

PREFACE OF RUFINUS

1. I know that many of the brethren, impelled by their earnest desire to understand the scriptures, have made requests to a number of scholars well versed in Greek literature to put Origen into Roman dress and present him to Latin ears. And when, in furtherance of this object, our brother and colleague, at the entreaty of bishop Damasus, translated two of the Homilies on the Song of Songs from Greek into Latin, he composed so fine and noble a preface to that work, as to inspire everyone with a deep longing to read Origen and study him seriously. For he said that the text, 'The king hath brought me into his chamber', might well be applied to the soul of Origen; and added that while in the rest of his works Origen had surpassed all other writers, in the Song of Songs he had even surpassed himself. He promises, indeed, in that very preface, that he himself will give us not only these books on the Song of Songs but also many other works of Origen in a translation for Roman ears. I can see, however, that he derives most pleasure from the works of his own pen. He pursues a task that promises greater fame, that of being a 'father of the word'¹ and not a mere translator. For this reason I take up the work which was begun and approved by him. Nevertheless I cannot adorn the writings of this great man with a degree of eloquence comparable to his. Consequently I fear it may happen through my fault that the man whom he has deservedly praised as being the next teacher of wisdom and knowledge in the Church after the apostles may, owing to my poor style, appear far inferior to what he really is.

2. It was this oft-recurring thought which kept me silent and prevented me from yielding to the continual entreaties of the brethren to attempt this work. But so powerful is your influence, most faithful brother Macarius, that not even my want of skill could any longer provide grounds for resistance. Accordingly, not to suffer you to make too heavy a claim upon me, I gave way, even against my previous determination; but on the condition and understanding that in my translation I would follow as far as possible the rule observed by my predecessors and especially

by the distinguished man whom I mentioned above. For he, when translating into Latin more than seventy treatises of Origen, called Homilies, and also a number of his commentaries on St. Paul's epistles, both of which are known to contain in the original a good many statements likely to cause offence, so smoothed over and emended these in his translation, that a Latin reader would find in them nothing out of harmony with our faith. His example, therefore, I am following to the best of my ability; if not with an equal degree of eloquence, yet at least observing the same rules, and taking care not to reproduce such passages from the books of Origen as are found to be inconsistent with and contrary to his true teaching.

3. The cause of these variations I have explained to you more fully in the *Apologeticus*, a work written by Pamphilus in defence of Origen's books, to which I added a very brief tract, showing, as I think, by clear proofs that these have been corrupted in many places by heretics and evilly disposed persons.¹ This is especially the case with the books which you are now pressing me to translate, namely those entitled *Peri Archon*, which may be rendered either *Concerning First Principles* or *Concerning Principalities*. These books are indeed most obscure and difficult for other reasons. For in them Origen discusses questions on which philosophers, after spending their whole lives in the task, have succeeded in discovering nothing. But our author made it his aim, so far as he possibly could, to turn into a religious direction man's belief in a Creator and his reasonings about the created world, which philosophers have used to advocate irreligion. Wherever, therefore, I have found in his books anything contrary to the reverent statements made by him about the Trinity in other places, I have either omitted it as a corrupt and interpolated passage, or reproduced it in a form that agrees with the doctrine which I have often found him affirming elsewhere. If, however, speaking as he does to men of knowledge and discernment, he has occasionally expressed himself obscurely in the effort to be brief, I have, to make the passage clearer, added such remarks on the same subject as I have read in a fuller form in his other books, bearing in mind the need of explanation. But I have said nothing of my own, simply giving back to him his own statements found in other places.

¹ See Plato *Symposium* 177 D.

¹ See Introduction, pp. xii ff.

4. I have written thus in my preface by way of precaution, to prevent slanderers from supposing that they have once again discovered some matter for accusation against me. For you have seen what perverse and contentious men will do. The fact is, I have undertaken this heavy labour, God and your prayers helping me, not to shut the mouths of slanderers (for this is impossible, unless indeed God should do it), but to provide material for those who desire to advance towards the knowledge of things. One request, however, I solemnly make of every one who shall either transcribe or read these books, in the sight of God the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, by his faith in the kingdom to come, by the mystery of the resurrection from the dead, by the 'everlasting fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels',¹ that, as he would not possess for an eternal inheritance that place where there is 'weeping and gnashing of teeth',² and where 'their fire is not quenched and their worm dieth not',³ he shall neither add anything to this writing, nor take anything away, nor interpolate anything, nor change anything, but shall compare his copy with the originals from which it was made, and shall emend it and make it distinct to the very letter, and shall not allow a manuscript to remain incorrect or indistinct, lest the difficulty of ascertaining the meaning, if the manuscript is not distinct, should increase the obscurities of the work for those that read it.

¹ St. Matt. XXV. 41.

² St. Matt. VIII. 12; St. Luke XIII. 28.

³ Is. LXVI. 24; St. Mark IX. 48.

BOOK I

PREFACE

GREEK

1. All¹ who believe and are convinced that grace and truth came by Jesus Christ² and that Christ is the truth (in accordance with his own saying, 'I am the truth')³

LATIN

1. All who believe and are convinced that grace and truth came by Jesus Christ,² and who know Christ to be the truth (in accordance with his own saying, 'I am the truth')³,

LATIN

derive the knowledge which calls men to lead a good and blessed life from no other source but the very words and teaching of Christ. By the words of Christ we do not mean only those which formed his teaching when he was made man and dwelt in the flesh, since even before that Christ the Word of God was in Moses and the prophets. For without the Word of God how could they have prophesied about Christ? In proof of which we should not find it difficult to show from the divine scriptures how that Moses or the prophets were filled with the spirit of Christ in all their words and deeds, were we not anxious to confine the present work within the briefest possible limits. I count it sufficient, therefore, to quote this one testimony of Paul, taken from the epistle which he writes to the Hebrews, where he speaks as follows: 'By faith Moses, when he was grown up, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season, accounting the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt.'⁴ And as for the fact that Christ spoke in his apostles after his ascension into heaven, this is shown by Paul in the following passage: 'Or do ye seek a proof of him that speaketh in me, that is, Christ?'⁵

2. Many of those, however, who profess to believe in Christ, hold conflicting opinions not only on small and trivial questions but also on some that are great and important; on the nature, for instance, of God or of the Lord Jesus Christ or of the Holy Spirit, and in addition on the natures of those created beings, the dominions and the holy powers. In view of this it seems

¹ Frag. 1, Koetschau, from Eusebius, *Con. Marcellum* i. 4.

² St. John I. 17.

³ St. John XIV. 6.

⁴ Hebr. XI. 24 ff.

⁵ 2 Cor. XIII. 3.

necessary first to lay down a definite line and unmistakable rule in regard to each of these, and to postpone the inquiry into other matters until afterwards. For just as there are many among Greeks and barbarians alike who promise us the truth, and yet we gave up seeking for it from all who claimed it for false opinions after we had come to believe that Christ was the Son of God and had become convinced that we must learn the truth from him; in the same way when we find many who think they hold the doctrine of Christ, some of them differing in their beliefs from the Christians of earlier times, and yet the teaching of the church, handed down in unbroken succession from the apostles, is still preserved and continues to exist in the churches up to the present day, we maintain that that only is to be believed as the truth which in no way conflicts with the tradition of the church and the apostles.

3. But the following fact should be understood. The holy apostles, when preaching the faith of Christ, took certain doctrines, those namely which they believed to be necessary ones, and delivered them in the plainest terms to all believers, even to such as appeared to be somewhat dull in the investigation of divine knowledge. The grounds of their statements they left to be investigated by such as should merit the higher gifts of the Spirit and in particular by such as should afterwards receive through the Holy Spirit himself the graces of language, wisdom and knowledge. There were other doctrines, however, about which the apostles simply said that things were so, keeping silence as to the how or why; their intention undoubtedly being to supply the more diligent of those who came after them, such as should prove to be lovers of wisdom, with an exercise on which to display the fruit of their ability. The men I refer to are those who train themselves to become worthy and capable of receiving wisdom.

4. The kind of doctrines which are believed in plain terms through the apostolic teaching are the following:—

First, that God is one, who created and set in order all things, and who, when nothing existed, caused the universe to be.¹ He is God from the first creation and foundation of the world, the God of all righteous men, of Adam, Abel, Seth, Enos, Enoch, Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, of the twelve patriarchs, of Moses and the prophets. This God, in these last days,² according to the previous announcements made through his prophets, sent the Lord Jesus Christ, first for the purpose of calling Israel, and secondly, after the unbelief of the people of Israel, of calling the Gentiles also. This just and good God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, himself gave the law, the prophets and the gospels, and he is God both of the apostles and also of the Old and New Testaments.

¹ See *Hermas*, *Mand.* I. 1.

² See *Heb.* I. 1.

Then again: Christ Jesus, he who came to earth, was begotten of the Father before every created thing.¹ And after he had ministered to the Father in the foundation of all things, for 'all things were made through him',² in these last times he emptied himself and was made man, was made flesh, although he was God;³ and being made man, he still remained what he was, namely, God. He took to himself a body like our body, differing in this alone, that it was born of a virgin and of the Holy Spirit. And this Jesus Christ was born and suffered in truth and not merely in appearance, and truly died our common death. Moreover he truly rose from the dead, and after the resurrection accompanied with his disciples and was then taken up into heaven.

Then again, the apostles delivered this doctrine, that the Holy Spirit is united in honour and dignity with the Father and the Son. In regard to him it is not yet clearly known whether he is to be thought of as begotten or unbegotten,⁴ or as being himself also a Son of God or not; but these are matters which we must investigate to the best of our power from holy scripture, inquiring with wisdom and diligence. It is, however, certainly taught with the utmost clearness in the Church, that

¹ Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 2, says that in the beginning of the first book of the *De Principiis* Origen declared that 'Christ was not begotten the Son of God, but made such'. (Latin *factum*=Gr. *γενητόν*). Rufinus has modified this statement. It is probable, however, that *γενητόν* and *γεννητόν* were not very clearly distinguished in Origen's time. Origen certainly taught that the Son and Holy Spirit were created, but he thought that the alternative to this was to assert that they were unbegotten, which was true of the Father alone. See the quotation from this same letter below, and *Int.* p. xxxii.

² St. John I. 3.

³ See *Heb.* I. 1; *Phil.* II. 7; *St. John* I. 14.

⁴ Jerome (*Ep. ad Avitum* 2) says: 'As third in dignity and honour after the Father and the Son he (i.e. Origen) adds the Holy Spirit, of whom, though he professes to be ignorant whether he was created or uncreated, yet later on he has expressed his real opinion, when he insists that nothing is uncreated except God the Father alone.' Rufinus has modified Origen's 'created or uncreated' (*γενητός ἢ ἀγέννητος*) to 'begotten or unbegotten' (Lat. *natus aut innatus*=Gr. *γεννητός ἢ ἀγεννητός*). Origen explains his doctrine in his *Comm. in Ioh.* II. x. 'But we must inquire whether, if it be true that "all things were created through him", the Holy Spirit also was created through him. Now I think we are forced to admit to the man who says that he was created, and who quotes the text, "All things were created through him," that the Holy Spirit was created through the Word, since the Word is older than he. But the man who is unwilling to say that the Holy Spirit is created through Christ must assert that he is unbegotten. . . . We, however, believe that there are three hypostases, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and being of opinion that no one is unbegotten except the Father, maintain the pious and true belief to be that while all things were created through the Word the Holy Spirit is of more honour than all others and first in rank of all who have been created by the Father through Christ.'

this Spirit inspired each one of the saints, both the prophets and the apostles, and that there was not one Spirit in the men of old and another in those who were inspired at the coming of Christ.

5. Next after this the apostles taught that the soul, having a substance and life of its own, will be rewarded according to its deserts after its departure from this world; for it will either obtain an inheritance of eternal life and blessedness, if its deeds shall warrant this, or it must be given over to eternal fire and torments, if the guilt of its crimes shall so determine. Further, there will be a time for the resurrection of the dead, when this body, which is now 'sown in corruption', shall 'rise in incorruption', and that which is 'sown in dishonour' shall 'rise in glory'.¹

This also is laid down in the Church's teaching, that every rational soul is possessed of free will and choice; and also, that it is engaged in a struggle against the devil and his angels and the opposing powers; for these strive to weigh the soul down with sins, whereas we, if we lead a wise and upright life, endeavour to free ourselves from such a burden. There follows from this the conviction that we are not subject to necessity, so as to be compelled by every means, even against our will, to do either good or evil. For if we are possessed of free will, some spiritual powers may very likely be able to urge us on to sin and others to assist us to salvation; we are not, however, compelled by necessity to act either rightly or wrongly, as is thought to be the case by those who say that human events are due to the course and motion of the stars, not only those events which fall outside the sphere of our freedom of will but even those that lie within our own power.

In regard to the soul, whether it takes its rise from the transference of the seed, in such a way that the principle or substance of the soul may be regarded as inherent in the seminal particles of the body itself; or whether it has some other beginning, and whether this beginning is begotten or unbegotten, or at any rate whether it is imparted to the body from without or no; all this is not very clearly defined in the teaching.

6. Further, in regard to the devil and his angels and the opposing spiritual powers, the Church teaching lays it down that these beings exist, but what they are or how they exist it has not explained very clearly. Among most Christians, however, the following opinion is held, that this devil was formerly an angel, but became an apostate and persuaded as many angels as he could to fall away with him; and these are even now called his angels.

7. The Church teaching also includes the doctrine that this world was made and began to exist at a definite time and that

¹ 1 Cor. XV. 42 f.

by reason of its corruptible nature it must suffer dissolution. But what existed before this world, or what will exist after it, has not yet been made known openly to the many, for no clear statement on the point is set forth in the Church teaching.

8. Then there is the doctrine that the scriptures were composed through the Spirit of God and that they have not only that meaning which is obvious, but also another which is hidden from the majority of readers. For the contents of scripture are the outward forms of certain mysteries and the images of divine things. On this point the entire Church is unanimous, that while the whole law is spiritual, the inspired meaning is not recognised by all, but only by those who are gifted with the grace of the Holy Spirit in the word of wisdom and knowledge.

GREEK

The term¹ 'incorporeal' is unknown not only to the majority of Christians but also to the Scriptures.

LATIN

The term *asomaton*, that is, incorporeal, is unused and unknown, not only in many other writings but also in our

LATIN

scriptures. If, however, any one is inclined to produce it for us out of that little book called *The Teaching of Peter*, where the Saviour is represented as saying to his disciples, 'I am not an incorporeal daemon',² I must answer in the first place that the book itself is not included among the books of the Church and I can show that it is not a writing of Peter nor of any one else who was inspired by the Spirit of God. But even supposing this point is waived, the sense conveyed by the word 'incorporeal' in that passage is not the same as is expressed by Greek and non-Christian writers when they record a discussion by philosophers on incorporeal nature. For in the book in question the Saviour used the words 'incorporeal daemon' in order to denote that the fashion and outline, whatever it may be, of the daemonic body is not like this dense and visible body of ours. And the words must be understood in the sense intended by the author of that writing, namely, that the Saviour did not have such a body as the daemons have. Now this body is by nature a fine substance and thin like air, and on this account most people think and speak of it as incorporeal; but the Saviour had a body which was solid and capable of being handled. It is customary for

¹ Frag. 2 Koetschau, from Antipater of Bostra in John of Damascus, *Sacra Parallela* ii. 770 (Migne P. G. 96, p. 501).

² The extant fragments of '*The Teaching of Peter*' are collected in Von Dobschütz, *Das Kerygma Petri (Texte und Unters.* xi. 1), and in Hilgenfeld, *N. T. extra canonem* iv. 51 ff. The above fragment is found in Greek, *ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον*, in Ignatius, *ad Smyrnaeos* 3, where, however, its source is not mentioned.

everything which is not like this to be termed incorporeal by the more simple and uneducated of men, just as the air we breathe may be called incorporeal because it is not a body that can be grasped or held or that can resist pressure.

9. Nevertheless we shall inquire whether the actual thing which Greek philosophers call *asomaton* or incorporeal is found in the holy scriptures under another name. We must also seek to discover how God himself is to be conceived, whether as corporeal and fashioned in some shape, or as being of a different nature from bodies, a point which is not clearly set forth in the teaching. The same inquiry must be made in regard to Christ and the Holy Spirit, and indeed in regard to every soul and every rational nature also.

GREEK

10. It¹ has also been handed down to us in the teaching that there exist certain angels and good powers, who minister to the salvation of men; but when they were created, and what are their characteristics, no one has in any way made plain.

LATIN

10. This also is contained in the church teaching, that there exist certain angels of God and good powers, who minister to him in bringing about the salvation of men; but when they were created, and what they are like, or how they exist, is not very clearly defined. And as for

LATIN

the sun, moon and stars, the tradition does not clearly say whether they are living beings or without life.

Everyone therefore who is desirous of constructing out of the foregoing a connected body of doctrine must use points like these as elementary and foundation principles, in accordance with the commandment which says, 'Enlighten yourselves with the light of knowledge'.² Thus by clear and cogent arguments he will discover the truth about each particular point and so will produce, as we have said, a single body of doctrine, with the aid of such illustrations and declarations as he shall find in the holy scriptures and of such conclusions as he shall ascertain to follow logically from them when rightly understood.

¹ Frag. 3 Koetschau, from Antipater of Bostra in John of Damascus, *Sacra Parallela* ii. 770 (Migne P. G. 96, p. 501).

² Hosea X. 12 (Sept.)

CHAPTER I

GREEK

THE FATHER¹

LATIN

GOD

LATIN

1. I am aware that there are some who will try to maintain that even according to our scriptures God is a body, since they find it written in the books of Moses, 'Our God is a consuming fire',² and in the Gospel according to John, 'God is spirit, and they who worship him must worship in spirit and in truth'.³ Now these men will have it that fire and spirit are body and nothing else. But I would ask them what they have to say about this passage of scripture, 'God is light', as John says in his epistle, 'God is light, and in him is no darkness'.⁴ He is that light, surely, which lightens the whole understanding of those who are capable of receiving truth, as it is written in the thirty-fifth psalm, 'In thy light shall we see light'.⁵ For what other light of God can we speak of, in which a man sees light, except God's spiritual power, which when it lightens a man causes him either to see clearly the truth of all things or to know God himself who is called the truth? Such then is the meaning of the saying, 'In thy light shall we see light'; that is, in thy word and thy wisdom, which is thy Son, in him shall we see thee, the Father. For can we possibly think that, because it is termed light, it is like the light of our sun? And how can there be the slightest reason for supposing that from that material light the grounds of knowledge could be derived and the meaning of truth discovered?

2. If then they accept this argument of ours, proved by reason itself, about the nature of light, and will admit that the use of the word light cannot possibly mean that God is to be thought of as being a body, they will allow a similar reasoning in regard to the phrase 'a consuming fire'. For what does God 'consume' by virtue of this fact of being a 'fire'? Are we to suppose that he consumes bodily matter, 'wood or hay or stubble'?⁶ What is there in this statement consistent with the praises due to God, if he is a fire that consumes material substances like these? Let us rather consider that God does indeed consume and destroy, but that what he consumes are evil thoughts of the mind, shameful deeds and longings after sin, when these implant themselves in the minds of believers; and that he takes those souls which

¹ For the Greek title see Photius *Bibl. Cod.* viii. p. 4.

² Deut. IV. 24.

³ St. John IV. 24.

⁴ 1 John I. 5.

⁵ Ps. XXXV. 10 (Sept.)

⁶ See 1 Cor. III. 12.

render themselves capable of receiving his word and wisdom and dwells in them according to the saying, 'I and the Father will come and make our abode with him',¹ having first consumed all their vices and passions and made them into a temple pure and worthy of himself.

To those, however, who think that God is a body in consequence of the saying, 'God is spirit',² we must reply as follows. It is a custom of holy scripture, when it wishes to point to something of an opposite nature to this dense and solid body, to call it spirit, as in the saying, 'The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life'.³ Here undoubtedly the letter means that which is bodily, and the spirit that which is intellectual, or as we also call it, spiritual. The apostle also says, 'Even until this day, whenever Moses is read, a veil lieth upon their hearts; but when a man shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty'.⁴ For so long as a man does not attend to the spiritual meaning 'a veil lies upon his heart', in consequence of which veil, in other words his duller understanding, the scripture itself is said or thought to be veiled; and this is the explanation of the veil which is said to have covered the face of Moses when he was speaking to the people,⁵ that is, when the law is read in public. But if we turn to the Lord, where also the Word of God is, and where the Holy Spirit reveals spiritual knowledge, the veil will be taken away, and we shall then with unveiled face behold in the holy scriptures the glory of the Lord.

3. Further, although many saints partake of the Holy Spirit, he is not on that account to be regarded as a kind of body, which is divided into material parts and distributed to each of the saints; but rather as a sanctifying power, a share of which is said to be possessed by all who have shown themselves worthy of being sanctified through his grace. And to make this statement more easily understood let us take an illustration from things admittedly of lesser importance. There are many who share in the teaching and art of medicine; yet are we to suppose that all who share in medicine have some material substance called medicine placed before them from which they take away little particles and so obtain a share of it? Must we not rather understand that all who with ready and prepared minds gain a comprehension of the art and its teaching may be said to share in medicine? These illustrations from medicine must not be supposed to apply in every detail when compared with the Holy Spirit; they establish this point only, that a thing in which many have a share is not necessarily to be regarded as a body. The Holy Spirit is far

¹ See St. John XIV. 23. Origen quotes the passage in this form in two other places, *Con. Celsum* viii. 18 and *Hom. in Jerem.* viii. 1.

² St. John IV. 24.

³ 2 Cor. III. 6.

⁴ 2 Cor. III. 15-17.

⁵ See Exod. XXXIV. 33, 35.

different from the system or science of medicine, for the Holy Spirit is an intellectual existence, with a subsistence and being of its own, whereas medicine is nothing of the sort.

4. We must now turn to the Gospel passage itself, where it is written that 'God is spirit',¹ and must show that this is to be understood in a sense agreeing with what we have just said. Let us ask when our Saviour spoke these words, and to whom, and in what connexion. We find undoubtedly that he uttered them when speaking to the woman of Samaria, who thought that men ought to worship God in Mount Gerizim according to the belief of the Samaritans. 'God,' he told her, 'is spirit'. The woman of Samaria, supposing him to be an ordinary Jew, was asking him whether men ought to worship God 'in Jerusalem' or 'in this mountain'. These were her words: 'All our fathers worshipped in this mountain, but ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship'.² It was this belief of the woman, who thought that God would be worshipped rightly or wrongly by Jews in Jerusalem or by Samaritans in Mount Gerizim because of some special privilege attaching to the material places, that the Saviour contradicts by saying that the man who desires to seek for God must abandon all idea of material places. These are his words: 'The hour cometh, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father neither in Jerusalem nor in this mountain. God is spirit, and they that worship him must worship in spirit and in truth'.³ See, too, how appropriately he associated truth with spirit, calling God spirit to distinguish him from bodies, and truth to distinguish him from a shadow or an image. For those who worshipped in Jerusalem, 'serving a shadow and image of heavenly things',⁴ worshipped neither in truth nor in spirit, and the same is true of those who worshipped in Mount Gerizim.

5. Having then refuted, to the best of our ability, every interpretation which suggests that we should attribute to God any material characteristics, we assert that in truth he is incomprehensible and immeasurable. For whatever may be the knowledge which we have been able to obtain about God, whether by perception or by reflection, we must of necessity believe that he is far and away better than our thoughts about him. For if we see a man who can scarcely look at a glimmer or the light of the smallest lamp, and if we wish to teach such a one, whose eyesight is not strong enough to receive more light than we have said, about the brightness and splendour of the sun, shall we not have to tell him that the splendour of the sun is unspeakably and immeasurably better and more glorious than all this light he can see? In the same way our mind is shut up within bars

¹ St. John IV. 24.

² St. John IV. 20.

³ St. John IV. 21, 23, 24.

⁴ Heb. VIII. 5.

of flesh and blood and rendered duller and feebler by reason of its association with such material substances; and although it is regarded as far more excellent when compared with the natural body, yet when it strains after incorporeal things and seeks to gain a sight of them it has scarcely the power of a glimmer of light or a tiny lamp. And among all intellectual, that is, incorporeal things, what is there so universally surpassing, so unspeakably and immeasurably excelling, as God, whose nature certainly the vision of the human mind, however pure or clear to the very utmost that mind may be, cannot gaze at or behold?

6. But it will not appear out of place if to make the matter clearer still we use yet another illustration. Sometimes our eyes cannot look upon the light itself, that is, the actual sun, but when we see the brightness and rays of the sun as they pour into our windows, it may be, or into any small openings for light, we are able to infer from these how great is the source and fountain of physical light. So, too, the works of divine providence and the plan of this universe are as it were rays of God's nature in contrast to his real substance and being, and because our mind is of itself unable to behold God as he is, it understands the parent of the universe from the beauty of his works and the comeliness of his creatures.

God therefore must not be thought to be any kind of body, nor to exist in a body, but to be a simple intellectual existence, admitting in himself of no addition whatever, so that he cannot be believed to have in himself a more or a less, but is Unity, or if I may so say, Oneness¹ throughout, and the mind and fount from which originates all intellectual existence or mind. Now mind does not need physical space in which to move and operate, nor does it need a magnitude discernible by the senses, nor bodily shape or colour, nor anything else whatever like these, which are suitable to bodies and matter. Accordingly that simple and wholly mental existence can admit no delay or hesitation in any of its movements or operations; for if it did so, the simplicity of its divine nature would appear to be in some degree limited and impeded by such an addition, and that which is the first principle of all things would be found to be com-

¹ Rufinus has kept the Greek philosophical terms *Monas* (=Unit, Unity) and *Henas* (=Oneness) probably from the difficulty of finding Latin equivalents. Some of the later Pythagoreans seem to have distinguished, as Origen does here, between the Monad, the primal Unity which gives rise to multiplicity, and the bare One, a kind of Absolute which they tried to conceive as unrelated to anything. See Zeller, *Pre-Socratic Philosophy*, trans. S. F. Alleyne, Vol. I, p. 390 ff. Clement of Alexandria, Origen's predecessor and teacher, describes the Monad thus: 'Abstract from body its physical qualities, taking away the dimension of depth, then that of breadth and then that of length. The point which remains is as it were a unit having position. Take away its position, and you get the conception of unity.' *Stromata* V. 71, 2 f. (Stählin ii. 374 7 ff.).

posite and diverse, and would be many and not one; since only the species of deity, if I may so call it, has the privilege of existing apart from all material intermixture.

That mind needs no space in which to move according to its own nature is certain even from the evidence of our own mind. For if this abides in its own proper sphere and nothing occurs from any cause to enfeeble it, it will never be at all retarded by reason of differences of place from acting in conformity with its own movements; nor on the other hand will it gain any increase or accession of speed from the peculiar nature of any place. And if it be objected, for example, that when men are travelling by sea and tossed by the waves, their mind is somewhat less vigorous than it is wont to be on land, we must believe this experience to be due not to the difference of place but to the movement and disturbance of the body with which the mind is joined or intermingled. For it seems almost against nature for the human body to live on the sea, and on this account the body, as if unequal to its task, appears to sustain the mind's movements in irregular and disordered manner, giving feebler assistance to its keen flashes, precisely as happens even with men on land when they are in the grip of a fever; in whose case it is certain that, if the mind fulfils its functions less effectively through the strength of the fever, the cause is to be found not in any defect of locality but in the disease of the body, which renders it disturbed and confused and altogether unable to bestow its customary services on the mind under the well-known and natural conditions. For we men are animals, formed by a union of body and soul, and thus alone did it become possible for us to live on the earth. But God, who is the beginning of all things, must not be regarded as a composite being, lest perchance we find that the elements, out of which everything that is called composite has been composed, are prior to the first principle himself.

Nor does the mind need physical magnitude in order to perform any act or movement, as an eye does when in looking at large bodies it expands and at small ones narrows and contracts for the purpose of seeing. Mind certainly needs intellectual magnitude, because it grows in an intellectual and not in a physical sense. For mind does not increase by physical additions at the same time as the body does until the twentieth or thirtieth year of its age, but by the employment of instructions and exercises a sharpening of the natural faculties is effected and the powers implanted within are roused to intelligence. Thus the capacity of the intellect is enlarged not by being increased with physical additions, but by being cultivated through exercises in learning. These it cannot receive immediately from birth or boyhood because the structure of the bodily parts which the mind uses as instruments for its own exercise is as yet weak and feeble, being neither able to endure the force of the mind's

working nor sufficiently developed to display a capacity for receiving instruction.

7. But if there are any who consider the mind itself and the soul to be a body, I should like them to tell me how it can take in reasons and arguments relating to questions of great importance, full of difficulty and subtlety. Whence comes it that the power of memory, the contemplation of invisible things, yes, and the perception of incorporeal things reside in a body? How does a bodily nature investigate the teachings of the arts and the meanings and reasons of things? And divine doctrines, which are obviously incorporeal, how can it discern and understand them? One might perhaps think that, just as the bodily form and shape of the ears or eyes contributes something to hearing or to seeing, and as the various parts of our body, which have been formed by God, each possess some special capacity, due to their particular form, for doing the work for which they were by nature designed, so too, the soul or mind must be supposed to have an outward shape fitly and suitably formed, as it were, for the purpose of perceiving and understanding individual things and of being set in motion by vital movements. But what sort of appearance the mind could have, seeing that it is a mind and moves in an intellectual way, I do not know who could describe or tell us.

In further confirmation and explanation of what we have said about the mind or soul, as being superior to all bodily nature, the following remarks may be added. Each of the bodily senses is appropriately connected with a material substance towards which the particular sense is directed. For instance, sight is connected with colour, shape and size; hearing with the voice and sound; smelling with vapours pleasant and unpleasant; taste with flavours; touch with things hot or cold, hard or soft, rough or smooth. But it is clear to all that the sense of mind is far superior to the senses above mentioned. Does it not then appear absurd that these inferior senses should have substances connected with them, as objects towards which their activities are directed, whereas this faculty, the sense of mind, which is superior to them, should have no substance whatever connected with it, and that this faculty of an intellectual nature should be a mere accident arising out of bodies?¹ Those who assert this are undoubtedly speaking in disparaging terms of that substance which is the better part of their own nature; nay more, they

¹ Origen is hampered by an imperfect psychology, but his meaning is clear. The senses, which are regarded as bodily or material things, have their appropriate subject matter. Mind, which Origen contends is purely spiritual, must also have its appropriate 'substance' to act on. Substance (Lat. *substantia*; Gr. *πὸς τὰς οὐσίας*) is here to be understood in a spiritual sense; the mind's business is with God, truth and the reasons of things. Origen contradicts the view that mind is an *epiphenomenon*, or by-product of matter.

do wrong even to God himself in supposing that he can be understood through a bodily nature, since according to them that which can be understood or perceived through a body is itself a body; and they are unwilling to have it understood that there is a certain affinity between the mind and God, of whom the mind is an intellectual image, and that by reason of this fact the mind, especially if it is purified and separated from bodily matter, is able to have some perception of the divine nature.

8. But these assertions may perhaps seem to be less authoritative to those who desire to be instructed in divine things from the holy scriptures and who seek to have it proved to them from that source how God's nature surpasses the nature of bodies. See then, whether the apostle, too, does not say the same thing when he speaks as follows about Christ: 'Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation'.¹ It is not, as some suppose, that God's nature is visible to one and invisible to others; for the apostle did not say 'the image of God who is invisible' to men or 'invisible' to sinners, but he makes an absolutely unvarying declaration about God's very nature in these words, 'image of the invisible God'. And John, too, when he says in the gospel, 'No one hath seen God at any time',² plainly declares to all who are capable of understanding, that there is no existence to which God is visible; not as if he were one who is visible by nature and yet eludes and escapes the gaze of his creatures because of their frailty, but that he is in his nature impossible to be seen.

And if you should ask me what is my belief about the Only-begotten himself, whether I would say that God's nature, which is naturally invisible, is not even visible to him, do not immediately think this question to be impious or absurd, because we shall give it a logical answer. (For as it is incongruous to say that the Son can see the Father, so it is unbecomingly to believe that the Holy Spirit can see the Son).³ It is one thing to see, another to know. To see and to be seen is a property of bodies; to know and to be known is an attribute of intellectual existence. Whatever therefore is proper to bodies must not be believed either of the Father or of the Son, the relations between whom are such as pertain to the nature of deity. And finally, Christ in the gospel did not say, 'No one seeth the Father except the

¹ Col. I. 15.

² St. John I. 18.

³ Koetschau inserts here this sentence taken from Jerome, *Con. Ioh. Hieros. c. 7*. Origen was frequently attacked for the opinion here expressed, which Rufinus has softened down considerably. Epiphanius (*Haer.* 64, 4) adds that Origen also asserted that 'angels could not see the Spirit, nor could men see angels'. See also Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 489 B) and Jerome *Ep. ad Avitum* 2. Arius used Origen's language, cp. Athanasius, *Con. Arian.* i. 6.

Son, nor the Son except the Father', but 'no one knoweth the Son except the Father, nor doth anyone know the Father except the Son'.¹ This clearly shows that what is called 'seeing' and 'being seen' in the case of bodily existences is with the Father and the Son called 'knowing' and 'being known', through the faculty of knowledge and not through our frail sense of sight. It is, therefore, because the expressions 'to see' and 'to be seen' cannot suitably be applied to incorporeal and invisible existence that in the gospel the Father is not said to be seen by the Son nor the Son by the Father, but to be known.

9. But if the question is put to us why it was said, 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God',² I answer that in my opinion our argument will be much more firmly established by this passage. For what else is 'to see God in the heart' but to understand and know him with the mind, just as we have explained above? For the names of the organs of sense are often applied to the soul, so that we speak of seeing with the eyes of the heart, that is, of drawing some intellectual conclusion by means of the faculty of intelligence. So too we speak of hearing with the ears when we discern the deeper meaning of some statement. So too we speak of the soul as being able to use teeth, when it eats and consumes the bread of life who comes down from heaven. In a similar way we speak of it as using all the other bodily organs, which are transferred from their corporeal significance and applied to the faculties of the soul; as Solomon says, 'You will find a divine sense'.³ For he knew that there were in us two kinds of senses, the one being mortal, corruptible and human, and the other immortal and intellectual, which here he calls 'divine'. By this divine sense, therefore, not of the eyes but of a pure heart, that is, the mind, God can be seen by those who are worthy. That heart is used for mind, that is for the intellectual faculty, you will certainly find over and over again in all the scriptures, both the New and the Old.

Having thus investigated the nature of God, though in a manner far from worthy by reason of the weakness of our human understanding, let us now see what meaning is to be given to the name Christ.

¹ St. Matt. XI. 27.

² St. Matt. V. 8.

³ Prov. II. 5. Origen's reading, the Greek of which we have in *Con. Celsum* VII. 34, αἰσθησιν θεῖαν εὐρήσεις, is different from the Septuagint, which says, 'Thou shalt find the knowledge of God'.

CHAPTER II

CHRIST

1. First we must know this, that in Christ there is one nature, his deity, because he is the only-begotten Son of the Father, and another human nature, which in very recent times he took upon him to fulfil the divine purpose. Our first task therefore is to see what the only-begotten Son of God is, seeing he is called by many different names according to the circumstances and beliefs of the different writers. He is called Wisdom, as Solomon said, speaking in the person of Wisdom: 'The Lord created me the beginning of his ways for his works. Before he made anything, before the ages he established me. In the beginning before he made the earth, before the springs of waters came forth, before the mountains were settled, before all the hills he begets me'.¹ He is also called Firstborn, as the apostle Paul says: 'who is the firstborn of all creation'.² The Firstborn is not, however, by nature a different being from Wisdom, but is one and the same. Finally, the apostle Paul says, 'Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God'.³

2. Let no one think, however, that when we give him the name 'wisdom of God' we mean anything without hypostatic existence,⁴ that is, to take an illustration, that we understand him to be not as it were some wise living being, but a certain thing which makes men wise by revealing and imparting itself to the minds of such as are able to receive its influence and intelligence. If then it is once rightly accepted that the only-begotten Son of God is God's wisdom hypostatically existing, I do not think that our mind ought to stray beyond this to the suspicion that this hypostatis or substance could possibly possess bodily characteristics, since everything that is corporeal is distinguished by shape or colour or size. And who in his sober senses ever looked for shape or colour or measurable size in wisdom, considered solely as wisdom? And can anyone who has learned to regard God with feelings of reverence suppose or believe that God the Father ever existed, even for a single moment, without begetting this wisdom? For he would either

¹ Prov. VIII. 22-25. Origen, in his *Hom. in Jerem.* IX. 4 *ad fin.* lays stress on the present tense (Gr. γεννᾷ : Lat. *generat*) as evidence of his doctrine of the Son's eternal generation by the Father.

² Col. I. 15.

³ 1 Cor. I. 24.

⁴ Lat. *aliquid insubstantivum*. It almost means 'something impersonal', but Origen wishes to make it clear that personal existence does not involve the possession of a body.

say that God could not have begotten wisdom before he did beget her, so that he brought wisdom into being when she had not existed before, or else that he could have begotten her and—what it is profanity even to say about God—that he was unwilling to do so; each of which alternatives, as everyone can see, is absurd and impious, that is, either that God should advance from being unable to being able, or that, while being able, he should act as if he were not and should delay to beget wisdom.

Wherefore we recognise that God was always the Father of his only-begotten Son, who was born indeed of him and draws his being from him, but is yet without any beginning, not only of that kind which can be distinguished by periods of time, but even of that other kind which the mind alone is wont to contemplate in itself and to perceive, if I may so say, with the bare intellect and reason. Wisdom, therefore, must be believed to have been begotten beyond the limits of any beginning that we can speak of or understand. And because in this very subsistence of wisdom there was implicit every capacity and form of the creation that was to be, both of those things that exist in a primary sense and of those which happen in consequence of them, the whole being fashioned and arranged beforehand by the power of foreknowledge, wisdom, speaking through Solomon in regard to these very created things that had been as it were outlined and prefigured in herself, says that she was created as a 'beginning of the ways' of God, which means that she contains within herself both the beginnings and causes and species of the whole creation.

3. Now just as we have learned in what sense wisdom is the 'beginning of the ways' of God and is said to have been created, in the sense, namely, that she fashions beforehand and contains within herself the species and causes of the entire creation, in the same manner also must wisdom be understood to be the Word of God. For wisdom opens to all other beings, that is, to the whole creation, the meaning of the mysteries and secrets which are contained within the wisdom of God, and so she is called the Word, because she is as it were an interpreter of the mind's secrets. Hence I consider that to be a true saying which is written in the Acts of Paul, 'He is the Word, a living being'.¹ John, however, uses yet more exalted and wonderful language in the beginning of his gospel, when by an appropriate declaration he defines the Word to be God; 'And the

¹ The Acts of Paul is mentioned by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* III. 3, 25) as a writing used in some parts of the Church but not considered authoritative. Another quotation from it is to be found in Origen, *Comm. in Ioh.* XX. 12. In *Hom. in Jerem.* XX. 1, there is also a reference to the above passage, the Word being called ζῶον (=animal vivens). This appears to depend upon a misreading of Heb. IV. 12, ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος. The Acts of Paul is not extant, and must be distinguished from the Acts of Paul and Thecla.

Word was God, and he was in the beginning with God'.¹ Let him who assigns a beginning to the Word of God or the wisdom of God beware lest he utters impiety against the unbegotten Father himself, in denying that he was always a Father and that he begat the Word and possessed wisdom in all previous times or ages or whatever else they may be called.

4. This Son, then, is also the truth and the life² of all things that exist; and rightly so. For the things that were made, how could they live, except by the gift of life? Or the things that exist, how could they really and truly exist, unless they were derived from the truth? Or how could rational beings exist, unless the Word or reason had existed before them? Or how could they be wise, unless wisdom existed? But since it was to happen that some should fall away from life and bring death upon themselves by the very fact of their falling (for death is nothing else but a departure from life), and yet it would certainly not have been logical that beings once created by God for the enjoyment of life should utterly perish, it was needful that before the existence of death there should exist a power capable of destroying the death that was to come, and that there should exist a resurrection,³ the figure of which was shown in our Lord and Saviour, which resurrection should have its ground in the very wisdom and word and life of God. Or again, since it was to happen that some of those who were created would prove unable, in consequence of the good being within them as an accident and not by nature, that is, not essentially, to remain firm and steadfast and to abide for ever in the just and temperate use of their original blessings, but would turn and change and fall away from their first state, the word and wisdom of God became the way.⁴ And it is called the way for this reason, that it leads to the Father those who walk along it.

Whatever then we have said of the wisdom of God will also fitly apply to and be understood of him in his other titles as the Son of God, the life, the word, the truth, the way and the resurrection. For all these titles are derived from his works and powers, and in none of them is there the least reason to understand anything corporeal, which might seem to denote either size or shape or colour. But whereas the offspring of men or of the other animals whom we see around us correspond to the seed of those by whom they were begotten, or of the mothers in whose womb they are formed and nourished, drawing from these parents whatever it is that they take and bring into the light of day when they are born, it is impious and shocking to regard God the Father in the begetting of his only-begotten Son and in the Son's subsistence as being similar to any human being or other animal in the act of begetting; but there must needs be some

¹ St. John I. 1, 2.

² See St. John XIV. 6.

³ See St. John XI. 25.

⁴ See St. John XII. 6.



exceptional process, worthy of God, to which we can find no comparison whatever, not merely in things, but even in thought and imagination, such that by its aid human thought could apprehend how the unbegotten God becomes Father of the only-begotten Son. This is an eternal and everlasting begetting, as brightness is begotten from light.¹ For he does not become Son in an external way through the adoption of the Spirit,² but is Son by nature.

5. Let us now see how our statements are also supported by the authority of divine scripture. The apostle Paul says that the only-begotten Son is 'the image of the invisible God', and that he is the 'firstborn of all creation';³ and when writing to the Hebrews he says of the Son that he is the 'brightness of God's glory and the express image of his substance'.⁴ But we also find, in the book of Wisdom which is said to be Solomon's, a certain description of the wisdom of God in the following terms: 'For she is a breath of the power of God, and a pure effluence (that is, emanation⁵) of the glory of the Almighty'. Therefore, 'nothing that is defiled can enter into her. For she is the brightness of the eternal light and an unspotted mirror of the working of God and an image of his goodness'.⁶ Now, as we said above, the wisdom of God has her subsistence nowhere else but in him who is the beginning of all things, from whom also she took her birth. And because he himself, who alone is a Son by nature, is this wisdom, he is on this account also called the 'only-begotten'.

6. Let us now see what we ought to understand by the expression 'image of the invisible God', in order that we may learn therefrom how God can rightly be called the Father of his Son; and let us first of all consider what things are called images in ordinary human speech. Sometimes the term 'image' is applied to an object painted or carved on some material, such as wood or stone. Sometimes a child is said to be the image of its parent, when the likeness of the parent's features is in every respect faithfully reproduced in the child. Now I think that the first of these illustrations may be fitly applied to him who was made 'in the image and likeness of God',⁷ that is, man. Of man, however, we shall inquire more carefully, with God's help, when we come to the exposition of this passage in Genesis.⁸

¹ The thought comes from Wisd. VII. 26 and Heb. I. 3.

² See Rom. VIII. 15.

³ Col. I. 15.

⁴ Heb. I. 3.

⁵ For 'effluence' Rufinus retains the Greek *ἀπόρροια*, translating it afterwards by *manatio*.

⁶ Wisd. VII. 25f.

⁷ Gen. I. 26.

⁸ Origen discusses the passage in his *Hom. in Gen.* I. 13. See Introduction, p. vi.

But in regard to the Son of God, of whom we are now speaking, the image may be compared to our second illustration; for this reason, that he is the invisible image of the invisible God, just as according to the scripture narrative we say that the image of Adam was his son Seth. It is written thus: 'And Adam begat Seth after his own image and after his own kind'.¹ This image preserves the unity of nature and substance common to a father and a son. For if 'all things that the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise',² then in this very fact that the Son does all things just as the Father does, the Father's image is reproduced in the Son, whose birth from the Father is as it were an act of his will proceeding from the mind. And on this account my own opinion is that an act of the Father's will ought to be sufficient to ensure the existence of what he wills; for in willing he uses no other means than that which is produced by the deliberations of his will. It is in this way, then, that the existence of the Son also is begotten by him.

This point must above all be upheld by those who allow nothing to be unbegotten, that is, unborn, except God the Father only.³ Moreover, we must take care not to fall into the absurd fables of those who imagine for themselves certain emanations, splitting the divine nature into parts and, so far as they can, dividing God the Father.⁴ For it is not only the utmost impiety, but also the depth of folly, to entertain the slightest suspicion that such a thing could happen to an incorporeal being; nor is it at all consistent with our intelligence to think that a physical division of an incorporeal being is possible. Rather must we suppose that as an act of will proceeds from the mind without either cutting off any part of the mind or being separated or divided from it, in some similar fashion has the Father begotten the Son, who is indeed his image; so that as the Father is invisible by nature, he has begotten an image that is also invisible.

For the Son is the Word, and therefore we must understand that nothing in him is perceptible to the senses. He is wisdom, and in wisdom we must not suspect the presence of anything corporeal. 'He is the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world',⁵ but he has nothing in common with the light of our sun. Our Saviour is therefore the image of the invisible God, the Father, being the truth, when considered in

¹ Gen. V. 3.

² St. John V. 19.

³ According to Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 2, what Origen really said here was that 'nothing is *uncreated* except God the Father only'. But see above p. 3, n. 4.

⁴ These were the theories of the Gnostics. See Bk. IV, ch. iv (p. 326 below).

⁵ St. John I. 9.

relation to the Father himself,¹ and the image, when considered in relation to us, to whom he reveals the Father;²

GREEK

We, therefore,³ having been made according to the image, have the Son, the original, as the truth of the noble qualities that are within us. And what we are to the Son, such is the Son to the Father, who is the truth.

LATIN

through which image we know the Father, whom 'no one' else 'knoweth save the Son and he to whom the Son hath willed to reveal him'.⁴ And he reveals the Father by being himself understood; for whoever has understood him understands as a consequence the Father also, according to his own saying, 'He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father also.'⁵ * * * * *

7. But we quoted the saying of Paul in which he speaks of Christ as being 'the brightness of God's glory, and the express image of his substance';⁶ let us see, therefore, what we are to learn from this. 'God is light',⁷ according to John. The only-begotten Son, therefore, is the brightness of this light, proceeding from God without separation, as brightness from light, and lightening the whole creation. For by the same method of exposition which we have used above,⁸ to show how he is the

¹ Rufinus has here altered his original. See the quotation made by Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 2: 'The Son, who is the image of the invisible Father, is not the truth when compared with the Father; but in relation to us, who are unable to receive the truth of God almighty, he is a shadow and semblance of the truth.' That this correctly represents what Origen wrote is shown by an anonymous defender of Origen whose book is described by Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* 117. According to this work Origen was accused of saying that 'the image of God, considered in relation to God whose image he is, and in so far as he is image, is not truth'. In Theophilus, *Ep. Synod.* 2 (the letter written after the Council at Alexandria in 400 A.D., where Origenism was condemned: see Jerome *Ep.* 92), the charge is made in the following exaggerated form; 'The Son compared with us is truth, but compared with the Father he is falsehood.' See further the Greek fragment that follows.

² See St. John XIV. 6.

³ Frag. 4, Koetschau, from Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 525). Rufinus has omitted this.

⁴ St. Matt. XI. 27.

⁵ St. John XIV. 9. Koetschau suspects an omission by Rufinus at this point, where possibly the two following passages may originally have stood. Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 2, 'God the Father is light incomprehensible. In comparison with the Father, Christ is a very small brightness, though to us by reason of our weakness he seems to be a great one'. Theophilus, *Ep. Synod.* (in Jerome *Ep.* 92): 'Again, as much as Paul or Peter differ from the Saviour, so much is the Saviour less than the Father.'

⁶ Heb. I. 3.

⁷ 1 St. John I. 5.

⁸ See Ch. II. 4 (p. 17).

way and leads to the Father, and how he is the Word who interprets and presents to the rational creation the secrets of wisdom and the mysteries of knowledge, and how he is also the truth and the life and the resurrection, must we arrive at the meaning of his being the brightness; for it is through its brightness that the nature of the light itself is known and experienced. This brightness falls softly and gently on the tender and weak eyes of mortal man and little by little trains and accustoms them, as it were, to bear the light in its clearness; and when it has removed from them all that darkens and obstructs their vision, in accordance with the Lord's saying, 'Cast out the beam out of thine eye,'¹ it renders them capable of enduring the glory of the light, becoming in this respect even a kind of mediator between men and the light.²

8. Christ is said, however, by the apostle to be not only 'the brightness of God's glory' but also 'the express image of his substance'³ or subsistence. I do not think it superfluous, therefore, to turn our attention to this point, namely, how there can be said to exist, besides the actual substance or subsistence of God (whatever that substance or subsistence means), something else which is an image of his substance. See, then, whether the Son of God, who is called God's word and wisdom, and who alone knows the Father and reveals him to whom he will,⁴ to those, namely, who become capable of receiving his word and wisdom, may not perhaps be said to express the image of God's substance or subsistence for this reason, that he makes God understood and known; that is, when wisdom outlines first in herself the things which she wishes to reveal to others, by means of which they are to know and understand God, then she herself may be called the express image of God's substance.⁵

In order, however, to understand still more completely how the Saviour is 'the image of God's substance' or subsistence, let us use an illustration which, although it does not fully or properly represent the subject under discussion, we may yet be allowed to employ for the sole purpose of showing that when the Son, 'who was in the form of God, emptied himself,'⁶ his desire was by means of this very emptying to display to us the fulness of the godhead. Let us suppose, for example, that there existed a statue of so great a size as to fill the whole world, but which on account of its immensity was imperceptible to anyone, and that another statue was made similar to it in every detail, in shape of limbs and outline of features, in form and material, but not in its immense size, so that those who were unable to perceive and behold the immense one could yet be

¹ St. Matt. VII. 5, St. Luke VI. 42.

² See 1 Tim. II. 5.

³ Heb. I. 3.

⁴ See St. Matt. XI. 27.

⁵ Heb. I. 3.

⁶ Phil. II. 6, 7.

confident that they had seen it when they saw the small one, because this preserved every line of limbs and features and the very form and material with an absolutely indistinguishable similarity.¹

It is by some such likeness as this that the Son, in emptying himself of his equality with the Father,² and showing to us a way by which we may know him, becomes an 'express image' of God's substance;³ so that, through this fact of his becoming to us the brightness, we who were not able to look at the glory of pure light while it remained in the greatness of his godhead, may find a way of beholding the divine light through looking at the brightness. Needless to say, a comparison with statues, taken from the region of material things, is to be allowed for no other purpose but to show that the Son of God, though brought within the very narrow compass of a human body, yet gave indications, in the likeness of his power and works to those of God the Father, of the immense and invisible greatness that was in him; witness the words which he said to his disciples, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father also',⁴ and, 'I and the Father are one';⁵ along with which we must also interpret that similar saying of his, 'the Father in me, and I in the Father'.⁶

9. Let us now see what is the meaning of that passage which we find written in the Wisdom of Solomon, who speaks of wisdom as follows: 'She is a breath of the power of God and a pure effluence (that is, emanation) of the glory of the Almighty and the brightness of the eternal light and an unspotted mirror of the working or power of God and an image of his goodness.'⁷ He gives here five definitions of God and from each of them in turn he indicates a certain characteristic belonging to God's wisdom; for he speaks of God's 'power' and 'glory' and 'eternal light' and 'working' and 'goodness'. He says, however, that wisdom is a breath not of the glory of the Almighty, nor of the eternal light, nor of the working of the Father, nor of his goodness, since it was not suitable to apply the term breath to any one of these; but in all appropriateness he says that wisdom is a breath of the 'power' of God. Now the power of God must mean that by which he is strong, that by which he both established and also preserves and controls all things visible and invisible, and that by

¹ Jerome refers to this passage in his *Ep. ad Avitum* 2. 'He gives an illustration of two statues, an immense one and a very small one; the former fills the world and is in a way invisible from its very size, the latter is perceptible to our sight. The former he compares to the Father, the latter to the Son.'

² See Phil. II. 7.

³ See Heb. I. 3.

⁴ St. John XIV. 9.

⁵ St. John X. 30.

⁶ St. John X. 38.

⁷ Wisd. VII. 25, 26.

which he is sufficient for all things which are the objects of his providence and with all of which he is present as if they were joined in one. The breath, then, or if I may so call it, the strength of all this power, so great and so immense, comes to have a subsistence of its own; and although it proceeds from the power itself as will be proceeding from mind,¹ yet nevertheless the will of God comes itself to be a power of God. There comes into existence, therefore, another power, subsisting in its own proper nature, a kind of breath, as the passage of Scripture calls it, of the first and unbegotten power of God, drawing from this source whatever existence it has; and there is no time when it did not exist.

For if anyone is inclined to describe it as being non-existent at first but coming into existence afterwards, let him tell us why the Father who caused it to exist did not do so before. And if he lays it down that there was one definite beginning when this 'breath' first proceeded from the power of God, we shall ask again why it did not so proceed before this beginning of which he has spoken. Thus by ever inquiring what happened before and going further back with our questions, we shall reach the conclusion that, since God always had both the power and the will, there was never the slightest reason or possibility that he should not always have had this good thing that he desired. This proves that there always has existed that breath of the power of God, having no beginning but God himself. Nor indeed could it have fitly had any other beginning except him from whom it takes its existence and birth, that is, God. And in regard to the apostle's saying that 'Christ is the power of God',² this power must be called not merely a breath of the power of God but a power proceeding from the power.

10. Let us now look into the saying that wisdom is 'an effluence', that is, an emanation, 'of the clear glory of the Almighty', and if we first consider what 'the glory of the Almighty' is, we shall then understand what its 'effluence' is. Now as one cannot be a father apart from having a son, nor a lord apart from holding a possession or a slave, so we cannot even call God almighty if there are none over whom he can exercise his power. Accordingly, to prove that God is almighty we must assume the existence of the universe. For if anyone would have it that certain ages, or periods of time, or whatever he cares to call them, elapsed during which the present creation did not exist, he would undoubtedly prove that in those ages or periods God was not almighty, but that he afterwards became almighty from the time when he began to have creatures over whom he could exercise power. Thus God will apparently have experienced a kind of progress, for there can be no doubt that it is better for him to be almighty than not to be so.

¹ See p. 19 above.

² 1 Cor. I. 24.

GREEK

Now¹ how is it anything but absurd that God should at first not possess something that is appropriate to him and then should come to possess it? But if there was no time when he was not almighty, there must always have existed the things in virtue of which he is almighty; and there must always have existed things under his sway, which own him as their ruler.

LATIN

Of these we shall treat more fully in the proper place, when we come to discuss the subject of God's creatures.² Yet even now, since we are dealing with the question how wisdom is a pure effluence, or emanation, of the glory of the Almighty, I deem it necessary to give warning, however briefly, to prevent anyone from thinking that the title of Almighty belonged to God before the birth of wisdom, through which he is called Father; for wisdom, which is the Son of God, is said to be a 'pure effluence of the glory of the Almighty'. Let him who is inclined to believe this hear what the scriptures plainly proclaim; for it says that 'thou hast made all things in wisdom',³ and the Gospel teaches that 'all things were made by him and without him was not anything made';⁴ and let him understand from this that the title of Almighty cannot be older in God than that of Father, for it is through the Son that the Father is almighty.

But the passage speaks of a glory belonging to the Almighty, of which glory wisdom is the effluence. From this we learn that wisdom, through which God is called Almighty, has a share even in the glory of omnipotence. For it is through wisdom, which is Christ, that God holds power over all things, not only by his own authority as Master, but also by the voluntary service of his subjects. And to prove to you that the omnipotence of the Father and the Son is one and the same, just as God and

¹ Frag. 5 Koetschau, from Justinian *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 528).

² See Ch. IV. 3-5, pp. 41-43 below.

³ Ps. CIV. 24 (Sept. CIII. 24).

⁴ St. John I. 3.

LATIN

Now how does it seem anything but absurd that God should at first not possess something that is appropriate to him, and afterwards by a kind of progress should come to possess it? But if there was no time when he was not almighty, then of necessity those things must always have existed, in virtue of which he is called almighty; and he must always have had creatures over which he exercised his power and which were controlled by him as king and ruler.

the Lord are one and the same as the Father, listen to the manner in which John speaks in the Apocalypse: 'These things saith the Lord God, which is and which was and which is to come, the Almighty'.¹ For he who 'is to come', who else is it but Christ? And just as no one ought to be offended because, while the Father is God, the Saviour also is God; so too ought no one to be offended because, while the Father is called Almighty, the Son also is called Almighty.

Moreover we shall in this way see the truth of that saying which Christ utters to the Father: 'All things that are mine are thine, and thine are mine, and I am glorified in them'.² Now if all things which are the Father's are Christ's, and among all that the Father is, he is Almighty, then undoubtedly the only-begotten Son must also be Almighty, that the Son may have all that the Father has. 'And I am glorified,' he says, 'in them.' For 'in the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth; and every tongue shall confess that Jesus is Lord in the glory of God the Father.'³ He is therefore the 'effluence of the glory of God' in this respect, that he is Almighty, God's pure and clear wisdom itself, glorified as being the effluence of omnipotence or glory.

We add the following, however, to make it more clearly understood what the glory of omnipotence is. God the Father is almighty because he holds dominion over all things, that is, over heaven and earth, sun, moon and stars and everything contained in them. This dominion he exercises through his Word, for 'in the name of Jesus every knee bows, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth'. Now if every knee bows to Jesus, then undoubtedly it is Jesus to whom all things have been subjected, and it is he who wields dominion over all things, and all things have been subjected to the Father through him; for it is through wisdom, that is, by word and reason and not by force and necessity, that they are subject. His glory, therefore, lies in the very fact that he possesses all things; and this is the purest and brightest glory of omnipotence, that the universe is held in subjection by reason and wisdom, and not by force and necessity. It is called the 'purest and brightest' glory of wisdom as the most suitable way of distinguishing it from that glory which is not pure or sincere.

For every nature which is alterable and changeable, even though it may be glorified in works of righteousness or wisdom, cannot be said to possess a glory that is sincere and bright, by

¹ Rev. I. 8.

² St. John XVII. 10.

³ Phil. II. 10, 11. The Latin reads 'that the Lord Jesus is in the glory of God the Father'. But we have Origen's Greek in *Comm. in Ioh. VI. 44*; *Con. Cels. VIII. 59*; *Hom. in Jerem. XVIII. 3*, and in each case it agrees with the text of the N. T.

reason of the fact that its righteousness and wisdom are accidents, and whatever is accidental may also be separated and lost. But since the wisdom of God, which is his only-begotten Son, is in all respects unalterable and unchangeable, and since every good quality in him is essential and can never be changed or altered, his glory is on that account described as pure and sincere.

11. In the third place, wisdom is said to be the brightness of the eternal light. The force of this expression we have explained in a previous passage, where we introduced the illustration of the sun and the brightness of its rays¹ and showed to the best of our ability how the expression should be understood. We will add, however, this one point. The term everlasting or eternal properly denotes that which had no beginning of existence and can never cease to be what it is. This is the idea underlying the passage in John, where he says that 'God is light'.² Now God's wisdom is the brightness of that light, not only in so far as it is light, but in so far as it is everlasting light. His wisdom is therefore an everlasting brightness, enduring eternally. If this point is fully understood, it is a clear proof that the Son's existence springs from the Father himself, yet not in time, nor from any other beginning except, as we have said, from God himself.

12. Wisdom is also called an 'unspotted mirror of the energy or working of God'.³ We must first understand, therefore, what the 'working' of God's power is. It is a kind of strength, so to speak, by means of which the Father works, whether in his acts of creation, or of providence, or of judgment, or in the ordering and superintendence of every detail of the universe at his own appointed time. And when wisdom is called the 'unspotted mirror' of the Father's power and working, she would have us understand her nature to be like the image reflected in a mirror, which moves and acts in correspondence with the movements and actions of him who looks into the mirror, not deviating from them in any way whatever. So too the Lord Jesus Christ, who is the wisdom of God, speaks of himself when he says, 'the works which the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son in like manner';⁴ and again, 'the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he hath seen the Father doing'.⁵

As regards the power of his works, then, the Son is in no way whatever separate or different from the Father, nor is his work anything other than the Father's work, but there is one and the same movement, so to speak, in all they do; consequently the Father has called him an 'unspotted mirror', in order to make it understood that there is absolutely no dissimilarity between the Son and the Father. Some indeed have said

¹ See Ch. I. 6, p. 10.

² 1 St. John I. 5.

³ See Wisd. VII. 25; and above ch. II. 9, p. 22. Rufinus uses the Greek word *ἐνέργειας* and then translates it by *inoperationis*.

⁴ St. John V. 19.

⁵ *Ibid.*

that the Son's acts are to be compared with a pupil's work in likeness to or imitation of his master, or that such things as the Father has first formed in their spiritual essence are made by the Son in bodily material;¹ yet how can these opinions be reconciled with the Gospel, which says, not that the Son does like things, but that he does the same things 'in like manner'?²

13. There remains the inquiry, what is the 'image of his goodness'? Here, I think, we do well to adopt the same line of reasoning which we used above in regard to the image formed in a mirror. The original goodness is undoubtedly the Father; and from this is born the Son, who is in every respect an image of the Father, and who may also without any doubt be properly called an 'image of his goodness'.

GREEK

In the same way,³ therefore, I consider that in the case of the Saviour it would be right to say that he is an image of God's goodness, but not goodness itself. And perhaps also the Son, while being good, is yet not good purely and simply. And just as he is the image of the invisible God, and in virtue of this is himself God, and yet is not he of whom Christ himself says, 'that they may know thee, the only true God'; so he is the image of the goodness, and yet not, as the Father is, good without qualification.

LATIN

For there is no other second goodness existing in the Son, besides that which is in the Father. So the Saviour himself rightly says in the Gospel that 'none is good save one, God the Father',⁴ the purpose of this statement being to make it understood that the Son is not of some other 'goodness', but of that alone which is in the Father; whose image he is rightly called, because he neither springs from any other source than from original goodness itself,—for if that were so, there would seem to be a different goodness in the Son from that which is in the Father—nor has the goodness that is in him any dissimilarity or divergence from that of the Father. Accordingly we ought

¹ See Origen, *Comm. in Cant.* iii. 'Perhaps as God made man in his own image and likeness, he also created all other creatures in the likeness of other heavenly forms.' It looks as if the opinion expressed in the text above belongs really to Origen, and Rufinus is rejecting it.

² St. John V. 19.

³ Frag. 6, Koetschau, from Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 525). Rufinus has abbreviated and changed the sense of the original. See too Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 2: 'God the Father almighty he (i.e. Origen) calls good, and of perfect goodness. The Son is not good, but is a kind of breath and image of goodness, so that he is not called good absolutely, but with an addition, such as the good shepherd, etc.'

⁴ St. Mark X. 18.

not to imagine that there is some kind of blasphemy, as it were, in the saying that 'none is good save one, God the Father',¹ as if these words were to be taken as a denial that either Christ or the Holy Spirit is good; but, as we said before,² the original goodness must be believed to reside in God the Father, and from him both the Son and Holy Spirit undoubtedly draw into themselves the nature of that goodness existing in the fount³ from which the one is born and the other proceeds.

If then there are any other things called good in the scriptures, such as an angel, or a man, or a slave, or a treasure, or a good heart, or a good tree,⁴ all these are so called by an inexact use of the word, since the goodness contained in them is accidental and not essential. And it would be a long business, demanding another time and another work, to collect all the titles of the Son of God, such for example as the true light, or the door, or righteousness, or sanctification, or redemption, and countless others,⁵ and to explain for what reasons either in regard to his powers or his moral qualities each of these names is given to him. Let us rest content with those we have already discussed, and go on to inquire into the remaining parts of our subject in their proper order.

¹ St. Mark X. 18.

² See p. 27.

³ See Ch. I. 6, p. 10.

⁴ For 'good angel' see Tobit V. 21 and 2 Macc. XV. 23; 'good man', St. Matt. XII. 35; 'good slave', St. Matt. XXV. 21; 'good treasure', St. Matt. XII. 35; 'good heart', St. Luke VIII. 15; 'good tree', St. Matt. VII. 17.

⁵ Origen makes such a collection in his *Comm. in Ioh.* I. 21-24.

CHAPTER III

THE HOLY SPIRIT

1. We come, therefore, to the investigation, in as brief a manner as possible, of the subject of the Holy Spirit. Now all who in any way believe in the existence of Providence admit that God, who created and set in order the entire creation, is unbegotten,¹ and they recognise him to be the parent of the universe. And we are not alone in declaring that he has a Son. For although this may seem marvellous and incredible to those who are considered to be philosophers, whether of Greek or barbarian race, yet there are some even of them who appear to have held a belief in his existence, for they admit that all things were created by the word or reason of God.² We, however, in conformity with our faith in that doctrine which we hold for certain to be divinely inspired, believe that there is no possible way of explaining and bringing to man's knowledge the higher and diviner teaching about the Son of God, except by means of those scriptures which were inspired by the Holy Spirit, namely, the gospels and the writings of the apostles, to which we add, according to the declaration of Christ himself,³ the law and the prophets. But no one except those who are familiar with the law and the prophets, or those who profess their belief in Christ, could have even a suspicion of the personal existence of the Holy Spirit. For although no one is able to speak worthily of God the Father, still it is possible to gain some notion of him from our experience of the visible creation and from the instinctive thoughts of the human mind; and, moreover, it is possible for such knowledge to be confirmed from the holy scriptures. And in regard to the Son of God, although 'no one knoweth the Son save the Father',⁴ yet again from the divine scriptures the mind of man is directed how to think of him too; and this not only from the New, but also from the Old Testament, through those deeds done by holy men which allude figuratively to Christ, and from which we can learn both his divine nature and the human nature which he assumed.

2. Of the existence of the Holy Spirit, however, we are taught in many passages of scripture. For instance, David says in the

¹ See Ch. II. 6, p. 19 above.

² The doctrine of the Logos, the Reason or Thought of God immanent in creation, was first expressed by Heracleitus (c. 500 B.C.). Plato, in the *Timaeus*, 34 B, describes the World-soul which the Creator put within the body of the universe to be the source of life and reason.

³ See St. Luke XXIV. 25-27: St. John V. 39, 46.

⁴ St. Matt. XI. 27.

fiftieth psalm, 'And take not thy Holy Spirit from me';¹ and in Daniel it is said, 'The Holy Spirit, who is in thee'.² But in the New Testament we have proofs in abundance, as when the Holy Spirit is related to have descended upon Christ,³ and when the Lord breathed on his apostles after the resurrection and said, 'Receive the Holy Spirit';⁴ and the angel says to Mary, 'The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee';⁵ and Paul teaches us that 'no one can say that Jesus is the Lord except in the Holy Spirit';⁶ and in the Acts of the Apostles 'through the laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Spirit was given'⁷ in baptism. From all of which we learn that the person of the Holy Spirit is of so great authority and dignity that saving baptism is not complete except when performed with the authority of the whole most excellent Trinity, that is, by the naming of Father, Son and Holy Spirit;⁸ and that the name of the Holy Spirit must be joined to that of the unbegotten God the Father and his only-begotten Son. Who, then, is not amazed at the tremendous majesty of the Holy Spirit, when he hears that 'he who shall speak a word against the Son of man' may hope for forgiveness, but 'he who shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost has no forgiveness, either in this present world or in the world to come'?'⁹

3. It is proved by many declarations throughout the whole of scripture that the universe was created by God and that there is no substance which has not received its existence from him; which refutes and dismisses the doctrines falsely taught by some, that there is a matter which is co-eternal with God,¹⁰ or that there are unbegotten souls, in whom they would have it that God implanted not so much the principle of existence as the quality and rank of their life.¹¹ Moreover in that little book

¹ Ps. LI. (Sept. L.) 13.

² Dan. IV. 6 (Theodotion): see IV. 9, English version.

³ See St. Matt. III. 16 and parallels.

⁴ St. John XX. 22.

⁵ St. Luke I. 35.

⁶ 1 Cor. XII. 3.

⁷ Acts VIII. 18.

⁸ See St. Matt. XXVIII. 19.

⁹ St. Matt. XII. 32.

¹⁰ This is a Gnostic doctrine, taught by Marcion among others. Tertulian, *Adv. Marc.* I. xv. 'If, then, he constructed the world out of some underlying material that was unborn and uncreated and contemporaneous with God, as Marcion believes the Creator did, ...'

¹¹ See Origen, *Con. Cels.* IV. 30. 'We shall not, however, imitate him (i.e. Celsus) nor speak after his style about the philosophers who declare that they know the nature of the universe and argue with one another whether . . . souls are unbegotten and not created by God but simply arranged in order by him and changed from one body to another, or whether they are originated at the same time as the body and then either endure for ever or pass away.' Origen's own opinion, according to Rufinus (*Apol. ad*

composed by Hermas, called 'The Shepherd, or the Angel of Repentance',¹ it is thus written: 'First of all, believe that God is one, who created and set in order all things; who, when nothing existed before, caused all things to be; who contains all things, but himself is contained by none.'² Similar statements are also made in the book of Enoch.³ But up to the present we have been able to find no passage in the holy scriptures which would warrant us in saying that the Holy Spirit was a being made or created, not even in that manner in which we have shown above that Solomon speaks of wisdom, nor in the manner in which the expressions we have dealt with, such as life, or word, or other titles of the Son of God, are to be understood. The 'Spirit of God', therefore,

GREEK

Following⁴ the same reasoning we believe that everything whatever except the Father and God of the universe is created.

LATIN

who 'moved upon the waters', as it is written, in the beginning of the creation of the world,⁵ I reckon to be none other than the Holy Spirit, so far as I can understand; which indeed I have demonstrated in my exposition of these passages,⁶ not, however, according to their literal but according to their spiritual meaning.

4. Now some of our predecessors have observed that in the New Testament, whenever the Spirit is mentioned without its qualifying adjective, the expression should be understood to refer to the Holy Spirit; as for instance, 'the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace'⁷ and the rest. And here again: 'seeing ye began in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect in the flesh?'⁸ We, however, think that this peculiar use may be observed in the Old Testament also, as when it says, 'he that giveth spirit

Anastas, 6) was as follows: 'Some maintain that souls were created long ago, when God made all things of nothing, and that now he simply arranges them in bodies according to his own judgment. This is the opinion of Origen and certain other Greeks.' See below pp. 72-74.

¹ The second title occurs in Hermas, *Vis.* V. 8, and in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* I. 85, 4 (Stählin ii, 55, 12 f.)

² Hermas, *Mand.* 1.

³ Enoch, Ch. II. 5.

⁴ Frag. 7, Koetschau, from Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 528). Justinian's letter contains also the following sentence: 'that he (i.e. Origen) called the Holy Spirit a created being, as well as the Son, and included them in the number of the other created beings; and accordingly he terms them "ministering creatures".' Koetschau inserts these last two words in the text. Rufinus has omitted the heretical statements.

⁵ See Gen. I. 2, 1.

⁷ Gal. V. 22.

⁶ Not extant.

⁸ Gal. III. 3.

to the people who are upon the earth, and spirit to them that walk thereon'.¹ For undoubtedly every one who walks upon the earth, that is to say, every earthly and corporeal being, is a partaker of the Holy Spirit, which he receives from God. And

GREEK

my Hebrew master² used to say that the two six-winged seraphim in Isaiah³ who cry one to another and say, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts, were the only-begotten Son of God and the Holy Spirit. And we ourselves think that the expression in the song of Habakkuk, 'In the midst of the two living creatures thou shalt be known'⁴ is spoken of Christ and the Holy Spirit.

LATIN

my Hebrew master used to say that the two seraphim, which are described in Isaiah³ as having six wings each and as crying one to another and saying, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts, were to be understood to mean the only-begotten Son of God and the Holy Spirit. And we ourselves think that the expression in the song of Habakkuk, 'In the midst of the two animals' (or the two living creatures) 'thou shalt be known',⁴ should be understood to refer to Christ and the Holy Spirit.

LATIN

For all knowledge of the Father, when the Son reveals him, is made known to us through the Holy Spirit. So that both of these, who in the words of the prophet are called 'animals' or 'living beings', are the cause of our knowledge of God the Father. For as it is said of the Son that 'no one knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son willeth to reveal him',⁵ so in the same way does the apostle speak of the Holy Spirit; 'God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, even the deep things of God.'⁶ Again, when in the gospel the Saviour is referring to the divine and deeper doctrines which his disciples could not yet receive, he speaks to the apostles as follows: 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot receive them now; howbeit when the comforter is come, even the Holy Spirit, who proceedeth from the Father, he shall teach you all things, and bring to

¹ Is. XLII. 5.

² Frag. 8. Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 528). The passage is also adversely commented on by Antipater of Bostra, in John of Damascus, *Sacra Parallela* II. 771 (Migne P. G. 96, p. 505). It seems to suggest that the Son and the Spirit are creatures. But see below p. 311.

³ Is. VI. 2 f.

⁴ Habak. III. 2 (Sept.)

⁵ St. Matt. XI. 27.

⁶ 1 Cor. II. 10.

your remembrance all that I have said unto you'.¹ So then we must understand that as the Son, who alone knows the Father, reveals him to whom he will, in the same way also the Holy Spirit, who alone 'searcheth even the deep things of God',² reveals God to whom he will. For 'the Spirit breathes where he willeth'.³

We must not suppose, however, that the Spirit knows God as we do, through the revelation of the Son. For if the Holy Spirit knows the Father by this means, he passes from ignorance to knowledge; and it is certainly as impious as it is foolish to confess that he is the Holy Spirit and then to ascribe ignorance to him. For even if we grant that something else existed before the Holy Spirit, yet it was not by a process of development that he came to be the Holy Spirit; as if one should dare to say that at the time when he was not yet the Holy Spirit he did not know the Father, but that after he had gained this knowledge he became the Holy Spirit. That could not be, for the Holy Spirit would never have been included in the unity of the Trinity, that is, along with God the unchangeable Father and with his Son, unless he had always been the Holy Spirit.⁴ Of course, these terms that we use, such as 'always' or 'has been', or any similar ones that bear a temporal significance, must be interpreted with reservations and not pressed; for they relate to time, but the matters of which we are now speaking, though described in temporal language for the purposes of discussion, in their essential nature transcend all idea of time.

5. Nevertheless it seems right to inquire into the reason why he who is 'born again through God'⁵ to salvation has need of both Father and Son and Holy Spirit and will not obtain salvation apart from the entire Trinity, and why it is impossible to become partaker of the Father or the Son without the Holy Spirit. In discussing these points it will undoubtedly be necessary to describe the activity which is peculiar to the Holy Spirit and that which is peculiar to the Father and Son.

GREEK

The God⁶ and Father, who holds the universe together, is superior to every being that exists, for he imparts to each

¹ St. John XVI. 12 f.; XIV. 26.

² 1 Cor. II. 10.

³ Or, 'The Spirit (or wind) bloweth where it listeth.' St. John III. 8.

⁴ Cp. Origen *In Num. Hom.* XI. 8. 'I think therefore that the Holy Spirit is holy without ever having been made holy. For there did not come to him from some external source a holiness which he did not previously possess, but he always was holy, and never experienced a beginning of holiness.'

⁵ 1 St. Peter I. 3.

⁶ Frag. 9, Koetschau, from Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 524). The passage is omitted by Rufinus, but we have a Latin version of it in Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 2; 'The Son also, he says, is less than the Father,

one from his own existence that which each one is; the Son, being less than the Father, is superior to rational creatures alone (for he is second to the Father); the Holy Spirit is still less, and dwells within the saints alone. So that in this way the power of the Father is greater than that of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and that of the Son is more than that of the Holy Spirit, and in turn the power of the Holy Spirit exceeds that of every other holy being.

LATIN

I am of opinion, then, that the activity of the Father and the Son is to be seen both in saints and in sinners, in rational men¹ and in dumb animals, yes, and even in lifeless things and in absolutely everything that exists; but the activity of the Holy Spirit does not extend at all either to lifeless things, or to things that have life but yet are dumb, nor is it to be found in those who, though rational, still lie in wickedness² and are not wholly converted to better things. Only in those who are already turning to better things and walking in the ways of Jesus Christ, that is, who are engaged in good deeds and who abide in God,³ is the work of the Holy Spirit, I think, to be found.

6. That the activity of the Father and the Son is to be found both in saints and in sinners is clear from the fact that all

being second to him; and the Holy Spirit is inferior to the Son and dwells in all the saints. And in this order the power of the Father is greater than that of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; and in turn the power of the Son is greater than the Holy Spirit and so too the power of the Holy Spirit is greater than that of all other beings who are called holy.' Origen explains his meaning somewhat more fully in *Con. Cels.* V. 29 and VIII. 15. In the former passage he calls the Son a 'second God' in the sense that in him are contained all virtues and all reason, which virtues and reason dwelt pre-eminently in the soul of Jesus. In the latter he declares that Christians 'say that the Son is not stronger than the Father but inferior to him'. Origen's doctrine, which is susceptible of a strictly orthodox interpretation, may be illustrated from Justin, *I Apol.* 13 (Christ is regarded as God 'in the second place'); from a fragment in Leont. Byzant. *De Sectis*, Act. X. 4 (Migne P. G. 86. 1, p. 1264); and from Hilary, *De Trin.* III. 12, IX. 56, XII. 54 and *Tract. in Ps. cxxxviii.* 17. Compare also the practical teaching of the Church Catechism, 'First I learn to believe in God the Father, who hath made me and all the world; secondly in God the Son, who hath redeemed me and all mankind; and thirdly in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me and all the elect people of God.'

¹ In *hominibus rationalibus*. Semler suggests *omnibus* for *hominibus*. Koetschau, however, thinks that the text needs further emendation and proposes the following: 'the activity of the Father and the Son is to be seen in all rational beings, both saints and sinners; that of the Father in dumb animals also, yes, and even. . . . ' But Rufinus may well have written the text as it stands, in his keen desire to avoid anything like Origen's subordination of the Son.

² 1 St. John V. 19.

³ See 1 Cor. IV. 17, Eph. II. 10, 1 St. John IV. 13.

rational beings are partakers of the word of God, that is, of reason, and so have implanted within them some seeds, as it were, of wisdom and righteousness, which is Christ. And all things that exist derive their share of being from him who truly exists, who said through Moses, 'I am that I am';¹ which participation in God the Father extends to all, both righteous and sinners, rational and irrational creatures and absolutely everything that exists. Certainly the apostle Paul shows that all have a share in Christ, when he says, 'Say not in thy heart, who shall ascend into heaven? that is, to bring Christ down; or who shall descend into the abyss? that is, to bring Christ back again from the dead. But what saith the scripture? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart.'² By this he indicates that Christ is 'in the heart' of all men, in virtue of his being the word or reason, by sharing in which men are rational.

Moreover that passage in the Gospel which says, 'If I had not come and spoken unto them they had not had sin, but now they have no excuse for their sin',³ clearly refers to those who have come to the age of reason, up to which time a man does not 'have sin', but from whence onward he becomes responsible for sin; and it reveals how men are said to 'have sin' when they share in the word or reason, that is to say, from the time when they become capable of knowledge and understanding, as soon as the reason implanted within them has taught them the distinction between good and evil; and when once they have begun to know what is evil then, if they do it, they render themselves responsible for sin. This is the meaning of the saying that men 'have no excuse for their sin' from the time that the divine word or reason has begun to reveal within their heart the distinction between good and evil, to warn them that they must avoid and beware of evil; and it is also the meaning of that other saying, 'To him that knoweth good and doeth it not, to him it is sin'.⁴

Again, the gospel teaches that no men are without communion with God, when the Saviour speaks as follows, 'The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall they say, Lo here! or, there! but the kingdom of God is within you'.⁵ Further, we must see whether perhaps the same meaning does not attach to what is written in Genesis, 'And he breathed into his face the breath of life, and man became a living soul'.⁶ If this breath of life is understood to have been given to men in general, then all men have a share in God. But if we are to understand the expression as referring to the Spirit of God, in view of the fact that Adam is found to have uttered certain

¹ Exod. III. 14.

² Rom. X. 6-8.

³ St. John XV. 22.

⁴ St. James IV. 17.

⁵ St. Luke XVII. 20, 21.

⁶ Gen. II. 7.

prophecies,¹ then the breath of life may be regarded as given not universally but only to the saints.

7. Finally, at the time of the flood, when 'all flesh had corrupted God's way,'² it is written that God said, as if speaking of unworthy men and sinners, 'My spirit shall not remain in those men for ever, because they are flesh'.³ Here it is clearly shown that God's spirit is taken away from all the unworthy. It is also written in the Psalms; 'Thou wilt take away their spirit and they will die, and return to their earth; thou wilt send forth thy spirit and they shall be created, and thou wilt renew the face of the earth',⁴ which passage clearly points to the Holy Spirit who, after sinners and the unworthy have been taken away and destroyed, creates for himself a new people and 'renews the face of the earth', when through the grace of the Spirit men 'put off the old man with his doings'⁵ and begin 'to walk in newness of life'.⁶ And this is why the passage fitly applies to the Holy Spirit, because he will dwell not in all men, nor in those who are flesh, but in those whose 'earth has been renewed'. Finally, it was for this reason that the Holy Spirit was bestowed through the laying on of the apostles' hands after the grace and renewal of baptism.⁷ Moreover our Saviour after the resurrection, when 'old things had now passed away and all things had become new',⁸ being himself 'the new man'⁹ and the 'firstborn from the dead',¹⁰ says to the apostles, who were also renewed by faith in his resurrection, 'Receive the Holy Spirit'.¹¹ This is doubtless what our Saviour Lord himself was pointing out in the gospel, when he said that 'new wine could not be put into old wineskins'¹² and commanded that new wineskins be made, that is, that men should walk 'in newness of life'¹³ in order to receive the new wine, the newness of the Holy Spirit's grace.

Thus, therefore, the working of the power of God the Father and God the Son is spread indiscriminately over all created beings, but a share in the Holy Spirit is possessed, we find,

¹ Cp. Origen, *Comm. in Cant.* II. 'Adam also is reckoned among the prophets, because he prophesied the "great mystery" in regard to Christ and the Church.' See Eph. V. 32. Also Clem. Alex. *Strom.* I. 135, 3 (Stählin II 84. 5). 'Before the law Adam uttered prophecies in regard to the woman and in regard to the naming of the animals.'

² Gen. VI. 12.

³ Gen. VI. 3.

⁴ Ps. CIII. 29, 30 (Eng. vers. CIV.).

⁵ Col. III. 9.

⁶ Rom. VI. 4.

⁷ See Acts VIII. 18, Tit. III. 5.

⁸ 2 Cor. V. 17.

⁹ Eph. II. 15.

¹⁰ Col. I. 18.

¹¹ St. John XX. 22.

¹² St. Matt. IX. 17 and parallels.

¹³ Rom. VI. 4.

by the saints alone. Accordingly it is said, 'No man can say that Jesus is the Lord except in the Holy Spirit'.¹ Even the apostles themselves are scarcely at the last counted worthy of hearing the words, 'Ye shall receive power, when the Holy Spirit is come upon you'.² It follows logically from this, I think, that 'he who has sinned against the Son of Man is worthy of forgiveness',³ because he who is a sharer in the word or reason seems, if he ceases to live according to reason, to have fallen into ignorance or folly and so to deserve forgiveness; whereas he who has once been counted worthy to share in the Holy Spirit and then turns back again is by this very act and deed said to have blasphemed against the Holy Spirit.⁴

Let no one indeed imagine from what we have said about the Holy Spirit being bestowed on the saints alone, while the blessings and activities of the Father and the Son extend to both good and evil, just and unjust,⁵ that we are hereby exalting the Holy Spirit above the Father and the Son or claiming that his dignity is greater than theirs; for this by no means follows. What we have been describing is the peculiar grace and work of the Holy Spirit. But more, nothing in the Trinity can be called greater or less,⁶ for there is but one fount of deity, who upholds the universe by his word and reason, and sanctifies 'by the spirit of his mouth' all that is worthy of sanctification, as it is written in the Psalm, 'By the word of the Lord were the heavens established, and all their power by the spirit of his mouth'.⁷

There is, however, a special activity of God the Father, beyond that which he exercised on all things in giving them natural life. There is also a special ministry of the Lord Jesus Christ towards those on whom he confers the natural gift of reason, by means of which well-being is bestowed upon them in addition to mere existence. There is yet another grace of the Holy Spirit bestowed upon such as are worthy, a grace ministered indeed through Christ, but put into operation by the Father in proportion to the merits of those who become capable or receiving it. This is most clearly pointed out by the apostle Paul, when he is explaining that the power of the Trinity is one and the same, in the passage where he says, 'There are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit; and there are diversities

¹ 1 Cor. XII. 3.

² Acts I. 8.

³ See St. Matt. XII. 32.

⁴ See St. Matt. XII. 31, 32; St. Mark III. 29.

⁵ See St. Matt. V. 45.

⁶ Koetschau (following Schnitzer, who regarded the passage from 'But more' to 'spirit of his mouth' as interpolated by Rufinus) points out that this sentence contradicts the Greek fragment on p. 33. The probability would seem to be that Rufinus has modified some such phrase as 'there is no separation in the Trinity' (see p. 37) into what appears above.

⁷ Ps. XXXIII. 6.

of ministrations, but the same Lord; and there are diversities of workings, but the same God, who worketh all things in all. But to each one is given the manifestation of the spirit as is profitable.¹ Here we are most clearly shown that there is no separation in the Trinity,² but that this which is called the 'gift of the spirit' is ministered through the Son and worked by God the Father. And yet 'all these worketh that one and the self-same spirit, dividing to each man as he will'.³

8. This then, is the testimony we bear to the unity of Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Let us now return to the original plan of our discussion.⁴ God the Father bestows on all the gift of existence; and a participation in Christ, in virtue of his being the word or reason, makes them rational. From this it follows that they are worthy of praise or blame, because they are capable alike of virtue and of wickedness. Accordingly there is also available the grace of the Holy Spirit, that those beings who are not holy in essence may be made holy by participating in this grace. When therefore they obtain first of all their existence from God the Father, and secondly their rational nature from the Word, and thirdly their holiness from the Holy Spirit, they become capable of receiving Christ afresh in his character of the righteousness of God,⁵ those, that is, who have been previously sanctified through the Holy Spirit; and such as have been deemed worthy of advancing to this degree through the sanctification of the Holy Spirit obtain in addition the gift of wisdom by the power of the working of God's Spirit. This is what I think Paul means when he says that 'to some is given the word of wisdom, to others the word of knowledge, by the same spirit'.⁶ And while pointing out the distinction of each separate gift he refers them all to the fount of the universe when he says, 'There are diversities of workings, but one God, who worketh all things in all.'⁷

Thus the working of the Father, which endows all with existence, is found to be more glorious and splendid, when each one, through participation in Christ in his character of wisdom and knowledge and sanctification, advances and comes to higher degrees of perfection; and when a man, by being sanctified through participation in the Holy Spirit, is made purer and holier, he becomes more worthy to receive the grace of wisdom and knowledge, in order that all stains of pollution and ignorance may be purged and removed and that he may make so great an advance in holiness and purity that the life which he received from God shall be such as is worthy of God, who gave it to be pure and perfect, and that that which exists shall be as

¹ 1 Cor. XII. 4-7.

² See note p. 37 above.

³ 1 Cor. XII. 11.

⁴ See Gr. Frag. pp. 33-34 above.

⁵ See 1 Cor. I. 30.

⁶ 1 Cor. XII. 8.

⁷ 1 Cor. XII. 6.

worthy as he who caused it to exist. Thus, too, the man who is such as God who made him wished him to be, shall receive from God the power to exist for ever and to endure for eternity. That this may come to pass, and that those who were made by God may be unceasingly and inseparably present with him who really exists, it is the work of wisdom to instruct and train them, and lead them on to perfection, by the strengthening and unceasing sanctification of the Holy Spirit, through which alone they can receive God.

In this way, then, through the ceaseless work on our behalf of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, renewed at every stage of our progress, we may perchance just succeed at last in beholding the holy and blessed life; and when after many struggles we have been able to attain to it we ought so to continue that no satiety of that blessing may ever possess us; but the more we partake of its blessedness, the more may the loving desire for it deepen and increase within us, as ever our hearts grow in fervour and eagerness to receive and hold fast the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. But if at any time satiety should possess the heart of one of those who have come to occupy the perfect and highest stage, I do not think that such a one will be removed and fall from his place all of a sudden. Rather must he decline by slow degrees, so that it may sometimes happen, when a slight fall has occurred, that the man quickly recovers and returns to himself. A fall does not therefore involve utter ruin, but a man may retrace his steps and return to his former state and once more set his mind on that which through negligence had slipped from his grasp.

CHAPTER IV

LOSS, OR FALLING AWAY

To show what is this loss, or fall, of those who live negligently, it seems not unreasonable to make use of an illustration. Suppose a man has gradually become skilled in the science or art, let us say, of geometry or medicine, up to the point of reaching perfection, having trained himself for a long time by instructions and exercises so as to acquire completely the knowledge of the aforesaid art. It could surely never happen that such a man should lie down to sleep with all this skill and wake up without it. It is not to the point to bring forward or take account here of accidents which happen through some injury or weakness, for these do not apply in the case we have proposed as an illustration. According to that, so long as the geometrician or doctor in question occupies himself in the studies and rational instructions relating to his art, a knowledge of the subject will remain with him. If, however, he loses interest in these exercises and neglects to work, then through this negligence his knowledge is gradually lost, a few details at first, then more, and so on until after a long time the whole vanishes into oblivion and is utterly erased from his memory. Yet if, in the first stages of his fall, when the negligence which threatens to ruin him has not gone far, he is aroused and without delay returns to himself, it is certainly possible to recover that which had but recently been lost and to renew the knowledge which by that time had been only slightly erased from his mind. Let us now apply this to those who have devoted themselves to the knowledge and wisdom of God, to learn and labour about whom surpasses all other studies in ways beyond comparison; and let us consider, in the light of our illustration, what is involved in the acquisition of this knowledge and what in its loss, especially bearing in mind what the apostle says of those who are perfect, that they shall behold the glory of the Lord 'face to face' 'by revelations of mysteries'¹ * * * * (All² rational creatures who are incorporeal and invisible, if they become negligent, gradually sink to a lower level and take to

¹ It is evident that Rufinus has omitted a considerable section at this point, for in his text there is no discussion of 'what is involved in the acquisition of this knowledge, and what in its loss'. Fragments of the missing section are found in Jerome and are inserted into the text here by Koetschau. For the N.T. allusions see 1 Cor. XIII. 2 and Rom. XVI. 25.

² See Jerome *Con. Joh. Hieros.* 16, 'We wish to know . . . whether the doctrine of Origen is true, who said that all rational creatures . . .' and as above.

themselves bodies suitable to the regions into which they descend; that is to say, first, ethereal bodies, and then aerial. And when they reach the neighbourhood of the earth they are enclosed in grosser bodies, and last of all are tied to human flesh' '* * * It is² a mark of extreme negligence and sloth for any soul to descend and to lose its own nature so completely as to be bound, in consequence of its vices, to the gross body of one of the irrational animals.)'

2. But³ in our desire to explain the divine blessings which are bestowed upon us by the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, that Trinity which is the fount of all holiness, we have somewhat digressed from our subject in these last remarks; for when the question of the soul had arisen, we felt we ought to deal with it here, seeing that we were discussing the cognate topic of our rational nature. But the subject of rational nature as a whole, with its divisions into three genera and species, will be more conveniently considered in its proper place.⁴ And with God's permission, through Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, we shall so consider it.

3. This blessed⁵ and ruling power, therefore, that is, the power that exercises control of all things, we call the Trinity. This is the good God and kindly Father of all, at once beneficent power and creative power, that is, the power that does good and creates and providentially sustains. And it is absurd and impious to suppose that these powers of God have been at any time in abeyance for a single moment. Indeed, it is unlawful even to entertain the least suspicion that these powers, through which chiefly we gain a worthy notion of God, should at any time have ceased from performing works worthy of themselves and have become inactive. For we can neither suppose that these powers which are in God, nay, which are God, could have been thwarted from without, nor on the other hand, when nothing

¹ This doctrine of the descent of the soul is found in Plato, *Phaedrus* 246 B-D, a passage clearly referred to by Origen in *Con. Cels.* IV. 40. Jerome says (*Con. Joh. Hieros.* 19), in connexion with this doctrine: 'What you admire so much we long ago despised when we found it in Plato.' Koetschau refers also to the doctrine of Carpocrates, the Gnostic, as set forth in Irenaeus *Adv. Haer.* I, XXV. 4. But there is no resemblance between the ethical system of Origen and the antinomian theories of Carpocrates beyond the fact that both are based on the idea of transmigration.

² See Jerome *Ep. ad. Avitum* 3, 'When he comes to deal with rational creatures and says that they have descended into earthly bodies through negligence, he adds the following: It is a mark of extreme negligence. . . .' and as above. Jerome says also in *Con. Joh. Hieros.* 19 that 'Origen used Jacob's ladder to teach that rational creatures descend gradually to the lowest step, namely, to flesh and blood.' This may also belong here.

³ We return to Rufinus at this point.

⁴ i.e. in Ch. V. (p. 44 ff.).

⁵ This section, to the end of Ch. IV., is found in one MS. only and has been obliterated from another. See Koetschau's ed., p. 65, note on l. 8.

stood in their way, can we believe that they were reluctant to act and perform works worthy of themselves or that they feigned impotence. We can therefore imagine no moment whatever when that power was not engaged in acts of well-doing. Whence it follows that there always existed objects for this well-doing, namely, God's works or creatures, and that God, in the power of his providence, was always dispensing his blessings among them by doing them good in accordance with their condition and deserts. It follows plainly from this, that at no time whatever was God not Creator, nor Benefactor, nor Providence.

4. Yet in this matter human intelligence is feeble and limited, when it tries to understand how during the whole of God's existence his creatures have existed also, and how those things, which we must undoubtedly believe to have been created and made by God have subsisted, if we may say so, without a beginning. Since then there is this conflict in our human thoughts and reasonings, and the soundest arguments on either side oppose and rebut one another, each bending the mind of the thinker into its own direction, this truth, which can be confessed without any risk to piety, presents itself as appropriate to the small and narrow capacity of our mind, namely, that God the Father always existed, and that he always had an only-begotten Son, who at the same time, according to the explanation we have given above, is called Wisdom. This is that Wisdom in whom God delighted when the world was finished,¹ in order that we might understand from this that God ever rejoices. In this Wisdom, therefore, who ever existed with the Father, the Creation was always present in form and outline, and there was never a time when the pre-figuration of those things which hereafter were to be did not exist in Wisdom.

5. It is probably in this way that, so far as our weakness allows, we shall maintain a reverent belief about God, neither asserting that his creatures were unbegotten and coeternal with him nor on the other hand that he turned to the work of creation to do good when he had done nothing good before. For the saying that is written, 'In wisdom hast thou made all things,'² is a true one. And certainly if 'all things have been made in wisdom', then since wisdom has always existed, there have always existed in wisdom, by a pre-figuration and pre-formation, those things which afterwards have received substantial existence. This is, I believe, the thought and meaning of Solomon when he says in Ecclesiastes: 'What is it that hath been made? The same that is to be. And what is it that hath been created? The same that is destined to be created. And there is nothing fresh under the sun. If one should speak of anything and say, Behold, this is new: it already hath been, in the ages that were before

¹ See Prov. VIII. 30 (Latin text in Lactantius, *Inst. Div.* IV. 6).

² Ps. CIV. (Sept. CIII.) 24.

us'.¹ If then particular things which are 'under the sun' have already existed in the ages which were before us—since 'there is nothing fresh under the sun'—then

GREEK

all genera² and species have for ever existed, and some would say even individual things; but either way, it is clear that God did not begin to create after spending a period in idleness.

LATIN

undoubtedly all genera and species have for ever existed, and possibly even individual things; but either way, the fact is made clear that God did not begin at a certain time to be Creator, when he had not been such before.

¹ Eccl. I. 9, 10.

² Frag. 10, from Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 528.)

CHAPTER V

RATIONAL NATURES

1. After this brief discussion which we have conducted to the best of our ability on the subject of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, our next task is to say a few words about rational natures, their species, orders and functions. We shall include not only the holy and the wicked powers, but also those who occupy a middle position between the good and the bad and are still involved in struggle and conflict. We find in the holy scriptures very many names of certain orders and functions both of the holy powers and of the opposite kind. First we shall mention these names themselves, and then we shall attempt, so far as we are able, to investigate their meaning.

There are certain holy angels of God whom Paul calls 'ministering spirits, appointed to minister on behalf of those who shall receive the inheritance of salvation'.¹ Also, in the writings of the same Saint Paul we find him giving the names, from what source I know not, of certain 'thrones, dominions, principalities and powers';² and after enumerating these, as if he thought there were yet other rational functions and orders beyond those already mentioned, he says of the Saviour, 'Who is above every principality and authority and power and dominion, and every name that is named not only in this world, but also in the world to come'.³ Here he plainly shows that besides those beings he has mentioned there are certain others, which may be named indeed in this world, but yet have not on the present occasion been enumerated by him, and which perhaps were not known to any other person; and there are others still, which cannot be named in this world, but will be named in the world to come.

2. Then in the next place we must know that every being which is endowed with reason and yet fails to adhere to the ends and ordinances laid down by reason, is undoubtedly involved in sin by this departure from what is just and right. Every rational creature is therefore susceptible of praise and of blame; of praise, if in accordance with the reason which he has in him he advances to better things; of blame, if he departs from the rule and course of what is right, in which case he is also rightly subject to pains and penalties. We must believe this to be true even of the devil himself and of those who are with him and are called his angels. But the titles of these beings must now

¹ Heb. I. 14.

² Col. I. 16.

³ Eph. I. 21.

be explained, in order that we may know who they are with whom our discussion has to deal.

The name Devil, and Satan, and Wicked one, is mentioned in many places of scripture, and he who bears it is also described as being the enemy of God. Certain 'angels of the devil'¹ are also named, and in addition a 'prince of this world';² but whether this latter is the devil himself or some other has not yet been clearly proclaimed. There are also certain 'princes of this world' mentioned, who have a wisdom which is to be destroyed;³ but whether these princes are the same as those principalities 'against whom our wrestling is',⁴ or whether they are different, no one, it seems to me, can easily decide. After the principalities there is also a mention of certain powers, against whom we wrestle and maintain a struggle, as we do also against the 'princes of this world' and the 'rulers of this darkness'; and certain 'spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places'⁵ are also mentioned by Paul. And what are we to say of the 'evil spirits' and 'impure daemons'⁶ who are mentioned in the gospels? Then again, there are some who are included under the common title of 'heavenly beings', but who are said to bend the knee, or to be destined to bend the knee, at the name of Jesus; and others again who are 'earthly' or from 'under the earth',⁷ all of whom Paul enumerates in order.

And in a place where we have been discussing the subject or rational natures it would certainly not be right to keep silence about ourselves, the race of men, who as you know are called 'rational animals'. Nor must we pass over this point, as if it were unimportant, that even in regard to us men there are references to certain different classes, as when it is said that 'the Lord's portion is his people Jacob, Israel is the cord of his inheritance',⁸ whereas other nations are said to be the portion of the angels, as, 'when the Most High divided the nations and dispersed the sons of Adam, he fixed the bounds of the nations according to the number of the angels of God'.⁹ Therefore, along with all the other rational natures, the constitution of the human soul must also be examined.

3. Such, then, are the many important names of orders and functions that are given us, and behind them it is certain that there are real existences. We must now inquire whether God, the Founder and Creator of all things, made some of these beings so holy and blessed that they could admit nothing at all that

¹ St. Matt. XXV. 41; Rev. XII. 7.

² St. John XII. 31; XIV. 30; XVI. 11.

³ See 1 Cor. II. 6.

⁴ See Eph. VI. 12.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ See St. Luke VII. 21; IV. 33.

⁷ Phil. II. 10.

⁸ Deut. XXXII. 9.

⁹ Deut. XXXII. 8.

was contrary to this nature, and others in such a way that they could become capable both of virtue and of wickedness; or whether we are to suppose that he made some to be altogether incapable of virtue, and others who can admit no wickedness whatever but can only remain in a state of blessedness, and others still who can admit either of these conditions. To begin our inquiry from the names themselves, let us consider whether the 'holy angels', from the time they first existed, always were holy, and are holy, and will be holy, and neither have ever admitted nor could ever admit an occasion of sin.

Then in the next place, let us also consider whether those who are called holy 'principalities' began from the first moment of their creation by God to exercise their 'principality' over others who had been made subject to them, and whether the latter were created in this condition and made for the very purpose of being subject and subordinate. Similarly, in regard to those who are called 'powers', let us consider whether they were created in this condition and for this very purpose, that they might exercise power, or whether it is some prize or reward of virtue that they have come to this power and dignity. Moreover, in regard to those who are called 'thrones' or 'seats', let us consider whether they were counted worthy of their seat and secure possession of blessedness from the time their personality first emerged, so that they enjoy it solely by the will of the Creator, and whether those who are called 'dominions' have had this dominion not conferred upon them as a reward for their progress but freely bestowed as a privilege of their creation, so that it is in some way a part of their nature and inseparable from them.

Now if we accept the view that the holy angels and holy powers and blessed seats and glorious virtues and splendid dominions possess their powers and dignities and glories as part of their essence, it will seem to follow undoubtedly that those beings which have been mentioned in connexion with the opposite functions must be regarded in the same way. Thus those principalities 'against whom our wrestling is' must be held not to have departed from good of their own free will and after that to have adopted the determination to resist and oppose everything good, but to have possessed this determination as part of their essence from the beginning. Similarly in regard to the powers and virtues, the evil that is in them will not be later than or subsequent to their first existence. Those, too, whom scripture has termed 'rulers and princes of the darkness of the world', inherit this realm of darkness which they rule over and possess, not as a result of perversity of will but from the necessity of their creation. Similar reasoning will force us to the same conclusion in regard to the 'spiritual hosts of wickedness' and the 'evil spirits' and 'impure daemons'.

But if this is an absurd belief to hold of the bad and opposing powers—and it certainly is absurd that the cause of their wickedness should be separated from the determination of their own will and ascribed, as something unavoidable, to their Creator—how can we fail to come to a similar conclusion in regard to the good and holy powers, namely, that goodness is not in them as part of their essence. Essential goodness is found, as we have plainly shown,¹ solely in Christ and the Holy Spirit, and of course in the Father also. For the nature of the Trinity has been shown to contain nothing that is compound, which might appear to allow these good qualities to belong to it as accidental consequences. We conclude, then, that the position of every created being is the result of his own work and his own motives, and that the powers above mentioned, which appear as holding sway or exercising authority or dominion over others, have gained this superiority and eminence over those whom they are said to govern or on whom they exercise their authority, not by some privilege of creation but as the reward of merit.

4. Yet in questions of such importance and difficulty we do not wish to base our assertions merely on a correct train of reasoning and to compel the assent of our hearers by conjectural inferences alone. Let us see, therefore, whether we can obtain any statements from the holy scriptures, by the authority of which these conclusions may be more credibly upheld. First we shall bring forward what holy scripture contains on the subject of the evil powers; and after that, with the help of such light as the Lord shall be pleased to bestow upon us, we shall make inquiry about the rest of the powers, our object being, in matters of so great difficulty, to get as near to the truth as possible and to shape our belief according to the rule of piety.

Now we find in the prophet Ezekiel two prophecies addressed to the prince of Tyre, the first of which might appear, before one had heard the second, to be spoken of some man who was prince of the Tyrians. For the present, therefore, we shall take nothing from the first one. But since the second is most evidently of such a kind that it cannot possibly refer to a man, but must be understood of some higher power, which had fallen from higher places and been cast down to lower and worse ones, we shall adduce that as an illustration which most clearly proves that these opposing and wicked powers were not so formed and created by nature, but came from better conditions and changed for the worse; and that the blessed powers also are not of such a nature as to be unable to admit qualities the opposite of their own, supposing one of them should desire to do so and should become negligent and fail to guard with the utmost caution the blessedness of his condition. For when he who is called the

¹ See Ch. II. 13 (p. 27 f.).

'prince of Tyre'¹ is related to have been 'among the holy ones' and 'without stain' and set 'in the paradise of God', 'adorned with a crown of honour and beauty', how, I ask, can we suppose such a being to have been inferior to any of the holy ones? He is described as having been 'a crown of honour and beauty' and as having walked 'in the paradise of God' 'without stain'. How then can anyone possibly suppose that such a being was not one of those holy and blessed powers which, dwelling as they do in a state of blessedness, we must believe are endowed with no other honour than this?

But let us now see what the actual words of the prophecy teach us. 'The word of the Lord', it says, came unto me, saying, Son of man, take up a lamentation for the prince of Tyre, and say unto him, Thus saith the Lord God: Thou wert a signet of likeness and a crown of honour in the delights of the paradise of God. Thou wast adorned with every fine stone and gem, and wast clothed with sardius and topaz and emerald and carbuncle and sapphire and jasper, set in gold and silver, and with agate and amethyst and chrysolite and beryl and onyx; with gold also didst thou fill thy treasures and thy store-houses in thy midst. From the day thou wast created with the cherubim, I placed thee in the holy mount of God. Thou wast in the midst of the fiery stones, thou wast stainless in thy days, from the day thou wast created until the time that iniquities were found in thee; from the multitude of thy commerce thou didst fill thy storehouses with iniquity, and thou didst sin and wast cast wounded out of the mount of God. A cherub drove thee forth from the midst of the fiery stones. Thy heart was lifted up at thine honour; thy knowledge was corrupted with thy beauty; for the multitude of thy sins I have cast thee down to the earth in the presence of kings. I have given thee for a show and a laughing-stock because of the multitude of thy sins and thine iniquities. By thy commerce thou hast polluted thy holy places. And I will bring forth fire from the midst of thee and it shall devour thee, and I will give thee for ashes and cinders on the earth in the sight of all that see thee; and all who knew thee among the nations shall mourn over thee. Thou hast been made a destruction, and thou shalt exist no more for ever.'²

Who is there that, hearing such sayings as this, 'Thou wast a signet of likeness—and a crown of honour in the delights of the paradise of God', or this, 'from the time thou wast created with the cherubim, I placed thee in the holy mount of God', could possibly weaken their meaning to such an extent as to suppose them spoken of a human being, even of a saint, not to mention the prince of Tyre? Or what 'fiery stones' can he think of, 'in the midst' of which any man could have lived?

¹ See Ezek. XXVIII. 11-19.

² Ezek. XXVIII. 11-19.

Or who could be regarded as 'stainless' from the very 'day he was created', and yet at some later time could have acts of unrighteousness found in him and be said to be 'cast forth into the earth'? This certainly indicates that the prophecy is spoken of one who, not being in the earth, was 'cast forth into the earth', whose 'holy places' also are said to be 'polluted'.

These statements, therefore, from the prophet Ezekiel concerning the prince of Tyre, must relate, as we have shown, to an adverse power, and they prove in the clearest manner that this power was formerly holy and blessed, and that he fell from this state of blessedness and was cast down into the earth 'from the time that iniquity was found in him', and that his fallen condition was not due to his nature or creation. We consider, therefore, that these statements refer to some angel, to whom had been allotted the duty of supervising the Tyrian people, whose souls also were apparently committed to his care. But what Tyre, or what souls of Tyrians we ought to understand—whether it be the city which is situated in the territory of the province of Phoenicia, or some other city of which the one we know on earth is a figure, and whether the souls are those of the actual Tyrians, or of the inhabitants of that Tyre which we understand spiritually,—there seems no need to inquire in this place. For we should appear to be investigating, in a casual manner, matters whose importance and obscurity certainly demand a work and treatment of their own.

5. Again, we are taught by the prophet Isaiah the following facts about another opposing power. He says: 'How has Lucifer, who arose in the morning, fallen from heaven. He who assailed all the nations is broken and dashed to the earth. Thou saidst indeed in thy heart, I will ascend into heaven; above the stars of heaven I will place my throne; I will sit upon a lofty mountain above the lofty mountains which are toward the north; I will ascend above the clouds; I will be like the Most High. But now shalt thou be cast down to the lower world, and to the foundations of the earth. All who see thee shall be amazed over thee and say: This is the man that afflicted the whole earth, that moved kings, that made the whole round world a desert, that destroyed cities and did not loose those who were in chains. All the kings of the nations sleep in honour, each one in his own house; but thou shalt be cast forth upon the mountains, as an accursed dead man, with the many dead that have been pierced through with swords and have descended to the lower world. As a garment clotted and stained with blood will not be clean, so too shalt thou not be clean, because thou hast ruined my land and killed my people. Thou shalt not abide henceforth for ever, thou most wicked seed. Make ready thy sons for slaughter for the sins of their father, that they rise not up and possess the earth by inheritance and fill it with wars. And I will rise

up against them, saith the Lord of Sabaoth, and I will cause their name to perish and their remnant and their seed.¹

It is most clearly proved by these words that he who formerly was Lucifer and who 'arose in the morning' has fallen from heaven. For if, as some suppose, he was a being of darkness, why is he said to have formerly been Lucifer or light-bearer? Or how could he 'rise in the morning', who had in him no light at all? Moreover the Saviour teaches us about the devil as follows: 'Lo, I see Satan fallen as lightning from heaven'.² So he was light once. Further, our Lord, who is the truth, compared even the power of his own glorious advent to lightning, in the words: 'For as the lightning shineth from one end of heaven even to the other, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be'.³ Yet he also compares Satan to lightning, and says that he fell from heaven, in order to show thereby that he was in heaven once, and had a place among the holy ones, and a share in that light in which all the holy ones share, in virtue of which the angels become 'angels of light'⁴ and the apostles are called 'the light of the world'⁵ by the Lord.

In this way, then, even Satan was once light, before he went astray and fell to this place, when 'his glory was turned into dust',⁶ which is the peculiar mark of the wicked, as the prophet also says. And so he is called the 'prince of this world',⁷ for he exercises his princely power over those who are obedient to his wickedness, since 'this whole world' (and here I take 'world' to mean this earthly place) 'lieth in the evil one',⁸ that is, in this apostate. That he is an apostate, or fugitive,⁹ the Lord also says in Job, in the following words, 'Thou wilt take with a hook the apostate dragon',¹⁰ that is, the fugitive dragon. And it is certain that the dragon means the devil himself.

The opposing powers, then, are called by the name of 'fugitives' and are said to have been at one time 'stainless'. But to be stainless is a quality which belongs essentially to none except the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; for holiness is in every created being an accidental quality, and what is accidental may also be lost. These opposing powers, however, were once stainless and dwelt indeed among those that have continued stainless until now. All this shows that no one is stainless by essence

¹ Is. XIV. 12-22.

² St. Luke X. 18.

³ St. Matt. XXIV. 27.

⁴ 2 Cor. XI. 14.

⁵ St. Matt. V. 14.

⁶ See Is. XIV. 11, 12.

⁷ St. John XII. 31; XVI. 11.

⁸ 1 St. John V. 19.

⁹ Rufinus transliterates the Greek ἀποστάτης and then gives the Latin equivalent *refuga*, runaway, fugitive, or exile.

¹⁰ Job XL. 20.

or by nature, nor is any one polluted essentially. Consequently it lies with us and with our own actions whether we are to be blessed and holy, or whether through sloth and negligence we are to turn away from blessedness into wickedness and loss; the final result of which is, that when too much progress, if I may use the word, has been made in wickedness, a man may descend to such a state (if any shall come to so great a pitch of negligence) as to be changed into what is called an opposing power.¹

¹ Jerome's version of this passage should be compared with the above, which Koetschau regards as unfaithful to the original. See Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 3. 'Moved by these considerations we believe that as a result of their own free will some are included in the number of the saints and those who serve God, while others of their own fault have departed from holiness and descended to such a pitch of negligence as to be changed into opposing powers.'

CHAPTER VI

THE END OR CONSUMMATION

1. An end or consummation is clearly an indication that things are perfected and consummated. This fact is a timely reminder to us, that if a man is seized with a desire to read and learn about these matters that are so hard and difficult to understand, he must bring with him a perfect and instructed mind. Otherwise, if he has had no experience in inquiries of this kind, they may perhaps appear to him to be vain and superfluous; or else, if he has a mind full of prejudice and preoccupations in other directions, he may think these inquiries are heretical and contrary to the faith of the Church, not so much because he is convinced by reason as because he decides according to his own prejudices. Now we ourselves speak on these subjects with great fear and caution, discussing and investigating rather than laying down fixed and certain conclusions. For we have previously pointed out what are the subjects on which clear doctrinal statements must be made, and such statements we made, I think, to the best of our ability, when speaking of the Trinity.¹ Now, however, we are dealing, as well as we can, with subjects that call for discussion rather than for definition.

The end of the world and the consummation will come when every soul shall be visited with the penalties due for its sins. This time, when everyone shall pay what he owes, is known to God alone. We believe, however, that the goodness of God through Christ will restore his entire creation to one end, even his enemies being conquered and subdued. For so says the holy scripture: 'The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet'.² And if it is not very evident what the prophetic language here means, let us learn from Paul the Apostle, who says more openly, 'Christ must reign, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet'.³ But if even this clear declaration of the Apostle is not sufficient to inform us what is the meaning of 'putting enemies under his feet', hear further what he says in the words that follow: 'For all things must be made subject to him'.⁴ What then is this 'subjection', by which 'all things must be made subject' to Christ? In my opinion it is the same subjection by which we too desire to be subjected to him, and by which the apostles and all the saints who have followed Christ were subject to him. For the word subjection, when used of

our subjection to Christ, implies the salvation, proceeding from Christ, of those who are subject; as David also said, 'Shall not my soul be subject to God? For of him cometh my salvation'.¹

2. Seeing, then, that such is the end, when 'all enemies shall have been subjected to Christ', when 'the last enemy shall be destroyed, that is, death', and when 'the kingdom shall be delivered up to God and the Father by Christ, to whom all things have been subjected',² let us, I say, from such an end as this, contemplate the beginning of things. For the end is always like the beginning; as therefore there is one end of all things, so we must understand that there is one beginning of all things, and as there is one end of many things, so from one beginning arise many differences and varieties, which in their turn are restored, through God's goodness, through their subjection to Christ and their unity with the Holy Spirit, to one end, which is like the beginning.³ I refer to all those who, by 'bending the knee in the name of Jesus',⁴ have through this very fact displayed the sign of their subjection. These are they who dwell 'in heaven and on earth and under the earth',⁵ the three terms indicating the entire universe, that is, all those beings who started from one beginning but were drawn in various directions by their own individual impulses and were distributed throughout the different ranks of existence in accordance with their merit; for in them goodness does not reside essentially, as it does in God and his Christ and in the Holy Spirit. For only in this Trinity, which is the source of all things, does goodness reside essentially. Others possess it as an accident, liable to be lost, and only then do they live in blessedness, when they participate in holiness and wisdom and in the divine nature itself.

GREEK

In the case⁶ of those who do not pay sleepless attention to themselves, changes of condition take place, more quickly or

LATIN

But if they are careless and indifferent about this participation, then each becomes the cause of his own lapse or fall,

¹ Ps. LXII. 1 (Sept. LXI. 1).

² See 1 Cor. XV. 24-27.

³ Again Rufinus has altered Origen, considerably weakening his precise statements. See Jerome *Ep. ad Avitum* 3. 'Once again a beginning arises from the end and an end from the beginning, and all things are so changed that one who is now a man may in another world become a daemon, while a daemon, if he lives negligently, may be bound to a grosser body, that is, may become a man. Thus,' continues Jerome, 'he mixes up everything, so that one may be changed from an archangel into a devil, and on the other hand a devil may turn into an angel.'

⁴ Phil. II. 10.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Frag. 11. Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 528). A comparison of the two columns will show how freely Rufinus has dealt with Origen's work, omitting some passages and expanding others.

¹ See Preface 3-10 (pp. 2-6).

² Ps. CX. 1 (Sept. CIX. 1).

³ 1 Cor. XV. 25.

⁴ 1 Cor. XV. 27, 28.

GREEK

more slowly, and to a greater or less extent, according to the individual fault. So, arising out of this fault, by a divine judgment corresponding to the better or worse movements of each and in accordance with merit, one will have in the future order of things the rank of angel; or the power of a ruler; or authority over certain beings; or a throne over subjects; or lordship over slaves.

LATIN

one more quickly and another more slowly, one to a greater and another to a lesser extent, by the fault of his own personal slothfulness. Now, as we have said, the particular fall or lapse by which each one departs from its original state is capable of exhibiting the greatest diversity, corresponding to the movements of the mind and will, so that one recedes but slightly, another more seriously, to lower things. Here then we see the just judgment of God's providence, that diversity of conduct is taken into account and each is treated according to the deserts of his departure and defection from goodness. Certain of those, indeed, who have continued in that beginning which we have described as being like the end that is to come, have allotted to them in the ordering and arrangement of the world, the rank of angel, others that of powers, others that of principalities, others that of authorities (clearly in order to exercise authority over those who 'need to have authority above their head');¹ while others have the rank of thrones, the duty of judging and ruling those who need this, and others have lordship, doubtless over slaves. All these privileges the divine providence, by a fair and just judgment, has conferred upon them as a reward for their merit and for the progress they have made in imitating and participating in God.

¹ See 1 Cor. XI. 10.

GREEK

Others, however, who have not been utterly cast out, will have a subordinate position assigned them below those above mentioned. And thus, generally speaking, from among those who have been set under the rulers and authorities and thrones and lordships, even from these the human race will one day be constituted in the world in unity. . . .

LATIN

Those, however,¹ who have moved from their state of primal blessedness, yet not beyond the possibility of return, have been made subject to the rule and governance of those holy and blessed orders whom we have just described; and if they make use of the help of these and become reformed by their precepts and salutary discipline, they may return and be restored to their state of blessedness. It is probably from among these, so far as I am able to judge, that the order of our human race was constituted, in the hope of restoring it in the age to come, or in the ages beyond that, when there shall be the 'new heaven and new earth',² of which Isaiah speaks, to that unity

LATIN

which the Lord Jesus promises when he prays to God the Father for his disciples, 'I pray not for these alone, but also for all who shall believe on me through their word, that they all may be one; as I, Father, am in thee, and thou art in me, that so they may be one in us';³ and again when he says, 'That they may be one, as we are one, I in them, and thou in me, that they also may be perfected in one'.⁴ The Apostle Paul also confirms this when he says, 'Till we all come to the unity of the faith, to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ';⁵ and the same apostle also exhorts us, who even now in the present life have been placed in the Church, in which we see an imitation of the future kingdom, to strive after the same pattern of unity, when he says, 'That ye all say the same things, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be

¹ Cp. Jerome *Ep. ad Avitum* 3. 'Those, however, who have descended, but whose movement has not involved them in utter ruin, will be made subject to the care and rule and governance of the principalities, powers, thrones and dominions; and perhaps out of these the human race will one day be constituted in one of the worlds that will be made when, as Isaiah says, there shall be a "new heaven and a new earth".'

² Is. LXV. 17.

³ St. John XVII. 20, 21.

⁴ St. John XVII. 22, 23.

⁵ Eph. IV. 13.

perfected in one and the same mind and in one and the same judgment'.¹

3. We must know, however, that some of those² who fell from that beginning of which we have spoken above, have given themselves over so completely to a life of unworthiness and wickedness, that they are not only regarded as unworthy of this instruction and training whereby through the flesh the human race, aided by the heavenly powers, is being instructed and trained, but on the contrary become adversaries and opponents of those who are being so trained and disciplined. The result is that all our mortal life is full of struggles and conflicts, since we are resisted and thwarted by those who can see no way back to the better state from which they fell, those, namely, who are called 'the devil and his angels',³ and other orders of wicked beings whom the apostle enumerates among the opposing powers.

GREEK

But⁴ I think that, from among those that have been made subject to the worse kind of rulers and authorities and world-powers, in each world or in certain worlds, there are some who, by reason of their good deeds and their desire to be transferred from these powers, will speedily attain manhood *

LATIN

But whether among those orders that live under the chieftainship of the devil and conform to his wickedness there are some who will one day in the ages to come succeed in turning to goodness

by reason of the power of free-will which is in them, or whether it be true that long-continued and deep-rooted wickedness turns

¹ 1 Cor. I. 10.

² See Jerome, *Ep. ad Avit.* 3. 'Those, however, who do not deserve to return to their former state by passing through a human life, will become the 'devil and his angels' and the worst kind of daemons, and will be appointed to different tasks in one of the many worlds according to their varying degrees of merit.'

³ See above p. 44 ff.

⁴ Frag. 12 (Koetschau) from Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 529) Rufinus has shortened the original. There is another paraphrase of this passage of Origen in Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 3: 'the daemons themselves and the rulers of the darkness in any world or worlds, if they desire to turn to better things, become men and so revert to their original condition, in order that being disciplined by the punishments and torments which they endure for a long or short period while in the bodies of men they may in time reach the exalted rank of the angels. It follows logically from this that any rational creature can develop out of any other, not once or suddenly but over and over again; that we may become angels or, if we live carelessly, daemons, and on the other hand daemons, if they desire to possess virtue, may attain the dignity of angels.' No opinion of Origen's was more vehemently opposed than this one which gave daemons and lost men a chance of restoration. See Rufinus *Apol.* I. 10 and Augustine, *De Civ. Dei* XXI, 17; also pp. 40-41 above.

at last from a habit into a kind of nature, you, reader, must judge; whether, that is, this portion of the creation shall be utterly and entirely out of harmony even with that final unity and concord, both in the ages that are 'seen' and 'temporal' and in those that are 'not seen' and eternal.¹ But in the meantime, alike in these ages that are 'seen' and 'temporal' and in those that are 'not seen' and 'eternal',² all those beings are arranged in a definite order proportionate to the degree and excellence of their merits. And so it happens that some in the first, others in the second, and others even in the last times, through their endurance of greater and more severe punishments of long duration, extending, if I may say so, over many ages, are by these very stern methods of correction renewed and restored, first by the instruction of angels and afterwards by that of powers yet higher in rank, so that they advance through each grade to a higher one, until at length they reach the things that are 'invisible' and 'eternal', having traversed in turn, by some form of instruction, every single office of the heavenly powers. It appears to follow from this, in my opinion, that every rational nature can, in the process of passing from one order to another, travel through each order to all the rest, and from all to each, while undergoing the various movements of progress or the reverse in accordance with its own actions and endeavours and with the use of its power of free will.

4. Now Paul says that there are some things that are 'seen' and 'temporal', while besides these there are others that are 'not seen' and 'eternal'. We ask therefore in what sense those that are 'seen' are 'temporal'? Does it mean that in all those periods and ages to come, in which the dispersion and division of the one beginning is to be restored to one and the same end and likeness, there will exist nothing whatever corresponding to this present world? Or is it rather that while the form of the things that are 'seen' passes away, their substance is by no means destroyed? Now Paul seems to confirm the latter explanation when he says; 'the form of this world shall pass away'.³ Moreover David seems to indicate the same truth when he says; 'The heavens shall perish, but thou shalt remain; and they all shall grow old as a garment, and as a cloak thou shalt change them, as a garment they shall be changed'.⁴ For if the heavens shall be 'changed', certainly that which is 'changed' does not perish; and if 'the form of this world passes away', it is not by any means an annihilation or destruction of the material

¹ Rufinus leaves the salvation of the devil and his angels an open question, though Origen had asserted it as a fact. See Jerome *Ep. ad Pamm. et Ocean.* 7 (Origen teaches that) 'after many ages and the one restoration of all things Gabriel will be in the same state as the devil, Paul as Caiaphas and virgins as prostitutes.'

² See 2 Cor. IV. 18.

³ 1 Cor. VII. 31.

⁴ Ps. CII. 26.

substance that is indicated, but the occurrence of a certain change of quality and an alteration of the outward form.

Isaiah too, when he says in prophecy that 'there shall be a new heaven and a new earth',¹ undoubtedly suggests a similar thought. For the renewal of 'heaven and earth' and the transmutation of the 'form of this world' and the alteration of the 'heavens' will undoubtedly be accomplished in readiness for those who are journeying along the way which we have indicated above,² making for that end, namely, blessedness, to which we are told that even God's enemies themselves are to be subjected, the end in which God is said to be 'all' and 'in all'.³ And if anyone thinks that in this 'end' material or bodily nature will utterly perish, he can provide no answer whatever to my difficulty, how beings so numerous and mighty can exist and live their life without bodies; since we believe that to exist without material substance and apart from any association with a bodily element is a thing that belongs only to the nature of God, that is, of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Perhaps somebody else will say that in the end every bodily substance will be so pure and refined that we must think of it as being like the ether, as it were of a heavenly purity and clearness.⁴ But exactly how it will be is known to God alone, and to those who through Christ and the Holy Spirit are the 'friends'⁵ of God.

¹ Is. LXV. 17.

² See p. 57.

³ See 1 Cor. XV. 24, 25, 28.

⁴ Jerome's version of this is as follows (*Ep. ad Avitum* 4). 'Bodily substances will utterly disappear, or at any rate in the end of all things bodies will be similar to our air and sky or to any clearer and purer body that can be conceived.'

⁵ St. John XV. 15; St. James II. 23.

CHAPTER VII

THINGS CORPOREAL AND INCORPOREAL

1. In the preceding chapters, after the place in which we set forth to the best of our ability the doctrine of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, we have dealt with and discussed the subject of rational natures.¹ We have treated this subject in a general way, rather by logical inference than by precise dogmatic statement. Let us now see what are the matters which we ought to discuss in the following pages according to our doctrine, that is, according to the faith of the Church.

All souls and all rational natures, whether holy or wicked, were made or created. All these are incorporeal in respect of their proper nature, but though incorporeal they were nevertheless made. For all things were made by God through Christ, as John teaches in general terms in the Gospel when he says: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made through him, and without him nothing was made.'² Further, the apostle Paul enumerates created things by their kinds and numbers and ranks with the object of proving that all things were made through Christ. For he says: 'All things were created in him, things in the heaven and things on earth, things visible and invisible, whether thrones, dominions, principalities or powers, all were created through him and in him, and he is before all creatures, and he is the head.'³ Plainly, then, he declares that all things were made and created 'in Christ' and 'through Christ', whether they are 'visible', that is, corporeal, or 'invisible' which I take to be none other than the incorporeal and spiritual powers. Now it is these creatures, whom he has spoken of in general terms as being either corporeal or incorporeal, that he enumerates, as it seems to me, under their various kinds in the words that follow, namely, 'thrones, dominions, principalities, authorities and powers.'

2. Let these remarks serve as an introduction to our present purpose, which is to come in due order to an inquiry about the sun, moon and stars by the method of inference. We ask whether these bodies ought to be reckoned among the 'principalities' by reason of the fact that they are said to have been made to exercise rulership, that is principality, over day and night;⁴ or whether we must suppose that they possess only that 'rule over day and night' which is involved in their office of giving

¹ Origen refers to Chs. V. and VI.

² Col. I. 16-18.

³ St. John I. 1-3.

⁴ See Gen. I. 16.

light and are not princes belonging to the order and office of the 'principalities'. Now when it is said that 'all things were made through him'¹ and 'in him were created all things, whether, things in the heaven or things on earth',² we cannot doubt that those bodies which are 'in the firmament' (this being another name for heaven), in which those luminaries are said to have been 'set',³ are to be numbered among the heavenly things. Then again, since the course of our discussion has clearly revealed that all things were made or created, and that among the things that were made there is nothing which does not admit of good and evil and have a capacity for either, how shall we regard as reasonable the opinion held by some even of our own people about the sun, moon and stars, that these are unchangeable and incapable of becoming the opposite of what they are? Some too have entertained this belief about the holy angels, and there are heretics who even apply it to certain souls, which are called by them 'spiritual natures'.⁴

First, then, let us see what reason itself can discover about the sun, moon and stars, namely, whether it is correct to suppose, as some do, that they are exempt from the possibility of change;⁵ and so far as we can let us first employ statements from the holy scriptures. Now Job appears to show that not only is it possible for the stars to be subject to sins, but that they are in fact 'not clean' from the pollution of sin. For he writes as follows: 'The stars also are not clean in his sight'.⁶ This is certainly not meant to refer to the brightness of their body, as if, for example, one were to say that a certain garment was not clean. Were it to be understood thus, an injurious reflexion would undoubtedly be cast upon the Creator by the charge that there was something unclean in the brightness of their body. For if the stars are unable either by their own diligent efforts to assume for themselves a clearer body or by their slackness a less pure

¹ St. John I. 3.

² Col. I. 16.

³ See Gen. I. 17.

⁴ This was a Gnostic doctrine. Some men are by nature 'spiritual', possessing a spark of the divine life. Others, at any rate according to the earlier Gnostic teaching, are earthly and incapable of salvation. See Hastings, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, Art. Gnosticism (E. F. Scott), Vol. VI, p. 235.

⁵ It was a widespread opinion that the stars were living beings. Plato regarded them as divine (*Timaeus* 40 B). The Stoics held the same view (Cicero, *De Natura Deorum* II. 15, 39). Philo (*De Mundi Opif.* 24) says that they are pure and divine beings, but susceptible only of virtue, and not of evil. Origen probably introduced a new idea in regard to the stars when, in order to fit them into his theory of the continual progress or relapse of all rational creatures, he argued that they were capable of sin.

⁶ Job XXV. 5. Origen quotes this passage again in his *Comm. in Ioh.* I. 35, but there he more wisely adds: 'unless indeed this statement is hyperbolic'.

one, why are they blamed for being 'not clean', since they would receive no praise even if they were clean?

3. To make this point more clearly understood we must inquire, first, whether it is right to think of the sun, moon and stars as living and rational beings; next, whether their souls came into existence along with their bodies or at some previous time; and further, whether we are to understand that after the consummation of this age their souls will be released from their bodies and, just as we cease from this life, so will they cease from the work of giving light to the world. It is true that to inquire into these matters seems somewhat daring, yet impelled as we are by a keen desire to ascertain the truth, we see nothing unreasonable in examining and testing, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, all that lies within our power.

We think, therefore, that they may be called living beings from the fact that they are said to receive commands from God;¹ for commands are not usually given to any but living and rational creatures. Now the scripture says * * * commandment:² 'I have given precepts to all the stars'.³ What then are these precepts? Surely that each of the stars in its own order and its own courses should supply the world with brightness to the extent of what has been bestowed upon it. Now those which are called planets move in one kind of course, those called fixed stars in another. Here we have a most evident reminder of the fact that no movement can take place in any body which does not possess life, nor can living beings exist at any time without movement. And since the stars move with such majestic order and plan that never have we seen their course deflected in the slightest degree, is it not the height of stupidity to say that such order, such exact observance of rule and plan, is accomplished by things without reason? In Jeremiah indeed the moon is even called by the title 'queen of heaven'.⁴ But if the heavenly bodies are living and rational beings we shall doubtless observe among them instances of progress and relapse; for the statement of Job, 'the stars are not clean in his sight',⁵ appears to me to suggest some such idea as this.

4. We must now consider whether these beings, whom the course of our discussion has shown to be living and rational, would appear to have been endowed with life and bodies simultaneously, at the time when, as the scripture says, 'God made two great lights, the greater light to rule the day and the lesser

¹ Origen in *Con. Celsum* V. 11 expresses his belief that the 'sun, moon and stars pray to God who is over all through his Only-begotten'.

² Koetschau concludes that there is an omission in the text at this point, relying on Rufin. Palaest. *De Fide* 19, where it is stated that Origen quotes 'the prophet David', i.e. Ps. CIII. 18, as well as Is. XLV. 12.

³ Is. XLV. 12.

⁴ Jerem. XLIV. 17-19, 25.

⁵ Job XXV. 5.

light to rule the night; he made the stars also',¹ or whether it was not so, but that God put the spirit into them from without after their bodies were made.² My own opinion is that the spirit was put into them from without; nevertheless it will be worth while to prove this from the scriptures. We shall see that it is easy to prove this assertion by inference, but more difficult if we appeal to the witness of the scriptures. Now by inferences it may be shown to be true in the following way. If the soul of a man, which while it remains the soul of a man is certainly inferior, can be proved not to have been formed with the body but separately, and placed in the body from without, much more will this be the case with the souls of those who are called 'heavenly beings'.

Now with regard to man, how could it be possible that the soul of him who 'supplanted his brother in the womb',³ that is, Jacob, was formed at the same time as his body? Or how could the soul or formative principle of him who, while still lying in his mother's womb, was filled with the Holy Spirit, have been formed at the same time as his body? I mean John, who 'leaped in his mother's womb' and tossed himself about with great joy because the voice of Mary's salutation had sounded in the ears of his mother Elizabeth.⁴ How could the soul and formative principle of him who 'before he was fashioned in the womb' is said to have been 'known by God' and 'before he came to the birth was sanctified by him',⁵ have been formed at the same time as his body? Otherwise it would appear that God fills some men with the Holy Spirit regardless of justice and their merits and sanctifies them when they have done nothing to deserve it. And if that were so, how should we avoid the difficulty expressed in that passage in which it is said, 'Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid.'⁶ Or this, 'Is there respect of persons with God?'⁷ For this is the consequence of that line of argument which maintains that souls come into existence at the same time as their bodies.

(The sun⁸ also, and the moon and the rest of the heavenly bodies are living beings; and moreover, just as we men for

¹ Gen. I. 16. ² See above p. 4. ³ Gen. XXV. 22-26.

⁴ See St. Luke I. 41, 44. ⁵ See Jerem. I. 5. ⁶ Rom. IX. 14.

⁷ Rom. II. 11.

⁸ Koetschau inserts in the text this passage from Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 4. He follows Schnitzer in placing it here because Jerome definitely associates it with the quotation from Romans VIII. 20, 21, which occurs at the beginning of paragraph 5. The passage is clearly meant to give a true representation of the original, though not perhaps in a strict translation. In the quotation which follows it (see p. 65 n. 2) Jerome claims to give Origen's own words. In another passage (Jerome, *Con. Ioh. Hieros.* 17) he gives Origen's doctrine as follows: 'the sun itself and the moon and the whole host of the stars are souls of creatures once rational and incorporeal, but now subject to vanity, that is to fiery bodies, which

certain sins have been enveloped in these bodies of ours, which are gross and heavy, so the lights of heaven have been given bodies of one sort or another to enable them to provide more or less light, while the daemons, for greater offences, have been clothed with aerial bodies).

GREEK

And that¹ the soul of the sun is older than the covering which serves it for a body can, I think, be logically shown from a comparison of the sun with man, and after that from the scriptures.

LATIN

So far, then, as we can draw inferences from a comparison with the conditions of human life, it follows, I think, that whatever is shown by reason and scriptural authority to be true for men ought much more to be regarded as true in the case of the heavenly beings.

LATIN

5. But let us see whether we can find in holy scripture any passages that refer strictly to the heavenly beings themselves. Paul the apostle speaks as follows: 'the creation was subjected to vanity, not of its own will, but by reason of him who subjected it in hope, because the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the sons of God.'² To what 'vanity', pray, was the creation subjected, and what 'creation' is meant, and how 'not of its own will', and with what 'hope'; how, too, shall 'the creation itself be delivered from the bondage of corruption'? Moreover the same apostle says elsewhere: 'the expectation of the creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God'.³ And again elsewhere: 'not only so, but the creation itself groaneth and travaileth together in pain until now'.⁴ The question arises, 'What is its groaning, and what its pains?' But first let us see what is the 'vanity' to which the creation was subjected. My own opinion is, that this is nothing else than the possession of bodies, for even though the bodies of the stars are composed of ether, they are nevertheless material. This, it seems to me, is the reason why Solomon arraigns the whole bodily universe as being in a way burdensome and as impeding the activity of spirits, thus: 'Vanity of vanities, all is vanity, said the Preacher; all

we in our ignorance and simplicity call the lights of the world'. Justinian also (*Ep. ad Mennam*—*Mansi* IX. 513) charges Origen with saying that 'the sky and the sun and moon and stars and the waters above the heavens are living and rational powers'. Rufinus has apparently toned down the original and changed its order, but he does not seem to have omitted much at this point.

¹ Frag. 13, Koetschau, from Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam*. (*Mansi* IX. 532).

² Rom. VIII. 20, 21.

³ Rom. VIII. 23, 22.

⁴ Rom. VIII. 19.

is vanity'.¹ 'For', he adds, 'I looked and I saw all things that are under the sun, and behold, all is vanity.'²

This then is the 'vanity' to which the creation was subjected, and above all that creation which is certainly the greatest thing in this world and which holds a distinguished pre-eminence by reason of its function. That is, the sun, moon and stars are said to have been subjected to vanity, because they were clothed with bodies and set to perform the task of giving light to the human race. And this creation, scripture says, was subjected to vanity 'not of its own will'.³ For it did not undertake a service to vanity by the exercise of free-will, but in obedience to the wish of him who was subjecting it, because he who subjected it promised those who were being given over unwillingly to vanity that on the fulfilment of their splendid work of service they should be delivered from this bondage of corruption and vanity, when the time of redemption 'of the glory of the sons of God' should have come. Having received this hope, and looking for the fulfilment of this promise, the entire creation now in the meantime 'groans together' with us (for it even has sympathy with those whom it serves) and 'is in pain together', while in patience it hopes for what has been promised.⁴

Consider also the following passage, and see whether this other saying of Paul may not perhaps apply to these beings who not willingly, but in obedience to the will of him who subjected them and with the hope of promises to come were subjected to vanity. 'I could desire,' he says, 'to be dissolved (or "to depart") and be with Christ; for it is far better.'⁵ For I think

GREEK

For I consider⁶ that the sun might say that it was a finer thing to be dissolved and be with Christ; for it is very far better. And whereas Paul adds: 'But to abide in the flesh is more needful for your sakes',⁷ the sun might say: 'To abide in this heavenly body is more needful for the sake of the revealing of the children of God'. And the same may be said of the moon and the rest of the heavenly bodies.

¹ Eccl. I. 2.

² Eccl. I. 14.

³ Rom. VIII. 20.

⁴ See Rom. VIII. 21, 22.

⁵ Phil. I. 23.

⁶ Frag. 14, Koetschau, from Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 532).

⁷ Phil. I. 24.

LATIN

that the sun too might say, 'I could desire to be dissolved (or "to depart") and be with Christ; for it is far better.' And whereas Paul adds: 'But to abide in the flesh is more needful for your sakes',⁷ the sun might say: 'To abide in this heavenly and shining body is more needful for the sake of the revealing of the sons of God.' The same may well be believed and said of the moon and stars.

LATIN

Let us now see what is meant by the 'freedom of the creation' and its 'deliverance from bondage'.¹ (When² at the end and consummation of the world souls and rational creatures have been released as it were from their bars and prisons by the Lord, some of them by reason of indolence will move but slowly, while others by earnest effort will speed along in brisk flight. And since all have free will and of their own accord can acquire either virtues or vices, the former will be in a much worse condition than they are now, while the latter will arrive at a better state. For differences of movement and will in either direction will lead to different states; that is, angels may become men or daemons, and on the other hand daemons may become men or angels.) When Christ 'shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father',³ then those living beings, because they have before this been made part of Christ's kingdom, shall also be delivered up along with the whole of that kingdom to the rule of the Father; so that, when 'God shall be in all',⁴ they also, since they are a part of all, may have God even in themselves, as he is in all things.

¹ See Rom. VIII. 21.

² The passage in brackets is inserted here by Koetschau, following Schnitzer, from Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 4. Jerome prefaces this passage with the statement: 'lest any one should suppose that what we say is our own, let us quote his very words.'

³ 1 Cor. XV. 24.

⁴ 1 Cor. XV. 28.

CHAPTER VIII

THE ANGELS

1. A similar course of reasoning must be applied to the angels. We must not suppose that it is the result of chance that a particular duty is assigned to a particular angel; the work of curing and healing, for instance, to Raphael; the supervising of wars to Gabriel; the task of attending to the prayers and supplications of mortals to Michael.¹ We must believe that they have obtained these duties for no other reason except their own individual merits and that they entered upon them as a reward for the zeal and virtue they displayed before the construction of this world; after which event this or that kind of duty was assigned to each member of the order of archangels, while others were counted worthy of being enrolled in the order of angels and to act under this or that archangel, or under this or that leader or chief of his order. All this, as we have said, was arranged not by chance or at random, but by the most appropriate and righteous judgment of God, being settled in accordance with merit, God himself deciding and approving. Thus to one angel would be entrusted the Church of Ephesus, to another the Church of Smyrna;² this angel would be Peter's, that Paul's;³ and so on through the entire number of those 'least ones' who are in the Church it would be decided which of the angels, who daily 'see the face of God,'⁴ must be attached to each, and also which angel it must be who was to encamp 'around them that fear God'.⁵ Certainly we must suppose that all these duties are not performed by accident or chance, nor because the angels were naturally created for them, lest in so doing we should charge the Creator with partiality. Rather must we believe that they were conferred in accordance with merit and virtue and with the activity and ability of each individual spirit, by God the most righteous and impartial governor of all things.⁶ * * * *

¹ For the names of the archangels and their tasks, see Enoch ch. XL.

² Rev. II. 1, 8.

³ See Acts XII. 7-15; XXVII. 23-4.

⁴ See St. Matt. XVIII. 10.

⁵ See Ps. XXXIV. 7.

⁶ The text of Rufinus continues on p. 68. But a long passage dealing with the creation and fall of souls has been omitted here. For evidence we have not only the considerable fragments which immediately follow, but also indications in Jerome, *Ep. ad Ephes.* I., where reference is made to 'those who suppose that before the creation of the world souls dwelt with the angels and the other powers in the heavenly Jerusalem'; and in Jerome, *Apol.* ii. 8, 'some suppose that souls were made long ago, that is, at the time when God created all things out of nothing; but that now by his own judgment he has ordained that they should be born in the body. This is the opinion of Origen and other Greeks'. See Int. pp. xxvii-xxviii.

GREEK

God¹ did not begin to create minds * * before the ages² minds were all pure, both daemons and souls and angels, offering service to God and keeping his commandments. But the devil, who was one of them, since he possessed free-will, desired to resist God, and God drove him away. With him revolted all the other powers. Some sinned deeply and became daemons, others less and became angels; others still less and became archangels; and thus each in turn received the reward for his individual sin. But there remained some souls who had not sinned so greatly as to become daemons, nor on the other hand so very lightly as to become angels. God therefore made the present world and bound the soul to the body as a punishment. For God is no 'respector of persons',³ that among all these beings who are of one nature (for all the immortal beings are rational) he should make some daemons, some souls and some angels; rather is it clear that God made one a daemon, one a soul and one an angel as a means of punishing each in proportion to its sin. For if this were not so, and souls had no pre-existence, why do we find some new-born babes to be blind, when they have committed no sin, while others are born with no defect at all? But it is clear that certain sins existed before the souls, and as a result of these sins each soul receives a recompense in proportion to its deserts. They are⁴ sent forth from God as a punishment, that they must undergo on earth a first judgment. That is why the body is called a frame, because the soul is enclosed within it.⁵

But when⁶ they had revolted from their former blessedness they were endowed with bodies in consequence of the fall from their first estate which had taken place in them, and allotted to

¹ God did not . . . to p. 68 'his right hand'. Frag. 15 Koetschau. The passage is a composite one, made up from sources which will be indicated in these notes. The first sentence is from Antipater of Bostra in John of Damascus, *Sacra Parallela* ii. 770 (Migne P. G. 96, p. 501).

² 'Before the ages' . . . to 'deserts', from Leontius Byz. *De Sectis*, Act. X. 5 (Migne P. G. 86 i., pp. 1264-5).

³ Acts X. 34.

⁴ 'They are sent forth . . . ' to end of paragraph, is from Epiphanius, *Haer.* lix. 4 (Migne P. G. 41, pp. 1076-7).

⁵ The play upon words is between *δέμας*, the body (i.e. 'the frame or stature of man', Liddell & Scott), and *δεδέσθαι*, to be bound. In Justinian's *Ep. Synod.* (Mansi IX. 536) this fancied derivation is attributed to Plato, but incorrectly. Plato called the body a 'tomb' (*σῶμα*, *σῆμα*, *Crat.* 400 BC; *Gorg.* 493 A) and spoke of the soul as being 'bound' to it (*διαδεδεμένην Phaedo* 82 E).

⁶ This sentence is formed by Koetschau out of two passages from Antipater of Bostra in John of Damascus, *Sacra Parallela*, ii. 770 and 771. (Migne P. G., 96, pp. 504, 505).

various ranks. So from being 'minds' they have become angels, archangels * * * *

LATIN

Just as the daemons,¹ sitting by the altars of the Gentiles, used to feed on the steam of the sacrifices, so also the angels, allured by the blood of the victims which Israel offered as symbols of spiritual things, and by the smoke of the incense, used to dwell near the altars and to be nourished on food of this sort * * *

GREEK

But when they fell away,² as the New Testament says,³ from their unity with God, they were given the rule and lordship over those who had fallen lower still and were also 'sent forth to minister to those who are to inherit salvation',⁴ though they themselves had fallen from this salvation and were in need of one to lead them back * * * He did not wish to command them to return to their original perfect blessedness, for when commanded they are, according to the prophet, 'mighty in strength to do his word' and 'to hear the voice of his words';⁵ and the Spirit's testimony cannot lie⁶ * * * They were zealous for the sake of those who had lost the 'good seed'⁷ sown by the Lord and they sought to be entrusted by the Lord with the restoration of these, although they themselves had cast away the purity of the first seed. But if they are 'mighty in strength'⁸ to do the will of God, and if they seek the destruction of the impious, this is a sign that it is on account of their good-will towards God that they stand before him⁹ and serve him and are at his right hand.

LATIN

Concerning those who maintain that spiritual natures are of different kinds.¹⁰

2. (We must take care)¹¹ not to fall into the silly and impious fables of those who pretend that spiritual natures, both those belonging to the heavenly orders and those that form the human race, are of different kinds and were therefore originated by

¹ For this Latin fragment see Theophil. Alex. *Ep. Synod.* 2 (Migne P. L. 22, p. 763).

² 'But when . . . ' to end of Greek quotation. A series of sentences extracted from Antipater of Bostra in John of Damascus, *Sacra Parallela* ii. 770-771 (Migne P. G. 96, pp. 504, 505).

³ Perhaps a reminiscence of Jude 6.

⁴ Heb. I. 14.

⁵ Ps. CIII. 20.

⁶ See St. John V. 32, X. 35

⁷ St. Matt. XIII. 24.

⁸ Ps. CIII. 20.

⁹ See St. Luke I. 19.

¹⁰ In some MSS. this title has been incorporated into the text. It is at this point that we return to Rufinus.

¹¹ Words such as these appear to be missing from the text.

different creators. For while it seems absurd, and indeed is absurd, that the differing natures of rational beings should be attributed to one and the same creator, nevertheless the objectors are ignorant of the cause of these differences. They say that it seems illogical for one and the same creator, quite apart from any reason of merit, to confer on some the authority to rule, while others are subjected to rulers, or to assign principalities to some, while others are made subject to princes. All such opinions, however, are met and refuted by the line of reasoning we have set forth above,¹ in which the cause of the diversity and variety among these beings is shown to be derived not from any unfairness on the part of the Disposer but from their own actions, which exhibit varying degrees of earnestness or laxity according to the goodness or badness of each.

But to help us perceive more readily that this is the truth about the heavenly beings, let us take examples from human life, both past and present, in order that by logical inference from things visible we may behold even the invisible.² Our opponents will admit that Paul and Peter were undoubtedly men of 'spiritual nature'.³ When therefore we find that Paul did much that was contrary to religion, in having 'persecuted the church of God',⁴ and that Peter committed so grave a sin as to affirm with an oath, when questioned by the maid that kept the door, that he did not know who Christ was,⁵ how comes it that such men, who according to our opponents are spiritual, should have fallen into sins like these? I ask the more insistently because they are in the habit of quoting over and over again the saying, 'A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit'.⁶ Well, if we grant that 'a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit', and yet by their own admission Paul and Peter were certainly sprung from the root of a good tree, how can they be imagined to have brought forth fruit so evil as this? And if they return the answer which they generally contrive, that it was not Paul who persecuted but some unknown person who was in Paul, and not Peter who denied but sometimes else who denied in Peter, then why did Paul say, if he had done no sin, that 'I am not worthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God'?⁷ And why does Peter himself 'weep bitterly'⁸ for the sin of another? This shows how foolish are all their reasonings.

3. Our contention is, however, that among all rational creatures there is none which is not capable of both good and evil. But it does not necessarily follow that, because we say

¹ See p. 45 ff.

² Rom. I. 20.

³ 1 Cor. II. 13-16.

⁴ 1 Cor. XV. 9; Gal. I. 13.

⁵ St. Matt. XXVI. 69-74; St. John XVIII. 17.

⁶ St. Matt. VII. 18; St. Luke VI. 43.

⁷ 1 Cor. XV. 9.

⁸ St. Matt. XXVI. 75; St. Luke XXII. 62.

there is no nature which cannot admit evil, we therefore affirm that every nature has admitted evil, that is, has become evil. Just as we may say that every human nature possesses the capacity to become a sailor, and yet this will not result in every man becoming a sailor; or again that it is possible for every man to learn the art of grammar or medicine, and yet this does not prove that every man is either a doctor or a schoolmaster: so when we say that there is no nature which cannot admit evil, we do not necessarily indicate that every nature has actually done so; nor on the other hand will the statement that there is no nature which may not admit good prove that every nature has admitted what is good. Our opinion is that not even the devil himself was incapable of good, but the fact that he could admit good did not lead him to desire it or to take pains to acquire virtue. For, as we learn from the passages we quoted out of the prophets, he was at one time good, when he dwelt 'in the paradise of God', 'in the midst of the cherubim'¹ Just as, therefore, he

GREEK

But² it has been shown that the devil was not created as such, but that he fell to this state³ as a result of his own wickedness. It is clear, therefore, that they too came to their state as a result of their own goodness.

LATIN

had in himself the power of admitting either good or evil, and falling away from good he turned with his whole mind to evil, so also there are other created beings who, while possessing the power to choose either, by the exercise of free will flee from evil and cleave to the good.

There is therefore no nature which may not admit good or evil, except the nature of God, which is the source of all good, and that of Christ; for Christ is wisdom, and wisdom certainly cannot admit folly; and he is righteousness, and assuredly righteousness will never receive unrighteousness; and he is word or reason, which certainly cannot become irrational; further, he is light, and we are sure that 'darkness does not comprehend'³ the light. In like manner also the nature of the Holy Spirit, which is holy, does not admit pollution, for it is holy by nature or essence.

But if any other nature is holy, it is so because it is made holy by the reception or inspiration of the Holy Spirit; the

¹ Ezek. XXVIII. 13 f.

² Frag. 16, Koetschau, from Antipater of Bostra in John of Damascus, *Sacra Parallela* ii. 771 (Migne P. G. 96, p. 505).

³ St. John I. 5.

possession of this quality does not arise from its own nature, but is an accidental addition to it, and being an addition it can also become separated and lost. So too righteousness may be possessed as an accident, and accordingly this also may be lost. And even the wisdom which we possess is still accidental, in spite of the fact that it lies within our own power to become wise through personal effort and merit, when we pay due attention to wisdom; and that while we continue to display the requisite zeal we shall always have a share in wisdom, which share will be greater or less in proportion to the merit of our conduct and the degree of our zeal. For the kindness of God, as is worthy of him, incites and attracts all things to that blessed end, when 'all sorrow and sadness and sighing shall flee away'¹ and disappear.

4. So far then as I can see, the foregoing discussion has sufficiently proved that it is not from any random or chance circumstances that the principalities hold their princedoms or the other orders are assigned their respective offices, but that each has obtained his degree of dignity in proportion to his own merits, though it is not our business to know or to inquire what the actual deeds were through which they earned their entrance into a particular order. It is enough for us, to enable us to establish the impartiality and justice of God, to be certain of this, that in accordance with the statement of the apostle Paul 'there is no respect of persons with God',² who on the contrary dispenses all his gifts in proportion to the merits and progress of each recipient. No angelic office, therefore, exists except as a reward of merit, nor do authorities wield their authority except as a result of their progress, nor do those who are called thrones, that is, authorities for judging and ruling, administer their functions except as a reward of merit, nor do the dominions exercise dominion but by merit; for this supreme and most excellent order of rational creatures in the heavenly places is thus arranged in a glorious variety of offices.

We must think of the opposing powers in precisely the same way. These have become attached to their particular place or office, so as to be 'principalities', or 'powers', or 'rulers of the darkness of the world', or 'spiritual hosts of wickedness',³ or 'malignant spirits', or 'impure daemons',⁴ not because they hold it essentially nor because they were so created; on the contrary, these ranks in wickedness have been assigned to them in proportion to their bad conduct and the progress they have made in wrong-doing. Thus there exists that other order of rational creatures, who have so utterly abandoned themselves to wickedness that they lack the desire, rather than the power, to return,

¹ Is. XXXV. 10.

² See Eph. VI. 12.

³ Rom. II. 11.

⁴ See St. Luke VII. 21; IV. 33.

so long as the frenzy of their evil deeds is a passion and a delight.

The third order of rational creatures is composed of those spirits who are judged fit by God to replenish the human race. These are the souls of men, some of whom, in consequence of their progress, we see taken up into the order of angels, those, namely, who have been made 'sons of God' or 'sons of the resurrection';¹ or those who forsaking the darkness have loved the light and have been made 'sons of the light';² or those who, after winning every fight and being changed into 'men of peace', become 'sons of peace'³ and 'sons of God'; or those who, by mortifying their members which are upon the earth⁴ and rising superior not only to their bodily nature but even to the wavering and fragile movements of the soul itself, have 'joined themselves to the Lord',⁵ being made wholly spiritual, so as to be always 'one spirit',⁶ with him, judging each individual thing in company with him, until they reach the point when they become perfect 'spiritual men' and 'judge all things', because their mind is illuminated in all holiness through the word and wisdom of God, while they themselves are utterly incapable of being judged by any man.⁷

* * * * *

GREEK

Whole⁸ nations of souls are stored away somewhere in a realm of their own, with an existence comparable to our bodily life,

¹ St. Luke XX. 36; Rom. VIII. 14.

² St. Matt. V. 9; St. Luke X. 6.

³ 1 Cor. VI. 17.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ St. Luke XVI. 8.

⁶ Col. III. 5.

⁷ See 1 Cor. II. 15.

⁸ Frag. 17a, Koetschau, a composite passage from Gregory of Nyssa, *De Anima et Resurr.* (Migne, P. G. 44, pp. 112 C-113 D) and *De Hom. Opificio* c. 28 (Migne, P. G. 44, p. 250). This passage describes Origen's teaching on the pre-existence of souls, and the successive bodies which they receive as they fall or rise in the scale of being. Koetschau's arguments for including it in the text of Origen are given in his introduction, pp. 117-118. Briefly they are as follows. Jerome (*Ep. ad Avitum* 4) asserts that Origen 'argued at very great length' (*sermone latissimo disputavit*) that angels or human souls or daemons might for serious offences be condemned to inhabit the bodies of beasts, or even of fishes. The quotation from Justinian, *Ep. ad Menam* (see p. 74, n. 2) is in accord with this. But nothing of the kind is found in Rufinus. On the contrary, he summarily dismisses the doctrine of transmigration, as one that ought not to be accepted, being supported by false interpretations of scripture. Gregory of Nyssa, however, who regarded Origen as in some respects his theological master, has a passage in which he says that 'it is the opinion of some of our predecessors, who composed works on First Principles, that before their bodies were made souls existed as a kind of nation in a realm of their own' (*De Hom. Opificio* c. 28). The allusion is clearly to Origen. In another work (*De Anima et Resurr.*) Gregory says, 'I have heard from those who hold these opinions (i.e. on transmigration) that whole nations of souls are stored away somewhere in a realm of their own . . .' The repetition of the last phrase connects the two passages. As the second

but in consequence of the fineness and mobility of their nature they are carried round with the whirl of the universe.* * * There the representations of evil and of virtue are set before them; and so long as a soul continues to abide in the good it has no experience of union with a body.¹ * * * But² by some inclination towards evil these souls lose their wings and come into bodies, first of men; then through their association with the irrational passions, after the allotted span of human life they are changed into beasts; from which they sink to the level of insensate nature. Thus that which is by nature fine and mobile, namely the soul, first becomes heavy and weighed down, and because of its wickedness comes to dwell in a human body; after that, when the faculty of reason is extinguished, it lives the life of an irrational animal; and finally even the gracious gift of sensation is withdrawn and it changes into the insensate life of a plant. From this condition it rises again through the same stages and is restored to its heavenly place. * * * On earth³ by means of virtue souls grow wings and soar aloft, but when in heaven their wings fall off through evil and they sink down and become earth-bound and are mingled with the gross nature of matter.

For if⁴ a soul has been torn away from the more exalted realm through some wickedness and after having once tasted the life of the body again becomes a man, then, since life in the flesh is admittedly far more subject to passion than the eternal and bodiless life, it follows of necessity that the soul which comes into such a life, in which the occasions of sin are more numerous, comes also into the midst of greater wickedness and is rendered more subject to passion than before. Now passion in a human soul is a likening to the irrational. And when the soul has become closely associated with the irrational it descends to the nature of the brutes; and once it has taken the road of wickedness it never ceases in its advance towards further wickedness, not even when found in the irrational state. For the cessation of evil-doing means the beginning of an impulse towards virtue; and among irrational beings virtue does not exist. Thus

one goes on to give an account of the fall of the souls, it is reasonable to suppose that it corresponds to the *sermo latissimus* of Jerome, though not perhaps literally. The thought is Platonic in origin, based upon *Phaedrus* 245-249.

¹ The passage beginning 'there the representations. . . ' and ending at 'body' is taken from Gregor. Nyss., *De Hom. Opificio* c. 28 (*init.*), where it follows the statement that 'some of our predecessors, who composed works on First Principles' (i.e. Origen), have believed that souls pre-existed in a realm of their own.

² This passage continues from 'whirl of the universe' above. Gregor. Nyss. *De Anima et Resurr.* 112 C.

³ Gregor. Nyss. *De Anima et Resurr.* 113 CD.

⁴ This passage forms part of Koetschau's Frag. 17a and is taken from Gregory of Nyssa, *De Hom. Opificio* c. 28.

the soul will of necessity continually be changed for the worse, ever advancing towards what is more degraded and always discovering something worse than the nature in which it now is. And just as the sensible nature is lower than the rational, so too there is a further fall from this to the insensible.¹

GREEK

When the soul² falls away from the good and inclines towards evil it becomes more and more involved in this. Then, unless it turns back, it is rendered brutish by its folly and bestial by its wickedness * * and it is carried towards the conditions of unreason and, so to speak, of the watery life. Then, as befits the degree of its fall into evil, it is clothed with the body of this or that irrational animal.

LATIN

We think³ that those opinions, which some are accustomed unnecessarily to inquire into and uphold, to the effect that souls depart so far from their true selves as to forget their rational nature and dignity and to sink down into the condition of irrational animals, like beasts or cattle, ought certainly not to be accepted. In support of these

LATIN

opinions they are accustomed to quote certain alleged proof passages out of the scriptures; the fact, for instance, that a beast to which a woman has unnaturally prostituted herself is deemed equally guilty with the woman and is ordered to be stoned with

¹ The quotation from Gregory of Nyssa ends here.

² Frag. 17b, Koetschau, from Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 529). Rufinus' text continues here from p. 72. Compare with it Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 4: 'At the end (i.e. of Book I.) he argues at very great length that an angel, or a human soul, or a daemon (all of which he maintains are of a single nature though diverse in their wills) may through exceedingly great carelessness be reduced to the condition of an irrational beast; and that sooner than endure the pain of their punishments and the torment of the fire they may choose to become dumb creatures and to dwell in seas or rivers or to take the body of this or that animal; so that we have to fear not only the assumption of the bodies of quadrupeds, but even of fishes.' It must be remembered, however, that Origen put forward these opinions not as settled dogmas, but as speculations devised to answer problems of human thought. He stated this specifically, according to Jerome, who continues the above quotation as follows: 'Then at the end, to avoid the charge of holding the Pythagorean doctrine of transmigration, after this wicked discussion in which he has wounded the soul of his reader, he says, These arguments must not, in our opinion, be taken as dogmas, but as inquiries and conjectures, intended to show that the problems have not been completely overlooked.' Rufinus has inserted an altered version of this caveat on p. 75.

³ Rufinus' text continues here from p. 72 above. What he says is precisely the opposite of what Origen wrote.

her;¹ or that a 'bull that gores' is commanded to be stoned:² or further, that Balaam's ass spoke, when 'God opened its mouth' and the 'dumb beast of burden, answering with human voice, reproved the madness of the prophet'.³ For our part we beg leave to mention these things not as fixed doctrines, but as opinions to be discussed and then rejected. This is our sole reason for mentioning them, namely, that we should not appear to have refused to discuss any question that has been raised. But at the proper place and time we will refute and drive away this perverse doctrine, and then show how the passages which they quote out of the holy scriptures ought to be understood.

¹ See Levit. XX. 16.

² See Exod. XXI. 29.

³ See Num. XXII. 28-30 and 2 Pet. II. 16.