and, as the new Adam, restore the power of attaining salva-

tion which had been lost by the fault and crime of the first; whereby VII. it would come about that however many perish do not stumble into so great a destruction because they could not avoid it, but because they preferred darkness to light and esteemed death above life.

In order to elucidate and confirm all these things in the order in which I proposed them, first of all I shall bring forward Ambrose, whose exceptional praises were celebrated by Basil [1],—

—Jerome [1], Rufinus [2], Augustine [3], Paulinus [4], Cassian [5], Prosper [6], Theodoret [7], Idacius [8], Vigilius of Thapsus [9], Gelasius [10], Marcellinus [11], Gregory [12], Cassiodorus [13], and [14] Isidore. On the words [15] of the Psalm, "Thou art good, O Lord, and in thy goodness teach me thy justifications," he writes [16]:

> It is proper to God that he be good. Finally, you have in the Gospel [17] that a good tree makes good fruits. His fruits are angels; his fruits are men, that is, rational and holy, if they keep the commandments of the Lord; his fruits are those who are born upon the earth; his fruits are the virtues of men. Rightly, therefore, a good tree makes good fruits.

An argument of his connatural and infinite goodness is also this, Ambrose adds: that [18] God permitted us to call him Father, whose servant it is a virtue to be; and that, from the clemency [19] with which he follows all, he claimed for himself in the first place the name and appellation of God.

---

[1] Epistle LV, sent to Ambrose himself.

[1] To Eustochium, epistle XXII, chap. X; *Apology against Jovinian*; and *Apology against Rufinus*, book I, chap. I.

[2] *Against Jerome*, invective II.

[3] *Confessions*, book V, chap. XIII; book VI, chaps. I, III, VIII; *On the Grace of Christ*, chap. XLII; and *Against Julian*, book I, chap. III.

[4] Epistle to Alypius, which is epistle XXIV, otherwise XXXV, in Augustine.

[5] *On the Incarnation*, book VII.

[6] In the *Chronicle*, under the consulships of Gratian V and Theodosius I.

[7] *Polymorphus*, dialogue I.

[8] In the *Chronicle*, under the consulships of Gratian III and Equitius.

[9] *Against Eutyches*, book III.

[10] To the Dardanians, epistle XIII.

[11] In the *Chronicle*, under the consulships of Arcadius IV and Honorius III.

[12] Preface to the commentary on Ezekiel.

[13] *On Divine Readings*, chap. XX.

[14] *On Ecclesiastical Offices*, book II, chap. XXV.

[15] Ps. CXVIII.68.

[16] *Exposition of Psalm CXVIII*, n. 15, cols. 1083–1084, works, vol. I, Paris edition, 1686.

[17] Matt. VII.17.

[18] *On the Blessings of the Patriarchs*, chap. IV, n. 17, col. 518, works, vol. I.

[19] *On Noah and the Ark*, chap. XIII, n. 47, col. 246, works, vol. I.

Jerome [1] agrees and, explaining in a commentary [3] the words [2] of Paul, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has blessed us in every spiritual blessing in heavenly places, in Christ," says:

> Just as God, good according to substance and nature, has made us good by communion with himself, and speaks [4] to Israel, "Be holy, for I am holy," so may he who is blessed grant us to be blessed.

But elsewhere [5] he writes:

> God is merciful by nature and ready to save by clemency those whom he cannot save by justice; but we, through our own fault, lose and abandon mercy prepared and offering itself of its own accord. And he did not say [6], "those who do vanities" ("vanity of vanities, and all is vanity"), lest he seem to condemn all and to deny mercy to the entire human race; but "those who keep vanities," or falsehood, who have passed into the affection of the heart; who not only do vanities but so keep them as though they love them and think that they have found a treasure. And at the same time observe the magnanimity of the prophet: covered in eternal night in the depth of the sea, in the belly of so great a beast, he does not think of his own danger, but of the nature of things; he philosophizes by a general sentence. "They will abandon their mercy," he says. Although mercy has been offended—which we can understand as God himself, for "the Lord is merciful [1] and compassionate, patient and of much mercy"—nevertheless he does not abandon or detest those who keep vanities, but awaits their return; they, however, of their own accord abandon mercy standing and offering itself freely.

---

[1] I number him among the Italian doctors because he was for a long time at Rome and is deservedly reckoned among the more illustrious ornaments of the City. Prosper sang concerning him in the poem *On the Ungrateful*:

> Then also the guest at Bethlehem of illustrious name, Graced alike in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin Eloquence, an exemplar of morals and teacher of the world, Jerome, in most excellent books, dissected The enemy and made known by what whirlwind the shadows Which had arisen willed to obscure the true light.

[3] *Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians*, book I, chap. I, col. 546, works, vol. VII, Verona edition, 1737.

[2] Eph. I.3.

[4] Lev. XX.7; Deut. XI–XVIII.

[5] *Commentary on Jonah*, chap. II, col. 413, works, vol. VI.

[6] Jonah II.9: "Those who keep vanities in vain will abandon their mercy." Victorius edited "abandon" in the present tense, according to the norm of the Vulgate, a reading which Jerome supports in his commentary.

[1] Ps. CXLIV.8.

Struck by this image [2], Jerome exclaims, "O how great is the clemency of God!" Indeed, he adorns God himself by no title [3] more willingly than that of the wisest and most clement physician.

Therefore Chromatius, bishop of Aquileia, most closely joined by the bond of friendship to Jerome as well as to Ambrose [4], John Chrysostom, Heliodorus, and Rufinus, considering the form of prayer prescribed [5] by Christ, says:

> The Lord therefore established this form of prayer for his disciples unto the hope of human salvation, saying: "Our Father [6], who art in heaven." How great is the love of the Lord toward us! How great his mercy and piety, which granted us the gift of so great a grace, that we servants may dare freely to call our Lord and God Father! By this word he shows that we are now not only servants, but also sons of God. And although it would have been enough and more than enough for grace that we should merit merely to be called servants, the charity of God so abounded that we are called not only servants, but also sons of God through adoption.

CXXXVI.

For just as, if God is compared with himself, the first thing which occupies the mind and soul is the rationale of *τοῦ ὄντος*, of being, by which he is [1] and is believed to be *ὁ ὤν*, he who is; so, if he is referred to those things which have been effected and produced, the first thing which occurs is the rationale—

—of *τῆς ἀγαθότητος*, of goodness, by which he is both good to himself and beneficent to others. Hence the name Father, which is attributed to him by the unanimous consent of all; hence what [2] Synesius affirms:

> All peoples everywhere on earth, the wise as well as the unlearned, proclaim God good, and all profess this by mutual consent and with one voice, although, as pertains to other things, they disagree in various judgments concerning God and divide his incorrupt and indivisible nature by a diversity of opinions.

---

[2] *Commentary on Hosea*, book I, chap. II, col. 26, works, vol. VI.

[3] *Commentary on Habakkuk*, book I, chap. I, col. 591, works, vol. VI.

[4] Compare the things which Baronius at the year 388, n. 84; Fontanini, *Literary History of Aquileia*, book III, chap. III; and Bernard de Rubeis, *Monuments of the Church of Aquileia*, chap. X, committed to writing concerning Chromatius.

[5] *Tractate XIII on the Gospel of Saint Matthew*, § I, p. 347, in Gallandius, vol. VIII.

[6] Matt. VI.9.

[1] Exod. III.14.

[2] *Oration on Kingship*, p. 9.

And hence the illustrious opinion [3] of Philo, Pseudo-Dionysius [4], and [5] John Damascene: that the principal name of God in comparison with creatures is *τἀγαθόν, οὐ τι ἀγαθὸν ἀλλ' ἁπλῶς ἀγαθόν*, goodness itself, not a good of a certain genus, but the good absolutely; and therefore that God is *ἀγαθότητος τοῦ αἰτίου ὄνομα*, the name of the principle of goodness.

But if this goodness is considered in relation to lost and depraved men, it displays, as it were, a new face and puts on the force and nature of mercy, by which God extends his right hand to the fallen, offers medicine to the sick, and leads back those who have strayed. But does he lead all back, or are there those against whom he is disdainful and whom he casts away? Does he heal all, or are there those whom he neglects and abandons? I shall answer not in my own words, but in the words of those who committed to their works the faith and profession of the Italian churches. Therefore, if we hear them, such was the persuasion and judgment of Catholic Italy:

> God is benevolent to all; the earth is full of his mercy; he is the cause of death to no one; he redeems all, saves all, and almost hunts even those who flee; he approaches the souls of all and enters the minds of all, unless he is repelled; he distributes his benefits to all; and he so wills the salvation of all that he does not obey wrath and justice before he has fulfilled every part of clemency and goodness.

CXXXVII.

And indeed, considering the riches of divine goodness, Ambrose among other things [1] writes:

> Receive another thing: "How good," he says [2], "is the God of Israel to the upright of heart!" Is God, then, not good to all? He indeed is good to all, because he is the Savior of all, especially of the faithful. And therefore the Lord Jesus came that he might save what had perished; for he came that he might take away the sin of the world and cure our wounds. But because not all desire medicine, but many flee it lest the force of the ulcer be pierced by medicines, therefore he cures the willing; he does not constrain the unwilling. Those, therefore, who desire medicine receive health; but those who reject the physician and do not seek him cannot perceive the goodness of

[3] *Allegories*, book II.
[4] *On the Divine Names*, chap. IV.
[5] *On the Orthodox Faith*, book I, chap. XII.
[1] *On the Complaint of David*, book IV, chap. II, n. 4, cols. 663–664, works, vol. I.
[2] Ps. LXXII.1.

> the physician which they do not experience. But he who is treated is also healed, and therefore the physician is good to those whom he has healed. God, therefore, is good to those whose sins he has forgiven. But he who has an incurable sin in the ulcer of his mind—how can he judge good the physician whom he flees? Beautifully, therefore, the Apostle, as we premised, explained [3] both that God is good to all, who wills all men to be saved, and that the prerogative of divine goodness is preserved especially for the faithful, whom both the will and grace of God assist.

This prerogative, nevertheless, does not prevent the prophet [4] from having spoken most truly: "The earth is full of thy mercy, O Lord; teach me thy justifications." For, according to Ambrose's interpretation [5]:

> The earth is full of the mercy of the Lord, because remission of sins has been given to all. The sun is commanded to rise over all. And this sun indeed rises daily over all. But that mystical sun of justice has risen for all, came for all, suffered for all, and rose again for all; but he suffered for this reason, that he might take away the sin of the world. But if anyone—
>
> —does not believe in Christ, he defrauds himself of the general benefit; just as if someone with closed windows excludes the rays of the sun, the sun did not for that reason fail to rise for all because he defrauded himself of its warmth. But that which belongs to the sun preserves its prerogative; that which belongs to the imprudent man excludes from himself the grace of the common light. Rain is over all, and this is attributed to divine mercy, because it rains upon the just and the unjust.

But lest those infected with the Calvinian or Jansenian plague dare to twist these things away from their legitimate signification and reduce what is said of the universal and active offering both of the price and of grace to a universal and from itself infinite value, two things especially prevent them. The one is contained in the force of the words themselves and in the sequence and course of the whole discourse; the other consists in those things which Ambrose immediately [1] adds, saying:

> Perhaps you may say: for what reason was it not said, "Heaven is full of the mercy of the Lord"? Because there are also spiritual wickednesses in heavenly places. But they do not pertain [2] to the common

[3] I Tim. II.4.

[4] Ps. CXVIII.64.

[5] *Exposition of Psalm CXVIII*, n. 57, col. 1077, works, vol. I.

[1] Ibid., n. 58, col. 1077.

[2] Others: "they pertain to his common indulgence and the remission of sins."

> right of the indulgence of God and the remission of sins, for whom eternal fire is reserved. And those things which belong to heavenly powers or ministries, although sustained by the help of the Lord, nevertheless do not need his mercy to so great an extent as those things which are lower and earthly; for they are not clothed with the covering of flesh, in which there is the enticement of frequent error.

Do you hear the spiritual wickednesses rejected and excluded from the remission of sins, and the common right of indulgence which is bestowed upon all men denied to them? Do you hear the immense distinction by which, as regards reparation, the spiritual wickednesses are separated from men? Yet these things would be fallacious and altogether preposterous if, with the value of the offering considered from itself, no account were taken of the fruits which flow from it.

CXXXVIII.

That account of it must especially be taken Ambrose declares [1] when, on the words [2] of the Psalm, "Thy mercies are exceedingly many, O Lord," he writes:

> Although salvation is far from sinners, nevertheless let no one despair, because the mercies of the Lord are many. For those who perish by their own sin are delivered by the mercy of the Lord. "I shall have mercy," he says [3], "on whom I shall have had mercy." He appeared openly to those not seeking him; he called those fleeing; he gathered the ignorant; he offered himself to the Passion for all. Is he not, therefore, greatly merciful? For the mercy of man is toward his neighbor; the mercy of the Lord is toward all flesh, so that all flesh, endowed with that mercy of the Lord, might ascend to the Lord.

He explains the incredible benignity of this mercy much more illustriously [4] when, bringing together the testimonies [5], "For the Lord will not reject his people," and, "But now thou hast rejected and confounded us," he proceeds:

> Since God is one who draws near, not one who is far away, as the Scripture of the Old Testament has it [6], certainly he who draws near does not reject. For it belongs to divine mercy to be the cause of death to no one and to judge all to be redeemed. But see lest he

[1] *Exposition of Psalm CXVIII*, n. 29, cols. 1229–1230, works, vol. I.
[2] Ps. CXVIII.156.
[3] Exod. XXXIII.19.
[4] *Exposition of Psalm XLIII*, n. 25, col. 898, works, vol. I.
[5] Ps. XCIII.14, compare Ps. XLIII.10.
[6] Jer. XXIII.23.

> be rejected who removes himself far from the Lord, as David says [7]: "For behold, those who remove themselves far from thee shall perish; thou hast destroyed all who fornicate away from thee." What is it to fornicate away from thee? That through the mockeries of their turpitude they abandon thee and withdraw from thee and stray from thy commandments. Finally, elsewhere [8] you have it written: "But God judges adulterers," dispersing them away from himself. "Thou hast rejected," therefore, that is, by alienating them from thee thou hast destroyed them. Therefore, he who separates himself from the Lord is himself separated from the Lord; and he who does not know the Lord is not known by the Lord; and he who is ignorant is ignored,—
>
> —as the Lord himself [1] said: "Depart from me, all you workers of iniquity; I know you not." For he does not deign to know the ministers of injustice and the authors of iniquity. The sinner, therefore, is not rejected, because he rejects himself. In this manner, therefore, he says [2]: "But now thou hast rejected and confounded us."

So far is God from being the cause of death to anyone or from rejecting anyone from himself that Ambrose, inquiring [3] into the force and judgment of the words of God [4] to the first parent, "Adam, where art thou?" first writes:

> Certainly he seeks him as though absent, for he would not say, "Where art thou?" if he knew him to remain in himself.

Then immediately he adds:

> But let us hear who made him absent. "They both hid themselves," he says [5], "from the face of the Lord." Christ sees all; but he who hides himself is hidden, because he who is ignorant is ignored. For the Lord knows those who are his. He wills all whom he founded and created to be his own. Would that thou, O man, wouldst not flee and wouldst not hide thyself from Christ. He seeks even those who flee and does not will the hidden to perish; but he cries, saying: "Adam, where art thou?" That is, "Man, where art thou? I placed thee in light; thou hast sought darkness."

---

[7] Ps. LXXII.27.
[8] Heb. XIII.4.
[1] Matt. VII.23.
[2] Ps. XLIII.10.
[3] *Exposition of Psalm XXXIX*, n. 20, col. 865, works, vol. I.
[4] Gen. III.9.
[5] Gen. III.8.

For among the divine endowments none shines more splendidly than that by which [6] God is called one who draws near, not a rejecter of those who draw near.

> For he wills to be to all the cause of salvation, not of death. Finally, he rejects no one except one who has judged that he must be sequestered from his sight.

For in this manner [7],

> the heavenly prerogative of clemency is preserved, because he rejects no one; but whoever are unwilling to confess their own sins themselves withdraw from the Lord our God.

Unless they withdraw, he will always be benignly present to them. For, says [8] Ambrose:

> Since we cannot doubt concerning the sun—
>
> —that as the day advances it diffuses its rays throughout the whole world and pours light upon all, which even those who cannot see nevertheless perceive to be present by the warmth of the air itself—for where is its heat lacking? Whither do its rays not arrive when, after the darkness of night or clouds has been dispelled, it illuminates the earth? It shines in heaven, glitters in the sea, burns on the earth. Since, therefore, we cannot doubt concerning the sun that it shines everywhere, shall we doubt concerning God that the splendor of his glory and the image of his substance shines everywhere? What does the Word of God not penetrate, the eternal splendor which illuminates even the hidden things of the mind which this sun cannot penetrate?…. Therefore, he penetrates the soul and illuminates it as the brightness of the eternal light. But although he is diffused through all, and in all, and above all powers, because he has arisen from the Virgin for all, both good and evil—as he also commands his sun to rise upon the good and evil—he nevertheless warms him who draws near to himself. For just as he who has closed the windows of his house and chosen a dark place in which to abide excludes the brightness of the sun from himself, so he who turns himself away from the sun of justice cannot behold his splendor: he walks in darkness, and in the light of all he is himself the cause of blindness to himself. Therefore, open thy windows to him, that thy whole house may shine with the brightness of the true sun. Open thine eyes, that thou mayest see the sun of justice rising for thee…. If someone closes the doors of his house, is it perhaps the fault of the sun that

[6] *On the Complaint of David*, book IV, chap. XI, n. 29, col. 672, works, vol. I.
[7] *Exposition of Psalm CXVIII*, n. 31, col. 1167, works, vol. I.
[8] Ibid., cols. 1219–1220.

> it does not illuminate his house? Therefore, if anyone judges that his own mind is to be barred by the bolts of his sins, and foolishly turns away from himself the splendor of the Word and brings upon himself the blindness of foolishness, will he be able to complain that the sun of justice was unwilling to enter, or to accuse the weakness of the heavenly light? The Word of God knocks at thy door. "If anyone opens to me," he says [1], "I shall enter." Therefore, if anyone does not open, is it perhaps the fault of the one not entering, and not rather of the one not opening?

CXXXIX.

When these testimonies of Ambrose are reduced to a summary, it follows—

—that God is so disposed that he rejects no one, casts away no one, and is to absolutely no one the cause of destruction and death. Indeed, this other thing also follows: that God is of his own accord present to all, enters the minds of all, pervades their souls, and grants to all the power by which they may obtain both pardon of sins and the attainment of salvation. For he wills all to be saved, wills no one to perish, and therefore follows all with a universal and active benevolence. Nor for that reason are all saved or does no one perish. For in order that salvation itself may be attained and final destruction avoided, two things are plainly necessary: first, the faculty by which evil can be conquered and that which is right and holy can be performed; and then, free diligence by which the faculty received is employed as is fitting.

But the means and faculty of conquering evil and following what is honorable are supplied to all and are lacking to no one, for the sun of justice illuminates all and warms all; but many fail themselves, close their eyes to the light, and repel the one knocking and calling. Therefore, the reason why many perish lies in the will, but the will of men, not of God: of men, I say, who abuse the benefits received; not of God, who leaves nothing undone that he may show himself the father and pious Savior of all. God indeed punishes, is angry, and condemns; but since he is good to all, he takes notice only of those who resist goodness. But as long as they live the present life, he so takes notice of them that in the penalties inflicted he has their salvation proposed to himself, not their ruin. "God is always good," says [1] Ambrose,

> and therefore Paul also says [2]: "See, therefore, the goodness and severity of God"; for goodness is toward all, severity toward few.

[1] Apoc. III.20.

[1] *Exposition of Psalm CXVIII*, n. 7, col. 1081, works, vol. I.

[2] Rom. XI.22.

Finally, the same Apostle adds [3]: "Toward those, indeed, who have fallen, severity; but toward thee, goodness." For if they had not fallen, they too would certainly enjoy the goodness of God. For he is good to thee for this reason, that thou remainest; but if thou wilt not remain in goodness, thou too wilt fall away. God, therefore, does not for that reason cease to be good because thou hast fallen and needest—

—severity. For even the severity of God returns unto goodness, so that each one, having been chastised, may draw his foot back from sins and return to the path of the virtues and to good conduct. Finally, the Apostle teaches concerning those who have fallen [1]: "For if they do not remain in unbelief, they shall be grafted in. For God is able to graft them in again," so that, just as abandoned shoots, men also, grafted as though into certain trunks of virtue, may bear the fruits of good merits. It is necessary that you accuse a physician of cruelty because he judged that the putrefied fibers of wounds should be cut away with iron; because he burned harmful and creeping ulcers with fire lest the poison creep onward into farther parts; or because a master struck a negligent disciple so that by fear of blows he might put on diligence. For to chastise belongs to one who loves, not to one who execrates; and therefore it belongs to goodness, not cruelty. Rightly, therefore, the Lord is good everywhere, both when he forgives crimes and when he chastises sins. For "the Lord chastises [2] him whom he loves."

CXL.

Now, if God in the present life chastises only by loving, and manifests his love by the very penalties themselves, will there be any who doubt whether all of us who are men are situated within the order of reparation and salvation—within an order which benevolence has chosen, over which piety presides, and which mercy administers? There will be absolutely no one whose mind is sound and who holds worthy of faith Paulinus, bishop of Nola, whose excellent and illustri-

[3] Rom. XI.22.
[1] Ibid., v. 23.
[2] Heb. XII.6.

ous gifts Ausonius [3], Prudentius [4], Jerome [5], Ambrose [6], Augustine [7], Sulpicius Severus [1], Eucherius [2], Sidonius Apollinaris [3], Gennadius [4], and Cassiodorus [5] celebrated with abundant praises.

For, according to him [6]:

> Christ says to all [7]: "Come to me, you who are burdened and labor, and you shall find rest for your souls." For, as far as lies in him, he wills every man [8] to be saved, who made all. For this reason also he descended to us, that we might ascend to him; therefore he was conformed to the body of our flesh, which was serving sin, that he might conform us to the body of his flesh, which did no sin, that we might truly be reformed to original glory if, through imitation of Christ, we should take on the divine likeness. For Genesis itself, which narrates the workmanship of the divine hand, shows [10] that in Adam the image alone remained to us [9]: in it, likeness together with the image of God is named while the making of man is still in its very undertaking; but in the following chapter, in which man, now made, is written to be only according to the image of God, it indicates that likeness was withdrawn, as it were, from one about to sin—manifestly through foreknowledge of the future—so that it might be reserved for men in Christ, who through the obedience of his piety reconciled to the Father the world which the disobedience of the first parent had rendered unreconciled [11]. And therefore the Lord himself [12], emptied into the form of a servant, received the

[3] Epistles XX, XXI, XXIII, XXIV, and XXV to Paulinus.

[4] *Against Symmachus*, book I.

[5] Epistles XIII–CIII to Paulinus, and epistle XXXIV to Julian.

[6] Epistle XXX, otherwise XXXVI, to Sabinus.

[7] In several letters to Paulinus, *The City of God*, book I, chap. X, and the book *On the Care to Be Taken for the Dead*, written to the same man.

[1] *Life of Saint Martin*, chaps. XXI–XXVI.

[2] Paraenetic epistle to Valerian.

[3] Epistles, book IV, epistle III, and Poem IX.

[4] *On Ecclesiastical Writers*, chap. XLVIII.

[5] *Institutions of Divine Scripture*, book I, chap. XXI.

[6] Epistle XXIV to Severus, col. 153, Verona edition, 1736.

[7] Matt. XI.28.

[8] I Tim. II.4.

[10] Gen. I.26; compare II.7.

[9] Paulinus hands down a doctrine altogether common to many Fathers, by which both the image is distinguished from the likeness, and this latter is affirmed to have been lost by Adam's crime while the former survived.

[11] II Cor. V.19; compare Rom. V.19.

[12] Phil. II.7.

> likeness of God which the servant, made illustrious through a desire for the Lord's equality, had lost; and man, who in his pride [13] had fallen through the fraud of the devil, arose through faith in him in the humiliation of the most high Lord, the devil having been laid low.

Again explaining the force and abundance of this divine liberality [1], he says:

> The treasuries of his good things lie open, and the riches of his goodness are at hand, so that each one need not wait to receive, but may of his own accord seize for himself as much as he wills. For in this the good Lord and holy Father made us: that we should be good for our own good. For [2] what external good would he need, who, in the whole extent of what he is, is himself goodness and beatitude? For this reason, as far as lies in him, he wills every man [3] to be saved, because in every man he loves his own work; and he is lavish toward you from his own resources, if you yourself are not envious and avaricious toward yourself concerning those things which God made yours—not that they might be a cause of death for you, but that they might be a price unto life. O abundance of the goodness of God! He wills to lend at interest from those things which he himself bestowed; he desires to become the debtor of his own gifts, so that with manifold reckoning he may return your interest to you.

But after recalling the excellent benefits [4] "by which God always so nourishes our hope that he does not relax solicitude, and so takes counsel for infirm flesh that the spirit does not cease to be prompt," he adds [5] "that God wills these same gifts of his piety to be exercised throughout the whole world."

CXLI.

If all these things are weighed in mind and soul, it will be evident: I. that Paulinus proves that divine will which is customarily called first and antecedent. For he mentions it as many times, and proves it as many times, as he repeats this formula: that God, as far as lies in him, wills every man to be saved. It will then be evident, II. that he ascribes a twofold principal and more notable endowment to this first and antecedent will: namely, universal amplitude and an intrinsic efficacy, from

[13] Gen. III.6.

[1] Sermon XXXVI, *On the Treasury*, n. 6, cols. 215–216.

[2] Ps. XV.2.

[3] I Tim. II.4.

[4] Epistle XLIX to Macarius, n. 6, col. 280.

[5] Ibid., n. 7, col. 281.

which spontaneously flow the means and helps by which the damages inflicted upon the human race are repaired and the ability to obtain beatitude is supplied.

And certainly III. Paulinus ascribes universal amplitude to it, whether a) when he teaches that God, as far as lies in him, embraces the salvation of all men; or b) when he testifies that the whole world is its object; or c) when he discloses its origin and teaches that it is no other than that love by which God is believed to be the Father of all and by which he loves his work in every man. Then IV. he equally ascribes to it a manifold efficacy, by which it came about that the Only-begotten descended to us and assumed our infirmities, that we might ascend to him and be reformed to original glory. But therefore, V. according to Paulinus, neither do all ascend to God nor are all reformed to original glory, because a) although God is lavish toward us from his own resources, we nevertheless are envious and avaricious toward ourselves concerning those things which he himself made ours; and because b) we rebel against the law established by him, by which he willed that through free cooperation we should make him the debtor to us of his own gifts.

Those things which Jerome confirms once and again differ in no way from these. For, weighing the divine words in Ezekiel [1], "Is my will the death of the impious, says the Lord God, and not that he be converted from his ways and live?" he writes [2]:

> Therefore the will of the Lord is that all be saved [3] and come to the knowledge of the truth. But wherever the sentence of God appears severe and fierce, it condemns not men but sins.

But concerning this benevolent will of God he hands down things most similar when, after setting forth both meanings of the words in Hosea [4], both the literal [5] and that according to *ἀναγωγή*, he proceeds [6]:

> According to the tropological sense, this is brought forth: that God wills both heretics to be saved, and ecclesiastical sinners, and all to be called by their own name.

For if, he says elsewhere [1]:

> He spared the nations, which were unwilling to believe his law, and was unwilling to impute their iniquities to those who are left over and remain from the people, nor did he bring his wrath upon them as a testimony of their just punishment; what will he do concerning

[1] Ezek. XVIII.23.
[2] *Commentary on Ezekiel*, book VI, chap. XVIII, col. 215, works, vol. V.
[3] I Tim. II.4.
[4] Hosea XI.12.
[5] *Commentary on Hosea*, book III, chap. XI, cols. 132–133, works, vol. VI.
[6] Ibid., col. 133.
[1] *Commentary on Micah*, book II, chap. VII, cols. 530–531, works, vol. VI.

> his own flock, which is fed in the midst of Carmel and in Bashan and Gilead? For, willing mercy, he turns back and will have mercy upon us; and he himself will bear our grave sins and the iniquities which sit upon [2] the talent of lead, and will sink them in the sea and will not cause them to appear. He will give truth to Jacob and mercy to Abraham: so that in Christ he may render his truth to the supplanting people, young and always placed in struggle, and may bestow mercy upon the multitude of nations (for Abraham is called the father of many nations), just as he swore to those who became fathers of our faith according to the ancient days: that from the whole multitude of men he should save some in truth, others in mercy.

For no one is deprived of the faculty of attaining salvation except him who deprives himself of it.

Jerome splendidly declares this in his commentary upon these words of Paul [3], "In whom we also have been called by lot, predestined according to the purpose of him who works all things according to the counsel of his will," writing [4]:

> The word "inheritance" and "lot," through which we came into the portion of Christ, shows that we have migrated from one power to another, and that, according to what is written in Deuteronomy [5], "When the Most High divided the nations, when he scattered the sons of Adam," we were transferred from the dominion of the angels to the portion of the Lord. And they indeed held what belonged to another, either entrusted to them or usurped by them. But this one [6] received his own and, ascending on high, led captivity captive; that is, those who had formerly been taken captive unto perdition he himself took captive unto life, that he might lead them back on high. And captivity is, in a manner, captured when those who had formerly been captured are liberated through a second captivity. It must be considered that here also *προορισμός* and *πρόθεσις*, that is, predestination and purpose, are placed together, according to which God works all things according to the counsel of his will. Not that all things which happen in the world are accomplished by the will and counsel of God—for otherwise even evils could be imputed to God—but that all things which he does he does by counsel and will, namely, because they are full both of reason and of the power of the doer. We men will to do many things by counsel, but the effect

[2] Zech. V.
[3] Eph. I.11.
[4] *Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians*, book I, chap. I, cols. 557–558, works, vol. VII.
[5] Deut. XXXII.8.
[6] Ps. LXVII.

> by no means follows the will. But no one can resist him so as to prevent him from doing all things which he has willed. Yet he wills those things whatsoever are full of reason and counsel: he wills all to be saved [1] and to come to the knowledge of the truth. But because no one is saved without his own will (for we are possessed of free choice), he wills us to will the good, so that, when we shall have willed, he too may will to fulfill his own counsel in us.

CXLII.

The salvific will, therefore, is not of one mode but twofold, according to the twofold effect which depends upon it and according to the twofold term, as it were, which it regards. For it is not sound to doubt that there are two effects which depend upon it and two terms to which the same will is referred. For in the first place there depends upon it the institution of the repaired order, with which are connected all the means that are necessary and sufficient for attaining reparation. Then there depends upon it the very bestowal of the reward, in which is contained the last and likewise most excellent fruit of the repaired order. Wherefore the salvific will also has a twofold term proposed to it. One of these corresponds to the former effect and embraces both the institution of the repaired order and the eternal preparation and temporal dispensing of those benefits without which salvation cannot be obtained and with which it most certainly can. But the other term corresponds to the latter effect in such a way that it is completed by the attainment of salvation and the reward of the immortal crown.

Now, as regards the former effect and the former term, the salvific will is a) the principal and adequate cause, and likewise b) the universal cause, from which equally derive their origin both universal reparation and the universal benefits by which the faculty of attaining beatitude is conferred upon the human race.

But as regards the latter effect and the latter term, the salvific will is indeed a) the principal cause, but b) it is equally not the unique and adequate cause. For since c) whatsoever things God wills, he wills them full of reason and counsel, therefore he wills that no one be saved without his own will, and he wills us, with himself going before, to will the good, so that when we shall have willed, he too may will to fulfill his own counsel in us. A will of this kind, therefore, d) is affected by a condition and is so conjoined with the free cooperation of men that it is deprived of its effect unless the subordinate cause harmoniously conspires with the principal and supreme cause. But it comes to pass e) that men, far from following God who goes before, depart very far from him, and not only depart

[1] I Tim. II.4.

but persevere in their most wretched separation as rebels even unto the end. And when they bind themselves by this crime, f) they create death for themselves, and they themselves are the cause why they do not obtain the fruit of the salutary divine counsel.

For as pertains to God, he is sweet and agreeable to all; and if at any time in this present mortality he punishes men, he intends this: that at least by threats and penalties he may save those whom he could not soften and join to himself by benefits. Jerome is a witness and abundant authority for this doctrine in more than one place. He is an authority for it where, on the occasion of the Alexandrian interpretation, he says [1]:

> Moreover, that which the Seventy translated, "provoking me," or [2] "turning into bitterness," signifies this: that God, benign and sweet by nature, is changed into bitterness by our vices. For just as it is said to the saints [3], "Taste and see that the Lord is sweet," so sinners perceive him as bitter.
>
> Hence also the Apostle [1] refers the goodness and severity of God to saints and sinners. And concerning the sinners who were lying fallen, it is written [2]: "The Lord raises those who are cast down; the Lord loves the just; the Lord looses those who are fettered." But to the saints who stand he promises rewards.

He is an authority for the same doctrine where, speaking of God, he writes [3]:

> But in that he says [4], "My eye shall not spare you, and I shall not have mercy," like a most clement physician desiring to cut out putrid flesh and to burn carious wounds with the cautery, he does not spare that he may spare; he does not have mercy that he may have greater mercy, lest anything putrid, which by its proximity would corrupt the living flesh, remain in the body. But the Lord strikes him whom he loves [5], and chastises every son whom he receives. Of this meaning is that saying [6], "I shall strike, and I shall heal." For every medicine has bitterness for a time, but afterward the fruit of the pain is shown in health.

---

[1] *Commentary on Ezekiel*, book I, chap. II, col. 24, works, vol. V.
[2] From the original Hebrew text Jerome translates: "which [apostate nations] departed from me."
[3] Ps. XXXIII.9.
[1] Rom. XI.22.
[2] Ps. CXLV.8.
[3] *Commentary on Ezekiel*, book II, chap. VII, col. 64.
[4] Ezek. VII.4.
[5] Heb. XII.6.
[6] Deut. XXXII.39.

Jerome persists in the same judgment and, expounding the words of the Alexandrian version [7], writes:

> But in that they themselves likewise translated [8], "The rod has flowered," we can use that testimony [9]: "Do not take the rod away from your son." And the Apostle [10]: "What do you will? Shall I come to you with a rod, or in charity and the spirit of meekness?" But God also resounds through the mouth of the psalmist [11]: "I shall visit their iniquities with a rod, and their sins with scourges; but my mercy I shall not take away from them." Therefore the Lord visits and strikes so that all pride which long lay hidden and enclosed may arise and become manifest, and injury may be stirred against pride arisen and germinating, and the strength of the iniquitous man may be broken, not with perturbation nor with haste.
>
> For the end of the flowering rod is health and correction, which comes not by the merit of those who are corrected, nor by a beauty which they do not have in themselves, but by the mercy of the Lord.

CXLIII.

Jerome proceeds to confirm [1] that this is proper to the Lord: that even when he rages he loves, and, for as long as we live, seeks our salvation, where he explains the words of God in Ezekiel [2] thus:

> Do not think that your thoughts by which you blaspheme against me can be fulfilled. For you say: "We are unwilling to be under the Lord or to be called his people; but just as all the nations are in the whole world, and each nation lives by its own choice, so as to worship wood and stones and serve idols, we also shall be one nation among many." To these things God responds and swears by himself and says: "I shall not abandon you or contemn you, as negligent masters are accustomed to contemn fugitive servants; but I shall draw you back under my dominion, and with arm extended and striking

[7] *Commentary on Ezekiel*, book II, chap. VII, col. 68.

[8] For Jerome himself also renders from the Hebrew source, "The rod has flowered."

[9] Prov. XXIII.13.

[10] I Cor. IV.21.

[11] Ps. LXXXVIII.33–34.

[1] *Commentary on Ezekiel*, book VI, chap. XX, col. 235.

[2] These are as follows, Ezek. XX.32–33: "Nor shall the thought of your mind be accomplished, of those saying: We shall be like the nations, and like the kindreds of the earth, so that we may worship wood and stones. As I live, says the Lord God, with a strong hand, and with an extended arm, and with fury poured out, I shall reign over you."

> and with fury poured out I shall bring you back into your former servitude, and I shall reign over you, so that, whether you will or will not, you may have me as king and may perceive an angry king, whose clemency you have neglected."

And this will spares itself in no way and omits no means by which it might tame and conquer the obstinacy of men. For to the words of God which follow [3], Jerome appends this commentary [4]:

> Nor, he says, do I suffer you to be among the nations or to be detained in eternal captivity; but I shall bring you forth from the peoples and gather you from the lands into which hostile necessity dispersed you here and there to serve.
>
> But I shall do these things not that I may destroy and blot you out, but that I may be your king. From this we understand that even what the heretics call the cruelty of the Creator sounds forth clemency: since for this reason he is angry and rages and pours out all his fury, that he may draw back into his own kingdom those who chose to serve the tyranny of demons.

For nothing is truer than that which Jerome testifies concerning God [1]:

> He does not spare that he may spare; he is cruel that he may have mercy; nor does he consider the pain of the sufferer, but the health of the wound, according to that Gospel saying [2], willing rather that one member perish than that the whole body be destroyed.

To this merciful economy must also be attributed this: that after relating the words of Amos [3], "The Lord God will not do a word unless he has revealed his secret, or his correction, to his servants the prophets," Jerome adds [4]:

> Not that God reveals to the prophets all the things which he does in heaven or has already done before, but the things which he is about to do upon earth. He revealed to Noah his servant [5] that he was about to bring in the flood. He revealed to his servants Abraham and Lot [6] that he was about to burn Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboiim. He revealed to Joseph [7] the interpretation of the dream

[3] These read thus, Ezek. XX.34: "And I shall bring you forth from the peoples and gather you from the lands in which you have been dispersed; with a mighty hand and an extended arm, and with fury poured out, I shall reign over you."

[4] Ibid., col. 235.

[1] *Commentary on Ezekiel*, book VII, chap. XXIV, col. 276.

[2] Matt. V.

[3] Amos III.

[4] *Commentary on Amos*, book I, chap. III, cols. 255–256, works, vol. VI.

[5] Gen. VI.

[6] Gen. XVIII.

[7] Gen. XLI.

> of seven years of famine in Egypt, and to the prophet Jonah [8] the overthrow of Nineveh, so that those who heard the punishments to come might either do penance and avoid the torments, or, contemning them, be punished more justly. Thus even now the Lord reveals through Amos, his servant and prophet, what he is about to do to the ten tribes, so that, if they are converted to better things and abandon the idols, they may be freed from the impending danger. And note that the clement and benign God always foretells future things, lest he be compelled to inflict punishments. And what the heretics calumniate in the Creator as though he were severe and fierce, cruel and only a judge—
>
> —because there is no evil in a city which he does not do—this we refer to the greatness of mercy, because he does not inflict penalties unless he has first foretold them. But he who foretells does not will to punish sinners.

CXLIV.

Does God, then, not will to punish sinners? Yet he punishes them in very fact, and assuredly he punishes willingly, not unwillingly. In what manner, therefore, is he said not to will to punish sinners? Namely, because a) he does not exercise his rigor before, through the greatness of mercy and by setting threats before them, he has striven that sinners should not collide with the severity of justice; because b) even when he obeys severity and punishes sinners in the present life, by the penalties inflicted he seeks salvation rather than vengeance; and because c) he is not angry with them from himself and of his own accord, but as though compelled by the atrocity of their sins. For he is angry with them and takes punitive notice by that will which is stirred by an extrinsic cause and which for this reason is called the second and consequent will.

Indeed, by the first will, which derives its origin from intrinsic goodness, God is angry with no one and loves all; and by this will, as Jerome writes [1]:

> The Creator of all has care not only of Judah and Israel, but of all the nations; and according to the Apostle [2], those who have sinned without the law perish without the law, and those who committed offenses under the law are judged by the law of the Lord.

For the Lord [3]:

---

[8] Jonah III.

[1] *Commentary on Amos*, book I, chap. II, col. 240, works, vol. VI.

[2] Rom. II.

[3] *Commentary on Zechariah*, book II, chap. IX, col. 857, works, vol. VI.

> Regards all men equally, and all the tribes of Israel. . . . Because the Lord, without any acceptance of persons, regards both the faith of the nations and the faithlessness of the Circumcision, and is equally the God of all: placing the grave weight of his sentence upon some and resting in the seat of others.

Jerome teaches this much more illustriously when, having set before himself this inquiry [4], "It is therefore asked how God has made known to us in all wisdom and prudence [1] the mystery of his will," he responds with these words [2] in their entirety:

> And indeed this must first be understood simply: that the mystery of his will is our redemption through the blood of his Son and the remission of sins according to the riches of his grace, in which [3] he abounded toward us.

Altogether eminent are the things which Chromatius has concerning this mystery of the divine will in his commentary upon the Lord's Prayer [4], writing:

> Next he says, "Thy will be done, as in heaven and on earth." Here also the rationale of understanding is the same. For there is no one who can resist and contradict God, so that he should not do what he wills, since by his will all things subsist both in heaven and on earth; but we pray that his will may be done in us. And the will of God is that, believing in him with the whole heart, we should fulfill these things which he commands to be done. Concerning this will of God the Apostle testifies [5], saying: "The will of God is your sanctification, that you abstain from carnal concupiscences." Concerning this also the Lord spoke in the Gospel [6], saying: "But this is the will of my Father who sent me, that everyone who sees the Son and believes in him may have eternal life." When, therefore, we say, "Thy will be done [7], as in heaven and on earth," we pray this: that just as his will is faithfully kept by the angels in heaven, so too by us the aid of his favor may be entreated with religious and faithful devotion.

To the same mystery of the divine will must be attributed "that," as Paulinus of Milan testifies [8], "God the Father awaited the nations unto repentance for so

---

[4] *Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians*, book I, chap. I, col. 554.

[1] These are Paul's words, Eph. I.9.

[2] Ibid., col. 555.

[3] Another reading: "which."

[4] Tractate XIII, n. IV, p. 348, in Gallandius, vol. VIII.

[5] I Thess. IV.3.

[6] John VI.40.

[7] Matt. VI.10.

[8] *On the Blessings of the Patriarchs*, chap. II, n. 5, p. 36, in Gallandius, vol. IX.

long, that through the advent of his Son he might recall them from the worship of idolatry to knowledge of himself." Nor is it lawful to refer to any other source the innumerable benefits, as much natural as supernatural, by which God has at no time failed to enrich the human family and which Zeno of Verona—an eminent doctor of the fourth century, distinguished by the praises of Ambrose [1], Gregory [2], the Anonymous Writer of Pepin [3], and Ratherius [4]—embraced in these words [5]:

> Now, therefore, let us see whence true charity comes, where it subsists, and to whom it is owed above all. Certainly to him who made man; who delivered to him his own likeness as the gift of perpetual charity; who gave him the globe of the earth; who subjected to his power all the elements of the world together with their living creatures; who commanded the years, seasons, months, nights, days, and the two most brilliant chariots of the royal orbs always to serve him, as a gift, by the delight of their alternation; who, when he had been killed by the evilly sweet poisons of the aforesaid love and submerged in the infernal seat, gave him life through the mystery [6] of his majesty and enriched him besides with participation in the heavenly kingdom. O charity, how pious and how opulent! O how powerful! He who does not have you has nothing. You were able to change God into man [7]. You caused him, made small, to journey for a little while away from the immensity of his majesty. You bound him for nine months in the virginal prison. You restored Eve in Mary. You renewed Adam in Christ. You provided the sacred cross unto salvation for a world already lost. You emptied death by teaching God to die. It is yours that, when the Son of almighty God is killed by men, neither of the two is angry. . . . You—
>
> —make men diverse in morals, ages, and dominion, from one nature, into one spirit, one body. You permit glorious martyrs to be sepa-

[1] Epistle V to Syagrius, bishop of Verona, n. 1.

[2] *Dialogues*, book III, chap. X.

[3] In the rhythm *On the Praises of Verona*.

[4] *On Contempt for the Canons*, part I, p. 952, vol. I of Acherius's *Spicilegium*, and in the *Synodical Letter to the Presbyters*, p. 377.

[5] Book I, tractate II, § IX, pp. 24–25, Verona edition, 1739.

[6] Just as it is all one to the Fathers to say either *sacrament* or *mystery*, so it is customary for them to signify the Incarnation of the Only-begotten by the name both of sacrament and of mystery. In this matter they had Paul going before them, I Tim. III.16.

[7] Although these things seem Eutychian in outward appearance, they are nevertheless orthodox in Zeno, who willed nothing else to be signified there than that the Son of God was truly made man. For it was enough for him, as we understand from book II, tractate VIII, n. 2, and tractate IX, n. 2, that "the Only-begotten Son of God, preserving what he was, meditated becoming what he was not."

> rated from the confession of the Christian name by no torments, no novelty of death, no rewards, no friendships, no affections—things surely worse, through the biting force of piety, than every torturer. You are content to be naked so that you may clothe the naked. To you hunger is fattening. If the needy and hungry man has eaten your bread, it is your wealth to possess as wholly for mercy whatever you possess. You alone do not know how to be asked. You immediately rescue the oppressed who are placed in any distress, even with loss to yourself. You are the eye of the blind. You are the foot of the lame. You are the most faithful shield of widows. You are a better parent of orphans than both parents together. Either mercy or joy never permits your eyes to be dry. You so love your enemies that no one can discern what difference there is between them and those dear to you. You, I say, join heavenly mysteries to human things, and human mysteries to heavenly things. You guard divine things. You command in the Father [1]. You obey yourself in the Son [2]. You exult in the Holy Spirit. Although you are one in three, you are divided in no way and are moved by no calumny of human curiosity. From the paternal fountain you are poured forth entire in the Son [3], and you do not depart. Rightly are you called God, because you alone turn the power of the Trinity [4].

CXLV.

By this most abundant and forceful discourse of Zeno we are taught: 1) that the benevolent will of God, which he calls charity, is as opulent as it is powerful. And indeed 2) that it is opulent, since a) the benefits which flow from it are innumerable, and pertain to both the natural and the supernatural order; and since

[1] The Catholic sense in which the Father is said to command and the Son to obey is found in Zeno, book III, tractates I–VI.

[2] The Father is said to obey himself commanding in the Son insofar as, according to John XIV.10, the things which the Son does, the Father also works.

[3] I would more gladly read "into the Son," when the things contained in book II, tractate XVI are compared.

[4] "This passage," write the Ballerini brothers, "appears corrupt and obscure. That God indeed is named from power actually operative is clear from several opinions of the Fathers, which you may see in Denis Petau, vol. I, *On Theological Dogmas*, book VIII, chap. VIII. But why charity is called God by reason of the power which charity alone turns, one cannot plainly understand unless one explains it thus: namely, that charity alone, by which God loves himself and us, brought it about that he, intending to communicate himself outwardly, exercised power in the creation of the world, so that, namely, there might be those in whom the divine perfections would shine forth and whom he might make participants in his goodness."

b) there is no man whom God does not enrich with his benefits and, having enriched him, promote toward salvation. Then 3) that it is powerful, because it was able to change God into man; because it caused God, made small, to journey for a little while away from the immensity of his majesty; because it bound him for nine months in the virginal prison; because it restored Eve in Mary; because it renewed Adam in Christ; and because it provided the sacred cross unto salvation for a world already lost. Since 4) both the opulence and the power of divine charity are so great, we are taught besides that all of us who are men are situated within that state which must be called and believed to be the state and *οἰκονομία* both of reparation and of hope.

And it was assuredly necessary that, first of all, the hope of future things be set before us, without which we perceive that not even present things themselves can stand. For, Zeno adds [1]:

> Take away hope: the whole of humanity grows torpid. Take away hope: all arts and virtues will cease. Take away hope: all things have been destroyed. Why does the boy go to the man of letters if he does not hope for the fruit of letters? Why does the sailor commit his vessel to the deep gulf if neither profit nor the desired port ever meets him? Why does the soldier contemn—not to say the injuries of horrid winter or torrid summer—but his own self, if he does not bear the hope of future glory? Why does the farmer scatter seeds if he does not gather the harvest, the reward of his sweat? Why does the Christian believe in Christ if he does not believe that the time of perpetual felicity promised to him by Christ will come?

Therefore, lest the rationales of human life be utterly overthrown and humanity itself grow torpid, God gave to all the hope of everlasting beatitude and declared his benevolent and merciful will toward all.

On this matter Hippolytus offers an eminent testimony: a doctor of the Church [1], *γλυκύτατος καὶ εὐνούστατος*, "most sweet and most benign"; a disciple of Irenaeus [2]; nearly *γνώριμος τῶν ἀποστόλων*, "a familiar of the Apostles" [3]; adorned with the most noble encomia by Anatolius of Laodicea [4], Eusebius of Caesarea

[1] Book I, tractate II, § I, p. 16.

[1] The Anonymous Writer in the *Sermon on the Pseudoprophets*, in the appendix to vol. VIII of Chrysostom's works, p. 79, Montfaucon edition.

[2] Photius, *Bibliotheca*, codex CXXI.

[3] Palladius, *Lausiac History*, chap. CXLVIII.

[4] Preface to the *Paschal Canon*, in Giles Bucher, *On the Doctrine of Times*, p. 439.

[5], Jerome [6], Andrew of Caesarea [7], Cyril of Scythopolis [8], Leontius of Byzantium [9], Isidore of Seville [10], Germanus of Constantinople [11], John Damascene [12], Photius [13], and George Syncellus [14]; and likewise no mean ornament of the churches of Italy [15]. For, when the controversy has been proposed, *πῶς ἂν* [16] *πάλαι τοῖς μακαρίοις προφήταις ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος, αὐτὸς πάλιν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ παῖς, ὁ πάλαι μὲν Λόγος, τυχεῖν ἐπιζητεῖς;*—"In what manner, you ask to know, did the Word of God manifest himself of old to the blessed prophets, he himself again the servant of God [1] who of old was the Word?"—he immediately resolves it in these words [2]:

> For because the Word displayed through all the saints *τὸ ἑαυτοῦ εὔσπλαγχνον καὶ ἀπροσωπόληπτον*, his own mercy and the fact that he is in no way an acceptor of persons, illuminating them and dispos-

[5] *Ecclesiastical History*, book VI, chaps. XX–XXII.

[6] *On Illustrious Men*, chap. LXI.

[7] *On the Apocalypse*, XIII.1 and XVII.10.

[8] In the *Life of Saint Euthymius the Abbot*, in the Greek *Analecta* published by the labor of the Maurists, p. 82.

[9] Lecture III, *On the Sects*, p. 430.

[10] *Origins*, book VI, chap. XVI.

[11] *In Mystical Contemplation*, vol. II of Ducas's *Auctarium*, p. 148.

[12] *Sacred Parallels*, vol. II, p. 781, Lequien edition.

[13] *Bibliotheca*, codex CXXI.

[14] *Chronography*, at the year 215, p. 358.

[15] Stephen le Moyne, in the prolegomena to *Varia Sacra*, chaps. XXIX–XXX; Tillemont, on the life of Hippolytus, vol. III, note 2, p. 673; Theodoric Ruinart, admonition in the *Martyrdom of Saint Hippolytus*; Albert Fabricius, in the preface to the works of Hippolytus, p. XI; the Bollandists, in *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. IV, August, pp. 507 ff.; the Maurist authors of the *Literary History of France*, vol. I, part I, pp. 364 ff.; and Gallandius, in the prolegomena to vol. II, p. XLIV, diligently investigate to which church in particular Hippolytus ought to be assigned.

[16] Combefis warns that it seemed to Gudius that *ἦ* ought to be read. "But it does not appear so. He asks how, before the Incarnation, the Word of God made revelation, who himself through it was made God's *παῖς*, that is, servant and child. Isa. XLII.1: 'Behold my servant, I shall uphold him'; which passage the Lord himself expounds concerning himself—"

> "—Matt. XII.18: 'Behold my child, whom I have chosen.' And although *υἱός*, Son, exists from eternity and is so called, nevertheless not *παῖς*, because that word (although it is sometimes rendered *Son*) appears less suitable to be drawn to that eternal generation itself, in which there is no passion but perfect equality; since from common use, whether it is taken for *son* or for *servant*, it imports something of imperfection and, so to speak, inferiority." Thus far Combefis. I am moved not to subscribe to him because I think that the words *αὐτὸς πάλιν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ παῖς, ὁ πάλαι μὲν Λόγος* are most fittingly rendered: "he himself again the Son of God, who formerly was the Word." Compare Maran's work entitled *The Divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ*, book IV, chap. XIII.

[1] Isa. XLII.1; compare Matt. XII.18.

[2] *Demonstration concerning Christ and Antichrist*, § III, pp. 418–419, in Gallandius, vol. II.

> ing them *ὡς ἔμπειρος ἰατρὸς πρὸς τὰ ἡμῖν συμφέροντα, ἐπιστάμενος τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀσθένειαν*, like a skilled physician unto those things which are advantageous to us, since he knows the infirmity of men. And indeed he endeavors to teach the ignorant, but converts those who wander to his own true way. And by those indeed who seek in faith he is easily found; but to those who desire to knock at the door with clean eyes and a chaste heart he immediately opens. For he rejects none of his servants as though unworthy of the divine mysteries. He does not esteem the rich man more than the poor, nor does he spurn the poor man on account of his want. He does not reproach the barbarian, nor does he banish the eunuch as though not a man. He does not hate the woman on account of the disobedience of the first origin, nor does he defile the man on account of the guilt of transgression; *ἀλλὰ πάντας θέλων καὶ πάντας σώζειν ἐπιθυμῶν*, but he wills all and desires to save all. He wills to make all sons of God, and calls all the saints unto one perfect man. For there is also one Son of God, by whose gift we too, having obtained regeneration through the Holy Spirit, desire that all may come together unto one perfect and heavenly man [3].

CXLVI.

Since, therefore, there are principally two things by which the state of afflicted and lost nature discloses itself: first, ignorance, by which we either know not at all, or only dimly divine, that which is true, that which is just, and that which becomes us; and then infirmity, by which we are both inclined toward that which is unbecoming and without strength for that which is holy; a remedy could not be made for either disease without the human race itself appearing restored and repaired. But Hippolytus testifies in words which utterly remove every doubt that a remedy has been divinely made for either disease.

For nothing is more evident than these things: that God has both given and continues to give his labor so that he may teach *ἀγνοοῦντας*, the ignorant; may lead *πλανωμένους*, those wandering, back into the way; and, after the manner of a skilled physician, may strengthen and confirm *ἀσθένειαν*, sickness and weakness. Hippolytus is therefore witness that the destruction brought in by the original transgression was repaired by the benignity and mercy of the Creator.

But by what kind of reparation? By one altogether universal, whether one considers the rationale of time or regards the number of those to whom the repa-

[3] Eph. IV.13.

ration pertains. For a) the divine Word, most alien from acceptance of persons, displayed *τὸ ἑαυτοῦ εὔσπλαγχνον*, his own mercy, at every time and never omitted the offices of a most skilled physician conscious of human infirmity. But b) he never omitted them in such a way that he was always present to all as *Λόγος φωτίζων καὶ ῥυθμίζων πρὸς τὰ ἡμῖν συμφέροντα*, the Word illuminating and disposing unto those things which are advantageous to us. He was present to our first parents and therefore neglected neither the woman *διὰ τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς γενομένην παρακοήν*, on account of the original disobedience, nor the man *διὰ τὴν παράβασιν*, on account of the transgression. He was present to the whole of posterity, *πάντας θέλων καὶ πάντας σώζειν ἐπιθυμῶν*, willing all and desiring to save all.

Insisting upon these things, Hippolytus adds [1]:

> For the Word of God, when he was without flesh, put on holy flesh from the holy Virgin, like a bridegroom weaving it for himself as a garment upon the gibbet of the cross, *ὅπως συγκεράσας τὸ θνητὸν ἡμῶν σῶμα τῇ ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμει, καὶ μίξας τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ τὸ φθαρτὸν καὶ τὸ ἀσθενὲς τῷ ἰσχυρῷ, σώσῃ τὸν ἀπολλύμενον ἄνθρωπον*, so that, namely, by mingling our mortal body with his own power [1], and that which is subject to corruption with that which is immune from all corruption, and that which is infirm with that which is strong, he might bestow salvation upon man who had perished.

Hence you have three things set forth most clearly: first, the counsel by which the Word, himself *ἄσαρκος*, without flesh, assumed holy flesh from the holy Virgin; then the amplitude and extension of the reparation; and finally the mode in which the reparation itself was accomplished.

You have a) the counsel for assuming flesh tending to this end: that provision might be made for the salvation of men and that the glory of God, as Hippolytus adds [2], might be disclosed most splendidly.

You have b) the amplitude of the reparation, and it expressed in these words: *ὅπως σώσῃ τὸν ἀπολλύμενον ἄνθρωπον*, "that he might save man who had been lost." Nothing is more universal than these words, and nothing more suitable for proving that the whole human race was raised up and repaired.

Finally, you have c) the mode of the accomplished reparation, situated in this: that the Word most closely joined *τὸ θνητὸν ἡμῶν σῶμα τῇ ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμει, τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ τὸ φθαρτὸν καὶ τὸ ἀσθενὲς τῷ ἰσχυρῷ*, our mortal body to his own power, the corruptible to the incorruptible, and the infirm to the powerful. For

[1] *Demonstration concerning Christ and Antichrist*, § IV, p. 419.

[1] By words which at first sight signify commingling, Hippolytus teaches not a confusion of the natures themselves, but a most close union. Compare Thomassin, *On the Incarnation of the Word*, book III, chap. V.

[2] Ibid., § V, p. 419.

just as through separation from God it came about that all humanity through the first parents was subjected to mortality, fell into corruption, and succumbed to infirmity; so, in turn, through the marvelous artifice of wisdom and goodness, it came about that through the more intimate union of humanity with God through Christ, mortality was overcome, corruption was put to flight, and infirmity was conquered in the fullest triumph.

CXLVII.

Moreover, if not the very mode and rationale itself, Hippolytus certainly teaches once again the amplitude of reparation when, after setting down these things concerning the Precursor [1]: "He first evangelized even those who were in hell; taken away by the sword of Herod, he was made a precursor there also—namely, that there too he might announce that the descent of the Savior was to be awaited, who would free the souls of the saints from the hand of death," he thus adds [2]:

> *Ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ ἀναστάσεως πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἦν ὁ σωτήρ, ἔδει τὸν κύριον μόνον ἀνίστασθαι ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, δι' οὗ ἡ κρίσις παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ εἰσελεύσεται· ἵνα οἱ ἀξίως ἀγωνισάμενοι, ἀξίως καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ στεφανωθῶσιν· ὑπὸ τοῦ καλοῦ ἀγωνοθέτου, πρώτου τὸ στάδιον διηνυκότος· τοῦ ἀναληφθέντος εἰς οὐρανούς, καὶ ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς καθεσθέντος, καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ κόσμου κριτοῦ* [3] *πεφανερωθησομένου.* But because the Savior was to be the author and principle of the resurrection of all men, it was fitting that the Lord alone should be raised from the dead, through whom judgment would enter into the whole world; so that those who had worthily discharged the contest might worthily be crowned by him also—namely, by the illustrious establisher of the contest, who first completed the course; who, received into heaven, sits at the right hand of God and the Father and is again to be manifested as judge at the consummation of the world.

[1] *Demonstration concerning Christ and Antichrist*, § XLV, p. 432. Moreover, Allatius shows at length and diligently, in his work *On the Ecclesiastical Books of the Greeks*, pp. 303 ff., that this opinion—that the Precursor went to the infernal seats in order to announce the advent of the Savior to the just—was held not by Hippolytus alone, but also by other ecclesiastical writers.

[2] Ibid., § XLVI, p. 432.

[3] Gudius edited *πεφανερωμένου*, but Combefis preferred *πεφανερωθησομένου*.

With these things those agree splendidly which Hippolytus writes elsewhere concerning the rationale and end of the divine incarnation [4], where he writes [1]:

> For divinity was not made flesh through a change of nature—*ἡ σὰρξ γενομένη τῇ φύσει θεότητος σὰρξ*, namely, flesh made according to the nature of divinity—but, although joined to divinity, it remained what it was, that is, flesh infirm and passible by nature and operation, just as [2] the Savior says: "The spirit [3] indeed is prompt, but the flesh infirm." In it, working and suffering without sin the things which belonged to the flesh, he indicated for us the emptying of divinity [4], naturally confirmed by miracles and the sufferings of the flesh. *Διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος ὁ τῶν ὅλων Θεός, ἵνα σαρκὶ μὲν παθητῇ πάσχων, ἅπαν ἡμῶν τὸ τῷ θανάτῳ πραθὲν λυτρώσηται γένος· ἀπαθεῖ δὲ θεότητι διὰ σαρκὸς θαυματουργῶν, πρὸς τὴν ἀκήρατον αὐτοῦ καὶ μακαρίαν ἐπαναγάγῃ ζωήν· ἧς ἀπέπεσεν τῷ διαβόλῳ πειθόμενος.* For this reason the God of all was made man, so that, suffering indeed in passible flesh, he might redeem our whole race which had been sold to death; but, working wonders through the flesh by impassible divinity, he might lead it back to that immortal and blessed life from which it had fallen by obeying the devil. And through the mystery of his incorporation he would establish the holy orders of the heavenly intellectual substances [5] *πρὸς ἀτρεψίαν*, unto inconvertibility. The work of this mystery is the recapitulation of all in him. Therefore even when incarnate, he remained according to nature the super-immense God, having an operation cognate and suitable to himself: born substantially from divinity, but manifested dispensationally through the most holy flesh, *ἵνα πιστευθῇ Θεὸς εἶναι, δι' ἀσθενοῦς φύσει σαρκὸς αὐτουργῶν τὴν τοῦ παντὸς σωτηρίαν*, that he might be believed to be God, working by himself through flesh infirm by nature the salvation of the universe.

To what, therefore, did the Only-begotten direct the work of *σωμάτωσις*, incorporation? Namely, to this: that a) through it he himself might be *εἰς αὐτὸν ἀνακεφαλαίωσις*, the recapitulation of all in him;

---

[4] How frequently Hippolytus and the Fathers who followed him say *οἰκονομίαν* in order to express *Λόγου ἐνανθρώπησιν*. See Casaubon on the epistle of Gregory of Nyssa, pp. 105 ff., and Pfeifer and Veiel in their separate commentaries *On the Economy*.

[1] *On Theology and the Incarnation against Bero and Helico*, § II, pp. 466–467.

[2] Matt. XXVI.41.

[3] I judge that *τὸ πνεῦμα*, according to the manner of speaking received among the Fathers, has the same force as *τὸ νοητὸν* in Christ, and as his *τὸ θεῖον καὶ τὴν θείαν φύσιν*; but *τὴν σάρκα* has the same force as *τὸ ὁρώμενον*.

[4] The Greek has *ἐπιστώσατο*: "proved," "persuaded."

[5] I would believe that Hippolytus had regard to the words of Paul, Eph. I.10.

that b) he might accomplish by himself *τὴν τοῦ παντὸς σωτηρίαν*, the salvation of the universe; that c) *ἅπαν ἡμῶν τὸ τῷ θανάτῳ πραθὲν λυτρώσηται γένος*, he might redeem our whole race which had been sold to death; that d) he might call it back from the death into which it had fallen by obeying the devil, *πρὸς τὴν ἀκήρατον καὶ μακαρίαν ἐπαναγάγῃ ζωήν*, unto immortal and blessed life; and finally, that e) he might be believed and be *πάντων ἀνθρώπων ὁ σωτήρ*, the Savior of all men. But either these things suffice to prove universal reparation, or else no formulas and judgments could be desired even in one's expressed wishes which would persuade and demonstrate it.

CXLVIII.

Unless perhaps these things appear more splendid to someone, which Zeno of Verona subjoined after describing the ruin of the human race [1], saying [2]:

> When these things had thus continued for a long time, that most skillful artificer of things, the Son of God, whose wisdom has no end and whose strength has no measure, descended from heaven through love of his own image. He illumines the lodging of the virginal womb, and there encloses God in man [3]. He makes use both of mortal appearance and mortal condition [4]. He teaches that justice procures immortality; by deeds he consummates the precepts. Finally, he underwent death so that, when it had been conquered, by rising again he might through man—the man whom he bore—both bring to man the hope of conquering death and admit him to the rewards of immortality. Thus it came about that, just as through the condemnation of one condemnation extended to all men, so through the justification of one the justification of eternal life might extend to all men [5]. Do you now see clearly that there was providence in the assumption of man, a mystery in the Passion, and the highest good in the Resurrection?

[1] Book I, tractate XII, § II, pp. 86–88.

[2] Ibid., § III, p. 88.

[3] Speaking in book II, tractate IX, § I, concerning the divine nature of the Only-begotten, Zeno teaches that it is such "as the world and the magnitude of the world do not contain." What, therefore, do those things which we read here, "he encloses God in man," mean? They mean this alone: that the Son of God was truly made man, which is declared most splendidly in book II, tractate VIII, § II, in these words: "At the appointed time the Son of God, meanwhile dissembling his majesty, departed from the ethereal seat and pitches camp for himself in the temple of the predestined Virgin. Secretly infused into that camp, he is about to be born as man, and there, preserving what he was, meditates becoming what he was not."

[4] Lactantius had written things most similar to these, book VI, chap. X, n. 1.

[5] Rom. V.18.

Certainly we see 1) that there was providence in the assumption of man, and we have its very fountain and the noble origin of this providence among things known and ascertained. For the love with which the Only-begotten pursued his own image brought it about that he himself descended from heaven, illumined the lodging of the virginal womb, and completed the human *οἰκονομία* even unto the cross. But he completed it by that order of providence in such a way that, after the manner of a most skillful artificer, he did not cast away his work, but wisely repaired it after it had fallen and forcefully vindicated it into liberty after it had been sold and taken captive.

We see 2) the mystery of the Passion and death tending to this: that the triumph over death to be borne away by all might be foreshadowed in the head, that hope of it might be given to all, and that all might promise themselves the reward of immortality.

Finally, we see 3) the highest good in the Resurrection, in which is contained the fullest sealing of universal reparation. To Zeno is added Jerome, a witness greater than every exception to this universal reparation through Christ. After he has brought forward the words of Scripture [1], "Behold the Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world," and appended this commentary to them [2], "But the blood itself is precious in which we are redeemed in the Passion of the Lord and Savior, whose flesh we eat and whose blood we drink," with only a few things interposed he proceeds [3]:

> For he assumed a human body and through sin destroyed sin, who grieves for us and bears our infirmities; then, "for his house," which is written in the Seventy but is not contained in the Hebrew: that is, for the Church and for all the people of the earth, namely, for the whole human race. For he is the Savior of all men, especially of the faithful, and he himself is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the whole world.

CXLIX.

Therefore no one perished through the fault of the first parents who was not restored by the economy of the Only-begotten. Paulinus, bishop of Nola, fittingly sings concerning him [1]:

> When it was granted, upon seeing this divine person, To have seen the Father also—he who bore our contagions, And suffered the

[1] John I.29.

[2] *Commentary on Ezekiel*, book XIV, chap. XLVI, col. 571, works, vol. V.

[3] Ibid., cols. 571–572.

[1] Poem V, vv. 20–25, col. 331.

> mockeries of dire death, Taught that the way of eternal life could be traversed again; Nor only that the soul could return, but that with the whole body It could enter the heavenly regions and leave behind The empty mystery of the sepulcher, covered over with vacant earth.

And no less fittingly elsewhere [2], when he writes:

> It is more just to mourn those shadows of men Which we, degenerate souls, make for ourselves, Forgetful of the first origins of the heavenly image, Which the Father, having mercy, recalls to his own kingdoms. Through love of it the Son assumed my members, Conceived by a Virgin, born man of a Virgin, Bearing man in all things [3], and the Lord of all Assuming all servants in one body. For he was made the form of a servant, who lived as the Most High, Reigning in the form of God, God with the King and Father. He assumed the form of a servant and destroyed the guilt By which man was formerly a servant of penalty and death. And unto liberty the Lord restored the servant, Having become our flesh under the image of a servant.
>
> So that through Christ the heavenly image may return to me, Who upon the cross stripped the earthly Adam. My Creator, therefore, bore my flesh and my death, And by death redeemed the work dear to him.

By this most excellent work of redemption, as the same man says [1], the house of the devil fell and the kingdom of death was dissolved:

> Although Christ, the Word of God, always lived—as he does live—and before his carnal advent lived in the majesty of his nature with God the Father, nevertheless [2], throughout the ages disposed into their order from Adam even unto Moses, the power of death had reigned with license raging; and when through the law sin had been understood but not avoided [3], it had grown. The King of kings and dispenser of times, the Son of God, divided and destroyed this kingdom by his Passion, being made [4] under the law that he might loose those subjected to the law; being made through a woman, but a woman in sex and a virgin in childbirth, that the Creator of ei-

[2] Poem XXXIV, vv. 47–65, col. 667.

[3] *Cuncta*, that is, *per cuncta*, by a not infrequent Graecism, as Barthius illustrates at greater length, *Adversaria Commentaria*, book XIII, chap. XIV.

[1] Epistle XXIII to Severus, n. 14, cols. 126–127.

[2] Rom. V.14.

[3] Rom. VII.8.

[4] Gal. IV.4.

> ther sex might sanctify either sex by assuming man and being born through woman. Thus by dying he destroyed death itself, dissolving, as it is written [5], the enmities in his flesh and making both one, that is, man and God, whom God and man Christ Jesus joined together in himself. In him the substance of either nature laid aside discord [6] and acknowledged the eternal covenant of unifying grace. The brother in the Levite and the brother in the priest had passed by us, despoiled by the robbery of the devil and wounded on the way; the law had redeemed them neither by sacrifices nor by prophets. But that Samaritan did not pass by [7], who for our sake underwent the insult even of this name. He did not pass by, because he was not a hireling [8], but the true and good shepherd, who had come to lay down his life for the sheep. He—
>
> —had mercy upon the wounded man who had been passed by and not cared for by those who went before, approached him, and took him upon his own beast, that is, the Incarnation of the Word; and with the oil of grace and the wine of his Passion [1], having entrusted him to the innkeeper—that perfect teacher of the nations [2]—healed him by the wage of the denarius in the two Testaments, being about to render to him both abundant graces and innumerable crowns of blessed virginity from the innumerable fruits of this good, because, adding this counsel to the precept, he spent beyond what was required from his own.

By these things the fountain of reparation is opened, its mode is declared, its amplitude is shown, and its manifold fecundity is proved. a) The fountain of reparation is opened, and it is twofold: the love of the Creator for his own work and his mercy, by which he did not suffer it, depraved and corrupted, utterly to perish. b) The mode of reparation is shown as situated in this: that the evil and crime of original separation should be repaired by a new and far more intimate conjunction of humanity with God. c) Its amplitude is declared, which embraces either sex, the world, and the divine work infected by the poison of the devil. Finally, d) the manifold fecundity of reparation is explained, from which must be sought the restoration of former liberty, the renewal of the divine likeness, and full triumph over sin and death.

---

[5] Eph. II.14.

[6] That is, laid aside.

[7] Luke X.31–32.

[8] John VIII.48 and X.12–18.

[1] Luke X.34.

[2] This is Paul, as is evident from this epistle itself, n. 24; from epistle XXX, n. 5; and from poem XXII, vv. 178–353.

CL.

Paulinus repeats all these things and illustrates them more abundantly [3] when, upon the words [4], "He made us, and not we ourselves," he writes:

> He, I say, the Lord, made us, who also remade us from the beginning through all the things which he worked and spoke in his saints, preparing the mysteries of our salvation, that is, of human reparation. For the holy generation in Seth immediately restored just Abel [5], who reproduced his father, formed according to the image of God, with a similar countenance.
>
> From there [1], running down through the others from the first fountain, the vein of justice flowed continually; and although the flood intervened [2], the seed-stock of the destroyed whole stood in one man indeed, yet a just one, the mystery of the one Redeemer already then operating, so that reconciliation might come through one because the offense had come through many. But when justice fell away again as the human race advanced, and nations and crimes increased together, lest the iniquity of the human race should again merit destruction, one was again chosen [3] who would be called the father of faith, from whom both the promise of the kingdom and the seed of the eternal King would emerge. Christ fulfilled this, multiplied by the faith of the nations: he who was seen by the patriarchs, prefigured through the law, foretold through the prophets, and himself came to fulfill the law and the prophets, and so that grace might give the medicine which the law had been unable to confer through works.

In this discourse of Paulinus two things are plainly contained: first, that the work of reparation began together with the fall of the human race; and then, that this most noble work attained its summit and height by certain steps, as it were. Paulinus proceeds to explain when it attained that height and in what manner, adding [4]:

> Now sin had so pervaded the whole body, that is, the whole race of men, that neither a poultice nor a bandage [5] profited the weak

[3] Epistle XII to Amandus, n. 2, col. 59.
[4] Ps. XCIX.3.
[5] Gen. IV.25.
[1] Gen. VI.8; VII.1.
[2] II Pet. II.5.
[3] Gen. XV.13; compare Rom. IV.11; Gal. III.7; James II.21; Matt. V.17; and John I.17.
[4] Epistle XII to Amandus, n. 3, col. 59.
[5] Wis. XVI.12.

and wounded; for, when the ill health of the vices had been strengthened, the disease, stronger than the remedies, had excluded every medicine of human assistance. And therefore he came who both is and is to come, conformed to the body of our humility [6], that he might conform us to the body of his glory. Because no one except the artificer has power over his own work, and only the potter has right over his own clay [7], the Lord of all, who had made all, thus deigned to descend to our things and to assume us in his own body——that he might remake by the same art or [1] power by which he had made. But he came not in the sublimity of the Lord, which he was, but in the form of a servant [2], which he was not. He was made as a man without help [3], who is the power of God and the Lord of hosts, the helper and protector of all. He died for those to be freed [4], who was free among the dead. He was reckoned among the iniquitous, who justifies the impious through faith. Like a sheep he was led to slaughter, that Lamb who takes away the sins of the world. He suffered death, who gives eternity.

To this counsel and office [5] it must be attributed:

That we were found by the same paths by which we had perished: again from a tree, again from a Virgin; but not again to be cast down by pride, but, on the contrary, to return by humility. For this reason [6] the King of glory and Lord of majesty emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, and covered his invisible greatness with visible abasement, that he might raise us—outwardly exalted but inwardly crushed by that ancient disease of pride ill-conceived—into the form of his sublimity through the formula of our humility in himself. For the good Lord worked and daily works this: that we may attain the glory of divine conformity if we follow the exemplar of our conformity in Christ, recognizing in the governance of the Most High the tempered measure of our nature, so that we may be advanced beyond ourselves by his grace if we walk according to ourselves, mindful of ourselves.

[6] Apoc. I.4; Phil. III.21.
[7] Wis. XV.7; Ecclus. XXXIII.13; Jer. XVIII.6; Rom. IX.21.
[1] The particle *or* is employed in place of *and*.
[2] Phil. II.7.
[3] Ps. LXXXVII.5.
[4] Isa. LIII.7–12; I Pet. II.24; and John I.29.
[5] Ibid., n. 4, cols. 59–60.
[6] Phil. II.7.

For thus [7]:

> Through Christ we have been bound and grafted into God, so that in our earth we may hold the Holy Spirit, whom he gave us, as God's pledge [8], and in God we may have the flesh of Christ as a pledge of ourselves; because Christ continues that immense interval by which mortal things are separated from divine things by his mediation, common to either side, like a certain bridge, so to speak—
> —so that by its path earthly things may be joined to heavenly things, when [1] incorruption shall have poured over this corruptible thing of ours and immortality, as it is written, shall have swallowed our mortal thing, and victorious life in Christ and from Christ shall have swallowed death conquered for us. That we may attain this, we can doubt not the truth of so great a good, but our capacity for merit. But let us do the things which Christ commanded, that we may attain the things which Christ promised. His truth is present to us; let our faith not be absent from him. He is life to all, way to all, gate to all [2]. He closes his kingdoms to no one, for he even permits violence to be brought upon them.

CLI.

Therefore those altogether overturn and utterly undermine the rationale of the divine counsel and the divine *οἰκονομία* in Christ and through Christ who a) teach that there was some time when God neglected the care of the human race and did not provide with paternal piety for the wounds inflicted upon it. For the Lord, who made us, remade us from the beginning through all the things which he worked, and he was always preparing the mysteries of our salvation, that is, of human reparation.

Those who b) teach that the primitive stain was so virulent and fatal that it introduced a necessity of perishing. For the divine artificer always so had mercy upon his work, although depraved and corrupted, that he never wholly withdrew from it the ability to repair the heavenly likeness.

Those who c) teach that the blood of the Lamb who takes away the sin of the world did not always profit all. For it was poured out for the impious and offered for all those whom the Only-begotten first expressed according to his own image and breathing likeness.

---

[7] Epistle XIII to Pammachius, n. 26, col. 81.
[8] II Cor. I.22.
[1] I Cor. XV.54.
[2] John XIV.6; Matt. XI.12.

Those who d) teach that so great a ruin flowed into the human race from the original separation from God that afterward there were some who could not aspire to divine fellowship.

For Christ continued the immense interval by which mortal things had been separated from divine things by his mediation, common to either side, like a certain bridge, so to speak.

Finally, those who e) teach that there once were—or that even now some are found—for whom the kingdom of heaven ought to be considered closed by a supreme and absolute destination. For Christ is life to all, way to all, gate to all; he closes his kingdoms to no one, for he even permits violence to be brought upon them.

And in very truth, what cause was present to the Only-begotten Son of God, that he should unite our mortality to himself? Ambrose responds [1]:

> Therefore he received from us what he might offer as his own for us, so that he might redeem us from what was ours and confer upon us from what was his, by divine largess, what was not ours. Therefore according to our nature he offered himself, so that he might work beyond our nature. From what is ours is the sacrifice; from what is his is the reward. And you will find many things in the same one both according to nature and beyond nature. For according to the condition of the body he was in the womb, was born, was suckled, was placed in a manger; but beyond the condition of nature a Virgin conceived, a Virgin gave birth, so that you might believe that he was God, who was renewing nature, and that he was man, who was born according to nature from man.

And immediately afterward [2]:

> You have learned, therefore, that he offered a sacrifice from what was ours. For what was the cause of the Incarnation, unless that the flesh which had sinned might through itself be redeemed? Therefore that which had sinned is that which was redeemed. Consequently, the divinity of the Word was not immolated, because the divinity of the Word had not sinned; and therefore the nature of the Word was not converted into the nature of flesh, because divinity immune from sin ought not to offer itself for a sin which it had not committed. For Christ offered in himself that which he put on, and he put on that which he did not have before. Therefore he did not put on the divinity of his own divinity, in whom was the fullness of eternal divinity; but he assumed flesh, so that he might strip off the spoil of

[1] *On the Mystery of the Lord's Incarnation*, chap. VI, n. 54, cols. 715–716, works, vol. II.
[2] Ibid., n. 56, col. 716.

> the flesh and in himself crucify the spoils of the devil and raise the trophies of power.

With these agree the things which he writes when comparing Christ with Aaron [1]:

> Aaron indeed once stood in their midst [2], setting himself in the way so that death would not pass from the corpses of the dead to the ranks of the living. But this one, as the Word, always stands in each one, whom we do not see, separating within us the rational virtues from the corpses of lethal passions and pestilential thoughts. This one stands [3], as he who came into this world that he might blunt the sting of death, obstruct its devouring maw, give to the living the eternity of grace, and grant resurrection to the dead.

Nor are those things discordant [4] in which he compares the innocent first parents with their depraved offspring and describes the divinely supplied remedy, saying:

> But if that first man, who was speaking with God while placed in paradise [5], could fall so easily—created from virgin earth, which at its recent origin had been formed and created at the word of God, not yet congealed with the blood of parricide and slaughter, not yet polluted by crimes and dishonor, our flesh not yet condemned and subject to the curse of a guilty inheritance—how much more easily afterward did the slippery road to sin bring a greater precipice upon the human race, when through the successive turns of generation something worse succeeded something more tolerable? For [6], if a magnet stone has so great a force of nature that it draws iron to itself and transfuses itself into its species, in such a way that, when many who desire to make trial bring several iron rings to that stone, it holds all in an equal manner; and then, if to the ring to which the stone adheres you bring another ring, and again in order place others beneath each, although the force of nature from that stone penetrates into all in order—

[1] Epistle IV to Felix, n. 5, col. 764, works, vol. II.

[2] Num. XVI.47–48.

[3] Heb. II.14–15.

[4] Epistle XLV to Sabinus, nn. 13–16, col. 983.

[5] Gen. II.15.

[6] Ambrose took this image from Philo's work *On the Creation of the World* and by it foreshadowed the propagation of original guilt. But I judge that not even with the most acute eyes can there be discerned in this image anything of the kind which the Maurist editors thought it contained—namely, that the contagion of original sin is taught to have been transmitted by concupiscence and that the pact devised by the more recent theologians is rejected.

> —nevertheless it binds the former with a more vehement bond and the latter with a more relaxed one; how much more did the condition and nature of the human race fall from a purer state into a worse one when it touched what was more wicked? For if nature is diminished through those species which are not capable of guilt, how much more is its power blunted through souls and members polluted by the stain of crimes? Hence, because malice had increased and innocence had been abolished, there was none who did good [1], there was not even one: the Lord came, who would reform the grace of nature, indeed would increase it, so that [2] where sin abounded, grace might superabound.

For the man [3]:

> Whom the Lord protected as his own work and, as good parent and author, did not abandon, he cherished after creation to this extent: that he redeemed him after he had been disowned, received him after he had been cast out, and raised him from the dead through the Passion of his Only-begotten Son. God, therefore, is the author of man; and the good worker loves his own work, nor does the good father abandon him whom, even as a rich householder, he redeemed with the wealth of his own inheritance.

CLII.

We know, therefore, what moved God to decree and execute the *ἐνανθρώπησις* of the Only-begotten; what end God set for himself in decreeing and executing it; and what amplitude and extension he assigned to it. For this reason, a) if we trust Ambrose, God decreed from eternity the *σάρκωσις* of the Only-begotten and executed it when the fullness of the times arrived, because 1) he is the author of man, because 2) as a good worker he loves his own work, and because 3) as a good father he does not will to abandon it, but rather as a rich householder willed to redeem it with the wealth of his own inheritance.

But b) he directed the Incarnation and Redemption to this end: that nature might be renewed and reformed, indeed increased; that grace might superabound where sin had abounded; that the sting of death might be blunted; that the spoils of the devil might be crucified;

that what had been cast out and had died might be received and raised again; and that the eternity of grace might be given to the living.

[1] Ps. XIII.1.
[2] Rom. V.20.
[3] Ibid., n. 16, cols. 983–984.

Moreover, c) it is established by more than one indication and argument that this was God's purpose: that the fruit of the Incarnation and Redemption should of itself be universal and embrace all. And 1) it is established by those things by which God, moved and incited, decreed the *οἰκονομία* of the Savior and, having decreed it, brought it to completion. For these things are universal and of themselves except no one. Then 2) it is established by the express words in which Ambrose testifies that the Redemption pertains to all those who had been disowned through sin, who had been cast out, who were counted among the spoils of the devil, whom death had subjected to itself, and who bore mortal flesh. No less is it 3) established by those things in which he teaches that the divine blood was offered for those whose nature the Only-begotten put on. But the Only-begotten put on the common nature of men, humanity itself [1]. Therefore he redeemed it whole and entire.

Wherefore, when Ambrose discusses the types of the cross [2], among other things he gathers this from them:

> You see, therefore, that upon the cross of Christ the infirmity of all men is lifted.

But, discoursing concerning the most blessed Virgin [3], he writes:

> Mary was alone, and she spoke with the angel [4]. She was alone when the Holy Spirit came upon her and the power of the Most High overshadowed her. She was alone, and she wrought the salvation of the world and conceived the redemption of all [5].

For we were, Ambrose says [6]:

> Under a harsh creditor, who could not be paid and satisfied except by the death of the debtor. The Lord Jesus came and saw us gravely burdened by interest. No one could discharge his interest-bearing debt from the patrimony of his own innocence; I could not have from my own that whereby I might free myself. He brought me a new kind of absolution, that I might change the creditor, because I did not have the interest whereby I might pay.

[1] On this matter compare Petau disputing in *On the Trinity*, book IV, chap. IX, and *On the Incarnation*, book V, chap. V.

[2] *On the Sacraments*, book II, chap. IV, n. 11, col. 457, works, vol. II. But whether this work is rightly ascribed to Ambrose the Maurist editors inquire learnedly in the preface in which the authorship of the same work is discussed.

[3] Epistle XLIX to Sabinus, n. 2, col. 992, works, vol. II.

[4] Luke I.28.

[5] Another reading: "and conceived the Redeemer." "But," add the Maurist editors, "Mary can certainly be said to have conceived the redemption in the same manner in which she is said to have wrought salvation, namely, insofar as she brought forth for the world the mediator and repairer. This manner of speaking is by no means infrequent in Ambrose."

[6] Epistle XLII to his sister Marcellina, n. 7, cols. 957–958.

> But guilt, not nature, had made us debtors; for by our sins we contracted heavy debts, so that we who were free became liable. For a debtor is one who has received something from the creditor's money. But sin is from the devil; the impious man has these riches, as it were, in his patrimony. For just as virtues are the riches of Christ, so crimes are the resources of the devil. By a grave interest-bearing debt he had reduced the human race to the perpetual captivity of a liable inheritance, which the indebted author had transmitted to posterity by an interest-bearing succession. The Lord Jesus came; he offered his death for the death of all; he poured out his blood for the blood of all. . . . He forgave all [1], nor is there anyone whom he did not release. . . . For he judged [2] that men could be bound by benefits and provoked to do the things which are right more than by fear, and that charity avails more for correction than dread.

Through charity he underwent death [3]:

> And by the death of one the world was redeemed. For Christ could have not died if he had willed; but he neither thought that death was to be fled as cowardly, nor would he have saved us better than by dying. Therefore his death is the life of all. By his death we are signed [4]; praying, we announce his death; offering his death, we proclaim it. His death is victory; his death is a mystery; his death is the annual solemnity of the world. What more shall we say concerning his death, when by the divine example we prove that death alone sought immortality and death itself redeemed itself? Therefore death, which is the cause of public salvation, is not to be mourned.

For [5] Christ—

> —was made the sin of all and was washing away the sins of the human race. Finally he died—and a second and third time, exulting and triumphing, I say: he died, so that his death might become the life of the dead.

For [1]:

---

[1] Ibid., n. 8, col. 958.

[2] Ibid., n. 6, col. 957.

[3] *On Faith in the Resurrection*, book II, n. 46, cols. 1145–1146, works, vol. II.

[4] In this passage both the practice of signing the forehead and breast with the cross is indicated, and offering and sacrifice are openly distinguished from prayers.

[5] *On the Mystery of the Lord's Incarnation*, chap. V, n. 39, col. 712, works, vol. II.

[1] Epistle XXVI to Irenaeus, n. 16, col. 897.

> Neither an ambassador nor a messenger, but the Lord himself saved his people. He alone remains [2], because this cannot be common to any man with Christ: that he forgive sins. This office belongs to Christ alone, who took away the sin of the world [3]. The woman also merited to be absolved [4], who, when the Jews withdrew, remained alone with Jesus. But raising his head, Jesus said to the woman [5]: "Where are those who accused you? Has no one stoned you?" And she answered: "No one, Lord." And Jesus said to her: "Neither shall I condemn you. Go, and henceforth see that you sin not." See, reader, the divine mysteries and the clemency of Christ. When the woman is accused, Christ inclines his head; but he raises it when the accuser is lacking. He wills no one to be condemned, all to be absolved.

And because he bears this disposition:

> Christ embraces his world with no slight light [6], since [7] "his going forth is from the summit of heaven, and his course even unto its summit, and there is no one who hides himself from his heat." For the benign one illumines all and wills not to reject the weak, but to amend him; nor does the Church desire to exclude the hard, but to soften him. And therefore in the Song of Songs the Church invites them [8], and in the Gospel Christ [9], saying: "Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened, and I shall refresh you."

CLIII.

When I consider these things within myself, I would gladly ask those who might perhaps doubt the universal order of reparation and universal redemption through Christ what formulas of words they would desire to be employed so that, doubt having been set aside, they might profess the universal extent of either.

But I judge that, according to the prescription of reason, they can require no other formulas than such as these: that some be affirmative and openly and expressly signify the universal extent of reparation and redemption, while others be negative and confirm that absolutely no one is excluded from either order. For

[2] He has regard to the things which are read in John XVI.32.
[3] John I.29; compare Isa. LXIII.8.
[4] John VIII.3 ff.
[5] Ibid., vv. 10–11.
[6] *On Faith in the Resurrection*, book II, n. 117, col. 1166.
[7] Ps. XVIII.7.
[8] Song IV.16; compare V.1.
[9] Matt. XI.28.

if both kinds of formulas conspire, every equitable judge of things will of his own accord grant that universal reparation and redemption could neither be handed down more evidently nor established more firmly. Now, both kinds occur not only in Ambrose, but occur repeated and inculcated.

a) The kind of affirmative formulas occurs, by which it is taught: 1) that upon the cross of Christ the infirmity of all men was lifted; 2) that Mary wrought the salvation of the world and conceived the redemption of all; 3) that the human race was loosed from perpetual captivity; 4) that the Lord Jesus came to offer his death for the death of all and to pour out his blood for the blood of all; 5) that by the death of the one Christ the world was redeemed, that his death is the life of all and the public cause of salvation; and finally 6) that Christ was for this reason made the sin of all: that he might wash away the sins of the human race and that his death might become the life of the dead.

Then b) the kind of negative formulas occurs, by which it is declared: 1) that there is no one for whom Christ did not discharge the debt and whose debt he did not release; 2) that there is no one whom he wills to be condemned and whom he does not prefer to be absolved; 3) that there is no one whom the benign one does not illumine; and 4) absolutely no one whom he rejects and whom he does not desire to be amended.

Therefore, although [1]:

> I have nothing from which I can glory in my works, I have nothing from which I may boast; nevertheless I have reason to glory in Christ. I shall glory not because I am just, but I shall glory because I am redeemed. I shall glory not because I am empty of sins, but because sins have been remitted to me. I shall not—
>
> —glory because I have profited, nor because anyone has profited me, but because the blood of Christ was poured out for me. My guilt was made for me the price of redemption, through which Christ came to me. For my sake Christ tasted death. Guilt was more fruitful than innocence. Innocence had made me arrogant; guilt rendered me subject.

Hence there is no man to whom it cannot deservedly be said [1]:

> You have received the pledge of Christ's charity, since he who died for you is your advocate, reserves the recompense of his blood, and he who reconciled the sinner to the Father much more commends the innocent man and protects the subject, who took to himself the guilty man. . . . But you fear the uncertain windings of life and the

[1] *On Jacob and the Blessed Life*, book I, chap. VI, n. 21, cols. 451–452, works, vol. I.

[1] Ibid., n. 22, col. 452.

snares of the adversary [2], although you have the aid of God and have so great a favor from him that he did not spare his own Son for you [3]. Scripture employed a beautiful expression in order to declare the pious purpose of God the Father toward you, who offered his Son to death; and the Son could not feel the bitterness of death. As regards what was in the Father, he kept nothing for himself; he offered all for you. As regards what was in the fullness of divinity, he himself lost nothing and redeemed you. Consider the paternal affection. As pertains to piety, he took upon himself, as it were, the danger of a Son about to die; he drank, as it were, the sorrow of bereavement, lest the fruit of redemption perish for you. So great was the Lord's zeal for your salvation that he almost placed himself in danger while he gained you. For your sake he underwent our losses, that he might graft you into divine things and consecrate you to heavenly things. Wonderfully also he added [4]: "He delivered him up for us all," that he might show that he so loves all as to deliver for each one the Son most beloved to himself. Therefore, for those for whom he gave that which is above all things, can it come about that he has not given all things in him? For he excepted nothing, who granted the author of all things. There is nothing, therefore, which we should fear can be denied to us [5]; there is nothing in which we ought through perseverance to distrust the divine munificence, whose abundance was so lasting and continuous that he first predestined—

—then called; and those whom he called, these he also justified; and those whom he justified, these he also glorified. Will he be able to abandon those whom he has pursued with such great benefits even unto the rewards? Among so many benefits of God, are any snares of an accuser to be feared? But who would dare to accuse those whom he sees chosen by divine judgment? Can God the Father himself, who conferred the gifts, rescind his own gifts and banish from the grace of paternal affection those whom he received through adoption? But there is a fear that the judge may be more severe. Consider whom you have as judge. The Father has given all judgment to Christ. Will he, therefore, be able to condemn you whom he redeemed from death, for whom he offered himself, whose life he recognizes to be the recompense of his own death? Will he

[2] Ibid., n. 25, cols. 452–453.
[3] Rom. VIII.32.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid., n. 26, col. 453.

> not say [1]: "What profit is there in my blood if I condemn him whom I myself saved?" Then you consider the judge; you do not consider the advocate. Can he bear a more severe sentence, who does not cease to intercede that the grace of paternal reconciliation may be conferred upon us?

CLIV.

Now these matters are such that a question most suitable for illustrating the present treatment which we are conducting can very easily be resolved. For it can usefully be asked what sort of relation existed between God and the human race, now disfigured and corrupted by the primeval stain. Was there a relation a) of a nature condemned and rejected by God; or rather a relation b) of a nature raised up and repaired; and if this latter relation existed, ought c) the benefit of restitution and reparation to be considered particular or, on the contrary, universal? For when these things have once been explained and duly defined, it can in no way fail to happen that the controversy concerning the order of salvation appears wonderfully smoothed out.

Now, if we follow in the footsteps of Ambrose and give credence to him, before all else 1) it must be denied that the human race, wounded by a death-bearing wound, is related to God by that relation and in that manner which is proper to a nature cast away and condemned. For "my guilt was made for me the price of redemption, through which—"

> "—Christ came to me. Guilt was in some measure more fruitful for me than innocence. Adam [1], in order that he might fall, was deceived by the serpent and bent by his wife. Therefore there will now be no marriages in paradise, but all will be without the solemnities of marriage, like the angels in heaven. He had not said [2] to Adam, 'You will be with me,' because he knew that he was going to fall, that he might be redeemed by Christ. Happy the ruin which is repaired unto something better. Therefore now the pious shepherd, the good merchant, does not abandon his flock and his own merchandise."

For God regarded man with paternal affection; and, as belongs to piety, he took upon himself, as it were, the danger of a Son about to die; he drank, as it were, the sorrow of bereavement, lest the fruit of redemption perish for man.

Then 2) it must be denied that the force and rationale of the repaired order are such as to embrace not the whole human race but only some part of it. For

[1] Ps. XXIX.10.

[1] *Expositions on Psalm XXXIX*, n. 20, col. 865, works, vol. I.

[2] He alludes to the things contained in Luke XXIII.43.

Scripture wonderfully added, "He delivered him up for us all," in order to show that he so loves all as to deliver his most beloved Son for each one. Therefore each man can, and indeed ought, gratefully to exclaim: "I shall not glory because I am just, but I shall glory because I am redeemed. I shall not glory because I have profited, nor because anyone has profited me, but because Christ is my advocate before the Father; but because the blood of Christ was poured out for me." Of any man it can, and indeed must, be affirmed most constantly: "So great was God's condescension toward you that he did not spare his own Son for you. Scripture employed a beautiful expression in order to declare the pious purpose of God the Father toward you, who offered his Son to death. So great was the Lord's zeal for your salvation that he almost placed himself in danger while he gained you." Moreover, there is no one, even though he should have perished eternally, to whom the words [3] of the Savior to Judas the betrayer do not most perfectly apply: "Judas, do you betray the Son of Man with a kiss?" That is [4]: "Do you, a man, betray the Son of Man, who descended from heaven for the salvation of men? For thus [5] it is written: 'The Son of Man who is in heaven, he it is who descended—' "

> "—from heaven. Do you betray the Son of Man, who made you an apostle from a sinner? Do you betray the Son of Man, who came that in his blood he might wash away the sins of all?"

Therefore 3) it must be held that the order of reparation instituted by divine piety is entirely universal, and that to absolutely all men there always has been, there is, and, even unto the end, there will be present a supply and faculty whereby, after shaking off the bonds of sins, they may obtain the friendship of God and the inheritance of God together with Christ the Firstborn. Although Ambrose very frequently teaches these things elsewhere [1], he also hands them down clearly when, after relating [2] the words of Christ, "I will; be cleansed," he adds [3]: "Jesus says to all, 'I will,' who [4] does not will sin to exist. Christ's willing is common to all; to be cleansed belongs to the faith of one believing in Christ." For although [5] "the evil succession of Eve devoured the whole man, the illustrious inheritance of Christ liberated the whole man. Jesus wrote his testament not to one indeed, not to a few, but to all. We are all inscribed as heirs, not according to

[3] Luke XXII.48.

[4] *Expositions on Psalm XXXIX*, n. 17, col. 863.

[5] John III.13.

[1] *Expositions on Psalm XXXIX*, nn. 6 ff., cols. 860–861; on Psalm XL, n. 22, cols. 875–876; on Psalm XLVII, n. 16, col. 942; and *Exposition of the Gospel according to Luke*, book V, nn. 115–116, col. 1384, works, vol. I.

[2] Luke V.13.

[3] *On Psalm CXVIII*, n. 29, col. 1003.

[4] Another reading: "who does not will to be a sinner," a reading supported by seven manuscripts.

[5] *On Psalm CXVIII*, n. 41, col. 1155.

a portion but according to universality. The testament is common and the right belongs to all; the inheritance belongs to all together and the entirety to each one. Individuals enter upon the New Testament, and all possess it; nor is anything diminished for the heir, whatever is claimed by his coheirs. The advantage remains entire, and it increases for each one the more it has been acquired by more persons. The condition of a human inheritance is different. If its advantages have been divided, they are diminished; and the inscription of a coheir is a loss to the heir. The kingdom of Christ is undivided, the inheritance undivided. . . . Let us therefore hear [6] the advantages of the inheritance. The remission of sins is the inheritance of Christ. Certainly it is entire for each individual and profitable in common; for upon whomsoever—"

> "—it has been conferred, it withdraws from no one and accrues to all. . . . The resurrection is the inheritance of Christ. Would anyone call that his own loss which found in one the title of a common grace? For Christ, rising, rose for all, since through man came the resurrection of the dead. How, therefore, can that be the loss of individuals which is the reformation of the whole body and of the human race? Let the Testament, therefore, be recited, and let us consider its dispositions [1]: 'But the Holy Spirit also bears witness to us. For after he had said: This is the testament which I will make unto them, says the Lord. I shall give my laws in their hearts, and upon their minds I shall write them; and their sin and iniquity I shall remember no more.' O truly eternal testator, who fixes his laws in our hearts and writes them upon our minds, so that we can think nothing other than the divine precepts and ought to perceive nothing other than the oracles of God. He gave grace; he reformed nature; and for himself, who is accustomed to forget nothing, he removed the memory of my sins, while to me he gave the memory [2] of his precepts."

CLV.

But if Christ's willing is common to all; if Christ's Testament pertains to all, not to one or to a few; if all are inscribed in it as heirs; if the remission of sins is denied to no one; if reformation extends to all; and if grace is bestowed upon all—whence, then, shall we judge it to have come about that many lie wretched in corrupted oldness, lose the benefit of grace and reparation, and, though inscribed as heirs, are nevertheless deprived of the inheritance itself? We shall

[6] Ibid., n. 42, col. 1156.

[1] Heb. X.15 ff.

[2] "Memory" must be supplied from the preceding clause.

judge that it came about by this law: that it is plainly one thing to possess the faculty of obtaining the inheritance, and another thing to attain the inheritance itself. For the power of attaining the inheritance is universal and common to absolutely all, because it neither depends upon nor proceeds from anything other than God's pious purpose and Christ's benevolent economy. But the attainment of the inheritance is particular—

and belongs uniquely to those who obey God's pious purpose and join themselves to Christ the Savior. The power of entering upon the inheritance is a gift of the mercy of the Repairer conferred upon universal nature; but possession of the inheritance is a reward repaid to each individual person by a most equitable distribution. Finally, the power of entering upon the inheritance is in us without us; but the happiness of attaining it comes to us under this one law: if we freely cooperate with God.

Concerning this law, nothing is more splendid than these things which Ambrose writes [1]:

> You see, therefore, that God the Word both provokes the idle man and awakens the sleeper. For he who comes and knocks at the door always wishes to enter. But it rests with us that he does not always enter, does not always remain. Let your door lie open to him who comes; open your soul; expand the bosom of your mind, that he may see the riches of simplicity, the treasures of peace, the sweetness of grace. Enlarge your heart; run to meet the sun of eternal light, which illuminates every man. And that true light indeed shines for all; but if anyone closes his windows, he will defraud himself of the eternal light. Christ, therefore, is also shut out if you close the door of your mind; and though he can enter, nevertheless he does not wish to rush in importunately; he does not wish to compel the unwilling. Having arisen from the Virgin, he came forth from the womb, irradiating the whole universe, so that he might shine for all. Those who desire it receive the brightness of perpetual splendor, which no night interrupts. For upon this sun which we behold daily a dark night follows; but the sun of justice never sets, because malice does not succeed wisdom.

To this these things likewise pertain [2]:

> The Lord has mercy, lest anyone fail on the way. If anyone, therefore, has failed, he fails not through the Lord Jesus but through himself; nor do you have anything which you may ascribe to the Lord, who conquers when he is judged. For what will you say to him

[1] *On Psalm CXVIII*, n. 13, cols. 1117–1118.

[2] *Exposition of the Gospel according to Luke*, book VI, n. 74, col. 1401.

> who conferred upon you all the supports of virtue? Did he not beget you? Did he not feed you? His food is virtue; his food is fortitude. But if through your negligence you lost the virtue which you had received, it was not the supports of the heavenly nourishment but those of your own mind which failed you. Finally, just as the Lord rains upon the—
>
> "—just and the unjust, so also he feeds the unjust and the just."

And again [1]:

> The Lord Jesus, therefore, distributes the food. And he indeed wishes to give to all; he denies it to no one, for he is the dispenser of all. But when he breaks the loaves and gives them to the disciples, if you do not extend your hands so that you may receive the food for yourself, you will fail on the way; nor will you be able to transfer your fault to him who has mercy and distributes. But he distributes to those who remain with him even in the desert, who do not withdraw on the first, second, or third day [2]. . . . Therefore [3], do not fall away from the discipline of the Lord, nor grow weary when you are rebuked by him. Do not grow weary now, lest you grow weary afterward. For what will you answer him, or how will you excuse yourself, if you have lost the strength of the food which he ministers? You cannot say that he did not give the food, because he gives to all. You cannot say that he did not will to make you good, before whom he placed good and evil, so that your good might be not from necessity but voluntary. For there is a great difference between him who unwillingly does something from necessity and him who by his will chooses what is good; for [4], if I do this unwillingly, a stewardship has been entrusted to me; if willingly, I have a reward. Let us therefore consider that we shall stand before the tribunal of Christ, and if our work should burn, we shall have nothing whereby we can excuse ourselves. For he will say what he has already spoken through the prophet [5]: 'My people, what have I done to you, or in what have I been troublesome to you? Answer me.' He will also say to him who has failed on the way: 'For what reason did you fail on the way? Did I not break the loaves? Did I not bless them? Did I not command that they be given? But why were you unwilling to receive?'

[1] Ibid., n. 76, col. 1401.
[2] Ambrose has before his eyes the things read in Matt. XV.32.
[3] Ibid., n. 77, cols. 1401–1402.
[4] I Cor. IX.17.
[5] Mic. VI.3.

From these things it is manifest what can, and indeed must, be answered to those asking how it comes about that so many among men endowed with reason fall away from salvation and are eternally condemned. Does it a) come about from this, that original guilt infected the human stock and destroyed it after it had been infected? By no means: both because on this account no one could be safe, and because divine reparation in Christ and through Christ comes to the aid of original—

corruption. Does it b) come about from this, that the order of reparation is particular and does not extend to the universal posterity of Adam? Nothing less; since God, in accordance with his mercy, took counsel for all, and Christ was born for all, died for all, and rose again for all. Does it c) come about from this, that the order of reparation is sterile and that the aids necessary for salvation do not flow from it unto all? Not at all, since that order is efficacious and was therefore divinely chosen so that every occasion of excuse might be cut off and all might be endowed with the faculty of obtaining salvation.

How, then, does it come about that, although all are able by heavenly liberality, nevertheless not all possess heavenly happiness? Although, as Nicetas [1], bishop of Aquileia, speaks, Christ is for all the Son of Man, because for us men he deigned to be born man; for all a priest, because he offered his own body as an oblation and victim to God the Father for us, and deigns to be offered by us each day [2]; for all the way, because through him we proceed to salvation; for all the vine, because, extending the branches of his arms upon the cross, he supplied to the world the great fruit of sweetness; for all redemption, because he redeemed us, long ago lost, at the price of his blood; for all a physician, because by his visitation he cured our infirmities and wounds; and [3] for all peace, because he gathered those who were at variance into one and reconciled them to God the Father—nevertheless, how are so many found who either never recover the divine likeness or at last lose it after it has once been recovered?

It comes about precisely 1) from this: that the faculty allotted to all does not profit unless it is freely accepted and, when accepted, freely employed as is fitting.

It comes about 2) from this: that the supply for obtaining salvation is not without reason compared with food, without which no one lives, but with which all those die who do not suitably turn it to their own benefit. It comes about 3) from this: that there is a very great difference between the power of obtaining salvation

[1] *On the Diverse Appellations Befitting Our Lord Jesus Christ*, pp. 330–331, in the eminent Mai, *New Collection of Ancient Writers*, vol. VII.

[2] In these words both the Eucharistic sacrifice and its daily offering are contained.

[3] Nicetas enumerates other appellations of Christ, and indeed in a manner not very different from that which, in the same argument, Damasus followed in poem XI; Phoebadius of Agen, *Against the Arians*, chap. VI; and Orientius in the Pesaro collection, vol. VI, p. 89.

and an imposed necessity of attaining it. Now God, who imparts the power to all, constrains and compels no one by necessity. Finally, it comes about 4) from this: that the wise and good God decreed that the attainment of the inheritance should bear the force and rationale not more of a gift than of a reward: of a gift, indeed, because the faculty of attaining it is a gift; but of a reward, because the inheritance ought to be conferred only upon those who did not neglect the gift received but joined their own care and industry to it.

CLVI.

I would be content with these things and would turn my mind to surveying the other churches which still remain, did I not regard it as a religious duty not to pass over in silence that Church which Irenaeus [1] calls the greatest, most ancient, and known to all; with which [2], because of its more powerful principality, every church must agree; from which [3] the rights of venerable communion flow unto all; and which, just as it is the glory of Italy, so is it the chief glory and most powerful bulwark of the whole Catholic name. Therefore I shall investigate in a few words what the Roman See of Peter and the Roman bishops believed and taught concerning the salvific will of God and the order of human reparation, and what the other churches propagated throughout the whole world drew from these, as though [4] from their native fountain.

Now I see this head of doctrine especially to have prevailed among them: that although in Christian times divine grace flows much more copiously upon the human race, nevertheless there was never wholly withdrawn from it that which would be necessary and sufficient for conquering guilt and obtaining salvation. "Indeed," writes the great Leo [1],

> divine goodness always took counsel for the human race in diverse ways and by many measures, and mercifully imparted very many gifts of its providence throughout all past ages. But in the last times it exceeded every abundance of its accustomed benignity, when in

[1] *Against Heresies*, book III, chap. III, n. 2.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Thus speak the Fathers of the Synod of Aquileia in the letter given to the emperors, which is found in Ambrose's epistles, class II, epistle II.

[4] This sort of allegory, by which the doctrine of the Roman See is compared with a fountain, but the dogmas of the other churches with streams drawn from it, is frequent in ecclesiastical monuments, as anyone can gather from the letter of Aurelius, Alypius, Augustine, Evodius, and Possidius to Innocent; from his letters to the Fathers of the Councils of Milevis and Carthage; and from the synodical letter sent by three African councils to Pope Theodore—

—which occurs as read and approved in the Lateran Council under Martin I, act II.

[1] Sermon XXIV, otherwise XXIII, *On the Nativity of the Lord* IV, chap. I, col. 78, Venice ed. 1753.

> Christ mercy itself descended to sinners, truth itself to the erring, life itself to the dead, so that that Word, coeternal and coequal with the Begetter, might assume the nature of our lowliness into the unity of his divinity, and, born God from God, might also be born man from man. This indeed had been promised from the foundation of the world and had always been prophesied by many significations of things and words. But how great a portion of men would those figures and shadowed mysteries save, unless Christ by his advent fulfilled the long and hidden promises, and what then profited the few who believed it was to be done should now profit innumerable faithful as accomplished?

But that the mystery of the Incarnation, while yet to be done, profited few cannot be derived from the supposition that the goodness of God neglected many. "For [2] the benignity of God remains over all and denies his mercy to no one, since without distinction he lavishes many goods upon all, and prefers to invite by benefits those whom he could deservedly subject to punishments. For the postponement of vengeance gives a place [3] for penance. Nor, however, can it be said that there is no—"

> "—vengeance where there is no conversion, because a hard and ungrateful mind is already a punishment to itself and suffers in its own conscience whatever is deferred by the goodness of God."

Therefore it must be derived from this: that we neither consider the ineffable liberality of the divine gifts toward us nor judge it to belong to our part to cooperate with the grace of God which works in us. "For [1] the kingdom of heaven does not come to sleepers, nor is the beatitude of eternity bestowed upon those

---

[2] Sermon XXXV, otherwise XXXIV, *On the Solemnity of the Epiphany* V, chap. IV, cols. 130–131.

[3] With these agree the following things from Sermon XLIII, otherwise XLI, *On Lent* V, chap. III, col. 165: "Let no one (Rom. II.4) despise the patience of God's goodness because of—"

"—the impunity of his sins, nor therefore suppose him not to have been offended because he has not yet experienced him angry. The truces of mortal life are not long, nor is the license of foolish wills enduring, which will pass over into the pain of eternal punishments if, while the sentence of justice is suspended, the medicine of penance is not sought." And these things are likewise consonant, from Sermon L, otherwise XLIX, *On Lent* XII, chap. I, cols. 189–190: "Although (Matt. XXII.11) the benignity of the bridegroom invites all to communion in the royal banquet, nevertheless all who have been called must take care that they are not found unworthy of the gift of the sacred foods. Now some abuse the patience of God, and those who are not free in conscience become secure from long impunity, although vengeance is postponed for this reason, that correction may be able to have time. Therefore let no one delay embracing the mercy of our God, which (Ezek. XVIII.32–33) does not will the death of the sinner, but only that he be converted and live, because he has not received what he merited. For neither is whatever is deferred removed, nor has he escaped condemnation who has not sought indulgence."

[1] Sermon XXXV, otherwise XXXIV, *On the Solemnity of the Epiphany* V, chap. III, col. 130.

who grow torpid in idleness and sloth; but because, as the Apostle [2] says, 'if we suffer together, we shall also be glorified together,' we must run that way which the Lord himself [3] testified that he is. With no merits of works assisting us, he took counsel for us both by a sacrament and by an example: that by the former he might advance unto salvation those called to adoption, and by the latter train them for labor."

To this, therefore, returns the rationale of the providence by which we are ruled, and to this the divine economy by which we are governed. No sooner a) are we born and reckoned among men than the merciful benignity of God has received us. By it b) we are increased with benefits; by it we are advanced unto adoption; and by it we are trained for labor. Lest this c) befall us as burdensome and troublesome beyond our strength, [4] grace holds forth aid and obedience softens the command.

For d) the words of God thunder daily in our ears, and every man is convicted of knowing what is pleasing to divine justice. But because e) that judgment, in which [1] each one will receive according as he has done, whether good or evil, is deferred by the patience and goodness of him who will judge, the unbelieving hearts of the wicked promise themselves impunity and suppose that the qualities of human acts do not fall under the judgment of divine providence—as though deeds done evilly are not very often punished by most evident penalties, or the terror of heavenly threats is not frequently displayed. By these, indeed, faith is both admonished and unbelief rebuked. And it f) is rebuked for so long as [2] the end of this life finds unbelievers in their acts; since in hell there is no correction, nor is a remedy of satisfaction given where an action of the will no longer remains, as the prophet David [3] says: "For in death there is no one who remembers you; but in hell who will confess to you?"

Now what sort of order shall we judge that to be in which clemency and goodness claim the first parts for themselves; in which justice succeeds only in the second rank; and in which, for as long as we live this mortal life, the very functions of justice are tempered by mercy and directed toward assisting and advancing the attainment of salvation? Shall we judge it to be an order of reparation and salvation, or, on the contrary, of condemnation and death? Those who do not most constantly profess the former must not even understand the words. God, therefore, selected an order of reparation in which no necessity of perishing would

[2] Rom. VIII.17; compare II Tim. II.12.
[3] John XIV.6.
[4] Ibid., chap. III, col. 130.
[1] II Cor. V.10.
[2] Ibid., chap. IV, col. 131.
[3] Ps. VI.6.

lie upon men and in which the power of obtaining salvation would be readily available.

But did he select that order in which so happy a power would be available to absolutely all men? Leo teaches and repeats that divine goodness always took counsel for the human race and mercifully imparted very many gifts of its providence throughout all past ages; that God's benignity remains over all; and that mercy is denied to no one, by which many goods are bestowed without distinction upon all. Therefore God not only chose the order of reparation—

but chose an entirely universal order, so that only those suffer the loss of salvation who, growing torpid in idleness and sloth, do not join free cooperation to the grace working within them.

CLVII.

Concerning this most complete universality of the repaired order, the things which the Roman bishops hand down are entirely remarkable when, after describing the ruin of the human race, they declare both the origin and the means and necessity of restitution. To disclosing the origin of restitution pertain these things which Clement [2] writes in the most celebrated epistle to the Corinthians, which was once recited in many churches [1]:

> Who can recount the bond of the charity of God [3]? Who is sufficient to express, as is fitting, the magnificence of his goodness? The height to which charity raises us is ineffable. Charity joins us fast to God. Charity [4] covers a multitude of sins. Charity sustains all things; it bears all things [5] with an equable mind. In charity there is nothing sordid, nothing proud. . . . Without charity nothing is acceptable to God. *Ἐν ἀγάπῃ προσελάβετο ἡμᾶς ὁ δεσπότης· διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην, ἣν ἔσχεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, ἐν θελήματι Θεοῦ, καὶ τὴν σάρκα ὑπὲρ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν.* In charity [6] the Lord assumed us; because of the charity which he had toward us,

[2] First Epistle to the Corinthians, n. 49, col. 33, in Peter Coustant, Paris ed. 1721.

[1] As Eusebius relates, *Ecclesiastical History*, book III, chap. XVI, and book IV, chap. XXIII.

[3] Jerome praises these things in his *Commentary on Ephesians* IV.1.

[4] I Pet. IV.8.

[5] I Cor. XIII.

[6] Ephraem the Syrian agrees in the treatise *Περὶ ἀρετῶν καὶ κακιῶν*, saying: *Δι' ἀγάπης γὰρ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν παρεγένετο, δι' αὐτῆς καὶ ὁ παράδεισος ἠνέῳκται ἡμῖν, καὶ ἄνοδος εἰς οὐρανὸν ἐπεδείχθη πᾶσιν· ἐχθροὶ ὑπάρχοντες τῷ Θεῷ δι' αὐτῆς κατηλλάγημεν.* "For through charity God the Word also came to earth; through it paradise was opened to us, and an ascent into heaven was shown to all; though we were enemies of God, through it we were reconciled."

> Christ our Lord, according to the will [7] of God, delivered his blood for us, and his flesh for—
>
> "—our flesh, and his soul [1] for our souls."

Therefore the love of the Father, by which he decreed the Incarnation, and the love of the Son, who assumed body and soul, provided for men and changed their fallen and lost condition into one raised up and repaired.

So great was the necessity of this change that a graver one seemed unable even to be understood by thought. For, as Innocent argues [2] against the Pelagians:

> What more bitter thing could they have fashioned against the Lord than, when they made the divine aids void, also to take away the reason for daily prayer? This is to say: What need have I of God? Deservedly does the hymn-writer say [3] against these: "Behold the men who did not set God as their helper." Denying, therefore, the aid of God, they say that man can suffice for himself and does not need divine grace. Deprived of this, he must necessarily [4] fall, entangled in the snares of the devil, while by freedom alone he strives to fulfill all the commandments of life. O perverse doctrine of most depraved minds! Finally recognize [5] that freedom itself so deceived the first man that, while he used its reins too indulgently, he fell by presumption into transgression, and could not be delivered from this unless the advent of Christ the Lord, by the providence of regeneration, had restored to him the state of pristine liberty. Let him hear David [6] saying: "Our help is in the name of the Lord"; and [7], "Be my helper; do not forsake me, nor despise me, O God my Savior." He would have said these things in vain if that which he asked from the Lord in mournful speech were placed in his will alone.

With these things do not disagree those which he testifies concerning the destruction and reparation of the first parent—

saying [1]:

---

[7] John III.16; compare I John IV.9–10.

[1] By these things the Arians are refuted who contended that a *σῶμα ἄψυχον*, a soulless body, was assumed by the Only-begotten.

[2] Epistle XXX to the Council of Milevis, n. 3, col. 897.

[3] Ps. LI.9.

[4] Besides this reading, which some manuscripts support, there is another, confirmed both by manuscripts and by the authority of Celestine's epistle XXI, chap. VII, which reads: "Recognize at last, O doctrine of most depraved minds."

[5] These things are said hypothetically, and pertain to signifying what would be if reparation had not intervened, but by no means what actually happens.

[6] Ps. CXXIII.8.

[7] Ps. XXVI.9.

[1] Epistle XXIX to the Council of Carthage, n. 6, cols. 892–893.

> For he, having once been permitted free choice [2], while he used his goods without sufficient counsel, fell and was submerged in the depths of transgression, and found nothing whereby he could thereafter rise. Deceived forever by his own liberty, he would have lain oppressed [3] by this ruin, unless afterward the advent of Christ had raised him up by his grace [4]. Christ, through the purification of a new regeneration, cleansed every past vice by the laver of his baptism; and, strengthening his condition so that he might proceed more rightly and stably, he nevertheless did not deny his grace for the future. For although he had redeemed man from past sins, nevertheless, knowing that he could sin again, he reserved many things for his reparation, whereby he might correct him even after these things. He supplies daily remedies; unless, supported by and trusting in them, we strive, we shall in no way be able to conquer human errors. For it is necessary that, as we conquer with him assisting, so, with him again not assisting [5], we be conquered.

CLVIII.

Now these things solemnly defined by Innocent against the Pelagian errors are repeated in precisely the same words in that collection [6] which is entitled *Here Begin the Authorities of the Former Bishops of the Apostolic See—*

—Concerning the Grace of God [1], and which is read appended to the letter [2] of Celestine to the Gauls. For they are repeated either that a) it may be confirmed that in the transgression [3] of Adam all men lost natural [4] possibility and

[2] In Quesnell's edition we read, "For he, having once been perverted by free choice." But all the manuscript books oppose this reading, as do Augustine, *To Boniface*, book II, chap. IV, n. 6; Prosper, *Against the Collator*, chap. V, n. 15; and Celestine, epistle XXI, n. 5, who relate these very words. The sense of Innocent appears rather to demand "permitted" than "perverted," so that it can fittingly be read: "For he, having once been permitted free choice."

[3] Compare Augustine, *To Boniface against Two Epistles of the Pelagians*, book II, n. 6, and Celestine, epistle XXI, chap. IV.

[4] Another reading: "through his grace."

[5] But there is no reason why we should fear that aid will be lacking to us, for God supplies daily remedies. These things, therefore, are said not in order to signify what happens, but in order that the necessity of grace, which the Pelagians attacked, may be proved.

[6] Concerning this collection, the things which Coustant discusses—

—in his admonition to Celestine's epistle XXI and the authorities appended to it, cols. 1178 ff., may profitably be consulted.

[1] There are editions in which is added, "and concerning the free choice of the will."

[2] Celestine, epistle XXI to the bishops of the Gauls, chap. III ff., cols. 1189 ff.

[3] Ibid., chap. IV, n. 5, col. 1189.

[4] That is, received together with nature, though not owed to nature.

innocence, and that no one can rise from the depth of that ruin through free choice unless the grace of the merciful God raises him up; or that b) it may be established that no one [5], even when renewed by the grace of baptism, is fit to overcome the snares of the devil and to conquer the concupiscences of the flesh unless through the daily aid of God he has received perseverance in good conduct; or that c) all may be persuaded that [6] no one uses free choice well except through Christ.

But no one proposed and illustrated this head of doctrine more fully, no one more magnificently, than Leo. For, setting aside the other things [7], these are his words [8]:

> God the Word, the Son of God, who [9] in the beginning was with God, through whom all things were made and without whom nothing was made, was made man in order to liberate man from eternal death. He so inclined himself to the assumption of our lowliness without diminution of his majesty that, remaining what he was and assuming what he was not, he united the true form [10] of a servant to that form in which he is equal to God the Father, and joined each nature by so great a covenant that glorification did not consume the inferior, nor assumption diminish the—
>
> "—superior. . . . For unless he were true God, he would not bring a remedy; unless he were true man, he would not furnish an example."

And we likewise owe to Leo the things which follow [1]:

> Almighty and merciful God, whose nature is goodness, whose will is power, whose work is mercy, as soon as the malignity of the devil had mortified us with the poison of his envy, signified beforehand, among the very beginnings of the world, the remedies of his piety prepared for the renewal of mortals. He announced [2] to the serpent that there would be a seed of the woman which by its power would crush the exaltation of his harmful head, signifying, namely, Christ to come in the flesh, God and man, who, born of a Virgin, would con-

[5] Ibid., chap. VI, n. 7, col. 1190.

[6] Ibid., chap. VII, n. 8, col. 1190.

[7] Of this kind are found in Sermon XXIII, otherwise XXII, chap. III, cols. 75–76; Sermon XXIV, otherwise XXIII, chap. I, col. 79; Sermon XXV, otherwise XXIV, chap. V, col. 86; Sermon XXVI, otherwise XXV, chap. II, col. 88; Sermon XXXVII, otherwise XXXVI, chap. I, col. 136; Sermon LXX, otherwise LXVIII, chap. III, col. 274; and epistle XXVIII, otherwise XXIV, to Flavian, chap. II, col. 807.

[8] Sermon XXI, otherwise XX, chap. II, col. 65.

[9] John I.1.

[10] Phil. II.6.

[1] Sermon XXII, otherwise XXI, chap. I, cols. 67–68.

[2] Gen. III.15.

demn the violator of the human stock by an incorrupt birth. For [3], because the devil gloried that man, deceived by his fraud, had been deprived of divine gifts, and, stripped of the endowment of immortality, had undergone the harsh sentence of death; that he himself had also found in his evils a certain consolation from fellowship with the transgressor; and that God too, because the rationale of just severity demanded it, had changed his former sentence toward man whom he had established in so great an honor—it was necessary, through the economy of a secret counsel, that the immutable God, whose will cannot be deprived of its own benignity, should fulfill the first disposition of his piety by a more hidden mystery, and that man, driven into guilt by the craftiness of diabolical iniquity, should not perish contrary to the purpose of God.

Therefore [4],

when the times appointed beforehand for the redemption of men arrived, Jesus Christ the Son of God enters these lowest regions of the world, descending from the heavenly seat and not withdrawing from the Father's glory, generated in a new order, by a new birth [5]. For he came to take away our contagions, not to suffer them; not to succumb to vices but to heal them. He came that he might cure every infirmity of corruption and all the wounds of defiled souls—

"—for which reason it was fitting that he who was bringing the new grace of undefiled integrity to human bodies should be born in a new order. . . . He who had determined to raise up the fallen and to make firm the broken."

Moreover [1]:

The true mercy of God, although ineffably many means were available to him for repairing the human race, chose especially this way of taking counsel for it: that, for destroying the work of the devil, he would employ not the force of power but the rationale of justice. For the pride of the ancient enemy not without desert claimed for itself a tyrannical right over all men; nor did it oppress by an undue dominion those whom, of their own accord departing from the command of God, it had enticed into obedience to its will. Therefore it would not justly lose the original servitude of the human race unless it were conquered from that which it had subjected. That this might

[3] Precisely the same things are found in epistle XXVIII to Flavian, chap. III.
[4] Sermon XXII, chap. II, col. 68.
[5] Compare epistle XXVIII to Flavian, chap. IV.
[1] Sermon XXII, chap. III, col. 70.

be done, Christ was conceived from the Virgin without male seed; not human intercourse but the Holy Spirit made her fruitful.

Therefore, when [2]:

the wicked robber and greedy exactor persisted in rising up against him who had nothing of his, and, while pursuing the general prejudgment of a vitiated origin, exceeded the bond upon which he relied, exacting the penalty of iniquity from him in whom he found no guilt, the ill-counseled instrument of the death-bearing compact is therefore dissolved, and through the injustice of demanding more, the sum of the whole debt is made void. That strong one is bound with his own bonds, and every device of the malignant one is turned back upon his own head. The prince of the world having been bound, the vessels of captivity are seized. Nature, purged of its ancient contagions, returns to its honor; death is destroyed by death; nativity is repaired by nativity, since redemption at once takes away servitude, regeneration changes origin, and faith justifies the sinner.

For after [3]:

that first and universal ruin of human transgression, from which [4] through one man sin entered into this world, and death through sin, and so death passed into—

"—all men, in whom all sinned, no one would escape the foul dominion of the devil, no one the bonds of dire captivity; nor would either reconciliation unto pardon or a return unto life lie open to anyone, unless the Son of God, coeternal and coequal [1] with God the Father, deigned also to be the Son of Man, coming [2] to seek and to save that which had perished, so that [3], just as through Adam came death, so through our Lord Jesus Christ there might be the resurrection of the dead."

For by such [4] "bonds were we held fast that, unless through this aid, we could not be absolved. Therefore the humility of divinity is our advancement. We are redeemed at so great a price; we are cured at so great a cost. For what return would there be from impiety to justice, from misery to beatitude, unless one who

[2]Ibid., chap. IV, col. 71.

[3]Sermon LII, otherwise L, chap. I, cols. 198–199.

[4]Rom. V.12.

[1]That these things signify not an absolute necessity but one affected by a condition is abundantly declared by those things which we recently related from Leo, and by which it is taught that ineffably many means were available to God whereby he might repair the human race.

[2]Luke XIX.10.

[3]I Cor. XV.22.

[4]Sermon LII, otherwise L, chap. II, col. 199.

was both just inclined himself to the impious, and one who was blessed to the miserable?"

CLIX.

By all these illustrious and eloquent testimonies of Clement, Innocent, Celestine, and Leo we are plainly taught to number the following among those things which above all ought to be held certain and ascertained: a) that after that first and universal ruin of human transgression, the human race fell into such miseries that it was subject to the necessity of perishing and destitute of the possibility of recovering salvation, unless the advent of Christ the Lord had restored the state of pristine liberty, unless the grace of the merciful God had raised it up, unless true God had brought a remedy and cured every infirmity of corruption and all the wounds of defiled souls.

Let us number b), in the next place, that the magnificence of divine goodness is so great that it cannot be recounted; that it must be referred to the benefits received that the Lord assumed us; that, because of the charity which he had toward us, Christ, according to the will of God, delivered his blood for us, his flesh for our flesh, and his soul for our souls; that God, whose nature is goodness and whose work is mercy, as soon as diabolical malignity mortified us with the poison of its envy, signified beforehand among the very beginnings of the world the remedies of his piety prepared for the renewal of mortals; and that—

when the times appointed beforehand for the redemption of men arrived, he descended into this world in order to take away our contagions, heal our vices, seize the vessels of captivity, recall nature, purged of its ancient crimes, to its honor, and provide the means of returning from iniquity to justice and from misery to beatitude.

And therefore let us also number c) that the condition of the human race, which, if the works of men are regarded, would be a condition of ruin and condemnation, is, through the intervention of God's clemency and goodness, a condition of reparation and salvation. And indeed it is a reparation which is entirely universal, and yet so efficacious, active, and fruitful of all those things without which salvation cannot be obtained and with which the attainment of salvation is placed within the power of men, that only those are condemned and perish who spurn the benefits of divine liberality.

Certainly no one will be permitted to doubt the universality of reparation if it excluded no time and embraced within its compass absolutely all the posterity of Adam. For by each condition it is brought about that it is universal both in time and in persons, and therefore absolutely and simply universal. Now, as pertains to persons, Clement writes those things which demonstrate that absolutely no

one is excepted. For after he premised [1]: "Brethren, it is fitting that we think of Jesus Christ *ὡς περὶ Θεοῦ*, as of God, as of the judge of the living and the dead; *καὶ οὐ δεῖ ἡμᾶς μικρὰ φρονεῖν περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν*, nor is it fitting that we think lowly things concerning our salvation," he immediately subjoined [2] this reason:

> For when we think lowly things concerning him, we also hope that we shall receive small things; and [1] when we hear as though concerning trifling things, we sin, *οὐκ εἰδότες πόθεν ἐκλήθημεν, καὶ ὑπὸ τίνος, καὶ εἰς ὃν τόπον, καὶ ὅσα ὑπέμεινεν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς παθεῖν ἕνεκα ἡμῶν*, not knowing whence we were called, and by whom, and into what place, and how great things Jesus Christ endured to suffer for us. What recompense, therefore, shall we repay him? Or what fruit worthy of those things which he gave us shall we render to him? How many pious benefits [2] do we owe him! For he bestowed light upon us; as a father he called us sons; *ἀπολλυμένους ἡμᾶς ἔσωσεν*, he saved us when we were perishing. What praise shall we give him, or what recompense [3] whereby we may compensate for the things which we have received—we who were captive in mind and worshiped stones, wood, gold, silver, and bronze, the works of men; and our whole life was nothing other than death? Therefore, surrounded by obscurity and having our sight filled with such darkness, we looked up, laying aside by his will that cloud by which we were encompassed. *Ἠλέησεν γὰρ ἡμᾶς καὶ σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἔσωσεν, θεασάμενος ἐν ἡμῖν πολλὴν πλάνην καὶ ἀπώλειαν, καὶ μηδεμίαν ἐλπίδα ἔχοντας σωτηρίας, εἰ μὴ τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ· ἐκάλεσεν γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὐκ ὄντας, καὶ ἠθέλησεν ἐκ μὴ ὄντος εἶναι ἡμᾶς.* For he had mercy upon us and, moved in his inward parts, made us safe, when he had seen in us much error and destruction and that we had no hope of salvation except that [4] which is from—

[1] Second Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. I, col. 40.

[2] Ibid., cols. 40–41.

[1] Thus Coustant renders in Latin the Greek words: *καὶ οἱ ἀκούοντες, ὥσπερ μικρῶν*. These not without reason appeared difficult and gaping to learned men, and therefore to be supplied either, with Wotton, *καὶ (ἡμεῖς) οἱ ἀκούοντες κ.τ.λ.*, or, with Birr, *καὶ οἱ (παρ)ακούοντες κ.τ.λ.*, and to be rendered more harmoniously: "and we who hear these things negligently, as though they were trifling, sin."

[2] In the annotation placed below, Coustant says: "Or *spiritual*, supply *gifts*. For immediately afterward he speaks of spiritual light. Therefore Wendelin appears not at all to have attained the mind of Clement in this version: 'How much holiness, indeed, do we owe him?' " But it must altogether be rendered: "How many benefits, indeed, do we owe him?" since among the Alexandrian interpreters of Scripture *ὅσια* frequently means benefits.

[3] Cotelier proceeds less skillfully in this place, rendering: "a recompense compensating for those things which we receive."

[4] Rom. IV.17; IX.25.

> "—him. For he called us when we were not, and willed us to be from that which was not."

As soon as he had confirmed these things by the testimony and support [1] of the Scriptures, with nothing interposed he proceeds [2]:

> Another Scripture [3] also says: "For I came not to call the just, but sinners." *Τοῦτο λέγει, ὅτι δεῖ τοὺς ἀπολλυμένους σώζειν· ἐκεῖνο γὰρ ἐστὶν μέγα καὶ θαυμαστόν, οὐ τὰ ἑστῶτα στηρίζειν, ἀλλὰ τὰ πίπτοντα.* This means that he must save those who are perishing. For that is great and admirable: to support not the things which stand but those which fall. *Οὕτως ὁ Χριστὸς ἠθέλησεν σῶσαι τὰ ἀπολλύμενα, καὶ ἔσωσεν πολλοὺς ἐλθών, καὶ καλέσας ἡμᾶς ἤδη ἀπολλυμένους.* Thus Christ willed to save the things which were perishing, and saved many when he came and when he called us who were already perishing.

We, therefore, are those to whom Clement testifies that the reparation procured by the advent of Christ pertains. But how many does he understand by the pronoun *ἡμᾶς*, "us"? Does he signify only some among men, and those the faithful, or, on the contrary, all men? He signifies those who were *πηροὶ τῇ διανοίᾳ*, captive in mind, addicted to idolatry, entangled in manifold error and sickness, supported by no hope in themselves, and, in a word, *ἀπολλύμενοι*, perishing. But these are descriptions which display the whole human race, bound and laid low by the original stain and by the crimes which afterward followed. Therefore the reparation which is owed to Christ is one which excepts no one, extends to all, and is adorned with the mark and token of universal amplitude.

CLX.

And in very truth, says Leo [4]:

> Our Savior was born today; let us rejoice. For it is not right that there be a place for sadness where there is the birthday of life, which, after consuming the fear of—
>
> "—mortality, bestows upon us joy concerning the promised eternity. No one is separated from participation in this gladness; one reason for joy is common to all, because our Lord, the destroyer of sin and death, just as he found no one free from guilt, so came for the liberation of all. Let the saint exult, because he approaches the palm.

[1] Isa. LIV.1; compare Gal. IV.27.
[2] Ibid., chaps. II–III, cols. 41–42.
[3] Matt. IX.13; Luke V.32.
[4] Sermon XXI, otherwise XX, chap. I, col. 64.

> Let the sinner rejoice, because he is invited to pardon. Let the gentile take courage, because he is called to life. For the Son of God, according to the fullness of time which the inscrutable height of the divine counsel disposed, assumed the nature of the human race in order to reconcile it to its author, so that the devil, the inventor of death, might be conquered through that very nature which he had conquered."

And he would be conquered by that triumph whereby the universal nature of men would be repaired.

> For [1] among all the works of God's mercy which from the beginning have been expended for the salvation of mortals, there is nothing more admirable, nothing more sublime, than that Christ was crucified for the world. For all the mysteries of preceding ages served this mystery; and whatever was varied by sacred dispensation in the differences of victims, in prophetic signs, and in legal institutions, announced beforehand that which had been disposed and promised that which was to be fulfilled, so that now, when images and figures have ceased, it profits us to believe already accomplished that which formerly profited men to believe was to be done.

And it was to be done not merely for the benefit of some, but of absolutely all, even of those who perished eternally through their own perfidy.

> For whatever mockery and contumely, whatever vexation and punishment, the fury of the impious inflicted upon the Lord [2], was tolerated not from necessity but assumed by his will; for [3] the Son of Man came to seek and to save that which had perished. And he so used the malice of his persecutors for the redemption of all that, in the mystery of his death and resurrection, even his slayers could be saved if they believed. Hence you, Judas, were more criminal than all and more unhappy: penance did not call you back to the Lord, but despair drew you to the noose. Had you awaited the consummation of your crime and delayed—
>
> "—the hideous hanging of your death until the blood of Christ was poured out for all sinners! And although so many miracles of the Lord, so many gifts, tormented your conscience, at least those mysteries which you had received at the paschal supper, when you had already been exposed in your perfidy by the sign of divine knowledge, would have called you back from your precipice. Why do you

[1] Sermon LIV, otherwise LII, chap. I, cols. 203–204.
[2] Sermon LIV, otherwise LII, chap. III, cols. 204–205.
[3] Luke XIX.10.

> distrust his goodness, who did not repel you from communion in his body and blood? Who, when you came with the crowds and a cohort of armed men to seize him, did not deny you the kiss [1] of peace? But, an inconvertible man, a spirit [2] going and not returning, you followed the madness of your heart; and with the devil standing at your right hand, you turned back upon your own head the iniquity which you had armed against the head of all the saints, so that, because your crime had exceeded every measure of vengeance, your impiety might have you as its judge and your punishment might suffer you as its executioner."

This would by no means have happened if despair had allowed a place for confidence, as was necessary.

> For the Passion [3] of Christ contains the mystery of our salvation, and from the instrument which the iniquity of the Jews prepared for punishment, the power of the Redeemer made for us a step unto glory. The Lord Jesus so undertook this for the salvation of all men that, amid the nails by which he was held fast to the wood, he entreated the paternal clemency for his slayers and said [4]: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

Nor [5] is this wonderful:

> For the victory of the cross has been denied to none of the infirm; nor is there anyone whom the prayer of Christ does not assist. If it profited many of those who raged against him, how much more does it assist those who are converted to him? Ignorance has been taken away, difficulty has been tempered, and the sacred blood of Christ has extinguished that fiery sword by which the region of life had been enclosed [6]. The obscurity of the ancient night has yielded to the true light. The Christian people is invited to the riches of paradise, and for all—
>
> "—the regenerated a return to the lost fatherland has been opened, if no one causes that way to be closed to himself which could be opened by the faith of the thief."

That way would certainly lie open to absolutely all, were there not those who obstruct it for themselves.

---

[1] Luke XXII.48.

[2] Ps. LXXVII.39 and CVIII.6.

[3] Sermon LV, otherwise LIII, chap. I, cols. 208–209.

[4] Luke XXIII.34.

[5] Sermon LXVI, otherwise LXII, chap. III, col. 257.

[6] Quesnell suspects that "intercluded" would be read more suitably.

> For it must be confessed [1] what the blessed teacher of the gentiles, Paul the Apostle, confessed with a glorious voice [2], saying: "A faithful saying and worthy of all acceptance: that Christ Jesus came into this world to save sinners." For herein the mercy of God toward us is more wonderful: that Christ died [3] not for the just nor for the holy, but for the unjust and impious; and although the nature of divinity could not receive the sting of death, nevertheless by being born from us he assumed that which he could offer for us. For long ago he threatened our death with the power of his death, saying [4] through Hosea the prophet: "O death, I shall be your death, and I shall be your bite, O hell." For by dying he underwent the laws of hell, but by rising he dissolved them; and he so cut short the perpetuity of death as to make it temporal from eternal. For just as [5] all die in Adam, so in Christ all shall be made alive.

For the malignity [6] of the devil:

> poured out just blood, which, by reconciling the world, would be both its price and its drink. The Lord assumed that which he chose according to the purpose of his will. He admitted against himself the impious hands of those who raged, which, while they pressed upon their own crime, served the Redeemer. So great was the affection of his piety even toward his slayers that, entreating the Father from the cross, he asked not that he himself be avenged but that they be forgiven [7], saying: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." And it was surely from the power of this prayer that the preaching of Peter the Apostle converted to penance the hearts of many—
>
> "—of those who had said [8]: 'His blood be upon us and upon our sons'; and in one day almost three thousand Jews were baptized [1], and the heart and soul of all were made one, now prepared to die for him whom they had demanded to be crucified.

[1] Sermon LIX, otherwise LVII, chap. VIII, col. 229.
[2] I Tim. I.15.
[3] Rom. V.6.
[4] Hos. XIII.14.
[5] I Cor. XV.22.
[6] Sermon LXII, otherwise LX, chap. III, cols. 239–240.
[7] Luke XXIII.34.
[8] Matt. XXVII.25.
[1] Acts II.41; compare IV.32.

> Judas the betrayer could not [3] attain this indulgence [2], because, as a son of perdition at whose right hand the devil [4] stood, he passed into despair before Christ fulfilled the mystery of general redemption. For after the Lord had died for all the impious, even he could perhaps [5] have obtained a remedy if he had not hastened to the noose. But upon his malignant heart, now devoted to the deceits of theft, now occupied with parricidal dealings, none of the teachings of the Savior's mercy had ever settled. With impious ears he had received the words of the Lord saying [6]: "I came not to call the just, but sinners"; and, "The Son of Man came to seek and to save that which had perished." Nor had he understood the clemency of Christ, who not only healed bodily infirmities but also cured the wounds of feeble souls, saying [7] to the paralytic: "Be constant, son; your sins are remitted to you"; and saying to the adulteress [8] brought before him: "Neither shall I condemn you; go, and henceforth sin no more," so that through all his works he might show that in that advent of his he had come as the Savior of the world, not as Judge. Estranged from this understanding, the impious betrayer rose against himself, not by the judgment of one repenting but by the fury of one perishing, so that he who had sold the author of life to his slayers might, unto the increase of his condemnation, sin even by dying."

But he sinned for this reason, that he cast away hope [9]:

> "Since he who came to save sinners did not deny mercy even to his very slayers, but changed the evil of the impious into the good of believers, so that the grace of God, mercifully prepared not according to the merits of men but according to the multitude of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God, might become more wonderful when the wave [1] of baptism received even those who had poured out the blood of the Savior. . . . Therefore, because the Lord Jesus Christ willed to suffer the fury of those who raged, he was in no way the author [2] of their crimes. He did not bring it about that they willed

[3] He could not because he would not, as all the things which follow plainly demonstrate.

[2] Ibid., chap. IV, col. 240.

[4] Ps. CVIII.

[5] This particle "perhaps" is absent from other editions. But although it is approved, it conveys not the force of doubt but of a certain graver difficulty into which Judas had cast himself by his perversity.

[6] Matt. IX.13; compare Luke V.32.

[7] Matt. IX.2.

[8] John VIII.11.

[9] Sermon LXVII, otherwise LXV, chap. III, cols. 261–262.

[1] Acts II.37–41.

[2] Acts IV.27.

> this, but yielded so that they could; and thus he used the madness of the blinded people, just as also the perfidy of the betrayer, whom he deigned to call back from the savagery of the crime conceived both by benefits and by words: assuming him as a disciple, advancing him as an apostle, admonishing him by signs, consecrating him by mysteries, so that for him nothing of benevolence might be lacking for correction and no occasion might remain for crime.
>
> "But [3] you, most impious man, . . . believed the devil's incitements more useful to you, so that, inflamed by the torches of avarice, you might burn for the gain of thirty pieces of silver and not see what riches you were losing. . . . Hence the crime of your transaction is to be detested not because you valued the Lord cheaply, but because, that you might not spare yourself, you sold even your Redeemer. And deservedly your punishment was entrusted to you, because no one could be found more savage than you for your punishment."

CLXI.

I am so struck by the perspicuity and evidence of these things that I hold it certain there will be no one who calls into doubt the universal amplitude of reparation. For what, I ask, can not absurdly be required in order that it be considered plainly universal? Is it a) that by affirmative judgments all be said to have been repaired and all redeemed? But we have heard it everywhere inculcated that redemption is general, pertains to all, is common, embraces the human race, embraces the—

—world, and within its compass contains all the infirm, the crushed, and those about to perish.

Is it b) that by negative judgments no one be taught to be excepted from reparation and no one alien to redemption? But the use of such judgments is most frequent, and it is repeatedly asserted that no one is excluded from the benefit of reparation and no one is found for whom the piety of the Savior did not provide.

Is it c) that by distributive judgments all and each of the classes of men be shown enriched by those goods and raised up by those aids of which reparation consists? But there is no class to which the benefits proceeding from reparation are not attributed. For they are attributed to the gentiles, attributed to sinners, attributed to the slayers of Christ, and are attributed even to him to whom the infamous name of betrayer adhered from his betrayal.

Is it d) that the same universal amplitude be proposed by comparative judgments? But it is proposed by these also, whether when reparation through Christ

[3] Ibid., chap. IV, col. 262.

is compared with the ruin which the fall of Adam introduced, or when the same limits are assigned to reparation and to original transgression.

Is it e) that by judgments affected by an exception, all and only those be declared deprived of the benefit of reparation who have obstructed for themselves the way of salvation and impeded the return to the heavenly fatherland? But we have received these judgments also as employed once and again.

Is it f) that the supreme destruction of men be especially proved from this: that it cannot be separated and torn away from a certain incredible contempt of divine benefits? But not even this is passed over, when Judas is accused especially on this account: that he destroyed himself contrary to the will of God; that, in order not to spare himself, he sold his own Redeemer; and that he strangled himself with a noose, although nothing of benevolence was lacking to him for correction and no occasion remained for crime.

Finally, is it g) that an origin and cause of reparation be disclosed which suffers no limits and receives no bounds? But the origin which is disclosed and the cause of reparation which is shown are the infinite mercy of God and of his Christ, which extends as far as human misery extends itself. Either, therefore, nothing can be effected by witnesses—

—and nothing demonstrated by testimonies, or it must be judged altogether demonstrated from the profession and doctrine of the Apostolic See that the condition and benefit of reparation pertain to the universal human race and to absolutely all men.

CLXII.

And they pertain to all in such a way that not even one moment of time has passed since the most wretched transgression of Adam which was empty of the benefits of the reparation that was at last to be fulfilled and consummated. "For," writes Leo [1],

> because, according to the inscrutable purpose of the wisdom of God, in the last days [2] the Word was made flesh, it does not therefore follow that the birth of the salvific Virgin profited only the generations of the final time and did not also pour itself back into preceding ages. Absolutely all antiquity of those worshiping the true God, every number of the saints in the prior ages, lived and was pleasing in this faith; and neither for the patriarchs, nor for the prophets, nor for absolutely any of the saints was there salvation and justification except in the redemption of our Lord Jesus Christ. Just as it was

[1] Sermon LII, otherwise L, chap. I, col. 199.

[2] John I.14.

> awaited, promised by many oracles and signs of the prophets, so it was also presented by the gift and work itself.

For [3]:

> figures preceded so that the effect might follow; and with the advent of the things announced, the offices of the messengers were ended, the reconciliation of the human race being so ordered that the salvation which is in Christ was lacking to no ages under the same justification. And the rationale of the delays profited to this end: that those things which were believed for a long time before they occurred might be honored without hesitation. For since the virtue of faith consists in those things [4] which are not subjected to sight, heavenly doctrine dealt more indulgently with us, whom it deferred unto these times of the world, so that, for facility of understanding, we might employ many more prophets and witnesses than our predecessors.

It is necessary, therefore, to distinguish accurately and diligently: a)—

—when reparation was first completed and when it began to unfold its power; and then b) what difference of condition ought to be established between men who passed their mortal life before or after the mystery of reparation was completed.

As regards the former, the answer is readily at hand: reparation was not completed in the work itself before the fullness of times had arrived; nevertheless, in no ages were those benefits lacking of which perfect and absolute reparation was the fountain and most abundant origin. But as regards the latter, it must be held that more indulgently indeed was it done, and is it still done, with those who lived and will live after the fullness of times; nevertheless, the safeguards necessary for obtaining salvation were also present to those who had completed the course of mortal life in the ages which had previously passed.

Leo explains all these things remarkably when, having aroused [1] his hearers to the promised understanding of faith and admonished them not to be content to know the order of the deed unless they also inspect the very rationale of the piety expended upon them, so that human nature, by knowing how much it is loved by its author, may love him more, he immediately adds [2]:

> God had no cause for having mercy upon us except in his own goodness; and the second generation of men is more wonderful than their first condition, because it is a greater thing that in the last ages God repaired that which had perished than that in the beginning he made

[3] Sermon LXIX, otherwise LXVII, chap. II, cols. 268–269.

[4] Heb. XI.1.

[1] Sermon LXVI, otherwise LXII, chap. I, col. 255.

[2] Ibid., cols. 255–256.

> that which was not. Therefore no merits of the preceding saints received by themselves the liberty of natural innocence which we lost through the transgression of our first parents, because the sentence pronounced against the transgressors bound every offspring of the captive posterity, and no one was exempt from condemnation because no one was free from guilt. But the redemption of the Savior, destroying the work of the devil and breaking the bonds of sin, so disposed the mystery of his great piety that the predetermined fullness of the generations would indeed run unto the consummation of the world, but the renewal of origin through the justification of an undiscriminating faith would pertain to all past ages. For the Incarnation of the Word and the slaying and resurrection of Christ were made—
>
> "—the salvation of all the faithful; and the blood of the one just man bestowed this upon us who believe that it was poured out for the reconciliation of the world, which it conferred upon the fathers who similarly believed it was to be poured out."

Therefore, in another sermon again, having first explained in these words [1] both the amplitude and the necessity of the Incarnation:

> In order, therefore, that we might be called back from original bonds and worldly errors unto eternal beatitude, he himself descended to us, to whom we could not ascend. For although a love of truth was inherent in many [2], nevertheless the variety of uncertain opinions was deceived by the craftiness of deceiving demons, and human ignorance was drawn by knowledge falsely so called into diverse and conflicting judgments. But for removing this mockery, by which captive minds served the proud devil, legal doctrine did not suffice, nor could our nature be repaired by prophetic exhortations alone; but the truth of redemption had to be added to moral institutes, and the origin corrupted from the beginning had to be reborn from new beginnings. A victim had to be offered for those to be reconciled which would both share in our race and be alien to our contamination, so that this purpose of God, by which it pleased him that the sin of the world be destroyed in the nativity and Passion of Jesus Christ, might pertain to the ages of all generations, and that mysteries varied according to the rationale of times might not disturb us

[1] Sermon XXIII, otherwise XXII, chap. III, cols. 75–76.

[2] Without which human nature would have to be considered not infected and stripped of preternatural and supernatural gifts, but utterly lost.

> but rather confirm us, since the faith by which we live was diverse in no age.

With no delay interposed [3], he adds:

> Therefore let the complaints of those cease who, opposing the divine economies with impious murmuring, complain of the lateness of the Lord's nativity, as though that which was accomplished in the last age of the world had not been expended upon preceding times. For the Incarnation [4] of the Word conferred, while it was to be done, that which it conferred when accomplished; and the mystery of human salvation never ceased in any antiquity. What the apostles preached, this the prophets announced; nor—
>
> "—was that fulfilled late which was always believed. But the wisdom and benignity of God, by this delay of the salvific work, made us more capacious of his calling, so that what had been announced beforehand by many signs, many voices, and many mysteries through so many ages would not be ambiguous in these days of the Gospel; and the nativity of the Savior, which was to exceed all miracles and every measure of human understanding, would beget in us a faith the more constant, the more ancient and frequent the preaching of it had preceded. Therefore God did not take counsel for human affairs by a new counsel, nor provide for them with a late compassion, but from the foundation of the world he instituted one and the same cause of salvation for all. For the grace of God, by which the universality of the saints has always been justified, was increased when Christ was born, not begun; and this mystery of great piety, by which the whole world has now been filled, was nevertheless powerful even in its significations, so that those who believed it promised attained no less than those who received it when given."

Therefore the reparation of the human race obtained by the blood of Christ excels and shines especially by a twofold endowment: first, by universality of persons, by which it embraces all and each of men; and then by universality of times, by which it so encompassed all ages that it did not pass over even one empty of its graces. Nor can we judge that those ascended to the promised understanding of faith who either a) do not distinguish the work itself of completed redemption from its power; or b) circumscribe by the same boundaries both the work and its power; or c) judge that the delay of completed and consummated

[3] Ibid., chap. IV, col. 76.

[4] With these things agree those which Augustine discusses in epistle XLIX to Deogratias, question II.

redemption is to be attributed not to wisdom and benignity but to severity and justice. For although the Only-begotten came into the world only in the last times, underwent death, and consummated the very work of reparation by his poured-out blood, nevertheless its power passed over no ages and deprived none of its gifts. And although the nativity and death of the Repairer can perhaps be called late, nevertheless the mercy of him who repairs neither can nor ought to be called or believed late. For from the foundation of the world he instituted one and the same cause of salvation for all. Just as it belonged to mercy never to deny the necessary aids to anyone, so it belonged to wisdom and—

—benignity to educate and advance the human family by certain steps, as it were, and to lead it to a certain summit, as it were, of perfection. The institutor and reformer of men accomplished this by delaying the work of reparation; for the grace of God by which the universality of the saints has always been justified was increased, not begun, when Christ was born.

CLXIII.

By these things we are taught that, besides each universality of persons and times, a third endowment of efficacy and fecundity also belongs to the order of reparation. Certainly nearly all the things which we have hitherto described conduce to establishing and confirming this endowment. The very name of reparation also conduces to it, which cannot even be conceived in the mind when separated from efficacy. Then other altogether clear things conduce to it which the Roman bishops jointly testify.

Among these Clement, speaking of the things which Christ accomplished and continues to accomplish [1] for our benefit, says:

> This is the way, dearly beloved, in which we find our salvation, Jesus Christ, *τὸν ἀρχιερέα τῶν προσφορῶν ἡμῶν, τὸν προστάτην καὶ βοηθὸν τῆς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν*, the pontiff [2] of our oblations, the patron and helper of our infirmity. *Διὰ τούτου ἀτενίσωμεν* [3] *εἰς τὰ ὕψη τῶν οὐρανῶν, διὰ τούτου ἐνοπτρισώμεθα τὴν ἄμωμον καὶ ὑπερτάτην ὄψιν αὐτοῦ, διὰ τούτου ἠνεῴχθησαν ἡμῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῆς καρδίας, διὰ τούτου ἡ ἀσύνετος καὶ ἐσκοτωμένη διάνοια ἡμῶν ἀναθάλλει εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς, διὰ τούτου ἠθέλησεν ὁ δεσπότης τῆς ἀθανάτου γνώσεως ἡμᾶς γεύσασθαι· ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ, τοσούτῳ μείζων ἐστὶν ἀγγέλων, ὅσῳ*

[1] First Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. XXXVI, cols. 26–27.

[2] Heb. IV.15; VIII.1–3.

[3] Wotton and others prefer to read *ἀτενίζομεν*, "we behold," and immediately afterward *ἐνοπτριζόμεθα*, "we contemplate."

> *διαφορώτερον ὄνομα κεκληρονόμηκεν.* Through him let us fix our eyes upon the heights of heaven; through him let us behold his spotless and supreme countenance; through him [4] the eyes of our heart were opened—
>
> "—through him [1] our foolish and darkened mind rises unto his admirable light; through him the Lord willed that we should taste immortal knowledge—he who [2], since he is the splendor of his majesty, is as much greater than the angels as the name he inherited is more excellent. For thus [3] it is written: 'Who makes his angels spirits and his ministers a flame of fire.' But concerning his Son the Lord spoke thus [4]: 'You are my Son; today I have begotten you. Ask of me, and I shall give you the gentiles as your inheritance and the ends of the earth as your possession.' And again [5] he says to him: 'Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies the footstool of your feet.' *Τίνες οἱ (ἐχθροὶ αὐτοῦ); οἱ φαῦλοι καὶ ἀντιτασσόμενοι* [6] *τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ θελήματι τὸ θέλημα ἴδιον.* Who are his enemies? Those who are depraved and who oppose their own will to the divine will."

Therefore we contracted no disease for which God did not apply medicine through Christ; and we lost no ornament which God did not restore to us through Christ. For he restored to us knowledge against ignorance, virtue against infirmity, and conjunction and fellowship with the supreme truth and supreme good against the separation by which we departed from him through transgression.

Hence Clement, provoking us to consider [7] *τῆς ἁγίας κλήσεως ἡμῶν κανόνα*, the canon of our holy vocation, says:

> Let us see what is good, what grateful and acceptable before him who made us. *Ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἴδωμεν, ὡς ἐστὶν τίμιον τῷ Θεῷ αἷμα αὐτοῦ, ὅτι διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκχυθὲν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ μετανοίας χάριν ὑπήνεγκεν. Ἀνέλθωμεν εἰς τὰς γενεὰς πάσας, καὶ καταμάθωμεν, ὅτι ἐν γενεᾷ καὶ γενεᾷ μετανοίας τόπον ἔδωκεν ὁ δεσπότης τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐπιστραφῆναι ἐπ' αὐτόν.* Let us gaze intently upon the blood of Christ, and—
>
> "—let us consider how precious his blood is to God, which, poured out for our salvation, offered the grace of penance to the whole

[4] Eph. I.18.
[1] Rom. I.21; I Pet. II.9. Compare Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, book IV, § XVII.
[2] Heb. I.3–4; compare Wis. VII.26.
[3] Ps. CIII.4; compare Heb. I.7.
[4] Ps. II.7–8; compare Heb. I.5.
[5] Ps. CIX.1; compare Heb. I.13.
[6] More simply Wotton reads: *καὶ ἀντιτασσόμενοι τῷ θελήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ.*
[7] First Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. VII, cols. 12–13.

> world. Let us recur to all the ages of the world, and let us learn that in generation after generation the Lord granted a place of penance to those willing to be converted to him. Noah [1] was a preacher of penance, and those who obeyed him were saved. Jonah [2] preached destruction to the Ninevites; but they, doing penance for their sins, placated God by prayers and attained salvation, although they were alien to God.
>
> *Οἱ* [3] *λειτουργοὶ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου περὶ μετανοίας ἐλάλησαν, καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ δεσπότης τῶν ἁπάντων περὶ μετανοίας ἐλάλησεν μεθ' ὅρκου· ζῶ γὰρ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος, οὐ βούλομαι τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ, ὡς τὴν μετάνοιαν.* The ministers of divine grace spoke concerning penance through the Holy Spirit; and the Lord of all himself spoke concerning penance not without an oath [4]: "As I live, says the Lord, I do not will the death of the sinner, but penance." . . . *Πάντας οὖν τοὺς ἀγαπητοὺς αὐτοῦ βουλόμενος μετανοίας μετασχεῖν, ἐστήριξε τῷ παντοκρατορικῷ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ.* Therefore he confirmed by his omnipotent will his intention that all his beloved should become participants in penance. *Διὸ ὑπακούσωμεν τῇ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ καὶ ἐνδόξῳ βουλήσει αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἱκέται γενόμενοι τοῦ ἐλέους καὶ τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ, προσπέσωμεν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωμεν ἐπὶ τοὺς οἰκτιρμοὺς αὐτοῦ, ἀπολιπόντες τὴν* [5] *ματαιοπονίαν, τήν τε ἔριν, καὶ τὸ εἰς θάνατον ἄγον ζῆλος.* Therefore [6] let us obey his magnificent and glorious will and, as suppliants imploring his mercy and benignity, let us, after abandoning vain works, contention, and the rivalry which leads to death, cast ourselves upon and turn to his compassions."

Therefore, by his first and antecedent will, which is referred to and is occupied with that which is in itself *καλὸν καὶ—*

—τερπνὸν καὶ προσδεκτὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ ποιήσαντος ἡμᾶς, beautiful and pleasant and acceptable before our maker, God never failed to look to this: that *παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ*, for the whole world and for the universal posterity of Adam, the grace of penance should be present. By the same will and the same counsel, *διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν*, for our salvation, Christ poured out his blood. Nor with

---

[1] Gen. VII; compare II Pet. II.5.

[2] Jonah III.

[3] First Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. VIII, col. 13.

[4] Ezek. XXXIII.11; compare XVIII.30.

[5] Perhaps you would more fittingly read *ματαιολογίαν*, as may be conjectured from the things which Polycarp writes in the Epistle to the Philippians, chap. II.

[6] First Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. IX, col. 13.

another mind did God send throughout absolutely all ages those who would announce penance. Indeed, with this very mind, and in order to add hope to men, he testified not without an oath: "As I live, I do not will the death of the sinner, but penance."

God perseveres in this will toward men, no less benevolent than full of efficacy, for as long as men themselves pass their time in this present mortality. Clement hands this down in a remarkable and eloquent discourse [1], saying:

> Therefore, for as long as we live upon the earth, let us do penance; for we are clay in the hand of the artisan. For just as the potter, if he makes a vessel and it is distorted or crushed in his hands, fashions it again, but if he has determined to put it into the furnace of fire, he will no longer come to its aid; *οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἕως ἐσμὲν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ κόσμῳ, ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ ὃ ἐπράξαμεν πονηρά, μετανοήσωμεν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας, ἵνα σωθῶμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ἕως ἔχομεν καιρὸν μετανοίας. μετὰ γὰρ τὸ ἐξελθεῖν ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, οὐκέτι δυνάμεθα ἐκεῖ ἐξομολογήσασθαι ἢ μετανοεῖν ἔτι·* so also let us, for as long as we are in this world, do penance with our whole heart for the sins which we committed in the flesh, that we may be saved by the Lord while we have time for penance. For after we have departed from the world, we can no longer [2] confess there or do penance.

CLXIV.

Therefore, when we are first born, we are received in the arms of mercy—

and are not abandoned by them before we have persisted as rebels even unto the end. Since Celestine knew this well, he wrote to the bishops of the provinces of Vienne and Narbonne in these words [1]:

> We have learned that penance is denied to the dying, and that the desires of those who, at the time of their death, desire their soul to be assisted by this remedy are not granted. I shudder, I confess, that anyone of such great impiety should be found as to despair of the piety of God, as though he could not at any time come to the aid of one hastening to him and liberate a man endangered beneath the bur-

[1] Second Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. VIII, col. 44.

[2] "Hence," Coustant admonishes, "the error of Origen is forestalled, by which, as Justinian speaks, vol. V of Labbe's *Councils*, p. 666, he judged that the punishment of all impious men and, besides these, of the demons would have an end, and that both impious men and demons would be restored to their pristine order. For these things cannot be admitted without preceding penance."

[1] Epistle IV, chap. II, n. 3, col. 1068.

> den of sins from the weight from which he desires to be freed. What else, I ask, is this than to add death to a dying man and by one's own cruelty to kill his soul, lest it be able to be absolved? For God, most ready to come to aid, when inviting to penance, thus promises [2]: "The sinner," he says, "on whatsoever day he shall have been converted, his sins shall not be imputed to him." And again [3]: "I do not will the death of the sinner, but only that he be converted and live." Therefore whoever [4] has denied penance for the past at the time of death takes salvation away from a man. And he has despaired of the clemency of God who did not believe that God could suffice to assist the dying even in a moment. The thief [5] hanging upon the cross at Christ's right hand would have lost the reward if the penance of one hour had not assisted him. While he was in punishment, he repented, and through the profession of one declaration, with God promising, he merited the dwelling of paradise. Therefore the true conversion to God of those placed at the end is to be judged by the mind rather than by time, the prophet asserting this in such wise [6]: "When you have been converted and groan, then you shall be saved." Since, therefore, the Lord is the inspector of the heart, penance is not to be denied at any time to one who asks, since he binds himself to that judge to whom he knows all hidden things are revealed.

Things most similar to these are read in Ivo [7] and Gratian [8], attributed to Julius;—

—and Leo has things most similar to these when writing [1] to Theodore, bishop of Forum Julii:

> But to those who, in a time of necessity and at the urgent moment of danger, implore the aid of penance and immediately of reconciliation, neither is satisfaction to be forbidden nor reconciliation denied, because we can neither place measures upon the mercy of God nor define times for it. With him true conversion suffers no delays of pardon, as the Spirit of God says [2] through the prophet: "When you have been converted and groan, then you shall be saved." And else-

[2] Ezek. XXXIII.15.
[3] Ibid., chap. XVIII.23.
[4] That is, whoever at the time of death has denied penance for the past.
[5] Luke XXIII.42.
[6] Ezek. XVIII–XXXIII.
[7] *Decree*, part XV, chap. XLIII.
[8] *Decree*, distinction XXVI, question VI, canon XII.
[1] Epistle CVIII, otherwise LXXXIII, chap. IV, col. 1173.
[2] Isa. XXX.15, from the Alexandrian interpretation.

> where [3]: "Tell your iniquities first, that you may be justified." And again [4]: "For with the Lord there is mercy, and with him plentiful redemption." Therefore, in dispensing the gifts of God, we ought not to be difficult, nor to neglect the tears and groans of those accusing themselves, since we believe the very affection of repenting to have been conceived from the inspiration of God, as the Apostle says [5]: "Lest perhaps God give them penance, that they may recover themselves from the snares of the devil, by whom they are held captive according to his will."

But since the piety of God is so great, and his long-suffering mercy reaches so far that, for as long as men live, it never wholly casts them away and abandons them, will there be those who doubt either the instituted order of salvation or its fecundity and efficacy? Especially since there is no man whom Leo does not judge should be addressed with these words [6]:

> To you, once cast away; to you, driven from the seats of paradise; to you, dying through long exiles; to you, dissolved into dust and ashes, for whom there was now no hope of living—through the Incarnation of the Word power was given that you might return from afar to your author, recognize your parent, be made free from a servant, be advanced from a stranger into a son; so that you who were born of corruptible flesh might be reborn of the Spirit of God, and obtain through grace that which you did not have through nature; and, if you recognize yourself as a son of God through the spirit of adoption, dare to call God—
>
> "—Father."

For just as [1] "Adam, neglecting the precepts of God, introduced the condemnation of sin, so Jesus, made under the law, restored the liberty of justice. Just as the former, obeying the devil even unto transgression, merited that in him all should die, so the latter, obeying the Father even unto the cross, brought it about that in him all should be made alive. Just as the former, covetous of angelic honor, lost the dignity of his nature, so the latter, assuming the condition of our infirmity, placed in the heavenly regions those for whom he descended to the infernal regions. Finally, just as to the former, fallen through pride, it was said [2], 'You are earth, and into earth you shall go,' so to the latter, exalted through

[3] Isa. XLIII.26, from the same interpretation.
[4] Ps. CXXIX.7.
[5] II Tim. II.25.
[6] Sermon XXII, otherwise XXI, chap. V, col. 71.
[1] Sermon XXV, otherwise XXIV, chap. V, col. 86.
[2] Gen. III.19.

subjection, it was said [3], 'Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies the footstool of your feet.' "

For when human nature was assumed by the Only-begotten [4]:

> Iniquity returns to innocence, and oldness to newness; aliens come into adoption, and strangers enter into the inheritance. From impious they begin to be just, from covetous benign, from incontinent chaste, from earthly heavenly. But what is this change except that of the right hand of the Most High? Since [5] the Son of God came to dissolve the works of the devil, and so inserted himself into us and us into himself that the descent of God to human things became the advancement of man to divine things.

For the Word [6] "was made flesh so that a passible nature might be taken from the womb of the Virgin, and that which could not be perpetrated against the Son of God might be admitted against the Son of Man. For although at his very birth the signs of divinity flashed forth in him and all the increments of bodily advancement were filled with divine miracles, nevertheless he had assumed the truth of our infirmities and, excepting fellowship in sin, had excluded from himself nothing of human weakness, so that he might both bring his things into us and cure our things in himself. For by the almighty physician a twofold remedy was prepared for us wretched ones—"

> "—of which one is in a sacrament, the other in an example, so that through the one divine things may be conferred, through the other human things required. For just as God is the author of justification, so man is the debtor of devotion."

Certainly [1], "the first Adam and the second Adam were one in flesh, not in work; and in the former all die, in the latter all shall be made alive. The former through the desire of pride made a journey to misery; the latter through the fortitude of humility prepared the way to glory. Hence he himself says [2]: 'I am the way and the truth and the life.' The way, namely, in the form of a just manner of life; the truth in the expectation [3] of a certain thing; life in the reception of eternal felicity."

---

[3] Ps. CIX.1.

[4] Sermon XXVII, otherwise XXVI, chap. II, col. 93.

[5] I John III.8.

[6] Sermon LXVII, otherwise LXV, chap. V, col. 262.

[1] Sermon LXIX, otherwise LXVII, chap. III, col. 270.

[2] John XIV.6.

[3] Perhaps "hope," as Quesnell conjectures.

"Just as Jewish impiety, so diabolical pride did not know this mystery [4] of great piety. For if they had known [5], they would never have crucified the Lord of majesty. But because the counsel of God's mercy was hidden from the enemy of the human race, and God [6], reconciling the world to himself in Christ, was covered by the veil of flesh placed before him, he persisted in raging against him in whom he could find nothing of his own. For this could rather have profited his malignity: if he had spared him and abstained from pouring out his blood, through which the captivity of all was to be dissolved and liberty repaired. But [7] the darkness did not comprehend the light, nor could lying blindness behold the wisdom of truth. Meekness, therefore, maintained its appointed patience and, after the power of the angelic legions serving him had been restrained, he drank the chalice of sorrow and death and transferred the whole punishment into triumph. Errors were conquered, powers were subdued, the world received a new beginning, so that a condemned generation would not harm those for whose salvation regeneration came to their aid."

Therefore the ineffable reparation of our salvation, which commends itself by universality, likewise excels in efficacy and fecundity. For by it captivity is dissolved, liberty repaired, original [1]—

damage is repaired, and the rationale of human life is so administered [2] "that no place is left to us either for pride or for sloth, because we have nothing except what we have received, and we are continually admonished not to hold the gifts of God's grace negligently. For he who precedes us with aid justly presses upon us with a precept; and he who leads us to glory benignly invites us to obedience."

CLXV.

Having set forth these things concerning the doctrine and faith of the Roman Church, and explained them according to the faculty which was in us, we are in a certain manner admonished by the very nature of things immediately to question the Church of Antioch and diligently to inquire what it thought and determined

[4] Ibid., chap. IV, col. 270.

[5] I Cor. II.8.

[6] II Cor. V.19.

[7] John I.5.

[1] In the appendix to Leo's sermons the efficacy of reparation is explained in these words, Sermon II, chap. II, col. 407: "He who in the beginning created by majesty came in the last times to save through flesh. The creation of men was the first power; salvation, the second piety. The Lord, moved by an impulse of benignity, willed to restore to us by mercy whatever offense had taken away. Therefore he descended that we might ascend; he lowered heavenly things that he might lift up earthly things; he made himself a participant in man, that he might make man a fellow of God."

[2] Sermon LXVII, otherwise LXV, chap. VI, cols. 262–263.

concerning the salvific will of God and the order of reparation. For we judge that no one can be found who does not know that each Church is bound by a most intimate bond, since one and the same Peter presided over each, governed Antioch for some time, but governed Rome even unto death, and enriched it with his prerogatives and supreme principality. But it will not be difficult for us to discover the faith and profession of the diocese of Antioch and, when discovered, to bring it to light, since witnesses concerning it are available both more numerous in number and most weighty in authority, while they speak testimonies of such a kind as are deservedly and rightly judged most clear.

And to the sound teachers of the East nothing was more ancient and nothing more solemn than to extol the innate goodness of God and the beneficence poured forth from it upon—

—all, and by repeated judgments to confirm the universal amplitude of the salvific will. To each head pertain not a few of those things which Nemesius [1], a Christian philosopher of the fourth century and likewise honored with the amplest praises by Maximus [2], Anastasius of Sinai [3], and Moses Bar-Cepha [4], clearly embraces [5] in his golden little book *Περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου*, *On the Nature of Man*. For in that chapter [6] which he entitles *Περὶ προνοίας*, *On Providence*, he speaks precisely thus: *Ἄλλως τε ἀγαθός ἐστιν ὁ Θεός· ἀγαθὸς δὲ ὤν, εὐεργετικός· εἰ δὲ εὐεργετικός, καὶ προνοητικός.* "Moreover, God is good; and since he is good, he is inclined to benefit; and if inclined to benefit, he is also provident."

While other things ought to be attributed to this providence proceeding from benignity, this especially ought to be attributed: that to absolutely all men, and at any time in this present life, power is divinely given to recover their senses and to obtain salvation and immortality. "For [7] man has been affected by a twofold kind of honor and gift: both because he alone obtains by penance pardon of sins, and because his body alone—"

---

[1] John Fell treats accurately of Nemesius in the preface to his little work published at Oxford in the year 1671, and Michael Le Quien in *Oriens Christianus*, vol. II, pp. 839–840.

[2] In the theological and polemical works, works, vol. II, p. 153, Paris ed. 1674.

[3] Questions XVIII–XXIV, in Gretser, works, vol. XIV, part II, pp. 270–294.

[4] *On Paradise*, p. 55, Antwerp ed. 1569.

[5] In this little book all things are golden, if you except those in which, chap. II, he hands down the *προϋπαρξιν*, preexistence, of souls. For although Methodius in the *Banquet of the Virgins*, discourse II, § V; Pierius in Photius, *Bibliotheca*, codex CXIX; and others had previously gone into the same opinion with Origen, nevertheless it ought to be indubitable to us what Leo the Great sanctions in epistle XV to Turribius, chap. X: "The Catholic faith constantly and truthfully preaches that the souls of men did not exist before they were breathed into bodies, nor are they embodied by anyone other than God the artificer, who is the creator both of them and of bodies."

[6] *On the Nature of Man*, chap. XLII, pp. 417–418, in Gallandi, vol. VII.

[7] Ibid., chap. I, pp. 357–358.

> "—although mortal and perishable, is rendered eternal and immortal. Of these, the former, which pertains to the body, he attained on account of the soul; the latter, which pertains to the soul, on account of the body. *Μόνος γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῶν λογικῶν ἐξαίρετον ἔσχε τὸ συγγνώμης ἐν τῷ μετανοεῖν ἀξιοῦσθαι.* For man alone among all things endowed with reason has this distinction: that his error is pardoned by penance. For neither demons nor angels can obtain pardon of offenses through penance. *Καὶ ἐν τούτῳ μάλιστα καὶ δίκαιος καὶ ἐλεήμων ὁ Θεὸς δείκνυταί τε καὶ λέγεται.* In this especially God is both shown and called just and merciful. For since angels have no necessary cause which impels them to sin, but by nature are free from every affection of the body, from want, and from pleasure, deservedly they cannot aspire to pardon through penance. But man is not only a participant in reason but also an animal; and the necessary uses of animal life and turbulent motions very often weaken and undermine reason. Therefore, when he returns to health and, after declining the turbulent motions of the soul, embraces virtue, just mercy—that is, pardon—is bestowed upon him. And just as it is proper to his nature to laugh, for it is present both to him alone, to every one, and always, so among things constituted not by the law of nature but by God's benefit toward us, it is proper to man above all things endowed with reason that through penance he be liberated from every guilt. *Καὶ γὰρ μόνῳ ἀνθρώπῳ τοῦτο δεδώρηται, καὶ παντί, καὶ ἀεὶ παρὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐγκοσμίου ζωῆς, μετὰ δὲ θάνατον οὐκέτι.* For to man alone, and to every man, and always, for as long as he lives upon earth, has this been given; but after death, no longer."

From these things two consequences follow, and they most illustrious. First, that God conducted and still conducts himself in one way with the sinning angels and in another with fallen men. For he himself gave no opportunity of penance to the angels, but condemned them guilty forever; but he treated men far more benignly and, although all sinned in one, nevertheless granted to all time and the faculty to return to a better mind. Second, that with the angels he acted according to the norm of equity and justice; but with men he was far milder and so far indulged mercy that he instituted for them the order of universal reparation—

—for them. For the institution of this order it is necessary and sufficient if 1) no necessity of perishing lies upon men, although infected by the stain and bound by sin; if 2) to all and each of men is conferred all that whereby they themselves can recover their senses and be liberated from the bonds of sins; and if 3) it is conferred for as long as they live this present and mortal life. For these things

cannot agree and flow together into one sum, as it were, without the order of universal reparation arising from them.

Now what does Nemesius teach and testify? He teaches a) that it is a prerogative of the human race that it can obtain pardon of sins by penance. He teaches b) that it must be attributed to divine justice and mercy that God conferred this prerogative upon the human race; and that c) he conferred it *μόνῳ ἀνθρώπῳ, καὶ παντί, καὶ ἀεὶ παρὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐγκοσμίου ζωῆς*, upon man alone, upon every man, and always, for as long as he lives upon earth. So much so that d) it ought to be ascertained [1], *ὡς οἱ τὴν μετάνοιαν οὐ δεχόμενοι τὴν ἐξαίρετον δωρεὰν καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀνθρώπου περιγράφουσιν*, that those who reject penance take away the principal gift proper to man. Nemesius is therefore a rich authority for the divinely instituted reparation which has always so embraced all men that it has not excluded even one either at any time or now.

Therefore not only the things which God does, but even those which he permits, although more than once they appear to us neither sufficiently advantageous nor opportune, are nevertheless directed by divine benignity toward procuring the salvation of men. Nemesius hands this down at greater length in that chapter [2] in which he investigates *περὶ τοῦ τίνων ἐστὶ πρόνοια*, of what things there is providence, and in which, among other things, he writes [3]: "*Ἄλλο τε συγχωρεῖ τῶν ἀτόπων τι πραχθῆναι, ἵνα διὰ τῆς πράξεως τῆς δοκούσης ἀτόπου, μέγα τι καὶ θαυμαστὸν κατορθώσῃ, ὡς διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὴν σωτηρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων.* At another time he permits something absurd to be done, so that through an act which seems—"

> "—absurd he may accomplish a certain great and admirable thing,
> as through the cross the salvation of the human race."

By these last words the meritorious cause of the decreed universal reparation is shown. It was the cross which Christ ascended for all; and it was the death which Christ underwent for all. Nemesius speaks of this elsewhere also [1], when, enumerating the arguments which ought to persuade Jews and Christians of providence, he says: *Χριστιανοὺς δὲ καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἅπαντα διδάσκει πρόνοιαν εἶναι· μάλιστα δὲ τὸ θειότατον καὶ δι' ὑπερβολὴν φιλανθρωπίας ἀπιστότατον ἔργον τῆς προνοίας, ἡ δι' ἡμᾶς ἐνσωμάτωσις τοῦ Θεοῦ.* "But Christians are taught both by all these things [2] that there is providence, and especially by that most divine and, because of its extraordinary love for the human race, supremely incredible work of providence by which God, for our sake, clothed himself with a body."

---

[1] Ibid., p. 358.

[2] Ibid., chap. XLIV, p. 419.

[3] Ibid., p. 424.

[1] Ibid., p. 416.

[2] Those things, namely, which are available to the Jews so that they may give faith to divine providence.

Nothing is more illustrious than these things, whether a) that the principal cause of reparation may be known, which is nothing other than the *ὑπερβολὴ φιλανθρωπίας*, the extraordinary love for the human race, with which God pursues the human race; or b) that its meritorious cause may become known, which is the *ἐνσωμάτωσις τοῦ Θεοῦ*, the embodiment of God; or finally c) that its amplitude may be declared, which extends no less widely than human nature itself extends.

CLXVI.

But I do not know whether Titus, bishop of Bostra in Arabia, does not inculcate these very things and others similar to them much more forcefully—he whom Sozomen [3] proclaims *ἐπισημότατον*, most celebrated, and whom Jerome [4] numbers among those Fathers "who so fill their books with the doctrines and judgments of the philosophers that you would not know what you ought first to admire in them, secular erudition or knowledge of the Scriptures."

For at the outset he establishes [5]: "That it is pious indeed—"

> "—among men to confess with all one's powers that God is not the author of injuries and evil deeds, *πρῶτος πρεσβεύειν ἐσπούδακε τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ὁ λόγος*, the first doctrine of the Catholic Church was zealous to profess."

That not even Manichaeus himself was alien to this profession he then openly declares when he writes concerning him [1]:

> *Κακίας ἀναίτιον ἀποδεῖξαι τὸν Θεὸν βουληθείς, κακίαν πραΐων ἀντέστησεν αὐτῷ· ἀγέννητον, ὥς φησιν, ἀγεννήτῳ, ζῶσαν ζῶντι, ἀεὶ μὲν ἐπανισταμένην καὶ μαχομένην, καὶ οὔποτε μὴ, οὐχὶ πράγματα παρέχουσαν αὐτῷ· ἀναιρεθῆναι δὲ πρὸς αὐτοῦ παντελῶς μὴ δυναμένην, ὡς ἀΐδιόν τε καὶ συμπεπληρωμένην τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ ἀγέννητον· καὶ καπνόν, ὥς φασι, φεύγων, ἐμπέπτωκεν εἰς τὸ πῦρ.* Since it was settled for him to demonstrate that God was not the author of evil, he opposed evil to him: unbegotten to the unbegotten, living to the living, always resisting and fighting and never not causing him trouble and difficulties; and incapable of being wholly extinguished and destroyed by him, as being an eternal, complete, and unbegotten substance. Thus, fleeing smoke, as the proverb has it, he fell into the fire.

[3] *Ecclesiastical History*, book III, chap. XIV.
[4] Epistle LXX, otherwise LXXXIV, to Magnus, n. 4.
[5] *Against the Manichaeans*, book I, § II, p. 269, in Gallandi, vol. V.
[1] Ibid., § I, p. 269.

Having established this axiom and vindicated the goodness of God, he adds concerning the benefits conferred upon the human race [2]:

> *Τὸν ἄνθρωπον τετίμηκεν ὁ Θεός, κατ' εἰκόνα ἑαυτοῦ δημιουργήσας αὐτόν· ἵν' ὥσπερ αὐτὸς ἐλευθερότητι φύσεως ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρχῃ Θεοῦ, οὐκ ἀδυναμίᾳ φύσεως τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν ἀπεχόμενος, ἐλευθερότητι δὲ τὴν ἀρετὴν τιμῶν.* God honored man, creating him according to his own image, so that, just as he himself is good by liberty of nature [3], so man might be an imitator of God by liberty of purpose, abstaining from sin not because the power is lacking to nature itself, but honoring virtue by liberty of purpose.

And a little below [4]: *Ὅτι μὲν οὖν ἀναγκαίως τὸ ἐξεῖναι ἁμαρ—*

—τάνειν εἴληφεν ἄνθρωπος, οὕτω γενόμενος, ὡς οὐκ ἂν ἑτέρως τὸ κατορθοῦν δύνασθαι κτησάμενος· ὅπερ Θεὸς ἀγαθός τε καὶ ἄφθονος ὑπάρχων ἐντέθεικε τῇ φύσει· καὶ ὅτι τέως διά γε τὰ παρὰ ἀνθρώποις ἀδικήματα· οὐδεμία ἀνάγκη ὕλην ἄναρχον καὶ κακίαν δοκεῖν ἀντιπαρατάττειν Θεῷ . . . διὰ τῶν προειρημένων ἀποδέδεικται. "Therefore, that man necessarily received the ability to sin, having been so made that he could not otherwise acquire the power to live virtuously—a thing which God, since he is good and not envious, willed to be implanted in nature—and that on account of those things which are unjustly done among men there is in no way any necessity of supposing matter without a beginning and wickedness to resist God . . . has been demonstrated and concluded above."

From these things he concludes [1]:

> *Ῥητέον [2] τοίνυν, ὅτι [3] παρῆκται πρὸς τοῦ δημιουργήσαντος ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸν βίον, ἐμπορευόμενος ἕτερον οὐδέν, ἢ μόνην εὐσέβειάν τε καὶ ἀρετήν· ταῦτα γὰρ κτησάμενος μὲν, καλῶς ἂν [4] διανήξηται τόνδε τὸν βίον· ἀμελήσας δὲ τούτων, χαλεπῶς ἂν διαβαπτισθείη πλανώμενος.* It must therefore be said that man was produced by his author into this life in order to carry on no other business than to acquire piety and virtue alone. For if he had acquired these things, he would rightly swim across this life; but, neglecting them, he would be dangerously submerged while wandering.

---

[2] *Against the Manichaeans*, book II, § V, p. 299.

[3] In what sense these things ought to be taken is clear from those which immediately precede: "If we say that God cannot do anything unjust, we indeed speak rightly; nevertheless, we refer 'cannot' not to infirmity but to the highest perfection of not willing what is unjust. For since he is immutable according to nature, it is immutable for him not to will to do anything evil."

[4] Ibid., § VI, p. 300.

[1] Ibid., § VII, p. 300.

[2] Damascene relates these things in the *Sacred Parallels*, in Gallandi, p. 349, vol. V.

[3] Damascene reads *παρήχθη*.

[4] In Damascene it is *διανήξαιτο*.

For [5] "he alone to whom there accrues a firm felicity of soul according to virtue, whether he is rich or poor, possesses that for the sake of which man was made by God: *ὡς δέον παρὰ μὲν Θεοῦ τὸ εἶναι λαβεῖν, παρ' ἑαυτοῦ δὲ τὸ ἀγαθὸν προσγενέσθαι λαβεῖν, συνεργοῦντος Θεοῦ· βούλεται γὰρ Θεὸς καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἔχειν ἄν, τὸ λογικὸν ὄντα, πρὸς ἔνδοξον παῤῥησίαν*, so that now it is necessary to receive from God that he may exist, but from himself to receive that he may be good, with God cooperating. For God wills that man, since he is a participant in reason, should have something from himself unto glorious confidence."

CLXVII.

But man failed himself, wandered from the end proposed to him, and preferred injustice to justice, and vice and impiety to virtue and holiness. What counsel did God therefore undertake, or what did he decree concerning the human race? Titus meets this question splendidly when, opposing [1] the Manichaeans—who claimed the Law for the evil principle because of the punishments enjoined and the harshness of its judgments, but the Gospel for the good principle because of its *πέλαγος ἀφέσεως*, sea of remission—he says:

> If, overcome by negligence, they are unwilling to read the Scriptures, let them cease accusing here also. The Savior says [2]: "Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened, and I shall refresh you." *Οὐδένα παρείς, μηδένα ἀπολιπών, πάντας περιλαβών*, he passed over no one, left no one, embraced all. But David says [3]: "All nations, clap your hands." And again [4]: "Perceive with your ears, all you who inhabit the world, both earthborn men and sons of men, rich and poor together in one." *Πάντες ἐξ εὐαγγελίου, πάντες ἐκ νόμου κεκινημένοι· οὐδένα παραλέλοιπε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον· οὐδένα ἀφῆκεν ὁ νόμος· ἐβόησε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον· μετανοεῖτε, ἤγγικε γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν· πρὸς πάντας ἀφῆκε τὴν ὁμιλίαν ταύτην, πταίουσι διελέγετο· ἐσφαλμένοις ὡμίλει· ἤδη θάνατον ὀφείλουσιν ἐφθέγγετο· ἐλευθερίαν διὰ τοῦ κηρύγματος προεμνηστεύετο.* All were stirred in the Gospel, all in the Law. The Gospel left no one, the Law omitted no one. The Gospel cried out [5]: "Do penance, for the kingdom of heaven

[5] Ibid., § VIII, p. 301.

[1] Ibid., book III, § XV, pp. 340–341.

[2] Matt. XI.28.

[3] Ps. XLVI.2.

[4] Ps. XLVIII.2–3.

[5] Matt. III.2.

> has drawn near." It issued this discourse to all; it spoke with those who offend; it held discourse with the fallen; it spoke with those who were already liable to death; through its preaching it beforehand procured liberty.

He proceeds [1] to confirm that the Law contains things most similar to these and most suitable for commending the mercy of God by those things which are read in Jonah [2], and which God utters through Ezekiel [3] in these words:—

> "I do not will the death of the sinner, but rather that he be converted and live. *Ὁ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπισταμένων ὑμνεῖν δοξολογούμενος, οἰκτίρμων καὶ ἐλεήμων ὁ Κύριος, μακρόθυμος καὶ πολυέλεος· τηλικοῦτον γὰρ πέλαγος ἐστὶν οἰκτιρμῶν παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, ὡς καὶ τὴν ἐλαχίστην καὶ βραχυτάτην, καὶ τῶν πάνυ φαυλοτάτων πρὸς μετάνοιαν ῥοπὴν, μὴ ἀτίμητον ἐᾶσαι*, he who is glorified in praises by those who know how to sing his praises is called the compassionate and merciful Lord, patient and of much mercy. For so immense is the sea of compassions with God that he does not leave unhonored even the least and briefest inclination toward penance of the most thoroughly wicked."

The history of Ahab [4] illustrates this; and from it he concludes that the time of punishment was therefore prolonged, *ἵνα καὶ τὴν ἐλαχίστην ῥανίδα τῆς μετανοίας τιμήσῃ τῇ πρεπούσῃ τιμῇ ὁ Θεός*, "that God might pursue with fitting honor even the least drop of penance."

Since, therefore, a twofold condition of the human race can and indeed ought to be considered—one prior to ruin and sin, the other subsequent to transgression—it will have been worthwhile to know what relation must be believed to have intervened, and still to intervene, between God and men for each condition. Titus explains this question with such evidence that he closes every entrance to doubts.

For, according to him, 1) for that condition which precedes guilt and is called the condition of an integral and innocent nature, there existed between God and the human family no other relation than one of love and most inclined beneficence: of love, indeed, by which God, moved, established man according to his own image and directed him toward virtue and supreme felicity; of most inclined beneficence—

—by which he adorned him with gifts far surpassing the power of nature and instructed him with that faculty of choice by which those very gifts would redound unto the material of merit, praise, and glory.

[1] Ibid., § XV, p. 341.
[2] Jonah III.10–11.
[3] Ezek. XXXIII.11.
[4] III Kings XXI.29.

But 2) for that condition which followed transgression and is called the condition of fallen and despoiled nature, love put on the countenance of mercy, and piety succeeded beneficence. Love put on the countenance of mercy because it now regards the wretched and is referred to the unworthy; while piety succeeded beneficence because it now applies medicine to wounds, vindicates captives into liberty, and promises salvation to the lost.

But 3) to all the lost, so that mercy and the order of reparation proceeding from it ought to be considered plainly universal? The answer of Titus returns to this: a) there is no one whom the Savior passed over, no one whom the Gospel abandoned; b) the Savior expended his piety upon all, and the Gospel awakened all from the sleep of death; but c) this indulgence of merciful love and beneficent piety did not begin with the very advent of the Savior, but always existed, since God was always so disposed that he did not will the death of the sinner, but rather that he be converted and live.

These things indeed 4) demonstrate that each universality, both of time and of persons, is so proper to the repaired order that it can in no way be doubted. Hence Titus commands men not to be doubtful concerning the benevolent providence of God, but to rest securely in it and promise themselves every best thing from it. "For," he says [1], "just as most men do not inquire curiously into true and genuine friends, rendering friendship lawful and genuine by this very fact, that they deal with friends without curiosity, *οὕτω δὲ καὶ Θεὸς μάλιστα βουλόμενος ἡμᾶς διακεῖσθαι πρὸς ἑαυτόν, οὐχ ἅπασαν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ προνοίας σαφηνίζει τὴν ἐνέργειαν· ἐθέλει γὰρ ἡμᾶς πιστεύειν αὐτῷ, οὐ μὴν οὐδ' ἅπασαν ἀποκρύπτει, ἀλλὰ δι' ἐνίων ὑποδειγμάτων ὑπερείδει τρόπον τινὰ τὸν ἡμέτερον νοῦν*, thus—"

> "—also God, since he especially wills that we be well disposed toward him, does not disclose every force and efficacy of his providence; for he wills that we believe him. Nor, again, does he hide all of it from us, but by certain examples in some manner sustains our mind."

Sustained by these, the mind ought to persuade itself that even those things which happen to us as harsh and sorrowful are administered by benevolent providence. "For through these [1] God admonishes men and dispenses and governs these things, not serving the disturbance of wrath, *ἀλλὰ κηδεμονίας καὶ τῆς τῶν δεομένων ἐπιστροφῆς μεταποιούμενος*, but embracing the care of converting those who need to be converted. *Οὐδὲ γὰρ φιλανθρωπίας τῆς ἀνωτάτω καὶ ἀκριβοῦς ἂν εἴη τὸ ὑποκορίζεσθαι γε χρηστότητι τὰ ἀνθρώπινα πάθη, καὶ τῷ ἀνεπιπλήκτῳ τὴν αὔξησιν αὐτοῖς ἐπιτρέπειν· τοὐναντίον γὰρ τοῦτο πρὸς ἀπανθρωπίαν δρᾷ, εἴγε βουλόμενος τῆς κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον μὴ ἐξίστασθαι*

[1] Ibid., book II, § XXIII, p. 314.

[1] Ibid., book II, § XIV, pp. 306–307.

χρηστότητος, ἐπιβούλως συγχωροίη πρὸς ἔκλυσιν κακίας πάντῃ καταπίπτειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. For it would not belong to the highest and perfect charity toward men to lessen human sufferings through lenity and to permit them increase by not rebuking them; indeed, this would rather tend, contrariwise, toward inhumanity, if, while wishing not to depart from that lenity which has only an appearance, he should insidiously permit men to fall utterly into the dissolution of wickedness. But I say that mild things are to be supplied with reason, and those which are judged harsh to be inflicted from necessity. For a father is not inhuman when he beats a delinquent son; rather, on the contrary, if he did not bring him to conversion, he would not appear to possess paternal providence and mercy. Nor is a physician inhuman when he cuts and burns a creeping ulcer; indeed, the more he applies the rationale of his art, the more, in order to heal the sick man, he introduces pain from more severe remedies, since the sick man would perish from the ulcers unless he assisted him in this manner, but would be healed when cutting and burning were applied."

But to these manifest arguments of reasons and remarkable images for depicting the matter he adds [1]:—

> "Therefore, as this example teaches, *ἄνθρωποί εἰσιν, οἱ τὰ γε ἀνιαρὰ ποιοῦντες καθ' ἑαυτῶν, μᾶλλον ἢ ὁ Θεός· οἱ τὴν χρείαν καὶ τοὺς καιροὺς προθέσει γε οἰκείᾳ προκατασκευάζοντες, διὰ τῶν οἰκείων παθῶν*, it is men rather than God who inflict upon themselves things rugged and harsh, who by their own purpose prepare, through their own affections, the need and the opportunities of the time. For just as the physician does not bring it about that burning is needed and that it is time to burn, but the ulcer brings the physician and calls for burning, *οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα πάθη προκαλεῖται τῶν εἰς θεραπείαν συντεινόντων· παρὰ Θεοῦ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν, ἥκιστα γε ἀνεχομένου τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὡς οἰκείου ἔργου μὴ διὰ παντὸς προνοεῖν*, so human affections summon God to apply those things which pertain to a cure, since he by no means suffers that provident care should not always look after men as his own work. For he entrusted to men that they should have the free choice of virtue and probity. But what in us is infirm toward the affections he supports and strengthens through those things which he sometimes manifestly applies for admonishing and rebuking; neither perpetually introducing the more austere and harsh things, so that he may not exclude liberty through the necessity and force of grief, nor, again, leaving our appetite wholly released through sloth, lest he leave the anticipations of the affections without a cure. *Ἑκάτερα δὲ ἀῤῥήτῳ*

[1] Ibid., § XV, p. 307.

> *σοφίᾳ πρὸς ἀνθρώπων ὠφέλειαν οἰκονομεῖ· ἑκάστου τὸν δέοντα καιρὸν ἐπιστάμενος*, he dispenses and governs each by ineffable wisdom for the benefit of men, knowing the suitable time of each."

CLXVIII.

Since, therefore, two orders are distinguished, one of mercy and profuse clemency, the other of severity and justice, they nevertheless so relate to one another and mutually succeed one another that the former goes before, the latter follows after; the former emanates from God of its own accord—

—the latter takes its origin and occasion from men; the former is universal and infinitely extensive, while the latter is confined within limits, and so confined that it is put into execution only with the salvation of men proposed as its end, for as long as they live. For if you ask the Bishop of Bostra what most of all rules and tempers that penal order by which men are chastised in this mortality, you will hear that there presides over it, in a certain manner, a) the merciful will by which God desires that men be well disposed toward him and trust in his benignity; there presides b) the paternal love by which he punishes in order to heal, strikes in order to strengthen, and burns lest the ulcer creep onward even unto death; there presides c) an extraordinary and incredible *φιλανθρωπία*, by which he restrains and checks with the scourges set before it the human race rushing headlong; there presides d) the benevolent care by which he continually takes counsel for his own work; and, finally, there presides e) the vigilant solicitude by which he dispenses even temporal punishments for the benefit of men. Now, if not even the penal order is separated from goodness and mercy; if, even when he seems to be angry, God loves; and if, even when he punishes, he undertakes nothing which he does not will to be directed toward the salvation of men, will there be those who doubt either the universal amplitude of the repaired order or the benevolent mercy which cherishes absolutely all men in its bosom, liberates them by its graces, and leads them by its gifts to the inheritance proper to sons?

Those certainly will not doubt who examine the matter itself somewhat more deeply, who weigh without indolence the testimonies brought forward, who reflect within themselves that none perish except those who in the present life have despised each order, both that of mercy and justice and that of benefits and punishments, and who finally turn their mind to those things which James, Bishop of Nisibis—adorned with the highest encomiums of praise by Athanasius

[1], Theodoret [2], Gennadius [3], Gregory of Narek [4], and Dionysius [5], Patriarch of the Jacobites—committed to writing—

—and who went to the Council of Nicaea, *τῶν ὀρθῶν ὑπερμαχήσων δογμάτων, οἷά τις ἀριστεὺς καὶ πρόμαχος ἁπάσης τῆς φάλαγγος*, to contend for the true dogmas as a most valiant warrior and leader of the whole battle line [1]. For, after recounting the endowments of charity [2], and then turning his discourse [3] to God, who is its origin and perennial fountain, he cries out:

> O King of the terrestrial globe, we adore you because you are long-suffering toward your creatures. All who work hidden things are manifest before you, and you know the thoughts of all men. Many are apostates from you, and many blaspheme you; and they receive a garment from your sustenance and defraud you in your works; yet you are beneficent and long-suffering toward all men. You have not judged us before your judgment; you have not corrected us, nor constituted us guilty; and you do not remove the benefits of your graces from the wicked.

But God is therefore beneficent and long-suffering toward all men and does not remove the benefits of his graces even from the wicked, because this truth, which attracts penitents and joins them to the just, is indubitable [4]:

> This world is a world of grace, and until the consummation of its end there is in it a place for penance. The time approaches [5] when grace will pass away and truth will reign. Penance does not exist at that time, because by his will grace has held dominion in its own time. And when the time of judgment has arrived, he does not will to receive penitents, because the term of penance has been set and fulfilled, and thereafter there is no longer a place for it.

---

[1] Epistle to the Bishops of Egypt and Libya, n. 8.

[2] *Ecclesiastical History*, book I, chap. VII; book II, chap. XXX; and *Philotheos*, chap. I.

[3] *On Illustrious Men*, chap. I; and *On Ecclesiastical Dogmas*, chap. XV.

[4] Oration XCIX in the book of prayers, Constantinople edition, year 1700.

[5] In the *Chronicle* at the year 642 of Alexander and 335 or 336 of Christ, in Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, vol. I, p. 17.

[1] Cf. Theodoret in the places just cited.

[2] A single Sermon, or Synodical Epistle, § X, pp. CXXX–CXXXI, in Gallandi, vol. V.

[3] Ibid., § XI, p. CXXXI.

[4] Sermon VII, *On Penance*, § XII, p. LX.

[5] The ancient Fathers commonly judged that the day of the final judgment—which Christ did not will to be manifest even to the Apostles, Matt. XXIV.36; Mark XIII.32; Acts I.7—was not far distant from their own age. Setting the others aside, one may read what Justin writes in the Second Apology and in the *Dialogue with Trypho*, n. 38.

But because this world is a world of grace, therefore [6] "the covenant which God promised [7] that he would give is this, that all may know him, from the little one even to the old man."—

Hence [1], "long before, and much earlier, the nations from all tongues had been called into the inheritance of the Most High than Israel was called." He likewise never denied them a time for returning to their senses [2], but, on account of the clemency of his mercy, gave a place for penance, so that men might have nothing which they could answer. But if at some time he shortened this period [3], this is to be attributed to the same clement mercy [4], which did not suffer men, hardened in despising the divine long-suffering, to bind themselves with graver faults and merit more atrocious punishments. With these agree well those things which, after relating the slaughter of the Amalekites and recalling the Lord's command to Moses [6], he adds [5]:

> Employing this long-suffering of his, God spared the Amalekites, so that if perhaps, when they heard those things which had been written in the sacred books, they were converted to him, he himself would have mercy upon them. For if they had been converted to him, there would have been for them a place of penance, just as a place of penance was given to the Ninevites when overthrow was preached against them, and they displayed penance, and the fury of wrath was turned away from them. And just as a hand was extended to the Gibeonites [7], and they were not slain with the Canaanites; and just as a hand was given to Rahab [8], because she believed; so the penance of the Amalekites would have been admitted if they had believed. For through four hundred years God spared them. But

[6] Sermon XI, *On Circumcision against the Jews*, § XI, p. LXXXIV.

[7] Jer. XXXI.31 ff.; Heb. VIII.8–10.

[1] Sermon XV, *On the Entrance of the Gentiles in Place of the Jewish People*, § I, p. CII.

[2] Sermon II, *On Love*, § IX, p. XV.

[3] Ibid., §§ VIII–IX, pp. XIV–XV.

[4] John Chrysostom and Theodoret are witnesses to the same doctrine. Of these, the former writes in Homily XXV on Genesis VII concerning God: "Because he saw them—that is, the men of Noah's age—sinning incurably every day, and not only profiting nothing from his ineffable long-suffering, but also making their ulcers more savage, he therefore cut short the time, namely, lest they make themselves liable to a greater punishment." Theodoret, however, says on Ezekiel I: "Although he had prescribed one hundred and twenty years for penance to Noah (Gen. VI.3), when the increase of iniquity had been beheld, he did not await the end of the sentence, so that he might repress the progress of sin."

[6] Exod. XVII.14.

[5] Sermon III, *On Fasting*, § VIII, p. XXIV.

[7] Josh. IX.15.

[8] Josh. II.12; VI.17.

> when this entire period had elapsed, when he had seen that they had not been converted, the fury of his wrath [1] rushed upon them.—

CLXIX.

Of what kind, therefore, ought that order of providence to be judged which God has established for men fallen and infected by fault? It ought to be judged, namely, 1) an order in which God is long-suffering toward his creatures and beneficent toward all men. To this also pertain, not obscurely, the things which Isaac the Syrian, Bishop of the city of Nineveh, writes [2], saying:

> The protection and providence of God is over all men, nor is it seen except by those who have purified themselves from sin and have their mind fixed upon God. But the providence of God is especially manifested to those who for God fall into a great temptation; then they perceive it, and it appears as though to the eyes of the body, by which they see it according to the magnitude and force of the temptation which has befallen them.

Then 2) it ought to be judged an order from which it comes to pass that the present world is a world of grace and is so administered divinely that in it a place for penance and the faculty of returning to one's senses are never wholly denied. Hence Isaac's exhortation [3] to all sinners:

> O you who are condemned, be strengthened by hope; seek the face of the Lord through penance, and you will be sanctified by the sanctification of his countenance, and you will be cleansed from your sins. Run to God, O you who are guilty of sins, because he is able to remit sins and can blot out transgressions. With an oath he says through the prophet [4], saying: "As I live, says the Lord, I do not will the death of the sinner, but that he be converted and live."

Finally, 3) it ought to be judged an order in which even temporal punishments are directed toward the salvation of men. For whether he adorns with benefits or chastises with punishments, God, for as long as we live, has proposed this: that he may amend us, lead us to better fruit, and bless us when corrected.—

But an order distinguished by these endowments is separated by an altogether infinite interval from the order of damnation, and plainly bears the force and

[1] I Kings XV.8.

[2] *On Contempt of the World*, chap. XIII, p. 7, in Gallandi, vol. XII. Assemani has more concerning Isaac in *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, vol. I, pp. 207–444; but his sermons were published again in the year 1770, with renewed care, by Nicephorus Theotokis, whose edition was not in our hands.

[3] Ibid., chap. XIII, p. 9.

[4] Ezek. XXXIII.11; cf. Isa. LXV.2; Rom. X.21; Zech. I.3.

countenance of the repaired order, and indeed of that reparation which is universal, efficacious, and active, and pours forth its offices upon absolutely all men.

Nowhere does James teach this more clearly than when he opens the *σκοπός* of the New Testament and explains the end and fruits of that economy which the Only-begotten discharged after assuming our mortality. And, opening the *σκοπός* of the New Testament [1], he writes:

> The covenant which was made through Moses was not yet sealed until this final covenant came, because that first one [2] was announced from above, but this one was secured below by a seal. And he who established the covenant died, and thereafter the two covenants were confirmed; and he made the two one, and abrogated the law of precepts in the commandments of his precept, and the necessity of the law was abrogated in the advent of our Lord; and he offered himself for those sacrifices which were of the law; and he was handed over as a lamb to be immolated in place of the lambs of propitiation; and the fatted calf was immolated for us, lest we should need to offer calves of the field. He came and ascended the cross, lest victims and sacrifices should be required from us. He poured out his blood for all men, lest the blood of brute animals should be required from us.

But when he is engaged in proving [3] that Christ taught nothing by words pertaining to love which he had not first fulfilled in deed, he says:

> Our Savior first did what he taught his own, and he performed in deed what he afterward inculcated in words; for he reconciled our enmity with the Father and so loved us that he handed over his innocence for the guilty, and, beneficent, underwent insults for the impious; and, rich, became poor for us; and, although he was life, died for the dead, and by his death gave life to our mortality.—
> And the Son of the Lord of all, the Lord, assumed for us the likeness of a servant [1]. And he to whom all things were subject was made subject [2], that he might absolve us from the servitude of sin…. And

[1] Sermon II, *On Love*, § VI, p. XIII.

[2] The first covenant was announced from above because it was given by God through Moses to the Israelite people; it was not, however, sealed below, because it was not confirmed by the blood and death of the testator. But Christ sealed and confirmed the second covenant below—that is, on earth—by his blood and death, as is notably handed down in Heb. IX.15 ff. Therefore Augustine says of Christ, *Enarration on Psalm* LXXXVIII.29: "He is the mediator of the covenant, he the sealer of the covenant, he the surety of the covenant, he the witness of the covenant, he the inheritance of the covenant, he the coheir of the covenant."

[3] Sermon II, *On Love*, § XVII, p. XVIII.

[1] Phil. II.6–7.

[2] Luke II.51.

> he repaired our terrestrial nature and made us the salt of truth [3], and rescued us from the devouring of the serpent. And he called us the light of the world and saved us from the power of darkness. And from evil he made us good, and from abominable, lovable.

For "the Lord strengthened penitents" [4], saying, "I have not come [5] to call the just, but sinners to penance." And again saying [6], "There will be joy in heaven over one sinner doing penance more than over ninety-nine just who do not need penance." Therefore [7] the shepherd exercised greater care over the sheep which had perished from his whole flock than over those which had not wandered. "Christ died for sinners, and not for the just."

Lest this should ever fall from the mind, he inculcates it again [8], writing: "Our Savior himself says [9], 'I have not come to call the just, but sinners to penance.' Our Lord died for sinners, and his death was not in vain." But when he compares Christ the Lord with Joshua [10], he has these things among others:

> Joshua slew the unclean nations, and Jesus our Savior overthrew the devil with his army. Joshua made the sun stand still in heaven, and Jesus our Savior darkened the sun at midday when he was crucified. Joshua the son of Nun was the savior of the people, and Jesus our Savior is the Savior of the world.—

CLXX.

When these things are compared with one another, there is more than one thing which we clearly attain. For at the outset a) we attain that the benefits which accompany our reparation proceeding from love are extraordinary. For the death of Christ was not in vain, but overthrew the devil with his army, saved us from the power of darkness, absolved us from the servitude of sin, and called us, rescued from the darkness of death, back into the light of life.

Then b) we attain that the reparation procured by the merits of Christ is affirmed to be universal by a twofold kind of propositions: and 1) is affirmed to be universal by express propositions by which the blood of Christ is declared to have been poured out for all and for the world; but then 2) is affirmed to be universal by propositions equivalent in force, by which it is taught that Christ

[3] Matt. V.13–14; Mark IX.49; Luke XIV.34.
[4] Sermon VII, *On Penance*, § VI, p. LVI.
[5] Mark II.17.
[6] Luke XV.7.
[7] Matt. XVIII.12–13; cf. Luke XV.4.
[8] Ibid., § IX, p. LIX.
[9] Matt. IX.13.
[10] Sermon XI, *On Circumcision against the Jews*, § XII, p. LXXXIV.

died for the dead, that he might impart immortality to them; that, beneficent, he underwent insults for the impious; that he expired upon the cross for sinners; that he restored our terrestrial nature; and that he was the author by whom our enmity with the Father was reconciled.

Finally, c) we attain that the formulas by which Christ is said to have been crucified for us or for all and for the salvation of the world differ indeed in words but agree in power of signification. For James uses these formulas indiscriminately and shows that he uses the pronoun *us* to indicate the common nature by which we are all men, not a peculiar assembly of the faithful.

And this manner of speaking, which could easily be noticed in other testimonies of the Fathers as well, is not infrequent in Ignatius, the disciple of John [1], the fellow disciple of Polycarp, and among the apostolic men second to none in sanctity and splendor of glory. For before all else he establishes that there is one physician of men, and what kind he is he declares in these words—

—[1]:

> *Εἷς ἰατρός ἐστιν, σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικός, γενητὸς καὶ ἀγένητος, ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος Θεός, ἐν θανάτῳ ζωὴ ἀληθινή, καὶ ἐκ Μαρίας καὶ ἐκ Θεοῦ, πρῶτον παθητὸς καὶ τότε ἀπαθής, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν.* But there is one Physician, both carnal and spiritual, made [2] and not made, God existing in man, true life in death, both from Mary and from God, first passible and then [3] impassible, Jesus Christ our Lord.

With these agree the following [4]:

> *Τὸν ὑπὲρ καιρὸν προσδόκα, τὸν ἄχρονον, τὸν ἀόρατον, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς ὁρατόν, τὸν ἀψηλάφητον, τὸν ἀπαθῆ, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς παθητόν, τὸν κατὰ πάντα τρόπον δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπομείναντα.* Await him who is beyond time, the intemporal, the invisible who for us became visible, the impalpable, the impassible who for us became passible, who in every manner endured for us.

Having established the unity of the Physician and declared the infinite nobility of the Repairer, when treating of the price paid for reparation he calls it the passion of God, the blood of God, and the divinely blessed passion. He uses

[1] Cf. the acts of his martyrdom, chap. III.

[1] Epistle to the Ephesians, § VII, p. 123, Tübingen edition, 1842.

[2] The Florentine codex reports *γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος*, and the ancient interpreter, following this reading, rendered it "begotten and unbegotten." Several codices of Athanasius in the tract *On the Synods*, and Gelasius in the work *On the Two Natures of Christ*, confirm the reading *γενητὸς καὶ ἀγένητος*, "made and not made." Moreover, nothing is truer than Jacobson's observation that *ἀγέννητος* and *ἀγένητος* are used indiscriminately more than once.

[3] Supply: after the resurrection.

[4] Epistle to Polycarp, § III, p. 179.

the first designation when, addressing the Romans [5], he says: *Ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι μιμητὴν εἶναι τοῦ πάθους τοῦ Θεοῦ μου.* "Permit me to be an imitator of the passion of my God." To the second pertain these things with which he commends the Ephesians [6]: *Μιμηταὶ ὄντες Θεοῦ, ἀναζωπυρήσαντες ἐν αἵματι Θεοῦ, τὸ συγγενικὸν ἔργον τελείως ἀπηρτίσατε.* "Since you are imitators of God, recalled to life [7] through the blood of God, you have perfectly completed the work of brotherhood." But concerning the last designation nothing is clearer—

—than these words by which he extols the benefits of the cross [1]:

> *Ἀφ' οὗ καρποῦ ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ θεομακαρίστου αὐτοῦ πάθους, ἵνα ἄρῃ σύσσημον εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους καὶ πιστοὺς αὐτοῦ, εἴτε ἐν Ἰουδαίοις, εἴτε ἐν ἔθνεσιν, ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῦ.* From this fruit [2] we are through his divinely blessed passion, so that [3] through his resurrection he might raise a standard unto the ages for his saints and faithful, whether among the Jews or among the Gentiles, in the one body of his Church.

But who are those for whom the heavenly Physician and divine Repairer offered so great and so signal a price? Ignatius hands this down when he prays for himself [4] "that through martyrdom he may be able to become *μαθητὴς εἶναι τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἑαυτὸν ἀνενεγκότος Θεῷ προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν*, a disciple of him who offered himself to God for us as an oblation and sacrifice." And he hands it down again when he presents Christ [5] as *ἀληθῶς ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου καὶ Ἡρώδου τετράρχου καθηλωμένον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐν σαρκί*, "truly fixed with nails for us in the flesh under Pontius Pilate and Herod the tetrarch."

Therefore, it is *we* whom Christ repaired, and *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, for us, he underwent divine death and the divine passion. But it can be doubted how far the signification of the pronoun *we* extends and whether absolutely all men, or only some of them, are designated by it. But Ignatius cuts off the doubt in more than one way. For a) he cuts it off when he calls Christ, together with the Gospel, the common hope. "But let us also love the prophets," he says [6], "because they too announced the Gospel, hoped in Christ, and awaited him; through whom also, believing, they attained salvation, united to Jesus Christ; since they were holy, worthy of love and admiration, having received testimony from Jesus Christ—"

[5] Epistle to the Romans, § VI, p. 156. Anastasius of Sinai, in the *Hodegos*, chap. XII: *ἐάσατέ με μιμητὴν εἶναι πάθους Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ μου*.

[6] Epistle to the Ephesians, § I, p. 119.

[7] Namely, by the passion and death of Christ.

[1] Epistle to the Smyrnaeans, § I, p. 169.

[2] By this fruit of the tree, Christ hanging from it is understood, as though its fruit.

[3] Isa. X.26; XLIX.22.

[4] Epistle to the Ephesians, § I, p. 119.

[5] Epistle to the Smyrnaeans, § I, p. 169.

[6] Epistle to the Philadelphians, § V, p. 163.

> "—*καὶ συνηριθμημένοι ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τῆς κοινῆς ἐλπίδος*, and numbered together in the Gospel of the common hope."

Hence, concluding both the epistle to the Philadelphians and the letter to the Ephesians with an altogether similar form of speech, in the former he has thus [1]: *ἐρρῶσθε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, τῇ κοινῇ ἐλπίδι ἡμῶν*, "Farewell in Christ Jesus, our common hope"; but in the latter he writes [2]: *ἐρρῶσθε ἐν Θεῷ Πατρὶ καὶ ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, τῇ κοινῇ ἐλπίδι ἡμῶν*, "Farewell in God the Father and in Jesus Christ, our common hope."

Again, b) he cuts off the doubt when he testifies that all things were restored through Christ [3], writing:

> *Ὅθεν ἐλύετο πᾶσα μαγεία, καὶ πᾶς δεσμὸς ἠφανίζετο κακίας· ἄγνοια καθηρεῖτο, παλαιὰ βασιλεία διεφθείρετο, Θεοῦ ἀνθρωπίνως φανερουμένου εἰς καινότητα ἀϊδίου ζωῆς. ἀρχὴν δὲ ἐλάμβανεν τὸ παρὰ Θεῷ ἀπηρτισμένον. ἔνθεν τὰ πάντα συνεκινεῖτο, διὰ τὸ μελετᾶσθαι θανάτου κατάλυσιν.* Hence all magic was dissolved, every bond of wickedness was abolished, ignorance was destroyed, the ancient kingdom was overthrown, God being manifested in human wise unto newness of eternal life. But that which had been prepared with God from the beginning [4] now took its beginning. Hence [5] all things were moved, because he was preparing the abolition of death.

To cut off the same doubt, c) there contributes the fact that he writes that prayer ought therefore to be made for all men, because the hope of salvation shines upon all. Behold the very words of Ignatius [6]: *Καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων δὲ ἀνθρώπων ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε. ἔστιν γὰρ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐλπὶς μετανοίας, ἵνα Θεοῦ τύχωσιν.* "But pray unceasingly also for other men. For in them there is hope of penance, that they may attain God."

Nor d) does he cut it off less by numbering even heretics and those who deny the truth of Christ among those for whom prayers ought to be poured forth to God.—

"I forewarn you," he thus says to the Smyrnaeans [1], "against beasts clothed with human appearance, whom you ought not only not to receive, but, if it is possible, not even to meet; *μόνον δὲ προσεύχεσθαι ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, ἐὰν πως μετανοήσωσιν, ὅπερ δύσκολον. τούτου δὲ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, τὸ*

[1] Ibid., § XI, p. 168.
[2] Epistle to the Ephesians, § XX, p. 132.
[3] Ibid., § XIX, p. 131.
[4] He understands the advent of Christ upon earth, which God foreordained from eternity.
[5] In the kingdom of Satan, which feared destruction for itself.
[6] Epistle to the Ephesians, § X, p. 125.
[1] Epistle to the Smyrnaeans, § IV, p. 170.

ἀληθινὸν ἡμῶν ζῆν, but only to pray for them, whether somehow they may do penance, which is exceedingly difficult. But Jesus Christ, who is our true life, has the power of this." And concerning the same persons he adds a little below [2]:

> *Τὰ δὲ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν, ὄντα ἄπιστα, οὐκ ἔδοξέ μοι ἐγγράψαι. ἀλλὰ μηδὲ γένοιτό μοι αὐτῶν μνημονεύειν, μέχρις οὗ μετανοήσωσιν εἰς τὸ πάθος, ὅ ἐστιν ἡμῶν ἀνάστασις.* But their names, since they are unbelieving, it did not seem good to me to write. And far be it from me to make mention of them until [3] they return to the passion of Christ, which is our resurrection.

CLXXI.

With these two consequences are fittingly connected, one of which pertains to the matter itself and the other to the usage and manner of speaking. And the former consequence indeed comes to this: that the hope of salvation shines upon all; that there is reason for all to trust in Christ, who is the common hope; that prayer ought to be made for all, even the most abandoned; and that the redemption procured by the blood of Christ extends no less widely than the stain diffused by Adam's transgression extends; and that each is therefore universal. But this universality, to which the latter consequence pertains, is expressed *ἀδιαφόρως*, indiscriminately, whether Christ is declared to have been delivered to death for all or for us.

With this form of speaking Barnabas [4], or whoever else [1] was the most ancient author of the epistle which is distinguished by his name—

—wrote [2]:

> For this reason the Lord endured handing over his body to destruction, that we might be sanctified by the remission of sins, which is through the sprinkling of his blood. For certain things have been written concerning him, some to the Jewish people, others to us. But he says thus [3]: "He was wounded on account of our iniquities and

[2] Ibid., § V, p. 171.

[3] Until they believe that Christ truly both suffered and died, in whose true death and passion our salvation is contained.

[4] Almost all the ancients praise Barnabas as the author of the epistle; among more recent writers, Henke expressly defends them in a dissertation published at Jena in 1827, *On the Authenticity of the Epistle Attributed to Barnabas*, and Rördam in a commentary *On the Authenticity of the Epistle of Barnabas*, published at Copenhagen in 1828.

[1] Cf. Lumper, *Historia Theologico-Critica*, vol. I, p. 150.

[2] Epistle of Barnabas, § V, p. 6.

[3] Isa. LIII.5–7.

> afflicted on account of our sins; by his blood we have been healed. He was led as a sheep to the sacrifice, and as a lamb before him who shears it, so he did not open his mouth." Therefore we ought exceedingly to rejoice in the Lord [4], because he both showed us things past and made us wise, and we are not without understanding concerning things future. But he says [5]: "Nets are not unjustly spread for birds." He says this because the man who has the way of truth and knowledge, and yet does not restrain himself from the dark way, perishes justly. And for this the Lord endured suffering for our soul, although he is the Lord of the terrestrial globe, to whom he said [6] on the day before the constitution of the age: "Let us make [7] man according to our image and likeness."

Here anyone sees that the amplitude of reparation is explained by formulas by which it is taught that the Lord endured handing over his body to destruction, that we might be sanctified by the remission of sins; and again, that the Lord endured suffering for our soul. But that formulas of this kind are universal, although at first sight they appear confined and particular, is proved by certain arguments.

Indeed, a) no man perishes except justly. But, according to Barnabas, only those perish justly who, although they have the way of truth and of knowledge, nevertheless do not restrain themselves from the dark way. Therefore, as many as perish have had the way of truth and knowledge which they might follow. But they could not have had it except—

—through the sprinkling of the blood of Christ. Therefore Christ poured out his blood even for those who perish.

In addition, b) when discoursing on the Incarnation and its necessity [1], Barnabas writes: "Unless the Son of God [2] had come in the flesh, how would we men have been saved by seeing him? For those who behold this sun—which at some time will cease, a work of his hands—are not able to gaze upon its rays." Therefore the same force and the same power underlie the formula *to suffer for us* and *to suffer for us men*. But this latter formula is altogether universal.

Moreover, c) when setting forth the form and rationale of the final judgment [3], he says: "The Lord [4], without accepting a person, judges the world; each one will

[4] Since these things pertain to us, just as the things which follow are referred to the Jews.
[5] Prov. I.17.
[6] He who said it is God the Father.
[7] Gen. I.26.
[1] Epistle of Barnabas, § V, p. 7.
[2] Things most similar to these are found in the Sibylline Oracles, proem, vv. 10–15.
[3] Ibid., § IV, p. 5.
[4] I Cor. III.8; Gal. II.16; I Pet. I.17.

receive according to those things which he does. If he has been good, goodness goes before him; if wicked, the reward of wickedness follows him."

But the Lord would appear to accept a person if he gave to some the power of pursuing goodness and denied this very power to others; nor would he appear to exercise judgment concerning those things which men freely chose unless he granted to all a ready faculty toward either part. Therefore, to all equally he gives the power of goodness, and all equally he withdraws from the necessity of wickedness. But he confers no salutary benefit upon men except through Christ. Therefore Christ merited for all immunity from the necessity of wickedness and obtained for all the power by which they might devote themselves to goodness.

Concerning this power conferred upon all, d) nothing is more illustrious than those things which Barnabas has when, describing the two ways proposed to men [5], he says: *Ὁδοὶ δύο εἰσὶ διδαχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας, ἥ τε τοῦ φωτὸς, ἥ τε τοῦ σκότους· διαφορὰ δὲ πολλὴ τῶν δύο ὁδῶν. ἐφ' ἧς μὲν γάρ εἰσι τεταγμένοι φωταγωγοὶ ἄγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐφ' ἧς δὲ ἄγγελοι τοῦ Σατανᾶ.* "There are two ways [6] of doctrine and power—one [1]—"

—"of light, the other of darkness. But the difference between the two ways is great. For over the one are appointed the light-bearing angels of God, but over the other [2] the angels of Satan." For, after explaining by many things the condition of each way [3], he finally gathers by inference [4]:

> *Καλὸν οὖν ἐστι, μαθόντα τὰ δικαιώματα Κυρίου, ὅσα προγέγραπται, ἐν τούτοις περιπατεῖν. ὁ γὰρ ταῦτα ποιῶν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ δοξασθήσεται· ὁ ἐκεῖνα ἐκλεγόμενος, μετὰ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ συναπολεῖται. διὰ τοῦτο ἀνάστασις, διὰ τοῦτο ἀνταπόδοσις.* It is fitting, therefore, that a man, having learned the ordinances of the Lord, as many as have been written above [5], should walk in them. For he who accomplishes these things will be heaped with glory in the kingdom of God; but he who chooses those other things [6] will perish together with his works. For this reason the resurrection; for this reason the retribution.

Therefore the final judgment will be the most noble specimen and exemplar of the retribution by which each and every man, according to his own choice,

[5] Ibid., § XVIII, p. 37.

[6] These words treat of the twofold doctrine, good and evil, and of good and evil powers, namely angels and demons.

[1] Cf. Origen, *On First Principles*, book III, chap. II, n. 4; and book I of the *Explanations on the Epistle to the Romans*, I.24.

[2] II Cor. XII.7.

[3] Ibid., §§ XIX–XXI, pp. 37–41.

[4] Ibid., § XXI, p. 41.

[5] He refers to the things which he himself had set forth above.

[6] Namely, things contrary to the divine will, the sum of which he displays in § XX, pp. 40–41.

will either be honored with glory or consigned to everlasting punishments. But no place would lie open for choice unless the faculty of good were available to all and unless all were immune from the necessity of evil. Therefore we are governed in that order of providence in which the power of good is available to all and no one is oppressed by the necessity of evil. But in each endowment is contained the force and rationale of the salutary and repaired order. Therefore, as many as are men are to be believed to pertain to the salutary and repaired order.

CLXXII.

Of this doctrine I have one whom I may add as a most noble witness and defender: Theophilus of Antioch, whose illustrious praises—

—Eusebius celebrated [1]. For, after recalling the transgression by which Adam bound himself and recounting the punishments [2] which followed from it, he immediately proceeds [3]:

> And God bestowed this upon him in the place of a great benefit [4], that he should not remain bound by sins for all eternity; but he cast him out of paradise as though condemned to a certain exile, so that, when by this punishment he had expiated sin within a determinate time and had been chastised, *ἐξ ὑστέρου ἀνακληθῇ*, he might afterwards be recalled…. Moreover [5], just as a vessel, if after it has been fashioned it has some fault, is melted down and refashioned so that it may become new and whole, death brings the same thing to man: for in a certain manner he is broken, that he may be found sound in the resurrection, that is, clean, just, and immortal. But when God calls Adam and says, "Adam, where are you?" *οὐχ ὡς ἀγνοῶν τοῦτο ἐποίει ὁ Θεός, ἀλλὰ μακρόθυμος ὤν, ἀφορμὴν ἐδίδου αὐτῷ μετανοίας, καὶ ἐξομολογήσεως*, he did this not because he was ignorant [6], but, since he is exceedingly patient, he gave him a place for doing penance and confessing.

[1] *Ecclesiastical History*, book IV, chap. XXIV.

[2] *To Autolycus*, book II, n. 25.

[3] Ibid., n. 26.

[4] He speaks of death. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, book III, chap. XXIII, n. 6, and John Chrysostom, Homily XVII on Genesis, agree.

[5] "We have similar things," says Maran, "in Clement, Second Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. VIII; Origen, Homily XVIII on Jeremiah, p. 166; Methodius, *On the Resurrection*, p. 198; Gregory of Nyssa in the book *On the Soul and the Resurrection*; and Ambrose, book II, *On Faith in the Resurrection*."

[6] As the Gnostics raved when they ascribed ignorance of the universe to its maker. Hence Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, book II, chap. XXV: "God asked, as though uncertain, that he might give him a place for spontaneously confessing his transgression and for being relieved on this account."

But soon, treating the question formerly agitated with the greatest contention by the heretics [7]—whether death ought or ought not to be attributed to the Creator—he writes [8]:

> But someone will say to us: *θνητὸς φύσει ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος; οὐδαμῶς. τί οὖν ἀθάνατος; οὐδὲ τοῦτό φαμεν. ἀλλὰ ἐρεῖ τις, οὐδὲν οὖν ἐγένετο; οὐδὲ τοῦτο, ἐγώ φημι.* Was Adam made mortal by nature? By no means. Then was he immortal? Neither do we say this. Therefore was he nothing? Neither do we say this.—
> *οὔτε οὖν φύσει θνητὸς ἐγένετο, οὔτε ἀθάνατος*, therefore he was made neither mortal by nature nor immortal. For if he had made him immortal from the beginning, he would have made him God. Again, if mortal, God would seem to be the cause of his death. *οὔτε οὖν ἀθάνατον αὐτὸν ἐποίησεν, οὔτε μὴν θνητόν, ἀλλὰ καθὼς ἐπάνω προειρήκαμεν, δεκτικὸν ἀμφοτέρων.* Therefore he made him neither immortal nor mortal, but, as we said above, capable of both. So that, if he were borne toward those things which lead to immortality by observing the commandments of God, he would receive from him immortality as a reward and become a god; but if he turned aside toward those things which lead to death, not obeying God, he himself would be the author of death for himself. *Ἐλεύθερον γὰρ καὶ αὐτεξούσιον ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς ἄνθρωπον· ὃ οὖν ἑαυτῷ περιεποιήσατο δι' ἀμελείας καὶ παρακοῆς, τοῦτο ὁ Θεὸς αὐτῷ νυνὶ δωρεῖται διὰ ἰδίας φιλανθρωπίας, καὶ ἐλεημοσύνης ὑπακούσοντας αὐτῷ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους.* For God made man free and master of himself. What, therefore, he had procured for himself by negligence and disobedience, God now gives back to him by his singular humanity and mercy toward men obeying him. For just as man, by not obeying, drew death upon himself, *οὕτως ὑπακούσας τῷ θελήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ βουλόμενος δύναται περιποιήσασθαι ἑαυτῷ τὴν αἰώνιον ζωήν*, so, by obeying the will of God, whoever wills can procure eternal life for himself. *ἔδωκε γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῖν νόμον καὶ ἐντολὰς ἁγίας· ὡς πᾶς ὁ ποιήσας δύναται σωθῆναι, καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τυχὼν κληρονομῆσαι τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν.* For God gave us a law and holy precepts, which whoever observes can attain salvation and, having become a participant in the resurrection, inherit incorruption.

[7] Among the ancient heretics, the Valentinians, according to the testimony of Clement of Alexandria in the fourth book of the *Stromata*, taught *θανάτου γένεσιν ἔργον εἶναι τοῦ κτίσαντος τὸν κόσμον*, that the origin of death was the work of him who created the world. See Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, book II, chaps. V–XIV.

[8] *To Autolycus*, book II, n. 27.

Therefore a threefold relation can, indeed ought to, be distinguished by which all men in and through their first parents are referred to God. The first a) is that by which they are compared with God creating and adorning his work with excellent gifts. But this relation is one of love and extraordinary benevolence, by which he conferred upon men not only that which was joined to their nature but beneficently added many things which surpassed every power of nature.

The second b) follows, by which the human race, fallen and lost in its first parents, is compared with God as the defender of his law and judge of the transgression committed. But this relation is one of most just severity, by which God expelled all men together with their first parents from paradise, subjected them to temporal punishments, despoiled them of preternatural gifts, and punished those already dead in soul also by the very death of the body.

This is succeeded by the third and last c), and it is proper to the divine *φιλανθρωπία καὶ ἐλεημοσύνη*, benignity and mercy; and it proceeds from the fact that it seemed good to God 1) to restore the work which had been lost, 2) to furnish it full opportunity and power for recovering those things which it had squandered, and 3) so to temper and soften [1] the very order of temporal punishments that even the punishments might conduce to the benefit of men.

Who, then, weighing these things within himself, does not almost behold with his eyes the harmony of heavenly justice with benignity, the triumph of mercy, and the institution of the repaired order? And indeed that institution by which first the first parents, and then the whole of posterity, had, and continues to have, the faculty of obtaining again those things which they lost and of seeking anew the eternal felicity from which they fell?

CLXXIII.

To this, assuredly, the doctrine of Theophilus returns; to this those things which we copied from him look; and to this are referred the following things which he adds after narrating the murder of Abel [2]:

> From these beginnings death, having been introduced into this world, has pervaded the whole human race until now. *ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ἐλεήμων ὤν, καὶ βουλόμενος ἀφορμὴν μετανοίας καὶ ἐξομολογήσεως παρασχεῖν τῷ Κάϊν, καθάπερ καὶ τῷ Ἀδάμ, εἶπε· ποῦ Ἄβελ ὁ ἀδελφός σου;* But since God is merciful and wished to open an approach to

[1] Concerning this divine lenity in establishing temporal punishments, three most learned men discourse excellently from the judgment of the ancient Fathers: Dionysius Petavius, *On the Work of the Six Days*, book II, chap. X; John Garnier, *On the Pelagian Heresy*, dissertation VII, chap. III; and Bernard de Rubeis, *On Original Sin*, chap. III, §§ IV–V.

[2] *To Autolycus*, book II, n. 29.

penance and confession for Cain, just as also for Adam, he thus addressed him: "Where is Abel your brother?"—

To this likewise pertain those things by which, commending divine providence [1], he says:

> *Ὁ μέν τοι γε Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ καὶ κτίστης τῶν ὅλων, οὐκ ἐγκατέλιπε τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ἀλλὰ ἔδωκεν νόμον, καὶ ἔπεμψε προφήτας ἁγίους, πρὸς τὸ καταγγεῖλαι καὶ δεῖξαι* [2] *τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων, εἰς τὸ ἕνα ἕκαστον ἡμῶν ἀνανῆψαι καὶ ἐπιγνῶναι, ὅτι εἷς ἐστι Θεός.* But God, the Father and Maker of all, did not abandon the human race, but gave a law and sent holy prophets, who would announce to the human race and command that each one of us, awakening, should recognize that there is one God. By the same we have been taught to abstain from the impious worship of idols, … from all lasciviousness and impurity, and not to do to another those things which each would not will to be done to himself; *καὶ οὕτως ὁ δικαιοπραγῶν ἐκφύγῃ τὰς αἰωνίους κολάσεις, καὶ καταξιωθῇ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and thus the cultivator of justice may escape eternal punishments and obtain eternal life from God.

To the same pertain the things which, after describing the benefits of the natural order of which no one is deprived, he has when, comparing the world with the sea [3], he says:

> In the sea a certain similitude with the world is displayed to us. For just as the sea, unless it were nourished by the influx of rivers and fountains, would long ago have been dried up and burned by its saltness, so the world, unless it had possessed the law of God and the prophets, from whom flow and spring forth meekness, mercy, justice, and the doctrine of the holy commandments of God, would long ago have failed because of wickedness and the sins multiplied in it. And just as in the sea there are certain habitable islands, healthful in waters, fruitful, secured by roadsteads and harbors, that they may be a refuge for those tossed by a storm, so God gave holy churches to the world fluctuating and surging beneath sins, in which the doctrine of truth is preserved as in the roadsteads of harboring islands; to these flee those who desire to attain salvation, having become lovers of truth and wishing to flee the wrath and judgment of God.—
>
> And just as there are other rocky islands, … uninhabited, placed for the destruction of seafarers and those undergoing a storm, upon

[1] Ibid., n. 34.

[2] One must read *διδάξαι*.

[3] Ibid., n. 14.

> which ships are shattered and those who approach utterly perish, so are doctrines of error, I mean heresies, those who approach which utterly perish; for they do not follow the word of truth as leader. But just as pirates, when they have filled ships, drive them into the aforesaid places in order to destroy them there, the same thing happens to those who wander from the truth, that they are sunk by error.

Therefore the heavenly clemency which raised man scarcely had he fallen was always present to the human race and never abandoned it. It was present to Cain and strove to lead the lost fratricide to penance and confession. It was present to the rest and, by a manifold dispensation and a certain incredible variety of offices and gifts, endeavored that men should be advanced to the worship of the one God after casting away idols, should be aroused to fulfilling the offices of the virtues, should be exempted from eternal punishments, and should be endowed with eternal felicity. Theophilus confirms this on the occasion of the Israelite people [1], saying:

> But when the people transgressed the law given to them by God, *ἀγαθὸς ὢν καὶ οἰκτίρμων ὁ Θεός, μὴ βουλόμενος διαφθεῖραι αὐτούς, πρὸς τὸ δεδωκέναι τὸν νόμον, ὕστερον δὲ καὶ προφήτας ἐξέπεμψεν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτῶν, πρὸς τὸ διδάσκειν καὶ ἀναμιμνήσκειν τὰ τοῦ νόμου αὐτούς, καὶ ἐπιστρέφειν εἰς μετάνοιαν, τοῦ μηκέτι ἁμαρτάνειν*, God, being benign and merciful and not willing to destroy them, added this also to the law which he had given them: that thereafter he should send them prophets from among their brethren, who would teach them and recall to their memory the ordinances of the law and convert them to penance so that they should no longer sin…. Concerning penance, therefore, Isaiah the prophet addresses *κοινῶς μὲν πρὸς πάντας*, all indeed in common, but the people by name.

And immediately after relating the exhortations to penance of Isaiah [2], Ezekiel [3], and Jeremiah [4], he adds—

—:

> *πολλὰ μὲν οὖν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀναρίθμητά ἐστιν ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις γραφαῖς εἰρημένα περὶ μετανοίας, ἀεὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ βουλομένου ἐπιστρέφειν τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν.* Many things indeed, or rather innumerable things, are said concerning penance in the sacred Scriptures, God always willing to convert the human race from all sins.

[1] *To Autolycus*, book III, n. 11.
[2] Isa. XXXI.6; XLV.22; LV.6–7.
[3] Ezek. XVIII.21 ff.
[4] Jer. VI.9.

Whence, therefore, shall we judge it to come about that so many never return to their senses from sins but persevere in them even unto the end and are punished with eternal death? We shall assuredly derive it from this: that they themselves do not join their own will with the benevolent will of God, but rebelliously oppose it and procure destruction and ruin for themselves.

Therefore Theophilus, turning his discourse to Autolycus, addresses him with these words [1]:

> Therefore do not be unbelieving, but rather believe; for I too did not believe that it would happen, but now I believe after I considered these things more attentively, and also because I encountered the sacred Scriptures of the holy prophets, who through the Holy Spirit foretold both past things in the same manner in which they were done, present things in the same manner in which they are being done, and future things in the same order in which they will be accomplished. Since, therefore, those things which occur and were foretold furnish me a demonstration, I am not unbelieving, but I believe, obeying God; *ᾧ εἰ βούλει, καὶ σὺ ὑποτάγηθι, πιστεύων αὐτῷ, μὴ νῦν ἀπιστήσας, πεισθῇς ἀνιώμενος τότε ἐν αἰωνίοις τιμωρίαις*, whom you also, if you will, obey, believing him, lest, if you are now unbelieving, you believe then when tormented in eternal punishments. Since these punishments had been foretold by the prophets, poets and philosophers born later than they stole them from the sacred Scriptures, that they might procure authority for their opinions. But these too foretold future punishments for the impious and unbelieving, that they might be attested to all, *πρὸς τὸ μὴ εἰπεῖν τινας ὅτι οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν, οὐδὲ ἔγνωμεν*, lest some should say, "We did not hear, nor did we know."
>
> You also, if it thus seems good to you, read the prophetic Scriptures studiously, *καὶ αὐταί σε τρανότερον ὁδηγήσουσι πρὸς τὸ ἐκφυγεῖν τὰς αἰωνίους κολάσεις, καὶ τυχεῖν τῶν αἰωνίων ἀγαθῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and you will have their light as a safer guide, that you may flee eternal punishments and attain the perpetual goods of God.

CLXXIV.

For attaining these everlasting goods, a twofold will is necessary: the divine, which refashions its work, goes before it, and assists it; the human, which follows, complies, and joins its own efforts. Now, although the divine will is lacking to no

[1] Book I, n. 14.

one, the human is lacking to many: instead of cooperating, it resists; and instead of striving to follow God, it withdraws as far as possible from him. Therefore the fault of the human will, not a defect of divine benignity; the abuse of the faculty received, not the subtraction of the aid of grace, has hindered, does hinder, and will continue to hinder all from fleeing eternal punishments and possessing eternal beatitude.

For nothing is truer, nothing more accurately expressive of the unanimous doctrine of the Fathers, than what Theodoret, second to none among the bishops of the East, writes [2] in his commentary on these words of Paul [1], "For this is good and acceptable before God our Savior, who wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth":

> *πάντας γὰρ ἀπολαῦσαι βούλεται σωτηρίας.* For he wills all to attain salvation. He then confirms what he says from another passage also [3]: "For there is one God," *οὐ γὰρ ἄλλος τῶν πιστῶν, καὶ ἄλλος τῶν ἀπίστων ἐστὶ ποιητής, ἀλλ' εἷς ὑπάρχει δημιουργός.* For there is not one maker of the faithful and another of the unbelieving, but there is one Creator. "And one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus." *εἷς τῆς εἰρήνης ὁ πρύτανις, ὁ ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὰ διεστῶτα συνάψας.* There is one reconciler of peace, who in himself joined those things which had been separated…. *δείκνυσι δὲ καὶ τὸ δεσποτικὸν πάθος ὑπὲρ ἁπάντων γεγενημένον.* He also shows that the Lord's passion was undertaken for all. "Who [4] gave himself as redemption for all…." *Πάντων γὰρ ὑπὸ τὴν τοῦ θανάτου δυναστείαν γεγενημένων, αὐτὸς οὔτε ὡς Θεὸς ὑποκείμενος θανάτῳ, ἀθάνατον γὰρ ἔχει τὴν φύσιν, οὔτε μὴν—*
> *—ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἁμαρτίαν γὰρ οὐκ ἐποίησε τοῦ θανάτου τὴν πρόξενον, οἷόν τι λύτρον ἑαυτὸν δέδωκε, καὶ τῆς ἐκείνου δουλείας ἅπαντας ἠλευθέρωσε.* For since all had been reduced beneath the power of death, he himself, who neither as God was subject to death—for he has an immortal nature—nor as man—for he did not commit the sin which brings death—gave himself as a certain price of redemption and liberated all from its servitude.

For [1],

> *αὐτὸς ὁ μονογενὴς τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος, τὴν τοῦ Ἀδὰμ ἐνδυσάμενος φύσιν, καὶ πάσης ἁμαρτίας φυλάξας ἀμύητον, ταύτην ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν προσενήνοχε, καὶ τὸ χρέος τῆς φύσεως ἀποδούς, τὸ κοινὸν πάντων*

[2] Commentary on I Tim. II.3–4, pp. 647–648, works, vol. III, Halle edition, 1771.
[1] I Tim. II.3–4.
[3] I Tim. II.5.
[4] Ibid., v. 6.
[1] Commentary on Rom. I.17, p. 22, works, vol. III.

> *ἀνθρώπων διέλυσεν ὄφλημα*, the Only-begotten Word of God himself, having put on the nature of Adam and preserved it immune from every sin, offered it for us and, having paid the debt of nature, dissolved the common debt of all men.

Theodoret confirms that this payment was made for all when, having proposed the question [2] why the history of Ruth was written, he proceeds by saying that it was written *πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τὸν δεσπότην Χριστόν*, "first indeed on account of Christ the Lord. For from her he arose according to the flesh. And therefore the divine Matthew also, when composing the genealogy, passed over women illustrious and celebrated for virtue—Sarah, Rebecca, and others—but mentioned Tamar and Rahab [3], and Ruth and the wife of Uriah, *διδάσκων ὡς πάντων ἀνθρώπων χάριν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ μονογενὴς Υἱὸς ἐνηνθρώπησε, καὶ Ἰουδαίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν, ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ δικαίων*, teaching that the Only-begotten Son of God became man for the sake of all men: both Jews and the other nations, both sinners and the just."

Nor do these things pertain less clearly to demonstrating this universal amplitude of reparation which, after the words of the Psalm [4], *ὅτι ὀργὴ* [5] *ἐν τῷ θυμῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ—*

> *—ζωὴ ἐν τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ*, "because wrath is in his indignation, and life in his will," Theodoret adds [1]: "Rightly does he assign to the saints the hymn and thanksgiving [2]. *ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις ἔδωκε τὸ τῆς ἀναστάσεως δῶρον, οὐ πάντες δὲ τῆς χάριτος ἄξιοι, ἁρμοδίως τοὺς ἀξίους εἰς τοὺς ὕμνους ἀφιεροῖ.* For since he bestowed upon all men the gift of rising again, but not all are worthy of this grace, fittingly does he consecrate to the singing of hymns those worthy of this benefit. *ἀρίστην δὲ κομιδῇ πεποίηται καὶ τὴν ἄλλην διαίρεσιν· τὴν γὰρ ὀργὴν ἀπένειμε τῷ θυμῷ· ὀργὴν γὰρ τὴν παιδείαν καλεῖ· τὴν δὲ ζωήν, τῷ θελήματι· τοῦτο γάρ τοι βούλεται, οὐκ ἐκεῖνο. ἐκεῖνο γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἐπισπώμεθα. ὁ γὰρ Θεός, φησί, θάνατον οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ τέρπεται ἐπ' ἀπωλείᾳ ζώντων· ἔκτισε γὰρ εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα, καὶ σωτήριοι αἱ γενέσεις τοῦ κόσμου· ἀκούομεν δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος διὰ Ἰεζεκιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου· μὴ θελήσει θελήσω τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ, ὡς τὸ ἐπιστρέψαι αὐτὸν καὶ ζῆν;* More-

[2] Questions on Ruth, question I, p. 346, works, vol. I.

[3] Matt. I.5–6.

[4] Ps. XXIX.6.

[5] Nearly all the Greek interpreters translated the word רגע in this manner;

—whence it might seem possible for the suspicion to arise that they read רגז. Jerome more suitably translates: "Your wrath is for a moment."

[1] On Ps. XXIX.5–6, p. 788, works, vol. I.

[2] The author of the Psalm writes at v. 5: "Sing to the Lord, you his saints, and give praise to the memory of his holiness."

> over, how excellent another division he has made! For he ascribed wrath to indignation—for he calls chastisement wrath—but life to the will: for this he wills, not the former. For we draw the former upon ourselves. For God, he says [3], did not make death, nor does he delight in the destruction of the living; for he created all things that they might exist, and the generations of the world are salutary. We also hear him saying [4] through the prophet Ezekiel: "Do I will by my will the death of the sinner rather than that he convert himself and live?"

But it is wonderful how greatly all these things are illustrated by the words of the Psalmist [5], "The Lord is merciful and just, and our God has mercy," which Theodoret explains [6], saying: *Τὰς γὰρ τοῦ ἐλέους πηγὰς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις προσχεῖ· ἔχει δὲ καὶ—*

> *—δικαιοσύνην, τοὺς ἀδικοῦντας κολάζει μεταμελείᾳ χρήσασθαι μὴ βουλομένους· δὶς μέντοι τοῦ ἐλέους μνημονεύσας, ἅπαξ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἐμνήσθη· νικᾷ γὰρ ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ φιλανθρωπία τῆς δικαιοσύνης τὴν ψῆφον.* For he pours forth the fountains of mercy upon men; but he also has justice, and punishes the unjust who do not will to employ penance. Having made mention of mercy twice, he made mention of justice once. For the benignity of God conquers the sentence of justice.

CLXXV.

From these, however, while other things can conveniently be elicited, the following are especially most opportune for the present matter. And at the outset a) the division of the divine will into first and second is approved by Theodoret, is called by him an *ἀρίστη διαίρεσις*, an excellent division, and is so explained that the first will is that which flows from the benignity innate in God, but the second will that which borrows cause and occasion from us.

Moreover, b) the first will is salutary and universal: salutary because by it God wills men to possess salvation; universal because God wills absolutely all men to arrive at the summit of so great a felicity.

Furthermore, c) it is efficacious and active, because God, moved by it, willed redemption to be obtained by the blood of Christ and so obtained that the harms inflicted by original transgression would be repaired fundamentally.

[3] Wis. I.13–14.
[4] Ezek. XVIII.23.
[5] Ps. CXIV.5.
[6] Commentary on Ps. CXIV.5, p. 1418, works, vol. I.

But d) by the consequent will only those are punished who, enemies to themselves no less than rebels against God, have despised the fountains of mercy poured forth and the opportunity for penance offered.

With these agree exactly those things which Anastasius, Bishop of Antioch—who is properly to be distinguished [1] from Anastasius of Sinai, who is called *Μωυσῆς νέος*, a new Moses, by the more recent Greeks, and whose illustrious encomiums are found [2] in Evagrius and Gregory the Great [1]—committed to writing.—

For, refuting heretics who raved that the divine immensity was ruined by the Incarnation, he says [2]:

> Certainly these have not known, nor have they understood, the power of God; indeed rather [3], "their foolish heart was darkened; professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." But God most patiently bears these things, "who does not will any to perish, but all to come to penance"; for he wills [4] "all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth." May God bring it about that this wise counsel attain a good outcome in them, they themselves attaining salvation according to the purpose of God, "who [5] calls those things which are not as those which are."

Concerning this purpose, after the words of Isaiah [6], "Behold, the Virgin shall have in her womb and shall bear a Son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel," and after the song of praise by the same prophet concerning these things [7], "O Lord my God, I will glorify you; I will praise your name, because you have done wonderful things, a counsel," Anastasius adds [8]:

> *Τίς δὲ ἦν ἀρχαία βουλὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρός; τὸ σωθῆναι πάντας ἡμᾶς· ὁ γὰρ τὸ εἶναι δούς, πῶς οὐκ ἂν μᾶλλον τὸ εὖ εἶναι δέδωκε, τὸ ἴδιον ἀνακαλούμενος πλάσμα ἐπὶ τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἐνδιαίτημα, καὶ τὴν τῆς ἐντολῆς φυλακήν, δι' ἣν ἀτελεύτητος ἐν ἡμῖν ἡ τῆς ζωῆς ἐπαγγελία, ἣν ἀπωλέσαμεν εἰκότως, τὴν ἐντολὴν μὴ φυλάξαντες;* What, then, was

[1] Cf. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, vol. IX, p. 313; Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, vol. II, p. 734; and Pagi, annotations at the years 561, 563, 594, and 599.

[2] *Ecclesiastical History*, book IV, chap. XL; and book VI, chap. XXIV.

[1] Epistles, book I, epistles VII, XXV, and XXVI; book V, epistle XXXIX; and book VII, epistle XXVII.

[2] Oration II, *On the Uncircumscribed*, § I, p. 244, in Gallandi, vol. XII.

[3] Rom. I.21–22.

[4] I Tim. II.4.

[5] Rom. IV.17.

[6] Isa. VII.14.

[7] Isa. XXV.1.

[8] Sermon II, *εἰς τὸν εὐαγγελισμὸν τῆς πανυμνήτου δεσποίνης ἡμῶν τῆς Θεοτόκου*, *On the Annunciation of Our All-Praised Lady, the Mother of God*, § IV, p. 263.

> the ancient counsel of God and the Father? Assuredly, the salvation of us all. For he who had given us to be, how would he not much more give us to be well, calling his own creature back to its ancient dwelling and to the observance of the commandment, through which there is in us the promise of immortal life, which we deservedly lost by not observing that commandment?

And indeed he called us back to the ancient dwelling, and through the *οἰκονομία* of the Only-begotten restored the hope which had been lost and raised up minds which had been cast down. For although [1] "he alone perfectly knows the cause of this great descent, together with those to whom he disclosed it and who were worthy of this knowledge; nevertheless, as far as we have attained, instructed by their writings, the cause was that man who had perished miserably might be saved: he who, fashioned by the hand of God and honored by the image, was providently placed by the Creator in paradise, that he might work it and keep it [2], as he had been commanded [3]; but he did not always keep what had been entrusted to him. Through sloth, and approaching forbidden things, he was led on by the deceit of a certain deceptive pleasure. Hence all labor arose for him, and a flood of evils; although these ought otherwise to have been cut away, they were nevertheless increased all the more. For thus it is accustomed to happen to those who are sick without observing any order, and who likewise do not use the precepts of physicians as they ought. Therefore, 'when he had come into the depth of evils' [4], as the Wise Man says in Proverbs, 'he despised.' Hence, because he had fallen from so great an excellence and height, it did not befit the natural goodness of God to pass by him so fallen, without medicine and outside the happy state in which he had been established, as one neglected; for he who once was 'raised and reared in purple,' as the prophet says [5], 'was clothed in dung.' "

Moved, therefore, by the unworthiness of the thing and by his innate goodness, "wisely [6] did that great King, truly of illustrious lineage and truly free among all those who are from the rising of the sun, undertake the business of the economy of the Word of God; for, departing from his own city on account of him who had been exiled from it, he sat upon our dung, upon which we were sitting, stripped of the splendid garment with which we had been clothed—"

> "—before the transgression; and because from the foul dung we had received ulcers and wounds which were corrupting the whole fabric

[1] *On the Divine Economy*, oration III, §§ I–II, p. 246.
[2] Gen. II.15.
[3] Perhaps one should read "as was just."
[4] Prov. XVIII.3.
[5] Lam. IV.5.
[6] Ibid., § III, p. 246.

> of our nature, he took a potsherd that he might scrape away much of the corruption; for he willed to cleanse and wash the wound.
> "But what is this potsherd? Assuredly, the terrestrial body by which he cleansed our sin, having been made 'the Lamb of God' [1] 'who takes away the sin of the world.' This is for us the 'great mystery' [2], 'hidden from ages and from generations in God who created all things.'"

To fulfill this mystery and heal us, the Only-begotten Son of God "came [3] to us who were far away and, on account of charity, having spontaneously assumed the economy which befitted his natural goodness, put on gross, terrestrial, and mortal flesh, employing the surpassing greatness of his power to conceal his glory and to assume the flesh which he united to himself and in which he dwelt, covering the amplitude of his proper divinity with a shadow. For it was necessary that he who was invisible, whose purpose was to come to those who lived according to sense, should become visible and like to them. Therefore he formed this divine instrument for himself, that through it he might become visible, and that which was of our nature, united also to the divine nature, might minister to divine actions; so that in this manner he might say to all who awaited his redemption [4]: 'I who spoke, behold, I am present.'"

For [5], "since it was his purpose to raise up the whole which had fallen, and the whole race had fallen, he mingled his whole self with the whole Adam—life with the dead—that he might save him, penetrating the whole of him to whom he was united, like the soul of a great body, animating the whole and sensibly imparting life to the whole." For [6] "we had all been sold and made servants of death, which held dominion over all; therefore he willed to be sold for us: we, indeed, for the price of pleasure, but he for silver, since—"

> "—he was stronger than pleasure. And we ourselves were sold by ourselves; but he was sold by us, because he is not the seller of liberty but its vindicator. And we abused unto destruction the honors which we had received from him. But the valuation [1] of the free man was the burial of strangers, that it might preserve the bodies of those who ceased to live in a foreign land until he should come who raises bodies, whose souls were redeemed by precious blood; for his blood

[1] John I.29.
[2] Eph. III.9; Col. I.26.
[3] Ibid., § V, pp. 246–247.
[4] Isa. LII.6.
[5] Ibid., § XI, p. 248.
[6] Oration IV, *On the Passion and Impassibility of Christ*, § IX, p. 253.
[1] Matt. XXVII.7.

was poured out that it might be the price of redemption [2] for many. But perhaps it is better to say, for all; for all are those who are many."

CLXXVI.

Therefore, if any wish both themselves rightly to know, and to narrate to others as is fitting, the true and sincere rationale of divine providence toward the human race, they must establish within themselves: 1) that the divine counsel concerning the salvation of men was not one thing before and another thing after the transgression of humanity as regards the matter itself and its substance. For just as before the transgression God willed the salvation of men, so after the transgression he willed that not even one should perish but that all, converted to penance, should enjoy everlasting felicity.

Nevertheless, 2) this difference intervened between the two divine counsels: before the transgression the counsel was one of goodness, but after the transgression a counsel of benign and just mercy. Of mercy indeed, because it regarded the wretched, afflicted by manifold wound and dripping with gore; but of mercy benign and just alike, because it proceeded from the natural benignity of God and decreed that *οἰκονομία* of the Redeemer by which the rights of divine justice which had been injured would be most perfectly repaired.

And indeed 3) the Redeemer came, satisfied justice by the blood poured out for all, again joined man, torn away from God, with God in himself, imparted life to dead humanity—

—and formed the whole race as a certain great body to be washed and cleansed.

By these things he attained this 4): that he liberated [1] the whole world from servitude and recalled our entire race, guilty of death because [2] all sinned—and the sting of death is sin—to each life, both of the soul and of the body. For it ought to be indubitable what Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch, *ὁ πολὺς ἐν θεολογίᾳ, καὶ προσομιλητὴς καὶ μάρτυς καὶ κορυφαῖος τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνόδου διδάσκαλος*, excellent in theology, preacher, martyr, and supreme doctor of the Council of Nicaea, as Anastasius of Sinai speaks of him [3], affirms in entirely express words concerning the Only-begotten [4]: *οὗτος δὲ δικαίᾳ κρίσει σωφρονίζων ἅπαντας θρόνου μὲν οὐρανόθεν ἔχεται τῆς ἀϊδίου βασιλείας, ὀξείᾳ δὲ τιμωρεῖται δίκῃ τοὺς*

[2] Matt. XX.28.

[1] Oration IV, *On the Passion and Impassibility of Christ*, § III, p. 252.

[2] Rom. III.23; cf. I Cor. XV.56.

[3] *Anagogical Contemplations on the Hexaemeron*, book IV. Chrysostom, in his *Encomium* of Eustathius, § II; Jerome, *On Illustrious Men*, chap. LXXXV; and Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History*, book II, chap. XIX, adorn Eustathius with the same praises.

[4] *Against Origen, On the Ventriloquist*, § XIX, p. 364, in Gallandi, vol. IV.

ἀδίκους. "He, giving a better mind to all from heaven by a just judgment, possesses the throne of the everlasting kingdom and punishes the unjust by a swift sentence." Yet not before he has imparted to them a better mind, exempted them from servitude, and vindicated them into liberty.

For Eustathius, asking in what sense that which is written of Christ—that he was under the law—ought to be understood, says [5]:

> Nor was the Word subject to the law, as the calumniators suppose, since he himself is the law; nor did God need purifying sacrifices, who by a nod alone purifies and sanctifies all things. *ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ ἐκ τῆς παρθένου τὸ ἀνθρώπινον ὄργανον ἀναλαβὼν ἐφόρεσε, καὶ ὑπὸ νόμον ἐγένετο, κατὰ τὰς τῶν πρωτοτόκων ἀξίας καθαρισθείς, οὐκ αὐτὸς δεόμενος τῆς τούτων χρείας ὑπέμενε τὰς θεραπείας, ἀλλ' ἵνα τῆς τοῦ νόμου δουλείας ἐξαγοράσῃ τοὺς πεπραμένους τῇ δίκῃ τῆς ἀρᾶς.* But although he bore the human instrument assumed from the Virgin and was made under the law, being purified according to the rite of the firstborn [1], he underwent these observances not because he himself needed this remedy, but that he might redeem from the servitude of the law those who had been sold to the condemnation of the curse.

Indeed, says Basil of Seleucia [2]:

> The kings of the earth, after subjecting a hostile army, forcibly send rebels into a more hateful servitude and compel captives, their manner of life having been changed, to submit their spirit, exacting the punishments of their boldness. *ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς βασιλεύς, πολέμου νόμῳ καὶ οἰκονομίας σοφίᾳ, τὴν τοῦ διαβόλου τυραννίδα κρατήσας, τοὺς ὑπ' ἐκείνου κατὰ δεσπότου φρονήσαντας, εἰς ἐλευθερίαν καλεῖ, καὶ πρὸς βασιλείας ἀπόλαυσιν μεταπέμπεται.* But Christ, the true King, having overcome the tyranny of the devil by the arts of war and the wisdom of the Incarnation, calls into liberty those who, under him, had thought against the Lord, and summons them to the enjoyment of the kingdom. With a tranquil countenance, with hands outstretched, he attracts those returning to himself with human words [3], saying: "Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you." *πέλαγος φιλανθρωπίας γενόμενος κεκυμένῳ ῥοθίῳ κατακλύζει τοὺς ἅπαντας.*

---

[5] From the sermon on the words *Κύριος ἔκτισέ με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ*, "The Lord created me as the beginning of his ways," pp. 574–575.

[1] Luke II.21 ff.

[2] Oration XXIX on the words, "Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you," pp. 156–157, Paris edition, 1622.

[3] Matt. XI.28.

> Christ, having become a sea of humanity, inundates all with waters poured forth.
>
> "Come to me, all you who labor," who arrayed the battle line of the devil against me; enjoy me with my goods and delights. You who are weary because you stirred up wars against me, receive rest at my giving; exchange the diabolical servitude for my kingdom. He wearied you by arraying you in battle against me; the enemy armed you by violation of the law; … there was no remission for you while you fought with me. *ἀλλ' ἰδοὺ πάρειμι πρὸς ὑμᾶς καλούμενος· δεῦτε πρός με πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι.* But behold, I am present, calling to you: "Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened."

Nor was it then for the first time that the Savior was present to men, but he always assisted them with his aid and protected them by his help.—

For [1], *ἀρχαῖος οὗτος τῆς φιλανθρωπίας ὁ νόμος, ἀεὶ ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων γενεαῖς παροδεύσας. εἰ γὰρ μὴ ταύτην ἐξ ἀρχῆς τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν ὁ Θεὸς προεβάλλετο, οὐκ ἂν φύσις ἐκ παρακοῆς ἀρξαμένη προῆλθεν· ἀλλ' ἔμεινεν ἂν μέχρι τοῦ πρώτου*, "even from the very beginnings this law of benignity has always accompanied the generations of men. For unless God had set the shield of clemency before his own from the beginning, nature, which had taken its beginning from disobedience, would never have proceeded farther, but would have stopped at the first man." Basil confirms this after enumerating the benefits [2] with which God enriched the first parents and then describing their transgression, and immediately adds [3]:

> So bold a crime demanded the ultimate punishments. But Adam, struck by conscience, confirmed his condemnation by flight, and, not sustaining God with direct eyes, hid as a fugitive. *τί οὖν; ἀθρόον ἐπιφανεὶς ὁ δεσπότης, ὤφθη τῆς ἐλπίδος φιλανθρωπότερος, καὶ πατρικήν, οὐ δικαστικὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀπεφθέγγετο ῥῆσιν. Ἀδάμ, τὸ φιλοτίμημα ἐπιζητῶ, τὸ τῆς ἐμῆς ἀξίας ἔμψυχον ἄγαλμα.* What, therefore? Immediately the Lord appeared and was seen to be far more benign than had been hoped, and he directed toward him the voice of a father, not of a judge. I seek Adam, the object of my love, the living image of my dignity. I know [4] the machinations of the devil against you; I know the envy by which, wounded, you fell…. *ἀλλὰ φάνηθι μόνον, καὶ τοῦ λυποῦντος δέχου τὴν ἴασιν· κομίζου τοῦ πταίσματος ἐν μετανοίᾳ τὸ φάρμακον. ποῦ εἶ;* But only

[1] Ibid., p. 157.
[2] Ibid., p. 157.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid., p. 158.

> present yourself and receive the remedy of the evil; receive the medicine for your fall, laid up in penance. Where are you? He indeed discoursed such things with one sinner; *νυνὶ δὲ γένεσιν ὅλοις ἀνθρώπων τὰς τῆς φιλανθρωπίας συνευρύνει φωνάς· δεῦτε πρός με πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι. καλῶς πάντες· μηδεὶς μικρολογίας καταγινωσκέτω δεσπότου· ἀνέκλειπτος παρ' ἐμοὶ φιλανθρωπίας πηγή, καὶ πᾶν εἶδος ἁμαρτίας παρασύρειν ἰσχύουσα…. νεύσατε μόνον πρός ἐμέ, καὶ τὴν θεραπείαν κομίσαθε. παρ' ὑμῖν τὰ—*
>
> *—ἁμαρτήματα, παρ' ἐμοὶ τὰ ἰάματα· παρ' ὑμῖν τὰ τραύματα, παρ' ἐμοὶ τὰ φάρμακα· μετάνοιαν ἐπιζητῶ μόνον, καὶ θεραπεύω τὸ ἕλκος. δείξατέ μοι τὴν τοῦ τρόπου μεταβολήν, καὶ κομίσαθε τὴν τοῦ λυποῦντος ἀπαλλαγήν*, but now he sends forth to the whole race of men that voice full of humanity: "Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened." Excellently: *all*. Let no one accuse the Lord of narrowness of speech. With me is an unfailing fountain of clemency, capable of sweeping away every form of crime…. Only incline toward me and carry away a cure. With you are the crimes; with me, the remedies. With you are the wounds; with me, the medicines. I seek penance alone and heal the ulcer. Show me the change of your manner, and carry away freedom from the evil.

Nor let there be those who, doubting, turn away; for thus, according to Basil as interpreter [1], the Savior continues to speak:

> *οὐ στενοχωροῦμαι τοῖς πλήθεσιν· οὐκ ἀποκάμνω τοὺς πάντας ὑποδεχόμενος· οὐχ οὕτω μου μικρὸν τῆς φιλανθρωπίας τὸ πέλαγος, ὡς τοῖς εἰσρέουσι τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν ποταμοῖς στενοχωρεῖσθαι· ἔχω τόπον ἀναπαύσεως τῆς οἰκουμένης· φωνὴν γὰρ δεσποτικὴν ἄπρακτον μένειν ἀδύνατον· δεῦτε πρός με πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες.* I am not constrained by the multitude, nor do I grow weary although I receive all. The sea of my benignity is not so small that, although the torrents of criminals flow into it, it is brought into narrow bounds. I possess the terrestrial globe as a place of rest. For the voice of the Lord cannot remain inefficacious: "Come to me, all you who labor."

[1] Ibid., p. 159.

CLXXVII.

But these things had settled so deeply in Basil's mind that he not only frequently repeats them but also amplifies and adorns them. He repeats and indeed also illustrates them when, after lamenting the ruin of the first parents [2], he adds: "Perhaps the devil laughed when he had defiled the image of God with dishonor…. *Οἰκτείρας δὲ τὴν ἀπάτην Θεὸς πρὸς διόρθωσιν ἔτρεχεν.* But God, having pitied the deception, hastened to raise it up.—"

> "—He hastened, not by a change of place, but testifying to his presence by a certain terrible image. Struck with terror by him, displaying themselves as accusers and witnesses of the transgression, they lend support to their own exile. But God, terrifying them with resounding approach, most humanely calls: 'Adam, Adam, where are you?' *ὦ φιλανθρωπίας δεσπότου· ὡς ἀγνοῶν ζητεῖ, ὃν αὐτὸς ἐφυγάδευσε, καὶ ὡς οὐχ ὁρῶν καλεῖ ὁ τοῖς πᾶσι παρών. Ἀδάμ, Ἀδάμ, ποῦ εἶ; ποῦ μοι τῶν ἐμῶν χειρῶν τὸ πλαστούργημα; ποῦ τῆς ἐμῆς ἀξίας ὁ ἔμψυχος ἀνδριάς; ποῦ τῆς ἐμῆς φυτουργίας ὁ φύλαξ; Ἀδάμ, Ἀδάμ, ποῦ εἶ; θρηνώδης ἐκ φιλοστοργίας ἡ κλῆσις· ποῦ εἶ; … δεῖξον τῷ ἰατρῷ τὸ τῆς παραβάσεως ἕλκος· δεῖξον τὴν πληγὴν τῆς γυμνώσεως· ἔχω γὰρ φάρμακα τοῦ τραύματος ἰσχυρότερα· ἔχω βοηθήματα, δι' ὧν θεραπεύω τὰ τοῦ ὄφεως δήγματα.* O love of the Lord toward men! As though ignorant, he seeks him whom he himself was putting to flight; and, as though not seeing, he who is present to all things calls: 'Adam, Adam, where are you? Where is the work of my hands? Where is the living image of my dignity? Where is the keeper of my paradise? Adam, Adam, where are you?' From immense love the call is like a lament: 'Where are you?' … Show the ulcer of transgression to the physician; show the wound of nakedness. I have medicines more powerful than the wound; I have aids by which I heal the serpent's bites."

He repeats and illustrates them when, after relating the sentence of the judge against Satan and the first parents, he immediately infers [1]:

> The first parents bore this sentence of their condemnation. *σὺ δὲ μὴ ῥίψῃς τὰς τῆς σωτηρίας ἐλπίδας· οὐ γὰρ ἔστησεν ὁ Θεὸς ἄχρι τῆς κατάρας τὰ πράγματα· οὐκ ἀφῆκε χρηστῆς ἐλπίδος ὁ Θεὸς τὴν φύσιν χηρεύσασαν.* But do not cast away the hope of salvation; for God did not make creation subject to the curse, nor meanwhile deprive nature of good hope. *Χριστοῦ γὰρ παρουσία τῆς τοῦ πρωτοπλάστου*

[2] Oration III, *On Adam*, p. 17.
[1] Ibid., p. 18.

> *λαιμαργίας ἰσχυροτέρα· καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων διὰ παρανόμου βρώσεως ἀπατηθείσης, τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπαρχὴν ὁ μονογενὴς ἐνεδύσατο· καὶ τὸν δεύτερον Ἀδὰμ περιβάλλεται, φαρμάκοις ἐναντίοις θεραπεύων τὰ τραύματα.* For the presence of Christ is far more powerful than the voracity of the first-formed man; and when the race of men had been deceived through unlawful eating, the Only-begotten, healing the wounds by contrary medicines, took from man a body into which he might introduce himself and clothed himself with the second Adam.—

It came about through his innate goodness and the merits of the Redeemer who was to come that God never withdrew the opportunity for penance; indeed, it came about that he provoked men to penance in every way he could. Basil splendidly testifies to this [1] when he weighs those things which are narrated in the seventh chapter of Genesis and considers by name these words: "For yet after seven days I will bring the flood." For he writes [2]:

> *ἄπληστον γὰρ πρὸς φιλανθρωπίαν τὸ θεῖον καὶ πάσας προφάσεις ἐπινοεῖ σωτηρίας, εἴπου τὸν σώζεσθαι βουλόμενον εὕρῃ*, God cannot be satiated with love of men and leaves no occasions of salvation unimagined, if perhaps he may find someone desirous of salvation. "For yet after seven days." A brief time, he says, suffices me for the salvation of sinners. Only let them incline their mind to penance, and I retract the sentence and cast away the threats if I perceive that they repudiate their former counsels from the heart.

For incredible is the *φιλανθρωπίας ὑπερβολή*, the excess of benignity [3], with which God pursues men, and *ὁ τῆς χρηστότητος πλοῦτος πλημμυρῶν*, the overflowing opulence of goodness [4], by which [5], "when he saw Nineveh sick, *ὁ φιλάνθρωπος δημιουργὸς πέμπει τὸν Ἰωνᾶν ἰατρὸν τοῦ νοσήματος*, the Creator most loving toward men sends Jonah to heal the disease. For although he hated the soul living wickedly, *ἀλλ' ἐλεεῖ νόσῳ ἠλλοιωμένην τὴν φύσιν, καὶ γνωρίζει τῆς οἰκείας χειρὸς τὸ πλαστούργημα*, nevertheless he pities nature altered and perverted by disease and recognizes the work of his own hands. Therefore, having entrusted to the prophet the cure of the evil, he commands him to approach the sick before the disease, growing worse, confirms the verdict of death."

Jonah foresaw this and thus reasoned within himself [6]—

—:

---

[1] Oration V, *On Noah*, pp. 26–27.
[2] Ibid., p. 28.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Oration XII, *On Jonah*, p. 67.
[5] Ibid., pp. 67–68.
[6] Ibid., p. 68.

> I suspect that the threat will turn out to be the mother of clemency. For why does he foreannounce overthrow if he wills a true punishment? If he wills to punish, why does he admonish concerning the danger? Why does he anticipate the blow with an oracle? *ἀλλ᾽ οἶδα τοῦ φιλανθρώπου τὴν τέχνην, ὀργὴν σχηματίζεται, λῦσαι τὴν τιμωρίαν πρὸ πείρας βουλόμενος*, but I know the arts of God, the greatest lover of men: he assumes the appearance of wrath and strives to release them from punishment before they experience it.

Therefore, clothed with flesh [1], he said concerning himself, "I am the good shepherd." "Let us therefore look [2] to Christ our shepherd: *εἴδωμεν αὐτοῦ τὴν φιλάνθρωπον τέχνην, τῇ πραότητι νικῶσαν τῶν προβάτων τὴν ἡμερότητα*, let us behold his arts full of humanity, which by their meekness surpass the gentleness of the sheep themselves. *χαίρει τοῖς παροῦσι, καὶ ζητεῖ τὸ πλανώμενον. οὐ παραιτεῖται νάπας περιϊέναι καὶ ὕλας· κρημνοὺς περιέρχεται· καὶ τῷ πλανωμένῳ πλάνην μερίζεται. κἂν εὕρῃ κάμνον, οὐ μισεῖ διὰ τὸν τρόπον, ἀλλ᾽ οἰκτείρει διὰ τὸ πάθος· καὶ τοὺς ὤμους ὑποβαλών, οἰκείῳ μόχθῳ θεραπεύει τοῦ προβάτου τὸν πόνον.* He rejoices in those present and seeks that which wanders. He does not refuse to traverse mountains and forests; he approaches precipices and shares in the wandering of the one who has strayed. Nor is he inflamed with hatred on account of its manner, even if he finds it diseased; but he is moved by compassion for the evil and, placing his shoulders beneath it, by his own labor tends the suffering little sheep."

What, then, can remain except that it be said to each and every person [3]: *πρὸ τῆς δίκης τὸν δικαστὴν δωροδόκησον. δὸς αὐτῷ φιλανθρωπίας προφάσεις· δὸς αὐτῷ τῆς συγγνώμης τὰς ὕλας· μὴ τὰς ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ φωνὰς ἀναμείνωμεν.* "Before judgment, forestall the judge with gifts. Furnish him occasions for exercising benevolence; supply matter for pardoning. Let us not await his hostile words."

We must strive for this the more diligently, the truer are those things which Basil teaches and confirms on the occasion [4] of Christ's words, "It is not mine to give to you." For after he shows by testimonies of the Scriptures [1] that whatsoever things are done by the Father are similarly done by the Son, he proceeds—

—[2]:

> Since, therefore, you are one Creator with the Father, sit together with the Father, and govern together with the Father; since you raise

[1] Oration XXVI on the words, "I am the good shepherd," pp. 142–144.
[2] Ibid., p. 144.
[3] Ibid., p. 146.
[4] Matt. XX.23.
[1] Oration XXIV, pp. 132–135.
[2] Ibid., p. 135.

from the dead as he does those whom you will and give life to them no otherwise than he, why do you now say, "It is not mine to give"? Why? Because *τῆς τοῦ λαμβάνοντος ἀξίας, οὐ τῆς τοῦ διδόντος ἐξουσίας μόνον τὸ δῶρον*, the remuneration follows the merit of the receiver, not merely the faculty of the giver. The throne is the reward of labors, *οὐ φιλοτιμίας τὸ χάρισμα*, not a gratuitous gift of ambition. The throne is procured by things rightly done; *οὐκ ἐξ αἰτήσεως ἡ δόσις*, the giving does not follow a bare petition. *δεῖξόν μοι τὴν σὴν* [3] *ἀξίαν, καὶ βλέπε τὴν ἐμὴν ἐξουσίαν.* Show me your merit, and behold my power. If the sinner is weary of sin, I relieve the sickness and remit the debt; if the harlot weeps, I grant remission; if the publican strikes his breast, I do not impute his errors; if the leper seeks healing, I impart power…. *ἂν δὲ θρόνον τις αἰτῇ, καὶ βασιλείαν ζητῇ, καὶ τὴν ἐκ δεξιῶν καθέδραν ποθῇ, τότε τὴν ἐξουσίαν περιεργάζομαι. τοὺς περὶ εὐσεβείας ἱδρῶτας ἀναμαρτύρω· τούτων γὰρ ἡ μετ' ἐμοῦ καθέδρα μισθός· κἂν εὕρω τούτων ἐπάξιον, ἐμὸν ὑπάρχει τὸ δοῦναι. καλεῖ γὰρ τὴν διδόντος ἐξουσίαν, ἡ τοῦ λαμβάνοντος ἀξία. διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλὰ τοῦ Πατρός ἐστι τὸ διδόναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται παρὰ τοῦ Πατρός μου. εὐτρεπίζει δοκιμάζων ὁ Πατήρ, οὐχ ἁπλῶς χαριζόμενος. ἀναμένει τὸν τρόπον, εὐτρεπίζων τὸ δῶρον. οὐκ ἐκχεῖ τὴν χάριν ἁπλῶς, ἀλλὰ τὴν δωρεὰν ταμιεύεται. οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι. οὐδὲ γὰρ τοῦ Πατρός ἐστι τὸ εἰκῇ τοιαῦτα χαρίζεσθαι· διὰ τοῦτο τῷ μαρτυροῦντι τὴν βασιλείαν χαρίζομαι.* But if someone asks for a throne, seeks a kingdom, and desires to sit at the right hand, then I carefully consider what I can do; I demand as witnesses the sweat poured forth for piety, for the reward of these things is a seat in my assembly.—

If I find what is condign with these things, then it is mine to give; for the merits of the receiver call forth the power of the giver. Therefore it is not mine to give, but it is the Father's to give, yet to those for whom it has been prepared by my Father. The Father prepares while proving, not simply bestowing a favor; while preparing the gift he awaits our manners. He does not pour forth grace lightly, but stores up the gift. "It is not mine to give." Nor indeed is it the Father's to bestow such things rashly and gratuitously. Therefore I grant the kingdom to one who endures martyrdom.

[3] It seems impossible to doubt that in this place *ἀξία* means merit. Wis. III: *εὗρεν αὐτοὺς ἀξίους ἑαυτοῦ*. Matt. X: *ὁ φιλῶν τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα ὑπὲρ ἐμὲ, οὐκ ἔστι μου ἄξιος*.

CLXXVIII.

By all these things we are taught a) that there are two causes of that order which has been established for fallen men: namely, 1) God's *φιλανθρωπία* toward the human race—indeed, *φιλανθρωπίας ὑπερβολή*, an excess of benignity, *ἄπληστον πρὸς φιλανθρωπίαν τὸ θεῖον*, the inexhaustible charity of the divine Majesty toward men, and the overflowing opulence *τῆς χρηστότητος* of goodness; then 2) the wholly similar humanity of Christ the Savior, which Basil calls *πέλαγος φιλανθρωπίας*, *φιλανθρωπίας πηγή*, and *τὴν φιλάνθρωπον τέχνην*, a sea of love, a fountain of clemency, and a most humane art. Therefore b) this order is of the same kind as the causes from which it is understood to have proceeded. But these are beneficent love and infinite clemency. Therefore it must be believed to be an order of benevolence and charity.

It must be believed c) to be an order in which 1) all are called into liberty and summoned to the enjoyment of the kingdom; in which 2) God directs to men a voice *πατρικήν, οὐ δικαστικήν*, of a father, not of a judge; in which 3) he seeks Adam, *τὸ φιλοτίμημα*, the object of his love; and 4) seeks him that he may heal him of the wound, free him from the disease, and restore him to soundness; in which 5) he does not permit anyone to cast away the hope of salvation and to judge human nature subject to the curse and deprived of hope; in which 6) he pities humanity corrupted by disease and imparts medicines for healing its wounds; in which 7) he places his shoulders beneath the laboring sheep in order to support it; in which 8) he repairs the damage inflicted by original fault; and in which 9) he so governs all things that they conduce to the salvation of men.

But d) an order which is such and which is distinguished by these marks as though by tesserae—

—can be judged none other than the order of universal reparation; and indeed universal no less 1) in amplitude, by which it embraces all and excludes no one, than 2) in time, in which *ἀρχαῖος τῆς φιλανθρωπίας ὁ νόμος*, the ancient law of benignity, extends itself to all ages and accompanies all generations.

Therefore e) by the first and antecedent will the opportunity of salvation is granted to all, the medicine of penance is present, and grace is supplied by which all may strive toward salvation if they will.

But f) by the second and consequent will the throne is granted only as a reward, and is ascribed to merits procured by grace.

For this g) is the difference between the grace necessary for attaining salvation and the attainment itself of salvation and the crown: 1) the former is *τοῦ διδόντος μόνον τὸ δῶρον*, the bare gift of the one bestowing, common to all, and altogether of such a kind that not even in thought can it be separated from the order of universal reparation. But 2) the crown follows *τὴν τοῦ λαμβάνοντος ἀξίαν*, the dignity and merit of the receiver; for *καλεῖ γὰρ τὴν διδόντος ἐξουσίαν ἡ τοῦ*

λαμβάνοντος ἀξία: the power of the giver and the merit of the receiver answer to one another; and when God crowns, he does not bestow a favor *ἁπλῶς*, simply, but dispenses a reward for labors undergone.

CLXXIX.

And with these things I would bring to an end the treatment which I undertook concerning the judgment and faith of the Church of Antioch, were I not to hope that I would consult both truth itself and the convenience, and indeed also the pleasure, of readers if, as a crowning ornament, I were to append a few things culled from the works of him whom the ancients [1]—

—and the more recent writers [1] with one voice have saluted as the most splendid glory of the Syrian Church, a man surpassing all praises, an awakener of the sluggish, a consoler of the afflicted, the discipline, instructor, and exhorter of the young, a mirror of monks, a guide of penitents, a sword and dart against heretics, a receptacle of the virtues, and a dwelling and lodging place of the Holy Spirit. This man is the great Ephrem, deacon of Edessa, whose books display so many things, and things so perspicuous, for our matter that it is far more difficult to find what you should set aside than to choose what you should bring forward. Nevertheless, I shall employ moderation and prescribe this law to myself: that I be content with necessary things.

Therefore, after describing [2] the twofold class of men—those who devote themselves to piety and sanctity and those who obey lust and crimes—he adds [3]:

> Come before that terrible day arrives; *ῥίψωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ πέλαγος τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, let us cast ourselves into the sea of the mercies of God. For God himself exhorts and invites

[1] Joseph Simon Assemani diligently collects their testimonies in the preface to vol. I of the works of St. Ephrem, pp. I ff., Rome edition, 1732. But as for what Photius writes concerning Ephrem in codex CXCVI, *Σύρων δὲ παῖδες φασίν, ὑπὲρ τὰς χιλιάδας λόγους αὐτὸν ἀναγράψαι· οἷς καὶ ὁ περὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν, οὐκ ἀναξιόπιστος εἰ καὶ μὴ τὰ δόγματα Εὐσέβιος, ὁ τὸ Παμφίλου ἐπωνύμιον φέρων ἐπιμαρτύρεται*, "But the sons of the Syrians affirm that he wrote more than a thousand discourses, to which testimony is also rendered by Eusebius surnamed Pamphilus, whose fidelity is weighty concerning history, although not likewise concerning dogmas"—

—this departs from the truth, since Eusebius made no mention of Ephrem, nor could he have done so. I would therefore believe that Photius, having suffered a lapse of memory, substituted Eusebius for Sozomen. For it is Sozomen who, *Ecclesiastical History*, book III, chap. XVI, mentions those things which Photius relates.

[1] Among these, compare the Bollandists in the *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. I, February, pp. 49 ff.; Peter Lambeck, *Bibliotheca Caesarea*, book I, pp. 117 ff.; and Albert Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, book V, pp. 319 ff.

[2] Compunctory Sermon, p. 29, works, vol. I, Rome edition, 1732.

[3] Ibid., p. 30.

> all [4], saying: "Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you." *πάντας προσκαλεῖται ὁ φιλάνθρωπος καὶ ἀνεξίκακος, ὁ εὔσπλαγχνος καὶ μακρόθυμος, ὁ θέλων πάντας ἀνθρώπους σωθῆναι· οὐ προτρέπεται, καὶ ἰδίους κέκληκεν, ἀλλὰ πάντας καλεῖ· δεῦτε πρός με πάντες· κἂν πλούσιος κἂν πένης, ὅτι τὸν ἐρχόμενον πρός με, οὐ μὴ ἐκβάλω ἔξω.* He calls all, the lover of men, the one forbearing toward evils, the merciful and long-suffering one, who [1] wills all men to be saved. He does not exhort and call certain persons as his own and particular, but calls all. "Come to me, all," whether rich or poor, because [2] "him who comes to me I will not cast outside."—

Therefore, "while you have time [3], shake off and scatter the burden of your sins. *προσκαλεῖται γάρ σε ὁ φιλάνθρωπος Θεός, λέγων· δεῦτε πρός με πάντες οἱ πεφορτισμένοι· πάντας προτρέπεται.* For God, the lover of men, invites you, saying: 'Come to me, all you who are burdened.' He exhorts all." Hence [4], "if you will to approach him, *πλήρης ἀγαθῶν ἐστι, καὶ πλήρης εὐσπλαγχνίας*, he is full of goodness and full of mercy. For you he came from the bosom of the Father; for you he was incarnate, that you might approach him without fear.

> "For you he was made man, that he might liberate you from your grave wounds. *μετὰ πολλῆς ἀγάπης καὶ πάσης χρηστότητος φωνεῖ σε πρὸς ἑαυτόν.* With much love and all goodness he calls you to himself…. Approach, sinner, the good Physician, and offer tears as the best medicine. *οὕτως γὰρ καὶ βούλεται ὁ οὐράνιος ἰατρὸς ἰασθῆναι ἕκαστον τοῖς ἰδίοις δάκρυσι καὶ σωθῆναι.* For thus the heavenly Physician wills each one to be healed by his own tears and to be saved…. The Physician awaits the sight of your tears; approach and do not fear. Show him the wound, and bring tears and groans as medicine. *ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἀνέῳκται θύρα τῆς μετανοίας, σπούδασον ἁμαρτωλὲ πρὶν αὐτὴν ἀποκλείσει.* For behold, the door of penance has been opened; hasten, sinner, before it is closed."

But how long does it remain open, or when is it first obstructed? Ephrem answers [5], saying:

> *ὦδε, ἐν τῷ βίῳ τούτῳ ὅσον ἥμεθα ἡμεῖς, δυνάμεθα πάντοτε δυσωπῆσαι τὸν Θεόν.* As long as we are here in the present life, we can always entreat and placate God. It is easy for us to ask

[4] Matt. XI.28.
[1] I Tim. II.4.
[2] John VI.37.
[3] Ibid., p. 31.
[4] Sermon *On Penance*, p. 148.
[5] Ibid., p. 150.

> indulgence; it is opportune for us to knock at the door of his mercy.—
>
> Let us pour forth tears while there is time for our tears to be received, lest, departing into that age, we lament without any utility; *ἐκεῖ γὰρ τὰ δάκρυα εἰς οὐδὲν λογίζονται*, for there tears are accounted as nothing. As much as we will here, so much will the most benign God remit; for here he hears us entreating, here he remits to us when we supplicate him, here he blots out our iniquities when we return to our senses. Here there is prayer and entreaty, but there investigation. Here long-suffering, there severity. Here indulgence, there exact examination. Here liberty of the will, there judgments. Here security, there distress. Here pleasure and enjoyment, there torments. Here desire of possessing, there tortures. Here laughter, there mourning. Here negligence and lack of care, but there punishment. Here contempt, there eternal fire…. Here sloth, there no pardon of transgressions.

CLXXX.

For men are so administered and ruled by divine providence that the opportunity of obtaining salvation is not taken from them before this mortal life is taken away. Hence Ephrem addresses each man with these words [1]:

> Watch at least a little, O man; recollect yourself, and recognize as one wise that for you the most high God descended from heaven, that he might raise you from earth into heaven. *εἰς τοὺς γάμους ἐκλήθης οὐρανίου νυμφίου, ἵνα τί καταφρονεῖς;* You have been called to the nuptials of the heavenly Bridegroom; why do you despise them? And why do you hesitate? How will you be able to go to the nuptials, not having a precious nuptial garment nor holding a burning lamp? And how will you enter? Will you enter through contempt? But soon you will hear [2] that formidable voice: "Friend, how did you enter the nuptials without having the nuptial garment of my kingdom? Did you enter through contempt, that by your nakedness you might do injury to my guests?" But the King will command his ministers, saying—
>
> "Having bound his hands and feet, cast this wretch into the furnace of fire, that he may be tormented forever and ever. *διότι ἐγὼ αὐτὸς ἀπὸ χρόνων ἱκανῶν ἦλθον, καὶ ἐκάλεσα ἅπαντας εἰς τοὺς γάμους, οὗτος*

[1] Ibid., p. 152.
[2] Matt. XXII.11–13.

> *δὲ καταφρονῶν τῆς ἐμῆς κλήσεως, οὐχ ἡτοίμασεν αὐτῷ ἔνδυμα εἰς τοὺς γάμους· διὸ κελεύω ὑμῖν κολάσαι τὸν ἄθλιον, ὅτι κατεφρόνησε τῆς ἐμῆς βασιλείας.* For I myself came long ago and called all to the nuptials; but this man, despising my call, did not prepare for himself a garment for the nuptials. Therefore I command you to afflict the wretch with torments, because he scorned and despised my kingdom."

For no excuse, Ephrem continues [1], will be available to anyone, *ὅτι ἐν γνώσει ἡμεῖς πάντες ἁμαρτάνομεν*, because we all sin knowingly. "Let us all consider divine providence and how many things God bestows upon us according to his goodness. *ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ ἀεὶ ἐπισκέπτεται ἡμῶν τὰς καρδίας συνεχῶς· ἂν εὕρῃ ἀνάπαυσιν, εἰσιοῦσα, κατοικεῖ πάντοτε ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ εὕρῃ καθαρὰν τὴν καρδίαν, εὐθέως ἀφίσταται. πάλιν δὲ οἱ οἰκτιρμοὶ ἀναγκάζουσιν αὐτὴν ἐλθεῖν ἐπισκέψασθαι ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἁμαρτωλούς, ἐπειδὴ ἐσμὲν πάντες τρεπτοὶ τῇ προαιρέσει, οὐχὶ δὲ κατὰ φύσιν.* His grace always and continually visits our hearts; and if it finds a place where it may rest, it enters and always dwells in the soul; but if it encounters an unclean heart, it immediately withdraws. But again his mercies compel it to come to visit us sinners, because we are all changeable by free will, not by nature.

> "We are always found proud and covetous…, rejoicing in depraved and impure thoughts and continually lying in them as in the foulest mire. Hence it comes to pass that, when grace desires to enter in order to visit us, it finds the most foul stench of wicked thoughts in our hearts; therefore it immediately withdraws, since it does not find in us the place of entrance and repose which it willed. *πλὴν νύσσει τὴν καρδίαν ἐν γλυκασμῷ φωτεινῷ, ἵνα ἔλθῃ εἰς αἴσθησιν, ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο, καὶ οὐχ εὗρεν εἴσοδον, ἵνα οὕτως γλυκανθεὶς ἄνθρωπος τῷ φωτισμῷ ἐπιζητήσῃ αὐτήν. ὅμως αὕτη ἡ χάρις οὐ δύναται παντελῶς ἀποστῆναι ἀφ' ἡμῶν, διότι βιάζεται ἰδίᾳ εὐσπλαγχνίᾳ ἐλεῆσαι—*
> *—ἅπαντας· εἶδες πρόνοιαν Θεοῦ; εἶδες σπλάγχνα τοῦ Χριστοῦ; πῶς ἡμᾶς ποθεῖ ἀεὶ ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἅγιος, καὶ θέλει ἡμᾶς σωθῆναι;* Nevertheless, it strikes our heart with the sweetness of its light, that it may return to its senses, because grace visited it and did not find a place to enter. Thus, attracted by the sweetness of the light, let man seek it; for grace cannot entirely abandon us, since by its innate benignity it is impelled to have mercy upon us all. Do you perceive the providence of God? Do you perceive the bowels of Christ's piety toward us?

[1] Compunctory Sermon, p. 160.

> With how great a desire the holy God desires us, and how greatly he desires us to be saved?

Therefore it would be a crime, and a most grave one, if anyone should cast away hope on account of the crimes he had contracted. "For our Lord rejoices exceedingly [1] over those doing penance and willingly receives our conversion. For he says [2]: 'After all these things, return to me.' And again through the holy Gospels [3] he says: 'Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you.' *μηδεὶς οὖν ἀπελπιζέτω ἑαυτοῦ, ἐὰν καὶ ἥμαρτε· τοῖς γὰρ ἐκζητοῦσιν αὐτὸν μισθαποδότης γίνεται· τοῖς δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν αὐτόν, καὶ μὴ μετανοοῦσιν, ἀπότομος ὑπάρχει.* Therefore let no one despair of himself, even if he has sinned; for to those who seek him he will be a rewarder, but toward those who reject him and do no penance he will show himself rigid and severe."

Therefore, "if here [4] we have been slothful and negligent, we shall have no excuse on that terrible day. For we shall not find how we may purge our sins. For since our Lord and Savior descended to us, every excuse has been taken away from us. For he bestowed eternal life upon us. We were enemies, and our Lord was reconciled to us. We were terrestrial, and we were made heavenly; mortal, and made immortal; children of darkness, and we became children of light; captives, and we were recalled; servants of sin, and—"

> "—we were made free; lost and scattered, and we were found and gathered; infirm, and healed; formerly not having obtained mercy, and we obtained mercy…. *ἰδοὺ ταῦτα πάντα ἐχαρίσατο ἡμῖν ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν κατελθὼν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, σαρκωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς.* Behold, our Lord bestowed all these things upon us when, incarnate for us, he descended to earth."

CLXXXI.

All these things persuade even unto evidence a) that such is the state of the human race that for all who perish no rationale of excuse lies open and no means is available by which either they may cleanse themselves from their crimes or at least diminish their gravity. But b) whence does a state of this kind arise, or what ought to be believed to be its origin? I see that only a twofold origin can be assigned to it: either that God did not will lost humanity to be repaired by his benignity and therefore left it bound to original fault and original damnation; or that men, although repaired, nevertheless do not all employ the benefits of

[1] Ibid., p. 162.
[2] Hos. XIV.
[3] Matt. XI.28.
[4] Sermon *On the Second Advent of Our Lord Jesus Christ*, pp. 169–170.

that reparation. Which, therefore, c) shall we judge to be the true and genuine origin? The former or the latter? That which proceeds from universal reparation having been denied, or rather that which proceeds from the benefit of reparation having been neglected? Ephrem does not permit d) that we remain in doubt, but in absolutely every way routs and overturns the former origin, that derived from the denial of universal reparation.

He overturns it 1) when he magnificently commends *τὸ πέλαγος τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, the sea of the divine mercies, and represents God as full of goodness and full of mercy. He overturns it 2) when he teaches that all are called by God, who is *φιλάνθρωπος*, a lover of men, and that all are invited to the kingdom and the royal nuptials. He overturns it 3) when he hands down that not *ἰδίους*, certain persons of his own and particular, *ἀλλὰ πάντας*, but all, are advanced toward salvation. He overturns it 4) when, distributing his discourse, he numbers each and every one, whether poor or rich, among those called and saved. He overturns it 5) when he addresses any man whatsoever with these words: *μετὰ πολλῆς ἀγάπης καὶ πάσης χρηστότητος φωνεῖ—*

—σε πρὸς ἑαυτόν, "with much love and all goodness he calls you to himself." He overturns it 6) when he presents God as placable for as long as we pass through the present life. He overturns it 7) when, depicting the arts of divine grace, he testifies that it is always present to all men. For divine grace cannot abandon men *παντελῶς*, entirely, *διότι βιάζεται ἰδίᾳ εὐσπλαγχνίᾳ ἐλεῆσαι ἅπαντας*, since by its innate benignity it is impelled to pour forth its mercy upon all. Finally, he overturns it 8) when he exclaims: Do you perceive the providence of God? Do you perceive the bowels of Christ's piety toward us? With how great a desire does God desire us, and how greatly does he desire us to be saved? Therefore e) the true and genuine origin by which it comes to pass that so many men fall into eternal punishments is none other than the very malice of men and the incredible contempt of divine beneficence. Ephrem teaches this, repeats this, redoubles this. Nor does he present God as a severe judge and rigid exactor toward any other than those who have resisted prevenient mercy and repudiated the medicine of penance. Therefore f) to God and to the first and antecedent will is owed the state of universal reparation and the common order of salvation; but to men and to the second and consequent will must be attributed the fact that there are so many who perish and are deprived of a happy eternity.

These theorems, assuredly vindicated by most certain testimonies, are strengthened by a new accession of light and authority from the fact that the illustrious churches of Asia, Thrace, and Pontus approved them by their own suffrage. For so many witnesses of these churches are available, so many who committed their faith and doctrine to writing, that it is plainly not permitted to call into doubt the consensus concerning which we speak. For there are

witnesses—to mention only the more celebrated—Polycarp, Athenagoras, the most noble author of the Epistle to Diognetus, Amphilochius, Photius, Gregory of Neocaesarea, Basil, both Gregories—Nazianzen and Nyssen—and Caesarius, whose voice is one and judgment harmonious: that no one perishes by necessity; that the power of attaining salvation is furnished to all; and that all pertain to the order of nature raised up and repaired.

CLXXXII.

Polycarp, indeed [1], having been instructed by the apostles and having associated familiarly with many who had seen the Lord, writes in that epistle from which, as Irenaeus [2] says, all who take care for their salvation will be able, if they will, to know both the form of his faith and the preaching of the truth, concerning Christ the Lord [3], that he is he *ὃς ὑπέμεινεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν ἕως θανάτου καταντῆσαι, ὃν ἤγειρεν ὁ Θεός, λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ ᾅδου*, "who endured to come even unto death for our sins, whom [4] God raised up, having loosed the pains of hell."

But lest these things should seem to anyone narrower and circumscribed to the faithful alone, Polycarp adds [5] concerning the same Christ that he is *ὃς ἔρχεται κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν· οὗ τὸ αἷμα ἐκζητήσει ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπειθούντων αὐτῷ*, "he who comes as judge of the living and the dead, whose blood God will require from those who do not believe in him." But God would not require, nor indeed could he require, the blood of Christ from unbelievers unless it had also been poured forth for them and, by their hardened will, unbelievers deprived it of its fruit. Therefore there is no one who is foreign to the benefit of the divine blood poured forth; and consequently no one who is not signified when Christ is said to have come even unto death for our sins.

With the same amplitude of signification these things also [1] must be received:

---

[1] Thus Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, book III, chap. III, and Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, book IV, chap. XIV, testify concerning him.

[2] In Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, book IV, chap. XIV.

[3] Epistle to the Philippians, § I, p. 193, Tübingen edition, 1842.

[4] Acts II.24. In all the Greek manuscripts there is constantly found *ὁ Θεὸς ἀνέστησε*; nor does the Vulgate read otherwise, which therefore renders it, *God raised up*. We therefore conjecture that Polycarp substituted *ἤγειρεν*, an equivalent, for the verb *ἀνέστησε*. Moreover, the clause *λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ ᾅδου* is reported by the Greek-Latin codices, Irenaeus, Epiphanius, Fulgentius, Cassiodorus, and the Syriac and Vulgate versions, the latter of which renders it, *having loosed the pains of hell*. Therefore we seem to see no reason that persuaded Scholz to prefer *λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου* to so solemn a reading.

[5] Ibid., § II, p. 193.

[1] Ibid., § VIII, p. 199.

> *Ἀδιαλείπτως οὖν προσκαρτερῶμεν τῇ ἐλπίδι ἡμῶν καὶ τῷ ἀῤῥαβῶνι τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡμῶν, ὅς ἐστι Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ὃς ἀνήνεγκεν ἡμῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ἰδίῳ σώματι ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, ὃς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ· ἀλλὰ δι' ἡμᾶς, ἵνα ζήσωμεν ἐν αὐτῷ, πάντα ὑπέμεινε.* Therefore let us persevere unceasingly in our hope and in the pledge of our justice, which is Christ Jesus, who [2] bore our sins in his body upon the tree, who [3] committed no sin, nor was guile found in his mouth, but for our sake, that [4] we might live in him, endured all things [5].

But if Christ is our hope [6], if he is the pledge of our justice, if he underwent our sins in his body, if for our sake and for our eternal life he endured all things, what at last shall we judge to follow? Namely: a) that we pertain to a state which is a state of hope; consequently b) to a state in which there is no necessity of perishing, and in which c) there is present the faculty of obtaining life; finally d) to the state of a nature which, through the intervention of a just redemption, was recalled from the fall and destruction.

CLXXXIII.

For asserting and defending these things, nothing occurs more opportune than what the most cultivated and at the same time most ancient [7] author of the Epistle to Diognetus writes and most copiously explains—

—After describing [1] the divine majesty and nature of the Only-begotten, and proceeding immediately to recount the mystery of the incarnation [2], he says:

> He sent this one to men. Was it, as anyone might think, for the sake of exercising tyranny and striking terror? *Οὐ μενοῦν· ἀλλ' ἐν ἐπιεικείᾳ, πραΰτητι· ὡς βασιλεὺς πέμπων υἱὸν βασιλέα ἔπεμψεν· ὡς Θεὸν ἔπεμψεν, ὡς πρὸς ἀνθρώπους ἔπεμψεν, ὡς σώζων ἔπεμψεν, ὡς πείθων, οὐ βιαζόμενος· βία γὰρ οὐ πρόσεστι τῷ Θεῷ· ἔπεμψεν ὡς καλῶν, οὐ διώκων· ἔπεμψεν ὡς ἀγαπῶν, οὐ κρίνων· πέμψει γὰρ*

[2] I Pet. II.24.

[3] I Pet. II.22.

[4] I John IV.9.

[5] Polycarp seems in these words to have imitated those which Ignatius wrote to him, § III: *τὸν κατὰ πάντα τρόπον δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπομείναντα.*

[6] Compare the things we reported above from Ignatius.

[7] The more learned critics—Tillemont, *Memoirs*, vol. II, pp. 366–493; Nourri, *Apparatus*, vol. I, p. 445; Gallandi, vol. I, p. LXVIII; Lumper, *Critical Theological History*, vol. I, p. 183; Georg Böhl, *Selected Works of the Fathers*, part I, p. 109; and Carl Semisch, *Justin the Martyr*, vol. I, pp. 172 ff.—suspect our author to be not a little earlier than Justin.

[1] Epistle to Diognetus, § VII, pp. 231–232.

[2] Ibid., p. 232.

> *αὐτὸν κρίνοντα, καὶ τίς αὐτοῦ τὴν παρουσίαν ὑποστήσεται;* By no means; but in clemency, in gentleness. As a king sending a royal son, he sent him; as God he sent him; he sent him to men; he sent him as saving us, as persuading, not employing violence—for violence is not present in God. He sent him as calling, not persecuting; he sent him as loving, not judging. For he will send him to judge, and who will endure his advent?

Therefore God provided for men, and provided for them *ἐν ἐπιεικείᾳ, πραΰτητι*, in clemency, in gentleness. But he provided not for these or those, but absolutely for all, since the King sent the King, God sent God, not to these or those but to all, that through the King and through God he might call and save men, not judge them, but at last judge them if they should not obey the King and God who loves, calls, and saves.

But although God disclosed his love, clemency, and gentleness chiefly by sending the Son, nevertheless he was never so forgetful of the human race as utterly to forsake it. For [3]:

> *Ὁ δεσπότης καὶ δημιουργὸς τῶν ὅλων Θεός, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα καὶ κατὰ τάξιν διακρίνας, οὐ μόνον φιλάνθρωπος ἐγένετο, ἀλλὰ καὶ μακρόθυμος· ἀλλ' οὗτος ἦν μὲν ἀεὶ τοιοῦτος, καὶ ἔστι, καὶ ἔσται, χρηστὸς καὶ ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἀόργητος καὶ ἀληθής· καὶ μόνος ἀγαθός ἐστιν· ἐννοήσας δὲ μεγάλην καὶ ἄφραστον ἔννοιαν, ἣν ἐκοινώσατο μόνῳ τῷ παιδί· ἐν ὅσῳ μὲν οὖν κατεῖχεν ἐν μυστηρίῳ καὶ διετήρει τὴν σοφὴν αὐτοῦ βουλήν, ἀμελεῖν ἡμῶν καὶ ἀφροντιστεῖν ἐδόκει· ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀπεκάλυψε διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ παιδός, καὶ ἐφανέρωσε τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἡτοιμασμένα—*
>
> *—πάνθ' ἅμα παρέσχεν ἡμῖν, καὶ μετασχεῖν εὐεργεσιῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἰδεῖν καὶ* [1] *ψηλαφῆσαι αὐτόν· ταῦτα τίς ἂν πώποτε προσεδόκησεν ἡμῶν; πάντ' οὖν ᾔδει παρ' ἑαυτῷ σὺν τῷ παιδὶ οἰκονομικῶς.* God, the Lord and maker of all, who made all things and distinguished each according to its order, was not only a lover of men but was also patient. But he was always such, and is, and will be: benign and good and free from anger and true; and he alone is good. But he conceived in his mind something great and ineffable, which he communicated to the Son alone. Therefore, so long as he retained and preserved his wise counsel in secret, he seemed to neglect us and to take no care for us; but after he revealed through the beloved Son and disclosed the things prepared from the beginning, he furnished

[3] Epistle to Diognetus, § VIII, pp. 233–234.

[1] Beurer supplied what is lacking here, writing *ἰδεῖν καὶ ποιῆσαι*; Maran, with Sylburg, preferred *κατανοῆσαι*; but we have followed Böhl's conjecture, which is confirmed by what is found in Luke XXIV.39 and Acts XVII.27.

> us all things at once: both to partake of his benefits and to see and touch him. Who among us would ever have expected these things? Therefore he knew all things within himself together with his Son according to the economy.

Therefore two things must be diligently and accurately distinguished: a) the benign will of God toward the human race; and b) its manifold manifestation by works performed and benefits conferred. God was never not most inclined toward men, since he is *φιλάνθρωπος*, a lover of men, and was always such, is, and will continue to be; he never failed to provide for them, although at some time he seemed to take no care for them. Nevertheless, in the fullness of times, when he accomplished by the work of the Lord's incarnation that *μεγάλην καὶ ἄφραστον ἔννοιαν*, great and ineffable counsel, then indeed he surpassed every expectation and demonstrated his inexhaustible mercy.

> But in the former time, the author continues [2], he allowed us to be driven according to our pleasure by disordered impulses, led by pleasures and desires—not indeed because he in any way rejoiced in our sins, but tolerating them; nor approving that time of iniquity, but forming [3] a mind for justice—so that—
>
> —when at that time we had been found unworthy of life by our own works, now the benignity of God might deem us worthy of it; and when we had made it manifest that it was ours not to be able to enter the kingdom of God, by the power of God we might be made capable of it. But when our wickedness had been completed, and it had been fully manifested that its reward—punishment and death—was imminent, and the time appointed by God had arrived for thereafter declaring his benignity and power, *ὡς* [1] *ὑπὸ τῆς ὑπερβαλλούσης φιλανθρωπίας καὶ ἀγάπης*, on account of his overflowing benevolence and love toward men, he did not hate us, nor reject us, nor show himself mindful of our wickedness, but patiently bore and endured it; he himself received our sins; he himself gave his own Son as the price of redemption for us, the holy for the iniquitous, the one free from evil for the evil, the just for the unjust, the incorruptible for the corruptible, the immortal for mortals. For what else could cover our sins but his justice? In whom else can we, iniquitous and impi-

[2] Ibid., § IX, pp. 235–236.

[3] Namely, forming the mind for that justice which alone is approved by God—

—unless perhaps *νῦν* ought to be read for *γοῦν*, and the clause translated: "but forming the present time of justice."

[1] In the manuscript there is read, *ὡς ... ὑπερβαλλούσης φιλανθρωπίας μία ἀγάπη*, which Maran judged ought to be supplied and corrected thus: *ὦ ὑπερβαλλούσης φιλανθρωπίας, οἵα ἀγάπη!* But the conjecture, unless we are mistaken, is less happy than that which we have followed.

> ous, be justified but in the Son of God alone? O sweet exchange! O inscrutable arrangement! O benefits surpassing every expectation: that the iniquity of many should be hidden in one just man, while the justice of one should justify many unjust men! *Ἐλέγξας οὖν ἐν μὲν τῷ πρόσθεν χρόνῳ τὸ ἀδύνατον τῆς ἡμετέρας φύσεως εἰς τὸ τυχεῖν ζωῆς, νῦν δὲ τὸν Σωτῆρα δείξας, δυνατὸν σώζειν καὶ τὰ ἀδύνατα, ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων ἐβουλήθη πιστεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ χρηστότητι αὐτοῦ, αὐτὸν ἡγεῖσθαι τροφέα, πατέρα, διδάσκαλον, σύμβουλον, ἰατρόν, νοῦν, φῶς, τιμήν, δόξαν, ἰσχύν, ζωήν.* Therefore, when in the former time he had convicted us that our nature was unable to obtain life, but now had shown the Savior who is able to save even those things which could not be saved, through both he willed us to believe in his benignity and to regard him as nourisher—
>
> —father, master, counselor, physician, wisdom, light, honor, glory, strength, life.

Therefore God conferred his benefits upon men by certain steps, as it were; nor did he always enrich them with one and the same abundance of graces. Times preceded in which, although God did not withhold necessary things from men, he nevertheless conducted himself more sparingly with them; but there followed times in which he bestowed benefits surpassing every expectation and declared his overflowing benevolence and love toward men. But whether he was more generous or more restricted in dispensing his gifts, each economy had this purpose: that we should believe in his benignity and regard him as father, nourisher, and physician.

CLXXXIV.

And indeed in very truth, says Athenagoras the Athenian philosopher [1], second to none among the defenders of the Christian faith, let the end of created man be considered, and then let it be considered how it happens that so many are deprived of its attainment. And concerning the end [2] of created man, no one should doubt that among those things which are most certain this must be numbered [3]:

> God made man neither without purpose—for he is wise, and no work of wisdom is useless—nor for his own use, for he needs nothing…. Nor did he make man on account of any of the things created by himself. For nothing among those things which use reason and judgment

[1] Concerning Athenagoras, see what Philip of Side reports in the fragment in Dodwell at the end of the dissertations on Irenaeus; Epiphanius, Heresy LXIV; and Photius, codex CCXXIV.

[2] *On the Resurrection of the Dead*, no. 11, pp. 344–345, Venice edition, 1747.

[3] Ibid., no. 12, pp. 345–347.

> has been or is created for the use of another, whether superior or inferior, *ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν τῶν γενομένων ζωήν τε καὶ διαμονήν*, but for the proper life and perpetuity of those who are created…. Therefore, if man was created neither without cause nor in vain—
> —nor for the use of the Creator himself or of any other thing founded by him, *εὔδηλον ὅτι κατὰ μὲν τὸν πρῶτον καὶ κοινότερον λόγον, δι' ἑαυτόν, καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς δημιουργίας θεωρουμένην ἀγαθότητα καὶ σοφίαν ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον· κατὰ δὲ τὸν προσεχέστερον τοῖς γενομένοις λόγον, διὰ τὴν αὐτῶν τῶν γενομένων ζωήν, οὐκ ἐπὶ μικρὸν ἐξαπτομένην, εἶτα παντελῶς σβεννυμένην*, it is evident that, if the first and more broadly extending reason is considered, God was moved to found man on account of himself and the goodness and wisdom shining forth in all his works; but if the nearer reason, more interior to the created men themselves, is considered, it was on account of their own life, which indeed was not to be kindled for some brief time and thereafter extinguished entirely…. For *τοῖς αὐτὸν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀγαλματοφοροῦσι τὸν ποιητήν, νοῦν τε συνεπιφερομένοις, καὶ λογικῆς κρίσεως μεμοιραμένοις, τὴν εἰς ἀεὶ διαμονὴν ἀπεκλήρωσεν ὁ ποιητής, ἵνα γινώσκοντες τὸν ἑαυτῶν ποιητήν, καὶ τὴν τούτου δύναμίν τε καὶ σοφίαν, νόμῳ τε συνεπόμενοι καὶ δίκῃ, τούτοις συνδιαιωνίζωσιν ἀπόνως οἷς τὴν προλαβοῦσαν ἐκράτυναν ζωήν, καίπερ ἐν φθαρτοῖς καὶ γηΐνοις ὄντες σώμασιν*, to those who bear in themselves the image of the Creator himself, who are endowed with mind and have obtained rational judgment, the Creator allotted and destined perpetuity, that, knowing their own Maker and his power and wisdom, and obeying law and justice, they might perpetually and without any labor remain in those things by which they had steadfastly sustained their foregoing life, although they were in earthly bodies subject to corruption.

When these things had been confirmed, as was fitting, he repeats them in summary, and at the same time declares the cause and reason why so many, carried away crosswise, do not arrive where the goodness and wisdom of the Creator directed them. "For he would not have erred," he says [1], "who should say that this is the end of life endowed with prudence and rational judgment: perpetually and without interruption to be occupied in those things with which natural reason chiefly and primarily agrees, and unceasingly to glory in the contemplation of him who is and of his law, *κἂν οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐμπαθέστερον*—"

[1] *On the Resurrection of the Dead*, no. 25, p. 358.

> *—καὶ σφοδρότερον τοῖς τῇδε προσπεπονθότες, ἄστοχοι τούτου διατελῶσιν*, although many among men, passionately and vehemently affected by earthly things, do not attain this end; *οὐ γὰρ ἀκυροῖ τὴν κοινὴν ἀποκλήρωσιν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἀποπιπτόντων τοῦ προσήκοντος αὐτοῖς τέλους, ἰδιαζούσης τῆς ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐξετάσεως, καὶ τῆς ἑκάστῳ συμμετρουμένης ὑπὲρ τῶν εὖ ἢ κακῶς βεβιωμένων τιμῆς ἢ δίκης.* For the multitude of those who fall away from the end congruent with them does not overturn the common lot, since the examination and inquiry into things of this kind pertains to individuals, and the reward or penalty for a life well or badly lived is accommodated to each one.

Therefore a) the reason for creating man was none other than the goodness and eminent beneficence of God; and b) he founded him [1] *ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ*, incorruptible, and as an *ἔμψυχον ἄγαλμα*, animated image of himself; but c) he destined him for a most excellent end, of which kind is to be blessed by the contemplation of God himself and by the pleasure and gladness proceeding therefrom; nor did d) *δωτὴρ ἐάων*, the giver of good things, and he from whom, as James [2] says, there is *πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον*, every good gift and every perfect gift, deny any of those things by which men could obtain such felicity; but e) by their own wickedness many have brought it about, and still bring it about, that by divine justice they are repelled from the attainment of the common end and the common beatitude. What, therefore, is more certain than that eternal and happy immortality is prepared for all by the first and antecedent will, and that none are excluded from possessing it by the second and consequent will except those who have rendered the effects of benignity ineffectual and vain?

CLXXXV.

This assuredly is the doctrine, this the judgment, of Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, who was illustrious no less through his friendships with Basil [3] and Gregory Nazianzen [4] than through the praises of Jerome [5]—

—and by the unanimous suffrage of Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, Anastasius of Sinai, Leontius of Byzantium, Facundus of Hermiane, and John Damascene, who ennobled the books they published with sayings of Amphilochius.

[1] Wis. II.23: *ὁ Θεὸς ἔκτισε τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ*.

[2] James I.17.

[3] Compare his letters CL–CLXI, CLXXXVIII, CXCIX, and CCXVII, and his life composed by Maran, chap. XXX.

[4] As the many letters which he himself sent to Amphilochius show.

[5] *On Illustrious Men*, chap. CXXXIII, and Letter LXX, otherwise LXXXIV, to Magnus the Orator.

For, censuring [1] the Pharisee who had reproved the indulgence of Christ the Savior with these words [2], *If he were a prophet, he would surely know who and what manner of woman she is who touches him*, he exclaims: *τί οὖν αἰτιᾶσαι φιλάνθρωπον δεσπότην, ὦ Φαρισαῖε, ὁμοίως εἰς πάντας τὸν τῆς χρηστότητος ζυγὸν ταλαντεύοντα;* "Why, therefore, do you accuse the benign Lord, O Pharisee, who [3] balances the scale of goodness equally toward all?" In more than one place he describes the effects of this goodness, which cherishes all and embraces all. He describes them when, after reporting the words [4], *when they had nothing with which to repay, he forgave them both*, he adds [5]:

> *Εἶδες φιλάνθρωπον δανειστήν; πῶς δανείζει μὲν, οὐκ ἀπολαμβάνει δέ; πῶς δὲ ἀγνωμονούμενος οὐ ναρκᾷ, ἀλλ' ἥπλωται αὐτοῦ τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν ἡ χείρ; Μὴ ἐχόντων, φησίν, ἀποδοῦναι, ἀμφοτέροις ἐχαρίσατο· ἀφῆκε μὴ ἐχόντων, οὐχὶ μὴ θελόντων. Ἕτερον γὰρ μὴ ἔχειν, καὶ ἕτερον μὴ θέλειν. Οἷόν τι λέγω· Θεὸς οὐδὲν παρ' ἡμῶν ζητεῖ, ἢ μετάνοιαν· ὅθεν βούλεται ἡμᾶς ἀεὶ χαίρειν, καὶ προστρέχειν τῇ μετανοίᾳ.* Have you seen the humane creditor, how he lends but does not receive back, how even when men are ungrateful to him he does not grow numb, but keeps his hand open to those who ask? "When they did not have," he says, "with which to repay, he forgave them both." He forgave those who did not have, not those who did not will. For it is one thing not to have, and another not to will. For example, God requires nothing from us except penance. Therefore he wills us always to rejoice and to run to penance.

He describes [6] the effects of the common benignity, saying:

> Therefore, without abandoning heaven, he came to earth and was made man without laying aside divinity, that, navigating even the sea—
>
> —of this world, he might draw out from the depths of sin those tossed by a storm; and, going around villages and cities and running about lanes, paths, and approaches, he might lead back to his own sheepfold those wandering at the crossroads as [1] sheep having no shepherd. For it is he who [2] seeks the wandering sheep and who, having left the ninety-nine, came to seek the one. *Ἐζήτει*

[1] Homily *On the Sinful Woman*, Oration IV, § VIII, p. 482, in Gallandi, vol. VI.
[2] Luke VII.39.
[3] Wis. VI.8.
[4] Luke VII.42.
[5] Oration IV, § X, p. 484.
[6] Ibid., § I, p. 477.
[1] III Kings XXII.17.
[2] Matt. XVIII.12; Luke XV.4.

> *γὰρ τὸ ἕν, οὔτε τῶν πολλῶν καταφρονῶν, οὔτε τοῦ πλήθους τὸ ἕν προκρίνων· ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ἐννενήκοντα ἐννέα κατελίμπανεν· ἔδει γὰρ ἀσφαλῶς αὐτὰ ἐν τῇ μάνδρᾳ αὐλίζεσθαι· τὸ δὲ ἓν προϊὼν* [3] *ἐζήτει, ἵνα μὴ θοίνη τῷ διαβόλῳ γένηται. Πρόβατον γὰρ ἀποίμαντον, θηρσὶν ἕτοιμον δεῖπνον· καὶ ψυχὴ ἀσφράγιστος* [4]*, δαίμοσιν εὐεπιβούλευτος.* For he sought the one, neither scorning the many nor preferring the one to the multitude. Nevertheless he left the ninety-nine, for it was fitting that they should abide safely in the fold; but, going forth, he sought that one, lest it should fall as prey to the devil. For a sheep without a shepherd is a ready and prepared supper for wild beasts; and a soul lacking the seal is exposed to the snares of demons.

To the same point pertain the things which he immediately adds to the words [5], by which the birth of the Only-begotten according to the flesh is proclaimed. For he says [6]:

> *Τίς ἡ καινὴ καὶ παράδοξος αὕτη μυσταγωγία; τίς ἡ παντοδύναμος καὶ φθαρτοποιὸς τῆς θείας προνοίας εὐμένεια; τί τὸ δεινὸν καὶ πάνσοφον κατὰ τοῦ διαβόλου στρατήγημα; Ἠλευθέρωται κόσμος διὰ παρθένου, ὁ διὰ ταύτης τὸ πρὶν ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν πεσών…. Σύμμορφος τοῖς δούλοις ὁ δεσπότης γέγονεν, ἵνα οἱ δοῦλοι γένωνται σύμμορφοι πάλιν Θεοῦ.* What is this new and marvelous doctrine? What is this omnipotent and mortality-producing benignity of divine providence? What is this grand and all-wise stratagem against the devil? The world, which through a virgin formerly fell under sin, has been vindicated into liberty through the Virgin…. The Lord was made conformable to servants, that the servants might again be made conformable to God—
>
> —…. *Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὑγιαίνοντες οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν ἰατροῦ· ἡ δὲ νόσῳ συχνῇ κατασχεθεῖσα, τηλικούτου καὶ τοιούτου τετύχηκεν ἰατροῦ, ὡς μείζονος τῆς ὑγείας εὐτυχὴς ἐστὶ σωτηρίας, τοῦ νοσήματος δραπετεύσαντος.* Those who are healthy [1] indeed have no need of a physician; but she who was held by many diseases obtained such and so great a physician that, when the disease had fled, she was fortunate in a salvation greater [2] than health.

[3] Montfaucon reads *περιϊών*, "going around."

[4] I would think that here the reference is not so much to the character, which is most solemnly called *σφραγίς*, as to grace and charity, which alone distinguish between the children of the kingdom and of Gehenna and bring it about that the soul is not *εὐεπιβούλευτος*, exposed to the devil's snares.

[5] Luke II.6–7.

[6] Oration I, *On the Nativity of Our Great God and Savior Jesus Christ*, § IV, pp. 465–466.

[1] Matt. IX.12.

[2] We have often heard the Fathers celebrate with these or similar formulas the immense riches of the divine goodness toward the human race.

Nor do the things which he soon adds concerning divine providence [3] look to any other end:

> Therefore he allowed [4] us to be mingled with the gentiles, that we might shine as lights in the world: *ἵνα σπέρμα σωτηρίας ὦμεν, εἰς ἐπιστροφὴν θεωρούμενοι πᾶσι τοῖς συνοῦσι καὶ συντυγχάνουσιν*, that [5] we might be the seed of salvation for all who associate with us and meet us, having been made a spectacle to them for conversion; … that we might truly be made sacred leaven and that by our work the world might be leavened unto salvation.

Namely: a) the salvation of the world and of absolutely all men has been proposed to the divine goodness; this God desires, this he seeks. And b) lest he seem to seek and desire it in appearance only, he omits none of those things which are necessary and sufficient for the attainment of so great a good. c) He balances the scale of goodness equally toward all. d) He requires penance from all, that all may always rejoice and be blessed eternally. e) He condemns no one because he does not have, but because he does not will to have, what is offered to him. f) He so provides for the fullness of the sheepfold that he does not scorn even one little sheep wandering and straying. g) By a grand and all-wise stratagem against the devil he vindicated the world into liberty. h) He did not refuse to put on the form of servants, that servants might have the power of recovering the likeness of the Lord—

—i) He applied a medicine stronger than the contracted disease. But k) he so rules his faithful that he procures the salvation of all men. Therefore let there be no one who doubts either 1) the salvific will of God, which is universal and fruitful; or 2) the common redemption of all, acquired by the blood of Christ; or finally 3) the state of universal reparation, by which the merciful God altered the original ruin and destruction.

CLXXXVI.

As a witness to this most sweet truth there is added Photius, certainly learned and, in this matter, most tenacious of the ancient tradition, the author of the *Bibliotheca*. For in that question to Amphilochius in which [1] he asks, *πῶς θελητός τε καὶ ἀθέλητος τῷ Πατρὶ ὁ θάνατος λέγοιτ' ἂν εἶναι τοῦ Χριστοῦ· καὶ πῶς πάλιν ὁ αὐτὸς συνέλθοι τῷ πονηρῷ θελητός τε ἅμα εἶναι καὶ ἀθέλητος*, how the death of Christ can be said to have been both voluntary and involuntary to the Father,

[3] Ibid., § V, p. 466.
[4] Phil. II.15.
[5] Isa. I.9, compared with Rom. IX.29.
[1] To Amphilochius, question XXIV, p. 74, in Mai, *Ancient Writers*, vol. I.

and how it happens in turn that the same death was simultaneously voluntary and involuntary to the devil, among other things he writes excellently [2]:

> Who would be willing to say at all that, by him who takes care of his servants and of those whose blood was drained, and who hears the cries of the dead as of the living, *τὸ δὲ σωτήριον καὶ ζωοποιὸν αἷμα τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ ἐν τοῖς ἀθανάτοις τῆς αὐτοῦ προνοίας ταμείοις συνέχει ἀνώλεθρον αὐτῷ, καὶ φθορᾶς σωμάτων ἀνέπαφον* [3] *συντηρούμενος;* the salvific blood which vivifies the world was not preserved unharmed in the immortal treasuries of his providence and protected from every bodily corruption? Therefore he who paid the price suffered no loss; *ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν παντὸς ὁ φιλάνθρωπος προσεκέρδησε τὴν σωτηρίαν*, indeed, the lover of men, Jesus, gained the salvation of our entire race.

This infinite amplitude of reparation Photius confirms again—

—in that question in which [1] he asks, *διὰ τί τοῦ γένους ἡ ἀνόρθωσις οὐ διὰ τινὸς τῶν ἀσωμάτων δυνάμεων ἢ δι' ἀνθρώπου ψιλοῦ, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς τοῦ Λόγου κενώσεως γέγονεν*, why the redemption of the human race was accomplished neither through some incorporeal power nor through a mere man, but through the self-emptying [2] of the Word. For among other arguments he also employs this one [3]: that it was necessary for the Redeemer to advance to a better condition the laws given by God to the Israelites. But, says Photius:

> It is neither possible nor without punishment for a servile creature to convert the laws of the Creator and Lord into another form; *τῷ μέντοι τὴν σωτηρίαν διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους κατεργαζομένῳ τοῦ πλάσματος, ᾧ τε τῶν δεσποτικῶν νόμων μετακόσμησις πρέπουσα, τὴν δεσποτικὴν ἐξουσίαν κατὰ φύσιν ἔχοντι, καὶ τῆς πολιτείας ῥᾳδία τε καὶ ἁρμόδιος ἡ πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον ἀνανέωσις*, but only to him who, moved by his clemency, undertook to procure the salvation of the creature does the reformation of the Lord's laws also belong, namely, to him who has the Lord's power by his very nature; and for him the renewal of the polity toward a better state is very easy and congruent.

To this argument he immediately adds another [4]:

---

[2] Ibid., no. 4, pp. 79–80.

[3] The most learned editor advises that this passage of Photius is worthy to be noted because of the famous question concerning the blood of Christ poured forth, debated among Catholic theologians.

[1] To Amphilochius, question CXCI, p. 194. Eusebius had previously treated the same question copiously in *On Constantine's Tricennalia*, chaps. XIII ff.

[2] Compare Thomas, III, q. I, aa. I–II.

[3] Ibid., no. 3, pp. 196–197.

[4] Ibid., no. 4, pp. 197–198.

> A demonstration of such and so great a love, of the kind that we saw in the self-emptying of him who cannot be emptied: how could it have come to our knowledge, or how could we have recognized the magnitude of providence toward us, if God had taken care that through anyone other than himself we should obtain *τὴν κοινὴν τοῦ γένους σωτηρίαν*, the common salvation of the race? *Οὐ μέντοι γε οὐδ' ἀγγελικῆς φύσεως ἐνεργεῖν τὸ μέγα τοῦτο καὶ παγκόσμιον μυστήριον.* Nor indeed was it granted even to the angelic nature itself to carry out so great and universal a mystery. For although individual angels received individual boundaries of the nations to guard, *ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τοῦ παντὸς γένους τὴν κυβέρνησιν, μήτι γε τὴν ἀνάπλασιν ἐπιστεύθησαν*, nevertheless the governance, much less the restoration, of the whole race [5]—
>
> —was not entrusted to them. Much less was it permitted for a mere man to do this, although shining forth among others in virtues. For we see that even the most celebrated among these were often placed over the ruling and instruction of one nation, and indeed one not of the greatest number; and that they discharged this very office not without some defect.

Whence, after other arguments of no less weight, he at last concludes [1]:

> *Διὰ γοῦν ταῦτα καὶ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα, θεοσόφως ἄρα καὶ θεοπρεπῶς ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος καὶ Υἱὸς καὶ οὐχ ἕτερός τις, παρ' αὐτὸν τὴν ἡμετέραν προσειληφὼς σάρκα, τὴν κοινὴν τοῦ γένους σωτηρίαν εἰργάσατο.* On account of these and very many other things of this kind, most wisely the Word and Son of God and true God—not someone else—having taken our flesh about himself, accomplished the common salvation of the race.

Therefore Photius is not unworthy to be heard as a witness of the Church of Constantinople. When he discusses the reparation of man, a) he attributes it to the benignity and bowels of mercy with which Christ embraced us. But b) he teaches that it is altogether universal, and he confirms this both by open statements and by arguments: c) by open statements in which he extols *ζωοποιὸν αἷμα τοῦ κόσμου*, the blood which vivifies the world; *τοῦ γένους τὴν ἀνόρθωσιν*, the restoration of the race; *τὴν σωτηρίαν τοῦ πλάσματος*, the salvation of the creature; *τὴν κοινὴν τοῦ γένους σωτηρίαν*, the common salvation of the race; and *τοῦ παντὸς γένους τὴν ἀνάπλασιν καὶ τὴν σωτηρίαν*, the restoration and salvation of the whole race. Likewise d) he confirms it by arguments, since from a reparation which is infinite

[5] These things are remarkable for illustrating the doctrine concerning guardian angels.

[1] Ibid., no. 5, p. 199.

and bound by no barriers he concludes that it could have been expected neither from a mere man, however excellent, nor even from an angel.

But with this universal reparation there is joined that order of divine providence which Photius weighs while investigating the meaning to be placed beneath these and similar testimonies of the Scriptures [2]: *He delivered them to serve the host of heaven*; *he delivered them into passions of ignominy*; *he gave them a spirit of compunction, eyes that they should not see*; and *God hardened the heart of Pharaoh*. For concerning the former he writes [1]—

> Unless the homonymy of the word is distinguished, it produces an absurd meaning. For how or when does God blind the eye of the soul? How does he, who is the purifier of these, deliver it to passions and to impiety and error? But once the notions of the word have been distinguished, the discourse is freed from every cavillation. *Τὸ γὰρ παρέδωκε σημαίνει μὲν καὶ τὸ ἐνεχείρισεν καὶ παρέπεμψεν, ἢ συνώθησε καὶ συνήλασε· σημαίνει δ' οὐδὲν ἔλαττον καὶ μάλιστα γε τῷ βουλήματι τῆς γραφῆς καὶ τὸ συνεχώρησε, καθυφῆκε καὶ ἐνέδωκεν, εἴασε φέρεσθαι ταῖς ὁρμαῖς, ἀφῆκε τὸ ἑκούσιον αὐτοδέσποτον.* For the word *delivered* indeed signifies "gave into another's power," "sent over," "compelled"; nevertheless, and indeed especially according to the meaning of Scripture [2], it signifies "conceded," "indulged," "permitted," "allowed to be borne by its own impulse," "suffered the choice to be free." When the word *delivered* is understood in this sense, no absurdity follows. *Ἀφέλκει μὲν γὰρ τὸ θεῖον νόμῳ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ προνοίας τῶν παθῶν καὶ ἁμαρτημάτων τὸ ἀνθρώπινον· ἐπειδὰν δὲ μοχθηρίας ὑπερβολῇ τὸ ἀναστελλόμενον τῆς εὐεργεσίας καὶ χάριτος οὐκ ἀνέχοιτο, οὐδ' ἐθέλοι τῷ μεθέλκοντι πείθεσθαι, τότε δὴ τότε ὑπενδίδωσι φέρεσθαι τῇ ῥύμῃ τὸ ἀπειθοῦν, καὶ ἀφίησιν ἀποκεχρῆσθαι τῷ βουλήματι, ἵνα μὴ ἐπὶ πλέον ἀναστέλλων καὶ ἀναχαιτίζων τῆς ῥοπῆς, δόξῃ διαφθείρειν τὸ αὐτεξούσιον· καὶ ἡ εὐεργεσία καὶ ἡ πρόνοια τοῖς ἀγνώμοσι καὶ ἀχαρίστοις εἰς ἔγκλημα περιτρέποιτο.* For God, according to the inborn manner of his goodness and providence, draws men away from passions and sins; but when they, through the excess of malice, disdain the reins imposed by divine beneficence and grace and refuse to obey him

[2] Acts VII.42; Rom. I.26, XI.8; Exod. VII.3 ff.

[1] To Amphilochius, question I, no. 23, p. 30.

[2] Namely, according to the most certain usage of speech in Scripture, concerning which Glassius discusses at greater length in *Sacred Philology*, book I, treatise III, canon XXII, and according to which active verbs are employed metonymically of those who are not themselves the authors of an action, but only offer the occasion for its accomplishment when they do not prevent it.

who draws them back, then at last he allows the contumacious to be borne along in their course and grants the power to abuse their choice, lest, if he should restrain and arrest the inclination more vehemently, he should seem to destroy the faculty of free will, and thus his beneficent power and providence should be turned into a charge by the senseless and ungrateful.

Proceeding to the final testimony [1], he notes:

God is said to have hardened the heart of Pharaoh, not because he converted it, at first soft and docile to his commands, into hardness, pertinacity, and contumacy; *ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι μεθέλκων καὶ ἀνακόπτων τῆς ἀπειθείας καὶ τοῦ ἀντιτύπου φρονήματος, ἐπείπερ οὐδαμῶς εὗρεν ὑπενδίδοντα καὶ πρὸς πειθὼ μεθιστάμενον τὸν Αἰγύπτιον, ἀλλ᾽ ὅλον ἑαυτὸν ποιοῦντα τοῦ ἀντιθέτου καὶ ἀντιταγμένου βουλήματος, ὁ μηδαμοῦ φθείρων τὸ αὐτεξούσιον, ἀφῆκε τῇ γνώμῃ φέρεσθαι τὸν οὐ βουληθέντα πεισθῆναι τῇ κρείττονι*, but because, after he had long taken care to recall that heart from disobedience and a refractory spirit, when he perceived the Egyptian in no way yielding or returning to obedience, but rather wholly confirming himself in a contrary and repugnant judgment, God, who never harms the force of free choice, allowed him to be borne by his own will, who refused to obey the better counsel.

Whence, speaking of evils universally [2], he establishes:

In the primary sense sins are called evils, of which God is not the cause; moreover, those things are evils which afflict us with distress and happen against our will—disease, poverty, … and however many other things are frequently said and believed to be sent upon the guilty by divine providence, either that it may restrain mortals rushing toward sins or that it may wash away stains: *οὐ κακύνουσα τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, οὐδὲ πρὸς τὸ χεῖρον τὸ δημιούργημα μεταπλάττουσα, μὴ τί γένηται· ἀπάγουσα δὲ τῶν κακυνόντων μᾶλλον, καὶ τῇ καταλλήλῳ τοῦ νοσοῦντος θεραπείᾳ τὸ ἠῤῥωστηκὸς τῆς γνώμης πρὸς τὸ ἄμεινον ἐπανάγουσα*, not indeed that God may deprave the human race, nor that he may transform his creature into a worse condition, which God forbid; rather, that he may draw it away from the incentives of vices and, by a treatment congruent with the one laboring, recall the infirm part of the soul to better fruit.

[1] Ibid., no. 24, p. 31.

[2] Ibid., no. 23, pp. 29–30.

Therefore by this order of providence the life of men is administered: a) God is the cause of sinning for no one and the cause of perishing for no one; rather, b) his grace is present to all and even to the most abandoned men—

—it shines upon them and imparts to them the means of a sounder mind. Yet c) he reverences the work founded by himself, and neither impedes nor destroys the liberty of choice which he made; but d) he excites and advances it toward that which is good, and, by applying reins, restrains the heat of desire. With this counsel e) he also visits temporal evils upon the guilty and labors by means of diseases and pains, that he may quiet the incentives of vices and turn the mind, torn away from carnal delights, toward spiritual sweetnesses. But nothing is more manifest than that by this order both 1) the first and salvific will is displayed, and 2) universal reparation is established, and 3) the blame for ruin and eternal destruction is cast back upon those who perish, but in no way upon the rationale of their state or the defect of helps.

CLXXXVII.

Of these heads of doctrine there is not even one which is not abundantly confirmed by the testimony and suffrage of the Church of Pontus. For, to take my beginning from Gregory, the first bishop of Neocaesarea, who [1], on account of the signs and miracles which he accomplished with great glory to the churches,

[1] In Jerome, *On Illustrious Men*, chap. LXV.

was called Thaumaturgus: even if I set aside the most splendid things [3] which are available from his doubtful works [2], from that panegyrical oration alone—

—which [1] he delivered when a great assembly had been convoked, with Origen himself also present, and which the martyr Pamphilus had appended to those books [2] which he wrote in defense of Origen, things are contained which not without cause seem capable of sufficing. For, describing the Only-begotten by a circumlocution, he hands down [3] that he is *τὸν πάντων δημιουργὸν καὶ κυβερνήτην*, the founder and governor of all, and indeed also *τὸν προστάτην τῶν ἡμετέρων ψυχῶν καὶ σωτῆρα*, the protector and savior of our souls; and, not content with these things, he calls him both *τὸν τῆς μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελον*, the angel of the great counsel, and *τὸν κοινὸν πάντων σωτῆρα*, the common savior of all. But these things are so constituted that, circumscribed by no limits, they manifest the universal amplitude of reparation.

The things found in Caesarius, brother of Gregory Nazianzen, manifest this much more splendidly still. Caesarius was honored with his brother's praises [4], and is to be heaped with praises more ample on this account also: that he

[3]Of this kind are these things from Oration II, *On the Annunciation of Holy Mary*, pp. 19–26, Paris edition, 1622: "Scripture announces to us the most celebrated economy of the Savior: that, although he was God, by his exceeding benignity he was made man, not laying aside the dignity which he possessed from eternity, but putting on the salvific dispensation. It announces to us the most praiseworthy economy of the Savior: that a physician came to those laboring and sick, curing not with medicines but healing by the command of his benignity. It announces to us the most celebrated economy of the Savior: that he was made the way of salvation for those who wander, salvific grace for those who despair, *διαφόρως πάντας εὐεργετοῦσα*, conferring benefits upon all in manifold ways, seeking those who wander, illuminating those surrounded by darkness, vivifying the dead—"

"—granting liberty to servants, redeeming captives, *καὶ τοῖς πᾶσιν ἡμῖν τὰ πάντα γεγονέν, εἰς ὁδὸν σωτηρίας*, and made all things to us all unto the way of salvation—not on account of our grateful disposition, *ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν αὐτῷ τῷ εὐεργέτῃ πρέπουσαν ἀγαθότητα*, but on account of the goodness befitting the Savior himself. For the Savior did all things, not that he might acquire virtue for himself, but that he might procure eternal life for us. For, forming man according to the image of God, he commanded him to dwell in the paradise of delights; but, deceived by the envy of the devil and made a transgressor of the divine precept, man rendered himself subject to death; for which reason those born from him also, bound through succession by a hereditary debt, were punished with the sentence of damnation. For death reigned from Adam even unto Moses. But the most benign Lord, seeing his own formation held by death, did not abhor unto the end the man whom he had made according to his image; *ἀλλὰ καθ' ἑκάστην γενεὰν ἐπισκεπτόμενος, οὐ διέλειπεν*, but, visiting him through the individual generations, he did not abandon him." He writes things twin to these in the Oration *On the Holy Theophany*, p. 31.

[2]Among these are numbered four of his orations published in Greek and Latin by Vossius. Whether these are Gregory's or not, says Gallandi in the prolegomena to vol. III, chap. IX, § VIII, no one is able to pronounce with certainty.

[1]As Jerome testifies, *On Illustrious Men*, chap. LXV.

[2]As Socrates reports, *Ecclesiastical History*, book IV, chap. XXVIII.

[3]Panegyrical Oration to Origen, § IV, pp. 417–418, in Gallandi, vol. III.

[4]Oration X and Poem LIV, Muratori edition.

prescribed for himself this law of thinking and writing [5]: *οὐκ οἰκεῖά τινα ἢ αὐτοσχέδια φράζων, ἀλλ'—*

—ὅσα τῶν ἀοιδίμων καὶ μακαρίων πατέρων τοὺς λειμῶνας ἐπελθών, τῆς ἐκείνων ῥοδωνιᾶς συνήγαγον, "not setting forth certain things properly my own or trifling, but whatsoever, traversing the meadows of the renowned and blessed Fathers, I gathered from their rose-garden."

From this rose-garden he plucked this first and most sweet flower: that God is more vehemently delighted by no endowment and no ornament than by merciful long-suffering. "Since," says Caesarius [1], "*ἡ παντελὴς ἀρετὴ Θεὸς ὑπάρχει, εἰκότως μακρόθυμος προσαγορεύεται, ὡς μακρὰν ὑπάρχων θυμοῦ*, God is all-embracing virtue, he is rightly called long-suffering, as one who stands far distant from anger." But although innumerable effects of this merciful long-suffering are numbered, that effect must be considered second to none by which God, far from casting away man lost through fault, instead recalled him to life and safety. Caesarius describes [2] the ruin of man, represents the accusations of the devil which followed, and then continues [3]:

> *Ἀλλ' ὅμως ὁ φιλάνθρωπος Θεὸς ἀτρέπτως κατὰ τὸν διαβληθέντα γενόμενος, ἐπεφοίτησεν ἡμῖν τὸν πολέμιον χειρώσασθαι, ἐν θέᾳ τοῦ ἀπατηθέντος ἀληθῶς γενόμενος, ἵνα μὴ δῷ φάσκειν τὸν ἐχθρόν, ὅτι βροτοῖς πολεμήσας ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἥττημαι, αὐτὸς βροτὸς γίνεται μένων Θεός, καὶ ἥκει πολεμῶν ὑπὲρ βροτῶν.* Nevertheless God, the lover of the human race, being in no way changed toward him who had been accused, came to us that he might subdue the enemy, being truly born in the form of the one who had been deceived. And lest he give the enemy occasion to say, "Fighting against mortals, I have been conquered by God," he himself becomes mortal while remaining God, and comes to fight on behalf of mortal men.

This had already been foretold five hundred years before [4] by that prophet and author of divine songs, David: "Blessed," he says, "is he who comes in the name of the Lord." Who is he, divine prophet? "The Lord [5] is God, and he has appeared to us." But for whose sake does—

—God become mortal, my David? *Τοῦ καταλῦσαι ἐχθρόν, φησίν, καὶ ἐκδικητὴν τὸν διάβολον*, "In order," he says, "to destroy the enemy and exactor, the devil."

---

[5] Question I.

[1] Dialogue IV, response to question CXCII, pp. 144–145, in Gallandi, vol. VI.

[2] Dialogue III, response to question CXXIII, p. 76.

[3] Ibid., p. 77.

[4] Ps. CXVII.26.

[5] Ibid., v. 27.

Nevertheless he so destroyed him that he did not will the occasion of merit and praise to be taken away from us. For to one asking [1], "If the Lord removed the enemy, who attacks any one of us and involves him in unforeseen temptations and sins?" Caesarius replies [2]:

> Although God could have brought about his complete extinction and removal, nevertheless he did not will this, *διὰ τὸ μὴ ἀγέραστους ἡμᾶς καταλειφθῆναι ἐν τῇ μελλούσῃ ἀϊδίῳ ζωῇ, μὴ ὄντος ἡμῖν ἐνταῦθα τινὸς ἀντιπάλου, πρὸς ὃν ἀγωνιζομένους οἱονεὶ ἐν σταδίῳ τῇ παρούσῃ ζωῇ, ἐν τῇ ἀμείψει ταύτης στεφάνων ἐπιτυχεῖν*, lest we should be left without honor in the future eternal life if there were no adversary here against whom, contending as in the stadium of the present life, we might attain crowns at the time of recompense.

Lest men should fall away from these crowns, God never failed them with his graces and his doctrine, and never denied them necessary aid. Caesarius teaches this while expounding the parable employed by Christ [3]: "The kingdom of heaven is like leaven, which a prudent woman received and hid in three measures of flour, until the whole was leavened," saying [4]:

> By the leaven, the Lord seems to me to compare doctrine and faith in himself; but by the woman, his Church, which he also loved [5]. By the three measures of flour, however, the three sons of Noah … from whom alone after the flood proceeded all the nations, which are now gathered in the Church: *οἷς ἡ καθήγησις τοῦ κηρύγματος, καὶ ἡ πίστις, οἱονεὶ ζύμη ἐμφυραθεῖσα, τὸ ὅλον τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀλεύρων, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Νῶε τριῶν σάτων λογικῶν, ἐζύμωσε πρὸς τὴν θεοσέβειαν*, among whom the doctrine of preaching and faith, mixed in as leaven, leavened unto the worship of God the whole flour of the nations, which consists of Noah's three rational measures—

—He teaches the same thing in more explicit words when he adds this explanation [2] to another parable [1], "The sower went out to sow":

> *Ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ Χριστός, ὁ πρὸ αἰώνων Θεός· οὗτος γὰρ ὑπάρχει ὁ σπορεὺς τῶν σωτηρίων ἡμῶν· σπέρμα δὲ αὐτοῦ, θεῖος καὶ ζωοποιὸς λόγος· ἄρουρα δέ, ἡ ἀνθρωπότης πᾶσα.* Christ, God before the ages, went out from the Father. For he is the sower of our sal-

[1] Dialogue III, question CXXIV, p. 77.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Matt. XIII.33.
[4] Dialogue IV, response to question CLXXX, p. 136.
[5] Eph. V.25.
[2] Dialogue IV, response to question CXCIII, p. 145.
[1] Matt. XIII.3–7.

> vation. His seed is the divine and life-giving word; the field is all humanity.

Nor could the field be narrower: "For the same sower," Caesarius continues [3], "the same potter of our mass, Christ, *πρὸ σαρκώσεως μὲν ἡμᾶς ἐκ μὴ ὄντων δημιουργήσας· ῥυπωθέντας δέ, καὶ τοῦ χείρονος γενομένους δεκτικούς, διὰ θανάτου συντρίψας πάλιν ἀναπλάττει, καὶ διὰ τὸ μένειν τοῦ λοιποῦ κακίας ἀπαραδέκτους*, who before the incarnation indeed created us from nothing, but, after we had been contaminated and thereby made capable of the worse, having broken us through death, fashions us anew, and through perseverance thereafter makes us incapable of any malice." But although we are fashioned anew only by the death of Christ, nevertheless its benefits did not first begin with that death, but always accompanied the human race. "For he was not incarnate [4] on account of those present so as to benefit them alone, *ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς προκοιμηθέντας θανάτῳ ἀνέστησε, καὶ ἡμῶν τοῖς ἐπιγόνοις ἐλπίδα ἀναστάσεως ἐδωρήσατο καὶ ζωήν*, but he also raised from death those who had fallen asleep before and bestowed upon our posterity the hope of resurrection and life." Therefore upon all past, present, and future men the hope of salvation shone, shines, and will shine; and on account of Christ's reparation all had, have, and will have the power of acquiring life and felicity. For [5]:

> *Ἐνταῦθα ὑπάρχει τὰ τῆς ἰατρείας, ἐκεῖ τὰ τῆς ἀπολογίας· ἐνταῦθα τὰ τῆς ὑγιείας, ἐκεῖ τὰ τῆς τιμωρίας· ἐνταῦθα τὰ τῆς θείας μακροθυμίας, ἐκεῖ τὰ τῆς ἀκλώους δικαιοκρισίας*, here is the time—
>
> —of medicine; there, of rendering an account. Here is the time of health; there, of punishment. Here is the time of divine long-suffering; there, of inevitable and just judgment.

In accordance with this law of government, which God benignly established for himself, although while the guilty live as mortals he could punish them inexorably, nevertheless he does not will to do so, but sustains them and calls them to better counsels. Caesarius most openly proclaims this [1] when, investigating the signification of the accursed fig tree [2], he says:

> Through it Christ willed to teach that God could even punish the opposing synagogue of the Jews, *ἀλλ' ὡς ἀγαθός, οὐ βούλεται*, but as good does not will to do so…. *Τιμωρεῖται οὖν ἡ ἄψυχος, ἵνα καρποφορήσῃ πίστιν ἡ ἄθεος.* Therefore the inanimate fig tree is punished, that the impious synagogue may bring forth the fruit of faith.

---

[3] Ibid., p. 146.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Dialogue IV, response to question CLXXXV, p. 141.
[1] Dialogue IV, response to question CLXXXIII, p. 138.
[2] Matt. XXI.19.

But Christ selected this image chiefly with this intention [3]: "That he might show *ὅτι οἷός τε ὑπάρχει, καὶ ἐν τῷ παρόντι τοὺς πονηροὺς τιμωρεῖσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐπέχει τέως τὴν δύναμιν, ἐνδιδοὺς ἑκάστῳ πρὸς μετάγνωσιν*, that he is able even in the present life to afflict the wicked with punishment, but still restrains his power, granting to each one time for a change of mind."

Then [4], that by his desire for sensible fruits he might show *νοητῶς*, intelligibly, "that he hungers and has chiefly at heart *τὴν πάντων σωτηρίαν, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ Ἰουδαίων*, the salvation of all, but especially of the Jews."

CLXXXVIII.

God, affected in this manner, neither confers salvation upon any adult nor prepared salvation for any of them except as justly repaid for merits acquired by his grace and his aid. Caesarius is an abundant witness to this truth when he weighs what Christ answered [5] to the sons of Zebedee: *τὸ καθίσαι—*

—ἐκ δεξιῶν μου καὶ ἐξ εὐωνύμων, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται ὑπὸ τοῦ Πατρός μου, "to sit at my right and at my left is not mine to give, but to those for whom it has been prepared by my Father." For he writes [1]:

> He denied it, not as though it were not within his power to furnish it, but under a certain prudent pretext he recalls their pride to modesty and their elation against their fellow disciples; through them also chastising the rest, and by the terror of denial extinguishing in them the kindled and absurd love of primacy. For he does not say, "The Father grants this to you absolutely," *ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται πονοῦσιν*, but, "It has been prepared for those who labor," stimulating them to virtue and fortitude, that they might first demonstrate benevolence, gird themselves for contests, and persevere constantly for him even unto death…. Equip yourselves for contests in the stadium; descend into the arena of the theater; proceed eagerly; remain unconquered; and as soon as the theater of the present age has been dissolved, I will immediately bestow those thrones upon you as prizes of the contest. But now I rightly reject you.

And after interposing a few things [2]:

> It is not mine simply to give, but in turn to exact from you the recompense of contests and sweats. For I prefer to be indebted to

[3] Ibid., p. 138.
[4] Ibid., p. 139.
[5] Matt. XX.23.
[1] Dialogue III, response to question CXXXI, p. 84.
[2] Ibid., p. 84.

> you on account of benevolent eagerness rather than to accuse your sluggishness. It is not mine to give, nor is it my Father's simply to give to those who ask; otherwise, if obscure men and adulterers and every flagitious and intemperate man should ask, they would sit with me. *Οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμέτερον, τὸ δοῦναι εἰκῇ, καὶ παραχαράξαι τὸ δίκαιον· δικαιοκρίτου γὰρ τὸ πρὸς ἀξίαν ἑκάστῳ ἀπονέμειν, καὶ μὴ τοὺς ἱδρῶντας παριδεῖν, καὶ ῥᾳθύμοις παρασχεῖν. Εἰ τοίνυν τῶν θρόνων ἐρᾶτε, τοὺς ἀγῶνας οὐκ ἀγνοεῖτε, πρὸς οὓς ὀφείλετε ἀποδύσασθαι· μὴ τῷ τρίβωνι καὶ τῇ ὑπήνῃ καὶ τῇ βακτηρίᾳ μόνοις ἐναβρυνόμενοι, ἀλλὰ τοῖς πόνοις τοὺς θρόνους ἐξωνούμενοι, καὶ τὸ κριτήριον ἱλεούμενοι.* It is not ours to give rashly and to corrupt what is just. For it belongs to a just judge to bestow upon each one according to the dignity of his merit, not to overlook those who labor and grant something to the idle. Therefore, if you love thrones, do not be ignorant of the contests for which you ought to be equipped—
>
> —It is not fitting for you to glory delicately in the cloak, beard, and staff alone; but purchase thrones by labors and placate the judgment.

For since God did not will [1] "that we should lead an idle and sluggish life, … nor that he should unworthily honor us who have merited no reward, *ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ κατέλιπεν ἐξουσίᾳ ἐξομοιοῦσθαι αὐτῷ διὰ τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν μιμήσεως, καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀρετῶν κατορθώσεως καὶ ἐπιδείξεως, ὅπως τῇ περὶ τὸν πέλας κηδεμονίᾳ ἐξομοιωθῶμεν αὐτῷ, καθόσον οἷόν τε τῇ βροτῶν φύσει πρὸς Θεὸν ἀμιλλᾶσθαι*, he left it within our power to be made like to him through imitation directed toward him and through the achievement and display of the virtues, that by solicitude toward our neighbor we might be made like to him, insofar as it can be accomplished by mortal nature striving toward God."

Therefore there can be no doubt concerning the rationale of the economy by which the human race, although infected with the contagion of sin and wounded with manifold wounds, is administered and ruled. For it is ruled a) by the economy of long-suffering mercy, which b) is followed by the economy of most equitable retribution.

It is ruled by the economy of long-suffering mercy because 1) God fashioned anew corrupted and depraved human nature; because 2) he conferred upon all and continually proceeds to confer upon them the safeguards of his grace; and because 3) he gave and gives to all the hope of salvation, which is not utterly cut off before this present life of ours has ended.

But this economy is followed by the economy of most equitable retribution because 1) God decreed that salvation should be conferred only upon those who

[1] Dialogue III, response to question CLXV, p. 124.

have rightly employed the power granted to all; and because 2) he willed eternal felicity to be a gift in such a way that it should at the same time be believed to be a reward and crown acquired by merits and labors.

Now the state cohering with each economy neither can nor ought to seem other than a) the state of universal reparation, b) of common power, c) of most pleasant and solicitous hope, since d) it is owed no less to the first will and mercy than to the second will and justice. It is owed to the first will and mercy because from this font flowed universal reparation and the faculty of obtaining salvation made available to all—

—but it is owed to the second will and justice because no one will be crowned unless he has contended lawfully.

CLXXXIX.

With these things most perfectly harmonize those which Gregory Nazianzen, brother of Caesarius, committed to writings which will never perish: *σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς*, a vessel [1] of election, a most eloquent man [2], *ὁ θεολόγος* [3], and one concerning whom [4] "nothing more approved and holy than his life, nothing clearer and more illustrious than his eloquence, nothing purer and more correct than his faith, nothing fuller and more perfect than his knowledge can be found. For he alone is one concerning whose faith not even parties dissenting among themselves, as is wont to happen, could dispute; but he obtained such merit before the Lord and the churches of God that whoever should dare to contradict his doctrine in anything would, by this very fact, be shown rather to be himself a heretic. For it is a manifest indication that a man is not of the right faith if he does not agree with Gregory in faith."

But what faith concerning the salvific will of God and the amplitude of the repaired order did Gregory hold and propose to be held? The answer is ready, since his testimonies concerning this matter can be neither more luminous nor more explicit.

For in the place of a principle he posits that God is charity by his very nature and is thereby borne to impart benefits and to crown those increased by his benefits with his own beatitude. "The God of peace," he says [5], "who reconciled us to himself through the cross [6], although previously through sin we had been

[1] In Basil, Letter VIII, class I, vol. III, p. 81.
[2] In Jerome, *On Ecclesiastical Writers*, no. CXVII.
[3] In Theodore the Studite, *Antirrhetic II Against the Iconoclasts*, p. 123.
[4] In Rufinus, in the prologue to the Orations of Gregory which he rendered into Latin.
[5] Oration XI, otherwise VI, § VII, p. 246, Paris edition, 1778.
[6] II Cor. V.18; Eph. II.17; and I John IV.16.

made his enemies; who brought the auspicious announcement of peace both to those who were near and to those who were far off—that is—"

> —both to those who were subject to the law and to those who were foreign to the law; *ὁ τῆς ἀγάπης πατήρ, ἡ ἀγάπη· ταῦτα γὰρ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων χαίρει καλούμενος*, he the father of charity, indeed charity itself—for by these names he delights chiefly to be called—… may he perfect you [1] unto every good work."

But because love cannot be idle, God, who is the father of love and love itself, is borne by an implanted weight, as it were, to enrich all by his benefactions. Gregory employs this divine ornament [2] to refute those who imagined that the Christian faith belonged solely to the eloquent:

> Nothing more inequitable than our faith could be imagined if it fell only to the learned and to those who excel in the faculty of speaking and in logical demonstrations; but the common multitude were deprived of it just as of gold and silver and all other things which are held in value here and are most avidly sought by most men; and if God held grateful and acceptable that which is lofty and exalted and reaches few, but on the contrary scorned and rejected that which is nearer and does not exceed the grasp of the common people. For this does not befit even more moderate men: that they should not require such honors as can be rendered to them, but should delight only in excellent and extraordinary ones—much less God, *οὗ πολλῶν ὄντων ἐφ' οἷς θαυμάζεται, οὐδὲν οὕτως, ὡς τὸ πάντας εὐεργετεῖν ἰδιώτατον*, who, although he is admirable under many names, nevertheless possesses nothing so proper to himself as to pursue all with benefits.

Whence he both is and by his merit is called [3] *φάος ὀλβιοδώρον*, the light which is the font of beatitude.

To this will so inclined toward doing good must be attributed the fact that God did not cast away man depraved by fault, but undertook to fashion and repair him anew. "For since," says the Theologian [4], "to lack every stain of sin belongs to God and to the first and uncompounded nature; … I shall boldly add that it also belongs to the angelic nature, because it surely approaches this most nearly on account of the proximity it has to God; but to sin belongs to—"

> —human and earthly composition…. *Οὐκ ᾤετο δεῖν ἀβοήθητον τὸ ἑαυτοῦ πλάσμα καταλείπειν ὁ δεσπότης, οὐδὲ περιϊδεῖν κινδυνεῦον τὴν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ διάστασιν*, therefore the Lord by no means thought that he ought to leave his own formation destitute of aid, or to dis-

[1] Phil. I.6.
[2] Oration XXXII, otherwise XXVI, § XXVI, pp. 596–597.
[3] Poem IV, *On the World*, v. 82, p. 225.
[4] Oration XL, § VII, p. 695.

> regard it as it was in danger of being separated from him. *Ἀλλ' ὥσπερ οὐκ ὄντας ὑπέστησεν, οὕτως ὑποστάντας ἀνέπλασε, πλάσιν θειοτέραν τε καὶ τῆς πρώτης ὑψηλοτέραν ... ἵνα μὴ τῇ ἀπογνώσει χείρους γινόμενοι, καὶ ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ χεῖρον καταφερόμενοι, τελέως ἔξω τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς δι' ἀπόγνωσιν πίπτωμεν· μηδὲ εἰς κακῶν βάθος ἐμπεσόντες, ὃ δὴ λέγεται, καταφρονῶμεν.* But rather, just as he first created us when we did not exist, so he restored and refashioned us after we had been created, and indeed with a more divine formation, surpassing the first formation … lest otherwise, being made worse through despair and falling daily into graver crimes, we should at last fall entirely from the supreme good and from virtue on account of despair; and thus, fallen into the depth of evils, to use the words of Scripture [1], we should contemn. But rather, just as those who measure out a long journey rest in inns and refresh limbs wearied by labor, so let us complete with vigor and diligence what remains of the way.

He teaches things twin to these [2] when, explaining the rationale of the Mosaic rites, he says:

> We judge thus. Since through sin we fell from the beginning and had been carried away by the enticement of pleasure into the worship of idols and nefarious slaughters, *ἔδει πάλιν ἀνακληθῆναι, καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἐπαναχθῆναι, διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους Θεοῦ Πατρὸς ἡμῶν, οὐκ ἀνασχομένου ζημιωθῆναι τοσοῦτον ἔργον τῆς οἰκείας χειρὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον*, through the bowels of the mercy of God our Father, who did not endure to suffer the loss of man, so great a work of his own hand, it was necessary that we should be recalled and restored to the ancient state. In what manner, therefore, was it fitting that he should be reformed, or what ought to have been done?

Namely, according to Gregory, it was fitting that the providence of God toward men should be manifold and various, beginning [3] from easier things and advancing toward more perfect things and even unto the Gospel itself.

CXC.

To this, then, it advanced, when at length the Only-begotten appeared visibly and omitted nothing of those things which he had received in command from the

[1] Prov. XVIII.3.
[2] Oration XLV, otherwise XLII, § XII, p. 854.
[3] Ibid., §§ XII–XIII, pp. 854 ff.

Father. "Of all these things," Gregory continues [1], "*κεφάλαιον ἕν, ἡ ἐμὴ τελείωσις καὶ ἀνάπλασις, καὶ πρὸς τὸν πρῶτον Ἀδὰμ ἐπάνοδος*, this is the one head and this the single end: my perfection and restoration, and a return to the first Adam." Christ therefore came as the new origin of the human race, as the new Adam, and saved all, not even one excepted. Gregory teaches this when [2], weighing the sense in which the future [3] subjection of Christ ought to be understood, he says:

> Just as for the sake of my salvation he was called a curse [4], who loosed my curse; and sin [5], who takes away the sin of the world; *καὶ Ἀδὰμ ἀντὶ τοῦ παλαιοῦ γίνεται νέος*, and in place of the old Adam [6] he is made the new Adam: in the same manner he also takes my disobedience and rebellion upon himself, as the head of the whole body. Therefore, so long as I myself am disobedient and turbulent … so long also, so far as concerns me, Christ is said to be disobedient. But when all things have been subjected to him (and they will be subjected both through acknowledgment and through transformation), then he too will have completed the subjection, bringing me, now having obtained salvation.

He teaches the latter when, after recounting [7] the prodigies which accompanied Christ's death and resurrection, he adds:

> *Οὐδὲν δὲ οἷον τὸ θαῦμα τῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας· ῥανίδες αἵματος ὀλίγαι κόσμον ὅλον ἀναπλάττουσαι, καὶ γίνονται καθάπερ ἔπος γάλακτι πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, εἰς ἓν ἡμᾶς συνδέουσαι καὶ συνάγουσαι.* Yet nothing is comparable with the miracle of my salvation, in which a few drops of blood restored the whole world and performed for all men the same office as rennet for milk, binding and gathering us into one.

He writes things consonant with these [1] where, after enumerating those things which within the limits of nature are common to all men, enlarging the enumeration, he adds:

> To bring forward still greater things, I regard reason, the Law, the Prophets as common, *αὐτὰ τὰ Χριστοῦ πάθη, δι' ὧν ἀνεπλάσθημεν, οὐχ ὁ μὲν, ὁ δ' οὐ* [2], *πάντες δὲ οἱ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἀδὰμ μετασχόντες, καὶ*

---

[1] Oration XXXVIII, § XVI, p. 674.
[2] Oration XXX, otherwise XXXVI, § V, p. 542.
[3] I Cor. XV.28.
[4] Gal. III.13.
[5] II Cor. V.21.
[6] I Cor. XV.45.
[7] Oration XLV, otherwise XLII, § XXIX, pp. 867–868.
[1] Oration XXXIII, otherwise XXV, § IX, p. 609.
[2] Four manuscripts have *ὁ δὲ οὐ*, "not this one indeed, but that one."

> *ὑπὸ τοῦ ὄφεως παραλογισθέντες, καὶ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ θανατωθέντες, καὶ διὰ τοῦ ἐπουρανίου Ἀδὰμ ἀνασωθέντες, καὶ πρὸς τὸ ξύλον τῆς ζωῆς ἐπαναχθέντες, διὰ τοῦ ξύλου* [3] *τῆς ἀτιμίας ὅθεν ἀποπεπτώκαμεν*, the very sufferings of Christ, through which we all, without any exception, have been restored—we who participated in the same Adam, were led into deception by the serpent, were put to death through sin, were restored to salvation through the heavenly Adam, and were recalled to the tree of life, from which we had fallen, through the tree of ignominy.

Whence he calls absolutely all men [4] *τοὺς τῆς αὐτῆς ζωῆς κληρονόμους, ὑπὲρ ὧν Χριστὸς ὁμοίως ἀπέθανεν*, heirs of the same life, and those for whom Christ equally died. Concerning the same persons he also sings [5]:

> *Εἷς νόμος, εἷς δὲ Θεός· κλῆσις μία· πάντας ὁμοίως*
> *Σωθῆναι Χριστὸς σαρκ' ἀποδυσαμένους*
> *Βούλεται.*
>
> "One law, one God, the same calling; Christ wills all alike to be saved when they have put off the flesh."

And again [6]:

> *Θεὸς βροτὸν οὐκ ἀθερίζει,*
> *Ὃ θάνεν, ὃν συνέγειρε, καὶ ᾧ Θεὸς ἵξεται αὖτις.*
>
> "God does not despise the mortal for whom he died, whom he raised together with himself, and to whom God will come again."

By all these things the universality of reparation is proved with such perspicuity that it must be deemed like a prodigy if anyone should attempt to distort them and wrench them into foreign senses.

Lest anyone should take this upon himself, Gregory further prevents it by those testimonies in which, by a distributive form of discourse, he proclaims that the individuals also were redeemed and restored.

For, according to him, a) each sex, man and woman, obtained equal mercy from Christ. "*Ἀμφοτέρους*," he says [1], "*σώζει Χριστὸς τοῖς πάθεσιν· ὑπὲρ ἀνδρὸς σὰρξ ἐγένετο; τοῦτο καὶ ὑπὲρ γυναικός· ὑπὲρ ἀνδρὸς ἀπέθανε; καὶ ἡ γυνὴ τῷ θανάτῳ σώζεται·* Christ saved both through his suffering. Was he made flesh for man? Likewise for woman. Did he undergo death for man? By his death salvation was likewise obtained for woman."

---

[3] In an ancient scholium, *διὰ τοῦ ξύλου*, that is, *τοῦ σταυροῦ*, "through the tree," that is, "of the cross."

[4] Oration XIX, otherwise IX, § XIII, p. 372.

[5] Poem XLIV, vv. 18–21, p. 917.

[6] Poem III, to Vitalianus, vv. 8–9, p. 1019.

[1] Oration XXXVII, otherwise XXXI, § VII, p. 650.

According to him, b) Christ redeemed heretics [2], *τὰ ἀχάριστα κτίσματα*, ungrateful creatures, and those *ὑπὲρ ὧν δωρεὰν ἀπέθανε*, for whom he died in vain.

He redeemed c) even the most flagitious; whence Gregory does not so much address Julian in these words as most bitterly rebuke him [3]: "You against Christ's sacrifice with your expiatory victims? *Σὺ κατὰ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον καθήραντος αἵματος, τοῖς σοῖς αἵμασι;* You against that blood by which the world was purified, with your own bloodshed? You, war against peace? *Σὺ χεῖρα κατὰ τῆς ὑπὲρ σοῦ ἡλωθείσης τε καὶ διὰ σέ;* You, a hand against that hand which was pierced with nails both for you and because of you?"

Indeed, d) he did not pass over even those by whom he was afflicted with the ultimate punishment. For [4] *καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν σταυρούντων αὐτὸν*, even for those crucifying him, he most benignly poured out tears.

CXCI.

But with mercy so great, so universal, and poured forth upon all, God's purpose was [5] "*πτερῶσαι ψυχήν, ἁρπάσαι—*

> *—κόσμου καὶ δοῦναι Θεῷ, καὶ τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα, ἢ μένον τηρῆσαι, ἢ κινδυνεῦον χειραγωγῆσαι, ἢ διαρρυὲν ἀνασώσασθαι, εἰσοικίσαι* [1] *τε τὸν Χριστὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος· καὶ τὸ κεφάλαιον, Θεὸν ποιῆσαι, καὶ τῆς ἄνω μακαριότητος, τὸν* [2] *τῆς ἄνω συντάξεως*, to give wings to the soul, to snatch it from the world and give it to God; either to preserve the divine [3] image while it remains, or to support it when it is imperiled, or to restore it to its former state when it has fallen away; to admit Christ through the Spirit into the dwelling of the breast; and, to speak summarily, to make him who belongs to the heavenly host a God and to procure for him the beatitude above."

Let us therefore [4] "be as Christ, since Christ also became as we are. Let us be made Gods on his account, since he also became man on our account. He assumed what was worse that he might give what was more excellent. He was

---

[2] Oration XXXVIII, § XIV, p. 672.

[3] Oration IV, otherwise III, § LXVIII, p. 198.

[4] Ibid., § LXXVIII, p. 215.

[5] Oration II, otherwise I, § XXII, p. 23.

[1] He alludes to the words of Paul, Eph. III.16–17, and in place of *κατοικῆσαι*, which the Apostle uses, he employs *εἰσοικίσαι*, "to cause to dwell within."

[2] For man was created, as Elias observes, so that he might be numbered among the heavenly orders.

[3] Gen. I.26.

[4] Oration I, otherwise XLI, § V, p. 5.

made needy [5] that through his need we might be rich. He received the form of a servant [6] that we might receive liberty. He descended that we might be raised up. He was tempted that we might conquer. He was contemned that he might grant us glory. He died that he might bring us salvation. He ascended that he might draw to himself those lying upon the earth through the fall of sin. Let someone give all things; let him offer all things to him who gave himself as a price of redemption for us and as an exchange. Yet he will give nothing so great as when he has offered himself, understanding rightly the rationale of this mystery and becoming all things for his sake which he became for us." But whoever rightly understands the rationale of the mystery will perceive that the whole providence of God toward men looked to this: that all should be restored to integrity and recalled to their former fellowship with divinity. "For hither," says Gregory [7], "the Law, our teacher, tends—

> —hither the prophets interposed between Christ and the Law; hither Christ, the consummator and end of the spiritual law [1]. Hither the emptied divinity; hither the assumed flesh; hither *ἡ καινὴ μίξις, Θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος, ἓν ἐξ ἀμφοῖν, καὶ δι' ἑνὸς ἀμφότερα*, that new commingling, namely God and man, one from [2] both, and both through one. *Διὰ τοῦτο Θεὸς σαρκὶ διὰ μέσης ψυχῆς ἀνεκράθη, καὶ συνεδέθη, τὰ διεστῶτα τῇ πρὸς ἄμφω τοῦ μεσιτεύοντος οἰκειότητι· καὶ πάντα ὑπὲρ πάντων· ἦλθεν εἰς ἕν, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἑνὸς τοῦ προπάτορος· ἡ ψυχὴ διὰ τὴν παρακούσασαν· ἡ σὰρξ διὰ τὴν ὑπουργήσασαν καὶ συγκατακριθεῖσαν· ἡ μὲν, ψυχήν, ἡ δὲ, σάρκα· ὁ Χριστὸς διὰ τὸν Ἀδὰμ τὸν γενόμενον ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ὁ κρείττων ἁμαρτίας καὶ ὑψηλότερος.* For this cause God [3] was united to flesh through the intervention of the soul, and things separated and at variance among themselves were joined by the affinity and kinship of the mediating thing with each of them; and all things for all things, and on behalf of that one prince of our race, came together into one: the

[5] II Cor. VIII.9.

[6] Phil. II.7.

[7] Oration II, otherwise I, § XXIII, pp. 23–24.

[1] Heb. XII.2.

[2] "These things," says Elias of Crete, "are a sword sharpened on both sides against the heretics. For the words *ἓν ἐξ ἀμφοῖν*, one from both, inflict a lethal wound upon the Nestorians, who divide the one Christ into two hypostases; but the words *δι' ἑνὸς ἀμφότερα*, both through one, strike in turn the Severians, who deny the two natures in Christ and contract them into one nature, and not a few others."

[3] Petavius, *On the Incarnation*, book IV, chap. XIII; Thomassin, *On the Incarnation*, book IV, chap. IX; and Gerdil, in his notes on Feller concerning proposition LXI of the Synod of Pistoia, § III, pp. 339 ff., works, vol. XIV, Rome edition, 1809, rightly explain this formula solemnized by ecclesiastical usage.

> soul, namely, on account of the soul which did not obey the divine precept; the flesh, on account of the flesh which obeyed the soul's desire and was condemned together with it; the former for the soul, the latter for the flesh; and finally Christ for Adam, that is, for him who was made under sin, he who was more sublime and excellent than sin.

Merciful kindness therefore reigns, clemency rules, mercy claims for itself the principal parts; and only in the second rank does justice follow, armed with its punishments and furnished with its scourges. But whom does it punish and chastise with eternal torments? a) Those whom God of himself and of his own accord consigned to punishments? Yet God of himself is love, and has this as his proper character: to be beneficent toward all. b) Those whom he neglected when bound by the common transgression, and abandoned in the ruined mass? Yet he neglected no one, deprived no one of his aid, imparted to all the hope of salvation, and fashioned all anew. c) Those whom Christ the new Adam did not redeem? Yet he redeemed all, vindicated all into liberty, and conferred upon all the power by which, when sin had been conquered and the heavenly likeness recovered, they might be made gods.

Whom, then, does he at last punish and condemn by the severity of justice? Namely, 1) he punishes and condemns by the severity of justice those who, after despising the riches of mercy, contrive death and destruction for themselves [1]. "For this is *Θεοῦ κρίσεως νόμος, ἵν' ἢ σώσῃ τῇ μετανοίᾳ ἢ κολάσηται δικαιότερον*, the law of divine judgment: that either he may bring salvation through repentance or punish with a juster title."

He proceeds against 2) those who almost inflict violence upon him, so that, setting benignity aside, he advances to avenge. For after reciting the words of the prophet [2], "Who knows whether he will turn and be moved to repentance, and leave a blessing?" Gregory adds [3]:

> *Οἶδα τοῦτο σαφῶς, ἐγὼ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίας ἐγγυητής· καὶ ὁ παρὰ φύσιν ἐστὶν αὐτῷ τῆς ὀργῆς ἀφείς, ἐπὶ τὸ κατὰ φύσιν χωρήσει τὸν ἔλεον· εἰς ἐκεῖνο μὲν γὰρ ὑφ' ἡμῶν βιάζεται, πρὸς δὲ τοῦτο τὴν ὁρμὴν ἔχει· καὶ εἰ πατάσσει βιαζόμενος, πῶς οὐκ ἀνήσει τῇ φύσει χρώμενος;* But I know this plainly; I am the guarantor of God's benevolence toward men. For, having dismissed anger, which is contrary to his nature, he will turn to mercy, which accords with his nature. For he is driven by us through force to the former, but he is borne to the latter of his own nature. If, therefore, he strikes when

[1] Oration V, otherwise IV, § XXVII, p. 164.
[2] Joel II.14.
[3] Oration XVI, otherwise XV, § XIV, pp. 309–310.

> driven to it by force, how will he not remit when following his natural inclination? Only let us have compassion upon ourselves, *τοῖς δικαίοις τοῦ πατρὸς σπλάγχνοις ὁδὸν ἀνοίξαντες*, opening a way for the loving bowels of the Father.

Finally, he punishes 3) those who [1], when they have refused to know God *ὡς φῶς*, as light, will most certainly experience him *ὡς πῦρ*, as fire. These are Gregory's very words, again inculcated by him [2] when he says: "*Ὀφθαλμοῦ μὲν γὰρ ἀτονίαν ἥλιος, ψυχῆς δὲ ἀρρωστίαν ἐλέγχει Θεὸς ἐπιδημῶν· καὶ τοῖς μὲν ἐστὶ φῶς, τοῖς δὲ πῦρ, ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν ὑποκειμένην ὕλην τε καὶ ποιότητα.* For just as the sun discloses the weakness of the eyes, so God by his presence convicts the soul's infirmity; and to some he is light, to others fire, to each according to the underlying matter and quality."

CXCII.

But now I come to the other Gregory, bishop of Nyssa, second to none in subtlety of genius, distinguished by the praises of Theodoret, Socrates, Photius, and others, and most illustrious for the victories won on behalf of the Catholic cause against Eunomius and Apollinaris. Now, when he weighs the words of the Lord's Prayer, "Thy will be done," he speaks [3] precisely thus: *Θέλημα δὲ Θεοῦ ἡ σωτηρία τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐστίν*, "But the will of God is the salvation of men." But of all, or only of some? And, if of all, with what sort of will does God desire and seek their salvation? With a sterile and unfruitful will, or rather an efficacious and active one? The testimonies which we shall adduce remove all difficulties.

Gregory, therefore, discoursing concerning the purpose for which the Canticle of Canticles was composed [4], says that through those things which are contained in this book the soul is in some fashion adorned as a bride for an incorporeal and spiritual conjunction with God, exempt from matter. Then immediately he adds [5]: "*Ὁ γὰρ πάντας θέλων σωθῆναι, καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν, τὸν τελειότατον ἐνταῦθα καὶ μακάριον τῆς σωτηρίας ὑποδείκνυσι τρόπον, τὸν διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης λέγω.* For he who wills all to be saved and to come to the acknowledgment of the truth here shows the most perfect and blessed manner of salvation, I mean that which comes through charity."

For salvation is procured for some even *διὰ φόβου*, through fear, when, looking upon the threats of the punishment of Gehenna, *τοῦ κακοῦ χωριζόμεθα*, we

[1] Oration XXI, § II, p. 387.
[2] Oration IX, otherwise VII, § II, p. 235.
[3] *On the Lord's Prayer*, Sermon IV, p. 741, works, vol. I, Paris edition, 1615.
[4] *On the Canticle*, Homily I, pp. 474–475, works, vol. I.
[5] Ibid., p. 475.

separate ourselves from evil. There are also some *οἳ καὶ διὰ τὴν ἀποκειμένην τοῖς εὐσεβῶς βεβιωκόσι τὸν μισθὸν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀρετὴν κατορθοῦντες, οὐκ ἀγάπῃ τὸ ἀγαθόν, ἀλλὰ τῇ προσδοκίᾳ τῆς ἀμοιβῆς κατακτώμενοι*, who, on account of the hope of the reward laid up for those who have lived piously, conduct themselves rightly and according to virtue, not possessing the good by charity but by the expectation of remuneration.

He persists in confirming these things [1] when, explaining the words "Let him kiss me with the kiss of his mouth," he says:

> Since he who draws drink from a fountain must bring his mouth to the water—and the fountain is the Lord, who said [2], "If anyone thirsts, let him come to me and drink"—therefore the soul wishes to bring its mouth to the mouth that gushes forth life, saying: "Let him kiss me with the kiss of his mouth." *Καὶ ὁ πᾶσι τὴν ζωὴν βρύων, καὶ πάντας σωθῆναι θέλων, οὐδένα βούλεται τῶν σωζομένων τοῦ τοιούτου φιλήματος εἶναι ἀμέτοχον· καθάρσιον γάρ ἐστι ῥύπου παντὸς τοῦτο τὸ φίλημα*, and he who makes life gush forth for all and wills all to be saved wills none of those who are saved to be without a share in this kiss; for this kiss is the cleansing away of every stain.

The salvific will therefore a) proceeds from goodness, b) is universal, and, like an overflowing fountain, c) waters all with its waters, wipes them clean, and purifies them.

Wherefore Gregory refutes Apollinaris, who wrote concerning Christ that he indeed possessed equality of power with the Father, *καὶ τὴν κατὰ σάρκα τῆς ἐνεργείας διαίρεσιν, καθ' ἣν οὐ πάντας ἐζωοποίησεν, ἀλλά τινας, οὓς ἠθέλησεν*, "and the distinction of operation according to the flesh, by which he did not vivify all, but some whom he willed," with these words [3]:

> We, taking the simple and obvious sense from divine Scripture, judge concerning his sayings in such a manner that, when we hear the Lord speaking thus [4]—
>
> —"The Father raises the dead and vivifies them, and the Son vivifies whom he wills," *οὐχ ὡς τινῶν ἀποβαλλομένων τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ θελήματος, ἐκ τούτου νοοῦμεν*, we do not understand this as though some were rejected from his vivifying will. But since we have received and believe that all things which belong to the Father also belong to the Son, therefore we behold in the Son the will of the Father also, as one of all those things. If, then, the Father's will is in the

[1] *On the Canticle*, Homily I, p. 483.
[2] John VII.37.
[3] *Antirrhetic Against Apollinaris*, § XXIX, pp. 543–544, in Gallandi, vol. VI.
[4] John V.21.

> Son, while the Father, as the Apostle says [1], wills all men to be saved and to come to the acknowledgment of the truth, surely he who possesses all the Father's things and has the whole Father in himself has in himself, together with his Father's other goods, the will to save also. If, therefore, he does not lack this perfect will, it is entirely manifest that he too vivifies all whom the Father wills to be vivified, and is not inferior to the Father in the beneficent will toward men, as Apollinaris supposes when he says *ὅτι τινὰς ἠθέλησεν, οὐ πάντας ζωοποιηθῆναι*, that he willed not all but only some to be saved. *Οὐ γὰρ παρὰ τὴν τοῦ κυριακοῦ θελήματος αἰτίαν οἱ μὲν σώζονται, οἱ δὲ ἀπόλλυνται· ἢ οὕτω γ' ἂν εἰς ἐκεῖνο ἐπανίοι ἡ τῶν ἀπολλυμένων αἰτία· ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὴν προαίρεσιν τῶν δεχομένων τὸν λόγον, συμβαίνει τὸ σώζεσθαί τινας, ἢ ἀπόλλυσθαι.* For the divine will is not the cause why some are saved while others perish; otherwise the destruction of the latter would have to be referred to that will as its cause. But it happens through the free choice of those receiving the word that some are saved and others perish.

There was thus something in which Gregory and Apollinaris agreed, and something in which they differed. They agreed a) in this, that each attributed to God the Father a salvific will, and the same a universal one. But they differed b) in this, that Apollinaris asserted no other salvific will in Christ than one circumscribed and comprehending only the compass of some. Gregory opposes c) this opinion proper to Apollinaris, and ascribes one and the same will alike to the Father and to the Son. Nor d) does he merely ascribe it, but in addition assigns the reason why it must be judged universal: namely, lest otherwise e) the rationale of death and damnation should be laid not upon men abusing the gifts they had received and their liberty, but upon God, who had neglected some of them.

This cannot be done without the gravest and most manifest error. For just as God despises no one and desires the life and salvation of all, so [1] he perpetually pours forth his benignity upon all.

CXCIII.

For this reason he came into this world and put on our nature, that he might be the Savior and Redeemer not of one or another, or even of many, but of absolutely

[1] I Tim. II.4.

[1] *On the Psalms*, Tractate I, chap. IX, p. 289, works, vol. I.

all men. Gregory explains this [3], after adducing the words [2], "Confess unto the Lord, for he is good, for his mercy endures forever," writing:

> He commands that God be glorified on account of his goodness alone, signifying this: that whatsoever good and salvation came from God to mortals, all of it came by his grace and goodness, *οὐδεμίαν ἡμῶν αἰτίαν πρὸς τὸ ἀγαθὸν παρασχομένων*, when no cause for receiving that good existed in us. On the contrary, when we were overwhelmed by every kind of depravity, *ἐκεῖνος τῆς ἰδίας οὐκ ἐξίσταται φύσεως· ἀλλ' ὅπερ ἐστί, τοῦτο ποιεῖ· οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰκὸς ἦν τὸν ἀγαθὸν τῇ φύσει ἄλλο τι παρ' ὃ πέφυκεν ἐνεργῆσαι*, he did not depart from his own nature, but did that which he is. For neither was it fitting for him who is good by nature to do anything other than that which proceeds from his nature. "Let those who have been redeemed by the Lord say," he declares, "whom he redeemed from the hand of the enemy, and gathered them from the lands, from the rising of the sun and its setting, from the north and from the sea." *Τὴν παντελῆ τοῦ γένους τῶν ἀνθρώπων πρὸς τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐπάνοδον ὁ λόγος εὐαγγελίζεται.* The discourse promises the perfect and consummate return of the human race to the good. *Ἡ γὰρ λύτρωσις, τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας ἀνάκλησιν ἑρμηνεύει τῷ ῥήματι. Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς λύτρον δέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν κεκρατημένων ὑπὸ τοῦ θανάτου τῷ τὸ κράτος ἔχοντι τοῦ θανάτου, καὶ ἐπειδὴ πάντες ἦσαν ἐν τῇ τοῦ θανάτου φρουρᾷ, πάντας δηλονότι ἐξωνεῖται τῷ λύτρῳ, ὡς μηδένα καταληφθῆναι τῇ—*
>
> *—δυναστείᾳ τοῦ θανάτου μετὰ τὴν γινομένην τοῦ παντὸς ἀπολύτρωσιν.* For redemption signifies a recall from captivity. But God gave himself as the price of redemption for those who were held captive by death, and gave it to him who possessed dominion over death; and since all were under the power of death, he redeemed all from it by the price, so that none might be left under the empire of death after the general liberation of all. For it cannot be that anyone should remain subject to death when death has now been abolished and entirely removed. On this account, after the whole orb of lands had been divided into four parts according to position, *οὐδὲν ὁ λόγος ὑπελείπετο μέρος τῆς θείας λυτρώσεως ἄμοιρον*, Scripture teaches that no part remained without a share in the divine redemption. For it says, "From the rising of the sun and its setting, from the north and from the sea"; by the name of

[3] *On the Psalms*, Tractate I, chap. VIII, pp. 279–280.

[2] Ps. CVI.1–3.

> the sea the southern region is designated. *Ἐν κεφαλαίῳ τοίνυν τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ προεκθέμενος εὐποιΐαν, ἧς ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἐνήργησε φύσιν, μετὰ τοῦτο διασκευαῖς τισιν τήν τε πρὸς τὸ κακὸν ἀπορροὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐκδιηγεῖται.* Therefore, after setting forth summarily the beneficence of God poured forth upon all men, he thereafter explains, by certain artifices, both the wandering of men into malice and the recall of each one to the more upright way.

Gregory depicts universal redemption in entirely similar colors when, looking to the parable [1] of that sheep which wandered away from the common flock, he first says [2]:

> We too were once in the number of all; for we were counted in the catalogue of rational sheep belonging to the sacred hundred. But after one sheep, namely our nature, wandered from the mountain pastures, having been drawn by vice into this dry and uncultivated place, the same number is no longer recounted in the flock of those which did not wander, but ninety-nine are named.

Then immediately he adds [3]:

> *Ἦλθεν οὖν ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων ἀναλαβὼν ἀποκαταστῆσαι τοῖς οὖσι τὸ τῇ ματαιότητι τῶν ἀνυπάρκτων ἐναπολλύμενον, ἵνα πάλιν ἀρτία γένηται ὁ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀριθμός, ἀποσωθέντος τοῦ ἀπολωλότος τοῖς μὴ ἀπολλυμένοις.* He came, therefore, to seek and to save that which had perished, and, taking upon his shoulders that which was perishing in the vanity of things which do not exist, to restore it to the things which exist, so that the number of God's creation might again be whole, that which had perished having been preserved together with those which do not perish.

Whence, when the question has been proposed [1], what cause existed that God, having assumed flesh, should cast himself down to such humility, he immediately replies [2]:

> For us there is by no means lacking an answer worthy of God to these things. You ask the cause why God was born among men? If you separate from life the benefits which have been received from God, you will be unable to say from what things you recognize God. For from those things which we receive we recognize our benefactor. Looking to the things which are done, we consider through

[1] Luke XV.4–7.
[2] *On Ecclesiastes*, Homily II, pp. 389–390, works, vol. I.
[3] Ibid., p. 390.
[1] *Catechetical Oration*, chap. XIV, p. 500, works, vol. II.
[2] Ibid., chap. XV, p. 501.

> them the nature of him who acts. *Εἰ οὖν ἴδιον γνώρισμα τῆς θείας φύσεως ἡ φιλανθρωπία, ἔχεις ὃν ἐπεζήτησας λόγον, ἔχεις τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς ἐν ἀνθρώποις τοῦ Θεοῦ παρουσίας.* If, therefore, benevolence toward men is the proper character of the divine nature, you have the rationale which you were seeking; you have the cause why God appeared among men. For our nature, which labored under disease, had need of a physician; the man who had fallen had need of one who would raise him; he who had fallen from life had need of one who would vivify him; he who had fallen away from participation in the good had need of one who would lead him back to the good; he who was enclosed in darkness stood in need of the presence of light; the captive sought a redeemer, the bound man a helper, he who was pressed beneath the yoke of servitude a liberator. *Ἆρα μικρὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἀνάξια τὸν Θεὸν δυσωπῆσαι πρὸς ἐπίσκεψιν τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως καταβῆναι, οὕτως ἐλεεινῶς καὶ ἀθλίως τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος διακειμένης;* Are these things small and unworthy to move God to descend in order to visit human nature, when humanity was in so wretched and miserable a condition?

After this misery of humanity is described again [3] and its origin laid open, he continues: "Seek for me at once all those things which accord with those things believed concerning God: goodness, wisdom, justice, power, incorruption—

> —and if there is anything of more excellent signification. As good, therefore, he is moved by mercy toward him who had fallen; and as wise, he is not ignorant of the manner of recalling him."

But he executes that recall in such a manner that, according to Gregory [1], no divine perfection can either be conceived by the mind or uttered in words which does not shine forth most splendidly in the work of restoring the human race. Yet above the others mercy shines forth, the infinite amplitude of which he explains at greater length [2] in his *Exhortation Concerning Repentance*, and finally adds [3]:

> But I think that even Judas Iscariot, had he not hastened to become his own executioner—judging his crime graver than that he could be forgiven—but had suppliantly sought pardon, *οὐκ ἂν τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τῶν πάσης ὑπερχεομένων τῆς οἰκουμένης ἠστόχησεν*, would not have failed to obtain that mercy which was diffused throughout the whole world. The Jews who, after they had fastened Christ to the cross, believed and washed both minds and hands in baptism, are indeed

[3] Ibid., chap. XXII, p. 510.

[1] Ibid., chaps. XXIII ff., pp. 511 ff.

[2] Oration *On Repentance*, pp. 166–168, in the appendix published by Gretser.

[3] Ibid., pp. 168–169.

> a testimony to this matter. But if those who had driven Christ to the cross obtained mercy, surely he himself who had betrayed him would also have obtained pardon.

By these things the font of redemption is opened, its amplitude is shown, and its manifold efficacy is declared. And as concerns the font, no other a) is proposed than the native goodness of God and his inexhaustible clemency toward men, which did not fail itself and its own office even when the human race rebelled from God through transgression. But b) its amplitude, and indeed its universality, is signified under more than one name. For it is signified 1) by explicit formulas, by which either reparation is called general or all are declared redeemed and restored. It is signified 2) by equivalent formulas, when those very persons are said to have been restored who had fallen, who had fallen away from life, who had fallen away from fellowship in the good, who lived in darkness, and who bore the yoke of servitude. For these are all men, and there is absolutely no one who does not belong to this number. It is signified 3) by negative propositions, by which no one is taught to have been excluded and rejected from participation in so great a benefit. It is signified 4) by distributive discourse, by which all are presented as restored from the rising of the sun even to its setting—

—and from the north even to the southern region. It is signified 5) by that kind of discourse which we call argument from the greater to the lesser. For if the Savior redeemed even the most lost, and Judas himself, whom at last shall we judge to be without a share in redemption? Nor 6) ought it to be thought of lesser moment for establishing its infinite amplitude that the principal cause of reparation is referred to God's *φιλανθρωπία*, benevolence toward men. For this regards men themselves, and therefore comprehends all those who are contained within human nature.

Finally, c) concerning the efficacy of universal redemption, nothing more splendid should be sought than those things by which it is compared with a medicine, with light, with liberty, and with life.

CXCIV.

And to this power and heavenly efficacy it must be attributed that no man is held by the most miserable necessity of perishing. "The author of the Psalms," says Gregory [1], "declaring the end of the economy undertaken by the Lord, sings: 'Unless the Lord had helped me, my soul had almost dwelt in hell.' *Ἡ γὰρ βοήθεια τοῦ Κυρίου, οὐκ ἀφῆκεν ἡμᾶς τοῦ ᾅδου παροίκους εἶναι.* For the help of the Lord did not permit us to be inhabitants of hell." Indeed, he conferred upon us all

[1] *On the Psalms*, chap. VIII, p. 313, works, vol. I.

the liberty by which we might possess eternal beatitude. "For God did not [2] reduce nature to servitude, *ὃς γε καὶ αὐθαιρέτως ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ δουλωθέντας εἰς ἐλευθερίαν ἀνεκαλέσατο*, who even of his own accord recalled us, enslaved to sin, into liberty." But he recalled us by other gifts, and chiefly by the aid of his grace, which he imparts to all. "For the Lord is witness [3] in the Gospel [4] that he who sows the word sows not only in a good heart, but also if someone is stony, if he abounds in thorns, and if he is beside the way and trodden down, *πᾶσιν ἐπὶ φιλανθρωπίας ἐπιβάλλει τοῦ λόγου τὰ σπέρματα*, he casts the seeds of the word to all on account of his benignity."

Whence there can be no difficulty in meeting those who, as Gregory reports [1], opposed Christian truth by this argument: "Why has grace not come to all, but, although some have approached the word of God, no small part of them is absent? Is it because God was unwilling to impart the benefit to all, or because he was altogether unable? Yet neither is free from reproach; for it does not befit God either not to have willed what is good or not to have been able to do what he willed. *Εἰ οὖν ἀγαθόν τι ἡ πίστις, διὰ τί οὐκ ἐπὶ πάντας ἡ χάρις;* If, then, faith is some good, why does grace not come to all?"

"For," he adds [2], "if this were asserted by us—that faith is distributed among men by the divine will in such a manner that some indeed are called while others remain without a share in the calling—an objection of this kind would opportunely be cast against the mystery. *Εἰ δὲ ὁμότιμος ἐπὶ πάντας ἡ κλῆσις, οὔτε ἀξίας, οὔτε ἡλικίας, οὔτε τὰς κατὰ τὰ ἔθνη διαφορὰς διακρίνουσα· (διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ παρὰ τὴν πρώτην ἀρχὴν κηρύγματος, ὁμόγλωσσοι πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν οἱ διακονοῦντες τὸν λόγον ἐκ θείας ἐπιπνοίας ἀθρόως ἐγένοντο, ὡς ἂν μηδεὶς τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀμοιρήσειε·) πῶς ἂν κατὰ τὸ εὔλογον ἔτι τὸν Θεὸν αἰτιῷντο, τῷ μὴ πάντων ἐπικρατῆσαι τὸν λόγον;* But if the calling proceeds equally to all, distinguishing neither dignity, nor age, nor the differences among nations—(for on this account, at the very beginning of the preaching, those who ministered the word were suddenly made, by divine inspiration, to speak the same language as all the nations, lest anyone should be without a share in the goods)—how would it still be reasonable for them to accuse God because the word did not obtain dominion over all? For he who possessed free power over all, *δι' ὑπερβολὴν τῆς εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον τιμῆς*, on account of the extraordinary honor which he willed to be conferred upon man, left something also within our power, *οὗ μόνος ἕκαστός ἐστι κύριος*, of which each one of us alone is lord. But this is the free election of free will, which can-

[2] *On Ecclesiastes*, Homily III, p. 406, works, vol. I.
[3] *On the Canticle*, Homily II, p. 493, works, vol. I.
[4] Matt. XIII; Luke VIII; Mark IV.
[1] *Catechetical Oration*, chap. XXX, p. 522, works, vol. II.
[2] Ibid., pp. 522–523.

not be subjected and is of its own right, being situated in liberty of mind and thought.

Therefore the accusation may be transferred far more justly to those who were not brought to the faith, rather than to him who called them to assent."

Having resolved the difficulty in this manner, he proposes another [1], by which some were accustomed to say: "God, if he wills, is able necessarily to compel and draw even those who resist to receive the preaching." But he aptly answers: "Where, then, in these things is *τὸ αὐτεξούσιον*, free will? And where is the praise of those who conduct themselves rightly? For it belongs only to inanimate things, or things destitute of reason, to be led by the will of another to that which seems good. But a nature participating in reason and intelligence, if it loses free will, at the same time also loses the gift of intelligence. For to what good will it employ its mind and thought if the power of choosing that which it determines by its own judgment is situated in another? But if the free election of the mind remains ineffectual and of no use, virtue also is necessarily abolished. And if there is no virtue, life is deprived of honor, fate rules, the praise of those who conduct themselves rightly is removed, anyone may sin with impunity, and no distinction in the ordering of life remains…. *Οὐκοῦν οὐ τῆς ἀγαθότητος τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ ἔγκλημα, τὸ μὴ πᾶσιν ἐγγενέσθαι τὴν πίστιν, ἀλλὰ τῆς διαθέσεως τῶν δεχομένων τὸ κήρυγμα.* Therefore blame is not to be laid upon the goodness of God because faith was not present in all, but upon the disposition of those who hear the preaching of the word."

Let power, therefore, be carefully distinguished from necessity, and then, with Gregory leading the way, let the reasons be reckoned thus. Through the original transgression the human race fell away from God and, having lost the faculty of obtaining salvation, encountered the most bitter necessity of perishing. But divine clemency was at hand: it applied medicine to the sick, raised up the fallen, and by the power of the Redeemer broke the iron chain. But with what result? Was it that necessity should be substituted for necessity and men should be advanced to salvation by an imposed necessity? That is most foreign to the wisdom of God and is what most greatly conflicts with the free and moral nature of men. Therefore the universal necessity was met by a universal power—

—by which men, raised up and strengthened, might, if they willed, regain their former dignity and possess eternal beatitude with God. The Nyssene signified this in very few words indeed, but words altogether worthy never to fall from the mind, writing [1]: *Οὐ κοινὴ βασιλεία, καὶ γέεννα κοινή;* "Are not the kingdom common and Gehenna common?"

[1] *Catechetical Oration*, chap. XXXI, p. 523, works, vol. II.

[1] *On Ecclesiastes*, Homily III, p. 407, works, vol. I.

CXCV.

It is plainly so, as Basil also—the brother of Gregory of Nyssa, most closely joined in friendship with Gregory Nazianzen, and frequently laden with the highest praises of all men [2]—teaches and attests in explicit propositions. Among these is that most illustrious proposition which he subjoins to these words of the Psalms [3]: "For wrath is in his indignation, and life in his will." First warning that wrath must be distinguished from indignation [4], he says: "Indignation is a judgment concerning the infliction upon one deserving it of certain sorrows; but wrath is the pain and punishment which is now inflicted by a just judge according to the measure of injustice."

Then, illustrating the proposed distinction with an example [5], he writes: "If a physician should observe some part affected by inflammation and filled with hidden putrefaction, he judges an incision to be necessary for the sick man. Scripture calls this indignation. But after the physician has pronounced the sentence concerning the application of the remedy, at last there follows the action by which that which was decreed is accomplished, and the iron which cuts and causes pain to the one suffering the incision is applied. This is called the wrath of God."

Then, proceeding to the exposition [6], he says: "Come, therefore, to the proposition, and you will discover the sequence of this statement: 'For wrath is in—'

> —his indignation.' *Τιμωρία, κατὰ τὸ δίκαιον κρίμα τοῦ Θεοῦ· ζωὴ δὲ ἐν τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ. Τί οὖν φησιν; Ὅτι ὃ μὲν θέλει ὁ Θεὸς τοῦτό ἐστι, πάντας μετέχειν αὐτοῦ τῆς ζωῆς· τὰ δὲ περιστατικά, οὐχὶ τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ ἐνεργεῖται, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἀξίᾳ τῶν ἡμαρτηκότων ἐπάγεται· τὴν μὲν οὖν ζωὴν ὁ Θεὸς τῷ ἰδίῳ θελήματι ἑκάστῳ χαρίζεται, τὴν δὲ ὀργὴν αὐτὸς ἕκαστος ἑαυτῷ θησαυρίζει ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ Θεοῦ.* Punishment, according to the just judgment of God; but life is in his will. What, then, does he say? That what God wills amounts to this: that all should participate in his life. But evils are not brought about by his will; rather, they are inflicted according to the desert of those who have sinned. Therefore God bestows life upon each one by his own will; but each one heaps up wrath for himself on the day of wrath and revelation and just judgment of God.

[2] Compare Jerome, *On Ecclesiastical Writers*, chap. CXVI; Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History*, book IV, chap. XXVI; Cassiodorus, *On the Institution of Divine Letters*, chap. I; and Photius, codices CXLI and CXCI.

[3] Ps. XXIX.4.

[4] Homily on Psalm XXIX, no. 4, p. 127, works, vol. I, Paris edition, 1721.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

In these words is contained the solemn division of the divine will into the first and the second; the origin and object of each are disclosed, and the universal amplitude proper to the former is clearly declared. To the same point also belong those things by which Basil [3] answers this question [1]: "What is the meaning of that which is said [2] by the Apostle: 'That you may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God'?" He says:

> *Πολλά ἐστιν, ἃ ὁ Θεὸς θέλει· τὰ μὲν ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ καὶ χρηστότητι, ἅπερ ἀγαθά ἐστι τε καὶ λέγεται· τὰ δὲ κατ' ὀργὴν διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, ἅπερ κακὰ ὀνομάζεται. Ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι, φησίν, ὁ ποιῶν εἰρήνην, καὶ κτίζων κακά· κακὰ δὲ, οὐχ ὑπὲρ ὧν κολαζόμεθα, ἀλλὰ δι' ὧν παιδευόμεθα· τὰ δὲ παιδεύοντα καὶ διὰ τῆς κακώσεως εἰς ἐπιστροφὴν ἄγοντα, γίνεται εἰς ἀγαθόν. Ὅσα μὲν οὖν μακροθυμῶν καὶ χρηστευόμενος θέλει ὁ Θεός, ταῦτα καὶ ἡμᾶς καὶ θέλειν καὶ μιμεῖσθαι ἀναγκαῖον…. Ὅσα δὲ κατ' ὀργὴν διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἐπάγει, ταῦτα κακὰ λεγόμενα, ὡς εἶπον, τῷ λόγῳ τῆς κακώσεως οὐ πάντως καὶ ἡμῖν ἔξεστι ποιεῖν.* There are many things which God wills: some through long-suffering and benignity, which both are and are called good; but others through wrath on account of our sins, which are called evils. "For I am," he says [1], "he who makes peace and creates evils." But evils not on account of which we are punished, but through which we are instructed. Moreover, those things which instruct and lead to conversion through affliction issue in good. Therefore, whatsoever God wills as long-suffering and benign, these things we also must will and imitate…. But whatsoever he introduces through wrath on account of our sins—things which, as I have said, are called evils because they bring affliction—these things it is by no means lawful for us to do.

Therefore, in order that we may rightly grasp what must be held concerning the divine will, a manifold and accurate distinction is necessary. And first, a) from those goods which both are and are called good, a twofold [2] kind of evils must be distinguished: both those on account of which we are punished and which are sins, and those through which we are afflicted and which are contained within the compass of punishments. Once this distinction has been established,

[3] Response to question CCLXXVI, pp. 511–512.

[1] *Rules Treated More Briefly*, question CCLXXVI, p. 511, works, vol. II.

[2] Rom. XII.2.

[1] Isa. XLV.7.

[2] This division of evils has nothing in common with the condemned propositions of Baius and Quesnel, by which they taught that all afflictions must be derived from sins as their sole and proper cause. For the poison of this doctrine lies entirely in the fact that the condemned propositions, as we say in the Schools, are exclusive, and reject every cause of afflictions other than sins. Compare De Rubeis, *Theological Treatise on Original Sin*, chap. XLIII.

b) it must be observed that there is in God a will both of goods and also of those evils which are called evils because they create affliction; but that the will of those evils [3] by which we offend God and are rendered worthy to be chastised with punishments is most far removed from him. Wherefore, c) according to the twofold object a twofold will must be ascribed to God: one which concerns the good, and another which concerns the evil of punishment. This twofold will d) is distinguished not only by its object but also by its origin, amplitude, and mode and disposition of tending. For the former will, which is called *ἴδιον θέλημα, μακροθυμία καὶ χρηστότης*, proper will, long-suffering, and benignity, is in God of himself, proceeds from his inherent goodness, excepts no one, and embraces all, as living images of himself, with a beneficent inclination.

But e) the latter, which is called the will *κατ' ὀργήν*, according to wrath, is of the kind which each one draws upon himself, which comes to God *διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν*, on account of our sins, approaches him *ἔξωθεν*, from without, and causes God to be related to sinners in the disposition and person of a judge. Nevertheless, f) so long as we pass this mortal life, it is tempered with long-suffering and benignity to such an extent that, unless we resist, it at last issues in our benefit, and looks to this: that *διὰ τῶν κακώσεων*, through afflictions, we may be brought *εἰς ἐπιστροφήν*, to conversion, almost against our will.

CXCVI.

For in the present life goodness and clemency reign and claim primacy for themselves, and justice itself puts on the nature of each and displays their countenance. We read this said remarkably by Basil [1] when, explaining the words, "The Lord loves mercy and judgment," he writes:

> If the judgment of God were separate and according to itself, so that he severely repaid us according to the deserts of those things which we have done, what hope would remain? Who among all men would be saved? But now he loves mercy and judgment. After he has stationed mercy as though sitting beside him and standing before the royal throne of judgment, he thus brings each one to judgment. "If [2] thou shalt observe iniquities, O Lord, Lord, who shall endure it?" Neither mercy without judgment, nor judgment without mercy. *Πρὸ τῆς κρίσεως οὖν, ἀγαπᾷ ἐλεημοσύνην· καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην, ἔρχεται ἐπὶ τὴν κρίσιν.* Before judgment, therefore, he loves mercy,

[3] Basil demonstrates this in an entire homily entitled *Ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν αἴτιος τῶν κακῶν ὁ Θεός*, "That God Is Not the Cause of Evils," found in works, vol. II, pp. 72–83.

[1] Homily on Psalm XXXII, no. 3, pp. 134–135, works, vol. I.

[2] Ps. CXXIX.3.

> and after mercy he comes to judgment. But these are conjoined with one another: mercy with judgment, lest either mercy alone produce softness or judgment alone bring despair. The judge wills to have mercy upon you and to make you a participant in his acts of compassion, provided that after sin he finds you humble, contrite, greatly deploring your wicked works, publishing without shame those things which were done secretly, and asking your brethren to be of assistance to you in receiving medicine—
>
> —But if he sees a heart ignorant of repentance, a proud mind, a soul not believing in the future age, and no fear of judgment, then he loves judgment in you. For thus a good and humane physician first attempts to soothe a swelling with fomentations and gentle remedies; but when he sees that the mass yields nothing and resists in its hardness, then at last, after setting aside oil and the gentler manner of treatment, he employs the use of iron. *Ἀγαπᾷ οὖν ἐλεημοσύνην ἐπὶ τῶν μετανοούντων· ἀγαπᾷ δὲ καὶ κρίσιν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνενδότων.* Therefore he loves mercy in the penitent, but he also loves judgment in the obstinate.

But in the obstinate judgment comes only at the final day; for so long as they have not reached the fatal limit, they are fostered by mercy. Nor without cause, says Basil [1], is it written: "The earth is full of the mercy of the Lord." "Indeed, *ἐνταῦθα διέζευκται ἀπὸ τῆς κρίσεως ὁ ἔλεος· μόνου γὰρ τοῦ ἐλέους Κυρίου πλήρης ἡ γῆ, τῆς κρίσεως εἰς τὸν ὡρισμένον καιρὸν ταμιευθείσης· ἐνταῦθα μὲν οὖν, ἔλεός ἐστι χωρὶς κρίσεως· οὐ γὰρ ἦλθεν ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα σώσῃ τὸν κόσμον*, here mercy is separated from judgment. For the earth is full of the mercy of the Lord alone, judgment being reserved for the appointed time. Here, therefore, there is mercy without judgment. For he did not come [2] to judge the world, but to save the world."

By this law of mercy he provided for our first parents and recalled the human race which had fallen in them. For, after mercy has been defined [3] as "an affection toward those who, contrary to their merit, have been cast down, proceeding from those who are moved by compassion," Basil adds [4]: "Therefore, since we too, while dwelling in paradise, were once illustrious and worthy of regard, and yet through expulsion became inglorious and abject, our God has mercy upon us when he sees what sort we have become from what sort we were. *Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸν Ἀδὰμ ἀνεκαλεῖτο τῇ τοῦ ἐλέου φωνῇ*—"

[1] Homily on Psalm XXXII, no. 4, p. 135, works, vol. I.
[2] John III.17.
[3] Homily on Psalm CXIV, no. 3, p. 201.
[4] Ibid., no. 3, p. 202.

> —λέγων· Ἀδὰμ ποῦ εἶ; οὐ γὰρ διδαχθῆναι ἐζήτει ὁ πάντα εἰδώς, ἀλλὰ νοῆσαι αὐτὸν ἐβούλετο οἷος ἀνθ' οἵου γέγονε. Ποῦ εἶ; ἀντὶ τοῦ, εἰς οἷον πτῶμα κατελήλυθας ἀπὸ τηλικαύτου ὕψους; On this account he also recalled Adam with this voice of mercy, saying [1]: 'Adam, where are you?' For he who knows all things did not seek to be informed, but wished Adam himself to understand what sort of man he had become from what sort he had been. 'Where are you?' as if he were to say: 'Into what a ruin have you fallen from so great a height?' "

By the impulse of the same mercy the Only-begotten came into this world to bring aid and furnish assistance to absolutely all men. For, at the words [2], "Shall not my soul be subject to God? For from him is my salvation," Basil first observes [3] "that in these words is contained the cause why the author of the Psalm desires to be subject to God: namely, because salvation is from him. *Ἴδιον γὰρ δημιουργοῦ τὸ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ποιημάτων τῆς ἀσφαλείας φροντίζειν.* For it is proper to the maker to care for the preservation of his works."

Then, explaining the same words in another manner [4], he continues: "Or, salvation is from him because, prophetically foreseeing the future grace of the Lord's incarnation, he says these things: namely, that one ought to serve God and love him, *ὃς τηλικαύτην εὐεργεσίαν εἰς τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων προκατεβάλετο*, who first conferred so great a benefit upon the human race that he did not even spare his own Son [5], but delivered him up for us all. For it is the custom of Scripture to call Christ the salvation of God; as Simeon also says somewhere [6]: 'Now thou dost dismiss thy servant, O Lord, because my eyes have seen thy salvation.' Let us therefore be subject to God, because salvation is from him. But he explains what salvation is. *Οὐκ ἐνέργειά τις ψιλὴ χάριν τινὰ ἡμῖν παρεχομένη εἰς ἀπαλλαγὴν ἀσθενείας, καὶ σώματος εὐεξίαν.* It is not a certain bare operation bringing us some beneficence by which we are freed from infirmity and enjoy a good condition of body—

> —But what is salvation? 'For he is my God, and my Savior, my protector; I shall not be greatly moved' [1]. The Son who is from God is our God. *Ὁ αὐτὸς καὶ σωτὴρ τοῦ γένους τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁ*

[1] Gen. III.9.

[2] Ps. LXI.1.

[3] Homily on Psalm LXI, no. 2, p. 194, works, vol. I.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Rom. VIII.32.

[6] Luke II.29–30.

[1] In Greek, *οὐ μὴ σαλευθῶ ἐπὶ πλεῖον*, which in the older editions of Basil was rendered "I shall be moved no more." This accords well with the Vulgate interpretation, but not likewise with Basil's meaning, as the following commentary shows. In the Hexapla we also read from the Hebrew, "I shall not be greatly shaken"; and in Aquila, *οὐ σφαλήσομαι πολλήν*.

> *τὸ ἀσθενὲς ἡμῶν ὑπερείδων, ὁ τὸν ἐκ τῶν πειρασμῶν ἐγγινόμενον ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἡμῶν σάλον ἐπανορθούμενος.* The same is also the Savior of the human race, supporting our weakness and correcting the disturbance which comes upon our souls from temptations."

CXCVII.

Basil discourses upon this infinite amplitude of redemption and its singular efficacy so clearly and so frequently that his opinion must be regarded as most thoroughly ascertained. For, refuting those [2] who had reached such a point of temerity and impiety that they asserted a heavenly flesh for Christ and transferred human affections to the divinity itself, he establishes before all else that by ravings of this kind and by such monstrosities of opinions the saving dispensation of our Lord Jesus Christ is dissolved, while the grace of the great mystery, which indeed was silent [3] from the ages but declared in its own times, is overthrown—when the Lord, who had already traversed all things pertaining to the healing of the human race [4], after all things bestowed his advent upon us. Then, attacking and pressing the authors of the error more closely [1], he says—

> If the advent of the Lord in the flesh did not occur, the Redeemer did not give to death a price on our behalf, nor through himself did he overthrow the kingdom of death. For if that which was subject to the empire of death were one thing and that which was assumed by the Lord another, death would not have ceased to work those things which are its own, nor would the sufferings of the God-bearing flesh have become our gain; he would not have destroyed sin in the flesh. *Οὐκ ἐζωοποιήθημεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ οἱ ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ ἀποθανόντες· οὐκ ἀνεπλάσθη τὸ διαπεπτωκός· οὐκ ἀνωρθώθη τὸ κατερραγμένον· οὐ προσοικειώθη τῷ Θεῷ, τὸ διὰ τῆς ἁπάτης τοῦ ὄφεως ἀλλοτριωθέν.* We who were dead in Adam would not have been vivified in Christ; that which had collapsed would not have been repaired; that which had been broken would not have been restored; that which had been

[2] Letter CCLXI, otherwise LXV, no. 1, p. 401, works, vol. III.

[3] I Tim. III.16.

[4] In Greek, *διεξελθών*, a word which Maran writes must be diligently noted. For by it is shown that the Son of God appeared to the ancient fathers before he was born of the Virgin. Hence Basil, in book II *Against Eunomius*, maintains that he who is called God and Angel and appeared to Moses was no other than the Son. In the same manner, in Clement of Alexandria, in the book *Who Is the Rich Man That Shall Be Saved?*, no. 8, the Son of God is said to have traversed humanity from the creation of the world even to the sign of the cross, *ἀπὸ γενέσεως μέχρι τοῦ σημείου τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα διατρέχων*.

[1] Ibid., no. 2, p. 402.

> alienated by the serpent's deception would not have been conjoined to God. For all these things are taken away by those who say that the Lord came possessing a heavenly body.

But when he contradicts the Arians, who abused the words [2], "My Father is greater than I," in order to establish their heresy, among other things he writes [3]: "What wonder is it if he who is the Word and was made flesh confessed the Father to be greater than himself, since he was also seen as less than the angels [4] according to glory and less than men according to appearance? … *Τούτων δὲ πάντων ἠνέσχετο διὰ τὴν πολλὴν αὐτοῦ περὶ τὸ πλάσμα φιλανθρωπίαν, ἵνα τὸ ἀπολωλὸς πρόβατον ἀνασώσηται, καὶ τὸ σωθὲν καταμίξῃ, καὶ τὸν κατελθόντα ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ εἰς Ἰεριχὼ, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο περιπεσόντα λῃσταῖς, εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν ὑγιαίνοντα πάλιν ἐπαναγάγῃ πατρίδα.* But he sustained all these things on account of his great benignity toward his own work, that he might recover the lost sheep and bring back the one which had been saved, and might restore in health to his own country the man who had descended from Jerusalem to Jericho and on this account had fallen among robbers…. Therefore the Son is less than the Father, *ὅτι διὰ σὲ γέγονε νεκρός, ἵνα σε τῆς νεκρότητος ἀπαλλάξῃ, καὶ ζωῆς μέτοχον ἐπουρανίου ποιήσῃ. Ὥσπερ—*

> *—ἂν, εἴ τις καὶ τὸν ἰατρὸν αἰτιῷτο, ὅτι συγκύπτων ἐπὶ τὰ πάθη, τῆς δυσωδίας συναπολαύῃ, ἵνα τοὺς πεπονθότας ἰάσηται*, because for your sake he became dead, that he might free you from death and make you a participant in heavenly life. It is as if someone were also to accuse the physician because, bending down to diseases, he becomes a participant in their stench in order to heal the sick.

The divine physician always applied prolonged labor to healing them. "For," says Basil [1], "since every created nature, both this visible nature and the intelligible, needs the care of God in order that it may subsist, *ὁ δημιουργὸς Λόγος, ὁ μονογενὴς Θεός, κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς ἑκάστου χρείας, τὴν βοήθειαν ἐπινέμων, ποικίλας μὲν καὶ παντοδαπὰς διὰ τὸ τῶν εὐεργετουμένων πολυειδές, συμμέτρους γε μὴν ἑκάστῳ, κατὰ τὸ τῆς χρείας ἀναγκαῖον, τὰς χορηγίας ἐπιμετρεῖ· τοὺς ἐν τῷ σκότῳ τῆς ἀγνοίας κατεχομένους φωτίζει· διὰ τοῦτο φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν· κρίνει κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἔργων ἀξίαν, ἀντιμετρῶν τὴν ἀντίδοσιν· διὰ τοῦτο κριτὴς δίκαιος· ὁ γὰρ Πατὴρ κρίνει οὐδένα, ἀλλὰ τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν δέδωκε τῷ Υἱῷ· ἀνίστησιν ἐκ τοῦ πτώματος τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕψους τῆς ζωῆς πρὸς ἁμαρτίαν ὑπολισθήσαντας· διὰ τοῦτο ἀνάστασις· πάντα δὲ ποιεῖ τῇ ἐπαφῇ τῆς δυνάμεως, καὶ τῷ βουλήματι ἀγαθότητος ἐνεργῶν· ποιμαίνει, φωτίζει, τρέφει, ὁδηγεῖ, ἰατρεύει, ἀνίστησιν.* The creating Word, the Only-begotten God, distributing aid according to the measure

[2] John XIV.28.

[3] Letter VIII, otherwise CXLI, no. 5, p. 84, works, vol. III.

[4] Ps. VIII.6; Heb. II.9; and Isa. LIII.3.

[1] *On the Holy Spirit*, chap. VIII, no. 19, p. 16, works, vol. III.

of each one's need, dispenses various aids of every kind on account of the variety of those who are assisted by the benefit, yet aids proportioned to each one according to the measure of necessity. He illuminates those who are held in the darkness of ignorance; for this reason he is called the true light. He judges, measuring out the recompense according to the merit of works; for this reason he is called the just judge. For the Father [2] judges no one, but has given all judgment to the Son. He raises from ruin those who have fallen from the height of life into sin; for this reason he is called the resurrection [3]. But he does all things by the touch of power and by the will of goodness in operation. He spares, illuminates, nourishes, leads by the hand, heals, raises up."

Among all these things, while some are assuredly most illustrious, these are signified above all—

—first, a) in accordance with the twofold stage of human life, the former of which is contained in the present mortality and the latter embraces the eternity which follows, a twofold order of providence must be distinguished: one of mercy and merciful kindness, the other of severity and justice; then, b) the order of mercy and merciful kindness pertains to the stage of mortality, but the order of severity and justice to the stage of eternity; moreover, c) the cause of this distinction must be derived from the fact that God, moved by his goodness, most sincerely wills that absolutely all men, so long as they pass this mortal life, should possess the power by which they may attain the supreme end and heavenly beatitude; by this d) will of goodness God selected for the present life the order of mercy and salvation, and sent the Only-begotten, who would raise up what had fallen, bring back what had wandered away, and fashion anew what had been corrupted and depraved; and that he would fashion it anew e) by a manifold operation and various aids of graces, by which individual men, endowed according to need and opportunity, might dispel ignorance, conquer infirmity, recover the lost likeness of God, and be joined anew by a most blessed covenant with the supreme true, the supreme good, and the supreme beautiful.

CXCVIII.

Thus far we have surveyed almost the whole Christian world, and Palestine alone remains, whose faith and doctrine we must investigate, so that it may rightly appear that nothing has been passed over by us. But it will be worthwhile to know accurately what the churches of Palestine themselves also thought and what they handed down concerning the salvific will of God and the amplitude of reparation. For in this manner not only will the agreement of the whole Christian name shine

[2] John V.22.
[3] John XI.25.

forth more splendidly, but it will also be understood with what faith those were imbued whom the preaching of Christ and the Apostles instructed first of all and brought to the new and divine kingdom of the Church.

Now among the Palestinian witnesses Justin excels no less in antiquity than in dignity, *ὁ μετ' οὐ πολὺ τῶν ἀποστόλων*, one who was not long after the Apostles, and *ἀνὴρ οὔτε τῷ χρόνῳ πόρρω ὤν—*

—τῶν ἀποστόλων, οὔτε τῇ ἀρετῇ, a man distant from the Apostles neither in time nor in virtue, as Eusebius [1] and Methodius [2] speak of him. In the most illustrious dialogue which he held with Trypho, he not only averts from God every cause of sins [3], saying: "But if the Word of God foretells that certain angels and men will certainly be punished, it foretells these things because it foreknew that they would remain wicked without any change, *ἀλλ' οὐχ ὅτι αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς τοιούτους ἐποίησεν*, but not because God made them such"; but he also declares [4] that divine goodness lies open to all and that divine mercy is at hand for all, adding: "*Ὥστε ἐὰν μετανοήσωσι, πάντες βουλόμενοι τυχεῖν τοῦ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐλέους δύνανται, καὶ μακαρίους αὐτοὺς ὁ λόγος προλέγει εἰπών· μακάριος ᾧ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται Κύριος ἁμαρτίαν.* Wherefore, if they repent, all who will may obtain mercy from God, and Scripture proclaims them blessed [5] in these words: 'Blessed is he to whom the Lord has not imputed sin.' "

Nor ought it to seem wonderful that the amplitude of divine merciful kindness is so great. For to this end the Only-begotten put on human flesh [6]: that he might restore Jews and Gentiles equally and adorn with the same dignity all who should obey his precepts. Whence Christ is rightly called Israel [7], by which name is signified *ἄνθρωπος νικῶν δύναμιν*, a man conquering power. "*Τὸ γὰρ Ἰσρά, ἄνθρωπός ἐστι νικῶν, τὸ δὲ Ἤλ, δύναμις.* For *Isra* [8] is a man conquering, but *El* is power." For he conquered the devil, that is, that power which is called both serpent and Satan; and, when this victory had been won, he vindicated the human race into liberty. By this it came about [9] that all, from whatever region, whether slaves or free men, who believed in Christ and acknowledged the truth of those things which were handed down both by him and by the prophets, should know that together with him they would receive as an inheritance eternal and incorruptible goods—

---

[1] *Ecclesiastical History*, book II, chap. XIII.
[2] In Photius, codex CCXXXIV.
[3] *Dialogue with Trypho*, no. 141, p. 244, Venice edition, 1747.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Ps. XXXI.2.
[6] *Dialogue with Trypho*, no. 134, p. 239.
[7] Ibid., no. 125, p. 130.
[8] Israel would be nearly the same as אל ישרה איש, "a man conquering power."
[9] Ibid., no. 139, p. 243.

—That inheritance was proposed to all by the will of the testator, as may also be seen from the fact that he commanded prayers to be poured forth to God for absolutely all men. Concerning this command of the testator, these words are remarkable, which Justin writes when addressing the Jews [1]:

> Truly your hand is still extended to do evil; for although you have killed Christ, not even thus do you repent, but you also hate us who through him have believed in God and the Father of all, and whenever opportunity is given, you kill us; and without ceasing you execrate him and those who have arisen from him; *πάντων ἡμῶν εὐχομένων ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων ἁπλῶς ἀνθρώπων, ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου ποιεῖν ἐδιδάχθημεν, παραγγείλαντος ἡμῖν εὔχεσθαι καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν, καὶ ἀγαπᾶν τοὺς μισοῦντας, καὶ εὐλογεῖν τοὺς καταρωμένους*, while we all pray for you and for absolutely all men, as we have been taught to do by our Christ and Lord, who commanded us to pray even for our enemies, to love those who hate us, and to bless those who curse us.

CXCIX.

With this doctrine of Justin harmonize beautifully those things which Tatian—himself also a Palestinian [3], a disciple of the most blessed martyr [4], and, as we understand from Rhodo [5], his not inglorious successor in directing the Roman school—wrote and confirmed in his Oration against the Greeks before he embraced heresy [2]. For when he disputes concerning created man, he extols the benignity of the Creator in these words [1]—

> Before men were created, the Word became the maker of the angels. But each species of his workmanship was created free, *τἀγαθοῦ φύσιν μὴ ἔχον*, not possessing the nature of the good, for that inheres in God alone; but in men it is perfected by the free inclination of the mind, so that the wicked man may deservedly be punished, having been made wicked *δι' αὑτόν*, through himself; while the just man may rightly be praised on account of the things rightly done, since, employing free will, he did not transgress the will of God. And thus indeed are constituted those things which concern angels and men.

[1] Ibid., no. 133, p. 238.

[3] Compare Epiphanius, Heresy XLVI; and consider besides that it was not unusual for those who inhabited Palestine to be called Assyrians.

[4] See Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, book I, chap. XXVIII.

[5] In Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, book V, chap. XIII.

[2] Which Maran seems to me to have proved forcefully in the preface, part III, chap. XII, § III.

[1] Oration against the Greeks, no. 7, p. 263.

But man abused the gifts he had received and, imitating those among the angels who had fallen away before him, departed from God [2]; whence he who had been made *κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ Θεοῦ*, according to the image of God, *χωρισθέντος ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ δυνατωτέρου, θνητὸς γίνεται*, when the more powerful Spirit departed from him, became mortal. Assuredly he became mortal both by the death of the body, by which it was necessary that he should die, and by the death of the soul—not, however, an ontological but a theological death, consisting in the loss [3] either of that life which flowed back into man from conjunction with God or of the wings [4] by which man might strive toward heavenly things. "*Πτέρωσις γὰρ ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ τέλειον, ὅπερ ἀπορρίψασα διὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ἔπτη ὥσπερ νεοσσός, καὶ χαμαιπετὴς ἐγένετο· μεταβᾶσα δὲ τῆς οὐρανίου συνουσίας, τῶν ἐλαττόνων μετουσίαν ἐπεπόθησεν.* For the perfect Spirit was the wings of the soul; when through sin it had cast him off, it fluttered like a chick and fell to the ground; and, having fallen away from heavenly fellowship, it desired commerce with inferior things."

Yet God did not permit human nature, overwhelmed by its own fall, to perish, but extended to it a benign hand and imparted a faculty by which it might regain life and heavenly fellowship. Tatian teaches this [5], addressing each and every man in these words: "*Ἀπόθνῃσκε τῷ—*

> *—κόσμῳ, παραιτούμενος τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ μανίαν· ζῆθι τῷ Θεῷ, διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ* [1] *καταλήψεως τὴν παλαιὰν γένεσιν παραιτούμενος· οὐκ ἐγενόμεθα πρὸς τὸ ἀποθνῄσκειν, ἀποθνῄσκομεν δὲ δι' ἑαυτούς· ἀπώλεσεν ἡμᾶς τὸ αὐτεξούσιον, δοῦλοι γεγόναμεν οἱ ἐλεύθεροι, διὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐπράθημεν· οὐδὲν φαῦλον ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πεποίηται, τὴν πονηρίαν ἡμεῖς ἀνεδείξαμεν· οἱ δὲ ἀναδείξαντες, δυνατοὶ πάλιν παραιτήσασθαι.* Die to the world, rejecting the madness which is in it; live to God through the knowledge of him, repudiating the old generation. We were not made in order that we might die, but we die through our own fault. Free will destroyed us; we who were free have been made slaves; we have been sold through sin. Nothing

[2] Ibid., no. 7, p. 264.

[3] For nothing is truer than what Augustine writes in *On the Trinity*, book XIV, no. 6: "For the soul too has its own death when it lacks the blessed life." Whence, although Tatian calls the demons ontologically immortal, he nevertheless teaches in no. 14 that they die as many times as they entice men to sin.

[4] Ibid., no. 20, p. 277.

[5] Ibid., no. 11, pp. 267–268.

[1] Irenaeus aptly says in *Against Heresies*, book V, chap. XII, no. 4: "For the knowledge of God renews man." But what *κατάληψις περὶ Θεοῦ*, comprehension concerning God, as Tatian speaks in no. 20, possesses such power? That knowledge which is praised in the Scriptures and is joined with charity and the gift of the Spirit.

evil was made by God; we ourselves produced wickedness, and those who produced it are able to repudiate it again.

But whence comes so felicitous a power, if men contrived death for themselves? It will be to the point to hear Tatian, who first determines thus [2]: "*Δύο πνευμάτων διαφορὰς ἴσμεν ἡμεῖς, ὧν τὸ μὲν καλεῖται ψυχή· τὸ δέ, μεῖζον μὲν τῆς ψυχῆς, Θεοῦ δὲ εἰκὼν καὶ ὁμοίωσις· ἑκάτερα δὲ παρὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τοῖς πρώτοις ὑπῆρχεν, ἵνα τὸ μέν τι ὦσιν ὑλικοί, τὸ δὲ ἀνώτεροι τῆς ὕλης.* We know two distinctions of spirits, one of which is called the soul, while the other [3], more excellent than the soul, is the image [4] and likeness of God. Each was present in the first men, so that in part they might consist of matter and in part be superior to matter."

Moreover, he adds [5], after the gift of the divine likeness had been lost, human affairs would have been utterly despaired of unless the heavenly Spirit had been present to men and had brought them aid, so that whoever desired a perfect knowledge of God, although assailed by demons, might obtain a more perfect testimony on the day of judgment on account of his contests—

—Explaining this doctrine more fully immediately afterward, he continues: *Οὐκ ἔστιν ἀθάνατος ἡ ψυχὴ καθ' ἑαυτήν, θνητὴ δέ· ἀλλὰ δύναται ἡ αὐτὴ καὶ μὴ ἀποθνήσκειν· θνήσκει μὲν γὰρ καὶ λύεται μετὰ τοῦ σώματος, μὴ γινώσκουσα τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἀνίσταται δὲ εἰς ὕστερον ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τοῦ κόσμου σὺν τῷ σώματι, θάνατον διὰ τιμωρίας ἐν ἀθανασίᾳ λαμβάνουσα. Πάλιν τε οὐ θνήσκει, κἂν πρὸς καιρὸν λυθῇ, τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ πεποιημένη. Καθ' ἑαυτὴν γὰρ σκότος ἐστί, καὶ οὐδὲν ἐν αὐτῇ φωτεινόν, καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν ἄρα τὸ εἰρημένον· ἡ σκοτία τὸ φῶς οὐ καταλαμβάνει.* The soul is not immortal [1] through itself, but mortal. Yet it is able not to die. For it dies and is dissolved with the body if it does not know the truth; afterward, however, it rises [2] at the end of the world together with the body, receiving

[2] Ibid., no. 12, p. 268.

[3] With these things must be compared what Irenaeus writes in book V, chap. XII, no. 2: "The breath of life, which also makes man animate, is one thing; and the vivifying Spirit, who also makes him spiritual, is another. But that which was made is one thing, and he who made it another. Therefore the breath is temporal, but the Spirit eternal."

[4] Petavius discourses splendidly in *On the Trinity*, book VII, chap. VII, concerning the formulas by which the Spirit is called *εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, the image of God, and *εἰκὼν καὶ μορφὴ τοῦ Υἱοῦ*, the image and form of the Son.

[5] Ibid., no. 13, pp. 269–270.

[1] For each immortality, ontological and theological, belongs to the soul not of itself but by participation. Concerning this matter Justin at the beginning of the *Dialogue with Trypho* and Irenaeus, book II, chap. XXXIV, no. 2, are worthy of consultation.

[2] Theophilus to Autolycus, book I, no. 7; Irenaeus, book IV, chap. XVIII, no. 5; Tertullian, *On Repentance*, chap. III; and Lactantius, book VII, chap. XI, employ a similar manner of speaking concerning souls rising with the body. But what do they will to express and signify by it? Is it that which, according to Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, book VI, chap. XXXVII, was once believed by

death through punishments in immortality. But, in turn, it does not die, even if it is dissolved for a time, if it has been instructed in the knowledge of God. For through itself it is nothing other than darkness, nor is there anything luminous within it. And this is precisely what is said [3]: "The darkness did not comprehend the light." For the soul did not preserve the Spirit [4], but was preserved by him, and the light comprehended the darkness. Now the Word is divine light [5]—

—but the darkness is *ἡ ἀνεπιστήμων ψυχή*, the ignorant soul. Wherefore, if it dwells alone, it inclines downward toward matter, dying together with the flesh. *Συζυγίαν δὲ κεκτημένη τὴν τοῦ θείου πνεύματος, οὐκ ἔστιν ἀβοήθητος.* But when conjoined with the divine Spirit, it does not lack aid, but ascends to that place to which it is led by the Spirit. For the Spirit's seat is in heavenly places, while the soul's origin is in the lower regions. *Γέγονε μὲν οὖν συνδίαιτον* [1] *ἀρχῆθεν τὸ πνεῦμα τῇ ψυχῇ· τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ταύτην ἔπεσθαι μὴ βουλομένην αὐτῷ καταλέλοιπεν. Ἡ δὲ ὥσπερ ἔναυσμα τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ κεκτημένη, καὶ διὰ τὸν χωρισμὸν τὰ τέλεια καθορᾶν μὴ δυναμένη, ζητοῦσα τὸν Θεὸν κατὰ πλάνην πολλοὺς θεοὺς ἀνετύπωσε, τοῖς ἀντισοφιστεύουσι δαίμοσι κατακολουθήσασα.* At the beginning, indeed, the Spirit was the companion of the soul; but the Spirit abandoned it when it was unwilling to follow him. The soul, however, retaining as it were certain sparks of his power, but being unable because of the separation to behold more sublime things, fashioned many gods while seeking God in the error of opinion, following the demons who practice deceit. Moreover, the Spirit of God is not in all, but, residing in some who live justly and intertwined with their mind [2], he announced hidden things to other souls through predictions. *Καὶ αἱ μὲν πειθόμεναι σοφίᾳ, σφίσιν αὐταῖς ἐφείλκοντο πνεῦμα συγγενές· αἱ δὲ μὴ πειθόμεναι, καὶ τὸν*

those whom Origen recalled to a sounder mind, and who imagined that souls perish and rise together with bodies? By no means. Rather, by this form of speech the Fathers intended this one thing: to declare the restoration of souls to their former state.

[3] John I.5.

[4] Compare Irenaeus, book V, chap. IX, no. 4.

[5] Tatian distinguishes both the Word and the Spirit with the appellation of light, not that he may confound the hypostases, but that he may confirm their sameness of nature, *ταυτότητα*.

[1] Clement of Alexandria also, in the *Exhortation*, calls the Spirit *συνδίαιτον τῇ ψυχῇ*, the companion of the soul.

[2] Concerning the Spirit whom Tatian calls *συμπλεκόμενον τῇ ψυχῇ*, intertwined with the soul, Irenaeus writes in book V, chap. XII, no. 2: "*Τὸ δὲ περιλαβὸν ἔνδοθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον.* The Spirit encompasses man within and without."

> *διάκονον τοῦ πεπονθότος Θεοῦ παραιτούμεναι, θεομάχοι μᾶλλον, ἥπερ θεοσεβεῖς ἀνεφαίνοντο.* And those which obeyed wisdom drew to themselves the kindred Spirit; but those which did not obey and rejected the minister [3] of the God who suffered were found rather to fight against God than to worship him.

Although, therefore, the calamity inflicted upon the human race by the original transgression was most atrocious; although no evil can be conceived more bitter than that separation by which human nature separated itself from divine light, divine life, and divine immortality—

—and although, if the human race had been deserted and left to itself, nothing but utter destruction would have remained for it; nevertheless the benignity of God opposed so many and such great losses, restored the disordered order, and never failed to make his Spirit available to all, by whom all who willed might recover truth, life, and salvation itself. It therefore remains, Tatian infers [1], that none of us fail himself, but that each have set before himself "to seek now that which we possessed and lost, *τοῦτο νῦν ἀναζητεῖν, ζευγνύναι τε τὴν ψυχὴν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ, καὶ τὴν κατὰ Θεὸν συζυγίαν πραγματεύεσθαι*, to join the soul to the Holy Spirit and to strive after conjunction with God."

For sinful men differ from the fallen angels [2] in this: that by a most wise counsel of justice God granted those angels no pardon and offered them no hope of reparation, while concerning men he decreed with wisdom no less than mercy that, after the loss of immortality, by undergoing death through faith they should overcome death, and through repentance a calling should be granted to them [3] according to this saying [4]: "Because they were made a little less than the angels." Therefore, *δυνατὸν παντὶ τῷ νενικημένῳ, πάλιν νικᾶν, τοῦ θανάτου τὴν σύστασιν παραιτούμενον*, it is possible for everyone who has been conquered to conquer again, if he repudiates the cause of death.

---

[3] Christ, whom Tatian here calls the God who suffered, is called by him in no. 20 God born in the form of man. Maran rightly explains in the annotation below in what sense he called the Spirit a minister.

[1] Ibid., no. 15, p. 271.

[2] Ibid., no. 15, p. 272.

[3] The sentence must be supplied from the preceding things thus: "That through repentance a calling should be granted to men, as those who are inferior to the angels according to Scripture, which says: 'Because they were made a little less than the angels.' "

[4] Ps. VIII.4.

CC.

For as Methodius, bishop of Tyre [5], bears witness—*ἀνὴρ λόγιος καὶ σφόδρα περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀγωνισάμενος*, a learned man who contended vehemently for the truth [6], indeed also [1] a most eloquent martyr, who became illustrious as the third century was ending—God denied no one the opportunity and faculty by which he could both repudiate the cause of death and advance from the miserable servitude of the conquered to the liberty and glory of the victor—

"For to this end [2] the Word, sent into the world, first assumed our form infected by many stains of sins, *ἵνα δὴ τὴν θείαν ἡμεῖς, δι' οὓς αὐτὸς ἐφόρεσε, πάλιν χωρῆσαι δυνηθῶμεν*, that we, for whose sake he wore it, might be able to receive the divine form again. For to be accurately fashioned according to the likeness of God is precisely this: by imitation to transfer his characters and lineaments into the course of human life, by the same art by which skilled painters reproduce to the life upon prepared tablets the lines and colors of the exemplar set before their eyes. We shall attain this when we learn thoroughly and follow the way and discipline shown by him. For with this purpose he, although God, was pleased to put on human flesh: that, beholding as though upon a tablet the proposed divine exemplar of life, we too might be able to imitate its author."

Concerning this counsel of merciful kindness and the power granted by which all may express the divine likeness in themselves, Methodius again speaks in such a manner that nothing more fitting could seem capable of being sought. For he writes [3] that man was created most like the angels and exempt from corruption, "that he too might praise and celebrate the King and Creator of all, like a second choir responding to the cries of the angels from heaven." Then he continues [4]:

> But because it had happened that, after violating the command of God, he fell by a grave and deadly fall, being dissolved into death, for this reason the Lord says [5] that, leaving the angelic orders and cohorts, he came from heaven into the world. For the mountains must be understood to designate the heavens; but by the ninety-nine sheep, the Virtues and Principalities and Powers whom he left, when the Emperor and Shepherd himself descended to seek the sheep which had perished—

[5] Compare Fabricius, *Greek Library*, vol. V, p. 255, and Tillemont, *Memoirs*, vol. V, p. 767, note III on St. Methodius.

[6] In Epiphanius, Heresy LXIV, § LXII.

[1] In Jerome, *On Illustrious Men*, chap. LXXXIII, and the Commentary on Daniel XIII.

[2] *Banquet of the Ten Virgins*, Oration I, § IV, p. 677, in Gallandi, vol. III.

[3] Ibid., Oration III, § VI, pp. 686–687.

[4] Ibid., § VI, p. 687.

[5] Luke XV.4–6.

> —*Ταύτῃ γὰρ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀνείληφεν ὁ Λόγος, ὅπως δὴ δι' αὐτοῦ καταλύσῃ τὴν ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ γεγονυῖαν καταδίκην, ἠττήσας τὸν ὄφιν· ἥρμοζε γὰρ μὴ δι' ἑτέρου νικηθῆναι τὸν πονηρόν, ἀλλὰ δι' ἐκείνου, ὃν δὴ καὶ ἐκόμπαζεν ἀπατήσας αὐτὸν τετυραννηκέναι· ὅτι μὴ ἄλλως τὴν ἁμαρτίαν λυθῆναι καὶ τὴν κατάκρισιν δυνατὸν ἦν, εἰ μὴ πάλιν ὁ αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος ἄνθρωπος, δι' ὃν εἴρητο τό, γῆ εἶ, καὶ εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσῃ, ἀναπλασθεὶς ἀνέλυσε τὴν ἀπόφασιν τὴν δι' αὐτὸν εἰς πάντας ἐξενηνεγμένην· ὅπως καθὼς ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πρότερον πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν, οὕτω δὴ πάλιν καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀνειληφότι Χριστῷ τὸν Ἀδάμ, πάντες ζωοποιηθῶσι.* For with this purpose the Word assumed man: that, after conquering the serpent, by his own office and operation he might annul the condemnation passed for man's destruction. For it was fitting that the devil should be conquered by no other than that very man whom he boasted, after seducing him, that he had subjected to his own tyranny. For neither could sin be loosed nor damnation abolished in any other manner unless that same man, on account of whom it was said [1], "Earth you are, and unto earth you shall return," being formed anew, annulled the sentence which through his guilt had passed upon all; so that, just as [2] formerly in Adam all died, so again in Christ, who had assumed Adam, all might be vivified.

And the human race was indeed formed anew and augmented with the power of attaining immortality. For, as Aeneas of Gaza teaches splendidly [3] in the dialogue which he entitled *Theophrastus*, concerning the immortality of souls and the resurrection of bodies: "God, remaining that very thing which he is, *διὰ φιλανθρωπίαν ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος, τὴν τοῦ λόγου σοφίαν, καὶ τοῦ ἔργου τὴν δύναμιν τοῖς ἐπιτηδείοις ἐνέπνευσε*, having been made man out of love for our race, inspired the wisdom of the word and the power of the work into those who are fit to receive them. And he himself first, as one who is God, raised his own body to immortal life—

—*κοινὴν τὴν δωρεὰν ἅπασιν ἐπαγγέλλεται*, and thereafter promises this gift as common to all."

CCI.

And these things, which were indeed clearly but briefly comprehended by Aeneas and Methodius, Eusebius of Caesarea hands down much more luminously

[1] Gen. III.19.

[2] I Cor. XV.22.

[3] *Theophrastus*, p. 663, in Gallandi, vol. X.

and explains at greater length. He acquired so great a name in letters and gave so many specimens of his genius in history, chronology, knowledge of antiquity, hermeneutics, and theology that he is deservedly ranked with the foremost writers of the Church. According to him, God willed to have a surname given to himself from saving men; he always imparted life to all who freely approached him; he constantly offered more than could even be sought by men; he offered the Only-begotten, whom he constituted the Savior of all nations; through him he called all men to himself, not even casting aside the worst; he prepared the eternal crown for no one except on account of merits acquired; and he consigned no one to punishments which will never cease except the man rebellious against grace and mercy. The testimonies which pertain to this are remarkable.

For at the words of the Psalm [1], *ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ σώζειν, καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου Κυρίου αἱ διέξοδοι τοῦ θανάτου*, "Our God, the God of saving, and to the Lord, the Lord, belong the exits from death"; or according to the interpretation of Symmachus [2], *ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῖν Θεὸς εἰς σωτηρίαν, καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου τοῦ δεσπότου αἱ εἰς θάνατον ἔξοδοι*, "God is for us a God unto salvation, and to the Lord, the ruler, belong the exits into death," he writes [3]: "Since this one alone is God, he indeed discovered exits by which one might escape from death. For every man arrived at an entrance into death, but until then was unable to depart from it. But the Lord here commemorated, *διεξόδους ποιησάμενος τοῦ θανάτου, γέγονε Θεὸς ἐπώνυμος σωτηρίας*, having opened exits from death, was made God surnamed from salvation."

Whence, explaining the words [1], "My heart and my flesh have rejoiced in the living God," he says: "*Ζῶν γὰρ ὁ ἡμέτερος Θεός, καὶ μόνος ἰδιόκτητον καὶ φυσικὴν ἐν αὐτῷ κεκτημένος ζωήν, μᾶλλον δὲ αὐτὸς ἡ πηγὴ πάσης ζωῆς, πᾶσι τοῖς πλησιάζουσι ταύτης μεταδίδωσι.* For our God is living, and he alone possesses in himself his own proper and natural life; indeed, rather, he is the font of all life, and imparts it to all who approach him." For he is so disposed in mind that he sets no measure to his gifts. "For since he is munificent," says Eusebius [2], "he furnishes man with far more than he himself attains even by prayer, and surpasses with his gifts the man who works good according to his powers. Therefore Paul, ascribing the cause of every good to God [3], says: 'It is not of him who wills, nor of him who runs, but of God who has mercy.' "

---

[1] Ps. LXVII.21.

[2] Concerning this version, no differently than concerning that other of Aquila, he observes in the Commentary on Psalm XC, p. 346, Paris edition, 1706, that it is an *ἑρμηνεία ἰουδαϊκωτέρα*, a more Judaizing interpretation.

[3] Commentary on Psalm LXVII, p. 356, Paris edition, 1706.

[1] Commentary on Psalm LXXXIII, p. 518.

[2] Commentary on Psalm III, p. 19.

[3] Rom. IX.16.

To this divine merciful kindness it must be attributed [4] that there is one calling of all nations; that the kingdoms of the earth are invited to salvation; and that [5] through Christ all men, after fleeing the way of the impious, enter by faith in him upon the salvific way. "For *σωτὴρ ἀνθρώποις ἐπιδεδήμηκεν ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, σωτὴρ καὶ φωστὴρ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἁπάντων, διδάσκαλος εὐσεβείας, σωφροσύνης καθηγεμών, δικαιοσύνης ἀρχηγός, ἀρετῆς ἁπάσης καὶ θεογνωσίας ἀληθοῦς αἴτιος*, Christ of God came among men as Savior, the Savior and luminary of all nations, teacher of piety, guide of temperance, prince of justice, and cause of every virtue and of true divine knowledge." And indeed a cause so universal that he comprehended Judas himself, the worst of men. For, after describing the words of the Psalm [6], "For even the man of my peace, in whom I trusted, who ate my breads, has greatly supplanted me," Eusebius adds [7]: "Now Judas was a man of the Savior's peace, who with the other disciples had heard the Savior saying these things [8]—

> —'My peace I give to you; my peace I leave to you.' But, he says, *ἐφ' ὃν ἤλπισα*, 'in whom I hoped,' or according to Aquila, *ἐπεποίθησα*, 'I trusted,' or, as Symmachus, *ἐπεποίθειν*, 'I had trusted,' since he had affected Judas with gifts equal to the other Apostles. But the Savior trusted him and had a good hope concerning him because free will [1] was in him. *Οὐ γὰρ ἦν φύσεως ἀδυνάτου σώζεσθαι ὁ Ἰούδας· ἀλλ' οἷός τε ἦν θελήσας, ὁμοίως τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀποστόλοις μαθητευθῆναι τῷ Υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθὸς μαθητὴς ἀποτελεῖσθαι.* For Judas was not of a nature which could not attain salvation; but, had he willed, he could, like the other Apostles, have been instructed by the Son of God and have been made a good and upright disciple.

Since this is the condition of absolutely all men, therefore [2] *ἐν τῷ τῆς κρίσεως καιρῷ ὀργῆς Θεοῦ πειραθήσονται, καὶ τῷ θυμῷ αὐτοῦ ταραχθήσονται πάντες οἱ τοῦ σωτηρίου λόγου πολέμιοι*, in the time of judgment all the enemies of the salvific word will experience divine wrath and will be troubled by his fury. "For that very one who was crucified by them and delivered to death, who dwells in heaven and embraces all things, will deride them; and his Father, who is attacked together with Christ himself, will mock them and exact fitting punishments from

[4] Commentary on Psalm II, p. 11.

[5] Ibid., p. 12.

[6] Ps. XL.10.

[7] Commentary on Psalm XL, p. 171.

[8] John XIV.27.

[1] But not a bare and unarmed free will; rather, one equipped with the heavenly gifts of grace, as the sequence of the discourse shows.

[2] Commentary on Psalm II, pp. 14–15.

them." But just as he will exact punishments from them on account of the enmities which they practiced against the salvific word and on account of the contempt by which they rejected the gifts of divine merciful kindness, so he neither decreed eternal punishments for them nor predestined the pious and holy to the crown except with foreknowledge shining before him of those things which each one would choose even unto the end.

And concerning the impious and sinners Eusebius writes [3]: "God, *προλαβὼν τῇ προγνώσει*, anticipating them by his foreknowledge, knew before they came into the light that they would be such; nevertheless, he granted that they should be born and come into the light, *τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ χάριν καὶ αὐτοῖς δωρησάμενος*, bestowing his grace upon them also, so that their purpose might be made manifest."

But concerning the just and pious he adds: "For God, *προλαβὼν ἔγνω*, knowing beforehand, knew also that the order of the just would enter by its own will upon the straight and wholly undeflected way. Then he left to each order the free movement of free will, granting them to complete the course in the stadium. And since he had constituted all similar in nature, he permitted each one to choose the better things by his own will. But they, as those who were their own masters, of their own right, and free as regards movement, were separated by their own judgment, some choosing the straight way, others the crooked: *τούτου χάριν ὁ δίκαιος κριτὴς ἀγωνοθετῶν ἑκατέρῳ τάγματι, τῷ καταλλήλῳ καὶ προσήκοντι τέλει τοὺς ἀξίους παραδίδωσιν· οὐ καθάπερ ἄνθρωποι μαθὼν ἐκ τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων ἀποβάσεως τὸν ἑκάστου τρόπον, οἷα δὲ Θεὸς καὶ πρὸ γενέσεως εἰδὼς ἅπαντα.* For this reason that just judge, presiding as arbiter of the contest over each order, rewards the worthy with the fitting and due end—not learning each one's character from the event of his deeds after the manner of men, but, as God, knowing all things before their origin. Wherefore some, before they were known to others, were alienated from him; but the saints were deemed worthy of election, as Jeremiah the prophet, to whom God said: 'Before I formed you in the womb, I knew you; before you came forth from the womb, I sanctified you' " [1].

The Apostle declares the same thing in these words: "As he chose us in him before the constitution of the world, that we should be holy and immaculate in his sight in charity; who predestined us unto the adoption of sons through Jesus Christ" [2]. And again [3]: "In whom we also were called by lot, predestined according to the foreknowledge of him who works all things according to the counsel of his will, that we may be unto the praise of his glory." Do you see how he says that before the constitution of the world they were elected and predestined unto

[3] Commentary on Psalm LVII, p. 258.

[1] Jer. I.5.

[2] Eph. I.4–5.

[3] Eph. I.11–12.

the adoption of sons according to the purpose of him who works such things? And he sets forth the same proposition [4] in these words: "But we know that all things work together unto good for those who love God, for those who are called according to his purpose—"

> —For those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be made conformable to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. And those whom he predestined, these he also called; and those whom he called, these he also justified; but those whom he justified, those he also glorified." He declares similar things concerning himself [1], saying: "But when it pleased him who separated me from my mother's womb to reveal his Son in me."

Whence he concludes concerning each order, of the just and of the impious [2]:

> Therefore, just as, when he foreknew those who were to love him, he also predestined them, so also, when he foresaw that the impious would speak justice—as those who knew it but nevertheless were not to approach it in works—he therefore alienated them from the womb; and even before they existed, he reckoned them *παρ' ἑαυτῷ*, with himself, in the number of those who wander and speak lies. Nevertheless, although he knew that they would be such, he permitted them to come forth openly, so that the excellence of just and religious men might shine forth by comparison with the worse. For since all were constituted from one nature, employing free will, some indeed chose the good voluntarily, while others entered upon the contrary way. But that exalted and great judge of all, presiding over each order, renders to each according to his merit. Wherefore he affected those who loved him with glory, presenting them as conformable to the image of his Son, since they had proved their love toward him by works; *τοὺς δὲ ἐναντίους, ὡς ἂν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπαλλοτριώσαντας τῆς αὐτοῦ χάριτος καταβάλλει*, but he casts down the others opposed to them, as those who had alienated themselves from his grace … *αὐτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς τὸ τοιοῦτον προξενήσαντες τέλος*, since they themselves procured such an end and outcome for themselves.

[4] Rom. VIII.28.
[1] Gal. I.15–16.
[2] Ibid., pp. 258–259.

CCII.

A threefold disposition must therefore be distinguished, according to which God is related to the human race: the disposition of restoration, the disposition of condemnation, and the disposition of predestination. The first, which is also the disposition of God restoring, is: a) universal as regards its amplitude; b) proceeds from nothing other than divine goodness and mercy; c) has no knowledge shining before it other than that of the common misery; and d) tends to this, that by suitable aids it may raise up all and bestow upon all the power by which they may both overcome the lethal disease and recover their former health.

The second disposition, which is also that of God condemning, is: a) circumscribed in amplitude and extension; b) follows upon the knowledge by which God from eternity knows the contempt of his mercy and a will hardened in this contempt even unto the end; whence c) it is a disposition which must be attributed to justice and to the second will.

The final disposition follows, which is also that of God predestining; it is not of one kind, but is manifested in three ways altogether, since God predestines: 1) unto grace; 2) unto good works and perseverance itself; and 3) unto glory and the crown. Now the disposition of God predestining unto grace does not differ from that which arises from the decree of restoration; and it is therefore distinguished by the same notes and the same characters. But the disposition of God predestining unto good works and final perseverance: a) requires an antecedent knowledge of the free cooperation by which men comply with prevenient grace; whence b) it is a disposition particular in extension; c) affected by a condition; and d) one that must be attributed to the consequent will. These same things must also be repeated concerning the disposition of God predestining unto glory. For it is a disposition which: a) has a preceding knowledge of final perseverance; and therefore is b) not universal and infinite, but definite and circumscribed; c) not free from a condition; d) proper to the consequent will; and e) one which God assumes and manifests as judge and most equitable rewarder.

Unless it were so, and unless our free cooperation were required, all men whatsoever would most certainly obtain eternal felicity. "For," says Eusebius [1], "the joyful and salutary relationship of men with God, the Word of God sent to us from heaven *ἐκ τοῦ παναγάθου Θεοῦ*, from the supremely good God, *ὥσπερ τις ἀπειρομεγέθους φωτὸς αὐγή, πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις εὐαγγελίζεται*, proclaims happily to all men like some splendor of an immeasurable light. He—

> —vehemently invites men, not from one or another place, but from all the nations of the whole world, to the God of all things; and he urges Greeks and barbarians alike, men together with women and

[1] *Praeparat. Evang.*, lib. I, cap. I, pp. 2–3, Paris edition, 1628.

> little children, the poor equally with the rich, the wise and the unlearned, to hasten and to be willing to receive the offered gift with every alacrity and zeal of soul; nor does he exclude even the servile race itself from this fellowship of calling. *Ὅτι δὴ μίαν τὴν πάντων οὐσίαν τε καὶ φύσιν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτῶν συστησάμενος, μιᾶς εἰκότως καὶ τῆς ἴσης πάντας πάλιν μεγαλοδωρεᾶς ἠξίωσε, τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν γνῶσίν τε καὶ φιλίαν ἅπασι τοῖς ὑπακούειν ἐθέλουσι, καὶ τὴν χάριν εὐμαρῶς ἀσπαζομένοις δωρούμενος.* For since the Father of all brought forth all in one and the same substance and nature, he rightly admitted all alike into the communion of one and equal munificence, abundantly communicating knowledge and love of himself to all those who are willing to obey him when he calls and gladly to accept and embrace the benefit of his grace."

CCIII.

To this most illustrious testimony of Eusebius I add another and final one from Cyril, who governed the Church of Jerusalem in the fourth century, who is called by Theodoret [1] *τῶν ἀποστολικῶν δογμάτων προθύμως ὑπερμαχῶν*, a most ardent defender of apostolic doctrine, and whose authority on behalf of Catholic truth was frequently employed both by the same Theodoret [2], and by Gelasius [3], Eustratius [4], Leontius of Byzantium [5], Anastasius the Sinaite [6], Maximus [7], the Lateran Synod celebrated under the presidency of Martin I [8], John Damascene [9], and—

> —the Second Council of Nicaea itself, the seventh ecumenical council [1]. Cyril, therefore, holds nothing more important than to extol with the highest praises the infinite goodness of God and his clemency toward the human race, and to depict it as though with its own colors. "For," he says [2], refuting the Gnostics [3], "because

[1] *H. E.*, lib. II, cap. XXVI.
[2] In the dialogue entitled *Inconfusus*.
[3] In the book *De duabus naturis*.
[4] In the book *De utilitate precum pro defunctis*, in Leo Allatius's work *De Purgatorio*.
[5] *Con. Nestorium et Eutychem*, lib. I.
[6] *Hodegi.*, cap. X.
[7] In the dogmatic tome to Stephen of Dora.
[8] Act V.
[9] *De imaginibus*, Orat. III.
[1] Act V.
[2] *Catech.* VI, § VII, p. 91, Paris edition, 1720.
[3] Who, according to the testimony of Irenaeus, lib. II, cap. XXXV, n. 3, fashioned for distinct names an equal number of distinct powers, indeed an equal number of distinct gods.

> he is called good and just and omnipotent and Sabaoth [4], he is not therefore manifold and diverse; but since he is one and the same, *μυρίας ἐκπέμπει τὰς τῆς θεότητος ἐνεργείας*, he sends forth innumerable operations of the divinity. He does not have more in one respect and less in another, *ἀλλ' ἐν πᾶσιν ὅμοιος ὢν αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ*, but in all things is similar to himself. He is not great in goodness alone and lesser in wisdom, *ἀλλ' ἰσοδύναμον ἔχων τὴν σοφίαν καὶ τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν*, but has wisdom and benignity equal and of the same power." The force of this benignity is such that Cyril writes of it [5]: "*Πλήρη τὰ πέρατα τοῦ κόσμου τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ· πλήρης πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις τῆς αἰνέσεως αὐτοῦ· πλήρης πᾶσα ἡ ἀνθρωπότης τῆς συγκαταβάσεως αὐτοῦ· τὰ οὐράνια, τὰ ἐπίγεια, τὰ καταχθόνια, πλήρη τῆς εὐσπλαγχνίας αὐτοῦ· πλήρη τοῦ ἐλέους αὐτοῦ· πλήρη τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν· πλήρη τῶν δωρεῶν· πλήρη τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν αὐτοῦ.* The ends of the world are full of his goodness; the whole creation is full of his praise; the whole human race is full of his most merciful condescension toward us. The heavenly, the earthly, and those beneath the earth are full of his compassion, full of mercy, full of the effects of mercy, full of gifts, full of his beneficences." So much so that Cyril continues [6]: "No man can explain his clemency according to its worth; indeed, even if all the tongues of men should come together as one, *οὐδ'—*
> *—οὕτως μέρος τι τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίας διηγήσασθαι δυνήσονται*, not even thus would they be able to recount some part of his benignity."

Certainly [1], *ὁ κτίστης ἀγαθὸς ὤν, ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς ἔκτισεν· τὸ δὲ κτισθέν, ἐξ οἰκείας προαιρέσεως εἰς πονηρίαν ἐτράπη*, since the Creator is good, he created the creature for good works; but the created thing was turned to wickedness by its own choice. Satan was the first to indulge in wickedness [2], and [3] *διὰ τοῦτον ὁ προπάτωρ ἡμῶν Ἀδὰμ ἐξεβλήθη, καὶ ἀντὶ παραδείσου αὐτομάτως θαυμασίους φέροντος καρπούς, τὴν ἀκανθοφόρον ἀντικατηλλάξατο γῆν*, through him our first parent Adam was cast out and exchanged paradise, which of itself bore wondrous

[4] Cyril appears to reckon the name Sabaoth among the proper names of God and those expressing his attributes. Yet by it are designated the powers and hosts either of the stars or of the angels. Compare, however, Irenaeus, lib. II, cap. XXXV, n. 3; Ambrose, *De Fide*, lib. IV, cap. I, n. 13; and Prudentius, *Apotheos.*, carm. V, v. 51: *est impossibile spectare profunda Sabaoth*, it is impossible to behold the depths of Sabaoth.

[5] *Orat. in occursum D. N. I. C.*, § III, p. 383.

[6] *Catech.* II, § X, p. 26.

[1] Ibid., § I, p. 22.

[2] *Catech.* II, §§ III–V, pp. 22–24.

[3] Ibid., § IV, p. 24.

fruits, for the thorn-bearing earth. But what was the outcome of this exchange? Or what condition then befell our first parents and all their posterity? Cyril proposes to himself this very question to be resolved [4], in these words: "What, therefore? someone might say: having been deceived, we have perished; is there no salvation thereafter? We have fallen [5]; is it not permitted to rise again? We have been blinded; is it not lawful to recover sight? We have been made lame; is there no hope of someday walking rightly? To speak summarily, we are dead; is it not permitted that we rise again?" But he answers [6]: "O man, will he who raised Lazarus after four days and when stinking not much more easily raise you while living? He who poured out his precious blood for us will himself deliver us from sin. Let us not despair of ourselves; let us not cast ourselves into a desperate state. *Δεινὸν γάρ ἐστι τὸ μὴ πιστεύειν εἰς μετανοίας ἐλπίδα.* It is cruel not to believe in the hope of repentance. He who does not await salvation accumulates evils without measure; but he who hopes for healing easily spares himself…. *Ἡ μὲν οὖν φύσις ἐπιδέχεται τὴν σωτηρίαν, ζητεῖται δὲ λοιπὸν ἡ προαίρεσις.* Nature, therefore, is capable of salvation, but the will of free choice is further required for this."

And Cyril immediately teaches and confirms by many things that nature, although corrupted by the original stain, is nevertheless capable—

> —of salvation. For, repeating the most widely known maxim [1], *φιλάνθρωπος ὁ Θεός, καὶ φιλάνθρωπος οὐκ ὀλίγον*, God is benign, and not only slightly benign, he runs through the several ages of the human race down to Christ [2], and applies himself wholly to demonstrating by testimonies and arguments that there never existed even one man who was altogether deprived of a divinely received faculty for attaining salvation. Whence he finally infers [3]: "*Φιλάνθρωπος ὁ Κύριος καὶ ταχὺς εἰς συγχώρησιν, βραδὺς δὲ εἰς τιμωρίαν. Μηδεὶς οὖν ἀπελπίσῃ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σωτηρίας.* The Lord is benign and prompt to pardon, but slow to punish. Let no one, therefore, cast away the hope of his salvation."

[4] Ibid., § V, p. 24.
[5] Jer. VIII.4.
[6] Ibid., § V, p. 24.
[1] Ibid., § VI, p. 24.
[2] Ibid., §§ VI–XIX, pp. 24–31.
[3] Ibid., § XIX, p. 31.

CCIV.

And there is indeed reason why all should be of uplifted spirit and promise themselves every best thing from divine clemency. "For the crown and glory of the cross [4], *ἐφωταγώγησε μὲν τοὺς ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ τυφλούς, ἔλυσε δὲ πάντας τοὺς ὑπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας κατεχομένους, καὶ κόσμον ὅλον ἀνθρώπων ἐλυτρώσατο*, illuminated those who were blind through ignorance, released all who were held under sin, and redeemed the whole world of men." For he endured all things for this reason [5], that *ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ πάντων*, he came for the salvation of all. For this reason he sustained all things [6], that he willed to pacify [7] through the blood of the cross those things that are in heaven and those that are on earth. "For we were enemies of God through sin, and God decreed that the sinner must die. It was therefore necessary that one of two things occur: either that God, remaining consistent with himself, should destroy all, or that, employing clemency, he should dissolve the sentence that had been passed. *Ἀλλὰ βλέπε Θεοῦ σοφίαν· ἐτήρησεν καὶ τῇ ἀποφάσει τὴν ἀλήθειαν, καὶ τῇ φιλανθρωπίᾳ τὴν ἐνέργειαν.* But behold the wisdom of God: he preserved both the truth of the sentence and the efficacy of benignity—

> —Admire, therefore, the wisdom of God: he preserved both the firmness of his sentence and the efficacy of goodness. Christ took up sins [1] in his body upon the tree, that we, dead to sins through his death, might live to justice. He who died for us was of no small price; he was not a perceptible sheep; he was not a mere man; he was not merely an angel, *ἀλλὰ Θεὸς ἐνανθρωπήσας*, but God made man. The iniquity of sinners was not so great as the justice of him who died for our sake; we did not sin so greatly as he excelled in justice who laid down his life for us." But did he lay it down for all? Neither does the course of the discourse permit us to think otherwise, nor do these words bear another meaning [2], *ἔπαθεν οὖν Ἰησοῦς κατ' ἀλήθειαν ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων*, Jesus therefore truly suffered for all men; nor those in which he makes mention [3] of the Only-begotten Son of God and our Savior, *τοῦ τὴν οἰκουμενικὴν, κατὰ τὰς θείας γραφάς, ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις τελέσαντος σωτηρίαν*, who according to

[4] *Catech.* XIII, § I, p. 183.
[5] Ibid., § XXIX, p. 196.
[6] Ibid., § XXXIII, p. 199.
[7] Col. I.20.
[1] I Pet. II.24.
[2] Ibid., § IV, p. 184.
[3] Epistle to the Emperor Constantius concerning the sign of the luminous cross seen at Jerusalem, which appeared in the heavens, § VII, p. 354.

> the divine Scriptures accomplished at Jerusalem the salvation of the whole world.

By this altogether infinite largess of divine mercy it has been brought about that no one may lawfully lay aside the hope of salvation; that grace, and indeed varied and manifold grace for returning to soundness, may be present to all; that God may long-sufferingly await a will aroused by his light and inflamed by his fire; and that he altogether abandons and spurns no one unless the present life has been completed and the course of mortality finished. Cyril fittingly says [4]: *μὴ ἀπόγνωμεν ἑαυτούς, μὴ ἀπορρίψωμεν ἑαυτοὺς εἰς ἀνέλπιστον κατάστασιν*, let us not cast ourselves down; let us not give ourselves over to despair. For if, whoever you are, O man, you too strive and do not withdraw your effort [5], *οὐ κεκώλυταί σοι ἡ χάρις*, grace will not be withheld from you. Indeed, varied and manifold grace will be at hand. For [6], *ἑκάστῳ ποικίλος ὁ Σωτὴρ γίνεται πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον· τοῖς μὲν—*

> *—γὰρ εὐφροσύνης χρείαν ἔχουσιν, ἄμπελος γίνεται· τοῖς δὲ χρείαν ἔχουσιν εἰσελθεῖν, ἕστηκε θύρα· καὶ τοῖς χρείαν ἔχουσι προσενέγκαι τὰς εὐχάς, ἕστηκε μεσίτης ἀρχιερεύς· πάλιν τοῖς ἔχουσιν ἁμαρτίας γίνεται πρόβατον, ἵνα ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν σφαγιασθῇ· τοῖς πᾶσι γίνεται πάντα, μένων αὐτὸς κατὰ φύσιν ὅπερ ἐστί*, the Savior becomes manifold for each according to what is profitable for him. For those who need gladness, he becomes a vine; for those who need to enter, he stands as a door; and for those who need to offer prayers, he stands as mediator and high priest. Again, for those who have sins, he becomes a sheep, that he may be slaughtered for them. He becomes all things to all, while himself remaining according to nature what he is. Now he assumes so many forms for this reason [1], that *ὁ Θεὸς δαψιλής ἐστιν εἰς εὐεργεσίαν· περιμένει δὲ ἑκάστου τὴν γνησίαν προαίρεσιν. Διὰ τοῦτο ἐπήγαγεν ὁ Ἀπόστολος λέγων, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν· ἡ πρόθεσις γνησία οὖσα, κλητόν σε ποιεῖ*, God is liberal in beneficence; but he awaits each one's sincere will. For this reason the Apostle added [2], "to those who are called according to purpose." When a sincere purpose is present, it causes you to be called. God awaits this sincere purpose for as long as [3] we abide in this mortality; and *τοῦ ἀγῶνος ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ συνεστῶτος*, while the contest still stands in this world, just as *πάντων τῶν ἀγωνιστῶν τὸ τέλος*

[4] *Catech.* II, § V, p. 24.
[5] Ibid., § X, p. 26.
[6] *Catech.* X, § V, p. 138.
[1] *Procatech.*, § I, p. 2.
[2] Rom. VIII.28.
[3] *Catech.* XVIII, § IV, p. 287.

> *ἐνδέχεται*, he awaits the end of all the contestants, so he crowns no one and utterly casts away and condemns no one.

CCV.

We have completed what had been set for us, and have investigated the doctrine of the whole Catholic name concerning the salvific will of God and the universal order of restoration with such care and zeal that we may appear not to have been altogether wanting to the work undertaken. For we have not brought forward only a few obscure witnesses, but have questioned nearly all—Syrians, Greeks, Latins, Easterners, and Westerners; nor have we reported a few mutilated and doubtful judgments of theirs—

> —but have transcribed, weighed, and illustrated very many entire and most certain testimonies, so that we judge ourselves guilty rather of prolixity and satiety than of deficiency and scarcity. Indeed, what names of any reputation and celebrity have we passed over? What churches have we not traversed? Or what have we omitted by which it might become known what the individual churches, or what all of them, thought, handed down, and defended?

These things alone, therefore, appear to remain which may not undeservedly be required of us: first, that those things which we gave *ἀναλυτικῶς*, analytically—that is, separately and dispersed—we comprehend *συνθετικῶς*, synthetically, in one sum and one summit; and then, that we show what errors are destroyed by these things and what truths in turn are established. We shall carry out both by a certain series of *πορίσματα*, corollaries, and consequences, and we shall carry them out in this order: let those corollaries precede by which the way is leveled; let those follow which conduce to establishing the truths; and let those succeed in the final place by which the opposing errors are overthrown. Let the *παρασκευαστικά*, the preparatory conclusions, precede; let the *καταφατικά*, the affirmative, follow; and let the *ἀποφατικά* and *ἐριστικά*, the negative and disputative, close the column.

CCVI.

COROLLARY I.

Nearly all the canons which Martin I issued [1] in the Lateran Synod celebrated against the Monothelites are conceived in these words: *εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ κατὰ*

[1] *Act. seu Secret.* V, cols. 357 ff., *Concil.*, vol. VII, Venice edition, 1729.

τοὺς ἁγίους πατέρας, if anyone does not profess this or that according to the holy Fathers; *εἴη κατάκριτος*, let him be condemned. Certainly nothing is more evident or more forceful than this formula for persuading anyone that the consensus of the Fathers contains the rule of faith, and that no one can dissent from those things which the Fathers have taught with one mouth and confirmed with one voice without wandering astray from revealed truth. Now throughout the whole preceding treatment we applied ourselves wholly to this: 1) that we should investigate the faith and unanimous judgment of the Fathers—

> —2) report it when investigated and discovered; and 3) set forth no less candidly than clearly what was connected and joined with it. Therefore it can be lawful for no one to dissent from those things which we have thus far established by so great a weight of authority.

CCVII.

COROLLARY II.

Augustine, contending against Julian for Catholic truth, after commemorating [1] certain prelates of the West who had committed to their books the doctrine of transmitted original guilt, adds [2]: "Do you therefore think that they should be contemned because they all belong to the Western Church, and no bishop of the East has been commemorated among them by us?… I think that that part of the world ought to suffice for you in which the Lord willed to crown the chief of his Apostles with the most glorious martyrdom. Had you willed to hear blessed Innocent presiding over this Church, you would even then have extricated your perilous youth from the Pelagian snares." And shortly afterward [3]: "There is therefore no reason why you should appeal to the prelates of the East, because they too are certainly Christians, and this faith of both parts of the earth is one." Then, after adding the testimony of Gregory Nazianzen [4], he continues: "Does the authority of the Eastern bishops appear small to you in the one Gregory? He is indeed so great a person that neither would he say this except from the Christian faith most known to all, nor would they hold him so illustrious and venerable unless they recognized these things said by him from the most familiar rule of truth." After these things, having further enumerated several doctors of the East [5], he finally concludes by inference [6]: "You are convicted on every side; the

[1] *Con. Iulian.*, lib. I, capp. III–IV, nn. 5–13.
[2] Ibid., cap. IV, n. 13.
[3] Ibid., n. 14.
[4] Ibid., cap. V, nn. 15–16.
[5] Ibid., capp. V–VIII, nn. 16–30.
[6] Ibid., cap. VII, n. 30.

testimonies of the saints are clearer than light. Behold the assembly into which I have introduced—

> —you. Here is Ambrose of Milan…; here too is John of Constantinople…; here is Basil…; here too are the others, whose great consensus ought to move you…. Behold, not I alone, but so many and such great holy and learned doctors answer you, on my behalf or with me, and for the salvation of us all and of your own self, if you are wise." There is nothing at all among these things which I do not seem to myself able to urge and repeat with even greater right. For I have adduced nearly two hundred witnesses, and testimonies so many and so great that, if they do not suffice, I am plainly ignorant of what ought to be judged sufficient. There is reason, therefore, for those who read to consider within their minds into what assembly I have introduced them.

Here are present the Roman pontiffs [1], Clement, Innocent, Celestine, and Leo; present are the apostolic men [2], Barnabas, Ignatius, and Polycarp [3]; present are the most steadfast martyrs Justin [4], Irenaeus [5], and Methodius [6]; present are the lights of Egypt [7], Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, Athanasius, Didymus, Antony the Great, both Macarii, Serapion, Theophilus, Peter, Theonas, Phileas, Paphnutius, Orsiesius, Isidore, Cyril, and Synesius; present are the Fathers of Africa [8], Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius, Marius Victorinus, Optatus, Facundus, and Primasius; present from Spain [9] are Prudentius, Pacian, Orosius, Marius Mercator, Dracontius, and Isidore [10]; present from Gaul [11] are Hilary of Poitiers, Phoebadius, Sedulius, Caesarius, Valerian, Apollinaris Sidonius, Avitus, Salvianus, and both the Synod of Orange and that of Arles—

[1] §§ CLVI–CLIX.
[2] §§ CLXX–CLXXI.
[3] § CLXXXII.
[4] § CXCVIII.
[5] § CXVIII.
[6] § CC.
[7] §§ LXXII–LXXXIV.
[8] §§ XCIX–CXII.
[9] §§ CXIII–CXVI.
[10] § XLII.
[11] §§ CXVII–CXXXIII.

—Prosper [1], Arnobius the Younger [2], Gennadius [3], Hincmar [4], Paschasius [5], and Bernard [6]; present from Italy [7] are Hippolytus, Ambrose, Jerome, Zeno, Chromatius, Paulinus of Nola, Gaudentius [8], the anonymous author *On the Calling of All Nations* [9], Peter Chrysologus [10], Cassiodorus [11], Benedict [12], Paulinus of Aquileia [13], and Ratherius [14]; present are the doctors of Antioch [15], Theophilus, Nemesius, Titus of Bostra, Jacob of Nisibis, Isaac the Syrian, Theodoret, Basil of Seleucia, Eustathius, Anastasius, and Ephrem; present from Asia, Thrace, and Pontus [16] are Athenagoras, the author of the Epistle to Diognetus, Gregory of Neocaesarea, Amphilochius of Iconium, Caesarius, Basil, both Gregories—Nazianzen and Nyssen—Photius, and one who was to be placed after no one, John Chrysostom [17]; and, that I may not name the rest [18] individually, present from Palestine [19] are Tatian, Eusebius of Caesarea, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Aeneas of Gaza. The consensus of all these is so great, and the authority proceeding from the consensus so great—

—that no one can be found so senseless as not to be moved by it exceedingly.

[1] § LXII.
[2] § XLI.
[3] § XLI.
[4] § XXXV.
[5] § XXXVIII.
[6] § XXX.
[7] §§ CXXXV–CXLV.
[8] § XLVI.
[9] § XLVII.
[10] § L.
[11] § LIII.
[12] § XXXIX.
[13] § XXXIX.
[14] § XXXVIII.
[15] §§ CLXX–CLXXIX.
[16] §§ CLXXXIII–CXCV.
[17] §§ II–XII.
[18] Of this kind are Oecumenius, § VII; John Damascene, § XVII; Theophylact, § XXI; both Anselms, of Canterbury and of Laon, §§ XXV–XXVIII; Rupert, § XXIX; Atto, § XXXIV; Gildas, § XXXVIII; Venantius Fortunatus, § XL; the author of the *Praedestinatus*, § XLI; and Fastidius, § XLVI.
[19] §§ CXCIX–CCV.

CCVIII.

COROLLARY III.

Although a proof drawn from the judgments of the Fathers borrows all its force from their consensus, and that a universal one, nevertheless some added splendor and evidence—I know not what—accrues to it if, together with the Fathers, the factions of heretics also conspired in the same judgment. "For," says Maran [1], "nothing more illustrious can be adduced for the full defense of truth than the consensus of sects with the Catholic Churches. Cavils grow cold when matters have come to these arguments. For it is not to be feared that the Catholics received an error from the heretics, or the heretics from the Catholics, or that both conspired in embracing an innovation." Now just as in the fourth century the Apollinarists [2] professed one and the same faith and doctrine with the Catholics concerning the salvific will of God, so in the following fifth century did the Semi-Pelagians [3] concerning the nature of men restored by the blood of Christ. Therefore this faith, established even by the consensus of combatants, and this doctrine, confirmed even by the judgment of those who dissent, must be thought to have derived its origin from nothing other than the primitive and apostolic institution.

CCIX.

COROLLARY IV.

We are taught by ancient and recent history that heretical sects dissent no more from the Catholic Church than from themselves, and rage no more violently against it than they rave against themselves. Therefore it ought in no way to seem wonderful if—

> —although some of these conspired with the Catholic Church in one and the same profession of faith concerning the salvific will of God and the universal order of restoration, others on the contrary arose who resisted and strove against it with all their powers. And indeed they arose, and in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and ninth centuries declared a most bitter war upon both heads of the profession. But with what outcome, or with what fruit? None other than what was to be expected, and whereby the Catholic persuasion and consensus would shine forth more fully and clearly. For while sects of

[1] *De divinit. D. N. I. C.*, lib. II, cap. VII, § I.
[2] § CXCII.
[3] §§ LXII ff.

this kind were raging, not only did the orthodox Fathers and writers remain unmoved in the ancient faith, but they also vindicated it *ἀγωνιστικῶς*, by contest, through published works [1] and assembled synods [2]. Therefore, by the contentions and combats of the heretics it was brought about that the Catholic faith and persuasion, which had been propagated *εἰρηνικῶς*, peacefully, from its origins to subsequent ages, was asserted more forcefully and shone more illustriously.

CCX.

COROLLARY V.

It conduces not a little to increasing and amplifying the authority of the Catholic profession if it is said to be necessary, divinely revealed, pertaining to the deposit of faith, supported by certain testimonies of sacred Scripture, and resting upon indubitable arguments, by those to whom belong both the right of judging and a dignity by which they may win trust and assent for themselves. For not all those things which the Catholic name professes are of one and the same nature and account; nor do we believe in the same manner that Christ is *θεάνθρωπον*, the God-man, and judge that the Mother of God was advanced together with her body to heavenly beatitude. But the consensus of which we are treating, and which we have established by so great a cloud of witnesses, is of such a kind that it is called certain and ascertained [3], that it is asserted by the oracles of divine Scripture [4]—

—that it is approved by liturgical monuments [1], that it is declared to be contained in the deposit of revelation [2], and that arguments of every kind are employed to vindicate it [3]. It is therefore a consensus to which the greatest weight of authority must be attributed, and by which we know not only what is true concerning the salvific will of God and the amplitude of the order of restoration, but also what must be believed concerning each head of doctrine.

[1] §§ XXXV, XLVII, LXII, CXCII.
[2] §§ CXXXII–CXXXIII.
[3] §§ LXXII ff.
[4] §§ II ff.; §§ XLVII ff.; §§ XCIX ff.
[1] §§ XLVII ff.; §§ LXII ff.; §§ CLXX–CXCVIII.
[2] §§ CXXIX–CXXXII.
[3] §§ LXXVI ff.

CCXI.

COROLLARY VI.

Those things which pertain to the salvific will of God and the amplitude of the order of restoration are so closely joined with hope and with the doctrine of repentance that the consensus which existed concerning them could not but have been most widely known and employed after the manner of a norm to which the method of administering repentance and imparting reconciliation was conformed. And it was indeed most widely known, since it was expressed in homilies [4], catecheses [5], and even poems themselves [6]; whence it became known not only to Christians but even to the Gentiles themselves [7]. Moreover, in the Church it was customarily held as a rule [8] by which perverse opinions concerning the administration of repentance and the conferral of reconciliation were condemned. Wherefore it was also proper to this consensus that it should be known and ascertained both to pastors and doctors and to the flocks and Christian people.

CCXII.

COROLLARY VII.

Let no one deny that a consensus of the Fathers which is commended by universality, which was defended against heretics, asserted by testimonies of the Bible, fortified by arguments of every kind, proposed publicly and solemnly, and held as a rule by which the gravest questions concerning repentance and reconciliation were settled, contains dogmatic and apostolic tradition. That is, indeed, the tradition whose force and decisive authority for producing faith were explained most diligently above the rest by Tertullian [1], Hegesippus [2], and Irenaeus in six hundred places [3], who among other things has the following [4]: "Having received this preaching and this faith, as we have said before, the Church, although dispersed throughout the whole world, guards it diligently, as if inhabiting one house; and she believes these things similarly, namely, as if having one soul and one heart;

[4] §§ XLVI, L, CXVI, CXXIX.
[5] §§ CXCII–CCIII.
[6] §§ CXIII–CXV, CXXVIII, CXL.
[7] §§ XCIX ff.
[8] §§ CLVI–CLIX.
[1] *De praescriptt.*, capp. XIII–XXI.
[2] In Eusebius, *H. E.*, lib. IV, cap. XXI.
[3] *Con. Haeres.*, lib. III, capp. II, III, IV, V, XXIV; lib. IV, cap. XXXIII; and lib. V, cap. XX.
[4] Ibid., lib. I, cap. X, n. 2.

and harmoniously she preaches and teaches and hands down these things, as if possessing one mouth. For although the languages in the world are dissimilar, nevertheless the force of tradition is one and the same. Neither do the Churches founded in Germany believe otherwise or hand down otherwise, nor those among the Iberians, nor those among the Celts, nor those in Egypt, nor those in Libya, nor those constituted in the middle of the world." Moreover, Tertullian adds, this force of tradition, this rule instituted by Christ, has no questions among us except those which heresies introduce and which make heretics.

Now we have brought forward that consensus which shines by universality, which was constantly not another but one and the same—

> —among the Italians [1], Gauls [2], Spaniards [3], English [4], Africans [5], Egyptians [6], Easterners [7], Syrians [8], inhabitants of Thrace, Pontus, and Asia [9], and finally Palestinians [10]; which the doctors of the Church defended against heretics, vindicated by the oracles of the Bible and other arguments, publicly and solemnly proposed, and held in the place of a rule and norm by which they might establish true and sincere doctrines concerning repentance and reconciliation. Therefore there is at hand for us a dogmatic and apostolic tradition which permits no questions among Christians and from which no one departs without manifest danger to the faith. "For after the Apostles and Prophets," as Leontius of Byzantium most truly admonished in his first book against Nestorius and Eutyches, "God placed doctors in the Church, according to the incomprehensible providence of the Holy Spirit, for the work of ministry, for the edification of the body of Christ. Wherefore he who does not receive those Fathers who are illustrious and celebrated in the Church plainly resists the ordinance and constitution of God."

[1] §§ CXXXV–CXLV, CLIX.
[2] §§ CXVII–CXXXIII.
[3] §§ CXIII–CXVI.
[4] §§ XXV–XXXVIII, XLVI.
[5] §§ XCIX–CXII.
[6] §§ LXXII–LXXXIV.
[7] §§ CLXV–CLXXVI.
[8] § CLXXIX.
[9] §§ CLXXXII–CXCV.
[10] §§ CXCVIII–CCV.

CCXIII.

COROLLARY VIII.

Although dogmatic and apostolic tradition is one and the same in the force and weight of authority, nevertheless by object and matter it is rightly divided into *συστατικήν*, constitutive, and *ἐξηγητικήν*, explanatory. Vincent makes mention of this division in the *Commonitorium*, and declared its members in such a way that by the name of constitutive tradition must be understood that tradition whose objects and matter are dogmas and decrees of faith concerning which there is deep silence in the Scriptures, and which, first received orally—

> —are propagated only through the ministry of witnesses divinely instituted; but by the name and appellation of explanatory tradition is signified that by which dogmas comprehended in the divine writings are explained more fully, proposed more clearly, and so circumscribed that they can neither be corrupted nor in any way twisted into alien senses. The supreme necessity of this latter tradition is evident, first, from this consideration: that, according to Origen [1], it was universally purposed both by the Spirit who was in the Prophets and by the word of Christ which was in the Apostles to conceal the senses of truth and not bring them forth openly; so that, as Augustine and Prosper testify [2], frequent depths of mysteries occur in the holy Scriptures which are concealed for this reason, lest they become cheap; are sought for this reason, that they may exercise; and are opened for this reason, that they may nourish. It then becomes splendidly known from those things which Irenaeus writes [3] concerning heretics, who, when they are argued against from the Scriptures, turn to accusing the Scriptures, as though they were not correct, nor from authority, and because they were variously expressed, and because the truth cannot be found from them by those who do not know tradition. For after heretics, as Athanasius admonishes in the second discourse against the Arians, *κανόνα ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀσέβειαν*, have constituted impiety in their heart as a canon, *πρὸς τοῦτον πάντα τὰ θεῖα λόγια διαστρέφουσι*, they corrupt all the divine oracles according to it.

Since these things are so, a question arises as though of its own accord: of what kind must that tradition which we have reported be judged, and what util-

[1] *Philocal.*, cap. IX.

[2] In Prosper from Augustine, Sent. LXVII. Jobius teaches many things pertaining to the same matter in Photius, Cod. CCXXII.

[3] *Con. Haeres.*, lib. III, cap. II.

ity and fruit may we not undeservedly promise ourselves from it? It is manifest, however, that this tradition is not *συστατικήν*, constitutive, but *ἐξηγητικήν*, explanatory, and that an illustrious advantage is received from it. First, it is manifest that it is explanatory; for whatever the Fathers teach by it, whatever they unanimously confirm and defend, they elicit from the Scriptures, recall to the Scriptures—

> —and show to be intimately joined with the Scriptures. Moreover, that a singular advantage is received from it will be freely conceded by all those who consider within themselves either how greatly it matters to hold the genuine force and power of the Scriptures, or how many arts have been employed to twist the heavenly oracles pertaining to the salvific will of God and the amplitude of the restored order into alien and perverse senses.

CCXIV.

COROLLARY IX.

Having set forth the consequences by which the way toward estimating, as is fitting, the doctrine of the Fathers and Catholic tradition is laid and leveled, I come to those things which I called *καταφατικά*, affirmative [1], and which pertain to this: that they exhibit and represent the unanimous faith and judgment of the Christian name as if depicted upon a certain tablet. Now the first thing which presents itself and comes to mind is of what kind that disposition must be believed to have been which then existed between God and our first parents, when these first came forth into the light and before they were turned away from God by transgression and guilt. But this is the concordant response of tradition and of all the Fathers [2]: that it must be believed to have been a disposition of a certain incredible love and eminent charity. God created man only when moved by love; it belonged to love that he increased man with the preternatural gifts of immortality and integrity; and it must be attributed to love that he enriched man with the supernatural ornaments of heavenly likeness, grace, and divine filiation. In this first stage of humanity, love alone reigned; and God, who is love, placed his glory in this: that he should disclose himself most splendidly as efficacious and beneficent love. He became known as efficacious and beneficent love in creating man; and he shone much more splendidly still as efficacious and beneficent love when he enriched the man created by him not only with native endowments, and those eminent, but also with others both—

[1] § CCV.
[2] §§ CLXXII–CLXXVI, CLXXVIII.

—preternatural and supernatural, to such a degree that in man there appeared a living likeness of himself, an adoptive son, and one destined for paternal beatitude.

CCXV.

COROLLARY X.

Adam sinned, and in him all humanity sinned. But when human nature had been infected with this original and common stain, that bond by which God was bound with humanity was immediately broken; and the twofold antecedent relation—on the one side of father, but on the other of son—was changed into the disposition and relation of a judge and of an accused party liable to guilt and punishment. For just as God, who before transgression and guilt bore the person of a father, after transgression and guilt assumed the person of a judge, and, having assumed it, condemned guilty humanity to death [1] and deprived it of preternatural and supernatural gifts; so humanity, which while still pure was related to God in the disposition of a son, when disfigured and corrupted underwent the person of an accused party, and, having lost the power [2] of entering upon the paternal inheritance, fell into the most wretched necessity of perishing. That is, when the first institution had been overturned by guilt and the crime of men, the state of misery succeeded the state of felicity; the order of severity and justice succeeded the order of benevolence and love; and the full and in every respect complete faculty of attaining the paternal inheritance degenerated into the sorrowful and bitter necessity of perishing.

CCXVI.

COROLLARY XI.

God removed the damage inflicted by human guilt, applied medicine to the lethal wound, averted the necessity of perishing, restored the opportunity and faculty of entering upon the inheritance, and in Christ—

—and through Christ restored his work and lost humanity. For, as the Catholic doctors testify with one mouth [1], God did not assume the person of a judge in such a way that he put off the person of a father; nor did he indulge justice to such a degree that he seemed

[1] §§ LXXVI, XCVIII, CXVIII, CXXXV, CXL, CLXXXIII.
[2] §§ CLVII–CLIX.
[1] §§ LXXV–LXXXIV, C, CIX, CXVI, CXVIII, CXXII, CXXXV, and passim in the commentary.

> forgetful of his work and his image. According to his justice he punished humanity which had wandered from the way, but according to his goodness he led it back into the way; he condemned all in Adam, but in turn absolved all in Christ; in the first man he proscribed all, deprived them of the grace of adoption, and stripped them of the faculty by which they might obtain the eternal inheritance; but in turn, in the second man, he recalled all and furnished all the opportunity of recovering adoption and salvation.

CCXVII.

COROLLARY XII.

Wherefore a twofold state of humanity after the original transgression must be accurately distinguished: one in Adam, the other in Christ; one with the work of man considered, and the other with the indulgence of intervening goodness considered; finally, one before God condemning humanity in Adam, and the other before God restoring humanity in Christ. For just as all humanity perished in Adam, and from him the state of perdition burst forth as from a corrupted fountain, so in Christ all humanity was restored, and from him the state of salvation flowed forth. Just as, with the work of man considered, absolutely every hope of salvation withered away, so, with the indulgence of intervening goodness considered, the hope of salvation blossomed again. And just as before God condemning humanity in Adam no one could be saved, so before God restoring humanity in Christ there is no one who cannot, and indeed ought not, promise himself life and safety.

CCXVIII.

COROLLARY XIII.

Since these two states are separated from one another by so great an interval, it must appear not only opportune but plainly necessary to choose suitable words by which each is designated by name. None more suitable occur than that the prior state should be called one of condemnation and hypothetical, but the latter one of restoration and absolute. And the prior state indeed is aptly called a state of condemnation and hypothetical, both because all men in Adam underwent a judgment of condemnation and because it would have existed unless mercy had

intervened through Christ [1]. But the latter is rightly named the state of restoration, and indeed absolute: of restoration, because it must be credited to God restoring on account of Christ; and absolute, because it exists in reality and is that in which the human race actually abides.

CCXIX.

COROLLARY XIV.

Moreover, these things are so arranged that they plainly show that the three states of humanity, and indeed most diverse ones, cannot be confounded without danger of error. For there is no one who does not understand how dangerous it is either not to distinguish the state before the fall from that which followed the fall, or to intermingle the state of condemnation and hypothetical with the state of restoration and absolute. But with this distinction established, everyone sees what must be answered to those asking of what kind that state is in which the human race is found. For it must be answered [2] that it is a state not hypothetical but absolute, not of condemnation and destruction but of restoration and salvation.

CCXX.

COROLLARY XV.

The account of this state must be investigated more deeply, and its nature declared more distinctly. Following the Fathers of the Church as our guides, and with Christian revelation carrying the torch before us, as is fitting, we shall accomplish this if first we inquire into its origin and then its manifold endowments and properties. And as regards the origin, this is the indubitable judgment of tradition [1]: no other principal and supreme cause of the restored state can be found and assigned than the merciful love of God toward the human race. Love, indeed, by which God, moved by his innate goodness, loved his image, although corrupted and depraved; but merciful love, because God was present to the wretched and provided for the unworthy. To this merciful love, as to the supreme fountain of restoration, the doctors of East and West unanimously appeal; this they extol; they proclaim the excess of benignity; they celebrate mercy with the highest praises; and, adhering to the Scriptures [2], just as they call God *ἀγάπην*, love, so

[1] § CLIX.
[2] Pp. 212, 246, 257, 280, 309, 334….
[1] Pp. 210, 224, 246, 297, 327, 339, 380, 389, 404….
[2] I John IV.8; Luke I.78; and II Cor. I.3.

they attribute to him *σπλάγχνα ἐλέους*, the bowels of mercy, and salute him as *τὸν πατέρα τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν καὶ Θεὸν πάσης παρακλήσεως*, the Father of mercies and God of all consolation.

CCXXI.

COROLLARY XVI.

From this principal cause of the restored order another cannot be separated, and that the meritorious cause, which is contained in the dispensation of the Only-begotten and in his blood poured forth. For God, such is his infinite perfection, could neither love corrupted humanity unless it were first fashioned anew, nor pity humanity liable to guilt and punishment unless satisfaction were made to offended and violated justice. Therefore, that he might commit to execution [3] *τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν—*

> *—αὐτοῦ*, the mystery of his will according to his good pleasure, he gave [1] *τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ*, his Only-begotten Son, as a redeemer to captives, an avenger to the oppressed, and the hope of life to the dead, who would bring aid to the needy, wipe away stains, blot out crimes, wash away vices, revive the divine likeness, restore the lost endowment, pay a most precious *λύτρον*, ransom, and become for all [2] *αἴτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου*, the cause of eternal salvation. Concerning this meritorious cause of the restored order, so many and such great testimonies recur in Christian monuments that scarcely any head of doctrine can be found either more frequently handed down or established by a fuller consensus. For the Roman prelates patronize this cause [3]; the Italians [4], Gauls [5], Spaniards [6], and African Fathers [7] assent to it; those who adorned the Churches of Egypt [8], of the East [9], of Asia, Thrace, and Pontus [10], and of Palestine [11] unanimously hand it down; so that this is the faith and com-

[3] Eph. I.9.
[1] John III.16.
[2] Heb. V.9.
[3] §§ CLVI–CLIX.
[4] §§ CXXXV–CXLV.
[5] §§ CXVII–CXXXII.
[6] §§ CXIII–CXVI.
[7] §§ XCIX–CXII.
[8] §§ LXXIII–LXXXIV.
[9] §§ CLXV–CLXXIX.
[10] §§ CLXXXII–CXCV.
[11] §§ CXCVIII–CCV.

mon profession of the entire Christian name: the order of restored humanity must be attributed to divine love and to divine mercy in Christ and through Christ.

CCXXII.

COROLLARY XVII.

If the meritorious cause of the restored order is considered a little more intimately, it cannot be doubtful that it is referred to God under a twofold *σχέσει*, relation or disposition. For it is referred to God as merciful and good, and therefore we read in Scripture [12], *οὕτως ἠγάπησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ—*

—*ἔδωκεν*, "God so loved the world that he gave his Only-begotten Son"; and again [1], *οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ*, "For God did not send his Son into the world that he might judge the world, but that the world might be saved through him"; and again [2], *διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, ἐν οἷς ἐπεσκέψατο ἡμᾶς ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους*, "through the bowels of the mercy of our God, in which the Orient from on high has visited us." Then it is referred to God as the vindicator of his laws and the defender of his justice, to which, among other things, these pertain [3]: without the shedding of blood remission does not occur, and hence it was necessary that Christ should appear for the destruction of sin through the oblation of himself; he himself bore our sins in his body upon the tree; in him we have redemption through his blood and the remission of sins; while we were still sinners, Christ died for us according to the appointed time; God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their offenses to them; it pleased the Father through him to reconcile all things unto himself, peace having been made through the blood of his cross; when we were enemies, having been reconciled, we shall be saved in his life; the Son of Man came to give his life as a redemption for many; and just as he came to give, so too he gave himself as a redemption for all, so that in him we have re-

[12] John III.16.

[1] Ibid., v. 17.

[2] Luke I.78.

[3] Heb. IX.21–26; I Pet. II.24; Col. I.14; Rom. V.8–9; II Cor. V.19; Col. I.19–22; Rom. V.10; Matt. XX.28; I Tim. II.6; Eph. I.7; I Cor. VII.23; and I Pet. I.18–19.

> demption through his blood; we were bought with a price, and were redeemed not with corruptible gold or silver but with the precious blood of Christ as of a lamb immaculate and undefiled. Whence, if that question which the Philistines once proposed to David [4] were proposed to us—"How can we appease our lord?"—nothing would be at hand for us to answer except in the name of Jesus. For there is no salvation in any other [5], nor is there another name under heaven given to men in which we must be saved.

Now if the meritorious cause of restoration is considered in the former manner and compared with God, who commended his charity toward us [6], by which he did not spare his own Son but—

> —delivered him up for us all, nothing is more manifest than that Christ and his *οἰκονομίαν*, dispensation, are the gift of merciful love. But if it is considered in the latter manner and referred to God, who made him who had not known sin to be sin for us, that we might be made the justice of God in him [1], and who placed upon him the iniquities of us all, it appears clearly that both Christ himself and his dispensation are the price paid to offended justice, an incitement of mercy, and an infinite merit of divine love toward us. From these things we finally attain this: that the order of restoration, proceeding from love and mercy, most fittingly agrees with the laws of justice and returns again into love and mercy.

CCXXIII.

COROLLARY XIX.

When both the principal and the meritorious cause of the restored order have been ascertained, it follows of its own accord that the endowments and properties of each should be declared in order. But among the endowments and properties of the principal cause and of merciful love, that one excels and is eminent which is contained in universality of time and persons. The Syrian, Greek, and Latin Fathers inculcate this [2]; they adorn this with many things; and they confirm this by a manifold kind of arguments. For they confirm it by perspicuous oracles of the divine writings; they confirm it by considerations taken from the concord and

[4] I Reg. XXIX.4.
[5] Acts IV.12.
[6] Rom. V.8, compare VIII.32.
[1] II Cor. V.21, compare Isa. LIII.6.
[2] Pp. 203, 206, 224, 246, 255, 284, 331, 355, 380, 389, 417….

harmony *ἐκ δογμάτων*, of dogmas; and they confirm it by reasons drawn from the innate character of God and the condition of humanity. Wherefore this theorem of Christian tradition is ratified and fixed: that the restoration of humanity began together with its fall [3], and that absolutely no man ever came forth into the light who did not pertain to the state of restored humanity.

CCXXIV.

COROLLARY XX.

Lest these things be capable of being perverted and twisted into senses alien to the truth, the witnesses of Christian tradition left nothing undone in order to define their force and power most accurately. What universality of time, therefore, is to be understood according to these authors? Namely, such a universality as excludes absolutely no age and no stage of humanity [1]: not that which preceded the universal flood; not that which elapsed until the law was given; not that which reached unto Christ; not that which will run on until the consummation of the age. But concerning the universality of persons, what must be established and believed? It must be believed that all have been so provided for by merciful love that each individual has been provided for no less. It must be believed that the restored order so pertains to all humanity that it pertains equally to each individual. It must be believed that such is the compass of the restored order that it embraces all and each alike.

CCXXV.

COROLLARY XXI.

Another endowment follows the universal amplitude of the restored order, which we may not unsuitably call its force and efficacy. This is contained in the idea and notion of restoration itself; this is the necessary fruit of love; this cannot be torn away from mercy; and the Catholic Fathers with one mind and one mouth ascribe this to the restored order [2]. For suppose that you question them, either all and conjointly or individually and separately, as to what kind of thing the restored order must be judged: whether sterile and unfruitful, or on the contrary fruitful and active. From all alike and from each you will hear—

[3] Pp. 360, 362, 378, 399, 401….

[1] Thus they teach unanimously in the places which we have just indicated.

[2] §§ LXXIV, LXXVI, LXXVIII, LXXXIV, C, CX, CXV, and a hundred times elsewhere.

> —that a sterile and unfruitful restoration cannot even be conceived in the mind; that torpid love is not love; that mercy bursts forth by its native weight into manifold effects; and that the state of restoration is therefore fruitful and active.

CCXXVI.

COROLLARY XXII.

Just as the efficacy of the restored order must be estimated and measured almost entirely from those things which the good and merciful God works toward men, so it can neither be fully known nor clearly defined unless it is considered in a threefold order. For it must be considered according to the whole amplitude with which it is endowed. But its amplitude extends to a threefold order: supernatural, preternatural, and natural. Therefore, the divine works according to this threefold order must be recognized and brought forth into the light, that the efficacy of the restored state may become fully and perfectly known. Now the proper and eminent work of the supernatural order is grace, by which nature is raised up, elevated, and enriched with a new and heavenly power. Grace, therefore, is that work which must first be investigated and weighed. But concerning it the concordant judgment and universal vote of Christian tradition returns to this [1]: that from the fountain of divine benignity the waters of heavenly grace have flowed at every time and unto absolutely all men; that their abundance was varied and manifold, but always such as would suffice for abolishing guilt, recovering the divine likeness, and, together with it, the conjoined merit of entering upon the eternal inheritance.

Eusebius of Alexandria [2] seems to me to have comprehended this solemn doctrine, established by the unanimous consensus of the Churches, in few words indeed but altogether clearly, in the fifth—

> —of those sermons which the most illustrious man and most eminent Cardinal Angelo Mai published only in Greek. For, discoursing [1] *περὶ τοῦ ἔχοντος χάριν μεταδοῦναι τῷ μὴ ἔχοντι, καὶ περὶ πρεσβυτέρων*, concerning the fact that he who has grace ought to impart it to him who lacks it, and concerning presbyters, he thus begins: *Φιλάνθρωπος Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν οἰκτείρων τὸ γένος ἡμῶν,*

[1] Pp. 19, 32, 39, 109, 112, 121, 271.

[2] Concerning Eusebius, Bishop of Alexandria, the age in which he flourished, and the authority which he obtained in the Church, compare what His Eminence Mai writes in the preface to vol. IX of the *Spicilegium Romanum*.

[1] Serm. V, p. 659.

οὐκ ἀφίησι πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἄμοιρον τῆς αὐτοῦ χάριτος· οὐ γὰρ μόνον δικαίοις δίδοται χάρις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἁμαρτωλοῖς· ἐπειδὴ ἄφθονός ἐστιν, καὶ ἀπροσωπόληπτος καὶ ἀνατέλλει τὸν ἥλιον ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθούς, καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους, καὶ θέλει πάντας ἀνθρώπους σωθῆναι· καὶ γὰρ μὴ παρορᾷ τὸν ἁμαρτωλόν, ἀλλὰ δίδωσιν κἀκείνῳ μικρὰν χάριν, ἵνα τιμήσῃ τὸν δεδωκότα, καὶ εὐχαριστήσῃ αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐπιστρέψας μετανοήσῃ· ἐὰν δὲ καὶ λαβὼν τὴν χάριν, τοῖς αὐτοῦ ἔτι μείνῃ κακοῖς, τότε λοιπὸν ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἣν ἔχει χάριν, καὶ κατακριθήσεται εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός, διότι οὐκ ἐτίμησε τὴν τιμὴν καὶ τὸν τιμήσαντα· καὶ πληροῦται ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸ γεγραμμένον, ἄνθρωπος ἐν τιμῇ ὢν οὐ συνῆκε, παρεσυνεβλήθη τοῖς κτήνεσι τοῖς ἀνοήτοις, καὶ ὡμοιώθη αὐτοῖς. Rendered into Latin [2], these words yield this meaning: "Our Savior, a lover of men, pitying our race, leaves no man without a share in his grace. For grace is conferred not only upon the just but also upon sinners themselves, since God is liberal and free from respect of persons, causes his sun to rise upon the evil and the good, rains upon the just and the unjust, and wills all men to be saved. He in no way neglects the sinner, but imparts a small grace even to him, that he may honor the giver, give thanks to him, and, having been converted, return to soundness. But if, even after receiving grace, he persists hardened in his crimes, then indeed he will also be deprived of the grace which he has and will be sentenced to the Gehenna of fire, because he honored neither the honor nor him who honored him—"

—and concerning him will be fulfilled what is written: 'Man, when he was in honor, did not understand; he was compared to senseless beasts and became like them.'" Here: 1) the principal origin of the restored order is disclosed and is placed in merciful love; 2) the meritorious origin is also disclosed and is taught to be situated in the salvific dispensation of Christ; 3) the universal amplitude of restoration is established; 4) its efficacy in the supernatural order is shown; and 5) all things are drawn from the divine writings and proved by their authority.

[2] "Would that," says the distinguished editor in the note appended to p. 658, "both leisure had been mine and space in this volume, so that a Latin translation of these sermons of Eusebius, for those who do not know Greek, might not be lacking! Meanwhile I hope that there will be some studious and pious pupil of the Greek language who will wish to exercise himself in this useful labor."

CCXXVII.

COROLLARY XXIII.

The diseases by which humanity, cast down from its original dignity, is sick and most miserably afflicted are reduced to ignorance and infirmity: first, to ignorance, overwhelmed by which man either does not see what is in reality true and useful, or sees it in a malignant light, or most easily confounds it with the appearance of truth and the shadow of utility; then, to infirmity, which, having arisen from unbridled cupidity, drives man headlong, subjects him to the senses, and turns him away from those things which are honorable and eternal and are perceived by the mind and soul alone. Before the fatal ruin, provision was made against each disease by a twofold preternatural gift. Provision was made by knowledge, by which the mind, imbued with necessary and opportune notions, both attained the truth of its own accord and distinguished it from error and falsehood without any difficulty. Provision was made by integrity, by which the lowest and brute part of man, restrained and bound, neither plotted against the superior and rational part nor hindered it from freely and unencumberedly pursuing whatever is consonant with virtue and duty. But what shall we judge to have now been effected by restoration? Namely, if we place any faith in the Fathers [1], it has been effected by restoration that the good and merciful God is so present to men by his light and his power that none, provided they will and strive vigorously, suffers detriment to salvation either from ignorance or from infirmity—

> —For he is present to men by his light and dispels harmful ignorance; he is also present by his power and strengthens enervated and broken humanity. Therefore, that efficacy of the restored state which manifests itself in the supernatural order through graces opportunely distributed is also wonderfully unfolded in the preternatural order through aids supplied against ignorance and infirmity.

CCXXVIII.

COROLLARY XXIV.

I come to the natural order, and, reading the footprints of the Fathers [1], I observe that it must be considered in a twofold manner: in itself and *ὄντως*, really; and then *συγκριτικῶς*, comparatively, in relation to that form and plan of provi-

[1] Pp. 351, 403….

[1] Pp. 108, 122, 126, 128.

dence which God chose according to his merciful benignity. And considered in itself and *ὄντως*, really, it must be regarded as a most splendid hymn by which the divine glory and divine majesty, perpetually celebrated, shine forth, while men are most sweetly drawn to contemplate, desire, and love the fountain of all truth, goodness, and beauty. For to this belong the heavens, to this the earth, and to this those things which, both in the heavens and on the earth, either appear constantly or succeed one another in a certain wondrous variety according to fixed and established laws. And this must both be retained the more firmly and affirmed the more confidently, inasmuch as the Fathers testify with a fuller consensus that the plan of providence chosen by God is such that the interior speech of the Creator coheres with the external voice of creatures, and that with the corporeal light which shines before the eyes there is joined an incorporeal light which irradiates souls and suffuses the mind. That very light which John [2] calls *τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον*, "the true light which enlightens every man coming into the world," and of which this is the elegant paraphrase of Nonnus:

ὡς ἄνερα πάντα καθαίρει
Πνευματικαῖς ἀκτῖσι καταυγάζων φύσιν ἀνδρῶν,
"who cleanses every man,
illuminating the nature of men with spiritual rays."

That very light of which Justin makes mention [1], when, refuting those who pronounced the ancient generations of men guiltless for the reason that Christ had not come before one hundred and fifty years ago, he writes: *τὸν Χριστὸν πρωτότοκον τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι ἐδιδάχθημεν, καὶ προεμηνύσαμεν λόγον ὄντα, οὗ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων μετέσχε.* "We have learned that Christ is the Firstborn of God and that Reason of which the whole race of men is a participant, and we declared it above" [2]. Such, therefore, is the efficacy of restoration, such its force and abundance, that it pervades and informs even the natural order itself and renders it an instrument suited to producing and promoting salvation.

CCXXIX.

COROLLARY XXV.

The riches and abundance of restoration extend so widely that they are not contained within the circuit, though most ample, of the threefold supernatural, preternatural, and natural order. For they pour themselves forth more widely still and

[2] John I.9.
[1] *Apolog.* I, n. 46.
[2] Ibid., n. 32, and *Apolog.* II, nn. 8, 12, 13.

comprehend, besides, a twofold order: first, the order of those evils which we call physical, and then the order of those punishments which we call temporal. For it is a most fully attested doctrine of the Christian name [3] that physical evils no less than the temporal punishments of this present mortality are so tempered by God that, as far as pertains to him, they are at length directed toward ethical good and the utility of salvation. God permits physical evils and inflicts temporal punishments according to the exact rule of his equity and justice; but whether he permits the former—

> —or inflicts the latter, so long as men live he finally looks to this: that they either return to soundness or become better and be aided in attaining salvation. But if physical evils themselves and temporal punishments are subject to the power and efficacy of the restored state, and if the force and *ἐνέργεια*, operation, of restoration converts physical evils themselves and temporal punishments into utility and salvific good, will there be those who can doubt the sincerity and efficacy of the restored order? Certainly, in this administration of physical evils and temporal punishments are contained both a sign and an effect of sincere and active restoration: a sign indeed, as will easily become known to anyone who looks into the matter a little more attentively; but an effect, because the reason for such an administration can be deduced from no other source than sincere and active restoration.

CCXXX.

COROLLARY XXVI.

A no less weighty argument for this active restoration is gathered from that which the Fathers confirm in frequent and repeated statements [1]: that the order in which men live is such as affords hope of salvation and permits no place for despair or excuse. For if they are asked whence they know that hope of salvation pertains to the present order, and that despair and excuses cannot be composed with it, this is the one response of all: that they know it because they learned from the Scriptures and received from the Apostles that no native powers indeed inhere in lost and ruined men in which they may confide, and no strength by which they may sustain hope; nevertheless, there is reason for them to hope, not to cast down their spirits, and not to reckon themselves safe and secure under the excuse of weakness. For God is at hand to bring aid, to drive away the darkness and supply

[3] Pp. 163, 169, 226, 278, 312, 318, 334, 340, 413….
[1] Pp. 128, 176, 177, 292, 305, 327….

strength to the languishing, to lead back the wayward and wandering, and to invite—

> —and draw all toward that which is good and holy. There are innumerable arts [1] by which God applies medicine to all, and with paternal zeal he himself strives that an opportunity may be available to each by which they may obtain the most blessed adoption of sons.

CCXXXI.

COROLLARY XXVII.

Thus far we have spoken concerning the things themselves; it now remains that we speak concerning the formulas by which they are customarily expressed and explained. Now among the formulas that one is most commonly used by the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers [2] by which they designate the principal cause of restoration and merciful love with the appellation of the first and antecedent will. Concerning this appellation, indeed, in order that its full force may become known, these things must be investigated before the rest: 1) whence the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers derived it; 2) of what kind they handed down the character and nature of the first will to be; 3) what fountain they assigned to it; and 4) what endowments and properties they ascribed to it. Now, that I may begin from what I placed first, whoever weighs the testimonies, very numerous in number and evident in perspicuity, which we have reported [3], will be wholly unable to deny that the appellation of the first and antecedent will was drawn from those things which either stand forth in the divine writings, or are elicited from them when compared with one another, or a more inward consideration of the divine nature, such as it shines forth in the Scriptures, supplies of its own accord. And Catholic doctors used it precisely because they judged it to be contained *ἀμέσως*, immediately, in the Scriptures; because they judged that not a few testimonies of the Scriptures could neither be reduced to harmony nor skillfully explained unless a first and antecedent will were established; and because they finally judged the divine nature to be depicted in the Scriptures with such colors that a first and antecedent will must necessarily be attributed to it. Therefore, no more excellent or more noble origin could belong to this appellation, since it was—

> —drawn from those things which Scripture comprehends [1] *ἀμέσως*, immediately, or *ἐμμέσως*, mediately.

[1] Pp. 175–192….

[2] Pp. 9 ff., 22 ff., 35 ff.

[3] §§ II–XII, XVII, XXI, XXIV, XXX, CLXXIV….

[1] Francis Buddeus speaks to the point in *Institutt. theolog. dogmat.*, lib. II, cap. I, § XXIX: "There occur in sacred Scripture most evident declarations of the Deity, by which he expressly professes

CCXXXII.

COROLLARY XXVIII.

As regards the character and nature of the first and antecedent will, it can be brought into controversy whether the will is proper and interior, or, on the contrary, exterior and metaphorical. But the Fathers resolve a controversy of this kind with such perspicuity and such weight of statements that they cut off every occasion for doubt, even the slightest. For no less do the words by which they distinguish and name it demonstrate that the first and antecedent will must be believed not improper but proper and interior, not metaphorical but true, than does the exquisite abundance and copiousness of *περιφράσεων*, circumlocutions, by which they embellish and declare its character and disposition [2]. Certainly, both the words are such, and the circumlocutions are so arranged, that they cannot be transferred to an improper and metaphorical will unless the usage of speech is overturned.

CCXXXIII.

COROLLARY XXIX.

This will be understood much more evidently still if the mind is turned toward the fountain from which the orthodox Fathers derive the first and antecedent will [1]. For, adhering to the Scriptures with the greatest fidelity, they first deny that the first and antecedent will is of such a kind that its principal cause ought or can be sought outside God himself. Then, affirmatively, they establish that the sincere and native fountain of this will is *τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, τοῦ Θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίαν, τὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους Θεοῦ, καὶ τὸν ὑπερβάλλοντα πλοῦτον τῆς χάριτος*, the good pleasure of his will, the riches of his grace, the benignity of God toward men, the bowels of divine mercy, and

---

that he wills the salvation of all men, I Tim. II.4–6; that he does not will anyone to perish, but that all should be converted and live, Ezek. XVIII.23; XXXIII.11; I Pet. III.9. Again, there are other declarations by which God likewise expressly professes that he wills those to be saved who will believe in Christ and persevere in that faith unto the end, but that the rest should pay the eternal penalties of their unbelief and sins, John III.16–18; Mark XVI.16. How, therefore, will you reconcile these things with one another, unless you conceive the will of God in one manner without a condition, and in another manner as considered with that condition? And this, indeed, is what we mean when we distinguish the will of God into antecedent and consequent."

[2] Pp. 23, 31, 35, 40….

[1] §§ VI–VIII, XVII, XXIV…., where oracles are brought forward from Ps. CXLIV.9; Wisd. XI.24–27; John III.16; II Cor. I.3; and I John IV.8, so that the origin of the first will may be disclosed.

the superabundant vein of grace [2]. Who, then, would judge a will flowing from this fountain to be not true and intimate, but improper and metaphorical? Plainly no one who perceives what follows from each thing and what things mutually succeed one another.

CCXXXIV.

COROLLARY XXX.

Now if the antecedent will is interior, innate, and proper, by what marks shall we judge that it is especially distinguished, and with what properties adorned? This is the constant decree of Christian tradition [3]: that among the marks by which the antecedent will is distinguished and the ornaments by which it shines, infinite amplitude and absolute universality are eminent. For concerning this amplitude and absolute universality there are at hand innumerable—

> —testimonies of tradition, and Christian doctors so patronize it that they not only affirm and repeat it, but also defend and vindicate it by the authority of the divine oracles and by arguments gathered from every quarter. Nor, certainly, is this wonderful, since the closest nexus of things demands that the antecedent will extend no less widely than the merciful love of God is extended. But merciful love has no other limits than those by which the human race is circumscribed.

CCXXXV.

COROLLARY XXXI.

With universal amplitude there is joined and associated another excellence of the antecedent will, than which none is more illustrious and none established by the Fathers [1] with fuller consensus, and which is situated in this: that the antecedent will is and is called serious, efficacious, and active. For God [2], who is love and the Father of mercies, does not mock the wretched, does not act with dissimulation, and what, moved by his benignity, he wills, he wills seriously and sincerely. Hence he deters and calls all away from vices, although impious and overwhelmed with crimes; he exhorts all most lovingly to return to good fruit;

[2] Eph. I.5; II.4–5, 7; Rom. V.8; Tit. III.4; Luke I.78; and John III.16.

[3] §§ VIII–XI ff.

[1] Pp. 42, 45, 47, 49, 51, 303, 336 ff.

[2] God is called love, I John IV.16; and *ὁ πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν*, the Father of mercies, II Cor. I.3.

he is an aid to all; he rejoices in repentance from evils; and he covers, preserves, and seals all with his grace and his protection. He premoves them to ask and aids those who ask; he arouses them to seek and meets those who seek; he invites them to knock and most benignly opens to those who knock [3]. If the *εὐνοῦχος καὶ δυνάστης*, eunuch and potentate, of the queen of the Ethiopians gives himself to reading the Scriptures, Philip the deacon is immediately commanded to be present to expound them to him in order; and if Cornelius the *ἑκατοντάρχης*, centurion, importunes God with prayers, an angel is sent at once to signify to him what teacher he ought to summon to himself. It is thus true and established that the antecedent and salvific will is sincere, active, and efficacious.

CCXXXVI.

COROLLARY XXXII.

There is no more splendid argument for this active efficacy than that which is taken from the dispensation of Christ and is joined with his passion and death. For this was always the concordant doctrine and ratified dogma of all the Fathers expounding the Scriptures [1]: that the incarnation of the Only-begotten, his dispensation, the death which he exhausted, and the blood which he poured forth must be believed to be so many fruits which proceeded from the antecedent divine will. For why did the eternal Word of the Father come into the world and assume flesh? Because God wills the salvation of men. Why did he put on the form of a servant and empty himself? That he might obey the paternal love toward men. Why was he obedient even unto death, and, spent by sufferings and bruised by wounds, breathe forth his most holy soul upon the altar of the cross? Because God so loved the world that he did not spare even his own Son. Therefore, it is no more permissible to doubt the efficacy of the antecedent will than it is permissible to doubt whether the tree which produces sweetest fruits is fruitful, or whether the fountain from which a most copious river bursts forth is rich.

CCXXXVII.

COROLLARY XXXIII.

But that singular and altogether eminent accord between the Father, who gave the Only-begotten for us, and the Only-begotten, who offered himself for us,

[3] Matt. VII.8; Acts VIII.26–27; and X.4–5.

[1] Pp. 210, 224, 246, 297, 327, 359….

must not be passed over in silence. For just as the Father willingly sent the Only-begotten, so the Only-begotten who was sent could most truly say of himself [2]: "Therefore the Father loves me, because I lay down my life and shall take it up again. No one takes it from me, but I lay it down *ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ*, of myself—"

> —and I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again." Nor did Paul hesitate to write of him [1]: "I live in the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and delivered himself for me"; "Walk in love, as Christ also loved us and delivered himself for us, an oblation and sacrifice to God for an odor of sweetness"; and again, "Husbands, love your wives as Christ also loved the Church and delivered himself for her." Now, just as it must be attributed to the love of the Father and to the antecedent will joined with it that he gave the Only-begotten for men, so it must be referred back to the entirely similar love of the Only-begotten that he underwent death for men and redeemed them. To this pertain both those things which we have just reported and those which we immediately add [2]: "This is my commandment, that you love one another as I have loved you. Greater love than this no one has, that a man lay down his life for his friends." Whence John [3] prays peace and grace for the seven Churches of Asia "from him who is, and who was, and who is to come, and from Jesus Christ . . . who loved us and washed us from our sins in his blood."

CCXXXVIII.

COROLLARY XXXIV.

Concerning this redemption through Christ, two things are chiefly customarily investigated, one of which is referred to its amplitude, and the other to its power and efficacy. But as regards its amplitude, such is the perspicuity of Christian tradition [4], such its constancy in affirming, that those who do not wish to resist it frontally must necessarily confess that ruin and redemption are comprehended within the same limits. For no kind of formula can be devised, no argument which the witnesses of the Christian faith did not employ, in order to persuade men of the infinite and universal amplitude of redemption. Wherefore—

[2] John X.17–18.
[1] Gal. II.20; Eph. V.2, 25.
[2] John XV.13–14.
[3] Apoc. I.5.
[4] Pp. 203, 206, 224, 246, 255, 284, 331, 355, 380, 389….

—Aegidius Hunnius [1], an author otherwise not good, wrote in accordance with their mind and judgment: "Just as God seriously desires the eternal salvation of all men, so he sent his Son not to some one little part of the world, but to the whole world, or to the whole human race, so that, having been made man, he might suffer, die, and become a victim for the sins of all and each of men, with no one taken away or excluded. He also, having suffered, been crucified, and died for each and all the sins of each and all men, produced and acquired a most full satisfaction and propitiation for restoring the salvation of the whole world." Only in this manner does the will of the Son agree with the will of the Father; only in this manner does the love of the Son correspond to the paternal love toward men; only in this manner is redemption made equal with restoration; and only in this manner is it properly understood how it comes about that Christ is called [2] *μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων*, the mediator of God and men, infinitely and without qualification.

CCXXXIX.

COROLLARY XXXV.

Since redemption can be believed universal in two manners—first, considered in itself and *ὄντως*, really, according to the value of the price paid; and then comparatively, considered also in the offering of that same price for the advantage and utility of all—it matters greatly for a sincere exposition of the faith and an accurate understanding of the truth to know whether redemption ought to be judged and called universal in one of the two manners or in both together. For an immense difference exists between the two manners, since a redemption which is believed universal only *ὄντως*, really, and objectively, is of itself sterile and unfruitful; but that which was offered for all and expended for the common salvation of all cannot but be fruitful and active. Now the judgment of those of orthodox name [3]—

—a judgment not doubtful and variable but fixed and constant, returns to this: that redemption is plainly rightly believed and called universal if regard is had to the price paid and it is considered *ὄντως*, really, and objectively; but that absolutely all those are most gravely deceived and shamefully depart from the things contained in the

[1] *De provident. et aeterna praedestinat.*, p. 163.
[2] I Tim. II.5; II Tim. I.9; John I.17.
[3] Pp. 329, 365, 402, 410….

> Scriptures who do not at the same time confess and hold that redemption is further universal and called so because it was offered for all, because it reconciled God to all, rendered him benign, and most ready to bestow all those things without which salvation cannot be attained and with which it most certainly can. Wherefore the universality of redemption is of such a kind that it coheres with universal efficacy, offering, and power.

CCXL.

COROLLARY XXXVI.

These things having been established and explained, as was fitting, the fullest satisfaction can be given to those asking of what kind the true state and real condition of the human race must finally be judged. For if the merciful love of God is universal and efficacious; if the antecedent and likewise salvific will joined with it is universal and efficacious; and if the redemption procured by the death of Christ shines with the same endowments of universality and efficacy, no one fails to see that these things are such that neither the state of restoration nor the universal condition of salvation can be separated from them. For the state and condition of humanity necessarily borrow and take their account and appellation from the will of God and of his Christ. Since, therefore, the will of each is benign and merciful and looks to this, that it may raise up the fallen posterity of Adam and restore that which was lost, it appears clearer than light that the state of humanity is restored and its condition salvific. The Fathers of the Church also signify this [1] when they disclose the difference in providence between fallen humanity and the rebellious nature of the angels and investigate and propose the most wise causes of this difference. For they hand down that God assumed no other person toward the rebellious angels than that of a judge—

> —and discharged no other function than that of most just condemnation; but toward men he assumed the person of a judge in such a way that he softened its rigor by the benignity of a father and decreed medicine and restoration in Christ.

[1] Pp. 212, 246, 257, 280, 309, 334, 413….

CCXLI.

COROLLARY XXXVII.

Now two characters of this restored state must chiefly be weighed, one of which is contained in negation and the other in affirmation. The negative character pertains to this: that the state of restoration is to be judged immune and free from the necessity of perishing. But the affirmative returns to this: that all whom the restored order comprehends are endowed with the power and faculty by which they may conquer the diseases contracted, drive away the darkness of ignorance, extinguish the flames of cupidity, recover soundness, and, increased in liberty, enjoy the heavenly and paternal goods of the sons of God. Moreover, for each character, both the negative and the affirmative—both that which excludes the necessity of perishing and the other which consists in the faculty of obtaining salvation—there are at hand as many witnesses [1] as have recorded in their works the unanimous profession of Christians.

CCXLII.

COROLLARY XXXVIII.

Just as there are chiefly two characters of the restored state, so there are chiefly two things which are joined with them by an inward and most close nexus. First, the universality of grace is joined with them; then, the theorem than which none is more pleasing: that there is no adult who is necessarily condemned on account of the original transgression and the guilt contracted from it. And in very truth, that I may begin from the universality of grace, which Christian—

> —antiquity confirmed with such perspicuity of statements [1], I would have readers consider within their minds that neither can the necessity of perishing be removed nor the faculty of attaining salvation be conferred unless grace is dispensed from heaven, by which diseases are healed, the bonds of servitude are broken, and powers are imparted by which those things can be performed which pertain to the order of piety and salvation. For what the conjunction of the soul with the body is within the limits of the natural order, that very thing the intercourse of man with God through grace claims for itself with respect to the supernatural order. Whence there is no more

[1] Pp. 230, 314, 333, 338, 362, 377, 381….

[1] §§ XLVII, LXXII, LXXXIV, XCIX, CXII, CXIV, CXVII, CXXXV, CLVI, CLXV, CLXXIX, CLXXXII, CXCVIII, CCV.

need of that conjunction in order that man may be judged exempt from the necessity of dying and endowed with all those things without which the offices of the natural order cannot be fulfilled, than there is need of this intercourse lest man be subjected to the necessity of perishing and lack all those things without which the things comprehended within the compass of the supernatural order cannot even be attained. If, therefore, to the characters of the restored state pertain, on the one side, immunity from the necessity of perishing and, on the other, the faculty of attaining salvation, the universal amplitude of grace will also pertain to that same state. Once this has been admitted and proved, that also follows which we proposed in the second place as cohering with the state of restoration. For if, by the innate account of the restored state, grace is universal, and if all men live in the state of restoration, certainly all adults, although infected with the original stain, nevertheless have grace ready at hand, by which, either immediately or by certain degrees, they may wipe away the stain, wash away defilements, and obtain the dignity of adoption. But who does not perceive that it is wholly impossible to reconcile with this opportunity and presence of grace the view that even one of the adults necessarily perishes on account of original guilt? Who does not perceive the doctrine of the Fathers to be most true, that the original transgression harms only those among adults who spurn the benefits received from God [2]? And who does not perceive that they handed down with the highest truth that abundant provision was made by the merciful God, through the obedience of the second Adam, for absolutely all the evils inflicted upon humanity by the transgression of the first Adam—

—and foreseen? It must therefore remain ratified and fixed that the universal amplitude of grace is associated by the closest bonds with the state of restoration; but that it is most especially alien to the account and character of that same state that even one who is master of himself and endowed with the use of reason should perish on this account, and necessarily perish, because he contracted the original stain.

[2] Pp. 360, 362, 379, 399, 401….

CCXLIII.

COROLLARY XXXIX.

The necessity of perishing having been excluded, the power of attaining salvation having been asserted, and the origin from which each must be derived having been disclosed, it is not only expedient but altogether necessary, lest in an inquiry of the greatest importance we be deceived by a preposterous confusion of the most diverse things, that we distinguish from the attainment of salvation itself the power and faculty of obtaining it. Thus no one fails to know that there is an immense interval by which potentiality and the act of potentiality differ from one another, and that plainly different conditions are required for constituting potentiality and for its act and completion. But the interval and distinction which separate these things likewise divide and separate from one another the attainment of salvation and the faculty and opportunity of attaining it. The former can neither be thought in the soul nor conceived in the mind without the latter; but the latter without the former is both properly understood by the soul, and nothing prevents it from subsisting divided from the former.

CCXLIV.

COROLLARY XL.

In order that this real distinction, and its appositeness to the present matter, may shine forth more clearly, it will help not a little to have observed what is the cause both of the power of attaining salvation and of the attainment of it, and what conditions are necessarily demanded for effecting each. Therefore, if we give ear to the Fathers—

> —[1], the cause of that faculty by which we are rendered capable of obtaining salvation is situated outside us, and is wholly contained in the restored order, in redemption through Christ, in the antecedent will of God, and in his merciful love. Do you ask whence there is present to us men, as many as we are, the power of attaining salvation? The Fathers answer with one mouth that it is present from no other source than those things which we have enumerated. They answer that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, though in a diverse manner, are its authors: the Father, who loves and gives the Son, is its author; the Son, who loves and intervenes as *μεσίτης*, mediator, is its author; and the Holy Spirit, who loves and pours

[1] §§ LXXIII, LXXV, LXXVII, CVIII, CXV….

forth salvific grace upon the whole human race, is its author. But the same Fathers are witnesses that the cause to which the attainment of salvation is owed is neither one nor solely divine. For if it were one and solely divine, all would necessarily be saved [2]; and if it were one and solely divine, provision might indeed seem to have been made for the eudaimonic good of men, but not likewise for their moral good and virtue [3]. Therefore, the cause with which the attainment of salvation is joined as its proper and native effect is twofold: the one principal and divine, the other subordinate and human. The former is contained *ἐμμέσως*, mediately, in the antecedent will, and *ἀμέσως*, immediately, in grace, which accompanies the efficacy of the antecedent will; but the latter is the free cooperation of men itself, by which they do not repel God when he arouses them, hear him when he calls, and follow him when he goes before them. Therefore, the faculty of attaining salvation and its attainment cannot be compared *γενετικῶς*, according to their genesis, without their distinction appearing most manifestly. This is apprehended with equal evidence from the conditions which must conspire to effect the power of salvation and its attainment. For to effect the power of salvation the antecedent will, furnished with those endowments which we have vindicated for it, is necessary and suffices; but for attaining salvation there is need that the industry and diligent zeal of men be joined together with the antecedent will.

CCXLV.

COROLLARY XLI.

Things which are distinct and diverse in themselves can, and indeed also demand to, be expressed by distinct and diverse words. For it is no more fitting that ideas should suitably correspond to things than that signs should suitably correspond to ideas. Since, therefore, the cause from which the faculty of attaining salvation flows forth is one thing, and that from which the attainment of salvation itself must be derived is another, it is altogether expedient that each should be signified by proper and distinct words. Now it was a received custom among the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers [1] that they should call the prior cause the divine and antecedent will, but should name the latter the divine-human and consequent

[2] Pp. 3–22….
[3] Pp. 293, 298, 339, 416….
[1] Pp. 23, 31, 35, 41, 173….

will. There is reason, therefore, that we too should use formulas of this kind and properly retain their force and signification.

CCXLVI.

COROLLARY XLII.

But since almost everything concerning the divine cause and the antecedent will has already been treated, in order that we may come in order to those things which perhaps still remain, those things which are referred to the divine-human cause and the consequent will must be explained beforehand. This task will certainly have been satisfied if it becomes known with fitting perspicuity whence the appellation of the consequent will flowed, what its origin ought to be believed, and what endowments and properties belong to it. Now as regards the fountain of the appellation, there is no doubt that it is not found *αὐτολέξει*, verbatim, in the Scriptures, but that it is nevertheless found *δυνάμει*, in force and power. Certainly, the Fathers drew the appellation of the second and consequent will [2] from the same fountain from which they derived the very division—

> —of the divine will into first and second, into antecedent and consequent. But they derived this from no other source than from the oracles of the Scriptures suitably and diligently compared. Therefore, the appellation of the second and consequent will is commended under a twofold title: first, by the authority of those who used it; and then by the authority of the Scriptures from which they drew it.

[2] §§ III–VII, XI, XVII, XXI, XXIV ff. To this pertain the things which Laurence von Mosheim writes in *Elementa theologiae dogmaticae*, P. III, cap. III, sect. I, membr. I, p. 230: "The words of John III.16 are most worthy of note: 'God so loved the world that he gave his Only-begotten Son, that every—' "

> —one who believes in him should not perish but have eternal life.' In these words lies concealed that twofold theological proposition of which we have spoken. Christ states the first proposition, 'The grace of God is universal,' thus: 'God loved the world.' Here 'world' is put for the whole human race, the container for the contained. Christ therefore says that the love of God regards all rational inhabitants of the earth; hence it is universal. The other proposition is, 'The effective grace of God is particular': 'All who believe in the Son of God do not perish, but have eternal life.' Here we have the consequent will. For effective grace, or the benefit of eternal life, is restricted to those alone who will believe. Whoever do not believe are not the object of the effective love of God, although they are the object of affective grace."

CCXLVII.

COROLLARY XLIII.

The fountain of the appellation having been disclosed, four things above the rest must be established concerning the origin of the consequent will [1]. First, it must be established that the consequent will is a proper and interior will, not improper and metaphorical. Then it must be established that the supreme origin of this will must be derived from the fact that God is *οὐσιωδῶς*, essentially, just, that he performs the office and assumes the person of a judge, and that he administers distributive justice most holily. Next it must be established that the consequent will is so constituted that the eternal foreknowledge of those things which men will freely do cannot be separated from it. And finally it must be established that there is something innate in God from which the decree of the consequent will proceeds, but that the decree cannot actually proceed unless the forevision of human works has gone before it as a necessary condition.

CCXLVIII.

COROLLARY XLIV.

The endowments and ornaments of the consequent will correspond proportionately to its origin and nature, among which the following chiefly excel: 1) that the consequent will is rightly said and believed to be objective [1]; 2) that it is hypothetical and circumscribed by a condition; 3) that the condition is contained in the forevision either of the consent by which men comply with the benefits of the antecedent will, or of the dissent by which they spurn and repudiate them; and consequently, 4) that the consequent will is rightly called second, since it is considered in God as though in a second place and degree; indeed, 5) that it is also rightly named bipartite, since, according to consent or dissent foreknown, it assumes the force and account of a will decreeing or permitting, rewarding or punishing; that, therefore, 6) its effect is the decree either of a good work and of the reward accompanying it, or of permitting sin and inflicting the punishment which is owed to sin; whence, finally, 7) the consequent will is indeed universal if it is considered conjointly, but is altogether particular if it is considered divisively in conjunction either with the decree of bestowing a good work and its reward or with that of permitting sin and punishing it.

[1] Pp. 23, 31, 34, 41, 45, 49, 51, 303, 336….

[1] For just as the antecedent will is rightly called subjective because its account is innate in God and is in no way derived from men, so the consequent will is deservedly named objective because it accompanies an account proceeding from men themselves.

CCXLIX.

COROLLARY XLV.

Since these things are so, a comparison can usefully be instituted between each will, the first and the second, the antecedent and the consequent. The first comparison which offers itself pertains to the origin of each will; this is followed by another, which is referred to the proper endowments of each; then the last follows, which is concerned with the effects of each.

Now, that we may begin from the first head of comparison, nothing is more evident than that the origins of the first and second will are of such a kind that they differ from one another, as they say, by the whole heaven. For the former proceeds from mercy, the latter from justice; the former goes before, the latter follows; the former has no fore-shining knowledge other than that of lost and ruined humanity and of the means by which it may be restored and advanced to its end; the latter is directed by the foreknowledge of the consent or dissent by which men will have obeyed God when he brought aid, or will have repelled the medicine and soundness offered by him; the former belongs to God the restorer, the latter inheres in God the most equitable distributor of rewards and punishments.

I come to the proper insignia of each, of which I judge that two must chiefly be commemorated: first, that both the first and the second will are efficacious, but the former with the efficacy of mercy and the latter with the efficacy of equity and justice; and then, that the former is universal without qualification and of one form, while the latter is so divided and two-formed that it decrees rewards for some and punishments for others according to the variety of merits and demerits.

There remain the effects which proceed from either will and which can be recalled to this summary: 1) the antecedent will supplies the powers and means by which the faculty of good works is bestowed, but the consequent will defines and predestines the good works themselves; 2) the former exempts men from the necessity of perishing, the latter punishes those worthy of eternal death; finally, 3) the former affords the power of obtaining salvation, but the latter enriches lawful contenders with an immortal crown.

CCL.

COROLLARY XLVI.

It is readily apparent from this that, even if we cannot produce a definition of each will exact to the fine points of the dialecticians, we can certainly exhibit that description which clearly lays bare the character and nature of the thing.

And indeed I see nothing that could be greatly desired if, I. the antecedent will is so described that it is: *a sincere and active purpose flowing from love and mercy, by which God in Christ wills the restoration and salvation of the whole of humanity, although—*

> *—fallen and lost, and therefore directs it and the individual men contained within its compass toward beatitude, frees them from the necessity of perishing, and furnishes them with heavenly powers by which, unless they fail themselves, they may obtain the appointed end of salvation.* And then, II. the consequent will may be called: *an eternal and active purpose to be derived from justice, by which God destines to good works, final perseverance, and the immortal crown those whom he foreknows will consent to the benefits of mercy; or permits guilt and a will hardened in sin even unto the end, and consigns men guilty of so great a crime to punishments which will never cease.* For these descriptions contain everything by which the distinction of the first and second will, and the origin, nature, endowments, and effects of each considered separately, are properly and clearly explained.

CCLI.

COROLLARY XLVII.

Nevertheless, it does not escape me that for a fuller and more intimate knowledge of the whole matter it will be very opportune if several further heads pertaining to either will are examined a little more diligently. I shall therefore enter upon this examination and complete it as briefly as can be done. As regards the first will, then, it can come into controversy whether it ought to be believed and called absolute, or rather conditioned and hypothetical. But every controversy will cease, wholly removed from its foundation, provided the necessary and opportune distinctions are not neglected. For the antecedent will can and ought to be compared severally: a) with its proper and native origin; b) with the men whom it regards; c) with the order of which it is the cause and principle; d) with the means which it employs; and finally, e) with the salvation which it has proposed. Now if it is joined with its origin, it ought no more to be called absolute than hypothetical: absolute indeed, because it proceeds from the innate love of God; but hypothetical, because it flows at the same time from mercy, which supposes the ruin and transgression of humanity. But if it is referred to the men whom it regards, it is rightly named both absolute and—

—hypothetical. It is rightly named absolute because it prerequires no merits of men by which it may be incited to do good; for it does good precisely that men may be able to have merits. But it is named hypothetical because it is concerned with men who are not guiltless and whole, but wounded and infected by the contagion of guilt. Similar things must be repeated if it is compared with the order of which it is the cause and principle. For a twofold and diverse account inheres in an order of this kind: the account of a supernatural order and the account of a restored order. Therefore, just as by reason of the supernatural order it is referred to the antecedent and absolute will, so by reason of the restored order it pertains to the antecedent and hypothetical will. Nor must it be judged otherwise if it is considered in relation to the means which spring forth from it no otherwise than from a most abundant vein. For these can be regarded either as supernatural aids by which human nature is raised and elevated from a servile condition to the dignity of adoptive filiation, or as heavenly medicines by which contracted diseases are healed and broken powers are restored. But considered in the former manner, they are recalled to the antecedent will, and that absolute; in the latter, to the same will indeed, but hypothetical. Eternal salvation remains, with which the first will may be compared. It can be compared with this either insofar as it is the ultimate and supernatural eudaimonic good proposed to humanity, or insofar as it is indeed such a good, but one which is divinely presented for attainment to corrupted and unworthy humanity. But no one fails to know that, according to this diversity in the manner of considering salvation, it ought to be reduced to the first will, whether absolute or hypothetical. Wherefore the question whether the antecedent salvific will must be called and held absolute or hypothetical cannot be answered accurately otherwise than by naming it both absolute and hypothetical according to the manifold manner in which it is considered.

CCLII.

COROLLARY XLVIII.

But just as reasons are at hand on account of which the antecedent will may be judged hypothetical, so reasons are not lacking on account of which it may be regarded as bound and joined with certain remedies. Certainly, God does not will that all men infected and corrupted by the primeval stain should be ordered

to salvation and attain salvation whether they have a Redeemer or do not have one, whether they believe or do not believe, whether they express in themselves the image of the Firstborn or do not express it; but he wills that through the Redeemer, through faith, and through the other remedies which he established by his merciful benignity and which he offers to all, all should live in the order of salvation and attain the end proposed to this order. Christ signified this in words clearer than light [1], saying: *τοῦτο δέ ἐστι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ θεωρῶν τὸν υἱὸν, καὶ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτόν, ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον καὶ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐγὼ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.* "Now this is the will of him who sent me: that everyone who sees the Son and believes in him, and who embraces him in mind and soul and, as the vindicator of his liberty and the perennial fountain of salvation, bears him before his eyes, loves him, and imitates him [3], should have eternal life; and I will raise him up on the last day" [2].

CCLIII.

COROLLARY XLIX.

In order that the force and account of the consequent will may also be examined from every quarter and intimately known—

> —a fourfold object of it must chiefly be distinguished. For to it most certainly pertain: a) the decree concerning good works and merits, and concerning the greatest of all merits, such as final perseverance; b) the decree concerning tolerating the transgression of the law and permitting sins; c) the decree concerning inflicting punishments, whether temporal or eternal; and d) finally, the decree concerning dispensing rewards and rendering the crown of justice. But with respect to this fourfold object, the consequent will is hypothetical and has fore-shining before it: 1) knowledge of the restored order; 2) knowledge of the aids which accompany the restored order; 3) knowledge of free consent or dissent; and lastly, 4) knowledge either of final perseverance or of the human will which will have hardened itself even unto the end against the incitements of mercy.

[1] John VI.40.

[3] How widely the force of the verb *θεωρεῖν* extends is shown at greater length by the scholiast on Euripides at *Hecuba*, v. 342, and Julius Pollux, *Onomasticon*, lib. IV, cap. I, § VIII. It is referred not so much to the sight of the eyes as to that of the mind. Therefore, to see is to know the Son of God inwardly and to comply with him most perfectly. Cf. Campegius Vitringa, *Comm. in Isaiam*, T. II, p. 827.

[2] The Vulgate reads *τοῦ πέμψαντός με πατρός*, and rendered it "of my Father, who sent me."

CCLIV.

COROLLARY L.

Indeed, if the consequent will is referred expressly to the decree of inflicting punishment, it must be judged to be differently constituted with respect to this stage of mortality and with respect to the stage which follows the present mortality and is named the state of eternity. For with respect to the present stage of mortality we have received from the Fathers this fixed and universal judgment [1]: 1) that the order of justice is subordinated to the order of mercy; 2) that no man is punished by justice before he has received the benefits of mercy; 3) that the proper punishments of justice are inflicted on account of mercy contemned; 4) but that they are so inflicted that they are tempered in manifold ways, and by them provision is made no more for justice than for the salvation of men; and therefore, 5) that the present stage is truly the stage of grace [2], and one in which even the punishments themselves present the force of medicine and remedy. But with respect to the state of eternity the Fathers testify with one mouth: 1) that it is the state of equity and justice; 2) the state of eternal life or death; but that 3) it is decreed to no one, and no one lives in it, unless he has either wandered astray even unto the end and repelled mercy, or has finally proved just—

—[1].

CCLV.

COROLLARY LI.

Since, therefore, we know that the supreme law of providence is that all and only those should be destined for the crown and honored with it, or consigned to eternal punishments and punished with them, who will have completed the present mortality illustrious by adoption or deprived of it by their own crime, we also know that which must be judged to contribute not a little toward resolving and illuminating the controversies concerning election and reprobation. And in very truth, when we name election in words, we can understand in the soul three things, and those altogether distinct. For we can understand: 1) election to that state which is free from the necessity of perishing and imparts the faculty of obtaining salvation; then, 2) we can understand election to salvation itself and the immortal crown; and finally, 3) we can understand election to the sum of

[1] Pp. 57, 84, 104, 218, 222, 232, 291, 344, 381….
[2] Pp. 163, 169, 226, 278, 312, 318, 334, 340, 413….
[1] Pp. 66, 174, 218, 222, 232, 291….

goods which coalesces from the faculty of salvation and the very attainment of salvation. In the first and second manner election is understood in some measure, or, as the Schools love to speak, inadequately; in the third and last manner it is understood fully, or, as the same Schools are accustomed to say, adequately.

Now if election is employed in the former and inadequate manner, it must be held as certain: a) that election of this kind differs in no way from the benefit of restoration and ordination to grace; b) that it must be ascribed to the antecedent will; and therefore, c) that election is universal, merciful, procured by no merits, and the principle and fountain of all merits.

But if election is accepted in the latter and likewise inadequate manner, everyone must confess: a) that it cannot be referred back to anything but the consequent will; b) that it is altogether hypothetical—

> —and can suitably be called c) *προορισμὸν καὶ πρόθεσιν κατὰ πρόγνωσιν*, predestination and purpose according to foreknowledge [1]; and d) a purpose indeed, and that eternal and immutable, of imparting salvation and rendering the crown [2]; but e) a purpose according to foreknowledge, because God chooses no others to salvation and the crown except those whom he foresaw would contend lawfully; whence f) it can not unsuitably be expressed in the words of the Apostle [3], *οὓς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισε*, "whom he foreknew, those same he also predestined."

There remains the third and adequate manner of taking election. But if it is taken in this manner, according to the distinction among the goods which it comprehends [4], a) it pertains partly to the antecedent will—

[1] Rom. VIII.29; Eph. I.10.

[2] Matt. XXII.14.

[3] Rom. VIII.29; and I Pet. I.2.

[4] Thomas writes skillfully on Rom. VIII, lect. VI: "But concerning the order of foreknowledge and predestination, some say that the foreknowledge of good and evil merits is the reason for predestination and reprobation, so that it may be understood, namely, that God predestines some because he foreknows that they will act well and believe in Christ; and according to this the text is read thus: 'Whom he foreknew would become conformable to the image of his Son, those he predestined.' And this indeed would be said reasonably if predestination regarded only eternal life, which is given to merits. But under predestination falls every salvific benefit which has been prepared for man from eternity; whence, to posit that some merit on our part is presupposed, the foreknowledge of which is the reason for predestination, is nothing other than to posit that grace is given from our merits." Moreover, that the ancient theologians of the School were accustomed to discuss predestination considered fully and adequately has as a copious witness Charles du Plessis d'Argentré in the historical commentary *On Predestination to Glory and on Reprobation*, in which, after describing with the greatest care their testimonies from the year 1120 unto the year 1708, he finally infers in cap. X, § I: "The old scholastics treated chiefly of the cause of predestination considered altogether, both to grace and to glory, as is evident from their testimonies brought forward." Tricassin agrees in *Disputat. theologic. de praedestinat. hominum ad gloriam*, P. I, sect. I, p. 3, saying: "The ancients took predestination insofar as it includes grace and glory, and therefore they did not will it to be from

—partly to the consequent; b) it must be judged partly absolute and partly hypothetical; and c) it must be regarded partly as gratuitous and partly as rendered in return for merits.

CCLVI.

COROLLARY LII.

Reprobation is opposed diametrically to election, and no otherwise than election can be employed and understood in a manifold sense. And it can in truth be understood: either 1) of a reprobation by which God, according to his own judgment, consigns some to the causes of damnation; or 2) of a reprobation by which God of himself so neglects and spurns some that he does not will the state of restoration and the faculty of salvation intimately bound with it to be common to them; or 3) of a reprobation by which he determines that to some he will dispense only those graces which he foresaw would be joined with final impenitence, and deny all those which he understood would be adequate for conjunction with final justice; or finally, 4) of a reprobation which follows the foreknowledge of benignity contemned even unto the end and mercy spurned.

Moreover, lest I dissemble anything, and lest I be deservedly accused of betraying the truth, it is necessary that I confirm with the greatest gravity of words that I can that Christian tradition is of such a kind that one could reconcile anything with it more readily than believe and say that even one man is reprobated for the reason that God either consigned him to sins and to the causes of damnation, or excluded him from the benefits of the restored state, or ensnared him as if by a certain artifice and deprived him of graces suited to obtaining salvation. For there is none of these things which the Fathers of the West and East do not disapprove, condemn, and execrate [1]—

foreseen merits, because the grace which is included in it is not given, nor consequently predestined, on account of merits." If at any time, however, they disputed separately concerning predestination to glory, they taught the very thing which we received from Thomas and which, before Thomas, Honorius of Autun expressed in the *Dialogue on Predestination*—

> —which is read in T. IX of the Paris edition of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, pp. 1142 ff., in these words: "Predestination is nothing other than the eternal preparation of God, according to the merits of each, either to glory or to punishment. But predestination is twofold: one of the good to glory, the other of the evil to punishment. Those who are foreseen as destined to persevere in good are predestined to glory; but those foreknown as destined to end life in evil are certainly foreordained to punishment."

[1] Compare what we reported concerning the faith of the Alexandrian Church, §§ LXXII–LXXXIV; of the African Church, §§ XCIX–CXII; of the Spanish Church—

> —They execrate the first when they remove as far as possible from God the will of sin and perdition [1]; they execrate the second when they pronounce the state of restoration universal [2]; and they execrate the third when they recount and almost depict the paternal industries and maternal arts by which God seeks even the most lost in order that he may heal them, and aids them in order that he may save them [3].

It remains, therefore, that only that manner of reprobation be admitted which we enumerated in the fourth and last place and which is situated in this: that all and only those are believed to have been rejected and condemned from eternity whom God foresaw from eternity would be ungrateful for his benefits and proud contemners of his mercy. But a reprobation of this kind: 1) is a decree according to foreknowledge; 2) is hypothetical; 3) is referred to God the judge; and 4) is comprehended within the compass of the consequent will.

CCLVII.

COROLLARY LIII.

It is the token and necessary *κριτήριον*, criterion, of true and genuine doctrine that there be nothing disjoined in it, nothing torn away, nothing gaping, and nothing which does not suitably and elegantly harmonize no less with itself than with the rest. For truth accords with truth, and whatever is discordant can have no commerce with truth. If, therefore, the things which we have embraced thus far and reduced as it were to a certain summary are not counterfeit and adulterated but simple and sincere, they will certainly shine with that harmony and display a concord and consonance both with themselves and with the rest. And indeed they do display them, and with that splendor which strikes and smites even eyes not very acute—

> —For what in them, I ask, is not harmonious? What does not answer to itself exactly? Or what is not so constituted that, together with manifold variety, it presents an eminent unity? The last things accord with the first, and both the latter and the former cohere with the middle and intervening things. There is nothing which you can

—§§ CXIII–CXVI; of the Gallican Church, §§ CXVII–CXXXIII; of the Italian Church, §§ CXXXV–CXLV; of the Roman Church, §§ CLVI–CLIX; of the Antiochene Church, §§ CLXV–CLXXIX; of the Churches of Asia, Thrace, and Pontus, §§ CLXXXII–CXCV; and finally of the Palestinian Church, §§ CXCVIII–CCV.

[1] Pp. 20, 187….
[2] Pp. 203, 206, 224, 246, 255, 284, 351, 380, 389….
[3] Pp. 176–192….

move from its place without overturning the whole; nothing which you can disturb without the whole being endangered. Make the trial, and either deny one or another of the corollaries or cast it from its proper place. Immediately the rest are disturbed, spring apart, and fall away. Therefore, the doctrine which we have given is of such a kind that it cannot be considered in itself without the account and dignity of a system being vindicated for it. Indeed, neither can it be considered in comparison with the rest without being found to agree most beautifully with them. For it agrees most beautifully: 1) with those things which we believe and profess concerning God and the divine perfections; 2) with those things which we indubitably hold concerning redemption through Christ; and finally, 3) with those things which most especially pertain to human nature. For this doctrine is so constituted that: a) it fosters hope and repels security; b) it arouses to duty, sharpens solicitude, and precludes a place for sloth; c) it provides for liberty and aids the moral sense; and shows d) that the eudaimonic order is joined by the most intimate bonds with the ethical order; and consequently, e) that happiness is so a gift of divine benignity that it is at the same time a reward of labor and striving.

CCLVIII.

COROLLARY LIV.

But since it is a matter of the greatest importance to have before our eyes a certain *κριτήριον*, criterion, by which judgment may be made concerning the truth of some doctrine, we have therefore judged that it would be opportune if we should undertake to accomplish again, and by another way, what we have just accomplished. Therefore, just as every doctrine which is true can be reduced to the unity and form of a system, so no system is judged worthy of faith and assent which does not exhibit certain characters and established marks. For if these concur, there is no doubt concerning the truth of the system; but if they are wanting, the system itself is disregarded and numbered among the sportings of the human mind—

—Now, by the consensus of all, the following are chiefly enumerated as the characters of a true and indubitable theological system.

1) That the system rest upon certain principles, and those drawn from the purest fountains of truth. Lucretius writes skillfully [1]:

[1] Lib. IV, vv. 517 ff.

"If in construction the first rule is crooked, and if the standard departs falsely from straight directions, and if the level limps even a little in some part, it is necessary that all things be made faultily and askew."

2) That the system be deduced and composed from principles not diverse and fighting with themselves, but similar to one another and referring to the same origin. Would that, as was fitting, those certainly not few men [2] had observed this who proposed to us a theology concerning the Word drawn and derived partly from the divine writings and partly from the tenets of the Platonists.
3) That the system agree beautifully and harmoniously with itself in all its parts. For that which is true is also necessarily beautiful; and that which is at variance and suffers from internal conflict can be neither beautiful nor true.
4) That the system be most fit and accommodated for untying true knots and resolving true difficulties. For it is fitting to hold in no esteem those difficulties which Paul calls *τὰς μωρὰς καὶ ἀπαιδεύτους ζητήσεις*, foolish and unlearned questions [3], and concerning which Martial wrote pointedly: "It is base to have difficult trifles, and labor upon inanities is foolish."
5) That the system render to each his own, and not defer to one in such a way that it may seem to spurn the rights of another. For if it is otherwise constituted, it will sin at once by excess and defect.
6) That the system arouse and indeed inflame the zeal of men toward faith, constancy, piety, confidence—

—and other great and excellent virtues. For the Apostle declared that this is the *σκοπόν*, aim, of the Gospel, and that Christian doctrine and instruction pertain to this, saying [1]: "Every Scripture divinely inspired is useful for teaching, for arguing, for correcting, for instructing in justice, that the man of God may be perfect, furnished for every good work."

Finally, 7) that the system strengthen, raise up, and refresh the souls of pious men pressed by calamities and overwhelmed by anguish. For doctrine proceeding from him who is and is believed to be the God of peace [2] ought to be of such a kind that it brings peace to men of good will and procures tranquillity [3].

Now among these characters, which cannot all together fit a false and preposterous system, there is not even one which does not agree excellently with

[2]Cf. John Le Clerc, *Ars critica*, T. I, P. II, sect. II, cap. II, § II; and Laurence von Mosheim, *Commentarium de turbata per recentiores Platonicos Ecclesia*.

[3]II Tim. II.23.

[1]II Tim. III.16–17.

[2]Rom. XV.33; XVI.20.

[3]Luke II.14.

that summary of doctrine which we have described. The first, a), agrees with it eminently, since we have used no principles other than those approved by the suffrage of the entire Christian name, and collected from no other source than Christian and exegetical tradition. The second, b), agrees, since we have most diligently guarded against associating alien and discordant tenets with the doctrine of exegetical tradition. The third, c), agrees, for all things are so interwoven that they appear almost as so many links of a chain. The fourth, d), agrees, since no difficulty can be opposed, whether the difficulty pertains to theology, economy, or anthropology, which is not suitably explained. The fifth, e), agrees, since supreme *φιλανθρωπία*, love toward men, is vindicated for God the Father, most perfect *λύτρωσις*, redemption, for the Son, and moral liberty for men. The sixth, f), agrees, for nothing is more efficacious for kindling and moving souls than the fixed and ratified persuasion that the faculty of attaining salvation has been taken from no one, that no one is constrained by the harshest bonds of necessity; indeed, that all are so governed by God that God does not will to disclose the severity of justice against anyone before he has bestowed upon him the benefits of his mercy—

> —The seventh and last, g), also agrees; for all anguish either wholly ceases or is wonderfully alleviated once it has been established that God is supreme love, and that no one is destined by him to destruction and eternal death except according to the demerits of an evil and rebellious will.

CCLIX.

COROLLARY LV.

There follow the corollaries which we referred to the third and last class and which we judged could be called *ἐριστικά*, eristic. But among these none ought to be placed before those which fight more hostilely with the things established thus far. These are those in which the doctrine of the supralapsarians is contained. For it seemed good to the stricter Calvinists, upon whom the name of supralapsarians adhered from their proper dogma, that the entire human race ought to be divided into two orders. The one would comprehend those whom God, in order that he might manifest his power and disclose his supreme dominion, destined, without any forevision, to eternal felicity and to those means which cannot be separated from the attainment of salvation. But the other consists of those whom God, by the same form of a solely subjective decree [1], devoted unavoidably to eternal

[1] Cf. the sixth *Specimen de la prédestination et de quelque dogmes calvinistes*, by M. Chenevière, pastor and professor at Geneva, Paris, 1834.

punishments and to their causes, such as sins. "For," says Calvin [2], "all are not created in an equal condition, but eternal life is foreordained for some and eternal damnation for others. Therefore, according as each has been created for one or the other end, so we say that he has been predestined either to life or to death." And again [3]: "You see how the Apostle refers both to the judgment of God alone. Therefore, if we cannot assign a reason why he deigns to receive his own unto mercy except because it so pleases him, neither shall we have anything other than his will in reprobating the others." But—

> —as Theodore Beza continues [1]—as soon as God destines to his hatred those whom he pleases, he so lays beneath them the causes of his future just hatred that the whole matter of hatred inheres in the very men destined to destruction, and consequently his justice in pursuing them with hatred and finally condemning them is eminent. But concerning this head of doctrine established and defended by the supralapsarians, there are as many witnesses as have committed to writing the controversies concerning predestination and reprobation which arose either among the Calvinists themselves or among Calvinists, Lutherans, Remonstrants, and Catholics [2]. Yet nothing could be devised by them, nothing brought forth into the light and public view, which the orthodox Fathers either disapproved with greater consensus or branded with more severe censures. For they condemned and pronounced most alien to the faith and Christian profession either: 1) that some are thought to have been created for the reason that they might perish; or 2) that some are judged to have been destined to the causes of destruction; or 3) that the cause of death and punishments is referred back to God [3].

CCLX.

COROLLARY LVI.

The stricter Calvinists, who are also the supralapsarians, in order to delineate the form and account of the decree predestining and reprobating, and to subject it

[2] *Institutt.*, lib. III, cap. XXI, n. 5.

[3] Ibid., cap. XXII, n. 11.

[1] In *Opusc.*, p. 339; and in the book *De praedest.*, a. 2.

[2] See the work of Jean-Baptiste Du Chesne entitled *Le Prédestinatianisme*, lib. V, capp. II ff.; Wyttenbach, *Tentamina*, T. I, §§ 474–476; Hommius, *Specimen controversiarum Belgicarum*, Art. XV; Dannhauer, *Hodomoria spiritus Calviniani*, Part I, Phantasma II; Wilhelm Jahr, *Doctrina de praedestinatione*, sect. III, §§ CV ff.; and Möhler, *Symbolica*, lib. I, cap. II, § XII.

[3] §§ CLXXII–CLXXVI, CLXXVIII….

article by article to the eyes, use this scheme [4] and proceed in this order, as it were.

I. The most wise God decreed first concerning the ultimate end, and then concerning the means for the sake of the end.

II. The ultimate end of God was and is the manifestation of his glory.

III. The most excellent manifestation of the divine—

—glory cannot be obtained from any other source than from the manifestation of all the divine properties, but especially of mercy and justice: of mercy indeed, which shines forth in pardoning sins, and of justice, which is resplendent in imputing and punishing them.

IV. Just as God willed to exhibit an example of his mercy concerning some, those selected from the multitude of the rest, so he willed to disclose his justice concerning all the rest neglected and reprobated by him.

V. Therefore, both election and reprobation, decreed for this end and unto this end, must be judged absolute, subjective, and free and unencumbered by human conditions [1].

VI. In order that the manifestation of mercy and vindictive justice could have place, a miserable object and subject worthy of misery was required. It was therefore necessary that a miserable creature should exist.

VII. A miserable creature could not exist unless: a) its creation preceded; but creation was followed by b) legislation, and after legislation by sin; because c) without sin the creature could not be miserable; for misery d) is a punishment which cannot be separated from antecedent guilt.

VIII. In order that sin could be contracted, there was need of a creature endowed with intellect and liberty: with intellect by which it would know the law; with liberty by which it would violate the law or keep it.

IX. When the law had been given and liberty placed in the creature, and especially a liberty which was restrained by the golden bridle of original justice and reduced to order, it was doubtful whether sin would or would not occur; indeed, it ought to have seemed far more probable that it would not occur. Therefore, lest God either fall short of the end established for himself or appear subject to the free choice of creatures, it was altogether necessary

[4] Concerning this Friedrich Seiler has things worthy of being known in *Theologia Dogmatica Polemica*, P. II, cap. II, pp. 380 ff., Erlangen ed., 1820.

[1] Wyttenbach, *Tentam.*, T. I, § 416: "The decree," he writes, "of election is absolute; for God chose man not only to salvation but also to faith and holiness, which are means to salvation; and therefore he chose both to the end and to the means, which is absolute." And § 438: "Moreover, since a decree in general is concerned both with all means and with ends, hence it must be absolute; and predestination, which differs from it only as regards its object, must be absolute." With these agree the words of Friedrich Stapfer, *Institutt. Theolog. Polemic.*, T. I, cap. III, sect. XVII, p. 335: "Whatever depends upon no condition is absolute. But since the divine decree can depend upon no condition, hence it is called absolute."

that by some decree he should determine the liberty of the creature toward one side, namely, that of sin—

—X. In order that the decreed determination might be committed to execution, the bridle of original justice had to be removed, and the grace necessary for not sinning withdrawn or denied, while man himself was permitted to himself and to his weakness. This was within the right of God, that man, taught by experience, might understand what he could do from himself and when destitute of aid determining liberty toward good.

XI. When an order of providence of this kind had been chosen, which the supralapsarians call one of efficacious permission, it was necessary by a wholly unavoidable necessity that sin should exist, and together with sin liability to punishment and eternal damnation.

XII. Human nature having fallen into sin and misery, in order that mercy could come to the aid of the elect, it was necessary to decree a Mediator who: a) would make satisfaction for them and reconcile them to God; b) would lead them to faith and repentance; c) would implant faith itself and repentance in their souls by interior and insuperable grace; d) would protect the faith once implanted by a power which cannot be resisted; e) would either preserve repentance continually or restore it at least in the final struggle; and f) through death would advance the elect to immortal life.

XIII. But for fulfilling the decree of reprobation, by which all the rest not elect are comprehended, this one thing was necessary: that God should deny them the salvific aids of grace. For when these were denied, they could neither be reconciled to God, nor obey the external calling, nor abstain from all sins, nor complete the present mortality dear to God, nor finally escape the punishments threatened and the torments of hell.

These are their assertions, in which nothing occurs which is not most alien to the universal doctrine of Christian tradition [1]. For most alien from it is: 1) the very series of divine acts, which—

> —are distinguished virtually; most alien, 2) is what is said concerning a will determined toward one part, namely, that of sin; most alien, 3) is what is taught concerning grace withdrawn from many; and, lest I commemorate each item by reviewing it, most alien, 4) is what is affirmed concerning the manifestation of punishing justice before benignity and mercy have been expended.

CCLXI.

COROLLARY LVII.

Deterred by these and other things, several of the Calvinists [1] seemed to pass over to a different and more lenient judgment concerning predestination and reprobation, to defend it, and to represent it with such colors that the souls of men would

[1] For from the universal doctrine of Christian tradition which we have expounded, the *τάξις*, order, of decrees must be constituted thus: 1) God decreed to create men that they might be blessed eternally and might illustrate the divine glory by their beatitude; 2) for this reason he decreed to furnish the first men with all those gifts by which they could attain the end fixed for them; 3) since from all eternity he had seen that man would not rightly use the natural and supernatural gifts received, he decreed to permit the abuse of liberty and the sin cohering with it; 4) nevertheless, at the same time he decreed to bring aid to fallen—

> —and afflicted humanity and to stretch forth his right hand to it as it lay prostrate; 5) hence he decreed to reconcile all to himself through Christ; 6) he established for all and offered to all aids by which they might enjoy the benefits of universal restoration; 7) finally, he decreed to crown those whom he foresaw would join their own work with the aids offered even unto the end, but to condemn those whom he foreknew would be rebellious against his mercy even unto the last day. Such is the order of decrees which is gathered from Christian tradition, and from which there proceeds the following syllogism representing the form of divine predestination.
>
> *πρόθεσις*, proposition: Whoever rightly uses the benefits of universal restoration is to be saved.
>
> *πρόγνωσις*, foreknowledge: I foreknow that Clement will rightly use the benefits of universal restoration.
>
> *προορισμός*, predestination: Therefore Clement is to be saved.
>
> In this syllogism the proposition refers to the antecedent will of God, but the inference to the consequent will and predestination itself.

[1] Cf. Synod of Dort, cap. I, artt. VI ff.; then the Anglican Confession, art. XVII; the Scots Confession, art. VIII; and the Declaration of Thorn, art. XVIII.

not be so greatly offended. They established, namely [2]: 1) that men considered in themselves are not the object of predestination and reprobation, but that each decree is concerned with men fallen in Adam and therefore liable to eternal death and damnation; 2) that from this lost mass some are elected and others reprobated; 3) that both the former are elected and the latter reprobated by the absolute and mere good pleasure of the divine will, no account whatever being taken either of the perseverance of the former or of the final impenitence of the latter; and finally, 4) that the elect are necessarily led to glory by means which cannot be declined—

> —but the reprobate are driven to death by the same necessity. And it must be attributed to this doctrine that its defenders have customarily been called infralapsarians. But although it may in some manner seem more tolerable [1], it is nevertheless so constituted that it cannot be reconciled with the perennial profession of the Catholic name [2]. And these things certainly cannot be reconciled with it: a) that men fallen in Adam are consigned to eternal punishments without final impenitence foreseen; b) that lost humanity is not first referred to a benign and merciful God; c) that corrupted and depraved men are divided into the twofold class of the elect and reprobate by one will of God; d) that the elect are led to salvation by means which fasten them to one side; but e) that opportune aids of grace are withdrawn from the reprobate to such a degree that no faculty of escaping death and obtaining salvation is bestowed upon them.

CCLXII.

COROLLARY LVIII.

Among the propositions of Quesnel condemned by Clement XI, the twelfth reads thus: "When God wills to save a soul, at whatever time and in whatever place, an indubitable effect follows the will of God." The thirteenth follows it and consists of these words: "When God wills to save a soul and touches it with the interior hand of his grace, no human will resists him." Now the two propositions considered together show: a) that no salvific will of God is admitted except one which coheres with the very attainment of salvation; b) that the salvific will of

[2] See Heidegger, *Medulla*, lib. I, Locus V, §§ XL ff.; and Gürtler, *Institutt. Theolog.*, cap. XIII, §§ XXXIV ff.

[1] Episcopius nevertheless denies that this can be judged more tolerable if it is considered more inwardly, *Institutt. Theologic.*, lib. IV, sect. V, cap. VI.

[2] Pp. 25, 33, 163, 332, 336….

God is held not only as the principal but also as the sole and adequate cause of salvation; c) that the amplitude of the salvific will is estimated from the number of those who are saved; and finally, d) that this is rejected: that God, as far as lies in himself, is inwardly and outwardly lacking to no one, but that men neither take thought for themselves, nor frequently consent to grace, nor cooperate with God who goes before them. But Christian tradition fights against all these things with opposing front [1]. For by it—

> —we are taught: 1) that the salvific will of God, and that sincere and fruitful, can and not rarely does stand apart from the very attainment of salvation; 2) that the salvific will of God is indeed the sole and adequate cause of the power of obtaining salvation, but that the attainment of salvation so depends upon it as upon a principal cause that it also depends upon the free cooperation of men as upon a subordinate cause; 3) that the measure of the salvific will must be taken not from salvation itself as obtained, but from the faculty of attaining it; and 4) that God, according to his merciful benignity, is at hand for all, offers medicine to all, and stretches forth his hand, but that not all use the aids, not all obey the physician, and not all embrace the hand stretched forth. Therefore, by condemning the propositions of Quesnel, Clement safeguarded Christian tradition and revealed doctrine with the greatest right.

CCLXIII.

COROLLARY LIX.

To his doctrine concerning the salvific will of God, Quesnel subjoins those things which are referred to the redemption procured by the blood of Christ, and concerning these he establishes the following in four consecutive propositions [2]: "I. All whom God wills to save through Christ are infallibly saved. II. The desires of Christ always have their effect. III. Jesus Christ delivered himself to death to free forever by his blood the firstborn, that is, the elect, from the hand of the destroying angel. IV. Alas! How greatly must one have renounced earthly goods and oneself in order that one may have confidence in appropriating to oneself, so to speak, Christ Jesus, his love, death, and mysteries! As Saint Paul does when he says: 'Who loved me and delivered himself for me.' "

By these things, however, it is clearly and lucidly declared: a) that the redemption procured by the death of Christ is not universal; b) that it is altogether

[1] Pp. 26, 37, 68, 93, 252, 292, 305, 327….

[2] Propositions XXX–XXXIII.

circumscribed and pertains to the elect alone; c) that a manifest argument for this is held from the fact that neither the salvific will of God through Christ nor the desire of Christ himself to save men can be separated from the effect of salvation obtained by him; and consequently, d) that it is not open to all to exclaim with Paul, "Who loved me and delivered himself for me"—

> —But what is the account of these things, and of what kind must they be judged? They must plainly be judged discordant with those things which the orthodox Fathers most constantly taught. For their unanimous judgment [1] was always: 1) that the redemption procured by the blood of Christ poured forth is bounded by no other limits than those within which the human race is contained; 2) that this amplitude of redemption bound by no limits is handed down in the divine writings, confirmed by the prayers of the Church, and established by the proper economy of the restored state; 3) that the will by which Christ offered himself upon the altar of the cross extends much more widely than the number of those who attain salvation; 4) that indeed no one is saved for whom Christ did not undergo death, but that many fall away from salvation for whom Christ most sincerely breathed forth his soul; 5) that the chief cause of condemning the reprobate returns to this: that, ungrateful and proud, they contemned the benefit of redemption offered; and 6) that all can and indeed ought to repeat with Paul, "Who loved me and delivered himself for me." Therefore, the greatest thanks must be rendered to Clement XI because, having rejected the propositions of Quesnel, he took upon himself the guardianship of Christian tradition; and equal thanks must be rendered to Innocent X, who declared the fifth proposition of Jansenius, "It is Semipelagian to say that Christ died, or shed his blood, for absolutely all men," to be false, rash, and scandalous; and, understood in the sense that Christ died for the salvation only of the predestined, to be impious, blasphemous, injurious, derogatory to divine piety, and heretical.

CCLXIV.

COROLLARY LX.

For knowing and estimating the amplitude of that redemption of which Christ was the cause, the fourth among those propositions which Alexander VIII condemned in the year 1690 contributes not a little—

[1] Pp. 362, 369, 396, 401….

—and which is read as formulated in these words: "He delivered himself for us as an oblation to God, not for the elect alone, but for all and only the faithful." Do you see the amplitude of redemption extended? Do you see it amplified not to the elect alone, but to all and only the faithful? And nevertheless, this very thing is proscribed and, having been proscribed, is condemned. But why indeed? Because Alexander did not fail to know what we have proved by infinite testimonies [1]: 1) that the economy of redemption is overturned unless redemption is judged altogether universal; 2) that Christian tradition is attacked if limits are fixed for redemption; and 3) that the Catholic interpretation of the Scriptures is corrupted unless the oracles which pertain to the compass of redemption are employed universally and generally.

CCLXV.

COROLLARY LXI.

So great is the evidence of the Scriptures and of Tradition concerning this matter that even the Calvinists themselves seem to be stirred and moved by it. They therefore devised a distinction which I judge it worthwhile to bring to light and to set forth in their very own words. Thus the Batavian Calvinists in the *Specimen of Amsterdam* [2] say: "Although the passion of Christ was in itself sufficient for redeeming all men, nevertheless he did not, according to the counsel, mandate, and commission of his Father, die for all men." Nor do the delegates of the classis of Walcheren speak otherwise: "Our men teach that the death of Christ is indeed sufficient, since, on account of the dignity of the person, it is of infinite price for abolishing all the sins of all men; nevertheless, he was delivered to death only for the elect." Hence Beza, in his theological theses [3]: "We confess this oblation to be of so great a value that it could have made satisfaction for infinite worlds, much more for the individual men of one world, if God had willed to have mercy upon all of them and had sent his Son for all. Nevertheless, whether you consider the counsel of God, or the effect of the passion, or both, he in no way died for the impious."

[1] Pp. 203, 206, 224, 246, 255, 284, 351, 355, 360, 379, 399, 401….
[2] *Specim. amstelodam.*, art. XLIII.
[3] *Theses theolog.*, p. 129.

I omit the other things pertaining to the same subject which Piscator [1], Triglantius [2], and Kimedoncius [3] teach, and which Jansenius, excerpting from their books, teaches, who employs the same distinction [4] and repeats it; and I ask instead in what category it ought to be placed. But I judge that there is no need of many words for anyone to see that it is preposterous, and that it was devised with this intention: not that the decrees of Scripture and Tradition might be explained, but that a most shameful error might be covered as though by some mask.

Indeed, what is posited by this distinction, and what is denied? It is posited that the blood of Christ, as being the blood of the *θεανθρώπου*, God-man, was of itself and *ὄντως*, really, sufficient for redeeming even innumerable worlds. But it is denied: 1) that God the Father gave the Son with the will that he should suffer for all; and 2) that God the Son underwent death for all. The Calvinists and Jansenists deny these things as often as with one voice they proclaim [5]: that Christ did not pour forth his blood for the impious; that it is impious and blasphemous to affirm that anyone for whom Christ made satisfaction could be damned; that, according to the purpose of the Father, Christ was born, prayed, died, and suffered for the elect alone; that it is wonderfully absurd that Christ should have redeemed all and each on his part and reconciled them to God, yet that many of them, as regards the outcome, should be damned; that the blood and death of Christ necessarily profit those for whom he poured forth that blood and died; and that for those whom they in no way profit, he neither poured forth his blood nor died.

Come now, turn your mind to the tradition which we have exhibited and whose ratified and fixed *δόγματα*, dogmas, we have explained. Do these things seem to you to agree with Calvinist and Jansenist stratagems? Indeed, they differ from one another so greatly that they attack one another diametrically—

> —For although it is common to the orthodox Fathers and to the Calvinists and Jansenists that the Lord's blood, considered in itself and *ὄντως*, really, is of infinite price and infinite power, nevertheless what the latter deny, the former unanimously attest and confirm [1]. For they maintain: 1) that there was no other cause for sending the Only-begotten into this world than the merciful will of God the Father, a will beneficent toward all men; and 2) that the Only-begotten

[1] *Con. Schaffmanum*.

[2] *In declaratione*.

[3] *In synopsi de redempt.*, p. 59.

[4] *De gratia Christi*, lib. III, cap. XX.

[5] We drew these things from the acts of the Colloquy of Montbéliard, pp. 546–548; from the *Summa praelectionum* of Zanchi; from Perkins, *De praedestinat.*, T. I, col. 1023; and from Piscator, *Theses*, lib. II, p. 371.

[1] Pp. 329, 365, 402, 410….

came into the world and underwent the cross and death in order that he might fulfill the paternal will and, as the new Adam, might most fully repair the ruin brought about by the transgression of the former Adam. Cyril of Alexandria writes excellently [2]:

ἐπὶ γὰρ πᾶσαν τὴν φύσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν εὐεργεσία χωρεῖ· ὅτι καθάπερ τῷ προπάτορι Ἀδάμ, καὶ τῆς ἀρᾶς ἐκοινωνήσαμεν, καὶ γεγόναμεν ἅπαντες ὑπὸ τὸν θάνατον ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνος, οὕτω τοῦ σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ καὶ τὴν νίκην οἰκειούμεθα, καὶ τῆς δόξης συμμεθέξομεν, καὶ τῆς βασιλείας συναπολαύσομεν· καὶ τούτων μάρτυς ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος, τῶν τε παλαιῶν καὶ τῶν νέων ἀναμιμνήσκων, καὶ δεικνὺς τῶν προτέρων λύσιν γεγενημένην, τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν δικαιοσύνην.

"For the benefit of our Savior extends to the whole nature of men; so that, just as we shared in the curse of our progenitor Adam, and all came, as he did, under the dominion of death, so we make the victory of Christ the Savior our own, share in the glory, and rejoice together in the kingdom. And the witness of these things is blessed Paul, when he calls to mind at once the old and the new, and shows that the dissolution of the former things was accomplished through the justice of our Savior."

But after adducing suitable testimonies of the Apostle concerning this matter [3], he prefixes this lemma to the following chapter [4]: *ὅτι κοινὴ τῶν ἀνθρώπων εὐεργεσία ἡ τοῦ σωτῆρος οἰκονομία*, that the incarnation of the Savior was a common benefit toward men.

CCLXVI.

COROLLARY LXII.

When the Tridentine prelates treat [1] of the dispensation and mystery of the advent of Christ, in order to declare its *σκοπόν*, aim, and end, they first bring forth the words of John [2]: "God set him forth as a propitiator through faith in his blood for our sins, and not only for ours but also for those of the whole world"; then, in a continuous discourse, they add [3]: "But although he died for all [4], nevertheless

[2] *De incarnat. Domini*, cap. XI, in Cardinal Mai, *Novae Patrum Bibliothecae*, T. II, p. 44.
[3] Rom. V.15–18; I Cor. XV.22.
[4] Ibid., cap. XIII, p. 45.
[1] Sess. VI, cap. II.
[2] I John II.2.
[3] Ibid., cap. III.
[4] II Cor. V.

not all receive the benefit of his death, but only those to whom the merit of his passion is communicated." These things are altogether twin to those which the Synod of Quierzy had defined [5], saying: "Just as there is, was, or will be no man whose nature Christ Jesus our Lord did not assume, so there is, was, or will be no man for whom he did not suffer, although not all are redeemed by the mystery of his passion." But the Calvinist ministers who were present at the assembly of Dort declared war both upon other heads of doctrine sanctioned by Tridentine authority and upon this distinction also, and explained their mind in these words [6]: "The synod rejects the error of those who employ the distinction between impetration and application, in order that they may instill this opinion in the unwary and unskilled: that God, so far as pertains to himself, willed to confer upon all men those benefits which are acquired through the death of Christ. For while these men pretend that they propose this distinction in a sound sense, they endeavor to offer the people the pernicious poison of Pelagianism."

But what do they call the sound sense of this distinction, and what do they call the pernicious poison of Pelagianism? The answer—

> —is perfectly clear from the acts of that same assembly [1]: 1) that the sense is called sound according to which, although the blood of redemption is judged to have been poured forth for the elect alone according to the purpose of the Father and the will of Christ, it is nevertheless believed to be, in itself and ὄντως, really, of infinite price and infinite power; but 2) that the doctrine of those who, as regards redemption, carefully observe the following is called the pernicious poison of Pelagianism: a) that it is necessary to distinguish from one another those effects of which Christ is the sole and adequate cause, and those of which he is indeed the principal cause but not likewise the sole and adequate cause; b) that Christ is the sole and adequate cause of the power of having faith, practicing piety, and obtaining salvation, but that he is only the principal cause, and not likewise the sole and adequate cause, whether of faith possessed, of piety cultivated, of justice preserved even unto the end, or of salvation obtained; and c) that redemption is therefore universal if those things are considered of which Christ is the sole and adequate cause, but that the same redemption is particular if it is referred to those things of which Christ is only the principal cause and which, in order that they may exist, demand the free concurrence of a subordinate cause.

[5] Capit. IV, the words of which chapter are drawn from those which Prosper has in the first and second responses to the Vincentian objections.

[6] Synod of Dort, cap. II, art. VI.

[1] See the things which are read in the *Acts*, pp. 300, 609, 617, 625, 635, 656–658.

Now can it be endured that these three heads of doctrine should be judged the noxious and deadly poison of Pelagianism? That they should be disapproved by the Calvinists with the same confidence with which manifest heresies are rejected and condemned? It neither can nor ought to be endured, since each and every one of them is proved by the most certain testimonies of the Fathers and by the suffrage of Christian tradition [2]. There is therefore reason for us to rest in the Tridentine judgment, and there is reason for us to affirm with the Tridentine bishops that redemption must be believed to be universal if account is taken of those things which can be expected from God the Father alone and his Christ, but particular if those things are considered which demand the zeal and care of free will.

CCLXVII.

COROLLARY LXIII.

The merciful love of God and the redemption of Christ ought to be regarded as two fountains, as it were, of all the benefits by which the human race, freed from the necessity of perishing, is raised up, healed, transferred from the state of death unto life, and endowed with powers by which it can both recover the adoption of sons and obtain the paternal inheritance joined with it. But from this relation and mutual regard we plainly understand that the abundance and extension of benefits and graces necessarily correspond to the richness and amplitude of each fountain, so that, if those fountains are universal, the gifts of grace which flow from them must also be believed universal; but they must be believed circumscribed and particular if the fountains are contained within limits. Now behold what Quesnel judged ought to be affirmed [1]: "I. No graces are given except through faith. II. Faith is the first grace and the fountain of all the others. III. Outside the Church no grace is granted." Nor do the things taught in the fifth of the propositions rejected by Alexander VIII differ from these even by a nail's breadth: "Pagans, Jews, heretics, and others of this kind receive no influence at all from Jesus Christ; and therefore you rightly infer from this that in them there is a naked and unarmed will without any sufficient grace." But whence did it enter the minds of the Jansenists to maintain that so great a multitude of men was destitute of the necessary safeguards of grace? Or what arguments did they have ready at hand to persuade themselves and others of this? Namely: 1) that they judged that the merciful love of God and the redemption of Christ could extend to the elect alone, or certainly to the faithful alone; 2) that they admitted no

[2] Pp. 206, 224, 246, 297, 327, 351, 380, 389, 404….

[1] Propositions XXVI, XXVII, XXIX.

other aids of prevenient grace except those which would subject the human will to themselves and necessarily extort its consent; and 3) that they judged themselves free to determine from the fact whether grace had been offered or denied, so that they judged grace to have been offered if men believed and repented, but denied if they—

> —persevered in impiety. But it is well that these principles or arguments are overthrown by the weight of the whole Christian tradition. For the certain and concordant doctrine of Tradition [1] returns to this: a) that the merciful love of God and the restoration procured by the merits of Christ are distinguished chiefly by the token and mark of universality in every respect; b) that from each fountain the necessary aids of grace overflow unto absolutely all men; c) that the fivefold order—natural, preternatural, and supernatural, and likewise that of rewards and punishments—is so divinely tempered that all things conduce to the attainment of salvation; d) that the present state of mortality is for all a course of mercy and grace; e) that no one will be punished with eternal torments except he who has contemned the opportune aids for attaining salvation; and f) that innumerable graces are therefore bestowed which are deprived of their fruits through the wickedness of men.

CCLXVIII.

COROLLARY LXIV.

Just as the Jansenists nowhere explained their doctrine concerning the amplitude of grace more distinctly than in the Synod of Pistoia, so the Roman Church nowhere declared and subtly circumscribed its own faith more articulately than in the Constitution issued by Pius VI. Indeed, I. concerning the condition of man in the state of nature, the men of Pistoia affirmed [2]: "After the fall of Adam, God announced the promise of a future Liberator and willed to console the human race through the hope of salvation which Jesus Christ was to bring; nevertheless, God willed the human race to pass through various states before the fullness of time should come; and first, that in the state of nature man, left to his own lights, should learn to distrust his blind reason, and from his wanderings should move himself to desire the aid of a higher light." But the Pontiff pronounced his judgment concerning this sentence [3] in these words: "The doctrine—

[1] Pp. 112, 121, 128, 176, 292, 305, 327, 334, 340, 413….
[2] *De gratia*, § X.
[3] Proposition XVIII.

—as it stands, is captious; and understood of a desire for the aid of a higher light in the order of salvation promised through Christ, for conceiving which man, left to his own lights, is supposed to have been able to move himself, it is suspect and favorable to the Semipelagian heresy." II. Concerning the condition of man under the law, the men of Pistoia taught [1]: "Man under the law, since he was powerless to observe it, became a transgressor—not indeed through the fault of the law, which was most holy, but through the fault of man, who under the law without grace became more and more a transgressor; but the law, if it did not heal the heart of man, caused him to know his evils and, convicted of his infirmity, to desire the grace of the Mediator." But the Pontiff decreed [2]: a) that the doctrine of the synod, "insofar as it generally intimates that man became a transgressor through the nonobservance of a law which he was powerless to observe—as though he who is just could have commanded something impossible, or he who is merciful were to condemn man for what he could not avoid [3]—is false, scandalous, impious, and condemned in Baius." But [4] b) insofar as "it is given to be understood that man under the law without grace could conceive a desire for the grace of the Mediator ordered to the salvation promised through Christ, as though grace itself did not cause [the Mediator] to be invoked by us [5], the proposition, as it stands, is captious, suspect, and favorable to the Semipelagian heresy." III. Concerning illuminating and exciting grace, it seemed good to the men of Pistoia to say [6]: "The light of grace, when it is alone, furnishes nothing except that we know the unhappiness of our state and the gravity of our evil; grace in such a case produces the same effect which the law produced; therefore, it is necessary that God create holy love in our heart and inspire a holy delight contrary—

—to the love dominant in us; that this holy love, this holy delight, is properly the grace of Jesus Christ, the inspiration of charity by which we may do the things known with holy love; that this is the root from which good works germinate; that this is the grace of the New Testament, which frees us from the servitude of sin and constitutes

[1] *De gratia*, § X.

[2] Proposition XIX.

[3] From St. Caesarius, Serm. LXXIII in the appendix to St. Augustine, Serm. CCLXXIII; and Augustine, *De nat. et grat.*, cap. XLIII; *De grat. et lib. arbitr.*, cap. XVI; *Enarrat. in Ps.* LVI, n. 1.

[4] Proposition XX.

[5] From the Second Council of Orange, can. III.

[6] *De gratia*, § XI.

> us sons of God." But the Pontiff decreed [1] that a proposition of this kind, accepted so as to signify that "only that is properly the grace of Jesus Christ which creates holy love in the heart and causes us to act, or also by which man, liberated from the servitude of sin, is constituted a son of God; and that the grace by which the heart [2] of man is touched through the illumination of the Holy Spirit is not also properly the grace of Christ; and that no true interior grace of Christ is given which is resisted—is false, captious, inducing into the error condemned as heretical in the second proposition of Jansenius, and renewing it." Lastly, IV. concerning faith as the first grace, the men of Pistoia judged [3]: "That faith from which the series of graces begins, and through which, as through the first voice, we are called to salvation and to the Church, is that very excellent virtue of faith by which men are called and are faithful." But the Pontiff defined [4] that this proposition, understood "as though there were not a prior grace, that which, just as it precedes the will, so also precedes faith [5], is suspect of heresy and savors of another proposition condemned in Quesnel as erroneous."

To this, therefore, the chief heads of doctrine which the Roman Church willed to be established and fixed against the Jansenists manifestly return: 1) that human nature, permitted to itself and to its own powers, possesses absolutely no faculty by which it can desire and aspire to those things which conduce to the attainment of eternal salvation; 2) that God, as just and merciful, could neither command impossible things nor condemn men because they did things which they could not avoid; 3) that, in the threefold state of nature, law, and grace, in which men are customarily considered, the necessary—

> —aids of grace by which they might both perform the things commanded and abstain from the things forbidden and prohibited were never lacking to them; and 4) that the aids of grace neither derive their origin from that faith by which we are called and are faithful, nor are of such a nature that they always have the assent of the human will joined to them. But did the Roman Church establish this norm of thinking and believing rightly or wrongfully? Since that must be judged to have been done with the best right whereby antiquity is asserted against novelty, and whereby the tradition of all ages and of the whole Catholic name is vindicated from the impi-

[1] Proposition XXI.
[2] Council of Trent, sess. VI, cap. V.
[3] *De fide*, § I.
[4] Proposition XXII.
[5] From St. Augustine, *De dono persever.*, cap. XVI, n. 41.

ous temerity of factions, there is certainly reason for us to judge the prescriptions of the Roman Church not only equitable but also necessary. For the tradition of all ages and of the whole Catholic name [1] pertains to this: a) that men, deprived in Adam of the gifts they had received, fell into the necessity of perishing and a complete *ἀδυναμίαν*, inability, to obtain salvation; b) that God, aroused by his merciful goodness at so great a ruin of humanity, came to its aid and substituted a state of universal restoration for the state of universal destruction; c) that men therefore never lived in any state other than that of restoration; d) that in this state of restoration they lived in those stages which are called the stage of nature and that of law, and that they live in this present stage, which is called that of grace *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, par excellence; e) that these stages of humanity differ not because in any one of them men lacked the necessary aid of grace, but because, according to the difference of the stages, the manner of providence, both exterior and interior, existed as manifold and varied; and f) that nothing can therefore be established which represents the doctrine of constant tradition more excellently than if it be repeated with Cyril [2]:
οὐ ἐπαύσαντο πώποτε τῶν θείων δωρεῶν αἱ πηγαὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἀναβλύζουσαι, "the fountains of divine gifts never ceased pouring forth good things to men."

CCLXIX.

COROLLARY LXV.

So great is the connection of ideas and signs that opinions conceived in the mind can neither be rightly expressed nor arranged into the harmonious account of a system unless there are at hand certain formulas, and meanings of the formulas, which conduce to expressing and representing them [1]. Now among these formulas and fixed meanings, that one is not the least by which the Calvinists divide the divine will into that which they call revealed and that which they call hidden. For they chiefly rely upon this, repeatedly insist upon it, and expend no slight labor in embellishing it. For they teach: a) that the hidden will is and is called that by which God governs all things and directs them unto his own ends, but that the revealed will is comprised by divine manifestations, whether command-

[1] Pp. 212, 230, 246, 257, 280, 309, 314, 333, 338, 362, 367–371….
[2] *De incarnat. Domini*, cap. I, p. 32, T. II of the *Novae Patrum Bibliothecae*.
[1] Cf. Part I of the *Commentaries* which we published.

ing, prohibiting, promising, or threatening; b) that the hidden will differs from the revealed will in this: that the former really inheres in God, while the latter belongs to him only by way of a sign; c) that the two wills are distinguished from one another to such an extent that the very things which God, by commanding, prohibiting, affirming, promising, and threatening, shows that he wills by his revealed will, he more than once does not will to be done by his hidden will; for d) it can happen that God by his hidden will does not will that to be done which by his revealed will he signifies that he wills to be done, and that by his hidden will he wills that to be done which by his revealed will he signifies that he does not will to be done. For example, it can happen that by his hidden will he does not will the salvation of those whose salvation he declares by his revealed will that he wills; and that by his revealed will he declares that he wills all men to repent, believe, obey the Gospel, and be saved, while by his hidden will he does not will all to repent, believe, obey the Gospel, and obtain salvation. But he does not will this because by his hidden will he has reprobated a great multitude of men from all eternity and has determined by a horrible decree to deprive them of the means necessary for attaining salvation.

But will there be men so good-natured that they would not rather—

—obey Christian tradition [1], which professes a wondrous harmony and full agreement between the two wills? Men who would allow not indeed such a distinction but an opposition of the revealed and hidden will to be thrust upon them? Certainly, 1) the Calvinists who abuse it ascribe to God two wills hostilely opposed to one another: a hidden will by which God of himself wills the destruction of many, and a revealed will by which he bears witness that he does not will the destruction of anyone. But this is plainly unworthy of God and of divine veracity, and is so absurd and *ἀκατάληπτον*, incomprehensible, that Calvin himself, when he had willed to assert it with every effort, finally concluded [2]: "How God in the same matter in a diverse manner does not will it to be done and wills it to be done, we do not grasp." But we grasp entirely that it is discordant and plainly *ἀδύνατον*, impossible, for the same God of himself both not to will and to will. Moreover, 2) we can know nothing certain either concerning the inclined benignity of the Father toward men, or concerning the most generous pledge of the Son, or concerning the remedies most wisely established, unless it is disclosed to us by a

[1] Pp. 96, 103, 107, 139….

[2] *Institutt.*, lib. I, cap. XVIII, n. 3. Solomon Van Til also discusses the same division in *Compend. Theolog. natur. et revelat.*, P. II, cap. II, p. 31; Heidegger in *Corp. Theologiae christ.*, Loc. III, § LXXIII; Wyttenbach in *Tentam.*, T. I, Loc. III, § 288; Daniel Chamier in *Panstrat. catholic.*, T. III, lib. VII, cap. VI; and Samuel Pufendorf in the little book *De iure feciali divino*, § 71.

manifestation of the divine word. What, then, do the Calvinists do? They themselves extinguish this torch and, having introduced a separation between the hidden and revealed will, open for themselves the broadest road by which they may establish the incredible *παράδοξον*, paradox, concerning particular restoration and grace, and concerning absolute predestination and reprobation. But 3) we will adhere to the preaching of the Scriptures [3], which announces *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας*, the Gospel of salvation, to all men [4], and announces to all [5] *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς εἰρήνης*, the Gospel of peace, marked with this name because, as Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, and Theophylact bear witness [6], in it the most equitable conditions—
—of peace reconciled between God and men are offered to the human race through the benefit of preaching.

CCLXX.

COROLLARY LXVI.

The form and account of the doctrine which persuaded the Calvinists to distribute the divine will into the revealed and the hidden, and to separate the latter from the former, or even to oppose it to the former, also moved the same men to assail most bitterly the distribution of the divine will into first and second, antecedent and consequent. Gürtler's invectives against this division are known to learned theologians [1]; that saying of Jacob Hottinger is known, that this division is rightly called the *μῆλον ἔριδος*, apple of discord [2]; and those things are likewise known by which Forbes endeavored to create odium against this division on the ground that it had the Massilians as its authors [3]. But since two things can be brought into controversy, first the words by which the division is expressed, and then the realities which are signified by it, there can be no doubt that the words cannot be reprehended, and that the realities themselves cannot be disapproved without manifest error. 1) The words cannot be reprehended, since they are vindicated by the suffrage of the Fathers, of ecclesiastical writers [4], and of the whole School

[3] II Cor. V.19; Eph. II.16–17; Col. I.20; Rom. V.1, X.14–15, 17; Acts X.43.
[4] Mark XVI.15.
[5] Eph. VI.15.
[6] Cf. Caspar Suicer, *Thesaurus ecclesiasticus*, T. I, pp. 1221 ff.
[1] *Institutt. theolog.*, cap. IV, § 104.
[2] *Exercitat. qua fata doctrinae de praedestinat. et grat. exponuntur*, P. I, § VII.
[3] *Instruct. historic. theologic.*, lib. VIII, cap. III, § 5.
[4] §§ II, VII, XI, XVII, XXI, XXIV, XXV, XXX… CLXXIV…. Cf. Photius, *Biblioth.*, cod. CCLI.

[5]; nor 2) can the realities themselves be disapproved, since they are established by the unanimous agreement of Christian tradition [6]. Therefore, 3) Laurence von Mosheim seems to me to have touched the matter to the quick when he writes [7]: "The stricter Reformed, who reject the distinction of the divine will into antecedent and consequent, certainly act rashly—

> —For although these words are not read in Sacred Scripture, nevertheless the reality indicated by these words is most clearly present. For in some very well-known passages the sacred codex affirms that God wills well to all; in others, that God loves the elect and the faithful but rejects unbelievers. These sayings of Sacred Scripture are of two kinds, and they cannot be reconciled with one another in any other way than through the distinction of the will into antecedent and consequent. This matter can very easily be explained and illustrated by an example taken from human affairs. A good and just king loves all his subjects, or desires the happiness of all his subjects. This is the inclination of a good and just king; but the same good and just king nevertheless does not make all his citizens happy, but afflicts the disobedient and rebellious with grave punishments. This example declares the whole matter. In like manner, God wills men to be saved; but since there are many in the human race who resist the divine inclination to render all happy, the consequent will of God therefore cannot will the salvation of all."

But the example which we read in the Gospels [1] is much more splendid. God invites absolutely all the Jews; he invites them once and again and more often. He wills them to come; he wills them to eat and drink. All things have been prepared. This is the first act of the will. Those invited contemn the tables heaped with the most choice dishes; they treat the servants ill; they lay violent hands upon some, torment others with insults and reproaches, and punish others with death. When these things have been brought to the ears of the Lord, the most just Lord burns with anger, commands that the ungrateful and rebellious be slain by slaughter, and that their city be overthrown and burned. You have the other act of the will, and you have the antecedent and consequent will depicted.

---

[5] Concerning the suffrage of the whole School, the things written by Diego Ruiz in his work *De Voluntate Dei*, disputt. XIX–XX, ought to be read; he is an excellent theologian and plainly worthy to be worn by the hands of all.

[6] §§ XLIII, XLVII, LXII, LXXII, LXXIV, LXXVI….

[7] *Theolog. dogmat.*, P. III, cap. III, sect. I, membr. I, pp. 229–230.

[1] Matt. XXII.1–8. Similar things occur in Luke XIV.16–24.

CCLXXI.

COROLLARY LXVII.

The Calvinists oppose this distribution, and especially the antecedent will, chiefly for two reasons: first, a) because no will inheres in God except one that is victorious and efficacious [1]; but the antecedent will cannot be judged of this kind, since it is defined by its defenders as subject to the free cooperation of men; and then, b) because God cannot will in vain; but he would will in vain if by the antecedent will he desired the salvation of all men—

> —"If God," writes John Frederick Stapfer [2], "intended the salvation of all and each of men, and therefore ordered the means, namely, the bestowal of universal grace, toward obtaining that end, and nevertheless did not attain the end as regards a great part of men, which end he nevertheless intended universally, it would follow that God acts in vain." But 1) did it escape the Fathers and Christian Doctors that the divine will cannot be overcome by the human will; that the divine will is efficacious and active; and that God wills and attempts nothing vainly and idly? Indeed, they knew, held, and professed all these things. Nevertheless, with one mind and one voice they confirmed that an antecedent will, and that universal, must be ascribed to God [3]. What, therefore, shall we think follows? Namely, that neither the claim that the will of God is not victorious and efficacious nor the claim that God wills and acts vainly and idly coheres in any way with the doctrine by which an antecedent salvific will, and that universal, is asserted of God. And indeed, 2) what is the mark of an unconquered and efficacious will? I judge it to be this: that the effects which proceed from it as from the sole and adequate cause cannot be impeded and destroyed either by the angelic or by the human will [4]. But the antecedent will is altogether of this kind, since neither angels nor men have ever prevented, or indeed can prevent, God, moved by merciful charity, from loving the salvation of all and imparting to all the faculty of attaining it—

[1] Hence they everywhere inculcate and urge the things which we read in Ps. CXIII.3; CXXXIV.6; Isa. XLVI.10; and Rom. IX.19.

[2] *Institutt. Theolog. polemic.*, T. I, § 1189, p. 331.

[3] Pp. 43, 45, 47, 51… 337….

[4] For if effects require a subordinate and free cause, they do not always cohere with the divine will, but through a defect of the subordinate cause they are more than once wanting. We have heard absolutely all the Fathers as witnesses of this matter, with whom the Scriptures agree: Prov. I.24–25; Isa. LXV.12; LXVI.4; Jer. VII.13; Luke VII.30; Matt. XXIII.37; John I.11; V.40; and Acts VII.57.

—Moreover, 3) no sane man would say that he acts in vain who employs the best remedies for effecting the salvation of men. For if he acted in vain, his remedies could profit no one. But the things which God has disposed by his salutary antecedent will, and which he bestows upon all, profit many. Therefore, it certainly cannot be said that God wills and acts in vain. And here, 4) I judge that a *παραλογισμόν*, fallacy, by which not a few are deceived and deceive others, must be removed from our midst. The sophism is this: that the antecedent will is and is called not that by which the salvation of all is loved and all are ordered unto salvation by apt and suitable means, but that by which salvation itself is conferred. For just as medicine is not the art of healing, but the art of seeing all the things which are apt and accommodated either for preserving or recovering health, so the antecedent will is not the purpose of saving, but the purpose of seeing and imparting absolutely all the things which are necessary for obtaining salvation. For the end of every counsel is certainly that which each counsel so regards that it does not advance farther, but, when it has accomplished that, judges that it has discharged its function. Therefore, just as the physician does not judge that he has finally satisfied his function only if he has healed the sick man, but that he has abundantly performed whatever can be required of him if, according to the precepts of his art, he has employed all those things which pertained to healing; so God, even if he does not always save, provided nevertheless that he omits none of those things which are necessary for attaining salvation, has attained the end proposed to the antecedent will.

CCLXXII.

COROLLARY LXVIII.

The Jansenists seem to approve the division of the divine will into antecedent and consequent which was repudiated by the Calvinists; but they so approve it that they utterly overthrow its force and account. For, with Jansenius as their leader [1], they unanimously decree that a distribution of this kind can be conceded and usefully employed only insofar as this one thing is signified by it—

—that by his antecedent will, before the foreseen fault of Adam, God willed all men to be saved and, induced by that general will, destined to each the aids necessary for attaining salvation; but that by his

[1] *De grat. Christi*, lib. III, capp. XX–XXI.

consequent will, after the foreseen fault of Adam, he does not will all men to be saved. This explanation of the antecedent and consequent will indeed tends to demonstrate that the Jansenists agree with the infralapsarians but are most alien from the Fathers and orthodox masters. And 1) it demonstrates that they agree with the infralapsarians, among whose number the Genevans at the Synod of Dort issued this profession of their faith [1]: "From eternity, by his most free will, God determined within himself to leave certain definite persons, fallen, guilty, and corrupted in and with Adam, in the state of their own sin and corruption, and not to employ toward them the remedy of salutary grace in Christ." They then denied that after the fall of Adam God wills all men to be saved, and finally subscribed to these words: "This is our simple and faithful judgment, the faith of our Church, and indeed, as we do not hesitate firmly to assert, of all the French churches which adhere to the French Confession." "Moreover," Étienne De Champs adds [2], "the Dutch, British, Palatine, Hessian, Swiss, Zeeland, Frisian, Bremen, Emden, and many other Calvinists teach the same things, and their judgments are recited in the Acts of Dort. Hence it is that, since that robber synod of the Calvinists, no one has written concerning predestination who, just as Jansenius did, does not accurately explain these things and define that the will by which God does not will all men to be saved does not precede but follows the forevision of original sin. Peter Du Moulin in his letter to the Synod of Dort, William Ames in the *Anti-Synodica*, Moses Amyraut in the defense of Calvinist doctrine, and the remaining writers of that faction have taught this expressly and much more copiously than Jansenius himself." Agreement 2) with the infralapsarians is followed by disagreement with the orthodox Fathers, whose fixed doctrine [3]—

—and universal judgment the Jansenists could neither more shamefully corrupt nor more inwardly pervert. For the Fathers believe and call that will the antecedent salvific will which: a) is celebrated in the divine writings; b) proceeds from merciful benignity; c) is referred to Christ as to the meritorious cause; d) tends to this, that the damage introduced by the original transgression be repaired; e) withdraws all from the necessity of perishing; f) bestows upon all the faculty of adoption and salvation; g) cuts off every excuse; and h)

[1] Synod of Dort, p. 361.
[2] *De haeresi ians.*, lib. I, disput. VII, cap. II, § V.
[3] Pp. 66, 174, 218, 222, 232, 291, 303, 327, 381, 389….

> brings it about that the judgment of eternal damnation is pronounced against all and only those who have rejected the gifts of mercy even unto the end. But there is no reason for us to prove by arguments that a salvific will of this kind is called antecedent, not because it precedes the original transgression, but because it precedes final impenitence.

CCLXXIII.

COROLLARY LXIX.

In the *Catechesis on Grace* [1], to the question, "Does God will the elect alone to be saved?" the Jansenists respond: "Yes: he wills to save only those whom he has predestined; but he has predestined the elect alone. If he willed to save all and each of men, all would actually be saved, because he does all things whatsoever he wills in heaven and on earth, and there is no one who can resist his will." But they rely so greatly upon this confirmation that they neither employ any argument more frequently nor urge any more vigorously. But whence shall we judge it to have come about that this confirmation wholly occupied the minds of the Calvinists, but did not move the orthodox Fathers even so little? Whence shall we derive the fact that the things which occur everywhere among the Calvinists are nowhere read among the Fathers? That the Fathers nowhere teach either what Theodore Beza urges most bitterly [2]: "If God truly and simply willed all to be saved, all would necessarily be led unto salvation—

> —because his will is most omnipotent. But not all are actually saved; therefore, he does not will all to be saved"? Or what Jerome Zanchi inculcates [1]: "Since the will of God can be impeded by no means and is most omnipotent, it can therefore in no way be said that God simply and properly wills men universally to be saved"? Or what Andrew Willet repeatedly insists upon [2]: "If God willed all men to be saved, why would not all be saved? For who resists his will? Nor is the rather ancient escape of the Pelagians valid here, namely, that the will of God is not fulfilled because man resists. For thus men would be established as more powerful than God."

Certainly, we cannot take the cause of this difference from the fact that the Fathers were ignorant either of the first article of the Creed, "I believe in God

[1] *Catechis. de gratia*, resp. 66.
[2] *Apolog. colloq. momp.*, p. 315.
[1] *De praedestinat.*, cap. V, theses XI–XII.
[2] *Synopsis Papismi*, *De reparat. gen. humani*, p. 145.

the Father almighty," or of the well-worn oracles of Scripture [3], "Whatsoever the Lord willed, he has done in heaven and on earth," and, "There is no one who can resist his will." Whence, then, shall we judge so great a difference to have arisen? We shall derive it from no other source than the fact that the Fathers [4]: 1) skillfully understood that the will cannot be confounded with omnipotence; 2) saw that the oracles of Scripture in no way pertain to the matter; 3) believed that the physical order is governed in one way and the moral order in another; 4) so took thought for divine omnipotence that they did not destroy human liberty; 5) accurately distinguished from one another the things which God wills and perfects as the principal cause and those which he wills and perfects as the sole and adequate cause; 6) all saw that, according to the chosen order of restoration, all would necessarily be saved if the attainment of salvation depended upon the divine will as upon the sole and adequate cause; 7) did not fail to know that the will can be judged conquered only if it is deprived of those things which are referred to it as to the sole and adequate cause; and 8) having distinguished the power of obtaining salvation from—

> —its attainment, attributed the former to the antecedent will and the latter to the consequent; they believed the former independent, but the latter dependent upon human and free cooperation; finally, they numbered the former among bare gifts, but the latter among gifts and rewards together. Furthermore, that the power of salvation is offered to all through grace [1], and that it can most truly be said of grace with Hildebert of Tours [2]: "The grace of God is most dutiful toward men and, as it were, sworn to their service."

CCLXXIV.

COROLLARY LXX.

A system of doctrine which can neither be constructed nor explained except by assumed hypotheses which either immediately betray their own falsity or strongly introduce a suspicion of error is deservedly numbered among those which ought to be set aside and indeed rejected and disapproved. For that which is joined with error, and which, in order to be consistent with itself, needs hypotheses which display an affinity and association with error, cannot be judged worthy of as-

[3] Some of these do not pertain to the matter at all, while others treat of those effects which proceed from God as from the principal and adequate cause.

[4] Pp. 37, 93, 252, 293, 298, 339, 416….

[1] Pp. 203, 206, 210, 224, 246, 255, 284, 297, 351, 359, 380, 389….

[2] Epist. XXXIII.

sent. Now of this kind is the account of those systems which, in order that they might be brought forth into the light, required their authors to depart from those things which we established concerning the merciful benignity of God, restoration through Christ, the universal amplitude of grace, the mutual relation between the order of clemency and that of justice, predestination, reprobation, and the first and second will. For all these, in order that they might persuade themselves and others of their tenets and opinions, ask, indeed demand, that among those things which ought to be posited as fixed and indubitable we number the following: 1) that the principal and supreme norm for judging the instituted order of salvation must be derived from no other source than the absolute dominion and absolute power of God; 2) that no other instituted order can be believed except one from which the absolute justice and absolute mercy of God shine forth more splendidly—

> —3) that the institution of that order must therefore be maintained in which election and predestination to the crown admit no conditions dependent upon men excited and aided by grace; 4) that faith, good works, and final perseverance proceed from election to glory as from the first and original cause; but that foreseen perseverance even unto the end is in no way the condition and merit of election to glory; whence 5) the manner in which the execution of the eternal purpose, which occurs in time, is constituted is plainly diverse from that in which predestination to glory was decreed from eternity.

These hypotheses are common to the Calvinists and Jansenists; and upon these same hypotheses, more or less tempered and softened, all those also rely who defend election to glory and the crown as detached from foreknowledge [1]. But of what kind ought these hypotheses to be judged? Approved and received by the consensus and suffrage of the Fathers and of Tradition, or rather disapproved and proscribed by the same? Let the decision and judgment [2] belong to those who, having read the things which we have collected and illustrated with the greatest zeal we could, know well that the doctrine and judgment of Christian

[1] Cf. Joseph Tricassin, *Disput. theologic. de praedestinat. hominum ad gloriam*, Part I, sect. VI; and Charles du Plessis d'Argentré, *Comment. historicum de praedestinat. ad gloriam et de reprobatione*, cap. X, pp. 207 ff.

[2] In the second chapter of that commentary which we have just praised, Charles du Plessis reports the testimonies of the ancient Fathers who flourished before St. Augustine concerning predestination to glory; he specifically reports the testimonies of Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Gregory Nazianzen, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Photius, Gennadius, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Ambrose, Jerome, and Sedulius; then he adds: "Whoever weighs without preconceived opinion the lucid testimonies of the ancient Fathers just adduced will certainly confess this: that if those Doctors of the Church had willed to teach that predestination to glory is decreed after foreseen merits, as one party in the schools of the theologians teaches, they would have expressed their judgment in no other way."

tradition, drawn and taken from the divine writings, are comprised altogether in these heads: a) that only those judge the account of the instituted salvific order according to the exact rule of divine revelation who assign to it no other origin and no other fountain than *χάριν, φιλανθρωπίαν*—

> —*ἔλεον, χρηστότητα καὶ ὑπερβάλλοντα πλοῦτον τῆς χάριτος*, grace, love for men, mercy, kindness, and the surpassing riches of grace; b) that the chosen order of salvation is of such a kind that mercy dominates and reigns in it and does not permit justice its own place before the effects of benignity have come to naught; c) that God of himself wills salvation for all, destined and sent a Redeemer for all, and imparts to all the things which are necessary and sufficient for attaining salvation; d) that nothing proceeds absolutely from God toward the human race restored through Christ and in Christ unless it is a fruit of mercy and displays benignity and clemency; e) that damnation and whatever is joined with damnation are both decreed and inflicted only hypothetically; f) that the hypothesis is the foreseen contempt of mercy; g) that both the eternal decree of bestowing the crown and imparting perseverance, and the temporal execution of each, depend upon a hypothesis; h) that the hypotheses are, on the one hand, foreseen perseverance, and, on the other, free cooperation with those graces by whose aid perseverance is obtained; therefore, i) that in the same manner in which the execution of the eternal decree, which occurs in time, is constituted, the election to glory itself, which was made from eternity, is also constituted; so that just as actual justice is the cause of actual salvation, so foreseen final justice is the cause of predestined salvation.

CCLXXV.

SCHOLION.

What happens not rarely in the astronomical and physical disciplines, namely, that one or another *φαινόμενον*, phenomenon, can scarcely, or hardly at all, seem capable of being reconciled with a doctrine otherwise certain and ascertained, ought not to be wondered at if the same thing happens more than once also in the treatment of divine matters. And indeed it happens in those things which we profess concerning God one and triune; it happens in those things which pertain to the person of the Only-begotten and his *οἰκονομίαν*, economy; and it happens in those things which are referred to the sacraments divinely instituted. But what

follows on that account? Namely, the law obtains and flourishes, approved no less by the suffrage of the prudent [1] than by the perspicuous judgment of reason—

> —that it is not lawful to doubt those things which are certain because the manner does not shine forth by which these things may be brought into harmony and agreement with all the others. The law obtains and flourishes which is formulated by the author of the work *On the Calling of All Nations* [1] in these words: "The things which God willed to be hidden are not to be conjectured. But the things which he has made manifest are not to be denied, lest in the former we be found illicitly curious and in the latter damnably ungrateful." Hence Tertullian says [2]: "Let curiosity yield to faith; let glory yield to salvation. Certainly, let them either not clamor or be silent against the rule. To know nothing is to know all things." Finally, the law most similar to this obtains and flourishes, by which it is declared that it ought to be enough for us if we know the *ὅτι*, the fact that, of things, but not likewise the *διότι*, the reason why; if we know the *τί ἐστι*, what a thing is, but not the *πῶς*, how [3] the thing is and aptly agrees with the remaining things. *Ne sis sapiens* יותר *nimis*, do not be excessively wise, Scripture cries out [4]; for those who are excessively wise have no wisdom, and those who say that they know all things know nothing. He who inscribed this encomium upon the stone of Anaxagoras did not see this [5]:
>
> *Ἐνθάδ' ὁ πλεῖστον ἀληθείας ἐπὶ τέρμα περήσας, Οὐρανίου κόσμου, κεῖται Ἀναξαγόρας.*
>
> "Here lies that man to whom the recesses of things lay open, and the secrets of heaven: great Anaxagoras."

But I judged that these things ought to be recalled briefly for this reason: because I saw well that there would not be lacking those who would attack the demonstrated universal amplitude of restoration by an argument drawn from the fact that there have always been many who closed their final day before they could be aided by the means of restoration—

---

[1] The author of the *Recognitions of Clement*—

> —lib. III, cap. 37; Thomas Bonartes Nordtanus in *Concordia scientiae cum fide*, lib. III, §§ 27 ff.; and Leibniz in *Sermo de concordia rationis et fidei*, § 80.

[1] *De vocat. omnium gentium*, lib. I, cap. VII. To the same subject pertain Adam Rechenberg's disputation *De insana in Theologia curiositate* and Valentin Veltheim's inquiry *De ignorantia Theologorum laudabili*.

[2] *De praescriptt.*, cap. IV.

[3] Christian August Heumann's *Actt. Philosoph.*, Part X, n. III, p. 579, can usefully be read.

[4] Eccles. VII.17.

[5] In Aelian, *Variarum histor.*, lib. VIII, cap. XVIII.

> —And certainly there have always been more than a few infants who experienced the same womb of the mother as the beginning both of life and of death, and who were therefore incapable of having the necessary safeguards of restoration conferred upon them.

I do not deny that the difficulty taken from this fact is not utterly devoid of every appearance of force; I do not deny that there is some weight in it by which the persuasion concerning universal restoration can seem capable of being shaken; and I readily grant that the manner does not immediately occur to the mind by which the bitter death of so many infants, through which the faculty of applying restoration is snatched away, may be reconciled with universal restoration. Nevertheless, I add that it cannot be permitted that on this account a doctrine demonstrated by the authority and suffrage of Christian tradition should be called into question. But by the authority and suffrage of Christian tradition it is established [1] that the limits of restoration and of transgression are the same, and that the latter is no more marked with the sign and token of complete universality than the former. Therefore, although the manner does not appear by which universal restoration and the premature deaths of so many infants are reconciled, nevertheless it belongs to a prudent and resolute man not to deny what shines forth, but ingenuously to confess what lies hidden; not to deny what is established by the highest authority, but to judge that what Christ answered the Apostles was said to us [2]: *οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστι γνῶναι*, "It is not yours to know this."

CCLXXVI.

But is there absolutely no account at hand by which a difficulty of this kind may be smoothed and the apparent discord reconciled? Before I answer the question, I judge it useful to signify to the readers that it is my purpose to expend as diligent a labor as I can upon resolving this knot when I shall submit to examination Augustine's commentaries on the words of Paul [3], "who wills all men to be saved"; but for the present, to contain myself within those things which, if they do not conduce to showing the agreement openly, certainly conduce to dispelling the conflict and opposition by certain steps, as it were—

> —Therefore, I. the order of universal restoration requires this one thing: that however many men are conceived, they be conceived in that state which of itself is free from the necessity of perishing, and be divinely furnished with those resources which impart to each

[1] Pp. 203, 206, 224, 246, 255, 284, 351, 380, 389, 396….

[2] Acts I.7.

[3] Concerning these commentaries of Augustine, the things which John Baptist Faure has in the notes to chapter LII of the *Enchiridion* can be consulted.

> and every one the faculty of obtaining salvation. For if these things obtain, the order of universal restoration is secure. But in what state are those infants conceived who die before they can be endowed with the means of restoration? Without doubt, they are conceived in a state which of itself is freed from the necessity of perishing and abounds sufficiently in means suitable for obtaining salvation; they are conceived in a state not condemned but restored through Christ; and they are conceived in a state which is owed to saving mercy, not to punishing justice. Therefore, their premature death is not of such a kind as to oppose the institution of universal restoration.

Moreover, II. to which will must the institution of universal restoration be credited? To the first and antecedent, or rather to the second and consequent? It must altogether be attributed to the first and antecedent will. But it belongs to the first and antecedent will not actually to confer restoration itself, but to bestow the opportunity and faculty of restoration, and so to moderate and govern all things, so far as lies in itself, that no one may rightly seem deprived of that faculty. Therefore, if something impedes only the actual conferral of restoration, it in no way opposes either the antecedent will or its proper effect, which is the institution of universal restoration. But the premature death of infants indeed impedes the actual conferral of restoration, yet by no means removes either the institution of the restored order or the common means which are available to all. I seem to myself to be able to illustrate this not a little by an argument drawn from a very similar matter. It is a law of divine piety [1] that for as long as men live the present life, although bound by the greatest crimes, they can nevertheless, with grace breathing upon them, emerge from their mire, recover adoption, and attain salvation. Suppose, moreover, that someone from among these suddenly falls into insanity and, insane—

> —completes his life. What, I ask, will you determine, or what judgment will you render? This: that that law of divine piety has either been abrogated or circumscribed? I do not think so. And nevertheless, he who, bound by sins, fell into insanity and completed his life insane certainly could not, through physical impotence, turn the benefits of piety to his own advantage and usefulness. Therefore, an obstacle introduced by physical impotence is not of such a kind as to impede the universal amplitude of restoration.

In addition to these things, III. anyone easily understands that this comparison can be instituted between adults and infants: just as, in order that the former may enjoy the benefit of restoration, two things are necessary, of which the one depends upon God alone, is common to all, and consists in the offered suitable

[1] Pp. 128, 176, 292, 305, 327….

safeguards of grace; but the other, after God and with God, depends upon the free cooperation of adults, is proper and peculiar to those who do not resist grace; so also, in order that infants may obtain the fruit of restoration, two things are likewise necessary, of which the former must be derived from God alone and is contained in the destination of supernatural means; but the latter is situated in that course of physical laws which does not extinguish the life of infants before they have come forth into the light. In this comparison, indeed, it wholly escapes me what in it is not harmonious or what could rightly be found wanting. But from it there follows that, just as the failure of adults to cooperate freely does not obstruct the universal amplitude of restoration, so neither does the course of physical laws which brings premature death prevent the compass of restoration from being extended also to the infants themselves.

Again, IV. since a twofold order was overthrown by the original transgression, the supernatural and the preternatural, it can usefully be asked to what restoration properly tends and, as though bound to what laws, it attains its *σκοπόν*, aim. But no one would call into doubt that restoration properly tends to this: that the overthrown supernatural order be restored and that the faculty of conquering sin, recovering adoption, and obtaining the inheritance be bestowed. For as regards the preternatural order, which consisted of the gifts of immortality, integrity, and immunity from sufferings, we indeed believe that it will at some time be restored [1]—

> —when the last death shall be conquered, when the corruptible body shall put on incorruption, and God shall be all in all; but we abundantly perceive that it has not been restored at present. For we all die, we all experience unbridled concupiscence, and we are all tormented by sufferings and afflictions. Now, this difference between the restoration of the two orders having been observed, it ought not to seem alien from the truth that the means of restoration are indeed available to all and that no one is deprived of them by the principal will of God; nevertheless, that which they call the proximate possibility of application is joined with and depends upon those things which accompany the defect of the preternatural order not restored. The means of restoration, I say, are available to all, but the proximate faculty of using them can be impeded by the evils to which the human race is subject because God did not will the preternatural order to be restored. Since these things are so, two things are manifestly gathered: first, that a twofold faculty of obtaining salvation must be distinguished, the proximate and the remote; and then, that from the restored order a proximate faculty indeed flows of itself unto all,

[1] I Cor. XV.25–26.

> but only a remote faculty is at hand for those who are physically impeded from enjoying it more abundantly by evils which proceed from the defect of the preternatural order not yet restored. Among their number come the infants whom death seizes before they have come forth into the light.

CCLXXVII.

But if these things are less pleasing and seem unworthy of assent, I have at hand another hypothesis, V., by which I may reconcile with universal restoration the fact of the immature death by which so many infants are snatched away. The author of the work *On the Calling of All Nations* suggests it to me, and he explains it in these very words [1]: "I judge that it is neither irreligious to believe nor unfitting to understand that those men of a few days pertain to that portion of grace which has always been expended upon all nations; and if their parents made good use of it, they themselves would also be aided through them—

> —For all the beginnings of little ones, and all those first stages of an infancy not yet rational, lie under the judgment of another's will; nor can provision be made for them in any way except through others, and it follows that they pertain to the fellowship of those by whose right or perverse affection they are governed. For just as they believe by another's confession, so by another's infidelity or dissimulation they do not believe; and since they themselves had a desire neither for the present life nor for the future, just as it was brought about by them—that is, by the parents—that they were born, so it is brought about by them that they are not reborn." Now this hypothesis is commended no less by the suffrage of him who proposed it than by a perspicuous analogy. It is commended by the suffrage of its author, whom Gelasius, the Roman Pontiff, saluted as a master of the Church [1]; and then it is commended by that common analogy by which we see the order of nature so constituted that infants are entrusted altogether to the zeal and cares of their parents. By their work and zeal they are conceived, cherished in the womb, come forth into the light, and are formed for the threefold life: natural, moral, and religious. What, then, is more manifestly expressed according to analogy than that, as regards the supernatural life also, they are committed to the work and benevolence of their parents? God aids the parents that they may aid their offspring; he excites

[1] Lib. II, cap. XXIII.

[1] Cf. Scipione Maffei, *Histor. Theolog. de Gratia*, lib. XVI, § II, nn. 3 ff.

> the parents lest they fail their children; and he sharpens their love for their offspring lest they omit any part of their duty toward their dearest pledges. If they obey nature and grace, and if they also join their own work with God, the common Father of all, the infants are saved; but if not, the latter indeed perish, yet they do not perish because God failed them and denied his benevolence, but because the blind malice of men overturned the divine *οἰκονομίαν*, economy.

Furthermore, these things, VI., call another hypothesis into my mind, which I do not wish to suppress in silence and which I willingly submit to the judgment of the readers, that they may determine concerning it. Therefore, I would have the following recalled in order: 1) what we read in James [2], "Pray for one another that you may be saved"; 2) what we profess in the Creed [3]—

> —"I believe in the communion of saints"; 3) what Paul frequently inculcates [1], that one body is formed from all, and that it is altogether necessary that the members be solicitous for one another; and 4) what the Church is accustomed to do in baptizing infants [2]. Namely, she is accustomed not to baptize them before she has demanded faith from them, nor to wash them before they have rendered a confession of faith through others [3]. But to what end are these things? That, from these things compared with one another, it may become known that we shall depart minimally from the truth if we judge that, as regards infants, the proximate faculty of participating in restoration depends not only upon parents but also upon the prayers of all and the communion of saints; if we judge that it is a law of the restored order that the salvation of many infants is obtained only when adults cooperate; and if we judge that God willed to provide for them in adults and through adults. Certainly, nothing in these things is discordant with the Christian profession; indeed, there is nothing that does not agree with the doctrine of James, with the article of the Creed concerning the communion of saints, with the custom of the Church, and with the images employed by Paul, which tend to this: that the unity of all be commended, charity be

[2] James V.16.

[3] I would therefore believe that this article, which you seek in vain in the more ancient Creeds of East and West—

> —was added afterward so that the Donatists might be proscribed by its profession.

[1] Rom. XII.4–5; I Cor. X.17; XII.12–14; XV.16–27; Eph. IV.4; V.30; Col. III.15.

[2] Cf. Joseph Bingham, *Origg. Ecclesiast.*, lib. XI, cap. VIII.

[3] Witnesses concerning this matter are Tertullian, *De baptismo*, cap. XVIII; Augustine, *Ad Bonifacium*, epist. XXIII, and *Op. imp.*, lib. I, n. 56; the author of the *Hypognosticon*, lib. VI, cap. VII; and Gennadius, *De eccles. dogmat.*, cap. LII.

kindled, and the benefits which flow from all unto individuals and in turn flow back from individuals unto all be represented to the life.

CCLXXVIII.

If these things suffice, it is well; but if there continue to be those who resist, I shall finally employ that defense, VII., by which I shall either untie the knot or certainly cut it. Therefore, just as damnation is twofold, so a twofold acceptation of universal restoration can be distinguished. For just as one damnation is positive and another negative; one which comprises both the privation of the intuitive vision and eternal—

—fires, and another which is concluded by the privation of the intuitive vision alone; so universal restoration can be understood in two ways: either as it is opposed to the necessity of incurring positive damnation and supplies the opportunity and faculty of avoiding it, or as it also excludes the very necessity of negative damnation. Therefore, when we call restoration universal, it can be asked whether it is affirmed by us as universal insofar as it is opposed to the necessity of positive damnation, or also insofar as it excludes the necessity of negative damnation. For it is not the same whether it is established as universal in the former or in the latter sense. But even if, constrained by the difficulty, we should confess that the compass of restoration does not extend to those infants who die before they could receive the means by which the original stain is cleansed and the splendor of adoption is bestowed, it would nevertheless by no means follow that restoration ought not to be called and believed universal in the former sense. If you ask the cause, I have one to bring forth which is altogether lucid. Namely, it is a hypothesis which no prudent man would spurn and no one would condemn without rashness: that infants bound only by the guilt of origin are punished by no damnation other than the negative. This hypothesis alone a) the Eastern Church has approved and approves [1]; this alone b) not a

[1] Witnesses to this matter are both Gregories, Nazianzen and Nyssen: the former in Orat. XL *De baptismo*, the latter in *Orat. de infantibus*; the author of the *Questions to the Orthodox* which circulate under the name of Justin, q. LVI; the author of the *Questions to Antiochus* among the works of Athanasius, q. CXIV; and Nicetas in his commentary upon the oration of Gregory Nazianzen which we praised. Cf. Isaac Habert, *Theologia graecorum patrum de gratia*, lib. II, cap. X, § II.

few of the Latin Fathers have followed [2]; to this alone c) the School from the twelfth century onward has given its suffrage [3]—
—d) Innocent III confirmed it in express words [1]; e) the Synod of Florence seems not obscurely to have preferred it [2]; f) it alone occupied the minds and souls of the faithful [3]; and g) the analogy of dogmas and the harmony of doctrines alone persuade it [4]. Therefore, although the benefits of restoration did not pertain to those infants who are snatched away by a bitter fate, it would nevertheless remain fixed and ratified that there is no one who is pressed by the necessity of bearing positive damnation and who therefore rushes into Gehenna because he lacked the power by which he might avoid so great a destruction.

CCLXXIX.

THE THINGS PAUL TEACHES

IN I Tim. II.1–7 ARE EXPOUNDED.

Among the other endowments by which we have shown Christian tradition to be distinguished, by whose aid we have explained the true and sincere doctrine concerning the first and second divine will, the restored order of salvation, the amplitude of grace, predestination, and reprobation, that must not be commemorated in the last place by which we demonstrated that it ought to be called and held *ἐξηγητικήν*, exegetical [5]. For from this it follows of its own accord that the

[2] Among these must be commemorated Ambrose, *De Abraham*, lib. II, cap. XI, n. 84; Ambrosiaster, *Comm. in epist. ad Rom.* V.12; Anselm, *De conceptu Virginis et orig. peccato*, cap. XXIII; *De concordia grat. et lib. arbitrii*, cap. IX; *Monolog.*, capp. LXXII–LXXIII; and Bernard, *In Cantic.*, Hom. LXIX. I would believe that to these may not undeservedly be added Siricius, epist. I *Ad Himerium*, cap. II; Innocent I, epist. XXX, n. 5; Gelasius I, epist. VII; and John VIII, epist. CLXXXVIII *Ad Anselmum Lemovicensem*, whose words are reported by Ivo, Part I, cap. CCCVI, and Gratian, can. VII, caus. XXX, q. I.

[3] As most abundant witnesses of this agreement there are present Peter Lombard—
—in II, dist. XXXIII; Alexander of Hales in *S.*, P. II, q. CV, membr. X, § I; Albert in *S.*, P. II, Tract. XVII, q. CXIII; Thomas in *Quaestt. disputt.*, q. V, aa. III; in II, dist. XXXIII, q. II, a. 1; Bonaventure in II, dist. XXXIII, q. II; Giles of Rome in II, dist. XXXIII, q. II, a. 1; and Scotus in II, dist. XXXIII, q. unica.

[1] *Decret.*, Lib. III, Tit. XLII, cap. *Maiores*, § *sed adhuc*.

[2] Cf. Cajetan Maria De-Petio, additions to Felix Potestas, *Theologia moralis*, Appendix XXI, diss. IV.

[3] To this pertains proposition XXVI among those which Pius VI proscribed.

[4] Bonaventure discusses this harmony of doctrines excellently in *Breviloquium*, P. III, cap. V.

[5] In the corollaries, which it will be worthwhile to recall to mind.

tradition proposed and explained can be regarded in no other way than as a royal and most abundant river which has flowed from the rich vein of the Scriptures—

> —And indeed the Fathers taught nothing and transmitted nothing down to us which they did not draw from the oracles of the Scriptures and which they did not confirm by the testimonies of the divine writings. Although nearly all of these are illustrious and accommodated either for establishing or for adorning the matter, nevertheless there is one which excels the rest and which is employed more frequently and by the consensus of all. It is that which is read in Paul's First Epistle to Timothy. We undertake to expound it more diligently with this counsel: that all may see by what excellent right the Fathers and witnesses of Tradition had recourse to an oracle of this kind and held it as a fountain from which they might aptly deduce all the previously established heads of doctrine. But lest the commentary be destitute either of order or of perspicuity, first we shall transcribe the text itself; then we shall indicate the various readings, if there are any; next we shall demonstrate that it must be judged the principal and, as they are accustomed to say, classical passage in the present controversy; we shall declare the mutual connection of the parts and the *συνάφειαν*, coherence, of the clauses; and finally we shall submit each and every point to as accurate an examination as can be made.

CCLXXX.

Thus, in the received Greek editions the apostolic testimony reads as follows [1]:

1. *Παρακαλῶ οὖν πρῶτον πάντων ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις, προσευχάς, ἐντεύξεις, εὐχαριστίας, ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων,*
2. *ὑπὲρ βασιλέων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων, ἵνα ἤρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν ἐν πάσῃ εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ σεμνότητι.*
3. *τοῦτο γὰρ καλὸν καὶ ἀπόδεκτον ἐνώπιον τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ,*
4. *ὃς πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι, καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν.*
5. *εἷς γὰρ Θεός, εἷς καὶ μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός,*
6. *ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίοις.*

But it is rendered in Latin by the Vulgate interpreter in these words:

1. "I beseech, therefore, first of all, that supplications, prayers, petitions, and thanksgivings be made for all men.

[1] I Tim. II.1–7.

2. For kings and all who are in high station, that we may lead a quiet and tranquil life in all piety and chastity.
3. For this is good and acceptable before God our Savior,
4. Who wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth.
5. For there is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus,
6. Who gave himself a redemption for all, a testimony in its own times."

The various readings are neither many in number nor so constituted that they alter the force and sense of the discourse.

a) Where we read *παρακαλῶ*, some codices in Griesbach and Lachmann have *παρακάλει*; and the ancient version in Sabatier, as well as Hilary [1] and Ambrosiaster [2], who render it "beseech, exhort," give them their suffrage.
b) What in the Greek and Latin copies is expressed indefinitely, "I beseech—or, exhort—therefore, first of all, that there be made…," the Syriac interpreter renders definitely by inserting the pronoun "of you": "I ask, therefore, of you that before all things you offer supplication to God…."
c) The last clause of the sixth verse in some codices, with which the ancient version and Ambrosiaster agree, is thus: *οὗ τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίοις ἐδόθη*, "whose testimony was given in its own times."

Any other things, if there are any, ought to be judged not so much various readings as *σφάλματα*, errors, of the codices and citations.

CCLXXXI.

Those who discuss more subtly the laws of right interpretation skillfully admonish, among many other things, this also: that care must altogether be taken lest several testimonies which perhaps occur concerning the same matter be held in the same rank; but if some are fuller and more evident, they should be preferred to the others, and light should be derived from them unto the others. They call these the principal passages of interpretation and not rarely classical passages. Now that the apostolic testimony which we have reported and whose various readings we have indicated must be numbered among these in the present controversy is proved by both internal and external arguments.

For the internal arguments demand that that passage be regarded as principal whose reading is indubitable as regards the substance of the matter, which consists of perspicuous and common words, whose construction is simple and impeded by no roughness, and in which the matter itself is not indicated in passing but accurately declared and purposely explained. For if these things flow

[1] *In Ps.* CXL, col. 535.
[2] *In I Tim.* II.1.

together, everything is present by which the account of a principal passage is completed. But there is none of these things which does not most fittingly agree with the testimony of Paul: for its reading is certain and fixed as regards the substance; it is composed of perspicuous words worn by use; it exhibits a clear syntax freed from knots; and the salvific will is so treated in it that whatever things contribute to its knowledge are proposed fully and lucidly. Therefore, when the internal arguments are considered, the account of a principal passage cannot be denied to the testimony of the Apostle.

Nor can it be denied to the same testimony if the external arguments are weighed. But I call external those arguments which are sought from authority and which extend in two directions. For either they are drawn from an authority which simply creates persuasion, or they are drawn from an authority to which the force of producing faith belongs only hypothetically. Of the former kind are those which flow from the fountain of Christian tradition; but of the latter, those which the consensus of parties otherwise contending supplies. But the force and dignity of a principal passage are vindicated for the apostolic testimony no less by Christian tradition than by the consensus of the disputants.

It is vindicated, I., by Christian tradition, both because a) all the Greek—

—Fathers without exception had recourse to this testimony in controversies concerning the salvific will of God, the state of restoration, redemption through Christ, the amplitude of grace, predestination, and reprobation; explained it with one and the same commentary; and derived from it an open and excellent solution of the questions [1]; and because b), before the Pelagian and Semipelagian controversies had arisen, not even one Latin writer can be found who did not agree entirely with the Orientals in the same interpretation [2]; and because c), when the Pelagian and Semipelagian dissensions were growing stronger, the most weighty and especially orthodox writers asserted and strenuously defended the ancient and universal interpretation which had proceeded from the very age of the Apostles [3]; and because d), in the ninth century, this same original and apostolic interpretation was defended and confirmed by published canons [4]; and because e) the whole School drew especially from this oracle the division of the divine will into antecedent and consequent, and

[1] This is manifest from the whole commentary.

[2] Indeed, we have reported nearly all of them in the commentary, and we observed that all agreed entirely with the Greeks.

[3] You have these brought forth in great number in §§ XXVIII ff.

[4] § CXXXIII.

> with one voice taught the infinite amplitude and fecundity of the antecedent will and the state of restoration joined with each will [5].

To this is added the consensus of the disputants, by which, II., the dignity of a principal passage is vindicated for the apostolic words. For all the Calvinists, whether they are supralapsarians or infralapsarians, the Lutherans, Jansenists, and orthodox [1], readily confess that the substance of the controversy depends upon these words; and therefore they leave no stone unmoved so that they may persuade themselves that these words support them and their tenets, or at least do not oppose them. It is clear, therefore, that the internal and external arguments tend to this: that in the kind of controversies which we have here, we attribute the principal place and supreme seat to the words of Paul to Timothy [2].

CCLXXXII.

But these things are so constituted that the clauses which follow in order display the cause and reason of those which precede. The signs and arguments of this internal connection are both the rational particle *γάρ*, for, employed once and again [3], and the subject matter itself of the discourse. For Paul begins by commending worship and inculcating its most noble part, which consists in prayers offered to God; and he ordains [4] that prayers be poured forth earnestly for absolutely all men, and specifically for kings and the others who preside. He then immediately adds the cause of the precept [5], and takes it from the twofold fountain of moral goodness and the divine will and heavenly good pleasure. Moreover, Paul demonstrates that it is the will of God that prayer be made for all, partly by the

[5]This is perspicuous from those things which Peter Lombard teaches in the *Collectanea* on I Tim. II; Alexander of Hales in *S.*, P. I, q. XXXVI, membr. II; Thomas in I, dist. XLVI, q. I, a. 1; *De verit.*, q. XXII, a. III; in *S.*, P. I, q. XIX, a. VI; on I Tim. II; and in the Epistle to the Hebrews XII; Bonaventure in I, dist. XLVI, a. 1, q. 1; Giles Colonna in I, dist. XLVI; and Scotus in I, dist. XLVI, q. unica. To these must be added the judgments pertaining to the same matter which the more recent Greeks rendered and which are read partly in the *Acts and Writings of the Württemberg Theologians and D. Jeremias, Patriarch of Constantinople*, which both parties sent to one another concerning the Augsburg Confession from the year 1576 to the year 1581, and which were published at Wittenberg in the year 1584; partly in the *Censure of the Eastern Church concerning the Principal Dogmas of the Heretics of Our Age*, published in the year 1581 by the care of Stanislaus Socolovius; and partly in the work entitled *The Synod of Jerusalem against the Calvinist Heretics, Celebrated in the Year 1642 under Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem*.

[1]Cf. Petavius, *De Deo*, lib. IX, cap. VII; lib. X, cap. I; *De Incarnat.*, lib. XIII, cap. I ff.; William Forbes, *Institutt. Historico-Theolog.*, lib. VIII, cap. XVIII; Foertsch, *Selecta theologica*, P. I; Samuel Bochart, *Opp.*, T. II, p. 1043; and Hoornbeeck, *Disputt. miscellaneae*, p. 373.

[2]I Tim. II.1 ff.

[3]Namely, employed in vv. 3–5.

[4]I Tim. II.1–2.

[5]Ibid., vv. 3–4.

apposition "Savior," with which he distinguishes God, and partly by the explicit statement concerning him that "he wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth" [6]—

> —Not content with these things, he immediately discloses the fountain of such a benign and merciful will and teaches that it is situated in this: that one and the same is the Creator and Father of all [1], and that one and the same Christ is the mediator of all and gave himself as a redemption for all [2]. It is therefore manifest that this is the *ἀκολουθίαν*, sequence, of the discourse: that the things which follow display the cause and reason of those which precede, but all tend to this, either to declare or to prove that prayer must be made for all [3]. At the beginning Paul declares that prayer must be made for all. Then, to those asking the cause of the precept, he replies: "Because this is good and acceptable before God our Savior." But to what does the appellation "Savior" pertain, or what is signified by it? This is signified: that "God wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth." But whence shall we understand that so benevolent a will toward all men inheres in God the Savior? It will be plain to us if we consider in mind that "there is one God, one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself as a redemption for all." Therefore, just as there is one God of all and one mediator and redeemer of all, so prayer must be made for all, that all may be saved and obtain the knowledge of the truth. But in the very commentary which we undertake, the individual points will shine forth more splendidly.

CCLXXXIII.

Paul knew what virtues and endowments ought to adorn a bishop so that he might be able to uphold his dignity and discharge, as is fitting, the office committed to him and the administration of the flock entrusted to him. Therefore, he willed none of these things to be hidden from Timothy, whom he held most dear [4], whom he repeatedly called *τέκνον*, son [5], upon whom he had imposed hands *κατὰ τὰς προαγούσας προφητείας*, according to the preceding prophecies, that is—

[6] Ibid., v. 4.
[1] Ibid., v. 5.
[2] Ibid., v. 6.
[3] Ibid., v. 8.
[4] I Tim. I.2.
[5] Ibid., v. 18.

—*κατὰ πνεύματος ἀποκάλυψιν*, according to the revelation of the Spirit [1], and whom he had placed over the Church of Ephesus; but he signified and prescribed in order both the things which pertained to Timothy himself and those which pertained to the guardianship of the flock. He signified the former by an image customary to himself [2], declaring to Timothy that he should "wage the good warfare" [3], which he would wage on this one condition: if he most constantly retained *πίστιν*, faith, against the *ἑτεροδιδασκάλους*, perverse teachers, and *ἀγαθὴν συνείδησιν*, a good conscience, against the flagitious and wicked [4]. Proceeding next to those things of which the care of the flock and the administration of the Church consist, he begins from public and solemn worship and addresses Timothy in these words [5]: *παρακαλῶ οὖν πρῶτον πάντων*, "I beseech, therefore"; I exhort, admonish, indeed by praying I exhort, and by exhorting I pray [6], and this before all things, principally and especially, so that you may perceive the moment of the matter and recognize its gravity. But what? *ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις, προσευχάς, ἐντεύξεις, εὐχαριστίας ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων*, "that supplications, prayers, petitions, and thanksgivings be made for all men." Here so many words joined and heaped together at once excited the zeal of interpreters to inquire diligently what must be judged concerning them and what power of signifying ought to be attached to them. Concerning this matter, I know that there have been two opinions of the ancients and more recent writers; having expounded these briefly, I shall add what seems to me ought to be established.

Thus, among the ancient interpreters, Origen [7], Chrysostom [8], Augustine [9], Theodoret [10], and others whom Theophylact commemorates [11] subtly investigated the force of each word and judged that the force they found must be attributed to the testimony of Paul—

—Behold the words of Origen:

[1] As Oecumenius has it; and it can be illustrated by the things which occur in Acts XIII.2; XX.28.
[2] Eph. VI.10 ff.; II Tim. II.3.
[3] I Tim. I.18.
[4] Ibid., v. 19.
[5] Ibid., II.1.
[6] Rom. XV.30; I Pet. II.11.
[7] *De orat.*, § 44.
[8] *In comm. ad h. l.*
[9] Epist. CXLIX *Ad Paulinum*.
[10] *In comm. ad h. l.*
[11] *In comm. ad h. l.*

> *Δεήσεις, τὰς ἐλλείποντός τινι μεθ' ἱκεσίας περὶ τοῦ ἐκείνου τυχεῖν ἀναπεμπομένας εὐχάς. Προσευχάς, τὰς μετὰ δοξολογίας, περὶ μειζόνων μεγαλοφυέστερον ἀναπεμπομένας ὑπὸ τοῦ προσευχομένου. Ἐντεύξεις, τὰς ὑπὸ τοῦ παρρησίαν τινὰ πλείονα ἔχοντος, περὶ τινῶν ἀξιώσεις πρὸς Θεόν· Εὐχαριστίας, τὰς ἐπὶ τῷ τετυχηκέναι ἀγαθῶν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ μετ' εὐχῶν ἀνθομολογήσεις.*
>
> "He calls supplications the prayers of him who lacks something, sent forth with entreaty for obtaining it. Prayers are petitions with celebration, sent forth more magnanimously by the one praying for greater goods. Petitions are requests to God concerning certain things, made by him who has a certain greater confidence. Thanksgivings are praises with prayers on account of goods received from God."

But Theodoret has it thus:

> *Δέησις μὲν ἐστίν, ὑπὲρ ἀπαλλαγῆς τινων λυπηρῶν ἱκετεία προσφερομένη. Προσευχὴ δέ, αἴτησις ἀγαθῶν. Ἔντευξις δέ, κατηγορία τῶν ἀδικούντων. ἡ πάλη δὲ ἡμῖν οὐ πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις· κατὰ τούτων πρόσειμεν τῷ δικαιοκρίτῃ, καὶ τὴν δικαίαν αἰτοῦμεν ἐπικουρίαν. ἡ δέ γε Εὐχαριστία ὑπὲρ τῶν προηγμένων ἀγαθῶν προσφέρεται τῷ Θεῷ.*
>
> "Supplication indeed is an entreaty offered for the removal of certain evils. Prayer, however, is a petition for goods. Petition is an accusation of those inflicting injury. For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of this age, against the spiritual things of wickedness in the heavens. Against these we approach the just Judge as intercessors and seek just aid. But thanksgiving is offered to God for the goods which have already befallen us."

Among the more recent writers, Grotius and Vitringa gave their vote to this articulated interpretation before the others. The former says [1]: "*Δεήσεις* are deprecations [2] for averting evils—

> —*תחנות*. *Προσευχαί* are prayers [1] for obtaining goods for us, *תפלות*. *Ἐντεύξεις* are prayers [2] for others, *פגעים*. *Εὐχαριστίαι* are thanksgivings for goods already received which ought to be joined to prayers [3],

[1] *In comm. ad h. l.*
[2] Acts I.14; Phil. IV.6.
[1] Eph. I.16; VI.18.
[2] Rom. VIII.26.
[3] Phil. IV.6.

> תודות.” But Vitringa [4] compares the kinds of prayers commemorated by Paul with the Jewish kinds, so that *δεήσεις* are תחנות; *προσευχαί*, תפלות; *ἐντεύξεις*, בקשות or שאלות; and *εὐχαριστίαι*, ברכות. And he adds that those err who interpret *ἐντεύξεις* as prayers poured forth for others, since in truth supplicatory prayers are designated by that name.

But Theophylact judged otherwise, and these are his words [5]: “Supplication, prayer, and petition, as signifying the same thing, were assumed by the Apostle for perspicuity, since by so great a heap of words he inevitably demands, without refusal, that the thing which he asks and to which he exhorts be done. Some have curiously made a distinction among these, asserting that *δέησιν* is a supplication offered for liberation from sorrowful and harsh things; that *προσευχήν* is a petition for goods; but that *ἔντευξιν* is a petition or interpellation and accusation of those acting impiously and inflicting injury [6].” With Theophylact—to commemorate no more—George Raphelius and Heinrich Heinrichs went into the same judgment. The former of these first writes [7]: “The name *ἔντευξις* does not of itself signify intercession for others, but generally a meeting, conversation, address, and finally any prayers whatsoever, as appears also from I Tim. IV.5; in Isocrates, *Ad Demonicum*, *τὰς ἐντεύξεις μὴ πυκνὰς ποιοῦ τοῖς αὐτοῖς*, ‘do not converse and meet too frequently with the same persons’; and in Plutarch, *Solon*, *ἡ πρὸς Κροῖσον ἔντευξις*, ‘the meeting and conversation with Croesus.’ The same author in his little book *Περὶ δυσωπίας* says, *πρὸς ἡγεμόνας ἐντεύξεις*, ‘addresses by which rulers—

> —are addressed and approached concerning some matter.’ Stephanus collected these passages in the *Thesaurus*. To them Priceus adds from the same Plutarch, in the *Life of Numa*, *τὰς πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἐντεύξεις*. Hence *ἐντευκτικός* is said of one to whom access lies easily open, who shows himself accessible to those approaching.” Then he continues: “Nevertheless, I do not deny that *ἐντεύξεις ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων* are prayers for all men; but I say only this: that *δεήσεις* and *προσευχὰς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων* must no less also be understood in this way, since each word is found very frequently with this signification and construction. Thus *δέησις* in Rom. X.1, *δέησις ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ*; II Cor. I.11; IX.14; Phil. I.4; James V.16. Likewise *δέομαι* in Acts VIII.24, *δεήθητε ὑμεῖς ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ*; and Luke XXII.32. But *προσευχή* in Acts

[4] *De vetere synagoga*, p. 1025. Trigland agrees in the *Diatriba de secta Karaeorum*, p. 167, and Schoettgen in *Horae hebraicae* at this passage.

[5] *In comm. ad h. l.*

[6] Hesychius agrees, writing: *ἔντευξις, ἀπάντησις κατὰ τῶν πλημμελησάντων· δέησις εἰς ἐκδίκησιν.* “A petition is an objection against those who have transgressed; it is a request for vengeance.”

[7] *Annotat. in I Tim.* II.1.

XII.5, *προσευχὴ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ*; Rom. XV.30; Col. IV.12; Philem. 22; James V.17–18; and also *προσεύχομαι* in Luke VI.28; Acts VIII.15; IX.40; Phil. I.9; Col. IV.3; I Thess. V.25; Heb. XIII.18; James V.14." And finally he infers: "From so many passages I have no doubt that these three words, *δέησις, προσευχή*, and *ἔντευξις*, are of promiscuous use, and in this passage are indeed accumulated for the sake of emphasis, so that prayers for the salvation of others may be commended all the more. Meanwhile, I do not disapprove the division of prayers received by most theologians, although I do not judge it to be contained in these words." Heinrichs brings forth his judgment more briefly [1], writing: "Interpreters labor in discussing the difference among these words, which I believe to be synonymous and accumulated for this end, that the meaning 'most earnest prayers' may be expressed more vehemently; nevertheless, that natural distinction of prayers is retained by which we either ask the Deity for something or, having obtained our wish, render thanks."

CCLXXXIV.

In this variety of opinions I do not think it difficult to determine what should be preferred, if the things which we add are considered. If I. it is considered that beneath the words used by Paul there lies of themselves a proper and distinct signification. For—

—a) *δέησις* properly is need, and, according to the testimony of Harpocration, *δέησις* is said *ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνδείας*, in place of need; in this sense we read [1], *οὐδὲ προσώχθισε τῇ δεήσει τοῦ πτωχοῦ*, "nor did he disdain the supplication of the poor." Hence *δέησις* is not only *ἡ αἴτησις ἐνδεῶν*, the petition of those things which are lacking, as it is explained by Gregory Nazianzen [2], but properly and expressly a deprecation of evils. To the point Theodoret says [3]: *δέησις ἐστίν, ὑπὲρ ἀπαλλαγῆς τινων λυπηρῶν ἱκετεία προσφερομένη*, "deprecation is a supplication offered for the removal of certain evils." Nor does Theophylact speak otherwise [4]: *δέησις ἐστὶν ἱκετηρία προσφερομένη ὑπὲρ ἀπαλλαγῆς τινων λυπηρῶν*, "deprecation is a supplication

[1] Ibid.

[1] Ps. XXII.25.

[2] *In carm. iamb.* XV.

[3] *In comm. ad h. l.*

[4] Ibid.

which is offered for liberation [5] from certain sorrowful things." There follows b) *προσευχή*, a word which, although it extends most widely and embraces every pious declaration of the mind's sentiments made to God, and prayers of every kind, nevertheless specifically expresses a petition directed to God, as though *εὐχὴν πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, a prayer to God, that we may obtain those things which are good. *Προσευχή*, in the words of Theodoret [6], *ἐστὶν αἴτησις ἀγαθῶν*, "is a petition for goods." Gregory of Nyssa concurs [7]: *προσευχὴ ἱκετηρία ἐστὶ περὶ τινος τῶν συμφερόντων προσαγομένη θεῷ*, "prayer is a supplication offered to God for some useful thing." Basil [8], Olympiodorus [9], Cyril of Alexandria [10], and the Suda [11] have very similar things. Let Cyril be heard: *προσευχὴ ἐστὶν ἡ τῶν ἐκ θεοῦ πρὸς σωτηρίαν χορηγουμένων τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀγαθῶν ἐξαίτησις*, "prayer is the petition of the goods which are supplied by God to men for salvation." Furthermore, c) *ἔντευξις* properly is an approach, by which we go to another for the sake of any matter whatsoever. Hence Cyril [12] and Hesychius render *ἔντευξιν* by *ἐντυχίαν* and *ἀπάντησιν*. But because we are accustomed to approach others—

—that we may either petition or deprecate something, it therefore came about that *ἔντευξις* in common life signifies an intercession by which, conversing with another, we commend to him the affairs of our friends, but in religious life it expresses the prayers which we pour forth to God for others. To the point is the manuscript Lexicon cited by Alberti [1]: *ἔντευξις παράκλησις προσαγομένη θεῷ περὶ σωτηρίας ἑτέρων*, "petition is an entreaty offered to God concerning the salvation of others." Finally, d) *εὐχαριστία* is thanksgiving and the testimony of a grateful mind which we render to God and to men. "Thanksgiving," Chrysostom writes [2], "is then said, *ὅταν τις ὑπὲρ ὧν εὖ ἔπαθεν, εὐχαριστῇ τῷ θεῷ*, when someone gives thanks to God for the benefits received."

[5] Heb. V.7.
[6] *In comm. ad h. l.*
[7] Tract. II *in Psalmos*, cap. III, p. 295, *opp.*, T. I.
[8] *Orat. in Julittam martyrem*.
[9] *Comm. in Eccles.* V.
[10] *In collectaneis*, p. 63, and *ad Is.* XLIX, p. 666.
[11] *Ad h. v.*
[12] In the Lexicons.
[1] At Hesychius, T. I, p. 1261.
[2] Cf. the testimonies of Chrysostom in Suicer, *Thesaurus*, col. 1269.

If II. it is considered that usage has brought it about that the words *δέησις*, *προσευχή*, and *ἔντευξις* are employed promiscuously and *ἀδιαφόρως*, indifferently. Suicer [3], Wall [4], and Schleusner [5] collected a great number of examples which demonstrate even to evidence such promiscuous use; nor do I judge it worthwhile to linger longer over a matter most commonly known.

If III. it is considered that that commentary is deservedly preferred to the others in which apt provision is made both for the propriety of the words and for the mind and sentiments of him who writes; that is, in which regard is had no less for grammatical than for psychological interpretation [6]. For a perfect commentary, complete in all its parts, is one in which the laws of each interpretation are religiously observed.

If IV. it is considered that the form and habit of the discourse employed by Paul is such as it is accustomed to be when someone writes with his mind aroused and inflamed. For the word *παρακαλῶ* intimates this movement of sentiments and mind; the phrase *πρῶτον πάντων* shows it more fully; but the accumulated words demonstrate it most openly: *ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις, προσευχάς, ἐντεύξεις, εὐχαριστίας ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων*.

When these things are considered, as is fitting, those seem to me to touch the matter with a needle who establish: a) that, according to the laws of grammatical interpretation and for avoiding tautology, nothing more fitting can be said than that the distinct notions of the words must be retained, so that *δεήσεις* signify deprecations of evils; *προσευχαί*, prayers for goods; *ἐντεύξεις*, supplications poured forth for others; and *εὐχαριστίαι*, thanksgivings. But then b) that, according to the laws of psychological interpretation, it must be judged that Paul did not think distinctly about the proper notions of the individual words, that he saw them confusedly, and that he therefore accumulated so many words in order to designate every kind of prayer as vehemently as he could, and to express that which elsewhere [1] he said more compendiously: *διὰ πάσης προσευχῆς καὶ δεήσεως*, "through every prayer and supplication." In this matter we have Elsner agreeing with us, although he judged somewhat otherwise concerning the force of the individual words. For he writes [2]: "Since even synonyms when joined must be distinguished in some way, that tautology may be avoided, and

[3] In the *Thesaurus* at these words.

[4] In the *Clavis ad N. T.*

[5] In the new Lexicon at the New Testament.

[6] Pareau writes accurately concerning the method of psychological interpretation in *Hermeneutica codicis sacri*, P. II, cap. III, § XXXI, pp. 400 ff., Groningen edition, 1846.

[1] Eph. VI.18.

[2] *Observatt. Sacr.* at I Tim. II.1. Hence Louis Bauer also writes in *Logica Paulina*, cap. VI, *De methodo Pauli*, § III, p. 394: "I Tim. II.1. Paul divides prayers into *δεήσεις*, from *δέομαι*, I need, when we pray for goods and deprecate evils; *προσευχάς*, when we worship God in himself and celebrate his majesty; *ἐντεύξεις*, for others; *εὐχαριστίας*, when we give thanks for benefits. This is

εὐχαριστία is without doubt distinct from the others, I would believe that they are to be expounded thus: that *δέησις* is the deprecation of evils; *προσευχή*, a wish for goods; *ἔντευξις*, an earnest request or petition, as the Vulgate rightly renders the Hebrew בקשות, elsewhere *αἴτημα*, Phil. IV.6; *εὐχαριστία*, thanksgiving; so that the faithful are commanded to deprecate the evils of all, to wish goods for them and ask earnestly, and finally to give thanks to God in the place of all."

CCLXXXV.

In this commentary all things are so fitted and connected that they mutually procure credibility and splendor for one another. For if prayer must be made *ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων*, for all men, what is more evident than that prayers of every kind must be poured forth? And if—

> —prayers of every kind must be poured forth, and *δεήσεις, προσευχαί, ἐντεύξεις, εὐχαριστίαι* must be made, who does not perceive that prayer must be made for all? But force and strength will accrue to these things if they are compared with the illustrious doctrine of Christ. At the beginning Christ reports [1] the precept of the ancient law and the depraved interpretation of the Jews, saying: *ἠκούσατε, ὅτι ἐῤῥέθη*, "you have heard that it was said": *ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου*, "you shall love your neighbor." In the law of Leviticus [2] there is רע, which, like the word *πλησίον*, designates any other whatever, since every man is another man's nearest neighbor and associate through the conjunction of nature; whence the Alexandrian interpreters also [3] rendered רע by *ἕκαστον*, each one. Yet he is accustomed to be called *πλησίος* in a stricter sense who is joined with us by a closer bond, such as are reckoned friends, relatives, those of the same tribe, and followers of the same religion. Hence the Alexandrians also [4] rendered the word אח, brother, by *πλησίον*. Furthermore, the Jews interpreted the law in this narrower signification, and from it, as Christ continues [5], concluded by inference: *καὶ μισήσεις τὸν ἐχθρόν σου*, "and you shall hate your enemy." But they called enemies not only those by

a true division, fitted to the origin and use of the words and to the nature of the matter, and to the counsel and condition of prayers, of which you would find no kind omitted here."

[1] Matt. V.43.

[2] Lev. XIX.18.

[3] As may be seen in Exod. XVIII.16.

[4] Gen. XXVI.31; Joel II.8.

[5] Matt. V.43.

whom they had been injured, but also [6] all who did not profess the same religion as they.

Opposing his own doctrine to so manifest a corruption of the law, Christ adds [7]: *ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν*, "but I say to you"; behold the majesty of the legislator, who establishes precepts in his own name and sanctions laws by his own right: *ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν*, "love your enemies," both those who have injured you and those who follow institutions alien to yours: *εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους*—

—*ὑμᾶς*, "speak well of those who speak evil of you"; for *εὐλογεῖν*, ברך, is frequently to speak well of someone, and *καταρᾶσθαι*, to speak evil of someone [1]: *καλῶς ποιεῖτε* [2] *τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς*, "do good to those who hate you"; for *καλῶς ποιεῖν*, היטיב, is the same as [3] *ἀγαθοποιεῖν*, to do good: *καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς, καὶ διωκόντων ὑμᾶς*, "and pray for those who persecute [4] and harass you." By these words Christ restores the commandment of charity, discloses its amplitude, and prescribes its functions.

He restores the commandment of charity by repeating the law, *ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου*, "you shall love your neighbor." Then he discloses its amplitude and, to that end, rejects the corruption introduced by the Jews, *μισήσεις τὸν ἐχθρόν σου*, "you shall hate your enemy"; and he distributes all men into two classes, *τῶν πλησίων καὶ τῶν ἐχθρῶν*, of friends and enemies, and divides the latter class into four orders, *τῶν ἐχθρῶν* simply, *τῶν καταρωμένων*, *τῶν μισούντων*, and *τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων καὶ διωκόντων*, and declares that the law of charity must be observed toward every one of the orders. But what orders does he enumerate, or what offices of charity does he enjoin toward each? The orders which he enumerates are so constituted that it is manifest to men that those who are contained in the consequent order are more hostile to us than those who are contained in the preceding one. For in the first order are enumerated those who are called *ἐχθροί* simply; *καταρώμενοι* follow; *μισοῦντες* come after these; and *ἐπηρεάζοντες καὶ*

[6] This is gathered not obscurely from those things which Luke has, cap. X.27 ff.; Josephus, *Antiquitt.*, lib. II, cap. VI; and Tacitus, *Annal.*, lib. V, cap. IV.

[7] Matt. V.44.

[1] James III.9; Rom. XII.14; I Cor. IV.12, in which last place *εὐλογεῖν* and *λοιδορεῖν* are opposed to one another.

[2] I plainly assent to Fritzsche, who in his commentary at this place censures Griesbach and Lachmann because they expunged the words *εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς· καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς*, and believed them transferred here from Luke VI.27–28.

[3] Zech. VIII.15; Luke VI.33–36.

[4] Although *ἐπηρεάζειν* is not rarely a forensic word and has the same force as to prosecute someone and accuse him falsely, as Boisius and Elsner demonstrated by suitable examples, nevertheless it much more frequently assumes a wider signification and denotes the same as to injure and afflict with loss. Furthermore, the course of the discourse and the complete distribution of enemies demand that this signification be preferred here.

διώκοντες close the series. But *ἐπηρεάζοντες καὶ διώκοντες* are more hostile to us than *μισοῦντες*; these oppose us more bitterly than *καταρώμενοι*; and the latter exercise their enmities against us more savagely—

—than those who are simply called *ἐχθροί*. Therefore, the discourse increases, and degrees of graver enmity are proposed continuously.

From this we understand that the offices of charity enjoined upon us toward *τοὺς ἐχθρούς* must be fulfilled much more toward *τοὺς πλησίους*, and that the things which we are commanded to perform toward *τοὺς ἐπηρεάζοντας καὶ διώκοντας* ought by a much greater right to be conferred upon *τοὺς μισοῦντας καὶ τοὺς καταρωμένους καὶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς*. But we are commanded, *προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς καὶ διωκόντων ὑμᾶς*, "pray for those who persecute you and assail you by deeds and works." Therefore, let no one deny that this very office of prayer must by a far stronger right be fulfilled toward those who regard us less unjustly and whom Christ calls *τοὺς μισοῦντας, τοὺς καταρωμένους καὶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς*.

But when these things are compared with Paul's testimony, five consequences most opportune for the present matter are elicited. And I. it is elicited that Christ, by a distributed discourse which increases through degrees, commands by implication that very thing which Paul prescribes by signifying infinitely and absolutely. For Christ directly commands that prayer be made for those who persecute and harass us; but by the form and habit of a distributed and increasing discourse he signifies by implication that prayer must be made for all: he signifies that prayer must be made for those who demonstrate their hostile mind toward us by deeds; but he signifies by implication that prayer must much more be made for those who pursue us only with internal hatred, who assail us by words alone, who differ from us merely in nation or in sacred rites, and who are our friends and relatives. He signifies, namely, that prayer must be made for absolutely all men. But to this returns what Paul signifies infinitely and absolutely when he admonishes that prayer must be made *ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων*, for all men. It is elicited II. that the testimonies of Christ and Paul differ only in the manner and mode of expressing one and the same thing, and therefore are altogether similar and plainly worthy of being compared with and illustrating one another. It is elicited III. that Paul's infinite words, *ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων*, can and indeed also must be resolved in such a way that they distributively embrace *τοὺς πλησίους, τοὺς ἐχθρούς, τοὺς καταρωμένους, τοὺς μισοῦντας καὶ τοὺς ἐπηρεάζοντας καὶ διώκοντας*: relatives, enemies, revilers, haters,—

—persecutors, that is, all men whatsoever. It is elicited IV. that those [1] who circumscribe and contract the apostolic oracle oppose both the

[1] Under their name I understand Calvinists, Jansenists, and all who contract God's salvific will and the amplitude of restoration.

words used by Paul, *ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων*, which of themselves bear complete universality, and the doctrine of Christ. Finally, it is elicited V. that the intimate origin and supreme cause of the apostolic exhortation that prayers of every kind be poured forth for all men is contained in that law of charity by which it is enjoined upon each and every one, *ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου*, "you shall love your neighbor," namely, whomsoever you have as a sharer of the same human nature.

CCLXXXVI.

But the Apostle proceeds, and immediately adds [2] to the words *ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων* that prayer must be made *ὑπὲρ βασιλέων*, for kings, under whose name Roman emperors principally come, who, although they refused the royal appellation, nevertheless were frequently adorned with it by Greeks and Jews [3]: *καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων*, "and for all who are constituted in eminence," who elsewhere [4] are called *ἡγεμόνες*, *κείμενοι ἐν ὑπεροχῇ*, and by Josephus [5] *ὑπεροχαί*: *ἵνα ἥρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν ἐν πάσῃ εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ σεμνότητι*, "that we may lead a quiet and tranquil life in all piety and gravity." For *ἐν* has the same force as *σύν*, and *σεμνότης*, which properly is reverence and veneration, by metonymy signifies both whatever produces veneration and, most of all, gravity opposed to levity and inconstancy. Hence Aristotle interprets *σεμνότητα* as *βαρύτητα εὐσχήμονα*, seemly gravity.

But by what connection are these things joined with the preceding? They do not cohere a) in such a way that the subject of prayer is extended, since *βασιλεῖς καὶ πάντες ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντες* are comprehended within the compass of *πάντων ἀνθρώπων*. Nor do they cohere b)—

—in such a way that the subject of prayer is contracted. For no indication of this limitation appears, whether verbal or real, whether taken from the course of the discourse or from the matter. Therefore, c) the connection by which the latter things cohere with the former is that by which the contained is bound to the containing, and the particular to the universal. Now d) in prescribing offices we are accustomed to use this form of discourse when proper and private reasons are added to universal ones, and when we reckon what is particular to be of greater moment and worthy of being incul-

[2] I Tim. II.2.
[3] I Pet. II.13–18.
[4] I Pet. II.14; II Macc. III.15.
[5] *Antiquit.*, lib. VI, cap. IV.

cated more vehemently. And there were indeed proper and private reasons which moved Paul to command prayers by name for kings and rulers. There were those of which he himself makes mention when he writes, "that we may lead a quiet and tranquil life in all piety and gravity"; for quiet and the peaceful condition of civil life are owed chiefly to princes and rulers. There were also others, and these no less perspicuous than grave. For several *ἑτεροδιδάσκαλοι*, whom Jude [1] calls impious, were stirring up no slight odium against the Christian religion on this account: that they despised *κυριότητα*, dominion, but blasphemed *δόξας*, majesties. There was therefore reason for Paul, by enjoining prayers by name for kings and rulers, to show how greatly Christian piety abhorred crimes of opinion of this kind. Peter seems to me to have looked not obscurely to this when he says [2]: "Be subject, therefore, to every human creature for God's sake; whether to the king as excelling, or to rulers as sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, but for the praise of the good; because thus is the will of God, that by doing good you may make the ignorance of imprudent men silent…. Honor all: love the brotherhood: fear God: honor kings." Paul writes twin precepts to these [3]; and for commending prayers specifically for kings it must have seemed to him a matter of no small weight also that Christ expressly commanded that prayer be made for those who persecute and harass us. For the Roman emperors and the rulers of the provinces were those who, when Paul wrote to Timothy, were raging against the Christian assemblies. Therefore—

—the most fitting paraphrase of the whole passage is this: "I admonish and exhort that prayers of every kind be poured forth for all men; but especially that God be entreated for kings and the others who excel in authority."

CCLXXXVII.

To this paraphrase those things which are recorded in profane, Jewish, and Christian monuments add splendor and procure credibility. "The ancient Persians," Elsner says [1], "in sacred rites prayed well for all Persians, and principally for

[1] Jude 4–8.
[2] I Pet. II.13–18.
[3] Rom. XIII.1 ff.
[1] In *Observatt. sacrae* at I Tim. II.1–2.

the king, according to the testimony of Herodotus [2]; but when at one time a pestilence was spreading destruction throughout the whole world, the Athenians were commanded by an oracle of Apollo to make vows for all, *ὑπὲρ πάντων εὐχὰς ποιήσασθαι* [3]." Grotius [4], Lightfoot [5], Ottius [6], Elsner [7], and Heinrichs [8] have many remarkable things concerning the custom of the Jews, among whom Elsner writes: "The Jews formerly prayed [9] for the kings of Persia; afterward also for the Roman emperors, for example, for Augustus, for whom a daily holocaust was offered in the temple at Jerusalem, according to the testimony of Philo [10]; for Gaius likewise they made solemn vows [11], sacrificing hecatombs. Julian commends his kingdom [12] to the prayers of the Jews. The high priest is said by Philo [13] to have made vows in the Holy of Holies for the whole human race, *εὐξάμενος εἰρήνην ἅπασιν—*

> *—ἀνθρώποις*, having prayed for peace for all men." Hence the precept of Rabbi Chaninan [1]: "Pray for the peace of the kingdom, for unless there were fear, one would devour another."

Finally, as regards Christians, there are remarkable testimonies of Athenagoras [2], Theophilus of Antioch [3], Tertullian [4], Cyprian [5], Lactantius [6], Pseudo-Ignatius [7], Chrysostom [8], Prosper [9], and, lest I commemorate more, the author of

---

[2] Lib. I, cap. CXXXII.

[3] Cf. the Suda, s.v. *Ἄβαρις*.

[4] In the commentary at this place.

[5] In *Horae hebraicae* at this place.

[6] From Josephus, at this place.

[7] At the place cited.

[8] In the annotations at this place.

[9] Ezra VI.10.

[10] *Legat. ad Caium*, p. 1036.

[11] Ibid., p. 1041.

[12] In the epistles, p. 397.

[13] At the place cited, p. 1035.

[1] In *Pirke Aboth*, cap. III, § 2.

[2] *Legat. pro christianis*, § XXXVII. Nor does Polycarp, more ancient than Athenagoras, speak otherwise in the epistle to the Philippians, p. 189 in Cotelerius, T. II, *Patrum apostolic.*, Antwerp edition.

[3] *Ad Autolycum*, lib. III, § XIV.

[4] *Apologet.*, cap. XXX; book *Ad Scapulam*, cap. II.

[5] Epistle to Demetrianus. Origen concurs in Book VIII *Against Celsus*, where among other things he writes: "We labor for the Roman Empire when, living justly, we make vows for it."

[6] *De mortibus persecutorum*, cap. XXXIV.

[7] Epistle to the Philadelphians.

[8] On I Tim. II, Hom. IV; and Hom. XX to the people of Antioch.

[9] § LXII.

the books *On the Calling of All Nations* [10]. Athenagoras speaks excellently; in order to signify the hope conceived in his mind that Christians would be heard by the emperors, he concludes the embassy with these words: "For who are more worthy to obtain the things which they petition, *ἢ οἵτινες περὶ μὲν τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς ὑμετέρας εὐχόμεθα*, than we who pray for your empire, that, as a son from a father, as is most equitable, you may receive the kingdom, and that your empire may be enlarged by additions and increases, all being subjected to your dominion! And this indeed is also in our interest, that we may lead a tranquil life and cheerfully administer all things commanded." But Theophilus, discoursing on the love of enemies and the kindred virtues, writes among other things: "Holy Scripture also commands that we be subject to magistrates and powers and pray for them, that we may lead a tranquil and peaceful life. And it teaches that all things be rendered to all [11]: honor to whom honor; fear to whom fear; tribute to whom tribute; and to owe nothing to anyone, *ἢ μόνον τὸ ἀγαπᾶν πάντας*, except to love all—"

> —." Tertullian concurs, saying: "Looking thither, to heaven, Christians, with hands extended because innocent, with head uncovered because we are not ashamed, and finally without a prompter because from the heart, pray for all emperors: for a long life for them, a secure empire, a safe household, brave armies, a faithful senate, an upright people, a quiet world, and whatever are the wishes of a man and of Caesar." Prudentius, embracing these things more briefly, sang [1]:
>
> The shrines must be appeased by us for the prince's triumphs, That a favorable campaign may attend his glory, And that, when the enemies have been subjected, The leader may bridle a quiet world with laws.

Hence Prosper says: "It must most sincerely be believed and professed that God wills all men to be saved, since the Apostle, whose sentence this is, solicitously commanded what is most piously observed in all churches: that supplication be made to God for all." To these things the solemn ecclesiastical prayer beautifully responds [2]: "Almighty and eternal God, who savest all and willest that no one perish, look upon the souls deceived by diabolical fraud."

---

[10] Lib. I, cap. IV. Moreover, you have a far greater number of witnesses in Aurelio Pelliccia's dissertation *De christianae ecclesiae tum publica tum privata prece pro Principibus*, published at Naples in the year 1778.

[11] Rom. XIII.7–8.

[1] In the contest of St. Romanus.

[2] This is frequent in the ancient sacramentaries and is also celebrated in the present liturgy.

CCLXXXVIII.

Having commended the prayers either which must be poured forth universally for all men, or which must be offered specifically for kings and rulers, the Apostle proceeds: *τοῦτο γάρ*, "for this," which I have commended and insisted should be done, *καλόν*, is honorable and most consonant with duty; this is the force of *τοῦ καλοῦ* when it is referred to human acts [3], and it has the same force as honorable, laudable, and *τὸ προσῆκον*, that which is expressed according to virtue;—

> —*καὶ ἀπόδεκτον*, "and worthy of being received," according to the native signification of *ἀπόδεκτον*, which Hesychius renders *ἐπαινετόν*, laudable, and the ancient Glosses with the Vulgate interpret as acceptable: *ἐνώπιον τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ*, "in the sight of God our Savior," for *ἐνώπιον* is not an adverb, but is used elliptically [1] for *κατ' ἐνώπιον*, לפני, of God our Savior.

Now that these things are connected with the preceding is established by a twofold indication: the logical, which shines forth from the sequence of the discourse, and the grammatical, which is contained in the particle *γάρ*, for. But what is the nature of this connection, and what things are mutually joined? Grotius meets the latter question [2], writing: "*Τοῦτο γάρ*: this, namely, that we pray for the rulers of the republic. And what? We pray that kings and princes may be found endowed with a sound mind together with royal power, says Justin Martyr. This prayer obtained its effect in some part in Hadrian, Severus, and Antoninus, who were quite equitable toward Christians; but more perfectly in Constantine and the Roman princes after him, and thereafter also in the kings of other peoples." He judged, namely, that the pronoun *τοῦτο* was referred not to all the things which precede but only to the last phrase. That the sagacious interpreter departed from the truth in this matter is demonstrated by several things. It is demonstrated 1) by the consensus of the Greeks and Latins, into whose mind it never came to join the words *τοῦτο γάρ* here with only the proximate phrase. It is demonstrated 2) by the agreement of nearly all the more recent writers, who interpret *τοῦτο γάρ* as this which is to pray for all. It is demonstrated 3) by the idea which spontaneously occupies the minds of readers and which dictates that all the antecedents be joined with the things which follow. It is demonstrated 4) by the very form of the discourse in which the preceding things are expressed. For they are expressed not in two propositions, but in one and the same complex proposition, which consists both of the principal member, *παρακαλῶ οὖν πρῶτον πάντων ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις, προσευχάς, ἐντεύξεις, εὐχαριστίας ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων*, and of the incidental

[3] It is used in this sense at Matt. V.16; XV.26; Rom. VII.18–21, where *τῷ καλῷ* is opposed to *τὸ κακόν*; and II Cor. VIII.21, where *τὸ καλόν* is the same as *τὸ προσῆκον*, duty.

[1] Lambert Bos aptly observed this in *De ellipsibus graecis*, p. 443.

[2] Commentary at this place.

member, *ὑπὲρ βασιλέων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων*. But when this form of discourse has been observed, everyone sees that the phrase *τοῦτο γάρ*—

> —no less than the verb *παρακαλῶ*, must necessarily be referred to all the things which precede. It is demonstrated 5) by the things which Paul has in order to declare the mode and reason of the connection between *τοῦτο γάρ* and the antecedents.

For when he writes, *τοῦτο γὰρ καλὸν καὶ ἀπόδεκτον ἐνώπιον τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ*, he declares that the connection between these things and the preceding is causal and that the causes flow from a twofold source. And first, that they flow from the fact that it is *καλόν* to execute what he set forth before; and then from the fact that this very thing is *ἀπόδεκτον ἐνώπιον τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ*. But each cause is universal and cannot without absurdity be limited by the compass of kings and rulers. The first cause is universal, whether the words which Paul uses are regarded in themselves or compared with those which Christ employed. For Paul writes, *τοῦτο γὰρ καλόν*: "what I have admonished concerning the pouring forth of prayers is honorable and expressed according to the norm of duty." But who would take these things of prayers which are offered only for kings and rulers? Who would not rather refer them to the prayers by which God is supplicated universally *ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων*, and specifically *ὑπὲρ βασιλέων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων*? Moreover, Christ derives the office of prayers from that law [1] by which it is declared to each one, *ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου*, "you shall love your neighbor." But this law is of infinite amplitude, extends to all, and cannot be restricted without a Jewish transgression. Indeed, it cannot be restricted without perversely distorting this other saying of Christ [2], pertaining altogether to the same thing: *καὶ καθὼς θέλετε, ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως*, "and as you will that men should do to you, do you also to them likewise." For everyone wills and desires for himself that he be aided before God by the work and prayers of all. Therefore the first cause which Paul employed to enjoin the office of prayers, and which he expressed in these words, *τοῦτο γὰρ καλόν*, is altogether universal and so constituted that it cannot be referred only to the proximate phrase, *ὑπὲρ βασιλέων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων*.

CCLXXXIX.

And this same thing must be repeated concerning the other cause, *καὶ ἀπόδεκτον ἐνώπιον τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ*. For I ask that it be candidly explained to me what must be judged acceptable before God our Savior. I believe that it is what

[1] Matt. V.43.
[2] Luke VI.31.

is consonant with duty, what agrees with the laws laid down by him, and what is signified by the very appellation *τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ*. But none of these things is limited and defined; rather, each is infinite and altogether universal. The duty which is called *τὸ καλόν* is universal, since it is honorable and worthy of praise to deprecate for all; the law, *ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου*, "you shall love your neighbor," is universal, since it excludes absolutely no one; and finally, that which is contained in the appellation *τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ* is universal.

And this I. is established by the parallel words of Christ. For after proposing the law [1], *προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς, καὶ διωκόντων ὑμᾶς*, Christ immediately adds [2] this cause and reason for it: *ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*, "that you may be, and moreover may also appear, sons and *μιμηταί*, imitators [3], of your heavenly Father"; *ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθούς*, "who"—but with an exegetical rather than a relative signification [4]—"causes his sun to rise," for the verb *ἀνατέλλω*, intransitive of itself, is employed in a transitive sense [5], "upon the evil and the good"; *καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους*, "and causes it to rain [6] upon the just and the unjust." But this cause is plainly universal and is derived from God's universal beneficence toward all men. Since, therefore, it is twin to that which Paul urges when he says, *καὶ ἀπόδεκτον ἐνώπιον τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ*, it follows that by the appellation *τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ* a universal cause is—

> —exhibited, and one pertaining to this: that prayer be made for all. Certainly II. only in this way can that be attained [1], *ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι, ὥσπερ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τέλειός ἐστι*, "therefore you shall be perfect, and free from every fault and evil [2], as your heavenly Father is perfect and holy"; and only in this way can *σωζόμενοι*, the saved, by which epithet the faithful are distinctively marked [3], bear a will conformed to that which is proper to *τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ*.

But III. to what does this formula pertain, and what did Paul signify by naming *τὸν σωτῆρα ἡμῶν θεόν*? Just as *σώζειν* generally has the same force as to render

---

[1] Matt. V.44.

[2] Ibid., v. 45.

[3] Eph. V.1.

[4] The particle *ὅτι* is frequently employed, if not in place of the pronoun *ὅς*, who, certainly for explaining the matter, so that it cannot be more fittingly rendered than namely, to wit. Cf. Matt. VI.5; XI.29.

[5] And thus the Alexandrians employ it, Gen. III.18 and elsewhere.

[6] Gen. II.5, where *ὁ θεός* is added.

[1] Matt. V.48.

[2] For in the moral sense he is called *τέλειος* who lacks vices and shines with virtues, Deut. XVIII.13; I Kings VIII.62.

[3] Acts II.47; I Cor. I.18; II Cor. II.15.

someone safe and unharmed, whether this is done by averting and removing evils or by bestowing and conferring benefits, so every one generally is called *σωτήρ* who, by protecting, repelling evils, and imparting benefits, contributes so that someone may be safe and become unharmed. To the point is Cicero [4]: "He is *σωτήρ* who has given safety." But among the Greeks *σωτήρ* and *εὐεργέτης* were words of honor bestowed upon all who had become illustrious by repelling evils and increasing goods [5]. Therefore, when Paul calls God *τὸν σωτῆρα*, he exhibits him as one who brings safety and security, either negatively by vanquishing evils or positively by granting goods and ornaments. Yet it must not be dissimulated that God is called by Paul neither simply nor absolutely *τὸν σωτῆρα*, but, with the pronoun added, *τὸν σωτῆρα ἡμῶν*. Whence the question spontaneously arises: to what does the addition of this pronoun pertain? But I see that it can be answered that the force of this pronoun more than once [6] is such that it does not restrict the amplitude of the object, but embraces all who are of the same nature as we; it can be answered that a pronoun of this kind is not infrequently taken in a specific signification, by no means—

> —circumscribed by some order of men. But the things which immediately precede, *ἵνα ἤρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν*, are such as suggest and even persuade that the pronoun *ἡμῶν* is employed concerning a certain order of men, and concerning the faithful; and therefore that what is said, *ἀπόδεκτον ἐνώπιον τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ*, has the same force as acceptable before God the Savior of the faithful. But if such is the force of the formula, is not that which we defend endangered: that the second cause also employed to commend the office of prayers is universal? Would someone not deservedly gather that particular prayers are enjoined because God is exhibited as the particular Savior of the faithful? Lest anyone grant credibility to this consequence, keeping myself within the limits of the New Testament, I shall report those things which tear up the difficulty by the roots.

CCXC.

It must therefore be observed 1) that this very formula, conceived elsewhere in the same words, occurs: it occurs where it is said [1], "Paul, an apostle of Je-

[4] *In Verrem*, Orat. II, § LXIII.

[5] Cf. Deyling, *Observatt. sacr.*, P. II, p. 96; Stephan Le Moyne, *Adnotatt. ad varia sacra*, pp. 127–134; and Schlaeger's commentary *De diis hominibusque servatoribus*.

[6] §§ CLXX ff.

[1] I Tim. I.1.

sus Christ, *κατ' ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν*, according to the command [2] of God our Savior and of Christ Jesus our hope"; it occurs where it is read [3], "but God manifested in his own times his word in the preaching which was entrusted to me *κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ*, according to the precept of God our Savior"; it occurs where it is written [4], "not defrauding, but showing good faith in all things, that they may adorn *τὴν διδασκαλίαν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ*, the doctrine of God our Savior, in all things"; it occurs where it is handed down [5], "but when the benignity and humanity *τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ*, of God our Savior, appeared"; and finally, it occurs where Jude has [6], *μόνῳ θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*, "to the only God our—"

—Savior through Jesus Christ our Lord, glory and magnificence."

It must be observed 2) that, just as he is called our Savior, so God is once [1] called my Savior: "and my spirit rejoiced *ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρί μου*, in God my Savior."

It must be observed 3) that God is named no less our Savior and my Savior than the Savior of all men and especially of the faithful [2]: "for unto this we labor and are reviled, because we hope *ἐπὶ θεῷ ζῶντι, ὅς ἐστι σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, μάλιστα πιστῶν*, in the living God, who is the Savior of all men, especially of the faithful."

It must be observed 4) that the appellation our Savior is made of Christ time and again: "but grace has now been manifested *διὰ τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, through the manifestation of our Savior Jesus Christ, who indeed destroyed death but illuminated life and incorruption through the Gospel" [3]; "grace and peace *ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ our Savior"; "awaiting the blessed hope *καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, and the advent of the glory of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ" [4]; "which Holy Spirit he poured forth upon us abundantly *διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*, through Jesus Christ our Savior" [5]; "for thus an entrance will be ministered abundantly to you into the eternal kingdom *τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ*

[2] Mill, in *Proleg.*, n. 1207; Bengel; Matthaei; Griesbach; and Lachmann will give more concerning the various readings of this passage.

[3] Titus I.3.

[4] Ibid. II.10.

[5] Ibid. III.4.

[6] Jude 25.

[1] Luke I.47.

[2] I Tim. IV.10.

[3] II Tim. I.10.

[4] Titus II.13.

[5] Ibid. III.6.

σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ" [6]; and [7], "for if, fleeing the pollutions of the world *ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, they are again entangled in these and overcome, the latter things have become worse for them than the former."

It must be observed 5) that Christ is named the Savior of his body, which is the Church: "the husband [1] is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the Church, *καὶ αὐτός ἐστι σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος*, and he is the Savior of the body."

It must be observed 6) that the passages of Scripture in which Christ is named Savior absolutely and simply are frequent. "For [2] today there is born to you *σωτήρ, ὅς ἐστι Χριστὸς κύριος*, a Savior, who is Christ the Lord"; "this [3] Jesus, *ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτῆρα*, a prince and Savior, God exalted by his right hand, to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins"; "from the seed [4] of this David, God, according to the promise, brought forth for Israel *σωτῆρα Ἰησοῦν*, Jesus a Savior"; "but our conversation is in heaven, whence we also await *σωτῆρα*, a Savior, our Lord Jesus Christ"; "that [5] you may be mindful of those words which I foretold by the holy prophets, and of the precepts of your apostles, *τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος*, of the Lord and Savior"; "grow [6] in grace and in the knowledge *τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ."

It must be observed 7) that Christ is adorned with the appellation God the Savior. For thus the angel teaches Joseph [7]: "but Mary shall bear a son, *καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν*, and you shall call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins." But when the reasons have been reckoned, as is fitting [8], it must be judged: a) that the name *Ἰησοῦν*, in Hebrew ישוע, is said *ἀντὶ τοῦ* יהושוע, in place of יהושוע; b) that יהושוע is contracted from שוע and יהוה; c) that the word ישוע is a noun derived from the root ישע; d) that both the inherent signification of the root and the form of the word require that ישוע be rendered salvation; e) that nothing is more frequent than that abstract terms be employed for concrete ones—

> —and thus salvation for Savior; therefore f) that ישוע, *Ἰησοῦν*, has the same force as Jehovah the Savior. This seems to me to be confirmed not obscurely by those things which, after the explanation of

[6] II Pet. I.11.
[7] Ibid. II.20.
[1] Eph. V.23.
[2] Luke II.11.
[3] Acts V.31.
[4] Ibid. XIII.23.
[5] II Pet. III.2.
[6] II Pet. III.18.
[7] Matt. I.21.
[8] Cf. Schultens, *Origines hebraicae*, p. 18.

the name Jesus proposed by the angel, Matthew immediately infers [1]: "Now all this was done that what was spoken by the Lord through the prophet might be fulfilled, saying: behold, a Virgin shall have in her womb and shall bear a son, *καὶ καλέσουσι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ, ὅ ἐστι μεθερμηνευόμενον, μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός*, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which is interpreted God with us." But by what connection, finally, do these things cohere? Or how does it follow from the antecedents, in which the name Jesus is imposed upon Mary's son, that the oracle of Isaiah, in which it was foretold that the son to be born of a Virgin would be called Emmanuel, was fulfilled? It does not escape me that many things have been diligently sought out and subtly devised in order to show that these things are mutually joined and connected. But neither does it escape me that by all these things the industry of the commentators has been approved rather than persuasion produced in the readers. Nevertheless, there was a reason, and one sufficiently easy and obvious, by which the Evangelist's deduction might be illustrated. Certainly, it is not established that the son born of Mary was accustomed to be called Emmanuel; but it is plainly established that his most solemn name was Jesus. But although Jesus and Emmanuel differ in sound and letters, they agree in reality and in the force of signifying. For what is Emmanuel? God with us. Namely, according to the received usage of speaking in the Scriptures [2], God our avenger, God our defender. But Jesus is God the Savior, God who snatches us from evils and heaps goods upon us. Thus, therefore, Jesus and Emmanuel conspire in reality and signification, so that Matthew rightly joined the angel and the prophet, and therefore wrote that Christ was called Jesus because it had been foretold that he would be called Emmanuel; for the angelic name Jesus, God the Savior, is altogether the same as the prophetic Emmanuel.

It must be observed 8) that Christ is infinitely named the Savior of the world——: "we ourselves [1] have heard and know, *ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου*, that this is truly the Savior of the world"; and [2] "we have seen and testify, *ὅτι ὁ πατὴρ ἀπέσταλκε τὸν υἱὸν σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου*, that the Father sent the Son as Savior of the world."

[1] Matt. I.22–23.

[2] By these things, however, I would by no means wish to deny the signification which I nearly called ontological, and which is the foundation of the other, and by which *Ἐμμανουήλ* has the same force as *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ γενόμενος*, the Word made flesh.

[1] John IV.42.

[2] I John IV.14.

Finally, it must be observed 9) that Christ is called the Savior both of sinners and of all those who had perished: "a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptance [3], *ὅτι Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἁμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι, ὧν πρῶτός εἰμι ἐγώ*, that Christ Jesus came into this world to save sinners, of whom I am first"; then [4], *ἦλθε γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός*, "for the Son of Man came to save that which had perished."

CCXCI.

When these things have been observed, as is fitting, behold what follows of its own accord. It follows a) that God and Christ are alike distinguished by the same title and the same appellation, *our Savior*. It follows b) that the title and appellation *our Savior*, if not always, nevertheless frequently has the same force as the titles and appellations *Savior of the faithful* and Savior of that body which is the Church. It follows c) that both God and Christ are adorned with the names either *Savior of all men* or *Savior of the world*. It follows d) that the title *Savior of all men* is altogether universal: both because 1) such is the native force of the words; because 2) in force it is equivalent to the appellation *Savior of the world*; because 3) in force it is equivalent to the appellation *Savior of sinners*, and of all those who had perished; and because 4) it corresponds to the distributed formula, Savior principally of the faithful and then of the unfaithful. It follows e) that the titles *our Savior*, *Savior of the faithful*, and *Savior of the Church*, attributed to God and Christ, are such as bear a force not exclusive and negative, but affirmative and signifying a more excellent mode—

> —of salvation. For those who are decorated with these titles are also adorned with the distinctions *Savior of all men*, *Savior of the world*, *Savior of sinners*, Savior of all the faithful and unfaithful, *God the Savior*, and Savior simply and absolutely. Whence, finally, f) it follows that by the name *our Savior* the Savior of the faithful is so signified that the common and universal Savior is signified by implication.

Therefore, returning to the point from which we necessarily digressed, it is easy to understand that in those things which Paul writes—that the office of prayers is acceptable *ἐνώπιον τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ*, in the sight of God our Savior—this sense is contained: the office of prayers pleases God, who is the Savior of all men, especially of the faithful. But the cause drawn from the good pleasure of him who, although he is principally the Savior of the faithful, is nevertheless also the Savior of all men, is infinite and universal, and with it only

[3] I Tim. I.15.
[4] Matt. XVIII.11.

prayers poured forth for all fittingly agree. It is therefore evident that the office of prayers *ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων*, for all men, is remarkably confirmed by the second cause also employed by Paul and derived from the fact that it is acceptable before God our Savior.

CCXCII.

But the things which Paul immediately adds flood the whole matter with a richer light. For scarcely had he commemorated God our Savior when it immediately came into his mind to explain more distinctly what is signified by that appellation, and whence God must be judged to be called *σωτήρ*. Therefore, in continuous discourse he added: *ὃς πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι, καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν*, "who," God the Savior and therefore worthy of the name Savior, "wills all men," by a will proper to a savior, "to be saved and to come to the acknowledgment of the truth" [1]. Here these things must be determined part by part: I. what kind of will Paul commemorates; II. how great is its extension and amplitude; III. what the word *σωθῆναι* properly signifies; IV. to what the formula *εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν* pertains; and V. what twin testimonies of the Scriptures conduce to illustrating and establishing these things.

What kind of will, therefore, is that which Paul expresses when he says, *ὃς θέλει*, "who wills"? It is a will proper to a savior; and it is the will on account of which it is pleasing and acceptable to God the Savior that prayers be poured forth for the salvation of others. But the will of a savior can be neither sterile nor unfruitful, since he cannot uphold either the reality or the name of savior who does not bring aid, avert destruction, and provide for salvation; nor, likewise, can that will be sterile and unfruitful which by its own nature tends to this, that it excite and inflame men to pour forth prayers for the salvation of others. Therefore Paul commemorates that will which is fruitful, efficacious, active, and by which the power of escaping misery and attaining felicity is bestowed.

But what limits does he place upon it, and what amplitude does he assign to it? He assigns, namely, that amplitude which 1) the words *πάντες ἄνθρωποι* bear; which 2) the antecedents demand; which 3) the connection of the discourse requires; and which 4) befits the Savior of all men and especially of the faithful. But there is none of these which does not perspicuously demonstrate the complete amplitude and infinite universality of the salvific will. For a) the words *πάντες ἄνθρωποι*, beneath which lies an infinite extension, demonstrate this; b) the antecedents, in which the expression *ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων* can only be taken infinitely, demonstrate this; c) the connection of the discourse demonstrates this,

[1] I Tim. II.4.

for it would not follow that prayer must be made for absolutely all men if God willed not all but only some men to be saved; finally, d) the reason and property of the Savior of all men demonstrate this. For he is not, nor can he be reckoned, the Savior of all men who of himself is not so disposed that he wills the preservation of all men and procures their salvation.

CCXCIII.

In order to express this will of procuring salvation, Paul uses the word *σωθῆναι* [1], saying: "who wills all—"

> —men *σωθῆναι*." But what force must be assigned to this word? Certainly *σώζω* generally has the same force [1] as "I render someone safe and unharmed, and rescue and liberate him from evil, calamity, and danger"; but the passive form is the same as to be preserved, to be rescued, to be liberated from evil and danger. Therefore *σωθῆναι* will be the same as to be preserved, or, as the Vulgate interpreter has it, to be saved. But this can be understood both of an action begun and of an action completed and perfect. It is therefore worthwhile to determine accurately which of these two acceptations must be preferred. But the character [2] of the aorist tense, such as *σωθῆναι* is, cuts off the difficulty and shows that *σωθῆναι* must be understood of an action complete in all its parts, and cannot be more fittingly rendered than "to be safe." For just as in Herodotus [3], *ὀπίσω ἐς οἶκον σωθῆναι* is to have arrived home whole and safe, and in Euripides [4], *σωθῆναι κακῶν* has the force of to have been preserved from evils, so Paul's words, *ὃς πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι*, yield this sense: "who wills all men to have been preserved, to be happy, and actually to possess that preservation whose power and faculty of attaining they have received."

From this most true commentary, and one expressed most accurately according to the propriety of the words, these things flow of their own accord. It follows I. that God's salvific will is borne toward the very salvation of all men, and that salvation obtained by all men is the object which the salvific will of itself intends. It follows II. that those are greatly deceived who hold not salvation itself but only

[1] I Tim. II.4.

[1] Matt. I.21; VIII.25; X.22; John XII.27; Rom. V.9; Heb. V.7; and among the Alexandrians, Gen. XIX.17; Josh. VIII.23; Judg. II.16–18.

[2] For this is the force of aorists, that they designate an action completed and perfected. Cf. Matthiae, *Syntax*, § DVI.

[3] Lib. IV, § 97.

[4] *Or.*, v. 769.

the means fitted for obtaining salvation as the proper object of the salvific will. God indeed wills the means by which salvation is acquired; but principally he wills salvation, and for the sake of salvation he both disposes the means and most benignly imparts them. It follows III. that Paul therefore wrote, "who wills all men *σωθῆναι*, to be saved," but by no means "who wills *σώζειν*, to save, all men," lest suspicion occupy anyone's—

> —mind that God is not only the principal but also the full and adequate cause of salvation. God indeed is the principal origin of salvation, and of himself and by his merciful goodness he wills salvation and bestows the means by which salvation is acquired; but he does not grant salvation itself unless subordinate causes also contribute their work and apply their zeal. A perspicuous argument of this supernal ordination appears from the fact that God, who of himself wills all men to be saved, likewise wills that prayers be poured forth *ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων*, for all men, and that what is written be fulfilled [1]: "Pray for one another, that you may be saved."

CCXCIV.

The Apostle proceeds, and immediately adds [2] to the words "who wills all men to be saved," *καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν*, "and to come to the acknowledgment [3] of the truth." Here nothing ought to be more important to us than rightly to determine what is denoted here by the appellation truth. But it is evident that truth can be denoted which is *ἁπλῶς καὶ ἐξαιρέτως* such, which is *ἡ αὐτοαλήθεια*, truth itself, and bears God himself regarded *οὐσιωδῶς*, essentially, before us. And indeed God wills all men to be blessed, and therefore wills substantial truth to be possessed by them through knowledge. It is evident, next, that truth accepted *ὑποστατικῶς*, hypostatically, can be denoted, which is the only-begotten Son of God himself, who said concerning himself [4], "I am the way, *καὶ ἀλήθεια*, and the truth, and the life," and concerning whom we read [5], "This is eternal life, that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent."

---

[1] James V.16.

[2] I Tim. II.4.

[3] Celestine, epist. XVI, reads: "and to come to the knowledge of the truth." This is altogether fitted to the word *ἐπίγνωσιν*, which signifies not so much bare notice as a more perfect and exact knowledge, since the preposition *ἐπί* in compounds not rarely intensifies the signification.

[4] John XIV.6.

[5] John XVII.3.

But although these things can be denoted by the name of truth, it nevertheless ought not to be doubtful that, in this testimony of Paul with which we are occupied—

> —the doctrine of salvation which is contained in the Christian profession is in reality signified. For a) such is a frequent acceptation of truth in the New Testament, as is effected by perspicuous examples [1]. By these, b) moreover, it is effected that *τὴν ἀλήθειαν*, truth, on the one hand, and *τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς ἀληθείας, τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*, the truth of the Gospel, the way of truth, the word of truth, and the word of evangelical truth, on the other, mutually correspond in signification [2]. Hence c) ecclesiastical writers—Basil [3], Cyril of Alexandria [4], Oecumenius [5], and others [6]—according to the manner received in the Bible, interpret *τὴν ἀλήθειαν* sometimes as *τὴν ἀλήθειαν δογμάτων*, the truth of dogmas; sometimes as *τὴν κατάληψιν πραγμάτων, τῶν ἐπὶ τὸν μακάριον βίον φερόντων*, the comprehension of those things which conduce to the blessed life; and sometimes as *τὴν διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν θεσπισμάτων παίδευσιν, τὴν ἀληθοῦς καὶ ἐν πνεύματι λατρείας τὴν δύναμιν ἔχουσαν*, the instruction which is made through evangelical dogmas and which has the force of true and spiritual worship. That this interpretation d) is proper to this passage is evinced partly by the course and thread of the discourse and partly by the conjunction of the words. It is evinced e) by the course and thread of the discourse, since Paul labors at this, that he teach the order of acquiring salvation instituted by Christ as its author. But this order is expressed by the words [7], "He who believes and is baptized shall be saved, but he who does not believe shall be condemned." And again, f) it is evinced by the conjunction of the words *σωθῆναι* and *ἐλθεῖν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας*. For elsewhere [8] *σωθῆναι*, to be saved, is interchanged with the formula *εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ*, to enter into the kingdom of heaven, that is, to be—

[1] John VIII.31–32; II Cor. IV.2; Gal. III.1; Col. I.6; II Thess. II.10–12; II Tim. II.18; Titus I.14.
[2] Gal. II.5–14; II Pet. II.2; Col. I.5; II Cor. VI.7; Eph. I.13; James I.18.
[3] Homily on Ps. XIV.
[4] Commentary on Isa. LV.
[5] Commentary on Eph. VI.
[6] In Suicer, *Thesaurus*, at the word *ἀλήθεια*.
[7] Mark XVI.16.
[8] Matt. XIX.24–25; Mark X.25–26.

> —believed; whence also *τοῖς σωζομένοις*, those who are saved, is opposed to *οἱ ἀπειθοῦντες*, the unbelieving.

Therefore, the meaning of the whole member returns to this: "who wills all men to be saved and to come to the acknowledgment of the truth [1]," that is, to believe. God wills, namely, that all men whatsoever be saved, be exempt from evil and endowed with blessedness; but because he wills that they be saved through faith and the knowledge of the truth [2], he therefore also wills the faith of all, and wills that all believe and that all obtain in faith, as in a seed, the fruit of salvation.

Nor, indeed, does he will this by a circumscribed and sterile will, but by a wholly universal and fruitful will. For he wills it by the will of a savior, and indeed of the Savior of all men. But the will of a savior by its own nature is efficacious and active; and the will of the Savior of all men cannot be restricted and particular. In addition, let no one deny that the will of God shone forth most greatly in Christ, and that his *οἰκονομίαν*, economy, is therefore rightly and deservedly judged its most perfect manifestation [3]. But Christ signified, both by parables and by open sayings, that the divine will concerning advancing men to the knowledge of the truth is universal and active. He signified it by parables, and thus, comparing the followers of his doctrine with seed of good quality [4], he admonished that the field—

> —in which seed of this kind should grow is *τὸν κόσμον*, the world. But where he depicts his followers [1] by images taken from a flock, he testifies that besides the Jews [2] he has other sheep for whom he provides and whose care he solicitously bears. To the parables he added explicit testimonies: whether when, admiring the readiness of

[1] Concerning the signification of *ἐλθεῖν*, the same must be repeated which we observed concerning the word *σωθῆναι*.

[2] For just as human felicity complete in all its parts is contained chiefly in the clear knowledge of infinite truth, so men tend toward it only by a certain begun and rudimentary knowledge of the same. Therefore God, who (Heb. I.1) *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως*, in many portions and in many ways, formerly spoke to the fathers in the prophets, also continually provided for the whole human race. He provided by that voice which sounds inwardly in the minds of all (Rom. II.14–17); he provided by that voice which earth and heaven utter most loudly (Acts XVII.26–28; Rom. I.19–26); and he provided by that voice whose author is the Word who (John I.9) illuminates every man coming into this world. Therefore nothing remains for us but, on the one hand, to admire *τὴν ποικίλην σοφίαν τοῦ θεοῦ*, the manifold wisdom of God, and to exclaim, *ὦ βάθος πλούτου καὶ σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως θεοῦ!* "O depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God!" and, on the other hand, to reckon *ἀναπολογήτους*, without excuse, all those who have persisted in darkness and the shadow of death.

[3] John V.30; VI.38; VIII.29.

[4] Matt. XIII.38.

[1] John X.16.

[2] Matt. X.5, compared with XV.24.

> the Roman centurion [3], he foretold that many from the whole world would accede to faith and be participants in the covenant entered into with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; or when he declared [4] that the persecutions of the Jews would finally return to this, that both they and the remaining nations would be imbued with saving doctrine; or when to the words [5], "No one knows the Son except the Father, nor does anyone know the Father except the Son and he to whom the Son wills to reveal him," he immediately subjoined, "Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you"; or when, about to ascend into heaven, he commanded the apostles [6] to announce the Gospel *πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει*, to every creature, and to admit *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, all nations, into the number of disciples [7].

Nor indeed is it wonderful; for it was necessary [8] that Christ should suffer and rise from the dead on the third day, and that repentance and the remission of sins should be preached in his name *εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, unto all nations. It was necessary [9] that the apostles should be witnesses to Christ in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria, *καὶ ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς*, and even unto the uttermost part of the earth. It was necessary [10] that *εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν*, into all the earth, their sound should go forth, *καὶ εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης*, and unto the ends of the world their—

> —words. And it was necessary [1] that the word of salvation be proposed *τοῖς ἀνθρώποις πᾶσι*, to all [2] men, that *πανταχοῦ*, everywhere, all should do penance.

But what was necessary was abundantly fulfilled. For Mark writes concerning the apostles [3]: "But they, going forth, preached *πανταχοῦ*, everywhere." Paul concurs concerning the faith of the Romans, saying [4]: "Your faith is announced

---

[3]Matt. VIII.11.

[4]Matt. X.18.

[5]Matt. XI.27–28.

[6]Matt. XXVIII.19–20, compared with Mark XVI.15–16.

[7]The verb *μαθητεύειν* is of itself neuter and has the force "to be a disciple"; yet by a not infrequent usage it is taken in an active signification and denotes the same as "to make a disciple." That this acceptation must be maintained here is apparent even from the fact that it is plainly distinguished from the verb *διδάσκειν*, to teach.

[8]Luke XXIV.47.

[9]Acts I.8.

[10]Rom. X.18, compared with Ps. XIX.5.

[1]Acts XVII.30.

[2]The Vulgate omits "all," but inserts "all" later, reading: "to men, that all everywhere may do penance."

[3]Mark XVI.20.

[4]Rom. I.8.

ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ, throughout the whole world." And elsewhere [5]: "Whom, Christ, we announce, reproving *πάντα ἄνθρωπον*, every man, and teaching *πάντα ἄνθρωπον*, every [6] man, in all wisdom, that we may present *πάντα ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, every man [7] perfect in Christ Jesus." Therefore, if any do not believe and are not illuminated by the light of truth, this must be derived from the fact that God indeed stretches forth his hands all day, but the people contradict [8]; that God indeed calls, but men refuse [9]; that the word indeed is preached, but men blaspheme it [10]; that the Spirit indeed moves inwardly, but those men resist [11]; and that many who hear the voice of God harden their hearts [12].

CCXCV.

For God of himself wills all men to be saved no less than he wills the same men rich in faith and distinguished by knowledge of the truth. The twin—

> —testimonies of the Scriptures [1], which must altogether be compared with Paul's words, excellently support this doctrine. And first there must be compared what Peter answers to those who called the last judgment of Christ into doubt, or even altogether denied it, for this reason: that they did not yet perceive punishments being exacted from the impious and wicked. He answers in these words [2]: *οὐ βραδύνει ὁ κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ὥς τινες βραδύτητα ἡγοῦνται, ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ* [3] *εἰς ἡμᾶς, μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι, ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι*. That is, according to the Vulgate interpretation: "The Lord does not delay his promise, as some suppose; but deals patiently for your sake, willing not that any should perish, but that all should return to penance." Here it must first be explained a) what *βραδύνει τῆς ἐπαγγελίας* is; b) who are those *τινες βραδύτητα ἡγοῦνται*; c) to what the phrase *ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ἡμᾶς*

[5] Col. I.28.
[6] Thus the Vulgate reads, but *πάντα ἄνθρωπον* is absent from the received Greek editions.
[7] The appositive *τέλειον* is lacking in not a few Greek codices.
[8] Isa. LXV.2.
[9] Prov. I.24.
[10] Acts XIII.46.
[11] Acts VII.51.
[12] Heb. IV.7.
[1] § CCXCII.
[2] II Pet. III.9.
[3] The Vulgate reads *δι' ὑμᾶς*, for your sake, and several Greek codices likewise read thus, as does also the Old Latin version. In other Greek codices we read *δι' ἡμᾶς*, for our sake.

> looks; and d) by what connection it is bound with the following. Then 1) the sense of the whole verse must be elicited, and 2) Peter's doctrine must be compared with Paul's sentence.

Accordingly, after adducing the words *οὐ βραδύνει ὁ κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας*, Grotius [4] thus translates them: "the Lord does not delay the thing promised"; then he adds: "I would suppose that *τὰς ἐπαγγελίας*, the things promised, had been written, as in Isa. XLVI.13, *σωτηρίαν οὐ βραδύνω*, 'I do not delay salvation.'" But 1) there is no Greek codex which does not read *τῆς ἐπαγγελίας* and which prefers *τὰς ἐπαγγελίας*. In addition, 2) although *βραδύνω* be taken in an active signification, as it is taken by the Vulgate interpreter, nevertheless there is no need to alter the received reading; rather, it is sufficient either, with Drusius [5], to observe that permutations of cases are not infrequent among the sacred writers, and therefore that it cannot be wonderful if *βραδύνω*, taken actively, is construed not with the accusative but with the genitive case; or to supply the discourse—

> —and after *τῆς ἐπαγγελίας* to understand in the mind the substantive *ἀναπλήρωσιν* or *τελείωσιν*, or another similar to these which designates fulfillment. Moreover, 3) the very manner of construction sufficiently intimates that *βραδύνειν* is employed here no otherwise than often elsewhere [1], in an intransitive notion, and therefore that the phrase *οὐ βραδύνει ὁ κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας* is most fittingly rendered either, with the ancient interpreter [2], "the Lord is not tardy in his promises," or, with Jerome [3], "the Lord does not delay in the promise."

Peter adds, *ὥς τινες βραδύτητα ἡγοῦνται*, "as some suppose tardiness," as though he said: the Lord does not delay in confirming his promises by the event, as some judge concerning delay and tardiness—those, namely, who, because they do not yet see punishments divinely exacted from the impious, conclude that they will never be exacted. But who must be understood by the appellation *τῶν τινων*? Certainly none other than the *ἐμπαῖκται καὶ ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι*, mockers and false teachers [4], whom this manner alone of interpreting the divine tardiness befitted. Therefore, those who are called *τινες*, some, are lying and false teachers.

Having rejected the judgment of the *ψευδοδιδασκάλων*, false teachers, Peter immediately discloses the genuine origin of the divine tardiness in inflicting punishments, saying: *ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ἡμᾶς*, "but he is long-suffering toward

[4] In the commentary at this place.
[5] Ibid.
[1] Gen. XXXV.19; Deut. VII.10; I Tim. III.15.
[2] As may be seen in the Corbie manuscript and in Lachmann.
[3] Epistle to Cyprian, *opp.*, T. II, col. 698.
[4] II Pet. II.3.

us," indulges us, and for our sake and on our account defers vengeance. For God's *μακροθυμία*, long-suffering, is supreme because his *χρηστότης*, benignity, is supreme [5], by which he sustains even the *σκεύη ὀργῆς*, vessels of wrath, *ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ*, with incredible patience [6]. Therefore, if you ask concerning the cause of that tardiness with which God inflicts the punishments threatened, Peter exhibits this to you and teaches that it is situated both in that long-suffering by which God approaches punishment almost unwillingly, and in that love by which he pursues the faithful signified by the pronoun *ἡμᾶς*, us, and most benignly provides for their salvation.

Concerning this matter no doubt will be possible for you if you furthermore regard the connection—

> —by which these words are joined with those which follow. For immediately it is added, *μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι, ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι*, "since he does not will any to perish, but all to return to penance." Now two things from these are most manifest. And first it is most manifest that the word *πάντας*, by force of the opposed *τινας*, can only be taken most fully, and must be understood concerning absolutely all both collectively and distributively. Next, it is no less evident that the phrases *ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ἡμᾶς* and *μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι, ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι* are mutually related in that relation by which the thesis coheres with the hypothesis, and by which a universal proposition is joined with a particular proposition subordinated to it. For God is slow to take vengeance and uses long-suffering and patience toward us who have believed because he is so disposed in mind that, insofar as depends upon himself, he does not will even one man to perish, and conversely, insofar as depends upon himself, he wills each and all to convert themselves to penance, return to a better mind, and obtain eternal salvation.

CCXCVI.

Since these things are so, it is evident that the sentence of the whole verse is most fittingly embraced in this paraphrase: the Lord does not delay in confirming his promises by the event because, as lying teachers suppose, he is never going to fulfill them in deed; but according to his long-suffering he indulges us and for our sake defers punishments, since he absolutely does not will anyone to perish, but most sincerely wills all to repent and all to be saved through penance.

[5] Whence at Rom. II.4, *μακροθυμία καὶ χρηστότης* are joined.

[6] Rom. IX.22.

Furthermore, there is more than one similarity between this paraphrase and the doctrine of Paul which we are considering. For there exists a) a grammatical similarity: what Paul teaches by affirming when he says, *ὃς πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν*, "who wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth," Peter repeats partly by denying and partly by affirming, writing, *μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι, ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι*, "willing not that any should—"

> —perish, but willing all to return to penance." There exists b) a logical similarity, since no less in Paul than in Peter the words which we have just transcribed embrace the cause and reason of the things which precede. And there exists c) a real similarity, and that a twofold one, of which the former refers to the amplitude and the latter to the force and efficacy of the salvific will. For just as Paul, in order to declare the universal amplitude of the salvific will, uses a universal affirmative proposition, saying, "who wills all men to be saved," so Peter, both by the particular negative proposition, "who does not will any to perish," and by the universal affirmative proposition, "who wills all to return to penance," subjects the same amplitude of the salvific will to the mind and soul. But just as Paul shows the force and efficacy of the salvific will from the fact that it is the will of God the Savior, and that it is the will of him to whom it is pleasing and acceptable that prayers be poured forth for the salvation of all, so Peter demonstrates the force and efficacy of the same will from the fact that it is the will *τῆς μακροθυμίας*, of long-suffering, and of him who spares the rod and uses indulgence for this reason: that there may be opportunity for penance for all and that the faculty of attaining salvation may be lacking to no one.

CCXCVII.

Concerning this will, those things are altogether excellent which God opposes in Ezekiel to the Israelites, who complained on this account [1]: that punishments owed to wicked parents were exacted from innocent children. For he says [2]: "The justice of the just shall be upon him, and the impiety of the impious shall be upon him. But if the impious does penance for all his sins which he has committed,

[1] Ezek. XVIII.2.
[2] Ibid., vv. 20–21.

and keeps all my precepts and does judgment and justice, living he shall live and [3] shall not die." He would say almost—

> —in Jerome's interpretation [1]: "To such an extent the sins of the fathers do not redound upon the children, neither does a wicked father weigh down a just son, nor are some punished for the crimes of others, that the one and same man who formerly was impious and a sinner, if he afterward does penance and, converted to better things, has blotted out his former sins, is not judged by the antiquity of his sin, but is received into my flock by the renewal of virtue."

God proceeds [2], adding: "I shall not remember all his iniquities which he committed; in his justice which he has wrought, he shall live." But whence is the origin of so great a long-suffering? And whence flows the fountain of so great a benignity? God discloses the origin and fountain [3] in these words: *החפץ רשע מות אחפץ*, which the Alexandrians render *μὴ θελήσει θελήσω τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἀνόμου*, "shall I, willing, will the death of the wicked?" The Vulgate has, "Is the death of the impious of my will?" The Syriac: "I do not delight in the death of the sinner." And the Chaldean: "Do I, willing, will the death of the impious?" Now, although all these versions agree excellently as regards the sum of the matter, nevertheless the Chaldean represents the force and meaning of the original text more accurately. For since the prefixed *ה* serves for interrogation, and the verb *חפץ*, to which *קפץ* and *חפז* are near, properly expresses to bend, to incline, and, metaphorically, whether followed by *ב* [4] or by the accusative case [5], denotes to have been inclined, to have been delighted, to have willed, the whole phrase is most fittingly translated: "Do I, willing, will the death of the impious, says the Lord God?" But to what this pertains, although it is perspicuous of itself, nevertheless becomes known more splendidly from the next phrase, which has thus: *וחיה מדרכו בשובו הלא*, "is it not—"

---

[3] Although the conjunction "and" is absent from the common Hebrew editions and from most codices, nevertheless several Kennicottian and Rossian codices and all the ancient versions, if you except the Chaldean, prefer it.

[1] In the commentary at this place.

[2] Ezek. XVIII.22.

[3] Ibid., v. 23. Several Kennicottian and Rossian codices have not *מות*, death, but *במות*, in death; and Houbigant determines that it ought so to be read, saying: "Read *במות*, in the impious man's dying, so that afterward *בשובו*, in his returning, may be read. Thus it is written in the parallel passage below, XXXIII.11, and likewise in the last verse of this very chapter."

[4] Gen. XXXIV.19; Deut. XXI.14; Num. XIV.8; II Sam. XV.26; Ps. XVIII.20; Isa. LVI.4; LXV.13.

[5] Ps. XL.7; LI.8, 18, 21; Isa. I.11; Mic. VII.18.

—that he return [1] from his way and live?" Therefore, the members so correspond to one another that a universal negative proposition [2] precedes, while a universal affirmative proposition [3] follows. The former is thus: "Do I, willing, will the death of the impious?" that is, "I by no means will the death of the impious." The latter is this: "Do I not delight in his conversion from his way, and he shall live?" that is, "But, willing, I will his conversion from his way, and he shall live." Theodoret embraces the sentence of each in these words [4]: "I desire not the death of the unjust, but penance; for I created human nature not that I might punish it, but that I might communicate life with it. And deeds give testimony to the words; for he would neither have inspired prophets by his divine power, nor sent apostles, nor handed down written laws, and promised goods and threatened Gehenna, if he desired to punish; rather, he would have permitted men to be borne wherever they willed."

CCXCVIII.

Twin to this oracle is another in the same Ezekiel [5], concerning which Jerome writes [6]: "If we read negligently, it seems to us to be the same prophecy as that above [7], in which it is said: 'Do I, willing, desire the death of the unjust, says the Lord, rather than that he be converted from his evil way and live?' and at the end of the same prophecy [8]: 'Be converted and return from all your impieties, and your iniquities shall not be unto torment—' "

—." For there the discourse is made to those who will to do penance and to blot out sins by justice, that they may be converted with confidence and do penance with a full mind. But here he speaks to those who, on account of the magnitude of their sins, indeed of their impieties, despair of salvation and say [1]: "Our iniquities and our sins are

[1] Most codices with the *Keri* and the Vulgate have "from his ways."

[2] For it is a by no means doubtful canon that in affirmative interrogations the interrogative ה has a force of denying; as at II Sam. VII.5; Zech. I.5.

[3] The Greek version changes the absolute discourse of the Hebrew text into a comparative one in these words: *οὐ μὴ θελήσει θελήσω τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἀνόμου, λέγει ἀδωναι κύριος, ὡς τὸ ἐπιστρέψαι αὐτὸν ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ τῆς πονηρᾶς καὶ ζῆσαι αὐτόν*. "Shall I, willing, will the death of the unjust, says Adonai the Lord, as that he be converted from his evil way and live?"

[4] Commentary at this place.

[5] Ezek. XXXIII.11.

[6] In the commentary at this place.

[7] Ezek. XVIII.23.

[8] Ibid., v. 32.

[1] Ezek. XXXIII.10.

upon us, and in them we waste away; how, therefore, shall we be able to live?" And the sense is: since death has once been proposed to us, and no medicine can restore health to our wounds, what necessity is there to labor and be consumed in vain, and not to pass the present life in desperation, so that we may at least enjoy this life, since we have lost the future one? God answers these men [2] that he does not will the death of the impious, but that he return and live. And he makes an apostrophe to the despairing impious: "Be converted from your most evil ways." And that we may know who are the impious to whom he speaks, the following discourse demonstrates: "Why will you die, O house of Israel?" But life and death in this passage [3] do not signify this life by which, according to the law of nature common to beasts, we all either live or are dissolved by death, but that concerning which it is written [4]: "I shall please the Lord in the land of the living." And [5], "The soul which sins, it itself shall die."

Therefore, God thus addresses through the prophet the Israelites despairing of life and salvation [6]: "Say to them: As I live, says the Lord God, *במות אם־אחפץ הרשע*, if I delight in the death of the—"

—impious, *וחיה מדרכו רשע אם־בשוב כי*, but in the impious man's returning from his way, and he shall live." These things will be adjusted more fittingly to the genius of the Latin language if it is considered in the mind: a) that the particle *אם*, which of itself bears the force of a condition, in formulas of oath, such as the present, contains the signification of negating [1] and has the same force as "not"; and then b) that the particles *אם כי*, more closely joined and referred to the same sentence, after a preceding negation, are equivalent [2] to the adversative particle "but." When these things have been established,

[2]Ibid., v. 11.

[3]"Indeed," Rosenmüller writes in the scholia at this passage, "it can scarcely be doubted that natural death must be understood. For Jewish affairs were then in such a state that the citizens of Jerusalem were not far removed from death, or from that life, if it should happen that they escaped death, which on account of miserable and harsh servitude would have the likeness of a most bitter death." But a) neither the words nor the sequence of the discourse are so constituted that the things said can be understood only of temporal and natural death and destruction. Moreover, b) if God of himself so greatly abhors the temporal destruction of men, he will certainly much more vehemently abhor their eternal destruction.

[4]Ps. CXVI.9.

[5]Ezek. XVIII.4.

[6]Ibid. XXXIII.11.

[1]I Sam. XIV.45; II Sam. XIX.14; XX.20; Ps. XCV.11.

[2]Gen. XV.4; XXXII.29; Josh. XVII.3; I Sam. VIII.19. Whence *אם* is more than once omitted in the *Keri*.

> it appears that the genuine sentence of the words which we have adduced is this: "Say to them: As I live, says the Lord God, I do not delight [3] in the death of the impious, nor do I will it; but I delight in the repentance of the impious from his way, I will this, and he shall live."

But these things are such that they agree most exactly no less with the preceding oracle than with the testimonies of Peter and Paul, and exhibit no less the amplitude than the efficacy and sincere character of the salvific will. They agree with the preceding oracle and the testimonies of Peter and Paul; for what 1) is here, "Say to them: As I live, says the Lord God, I do not delight in the death of the impious," stands thus in the preceding oracle: "I by no means delight in the death of the impious"; or, as is added with several things interposed [4], "because I do not will the death of the dying man," that is, of him [5] who is worthy of death and who, unless he repents, is going to die. But Peter, expressing this very thing, writes of God: "who does not will any to perish." Again, 2) what is here, "but I delight in the repentance of the impious from his way, and he shall live," corresponds both to these words of the preceding oracle, "but, willing, I will—"

> —the conversion of the impious from his way, and he shall live,"

and to these words of Peter, "but he wills all to convert themselves to penance," or of Paul, "who wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth."

CCXCIX.

Certainly nothing more evident than these things can be desired by which either the infinite amplitude of the salvific will or its power, efficacy, and altogether sincere character may be disclosed. And indeed the infinite amplitude of the salvific will is disclosed partly a) by negative propositions, by which God is declared not to will the death of the impious and not to will the destruction and perdition of even one; and partly b) by affirmative propositions, by which God is declared to will the penance of the impious, to will the conversion of all, and to will the salvation of all.

---

[3] The Alexandrian version in this passage also exhibits a comparative discourse in place of the absolute; for it is of this kind: *εἰπὲ τοίνυν αὐτοῖς, ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει ἀδωναι κύριος, ὅτι οὐ βούλομαι τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ, ὡς τὸ ἀποστρέψαι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ζῆν αὐτόν*. "Say therefore to them: As I live, says Adonai the Lord, because I do not will the death of the sinner, as that he be converted from his way and live."

[4] Ezek. XVIII.32.

[5] This is the force of *המת*, the dead man, as Kimchi and afterward Michaelis and Rosenmüller observed.

But concerning the efficacy, power, and altogether sincere character of the salvific will, there are nearly as many arguments as words. For an argument is 1) that what is neither sincere nor active can be reckoned a false semblance of will, but not a will. An argument is 2) the whole color of the discourse, which exhibits a will not lying but true, not slothful but efficacious. An argument is 3) that God not without an oath denies that he wills anyone's death and destruction, and not without an oath affirms that he wills the penance and salvation of all. An argument is 4) that to a will of this kind there is attributed both that long-suffering by which God sustains the evil and impious, and that indulgence by which he imparts to the evil and impious time and opportunity for penance. An argument is 5) that a will of this kind is derived sometimes from the fact that God is a Savior, sometimes from the benevolence toward men inherent in him, and sometimes from the fact that nothing is more important to him than to turn the cause of human perdition as far away from himself as possible. Finally, arguments are 6) the most vehement exhortations which God subjoins [1], saying: "Return and live; be converted, be converted from your most evil ways; and why will you die, O house of Israel?" Whence, when supreme destruction threatened them on account of their will hardened in malice—

—the only-begotten Son of God, seeing the city [1], *ἔκλαυσεν ἐπ' αὐτῇ*, wept over it.

He wept because he loved it; he wept because of himself he did not will its destruction; he wept because he willed its preservation; he wept because he saw the cares to be vain by which he labored so greatly, lest through a defect of fruits he should at length someday be compelled to cut down the tree cultivated by him [2]; and finally, he wept that in him all might behold almost with their own eyes the paternal disposition and the paternal benignity toward men.

For thus Paul [3], addressing the Jews who placed no limit upon their sins, depicts the mind of God toward them: *ἢ τοῦ πλούτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς; ἀγνοῶν, ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει; κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ;* "Or do you spurn the riches and greatness of his benignity and of tolerance [4] and slowness, and do you not observe that the benignity [5] of God looks to

[1] Ezek. XVIII.32, compared with XXXIII.11.

[1] Luke XIX.41–45.

[2] Luke XIII.6–10.

[3] Rom. II.4–6.

[4] *Ἡ ἀνοχή* is not only the toleration of calamities and miserable things, but also that habit of mind which bears humanely with those who err and does not immediately exact punishments from them.

[5] *Τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ* has the same force as *ἡ χρηστότης τοῦ θεοῦ*. You have a twin sentence at Wisd. XI.23 and in Philo's second book *On Allegories*: *οὐδὲ τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσιν εὐθὺς ἐπέξεισιν ὁ*

this, that it lead you to penance? But you, according to your hardness and heart tenacious of malice [6], heap up wrath for yourself [7] in the day of wrath, in which the just judgment of God shall be revealed [8]."

Here, among other things, it must be observed: a) that the words *τῆς χρηστότητος, τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας* are therefore heaped together, that God's immense benignity toward the impious may be described more splendidly; b) that this very immense benignity and indulgence of God is expressed when it is called not *χρηστότης* but *πλοῦτος τῆς χρηστότητος*; c) that the riches of heavenly benignity are exhibited not as slothful and sterile, but full of fruitfulness and power, and pertaining to this, that God restrain his wrath and endow the impious with internal and external graces by which they may return to a better mind and obtain salvation; d) that the *σκληρότητα καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν* of men, hardness and a heart tenacious of evil, is the cause why so many and so great benefits of God come to nothing; and finally e) that no one will be damned in the day of wrath and manifestation and of the just judgment of God except him who has repelled *τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ*, the divine benevolence, and the opportunity of medicine afforded.

There is therefore reason that, with Theodoret leading the way [1], we conclude: "Who will be able worthily to admire the Lord's goodness? Although he is neglected by those whom he has affected with benefits, who are very ungrateful to him, he nevertheless pursues the most ungrateful with every providence, that he may behold their change. Therefore he subjoins a paternal admonition full of benevolence: *ἐπιστροφῇ* [2] *ἐπιστρέψατε ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ ὑμῶν τῆς πονηρᾶς, καὶ ἵνα τί ἀποθνῄσκετε οἶκος Ἰσραήλ;* 'By conversion be converted from your evil way; for why will you die, O house of Israel?' *Ὁ δὲ διπλασιασμὸς τῆς ἑβραίων γλώττης ἰδίωμα, δηλοῖ δὲ τῆς ἐπιστροφῆς τὸ γνήσιον.* 'The duplication is an idiom of the Hebrew language, and declares a genuine conversion' [3]."

θεός, ἀλλὰ δίδωσι χρόνον εἰς μετάνοιαν καὶ τὴν τοῦ σφάλματος ἴασιν, "Neither does God immediately proceed against those who sin, but he gives time for repentance and the healing of the fault."

[6] The expression *ἀμετανόητος καρδία*, an incurable heart and one which can scarcely be amended, occurs only in this passage: namely, a heart tenacious of evil and hardened in depravity.

[7] The verb *θησαυρίζειν*, more than once with the notion of a treasure cast aside, has the same force as to procure something for oneself and to heap up and acquire something for oneself; and it is employed no less in a good than in an evil part, Prov. I.18; Amos III.10.

[8] What is said, *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως*, must be taken as if it were said, *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς, ἐν ᾗ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται*.

[1] Commentary on Ezek. XXXIII.11.

[2] In Hebrew it is שובו שובו, "return, return."

[3] But another idiom obtains here, by which the same verb is repeated and the vehemence and ardor of the exhortation is signified. Cf. Glassius in *App. Gramm. Sacr.*, tract. II, observat. XIV.

CCC.

Moreover, it was not enough for Paul to testify in express words that God wills all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth; but he immediately proceeds [1] to confirm what he had affirmed, adding—

> —*εἷς γὰρ θεός, εἷς καὶ μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς*, "for there is one God, and one [2] mediator of God and men, the man [3] Christ Jesus." Concerning this verse it can, and indeed also ought, to be asked: I. in what sense, or with what signifying force, the name *God* is taken; II. what *μεσίτης* properly and fully means; III. what and how great an extension is attributed to Christ's mediation; IV. why Paul so greatly inculcates the unity of God and of Christ the mediator; V. what is the mutual relation of the clauses; VI. what is the meaning of the whole verse; VII. in what manner it coheres with the preceding things; and finally VIII. what is the breadth, what the force, and what the supreme origin of the salvific will.

Accordingly, the name *God* in the divine writings and ecclesiastical monuments [4] is used sometimes *οὐσιωδῶς*, essentially, and sometimes *ὑποστατικῶς*, personally; and essentially, indeed, it designates the divine nature common to the august Trinity, but personally it represents by name the Father or the Son or the Holy Spirit. But it is a canon by no means doubtful that the name God is used *ὑποστατικῶς*, not *οὐσιωδῶς*, and precisely of the hypostasis of the Father, whenever it is joined with the Son, who is distinguished by his own appellations. Examples are most frequent and occur everywhere [5] at the beginnings and at the conclusion of the epistles. Since, therefore, in the present passage which we are treating, the name God coheres with the name of the Son, who is set apart by the proper appellation Christ Jesus, it follows that the words *εἷς γὰρ θεός, εἷς καὶ μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* ought to be understood no otherwise than if it had been written, *εἷς γὰρ*—

---

[1] I Tim. II.5.

[2] Hilary in the fourth book *On the Trinity*, Ambrose in the commentary on Luke XXII, Augustine on John, Tracts XLI, XLVII, and LXVI, Ambrosiaster on this passage, and the author of the work *On the Calling of All Nations*, book I, chapter XII, transpose the particle *and*, and read: "for there is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus."

[3] Heinrich Heinrichs, by his own judgment and despite the opposition of the witnesses and instruments, omits *ἄνθρωπος*.

[4] Suicer shows this at greater length in the *Thesaurus*, under the words *θεός*, *πατήρ*, *υἱός*, and *πνεῦμα*.

[5] Rom. I.1–3; XVI.27; I Cor. I.1–4; II Cor. I.1–3.

—*θεὸς πατήρ, εἷς καὶ μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*, "for there is one God the Father, and one mediator of God and men, the man Jesus Christ."

CCCI.

But to what does the appellation *μεσίτης* pertain, with which the man Christ Jesus is distinguished? The Greek-Latin glosses have thus: *μεσίτης*, umpire, arbitrator, mediator; *μεσιτεία*, arbitration, sequestration, arbitral judgment. In the Latin-Greek glossary we read: intercedes, *μεσάζει*; intervention, *μεσιτεία*; intercessor, *βραβευτής*, *βοηθός*; intervenes, *βοηθεῖ*, *μεσάζει*. All these are nearly synonyms [1], and are taken for one who by his intervention and suretyship relieves someone and comes to the aid of one laboring and in peril. Whence in the *Etymologicum* in Biel, *μεσίτης* is described by these words: *ὁ μεταξὺ δύο ὤν, καὶ σημαίνει τὸν μεσάζοντα*, "he who is between two, and it signifies the one mediating."

In the Alexandrian version the word *μεσίτης* occurs only once [2], and by it the Hebrew words יש־בינינו are rendered; but in the same version [3], and in Aquila, the formula איש־הבנים is rendered *ὁ μεσάζων* or *ὁ μέσαιος*. From these things we attain the understanding that he is properly called *μεσίτης* who stands as a middle between two. Hence [4] Gregory Nazianzen, Basil of Seleucia [5], and [6] Theophylact call John the Baptist *μεσίτης*, because he stood as a middle—

—between the Old and the New Testament; and hence Greek writers [1] call challengers *μεσίται*, who stand and advance between either battle line, both of their own men and of the enemy, and intend to settle and decide the war by single combat.

[1] Jerome, in the commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians III, places some distinction between a mediator and an umpire, but without necessity, since by the usage of speech an umpire is *μεσίτης ἔντριτος*, a mediator who intervenes as a third between two. Tertullian is to the point, who in the book *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*, chapter LI, speaks thus of Christ the mediator: "This umpire of God and men, as he has been called, from the deposit of either party committed to him, also preserves in himself the deposit of the flesh, the earnest of the whole sum. For just as he left to us the earnest of the Spirit, so also from us he received the earnest of the flesh, and carried into heaven the pledge of the whole sum someday to be brought thither."

[2] Job IX.33.

[3] I Sam. XVII.4.

[4] Oration XXXIX, p. 633.

[5] Oration XVIII, p. 105.

[6] In the commentary on Matt. III.

[1] Cf. Fischer, *On the Greek Versions of the Old Testament*, pp. 58 ff., and Schmidt's dissertation in which the notion of *μεσίτης* is investigated.

Therefore, as Petavius [2] shrewdly admonishes, the common and native notion necessarily underlying *μεσίτης*, mediator, is this: that he be understood who is a participant in both and associated with them by a certain communion, of whom he is the reconciler and umpire. But this can be effected in two ways: in one way, that there be some conjunction of nature with each; but in the other, that he cohere with them by a harmony of minds and wills. The former species of *μεσιτεία* is not unfittingly called *φυσική*, natural; the latter *σχετική*, which consists in the affection of the mind alone and in the office of giving aid and deserving well that arises thence. "Now," Petavius adds, "Christ Jesus, the mediator of God and men, possesses both: joining both natures in the same person of his, he fulfills that first natural and substantial form of an intervener; then he answers to the latter by a manifold function—by satisfying, interceding, and praying, by appeasing God and meriting for us."

And in very truth, we no less believe that the one and the same Christ is [3] son of David, son of Mary, and son of man, than we profess him to be [4] *τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ*, the image of God; *τὸ ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸν χαρακτῆρα τῆς ὑποστάσεως θεοῦ*, the splendor of the glory and character of the hypostasis of God; *τὸν πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως*, the firstborn of every creature, that is, *τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς κτίσεως*, the principle of the creature; *τὸν ἔχοντα ὄνομα ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα, καὶ ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχοντα*, the one having a name above every name and existing in the form of God; *τὸν πρῶτον καὶ τὸν ἔσχατον*, the first and the last—

> —*τὸν μονογενῆ παρὰ πατρός*, the only-begotten of the Father; and *τὸν λόγον ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ ἴσα τῷ θεῷ ὄντα*, the Word who was in the beginning with God and was equal to God. For, as is the concordant testimony of Christian tradition [1], we had need of a mediator who would unite in himself the divine and human nature, who would be *θεάνθρωπος*, God-man, and who, as Bernard [2] speaks, "agreeing equally with the parties, would be suspected by

[2] *On the Incarnation*, book XII, chapter I, § IV.

[3] Matt. I.1; VIII.20; IX.6; X.23; XI.19; XII.32; XIX.28; Mark II.10; VIII.31–38; Luke VI.5–22; VII.34; XX.41; John III.13–14; V.27; VI.54.

[4] II Cor. IV.4; Col. I.15; Heb. I.3; Apoc. III.14; Phil. II.6–9; Apoc. I.18; II.8; XXII.13; John I.1, 14, 18.

[1] The rich witnesses of this tradition are Tertullian, *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*, chapter LI, and *Against Praxeas*, chapter XXVII; Cyprian, book II of the *Testimonies to Quirinus*, § X; Novatian, *On the Trinity*, chapters XIV–XV; Lactantius, *Divine Institutes*, book IV, chapter XXV; Hilary, *On the Trinity*, book IX; Ambrosiaster on I Tim. II.5; Augustine, *City of God*, book IX, chapters IX–XV; Fulgentius, *On Faith to Peter*, chapter II; Ferrandus in the epistle to Anatolius; Vigilius in the fourth book against Eutyches; and Gregory, book XXII of the *Moralia*, chapter XIII. Petavius presents the Greek defenders of the same tradition in *On the Incarnation*, book XII, chapter III.

[2] Sermon II on the Canticle.

> neither." "For all," Fulgentius [3] testifies, "who desire to be participants in eternal salvation, ought equally to acknowledge and hold that the man Jesus Christ was not in vain named the mediator of God and men, except because the same God assumed the whole nature of man in himself, and the same man has in himself the whole substance of deity. For because through sin man was separated from God, there ought assuredly to intervene between God who was angered and man who was sinning the person of such a mediator, who, for propitiating God to man, would have in himself the whole and true God born of God, and, for reconciling man to God, would contain in himself the whole and true man born of man; and thus from both, in both, there would be one Christ, so that the fullness of deity would not consume but advance the man assumed, and the fullness of humanity would neither diminish the immense nor change the impassible deity; and thus the nature of man, which had been changed for the worse, would through him be wholly reintegrated, than whom nothing is better. Therefore, the mediator of God and men deigned to demonstrate himself full God and full man."

But although the sincere account of a mediator comes back to this, if he is regarded *ὄντως* and substantially, nevertheless it must be confessed—

> —that it is indicated by Paul by implication rather than signified in open and express discourse. And indeed it is indicated by implication when mention is made of Christ, who is the Word himself incarnate; but the nature according to which Christ discharged the offices and parts of mediator is expressly signified. For the appellation of *man* proves this, by which it is said, *εἷς μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς*, "one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus"; and the things continuously added likewise prove this: *ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων*, "who gave himself a redemption for all." For they are so disposed that they proclaim not so much the person of the mediator as that nature according to which Christ the mediator satisfied for all, suffered, and reconciled all with God. Therefore, a twofold notion expressed by Paul under the name *mediator* must be distinguished: first, indeed, a notion indicated by implication, which is the notion of *θεάνθρωπος*, God-man; but then a notion signified, which is the notion of the assumed human nature, by which God the Word completed the work of mediation.

[3] *To Thrasamund*, book I, chapters XV–XVI.

CCCII.

Concerning this work of mediation, neither is the mode doubtful nor is the extension ambiguous. For Paul exhibits the mode, the types shadow it forth, the Fathers illustrate it, and the universal doctrine of the Scriptures sets it before the eyes. Paul exhibits it when by the words *εἷς καὶ μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς* he sets forth the man Christ Jesus as a middle and an umpire [1] between God and men. The types shadow it forth, among whom Moses is eminent [2], through whose work, as that of a mediator [3], the law was given, and concerning whom Basil [4] relates that he bore the figure of Christ and represented the person of Christ when he stood between God—

> —and men as a middle. Nor indeed must the type which preceded in the High Priest of the Jews be passed over, whom Philo [1] calls *μεσίτης* and says to be situated in a certain borderland of the divine and human nature, *ἵνα διὰ μέσου τινὸς ἄνθρωποι μὲν ἱλάσκωνται θεόν, θεὸς δὲ τὰς χάριτας ἀνθρώποις, ὑποδιακόνῳ τινὶ χρώμενος ὀρέγῃ καὶ χορηγῇ*, "that through a certain mediator God may be propitiated to men, and by the ministry of the same may extend and bestow his grace upon them." The Fathers succeed, from whose number Theodoret [2] thus describes the mode of mediation: "There is one *τῆς εἰρήνης ὁ πρύτανις*, arbiter of peace, who joined in himself those things which were disjoined. But he named Christ *man* because he called him mediator; for having become man, he was mediator. And just as one who wishes to reconcile two persons contending with one another, placing himself in the middle and holding this one with his right hand and that one with his left, joins them in friendship, so he, when he had joined the divine nature to the human, conciliated an inviolable and indissoluble peace." For he himself, as we are taught by the most splendid testimonies of the Bible [3], took away the sin of the world; he himself made the purgation of sins; he himself cleansed our conscience from dead works; and he himself became the author of the truth which shone forth, and likewise of the grace which God dispensed and continues further to dispense.

---

[1] Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, discoursing on this matter in the first dialogue *On the Holy Trinity*.

[2] Gal. III.19.

[3] Neither formerly were there lacking, nor in our age are there lacking, those who understand *μεσίτης* in this place not of Moses but of Christ. Chrysostom is worthy above the rest to be consulted.

[4] *On the Holy Spirit*, chapter XIV.

[1] In the book *On the Special Laws*.

[2] In the commentary on I Tim. II.5.

[3] John I.17, 29; Heb. I.3; IX.14.

And he willed this office of mediation to be of such breadth that it would embrace absolutely all men. Indeed, Paul calls Christ *μεσίτην θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων*, "mediator of God and men." But of some only, or plainly of all? This answer contained in the apostolic words is: Christ is the mediator of *ἀνθρώπων*, men, absolutely and simply; so that whoever is a man and participant in human nature pertains by this name alone to the mediation of Christ. Therefore, the mediation of Christ must be reckoned universal in extension; as is remarkably confirmed—to say nothing now of the things consequent, of the connection with the preceding things, or of the very care with which Paul repeats that there is one God and one Christ the mediator.

CCCIII.

For while I ponder with myself the apostolic words, "for there is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus," I understand well that the causes which moved Paul to repeat with manifest care the unity of God and of Christ the mediator cannot be lacking. And indeed they are not lacking; rather, two are present, of which the one immediately discloses itself, while the other is somewhat more inward and hidden. Accordingly, 1) for the same reason Paul writes, "for there is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus," for which in the catholic creeds [1] we read: "I believe in one God, the Father almighty, creator of heaven and earth, and I believe in one Jesus Christ." But each profession of the Creeds by its own nature pertains to this: that no less a multitude of gods and mediators be excluded than that the one God of all and the one Mediator of all be affirmed. Therefore Paul inculcates the unity of God and the unity of Christ the mediator for this reason: that his purpose is as much to refute errors concerning the plurality of gods and the multitude of mediators as to defend the truths concerning the one God of all and concerning the one and same common mediator of all, Christ Jesus. For defending and illustrating these truths, these things [2] conduce excellently: "Is he God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? Indeed, of the Gentiles also, *ἐπείπερ εἷς ὁ θεός*, since indeed God is one." And [3] again: "But the justice of God through faith in Jesus

[1] Such is the Nicene Creed; indeed, such are all the Creeds of the East, even the more ancient ones, in which this concordant profession of faith occurs: *πιστεύω εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα*, "I believe in one God the Father," *καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν*, "and in one Jesus Christ."

[2] Rom. III.29.

[3] Ibid., vv. 22–24.

Christ [4], *εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας*, unto all and upon all who believe in him; for there is no [5] distinction. For all have sinned and need—"

> —the glory of God." Then [1] elsewhere: "For there is no distinction of Jew and Greek. *ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸς* [2] *κύριος πάντων, πλουτῶν* [3] *εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους αὐτόν.* For there is one and the same Lord of all, rich unto all who invoke him. For [4] everyone whosoever shall invoke the name of the Lord shall be saved."

But 2) to this cause another succeeds, which can scarcely be explained more fittingly than if it be said that Paul therefore wrote, "for there is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus," because it was established for him to reduce things which in themselves are various and diverse to a certain supreme unity, and from this to conclude more forcefully that Christians ought consequently to be borne by a common affection toward all men and to be solicitous for the salvation of all, because all things proceed from one and the supreme principle. Indeed, when the Apostle writes, "for there is one God," by the appellation *God* he signifies the Father. But the Father is the ultimate principle both of the divine persons and also of all creatures, and therefore the supreme origin of the whole *τὸ ὄν*, being. Hence Gregory Nazianzen [5] calls him *ἕνωσις*, unition, while Theodore Abucara [6] calls him *ἀνακεφαλαίωσις*, the collection and comprehension in unity of all things which exist. For as Richard of St. Victor [7] is the authority, "without doubt the Father alone has it that he be according to principality. For the others are according to reception, and according to the likeness of another. Here, therefore, is gathered why unity is, as it were, specially attributed to him according to this consideration." Therefore, to say with the Apostle, "for there is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus," is equivalent to speaking thus—

> —"for there is one God the Father, who is from himself, proceeds from no other, and is the font and origin of all; and one mediator of

[4] The clause *καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας*, "and upon all," is lacking in several codices, versions, and citations of the Fathers.

[5] Namely, with respect to divine benefits a Jew is not worthier than a Gentile, but each is equally unworthy.

[1] Rom. X.12–14.

[2] The formula *ὁ αὐτὸς κύριος πάντων*, "the same Lord of all," plainly corresponds to the other, *εἷς ὁ κύριος πάντων*, "one Lord of all."

[3] Eph. I.7; II.7. God is called *πλοῦτος χάριτος*, a wealth of grace, which no multitude of believers, however great, can exhaust.

[4] Joel III.5.

[5] Orations XXIX and XXXVII. Cf. Petavius, *On the Trinity*, book IV, chapter XV.

[6] Opuscule XLII, vol. I, *Bibliotheca Patrum Graeco-Latina*, p. 435.

[7] In the little book *On the Three Appropriations of the Persons in the Trinity*, by which he replied to Bernard asking what seemed to him concerning that sentence of Augustine in which unity is attributed to the Father, equality to the Son, and the concord of both to the Holy Spirit.

God and men with the Father, by whom he was sent, Christ Jesus." But when we speak thus, just as we reduce all things to the Father as to the universal cause, so we refer all things to the Son as to the common and universal mediator with the Father.

Paul discourses splendidly concerning this relation, who, having first established this as a theorem [1], "we know and have ascertained that an idol is [2] nothing in the world, and that there is no [3] other God besides that one whom we worship"; and then, having comprehended the superstition of the Gentiles in these words [4], "for although there are those who in the [5] estimation of men are held to be gods, whether in heaven or on earth"; finally concludes by inference [6], *ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν· καὶ εἷς κύριος, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ*, "but for us Christians there is one God the Father, from whom are all things, and we [7] unto him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him." Here a) when the Father and Son are enumerated together, the former is named *God*, the latter *Lord*, according to the solemn law; b) but this is attributed to the Father, that he be and be believed the supreme [8] *καὶ μία τῶν πάντων ἀρχή*, and the one cause of all, and therefore he in whom [9] the august dogma of monarchy shines forth; but c) among those things, both visible and invisible, of which the Father is the principle without principle, the Son excels—

—inasmuch as he proceeded from his substance, consubstantial with him, the first of all and altogether coeternal; and indeed d) proceeded [1] as the only-begotten Son, as the Word, as Wisdom, as Power, as he through whom all things were made; and therefore e) as he who by his origin [2] and by his personal mark stood as a middle between the Father and all other things. Paul signifies this f) concerning him [3], saying: *ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, "who is the begotten image of the invisible God, the first-

[1] I Cor. VIII.4.

[2] That is, that no god of the Gentiles truly exists in the world and the nature of things.

[3] The word *ἕτερος*, other, is of wholly uncertain authority.

[4] I Cor. VIII.5.

[5] For in this sense *λεγόμενοι θεοί*, "those called gods," must be understood, that is, *νομιζόμενοι*, those reputed.

[6] I Cor. VIII.6.

[7] Unless *εἰς* be taken for *διά*, and the words *καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν* be rendered "and we through him," they will have the same force as *καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτῷ*, "and we are his own and devoted to his worship."

[8] In Basil, epistle LXXVIII.

[9] Concerning which Athanasius discourses splendidly in the second oration against the Arians.

[1] John I.1, 14, 18; III.18; I Cor. I.24.

[2] I say by his personal mark, but by no means by nature, which Cyril of Alexandria relates and refutes that the Arians impiously imagined in the first dialogue *On the Trinity*.

[3] Col. I.15–17.

born [4] of every creature." But why? *ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα, τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὁρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα . . . τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται.* "Because through him were created all things heavenly and terrestrial, visible and invisible . . . all things were created through him and [5] unto him." Whence g) nothing is truer than what Alexander of Alexandria [6], speaking of God the Father and of the universe of things produced by him, writes as regards the Son: *ὧν μεσιτεύουσα φύσις μονογενής, δι' ἧς τὰ ὅλα ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐποίησεν ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου, ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὄντος πατρὸς γεγέννηται*, "between which two the only-begotten nature holds the middle, through whom the Father of God the Word made all things from nothing, but who was begotten from the Father himself who is."

CCCIV.

Since, therefore, the character of *μεσίτης*, through whom all things are referred to the Father as to the [1]—

—*πηγὴν καὶ ῥίζαν*, font and root of the universe, is innate in the Son and cannot be separated from his hypostatic property, for the twofold order—whether the natural order of creation and conservation, or the supernatural order of reparation and salvation—a twofold *μεσιτεία* of the Son must be distinguished. And principally that mediation must be distinguished which belongs to him insofar as he is the Word, through whom [2] God the Father also made the ages, through whom he sustains all things, and through whom all things are referred to God the Father as to the supreme principle of all. Then that mediation must be distinguished which belongs to the Son insofar as he [3] put on flesh and, sent by the Father, made the purgation of sins, reconciled terrestrial things with heavenly things, and restored the paternal work—rightly instituted but corrupted by

[4] It seemed to Johann David Michaelis, in the annotations on this passage, that it was preferable with Isidore of Pelusium to read not *πρωτότοκος* but *πρωτοτόκος*, first begetter, and therefore to render the words *πρωτοτόκος πάσης κτίσεως*: "the first begetter," that is, "author of all created things." But there is no need to engage in slender disputes about accents, since *πρωτότοκος*, from the most frequent usage of speech, is one who is eminent and excels.

[5] For he is the principle and end of all things.

[6] In Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History*, book I, chapter IV.

[1] Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, Oration XXIX.

[2] Heb. I.2.

[3] John I.14; Heb. I.3.

> the wickedness of men—to its pristine integrity and health. When this distinction between the twofold mediation has been observed, everyone easily perceives that not the former but the latter mode is considered by Paul, and that for its sake he writes that there is one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus.

But this proposition, together with the antecedent by which God is said to be one, not only [4] adheres by a copulative nexus, but also by the nexus in which the supreme cause of salvation and the principal means of the same are most closely joined together. It adheres by the copulative nexus which the words manifest of themselves: "for there is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus." But it also adheres by the nexus which we mentioned in the second place: for just as the clause "for there is one God" corresponds to this, "for there is one God the Father [5], Savior and supreme origin of salvation," so the clause "and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus" comes back to this: "and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus, sent by God the Father and Savior, and through whom God the Father, the same Savior, recalled the lost human race to himself as to the supreme font of salvation."

Accordingly, this is [1] the truest circumlocution of the whole verse: "For there is one God the Father, and he the Savior and principal origin of salvation; and likewise there is one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus, whom the Father sent for this reason, that he might remedy the lost human race and by his mediation bring it back to himself as to the supreme font of salvation." Namely: a) *εἷς θεός*, one God the Father, the font and origin that all good things may exist; *εἷς καὶ μεσίτης*, and one mediator, the man Christ Jesus, through whom they may be preserved intact; b) *εἷς θεός*, one God the Father, the principal cause of the salvific order; *εἷς καὶ μεσίτης*, and one mediator, the man Christ Jesus, through whom we believe the order of salvation to have been repaired; c) *εἷς θεός*, one God the Father, from whom the grace of adoption first flowed into the whole human race; *εἷς καὶ μεσίτης*, and one mediator, the man Christ Jesus, through whom [2] the power of recovering adoption was bestowed upon the children of wrath; d) *εἷς θεός*, one God the Father, who created all men joined to himself and associated in friendship in their first parents; *εἷς καὶ μεσίτης*, and one mediator, the man Christ Jesus, through whom he recalled men divided from him and rebelling against him to the covenant of friendship; finally e) just as there is one God the Father, who first was for all the author that they might be well and that they might abound in those things by which, provided only that they willed, they would merit eternal felicity, so there is also one mediator, the man Christ

[4] I Tim. II.5.
[5] Tit. III.4.
[1] I Tim. II.5.
[2] Eph. II.3.

Jesus, through whom all were repaired, all restored to their pristine state, and all endowed with those gifts by whose aid, unless they fail themselves, they may at last enjoy the supreme good.

CCCV.

But these things are abundantly sufficient that the kinship which mutually [3] binds the verses and gathers the whole discourse together may shine forth. For just as the particle *γάρ*, which Paul [4]—

> —uses when writing, *εἷς γὰρ θεός, εἷς καὶ μεσίτης*, "for there is one God, and one mediator," clearly shows that these things cohere with the preceding things in that relation which we call rational and by which a cause and principle are joined with their effects, so the things themselves subjected to the discourse demonstrate the same affinity and fellowship. And in very truth, in order that Paul may bring it about that prayers ought to be poured forth to God for [1] all men and their salvation, he first seeks the cause from this [2]: that an office of charity of this kind ought to be regarded as both *καλόν*, excellent and honorable, and *ἀπόδεκτον ἐνώπιον τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ*, acceptable before God our Savior. But that he may illustrate this same thing more abundantly, explain more fully the force attached to the appellation Savior, and confirm more strongly the cause brought forward, he then adds [3] concerning God, whom he had called Savior: *ὃς πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν*, "who wills all men to be saved, to be imbued with knowledge of the truth, and to believe unto salvation." But lest any shadow remain, and that it may be plainly and evidently known whence the universal salvific will ought to be derived, he finally [4] adds: *εἷς γὰρ θεός, εἷς καὶ μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς*, "for there is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus."

These things assuredly render this sense: "God therefore wills all men to be saved, all believing and imbued with knowledge of the truth, because there is one God the Father, who first instituted the universal order of salvation, and be-

[3] § CCCII.
[4] I Tim. II.5.
[1] I Tim. II.1–2.
[2] Ibid., v. 3.
[3] Ibid., v. 4.
[4] Ibid., v. 5.

cause there is one mediator, the man Christ Jesus, through whom he repaired and restored the universal order of salvation after it had been ruined and convulsed from its foundations."

CCCVI.

From these things it is ready and easy clearly to define both the breadth and the force and supreme origin of the salvific—

> —will and of the whole repaired order. And as regards the breadth, it ought indeed to correspond a) to the office of prayers; b) to the repeated formulas *ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων*, for all men; c) to the extension of the salvific order, which God the Father first instituted and repaired through Christ; and finally d) to the economy of mediation, on account of which Christ is hailed as *εἷς μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων*, the one and common [1] mediator of God and men. But these things are confined by no limits and altogether display the mark of universality. It remains, therefore, that the salvific will itself also be regarded as circumscribed by no boundaries and wholly universal.

And not only universal, but also efficacious and active. For its fruits are a) the manner of providence by which mutual prayers are commanded for the common salvation of all; b) means divinely appointed by which men may be led to salvation and knowledge of the truth; c) the primitive institution of the salvific order; and d) the restoration of the same through Christ, *θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων μεσίτην*, the umpire of God and men.

[1] "All the Greek and Latin interpreters," says Petavius, *On the Incarnation*, book XII, chapter V, § IV, "acknowledge this to be the meaning of the whole passage: the Apostle commands prayers and supplications to be made for all mortals, of whatever race and order, because God desires all to be saved. And thereafter he renders the reason that there is one God of all, and one mediator and umpire between God and men. There the word *one* properly and of itself indicates nothing other than that God is common to all and the mediator common, so that he therefore wills it to be provided for all."

But the ultimate and principal origin of all these things is neither other, nor is another taught in the sacred writings [2], than the merciful love and will of God the Father through Jesus Christ, the common mediator and umpire of all—

> —and umpire. 1) Paul teaches this when he exhibits the principal cause of the salvific will in the words so often set forth: "for there is one God the Father, institutor of the salvific order, and likewise one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus, through whom the salvific order was restored." 2) The Scriptures everywhere teach this, whether when they testify that all graces flowed and continue further to flow from the Father through the Son into the whole human race, or when they refer the salvific economy of the Son back

[2]The benignity of God in the New Testament is distinguished by diverse words. And 1) generally there is praised (Rom. V.5–8; VIII.39; II Cor. XIII.13; I John III.1; IV.9–16) God's *ἀγάπη*, the love by which he wills well to men and benefits them, and delights in the felicity of men; and that love is called (Eph. II.4), on account of its magnitude, *ἡ πολλὴ ἀγάπη*, while God is said (John III.16; XVI.27; I John IV.10–11, 19; Eph. II.4) *ἀγαπᾶν* and *φιλεῖν* men, to love and cherish them, and to him is attributed (Tit. III.4) *φιλανθρωπία*, love toward men; and men loved by God and increased with benefits (Rom. IX.25; XI.28; Col. III.12; I Thess. I.4; II Thess. II.13) are called *ἠγαπημένοι*, *ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ θεοῦ*, or *ὑπὸ κυρίου*. Moreover, 2) God, benign and likewise beneficent, is called (Luke VI.35; I Pet. II.3, compared with Ps. XXXIV.9) *χρηστός*, properly useful, and one who furnishes usefulness; and to him is asserted (Rom. II.4; XI.22; Eph. II.7; Tit. III.4) *χρηστότης*, beneficence, usefulness, and the disposition by which he is inclined to do good; likewise (Rom. II.4) *τὸ χρηστόν*, the same as *χρηστότης*, and *πλοῦτος τῆς χρηστότητος*, an abundance of benignity, that is, copious and abundant beneficence. But 3) since God's love and benignity are expended upon men who are miserable and needy, therefore (Luke I.50, 54, 58, 72; I Tim. I.2; Tit. III.5; Heb. IV.16) it is called *ἔλεος*, mercy; likewise (I Pet. I.3) *πολὺ ἔλεος*; and God himself sometimes (Rom. IX.15–16, 18; XI.32; Phil. II.27) is said *ἐλεεῖν*, to have mercy, sometimes (Eph. II.4) *πλούσιος ὢν ἐν ἐλέει*, rich in mercy, abundantly and amply merciful, and sometimes (Luke I.78) there are attributed to him *σπλάγχνα ἐλέους*, bowels of mercy, a merciful breast and inward mercy. The same divine mercy (Rom. XII.1; Col. III.12; Phil. II.1) is called *οἰκτιρμός*, while God (Rom. IX.15; Luke VI.36; James V.11; II Cor. I.3) is said *οἰκτείρειν*, to have compassion, and is called *οἰκτίρμων*, compassionate, *πολύσπλαγχνος*, very merciful, and *ὁ πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν*, the Father of mercies and therefore supremely merciful. But 4) the men who are adorned with the benefits of God are not only miserable and needy, but also plainly unworthy and never deserving well of anything; hence very often (Rom. V.15–17; XI.5–6; I Cor. XV.10; Eph. II.7; Tit. II.11) there is praised *χάρις*, gratuitous favor, benignity, and gratuitous beneficence; *χάρις ἡ σωτήριος*, saving grace; *ὑπερβάλλων πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος*, the surpassing riches of grace; *περισσεία τῆς χάριτος*, abundance of grace; and God (I Pet. V.10) is called *ὁ θεὸς πάσης χάριτος*, the God of all grace. Sometimes, however, (II Cor. VI.1; IX.8) *ἡ χάρις* indicates God's benefit and gift proceeding from gratuitous favor, and (I Pet. IV.10) is interchanged with *χάρισμα*, by which (Rom. V.15–16; VI.23; XI.29) the gratuitous benefits of God are proclaimed. Whence (II Cor. IV.15; IX.14) *ἡ χάρις πλεονάσασα* is an accumulated benefit of God, and *ἡ ὑπερβάλλουσα χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ* is the most excellent gift of God. Finally, 5) since the most benign God tolerates men who sin and defers the punishments they have merited, there is praised (Rom. II.4; III.26; IX.22; I Pet. III) God's *ἀνοχή*, tolerance, mildness; *μακροθυμία*, long-suffering; and *πλοῦτος τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας*, the riches of tolerance and long-suffering; and God himself (Luke XVIII.7; II Pet. III.9) is said *μακροθυμεῖν*, to be long-suffering.

to the Father who sent him, as to the supreme origin. The things which we subjoin indeed demonstrate both—

—"I give thanks [1] to my God always for you *ἐπὶ τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ δοθείσῃ ὑμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, for the grace of God the Father which was given to you in Christ Jesus." God the Father [2], "who delivered us . . . *κατ' ἰδίαν πρόθεσιν καὶ χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων*, according to his own purpose and the grace which was given to us in Christ Jesus before secular times." "We give thanks [3] to God the Father, who made us worthy of a share in the lot of the saints in light; who rescued us from the power of darkness and transferred us into the kingdom of the Son of his love, *ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν* [4] *διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*, in whom we have redemption through his blood, the remission of sins." "We see [5] Jesus, on account of the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor, *ὅπως χάριτι θεοῦ* [6] *ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσηται θανάτου*, that by the grace of God he might taste death for all [7]." "For God the Father so [8] loved the world [9] that he gave his only-begotten Son, that everyone who believes in him may not perish but may have eternal life. For God did not send his Son into the world that he might judge the world, but that the world might be saved through him." If, therefore, [10] the Son of man came *ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός*, "to seek and save [11] that which had perished," and if—

---

[1] I Cor. I.4.

[2] II Tim. I.9.

[3] Col. I.12–15.

[4] Griesbach and Lachmann expunged from the text the words *διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ*, which nevertheless the Vulgate interpreter and Irenaeus, book V, chapter II, retain.

[5] Heb. II.9.

[6] The most widespread reading exhibits not *χάριτι θεοῦ* but *χωρὶς θεοῦ*.

[7] The expression *ὑπὲρ παντός* most certainly corresponds to the other *ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων*, for all men.

[8] John III.16–18.

[9] Ikenius, in *Philological and Theological Dissertations*, vol. I, dissertation XXIV, and Stronkius, in *Specimen Hermeneuticum Theologicum*, pp. 149 ff., treat excellently of the universal signification of *τοῦ κόσμου* in this passage.

[10] Matt. XVIII.11.

[11] The neuter gender is not seldom used for the masculine, namely, when the discourse concerns a person. Examples which show this are frequent (John I.47; III.6; I John I.1; V.4; Heb. VII.7; Luke I.35; Matt. I.20; XII.6), and among these the present passage also ought to be numbered: "the Son of man came to save *τὸ ἀπολωλός*, the lost thing, that which perished," that is, lost man and the human family.

—he was for us the author of regeneration and salvation, these things are principally to be attributed to the Father, who both gave and sent the Son, and of whom we [1] *ἐσμεν ποίημα, κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς, οἷς προητοίμασεν ὁ θεός, ἵνα ἐν αὐτοῖς περιπατήσωμεν*, "are the workmanship, created in Christ Jesus in [2] good works, which God prepared that we might walk in them."

Moreover, 3) oracles of the Bible occur which are no less frequent than express and which ascribe and vindicate the whole reparation and the instituted order of salvation to the love and mercy of God the Father. To this assuredly pertain the things we have just related concerning the love of God the Father by which he imparted the Son to the world; and to this pertain these plainly twin things which Paul [3] writes: "But God commends *τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς*, his own love toward us, because when we were yet sinners, *Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανε*, Christ died for us [4]"; and he underwent death [5] for this reason, that, justified through his blood, we might be saved from the wrath of the Father and return into grace with him. Therefore [6], "we glory *ἐν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, *δι' οὗ*, through whom we have now received reconciliation." For it pleased [7] God the Father *δι' αὐτοῦ*, through him, to reconcile all things and *διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ*, through the blood of his cross, to reduce to peace things terrestrial—

—and heavenly. Whence [1] God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is worthy of the highest praises, *ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος*, "who according to his great mercy regenerated us unto a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead"; "who [2] blessed us with every spiritual blessing in heavenly things in Christ, as he chose us in him before the constitution of the world . . .; who predestined us unto the adoption of sons through Jesus Christ unto himself, *κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ*, according to the good pleasure of his will"; who finally [3] *τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο,*

[1] Eph. II.10.

[2] The preposition *ἐπί* with the dative expresses ordination and destination; therefore *ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς* is the same as *ἐπὶ τῷ ἐργάζεσθαι ἀγαθά*, for the doing of that which is good and honorable.

[3] Rom. V.8–9.

[4] What is said here, *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, for us, although it may seem circumscribed, nevertheless in the reality itself, as the context evinces, is universal, and has the same force as *ὑπὲρ πάντων* and *ὑπὲρ κόσμου*, for all and for the world.

[5] Rom. V.9.

[6] Ibid., v. 11.

[7] Col. I.19–20.

[1] I Pet. I.3.

[2] Eph. I.3–6.

[3] Rom. VIII.32.

> *ἀλλ᾽ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν, πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν χαρίσεται;* "did not spare his own Son [4], but delivered him up for us all; how will he not also with him give all things to us?"

CCCVII.

But 4) John must be heard by name, who disclosed most splendidly of all the font of reparation and salvation. For he describes God the Father once and again [5] in these words: *ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν*, "God the Father [6] is love," and it belongs to his nature to pursue men with love and to heap benefits upon them. Then principally under this name—as the connected discourse teaches—he commends and extols *τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ*, the love of God: that God gave his only-begotten Son to us who by no means loved him, but who sinned against the divine law and by sinning had been made miserable and even worthy of death, that he might exempt us from punishments and adorn us with the means of attaining felicity. Behold—

> —some testimonies concerning this matter [1]: *ἐν τούτῳ ἐφανερώθη ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν*, "in this the charity of God appeared in us, because God sent his only-begotten Son into the world that we may live through him"; *ἐν τούτῳ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη*, "in this is charity: not as though we had loved God, but because he first loved us and sent his Son as a propitiation for our sins"; "and we have seen and testify *ὅτι ὁ πατὴρ ἀπέσταλκε τὸν υἱὸν σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου*, that the Father sent the Son as Savior of the world." The Son himself also testified this concerning himself [2], saying: "This is the will of him who sent me, the Father: that of all that he has given me, I should lose nothing from it, but should raise it up on the last day. But this is the will of my Father who sent me: that everyone who sees the Son and believes in him may have eternal life." Therefore [3], "I came as light into the world, that everyone who believes in me may not remain in darkness. And if anyone shall hear my words and shall not keep them, I do not judge him: *οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον, ἵνα κρίνω τὸν κόσμον,*

[4] The Greeks are accustomed to oppose *ἴδιον υἱόν*, own son, to *τοῖς θετοῖς*, adopted sons. Christ, therefore, is called Son by nature.

[5] I John IV.8–16.

[6] And indeed the Savior commanded us to address God with these words (Matt. VI.9): *πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*, "our Father who art in the heavens." That the force of signifying benignity inheres in this address is evident from Matt. VI.26; VII.9–11, compared with Luke XI.11–13.

[1] I John IV.9, 11, 14.

[2] John VI.39–40.

[3] John XII.46–48.

> *ἀλλ' ἵνα σώσω τὸν κόσμον*, for I did not come that I might judge the world, but that I might save the world." For I came not [4] that I might fulfill my own will, but that of the Father; but this is [5] the will of God the Father, *ὁ ἁγιασμὸς ὑμῶν*, your sanctification. Therefore, [6] "entering the world I said: Sacrifice and oblation you did not will, but you fitted a body for me. Holocausts for sin did not please you. Then I said: Behold, I come; in the head of the book it is written of me, that I may do your will, O God." This will looked to this: that [7] "we might be sanctified *διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐφάπαξ*, through the oblation of the body of Jesus Christ once."

Therefore, the supreme origin of all benefits is contained in the love and mercy [8] by which God the Father repaired and restored the whole—

> —human race, created by himself through the Son and enriched with heavenly gifts, likewise through the Son, but clothed in our flesh. And it was indeed fitting that all things at last, for each order, both natural and supernatural, integral as well as healed and raised up, should be referred back to one and the same font; it was fitting that the unity of the principle should shine no less in creation and elevation than in reparation; and it was fitting that each of us should be able to repeat [1], *ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν· καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ*, "for us there is one God the Father, from whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him."

CCCVIII.

Through him, namely, who is the one and common mediator of God and men, and who, besides discharging many other functions of mediation [2], discharged also that noblest of all which Paul [3] attributes to him, saying: *ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων*, that is, according to the Vulgate interpretation, "who

[4] John V.30; VI.38.

[5] I Thess. IV.3.

[6] Heb. X.5–9.

[7] Ibid., v. 10.

[8] Hos. II.8; Wisd. VI.8; XI.24; XII.13; Acts XVII.25; I Pet. V.7.

[1] I Cor. VIII.6.

[2] Petavius speaks accurately of the various functions of Christ the mediator in *On the Incarnation*, book XII, chapters VI ff.

[3] I Tim. II.6.

gave himself a redemption for all." Here both the notion of *ἀντίλυτρον* must be explained in a few words and the extension of the formula *ὑπὲρ πάντων* must be defined somewhat more accurately.

1. Accordingly, *τὸ ἀντίλυτρον* must altogether be rendered "a price which is paid for someone," or "a price paid for the redemption of a thing or person which is held in the power of another." For a) the simple noun *λύτρον* proves this signification, which from the usage of speech common both to the classical Greeks [4] and to the Alexandrian interpreters [5] properly denotes a price paid either for captives or for a thing which was lost. Hesychius is to the point—

   —*λύτρον· τίμημα· λύτρα· καθάρματα, λυτήρια καὶ πάντα τὰ διδόμενα εἰς ἀνάκτησιν ἀνθρώπων*, "ransom: a price; ransoms; purifications, means of release, and all things given for the recovery of men." The lexicon of Cyril has no otherwise: *λύτρα· δῶρα ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ αἰχμαλώτων γινόμενα, ἤτοι διδόμενα*, "ransoms: gifts made, that is, given, for the freedom of captives." b) The very form of the noun *ἀντίλυτρον* proves it. For although, as Grotius [1] shrewdly admonishes, "it should be most true that *λύτρον* can be taken for any expenditure whatsoever, even one by which no one is moved to liberate—which is proved by no example—nevertheless the word *ἀντίλυτρον* is more significant than to admit so frigid an interpretation. For the word *ἀντί* in composition signifies either contrariety [2] or exchange. With Paul, contrariety has no place; compensation is therefore signified. Nor by any other form in Greek [3] are they called *ἀντίψυχοι*, those supplying the place of a life, who devote themselves to death for another that they may liberate him. Thus *ἀντίλυτρον* is such a *λύτρον*, a price, in which the liberator undergoes something similar to that evil which threatened the one who is liberated; and there is an excellent, as it were, *περίφρασις*, circumlocution, of that word

[4] Thucydides, book VI, chapter V; Aelian, *Various History*, book XIII, chapter XIV; and Diogenes Laertius, book II, section CV.

[5] Exod. XXI.30; Num. XXXV.31–32; Prov. VI.35.

[1] *On the Satisfaction of Christ*, chapter VIII.

[2] As in the compounds *ἀντίπαλος*, *ἀντίδικος*, *ἀντίγραφον*.

[3] Among Greek writers those are called *ἀντίψυχοι* who devote themselves to death for another, just as Cicero relates concerning Damon and Pythias in *On Duties*, book III, chapter X. Isaac Casaubon in the notes on Suetonius's *Caligula*, chapter XIV; Johann Lomeier in *On the Lustrations of the Ancient Gentiles*, chapter XXII; John Pearson in the *Vindication of Ignatius*, part II, chapter XV; and Suicer in the *Ecclesiastical Thesaurus*, under the word *ἀντίψυχος*, will furnish more concerning this matter.

at Gal. III.13: 'Christ *ἐξηγόρασεν*, redeemed [4] us from the curse, having been made a curse for us.' " c) The wholly universal usage proves it, which Conrad Schwarz, in the *Critical and Philological Commentaries on the Greek Language of the New Testament*, established with a remarkable abundance of examples [5]. d) Symmachus proves it, who simply renders as *ἀντίλυτρον* the formula *τιμὴν τῆς λυτρώσεως* employed by the Alexandrians [6]. e) Ecclesiastical writers prove it—Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, Theophylact, and Oecumenius in their commentaries—

—in which they explain the words of the Apostle. For there is none of them who does not assent to Theophylact writing: *τί δὲ ἐστιν ἀντίλυτρον; ἔνοχος ἦν ἡ φύσις, ὥστε ἀπολέσθαι, ἀλλ' ἀντ' ἐκείνης ἑαυτὸν ἔδωκε.* "But what is the price of redemption? Nature was liable to perdition, but he gave himself for it." For he came [1] *δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*, "to give his soul as a redemption for many." f) The Latin interpretations prove it [2], both the Hieronymian and that more ancient one, which render the apostolic words: "who gave himself a redemption for all." Finally, g) the words repeatedly employed concerning the same matter in the Scriptures [3] prove it: *ἀγορασμός*, purchase; *ἐξαγορασμός*, redemption; *λύτρωσις*, redemption; *ἀπολύτρωσις*, redemption; *ἀποκαταλλαγή*, reconciliation; *ἱλαστήριον*, propitiatory; and *ἱλασμός*, expiation—which demand that *ἀντίλυτρον* be understood of a price paid for another.

CCCIX.

Moreover, concerning the scope and extension of the words *ὑπὲρ πάντων*, there is no one who can doubt without injury. Indeed, 1) they are universal of themselves, extend infinitely, and show that *ἀντίλυτρον* was expended by Christ for absolutely all men. 2) They display the same breadth whether they are compared with the proximate context or with the somewhat more remote context. For im-

[4] For illustrating these things, both these words of I Cor. VI.20 conduce, *ἠγοράσθητε γὰρ τιμῆς*, "for you have been bought at a great price," and these of I Cor. VII.23, *τιμῆς ἠγοράσθητε*, "you have been bought at a price."

[5] Under the word *ἀντίλυτρον*.

[6] Ps. XLVIII.8.

[1] Matt. XX.28.

[2] Consult Sabatier concerning these.

[3] II Pet. II.1; I Cor. I.30; VI.20; Gal. III.13; Rom. III.24; Col. I.20; I Pet. I.18; Eph. II.16; I John II.2; IV.10; Matt. XX.28; Luke I.68.

mediately precedes the universal expression *εἷς καὶ μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων*, "one also and common mediator of God and men"; but somewhat more remotely either *πάντες ἄνθρωποι*, all men, are mentioned, whom God desires to be safe and saved, or prayers are commanded which ought to be poured forth *ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων*, for all men, for this reason: that Christ gave himself *ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων*, a redemption for all. Nor is that 3) of no account which Heinrich Heinrichs [4] observed: "By so frequent a repetition of *ὑπὲρ πάντων*, it is not—"

> —far from the truth that the Apostle was attempting to overthrow the proud particularism of the Jews." He certainly 4) opposed it, since, with Theodoret [1] as interpreter, he willed this to be expressed and signified by his words: "When all had been brought under the power of death, Christ, who neither as God was liable to death—for he has an immortal nature—nor as man, for he committed no sin which brings death, *οἷόν τι λύτρον ἑαυτὸν δέδωκε, καὶ τῆς ἐκείνου δουλείας ἅπαντας ἠλευθέρωσε*, gave himself as a certain price of redemption and liberated all from its servitude." Concerning this 5) universal liberation and the price of redemption paid for all, nothing is more evident than the things which are drawn from the harmony and concord of the Scriptures. For in the first place it is drawn out that the apostolic sentence concerning Christ "who gave himself a redemption for all" corresponds to those things by which the same is called [2] *σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, μάλιστα πιστῶν*, Savior of all men, especially of the faithful; *σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου*, Savior of the world; and *ἱλασμός*, propitiation for our sins, but not for ours only, *ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου*, but also for those of the whole world. But these things joined together do not allow the procurement of salvation to be regarded as restricted by boundaries. Indeed, [3] "the saying is faithful and worthy of all acceptance, *ὅτι Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἁμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι*, that Christ Jesus came into this world to save sinners." But there is no man who is not of himself and by his nativity a sinner. Therefore Christ came that he might preserve all men. For the charity [4] of Christ urges us, judging this: *ὅτι εἰ εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον. καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν*, "because if one died for all, therefore all died. And Christ died for all." For on this account [5], *ἐφανερώθη ὁ υἱὸς*

[4] In the annotations on this passage.
[1] In the commentary on this passage.
[2] I Tim. IV.10; I John II.2; IV.14.
[3] I Tim. I.15.
[4] II Cor. V.14 ff., compared with Rom. V.18–19.
[5] I John III.8.

> *τοῦ θεοῦ ἵνα λύσῃ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ διαβόλου*, "the Son of God appeared, that he might dissolve the works of the devil." But the work—
> —of the devil [1], together with the first man, bound the whole posterity. Therefore the Son of God put on flesh and appeared conspicuous among men, that he might exempt all from the chains of sin and death cast upon them and, once they had been exempted, might reward them with the liberty of the sons of adoption.

CCCX.

How does it therefore happen that more do not enjoy so great a good? Does it happen for this reason, that the faculty of breaking the chains is denied to them? By no means; but it happens for this reason, that they spurn the faculty divinely conferred. Of himself and by his own counsel [2], Christ is *τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν*, the true light, which illuminates not this or that man, but *φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον*, "illuminates every man coming into this world"; whence [3] he is called simply *τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, the light of men, and *τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει*, the light which shines in darkness, and therefore shines upon all men who, being turned away from the sun of justice, are deservedly called darkness. Why, therefore, when light is lacking to no one, are so many nevertheless occupied in the shadow of death and in most miserable blindness? Because [4] *ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν*, the darkness did not comprehend it. Blinded men could have comprehended the salutary light; they could have received the sight they had lost; but [5], ungrateful and enemies to themselves, they repelled "the light which came into the world, *καὶ ἠγάπησαν μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς*, and loved darkness more than light." In these things is contained the reason why men are blind and, destitute of knowledge of the truth, perish eternally. They are blind and perish eternally, not because they are deprived of the means of seeing and obtaining salvation, but because, contrary to the counsel of God and the benefits of the mediator, they prefer flesh to spirit and error to truth.

> Concerning this matter John must be heard, who first [6] writes concerning—
> —the Word: *ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν, καὶ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο*, "he was in the world, and the world was made through him"; namely, the Word was not absent from the world which he founded, nor was

[1] Rom. V.12 ff.
[2] John I.9.
[3] John I.4–5.
[4] Ibid., v. 5.
[5] John III.19.
[6] John I.10.

he absent from the men whom he created, and it ought therefore to have been expected that men would know him and would reverence him piously and holily as their own author and that of the world—especially since they could not excuse themselves by ignorance. The Precursor [1], sent by God, had come *εἰς μαρτυρίαν, ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός, ἵνα πάντες πιστεύσωσι δι' αὐτοῦ*, "for a testimony, that he might bear testimony concerning the light, that all might believe through him." But what then happened? Behold the things which John [2] adds: *καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγνω. εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθε, καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον*, "and [3] the world did not know him. He came unto his own, and his own did not receive him." It is almost as if he said: God left nothing undone that men, suffused with the light of truth, might know Christ and, once he had been known, embrace him by faith; but very many failed themselves and repudiated the grace offered to all. "But as many as [4] received him, *ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*, he gave them the power [5] to become sons of God, to those who believe in his name." Therefore, the benefit of the grace of adoption and of the paternal inheritance extends as far as the very faculty of believing extends itself. But this is at hand for all and is utterly withdrawn from no one. For just as [6] "he who believes in Christ *οὐ κρίνεται*, is not judged; but he who does not believe, *ἤδη κέκριται, ὅτι μὴ πεπίστευκεν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ*, is already judged because he does not believe in the name of the only-begotten Son of God," so *οὐκ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ*, "God did not send his Son into the world that he might judge the world, but—"

—that the world might be saved through him." Therefore Christ imparts to all the faculty of believing, and the judgment [1] by which unbelievers will be condemned comes back to this: *ὅτι τὸ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον*, that the light came into the world and shone upon

[1] Ibid., vv. 6–7.

[2] Ibid., vv. 10–11.

[3] The copulative particle *and* here is equivalent in signifying force to the adversative *but*.

[4] John I.12.

[5] Nonnus in the paraphrase renders *ἐξουσίαν* by *τιμήν*, prerogative, dignity; in which sense *ἐξουσία* is read in I Macc. I.13; XI.58.

[6] John III.17–18.

[1] Ibid., v. 19.

all; *καὶ ἠγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς*, but men preferred darkness to light.

For as regards Christ, he most truly [2] affirms concerning himself: "I came as light into the world, that everyone who believes in me may not remain in darkness. And if anyone shall hear my words and shall not keep them, I do not judge him: *οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον, ἵνα κρίνω τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σώσω τὸν κόσμον*, for I did not come that I might judge the world, but that I might save the world." This he repeats elsewhere [3] in a somewhat inflected manner of speaking, saying: *ἦλθε γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός*, "for the Son of man came to save that which had perished." And [4] again: *ἦλθε γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός*, "for the Son of man came to seek and save that which had perished." To these words these [5] correspond excellently: *ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθε ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων ἀπολέσαι, ἀλλὰ σῶσαι*, "for the Son of man did not come to destroy souls, but to save them."

Since these things are so, I do not think that an end can be imposed upon the entire treatment more fittingly than by those words with which Saint Bruno, father of the Carthusians, meets this question: "Why does the Apostle command prayer to be made for all, when certain men have been reprobated by God, and he who prays for them seems to offend God who reprobates them?" [6], saying: "Against these things it is said that God indeed, from his benignity and clemency, wills every man to be saved, because, insofar as it lies in him, the obstacle does not remain in God; but the injustice of the impious turns aside the benignity of God. Whence a twofold will is considered in God: one of benignity and clemency, by which he wills all to be saved; the other is the—"

—will of justice, which reprobates the evil and elects the good. But according to the will of God's benignity, the Apostle commands prayer to be made for all. God truly wills all to be saved, which is evident from this: that there is one God, that is, creator of all. And since God is the creator of all, there is no cause why he should deny his benignity to one creature and give it to another—a benignity which the impious man indeed denies to himself because he acts impiously, while the benignity of God endures safe and integral toward all. Hence it is also manifest that God wills all to be saved, because there is one mediator of God and men, and not several mediators. Whence it is established that he wills equally to profit all, for he was made the mediator of all."

[2] John XII.46–47.
[3] Matt. XVIII.11.
[4] Luke XIX.10.
[5] Ibid., IX.56.
[6] In the commentary on I Tim. II.1 ff.

THE END.

LET IT BE PRINTED

Fr. D. Buttaoni, S. P. A. Mag.

LET IT BE PRINTED

P. A. Ligi, Vicesg.