

BOOK II

CHAPTER I

GREEK

THE WORLD AND THE CREATURES IN IT.¹

LATIN

1. Although the whole discussion in the preceding book has been concerned with the world and its arrangement, I think that we ought now to follow this up by dealing with a few particular questions about the world itself; for instance, about its beginning and its end; and about the events which occur between the beginning and the end by the ordering of divine providence; and about those which are supposed to occur before or after that period.

In this inquiry one fact appears clear at the outset. The entire constitution of the world is various and diverse; for it consists of rational beings, and others more divine, and of bodies of different kinds; and besides these, of dumb animals, that is, wild beasts, cattle, birds and all creatures that live in water; then secondly, of places, such as heaven or the heavens, earth, water, and also the air which is between these two, or that which men call the aether; and finally of all things which spring or grow out of the earth.

GREEK

Now² since the world is so very varied and comprises so great a diversity of rational beings,

what else can we assign as the cause of its existence

LATIN

Seeing then that the world contains this great variety, and that even among rational beings there is great diversity,—which indeed we must suppose to be the object for which all the other variety and diversity exists—what cause can be given to account for the existence of the world, especially when we bear in mind that end in which, as we argued in the preceding

GREEK

except the diversity in the fall of those who decline from unity in dissimilar ways?

LATIN

book,¹ all things shall be restored to their original state? If our argument there is admitted to be sound, what other cause can we imagine to account for the great diversity of this world except the variety and diversity of the motions and declensions of those who fell away from that original unity and harmony in which they were at the first created by God?

LATIN

These beings, disturbed and drawn away from that state of goodness, and then tossed about by the diverse motions and desires of their souls, have exchanged the one undivided goodness of their original nature for minds that vary in quality according to their different tendencies.

2. But God who, by the unspeakable skill of his wisdom, transforms and restores all things, whatever their condition, to some useful purpose and the common advantage of all, recalls these very creatures, so different from each other in mental quality, to one harmony of work and endeavour; so that, diverse though the motions of their souls may be, they nevertheless combine to make up the fulness and perfection of a single world, the very variety of minds tending to one end, perfection. For there is one power which binds and holds together all the diversity of the world and guides the various motions to the accomplishment of one task, lest so immense a work as the world should be dissolved by the conflicts of souls. It is for this reason, we think, that God, the parent of all things, in providing for the salvation of his entire creation through the unspeakable plan of his word and wisdom, has so ordered everything that each spirit or soul, or whatever else rational existences ought to be called, should not be compelled by force against its free choice to any action except that to which the motions of its own mind lead it,—for in that case the power of free choice would seem to be taken from them, which would certainly alter the quality of their nature itself—and at the same time that the motions of their wills should work suitably and usefully together to produce the harmony of a single world, some being in need of help, others able to give help, others again to provide struggles and conflicts for those who are making progress, whose diligence

¹ The Greek chapter heading is taken from Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* 8.

² Frag. 18 (Koetschau), from Justinian *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 529), Rufinus has reproduced it in an enlarged form.

¹See Bk. I, Ch. VI. 2 (p. 53 above).

will be accounted the more praiseworthy and whose rank and position recovered after their victory will be held the more securely, as it has been won through difficulty and toil.

3. Although therefore the whole world is arranged in diverse parts and functions, we must not suppose that its condition is one of discord and self-contradiction; but as our 'one body' is composed of 'many members'¹ and is held together by one soul, so we should, I think, accept the opinion that the universe is as it were an immense, monstrous animal, held together by the power and reason of God as by one soul.² This truth is, I believe, referred to by holy scripture in the following passage spoken through the prophet, 'Do not I fill heaven and earth, saith the Lord?'³ And again, 'Heaven is my throne, and earth is the footstool of my feet';⁴ and in what the Saviour said, when he tells us not to swear, 'neither by heaven, for it is the throne of God, neither by the earth, for it is the footstool of his feet';⁵ and further, in what St. Paul says in his oration to the Athenians, 'in him we live and move and have our being'.⁶ For how do we 'live and move and have our being in God' except through the fact that he binds and holds together the universe by his power? And how is heaven the 'throne of God' and earth the 'footstool of his feet', as the Saviour himself declares, except through the fact that alike in heaven and in earth God's power fills all things, as he says, 'Do not I fill heaven and earth, saith the Lord?'⁷ I do not think, therefore, that anyone will find it difficult to admit, from the passages we have quoted, that God, the parent of all things, fills and holds together the entire universe with the fulness of his power.

And now, since the argument of the preceding discussion has shown that the diverse motions of rational creatures and their varying opinions have given rise to the diversity of this world, we must see whether it may not be appropriate that the world should have a conclusion similar to its beginning.⁸ Now there is no doubt that its end must be looked for in much diversity and variety, and this variety, when found to exist at the end of this world, will in its turn provide causes and occasions of diversity in that other world which is to come after this; for clearly the end of this world is the beginning of the world to come.

4. If the course of our discussion has revealed this to be the case, it seems to follow that, as the diversity of the world cannot exist apart from bodies, we should discuss the question of bodily nature. It is evident from the observation of ordinary things that bodily nature admits of diverse and various changes,

¹ See 1 Cor. XII. 12.

² The theory of the World-soul comes from Plato, *Timaeus* 30 AB. See Zeller, *Plato and the Older Academy*, Ch. VII. 3 (p. 341, Eng. Trans. 1876).

³ Jerem. XXIII. 24.

⁴ Is. LXVI. 1.

⁵ St. Matt. V. 34 f.

⁶ Acts XVII. 28.

⁷ Jerem. XXIII. 24.

⁸ See above, p. 53.

to such an extent that it can undergo every kind of transformation; for example, wood turns into fire, fire into smoke and smoke into air; and even oil, a liquid, changes into fire.¹ Do not also articles of food whether used by men or by animals, exhibit the same fact of change? For whatever it is that we take as food, it turns into the substance of our body. Moreover it would not be difficult to explain the way in which water changes into earth or air, and air again into fire, or fire into air or air into water; in the present place, however, it is enough simply to mention these facts, as our purpose is to discuss the question of bodily matter. Now by matter we mean that which underlies bodies, namely, that from which they take their existence when qualities have been applied to or mingled with them.² We speak of four qualities, heat, cold, dryness, wetness. These qualities, when mingled with the *hyle* or matter (which matter is clearly seen to have an existence in its own right apart from these qualities we have mentioned), produce the different kinds of bodies. But although, as we have said, this matter has an existence by its own right without qualities, yet it is never found actually existing apart from them.

In regard then to this matter, which is so great and wonderful as to be sufficient for all the bodies in the world, which God willed to exist, and to be at the call and service of the Creator in all things for the fashioning of whatever forms and species he wished, receiving into itself the qualities which he had willed to bestow upon it, I cannot understand how so many distinguished men have supposed it to be uncreated, that is, not made by God himself the Creator of all things, but in its nature and power the result of chance.³ I wonder, too, how such men can find fault with those who deny that God is the Maker of this universe or that he providentially cares for it, and can charge them with impiety for believing that so great a work as the world exists without a Maker or Sustainer, when they themselves are guilty of a like impiety in saying that matter is uncreated and co-eternal with the uncreated God. Their theory is as follows: if we suppose for the sake of argument that matter did not exist, then, they say, since God could not make anything when nothing existed, he would undoubtedly have been idle, having no matter on which to work; but they believe that this matter was at his hand by chance, and not by his own provision, and they think that this thing which was discovered by

¹ See Zeller, *Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics*, Ch. IX. B. (Eng. trans. 1897, pp. 482-5).

² See Plato, *Timaeus* 51 A. 'The mother and receptive basis of the visible and sensible world is neither earth, nor air, nor fire, nor water, nor anything derived from these nor anything from which they are derived, but an invisible and formless substance, capable of receiving all.'

³ See Zeller, *Plato and the Older Academy*, Ch. VII. 1. (Eng. trans. 1876, pp. 293 ff.).

chance was able to suffice him for so immense a work and for the exercise of his mighty power, so as to subserve the plan of all his wisdom and be separated and formed into a world. This seems to me to be very absurd and characteristic of men who are utterly ignorant of the power and intelligence of an uncreated being.

But in order to look more carefully into the plan of things, let it be granted that for a little while matter did not exist, and that God, when nothing existed before, caused to exist the things which he desired. What shall we think? Would God have created a matter that should be better or greater or of a kind other than that which he did produce from his own power and wisdom, in order that things which before were not might exist? Or would he have created it worse and inferior? Or would he have created it like to and the same as that matter which these men call uncreated? I think anyone can easily discern that neither a better nor an inferior matter could have assumed the forms and species of the world, but only such a matter as that which did assume them. How then will it seem anything but impious to call that uncreated which, if we believe it to be made by God, is found beyond a doubt to be exactly the same as that which is said to be uncreated?

5. To obtain scriptural authority for believing that this is so, hear how the doctrine is confirmed in the book of Maccabees, where the mother of the seven martyrs is exhorting one of her sons to endure the tortures. She says: 'I pray you, my son, look at heaven and earth and all that is in them, and when you see all this, remember that God made it when it did not exist'.¹ Further, in the book of The Shepherd, in the first commandment, it says as follows: 'First of all believe that God is one, who created and set in order all things and caused the universe to exist out of nothing'.² Perhaps also that passage which occurs in the Psalms refers to this doctrine: 'He spake and they were made; he commanded and they were created'.³ For the statement 'he spake and they were made' seems to point to the substance of things that exist, whereas 'he commanded and they were created' seems to be spoken of the qualities by which the substance itself was moulded into form.

¹ 2 Macc. VII. 28.

² Ps. CXLVIII. 5.

³ Hermas, Mand. I. 1. See p. 2 above.

CHAPTER II

THE PERPETUITY OF BODILY NATURE

1. At this point some are wont to inquire whether, as the Father begets an only begotten Son and brings forth a Holy Spirit, not as beings who did not exist before, but in the sense that the Father is the origin and source of the Son or the Holy Spirit and no thought of before or after can be entertained in respect of them, some similar kinship or close connexion may not be understood to exist also between rational natures and bodily matter. In order to examine this question with due care and completeness they are wont to direct the beginning of their discussion to the inquiry whether this bodily nature, which supports the lives and upholds the movements of spiritual and rational minds, will last eternally like them or whether in fact it will be destroyed and utterly perish. And that this may be determined more precisely a previous inquiry seems necessary, namely, whether it is possible for rational beings to endure altogether without bodies when they have reached the height of holiness and blessedness,—a thing which to me indeed seems very difficult and well-nigh impossible—or whether it is necessary that they should always be joined to bodies. If then anyone could show a reason whereby it was possible for them to do without bodies of any kind, the consequence would seem to be that just as bodily nature was created out of nothing after a space of time and brought into being from non-existence, so too it might cease to exist when the need it had served had passed away.

2. But if it is impossible by any means to maintain this proposition, namely, that any being, with the exception of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, can live apart from a body, then logical reasoning compels us to believe that, while the original creation was of rational beings, it is only in idea and thought that a material substance is separable from them, and that though this substance seems to have been produced for them or after them, yet never have they lived or do they live without it; for we shall be right in believing that life without a body is found in the Trinity alone.¹ Now as we have said above, material substance possesses such a nature that it can undergo every kind of transformation. When therefore it is drawn down to lower beings it is formed into the grosser and more solid condition

¹ See Bk. I. Ch. II. 2 (p. 15 above). In Bk. I. Ch. VII. 1, (p. 59 above) Origen says that all rational beings are, so far as their essential nature goes, incorporeal. It is their fall which causes them to assume bodies; see Ch. IV. 1 (pp. 40-41 above). Rufinus has probably modified this passage.

of body and serves to distinguish the visible species of this world in all their variety. But when it ministers to more perfect and blessed beings, it shines in the splendour of 'celestial bodies'¹ and adorns either the 'angels of God' or the 'sons of the resurrection'² with the garments of a 'spiritual body'.³ All these beings go to make up the diverse and varied condition of the one world.

If you wish to discuss these questions more fully, it will be necessary to examine the divine scriptures very intently and diligently, with all reverence and fear of God, to see whether there can perchance be found in them any secret and hidden meaning, anything spoken in deep or veiled language (the Holy Spirit making the meaning clear⁴ to those who are worthy) about matters such as these, after more testimonies have been collected that bear on this particular point.

¹ 1 Cor. XV. 40.

³ 1 Cor. XV. 44.

² See St. Luke XX. 36; St. Matt. XXII. 30.

⁴ The phrase is taken from Heb. IX. 8.

CHAPTER III

THE BEGINNING OF THE WORLD AND ITS CAUSES

1. It remains to inquire next, whether there was another world before the one which now exists;¹ and if there was, whether it was of the same kind as the present world, or slightly different or inferior; or whether there was no world at all, but something like that 'end' which we understand will exist at the conclusion of all things, 'when the kingdom is delivered up to God, even the Father';² and whether this 'end' was in its turn the end of another world, obviously of that which preceded the beginning of the present one, and whether it was the varying falls of intellectual beings which provoked God to form a world of such variety and diversity as this.

Further, I think that the following point also calls for similar inquiry, whether after this world there will be a course of healing and improvement, very severe no doubt and full of pain to those who have refused to obey the word of God, yet a process of instruction and rational training through which those who in this present life have devoted themselves to these pursuits and, being made purer in mind, have attained here and now to a capacity for divine wisdom, may advance to a richer understanding of truth; and whether after this the end of all things follows immediately. Or again, whether for the correction and improvement of those who need it there will be yet another world, either similar to the one that now exists, or better than it, or possibly much worse; and how long will the world that comes after this exist, of whatever sort it be, or whether it will exist at all; and if there will ever be a time when there will be no world anywhere, or if there ever was a time when there was

¹ With this paragraph compare Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 5. 'In the second book he (i.e. Origen) asserts that there are innumerable worlds, not, in the manner of Epicurus, many similar worlds existing at one time, but that after the end of one world comes the beginning of another. A world existed before this world of ours, and another in turn will exist after it, and another after that, and others in constant succession. But he is in doubt whether there will ever be a world similar in every respect to another world, so that the two would appear to differ in no particular, or whether it is certain that there will never be one world quite like another and totally indistinguishable from it.' In Theophilus of Alexandria's Paschal letter, translated by Jerome in his *Ep.* 96, we also find the following: 'Nor does any man die over and over again, as Origen dared to write, in his desire to establish that most impious doctrine of the Stoics by the authority of the divine scriptures.' Rufinus has carefully avoided giving the views that Origen really expressed.

² 1 Cor. XV. 24.

no world at all; or if there have been, or shall be, many worlds; or if it will ever happen that one world will turn out to be equal to another and similar in all respects and indistinguishable from it.¹

2. To make it the more clear, then, whether bodily matter exists but for a space of time and whether, just as it did not exist before it was made, so it will be again resolved into non-existence, let us first see if it can possibly happen for any being to live without a body. For if any being can live without a body, then it is possible for all things to exist without bodies, since our previous chapter has shown that all things work towards one end.² But if all things can exist without bodies, doubtless bodily substance will cease to exist when there is no use for it.³ Yet how are we to understand the words spoken by the apostle in the passage where he discusses the resurrection of the dead? For he says, 'This corruptible must put on incorruption and this mortal must put on immortality. But when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall come to pass the saying that is written: Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy victory. O death, where is thy sting? The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law'.⁴ Some such meaning as the following seems to be suggested by the apostle. When he speaks of 'this corruptible' and 'this mortal', with the air of one who is as it were touching and displaying something, to what else can it apply except bodily matter? This matter of the body, then, which now is corruptible, shall put on incorruption when a perfect soul, instructed in the doctrines of incorruption, has begun to use it.

And I would not have you be surprised that we should use the metaphor of bodily clothing to describe a perfect soul, which on account of the word of God and his wisdom is here called

¹ Photius (*Bibl. Cod.* 109) says that Clement, Origen's predecessor at Alexandria, 'talked marvels about transigrations of souls and about many worlds having existed before Adam'.

² See above Bk. II. Ch. I., 2. (p. 77).

³ See Jerome, *Ed. ad Avitum* 5. 'If,' he says (i.e. Origen), 'as the course of the argument forces us to admit, all things have lived without bodies, then all bodily existence will be swallowed up, and that which was once created out of nothing will be resolved into nothing. And a time will come when its use will once again be necessary.' So Theophilus Alex. in Jerome *Ep.* 96: 'For if, according to the error of Origen, bodily nature is empty and transient . . . and the same author in Jerome *Ep.* 92: 'What shall I say about the resurrection of the dead, in regard to which he (i.e. Origen) most clearly blasphemes, declaring that after a succession of many ages our bodies will gradually be resolved into nothing and vanish into thin air; and, lest we should think this a trifle, he adds that the resurrection body will be not only corruptible but mortal.' Other similar passages occur in these two letters. Rufinus has again modified the out-spoken views of Origen and omitted much.

⁴ Cor. XV. 53-56.

'incorruption'. For indeed Jesus Christ himself, who is the Lord and Creator of the soul, is said to be the 'clothing' of the saints, as the apostle says, 'Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ'.¹ As therefore Christ is the clothing of the soul, so by an intelligible kind of reasoning the soul is said to be the clothing of the body; for it is an ornament of the body, covering and concealing its mortal nature. When therefore the apostle says, 'This corruptible must put on incorruption', it is as if he said, 'This body, with its corruptible nature, must receive the clothing of incorruption, that is, a soul that possesses in itself incorruption, by virtue of the fact that it has put on Christ, who is the wisdom and the word of God.' And when this body, which one day we shall possess in a more glorious form, shall have become a partaker of life, it will then, in addition to being immortal, become also incorruptible. For whatever is mortal is on that very account also corruptible, but we cannot say that what is corruptible is also mortal. For instance, we call a stone or a log corruptible, but it will not follow that we also call them mortal, for they have never lived. But since the body partakes of life, we call it mortal because the life can be and is separated from it, while in another sense we also call it corruptible.

A wonderful insight is therefore revealed in the following words of the holy apostle. Referring in the first place to bodily matter in general, that matter which, in whatever form it is found, whether carnal as now or as hereafter in the subtler and purer form which is called spiritual, the soul always makes use of, he says, 'This corruptible must put on incorruption'. In the second place, referring to the body in particular he says, 'This mortal must put on immortality'. Now what else can this 'incorruption' and 'immortality' be except the wisdom and word and righteousness of God, which mould and clothe and adorn the soul? This is the meaning of the saying that the corruptible puts on incorruption and the mortal puts on immortality. For now, although we may make great progress, still since 'we know in part and we prophesy in part' and even those things which we seem to understand are seen 'through a glass darkly',² 'this corruptible' does not yet 'put on incorruption', nor is 'this mortal' encompassed with 'immortality'; and since undoubtedly this training of ours in the body extends over a very long period, namely, up till the time the bodies themselves with which we are encompassed are found worthy of incorruption and immortality by reason of the word and wisdom and perfect righteousness of God, on this account it is said that 'this corruptible must put on incorruption and this mortal must put on immortality'.

3. Nevertheless, those who believe³ that rational creatures can ever lead a life apart from the body may at this point raise

¹ Rom. XIII. 14.

² See 1 Cor. XIII. 9, 12.

³ i.e. Origen: see quotation from Jerome in the note that follows.

such questions as the following. If it is true that 'this corruptible shall put on incorruption and this mortal shall put on immortality' and that in the end 'death shall be swallowed up', this is nothing else but a declaration that material nature is to be destroyed; for it is on material nature that death can have its effect,¹ during the time that those who are in the body have their powers of mind blunted, as it appears, by the nature of bodily matter. If, however, they exist apart from the body, they will then escape all the trouble that comes from this kind of disturbance. But since they could not of a sudden escape from all bodily clothing, they must first be supposed to abide in bodies more pure and subtle, which have in addition the property of not being conquered by death or pierced by 'death's sting',² so that finally when material nature has gradually ceased to be, death may be 'swallowed up' and destroyed 'in the end', and all its sting entirely blunted through the divine grace, which the soul has become capable of receiving and has thereby proved itself worthy of obtaining 'incorruption' and 'immortality'. And then all will indeed be able to say, 'O death, where is thy victory? O death where is thy sting. The sting of death is sin'.³ If therefore these conclusions appear logical,⁴ it follows that we must believe that our condition will at some future time be incorporeal; and if this is admitted, and it is said that all must be subjected to Christ, it is necessary that this incorporeal condition shall be the privilege of all who come within the scope of this subjection to Christ, since

GREEK

But if⁵ what has been subjected to Christ shall in the end be subjected also to God,⁶ then all

LATIN

all who have been subjected to Christ will in the end be subjected also to God the Father,⁶

¹ See Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 5. 'And in the words that follow (Origen says); if, as has been proved by reason and by the authority of the scriptures, this corruptible shall put on incorruption and this mortal shall put on immortality, and death shall be swallowed up in victory and corruption in incorruption, then perhaps also the whole of bodily nature will be destroyed, for on this alone can death have its effect.'

² 1 Cor. XV. 55, 56.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ For the passage beginning here see Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 5: 'And a little further on (Origen says); if these opinions are not contrary to the faith, perhaps we shall one day live without bodies. And if he who is perfectly subjected to Christ must be understood to be without a body, and all are to be subjected to Christ, then we too shall exist without bodies, when we have become perfectly subjected to him.'

⁵ Frag. 19 (Koetschau), from Justinian *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 529).

⁶ See Jerome *Ep. ad Avitum* 5 (following the passage last quoted): 'If all shall be subjected to God, then all will lay aside their bodies; and

GREEK

will lay aside their bodies; and I think that there will then be a dissolution of bodily nature into non-existence, to come into existence a second time if rational beings should again fall.

LATIN

to whom it is said that Christ will deliver up the kingdom. Thus it appears that then even the use of bodies will cease; and if this happens, bodily nature returns to non-existence, just as formerly it did not exist.

But let us see what those who make these assertions have to face. It will be seen to be a necessity that, if bodily nature were to be destroyed, it must be restored and created a second time. For it is apparently possible that rational creatures, who are never deprived of the power of free-will, may once again become subject to certain movements. This power is

LATIN

granted them by God lest, if they held their position for ever irremovably, they might forget that they had been placed in that final state of blessedness by the grace of God and not by their own goodness. These movements would again undoubtedly be followed by a variety and diversity of bodies, out of which a world is always composed; for it could never exist except as a result of variety and diversity, and this can in no way be produced apart from bodily matter.

4. Moreover, as for those who maintain that worlds similar to each other and in all respects alike sometimes come into existence, I do not know what proofs they can bring in support of this theory. For if it is said that there is to be a world similar in all respects to the present world, then it will happen that Adam and Eve will again do what they did before, there will be another flood, the same Moses will once more lead a people numbering six hundred thousand out of Egypt, Judas also will twice betray his Lord, Saul will a second time keep

then the entire universe of bodily things will be dissolved into non-existence; but, if necessity should demand it a second time, it would come into existence again in the event of the fall of rational creatures. For God has given souls over to struggle and conflict, in order that they may understand that their complete and final victory has been attained not by their own strength but by the grace of God. I think, therefore, that on account of the variety of causes worlds become diverse, and that the errors of those who maintain their similarity are hereby shattered.' The words 'If all . . . rational creatures' agree with Frag. 19.

the clothes of those who are stoning Stephen, and we shall say that every deed which has been done in this life must be done again.¹ I do not think that this can be established by any reasoning, if souls are actuated by freedom of choice and maintain their progress or the reverse in accordance with the power of their own will. For souls are not driven on some revolving course which brings them into the same cycle again after many ages, with the result that they do or desire this or that, but they direct the course of their deeds towards whatever end the freedom of their individual minds may aim at.

What these men say, however, is the same as if one were to maintain that if a bushel of corn were poured out on the ground it could happen that on two occasions the grains would fall in exactly the same positions, so that each single grain would lie the second time next to that grain besides which it was thrown at the first, and the bushel would be scattered in the same order and with the same marks as formerly. Certainly this is an utterly impossible thing to happen with the innumerable grains of a bushel, even if they were to be poured out again and again without ceasing for countless ages. It seems to me, then, impossible that the world could be restored again a second time with the same order and the same number of births, deaths and actions; but worlds may exist that are diverse, having variations by no means slight, so that for certain clear causes the condition of one may be better, while another for different causes may be worse, and another intermediate. What may be the number or measure of these worlds I confess I do not know; but I would willingly learn, if any man can show me.

5. This world, however, which is itself called an 'age',² is said to be the end of many ages. Now the holy apostle teaches that Christ did not suffer in the age that was before this, nor yet in the age before that; and I do not know whether it is in my power to enumerate all the previous ages in which he did not suffer. I will, however, quote the statements of Paul from which I have arrived at this point of knowledge. He says: 'But now once at the consummation of the ages he has been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.'³ He says that Christ has become a 'sacrifice' once, and that 'at the consummation of the ages he has been manifested to put away sin'.⁴ But after the present age, which is said to have been

¹ Cp. Origen *Con. Celsum* IV. 67, 68: V. 20, 21. The identical recurrence of things in cycles was a Stoic doctrine. See Hicks, *Stoic and Epicurean*, pp. 33 ff., and Arnold, *Roman Stoicism*, p. 193.

² Wisdom XIII. 9 (Sept. and R. V. marg.).

³ Hebr. IX. 26.

⁴ Jerome, in his *Apology* I. 20, says that 'your Origen allows himself to assert that Christ has often suffered and will often suffer, on the ground that what was beneficial once will be beneficial always'. Compare Book IV. Ch. III, 14 (26), on p. 310 below.

made for the consummation of other ages, there will yet be further 'ages to come'; for we learn this plainly from Paul himself when he says, 'that in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace in kindness towards us'.¹ He did not say, 'in the age to come'; nor, 'in two ages'; but, 'in the ages to come'. I think, therefore, that the indications of this statement point to many ages.

If, however, there is something greater than the ages,—so that among created beings we think of ages, but among those who exceed and surpass visible created beings, something still greater—which will perhaps exist at the 'restitution of all things',² when the universe reaches its perfect end, then possibly that period in which the consummation of all things will happen is to be understood as something more than an age. In regard to this I am influenced by the authority of holy scripture, which says, 'For an age, and still more'.³ Now when it says 'still more', undoubtedly it wishes something more than an age to be understood. And see whether that saying of the Saviour, 'I will that, where I am, these also may be there with me' and, 'as I and thou are one, that they also may be one in us',⁴ does not seem to point to something more than an age or ages, perhaps even more than the 'ages of the ages',⁵ to that period, namely, when all things are no longer in an age, but 'God is all and in all'.⁶

6. Now that we have discussed to the best of our ability these questions about the system of the world, it seems not inappropriate to inquire into the meaning of the actual term 'world'; for it is a term which is frequently shown in the holy scriptures to possess different significations. That which in Latin we speak of as *mundus*, in Greek is called *kosmos*; and *kosmos* signifies not only the world, but also an ornament. For instance in Isaiah, where a reproving speech is addressed to the 'chief daughters of Sion' and the prophet says, 'Instead of an ornament of gold for thy head thou shalt have baldness on account of thy works',⁸ he uses for ornament the same word as for world, namely, *kosmos*. It is said also that a representation of the world was to be seen on the garment of the high priest, as we find in the Wisdom of Solomon when it says, 'Upon the long garment was the entire world'.⁹ This earth of ours together with its inhabitants is also called the world, as when the scripture says, 'The whole world lieth in the evil one'.¹⁰ Clement indeed, a disciple of the apostles, mentions those whom

¹ Eph. II. 7.

² Acts III. 21.

³ This is a misinterpretation of 'from this time forth and for evermore', Ps. CXV. 18; CXXI. 8; CXXV. 2.

⁴ St. John XVII. 24, 21.

⁵ Gal. I. 5; 1 Tim. I. 17.

⁶ 1 Cor. XV. 28.

⁷ See Is. III. 17.

⁸ Is. III. 24.

⁹ Wis. XVIII. 24.

¹⁰ 1 St. John V. 19.

the Greeks call 'people of the opposite earth', and speaks of other parts of the world which none of our people can reach, nor can any of those who live there cross over to us; and these parts themselves he called 'worlds,' when he says, 'The ocean is impassable to men, and the worlds beyond it are governed by the same ordinances of God the Ruler'.¹

This universe which consists of heaven and earth is also called a world, as Paul says, 'The fashion of this world will pass away.'² Our Lord and Saviour indeed alludes to yet another world, which it is difficult to describe and depict in actual truth, beyond this visible one. For he says, 'I am not of this world';³ and the words, 'I am not of this world', suggest that he was of some other world. We have already said that it is difficult for us to explain this other world; and for this reason, that if we did so, there would be a risk of giving some men the impression that we were affirming the existence of certain imaginary forms which the Greeks call 'ideas'. For it is certainly foreign to our mode of reasoning to speak of an incorporeal world that exists solely in the mind's fancy or the unsubstantial region of thought; and how men could affirm that the Saviour came from thence or that the saints will go thither⁴ I do not see.

There is no doubt, however, that the Saviour alludes to something more glorious and splendid than this present world, and invites and exhorts all who believe in him to direct their course towards it. But whether that world, which he wishes us to know of, is one that stands widely apart and separate from this in space and quality and glory, or whether, as seems to me more likely, it excels in quality and glory but is nevertheless contained within the limits of this world, is uncertain, and in my opinion an unsuitable subject for the mind and thoughts of men. But from what Clement appears to allude to when he says, 'The ocean, which is impassable to men, and the worlds beyond it',⁵ where he uses the plural 'worlds' and indicates that they are all directed and ruled by the same providence of the most high God, he would seem to throw out to us some germs of an opinion such as this, that the entire universe of things that exist, both celestial and supercelestial, earthly and infernal may be spoken of in a general way as a single perfect world, within which or by which those other worlds that are in it must be supposed to be contained.

¹ The 'people of the opposite earth' are the Greek *antichthonēs*. See Clem. *Ad Cor.* XX. 5, 8. 'The unsearchable places of the abysses and the unfathomable realms of the lower world are controlled by the same ordinances. . . . The ocean, which men cannot pass, and the worlds beyond it, are ruled by the same injunctions of the Master.' (Kirsopp Lake's translation, Loeb Classical Library, *Apostolic Fathers*, Vol. I. p. 45).

² 1 Cor. VII. 31.

⁴ See St. John XVII. 24.

³ St. John XVII. 14, 16.

⁵ 1 Clem. *Ad Cor.* XX. 8.

Accordingly there are some who would apply the term 'world' to the spheres of the moon and the sun and the heavenly bodies called 'planets' or wanderers; and further, they would maintain that the uppermost sphere itself, which they call 'fixed', is rightly termed a world. Finally they appeal to the book of the prophet Baruch to bear witness to this assertion, because in it there are very clear indications of the seven worlds or heavens.¹ They would maintain, however, that above the sphere which they call 'fixed' there is another; and that, just as in our system the heaven contains all things that are under it, so this sphere, with its immense size and indescribable span, encloses the vast extent of all the other spheres in its yet more magnificent circuit, so that all things are within it as this earth of ours is under the heaven.² They believe that this sphere is called in the holy scriptures the 'good land' and the 'land of the living',³ and that it has its own heaven, the one we have before spoken of, in which the names of the saints are said to be written, or to have been written, by the Saviour.⁴ This heaven it is which contains and encloses that 'earth' which the Saviour in the gospel promises to the 'meek' and gentle.⁵ Further, they would say that this earth of ours, which was formerly called 'dry land', took its new name from that earth, just as our firmament was called 'heaven' after the designation of that heaven.⁶ But we have treated more fully of such opinions in the place in which we inquired into the meaning of the passage, 'In the beginning God

¹ The Greek *Apocalypse of Baruch* is an account of the journey of Baruch through five heavens. But both M. R. James (*Texts and Studies*, Vol. V., p. li, 1897) and R. H. Charles (*Apoc. and Pseudep. of O. T.* Vol. II., p. 527) regard the work as being incomplete in the form in which we have it; so that probably when Origen read it there were seven heavens described. It is called 4 Baruch by James and 3 Baruch by Charles, and is probably a Christian redaction of a Jewish work dating from early in the 2nd century.

² Koetschau quotes the following parallels. Cicero, *De Repub.* VI. 17 (*Somn. Scip.* 4). 'All things are bound together by nine circles or spheres, one of which, the outside one, is the heavenly sphere, which embraces all the rest.' Gregor. Nyss. *In Hexaem.* (Migne, P. G. 44 p. 117). 'On account of the limitless extent of the sphere of the fixed stars the great wisdom of God established in the middle of the entire span the nature of the sun, to be the basis of earthly things.'

³ See Exod. III. 8; Deut. VIII. 8; Jerem. XI. 19; Ps. XXVII. 13; CXLII. 5.

⁴ See St. Luke X. 20.

⁵ See St. Matt. V. 4.

⁶ See Gen. I. 10, 8 and Origen *In Psalm. Hom.* II. 4. 'There is also that other earth, of which the scripture speaks, the one that flows with milk and honey, which the Saviour in the Gospels promises to the meek, when he says: "Blessed are the meek, for they shall possess the earth". This earth which we inhabit is in its true designation called the "dry land". just as the heaven which we behold is properly called the firmament. But the firmament takes the name of heaven from the appellation of that other heaven, as the scripture teaches in Genesis.'

made the heaven and the earth'.¹ For it was shown that there is another 'heaven' and another 'earth' besides the firmament, which is said to have been made after the second day, and the 'dry land', which was afterwards called 'earth'.

Certainly what some say of this world, that it is corruptible because it was made, and yet does not go to corruption because the will of God, who made it and preserves it from being mastered by corruption, is stronger and more powerful than corruption, may more rightly be believed of that world which we have above called a 'fixed' sphere, because by the will of God it is in no way 'subject to corruption',² for the reason that it has not admitted the causes of corruption. For indeed it is a world of saints and of those who have been completely purified and not of the wicked, as our world is. Now we must see whether the apostle may not have been thinking of that world when he said, 'While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal. But we know that if the earthly house of this our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens'.³ For when it is said elsewhere, 'Because I shall see the heaven, the works of thy fingers',⁴ and when God said through the prophet about all visible things that 'My hand made all these',⁵ he declares that that 'eternal house' which he promises to the saints in heaven was not 'made with hands', which undoubtedly signifies a difference in creation between the 'things which are seen' and the 'things which are not seen'. Now the phrase 'things which are not seen' does not mean the same as 'things which are invisible'. For the things which are invisible are not only not seen, but do not even possess a nature which admits of their being seen; they are what the Greeks have called *asomata* or incorporeal.⁶ But the things of which Paul said, 'they are not seen', possess a nature which admits of their being seen; he is explaining, however, that they are not yet seen by those to whom they are promised.

7. We have outlined, then, to the best of our knowledge, these three opinions' about the end of all things and the supreme

¹ This is not found in Origen *In Gen. Hom.* I. 1, 2. See the previous note.

² See Rom. VIII. 20, 21.

³ 2 Cor. IV. 18, V. 1.

⁴ Ps. VIII. 3 A. V. and R. V. The reading above is that of VIII. 4 in Vulg. and Sept.

⁵ See Is. LXVI. 2.

⁶ See Book I, Preface 8 (p. 5 above).

⁷ Compare Jerome *Ep. ad Avitum* 5, 6. 'Three notions of the end are suggested to us, from which the reader is invited to discover the truest and best. Either we shall live without a body, when by being subjected to Christ we shall be subjected to God, and God shall be all in all; or

blessedness. Each of our readers must judge for himself, with all care and diligence, whether one of them may be approved and adopted. We have said that either we must suppose it possible to lead a bodiless existence, after 'all things have been subjected to Christ' and through Christ to God the Father, when God shall be 'all and in all';¹ or that when the universe has been subjected to Christ and through Christ to God, with whom it becomes 'one spirit'² in view of the fact that rational beings are spirits, then also the bodily substance itself, being united to the best and purest spirits, will be changed, in proportion to the quality or merits of those who wear it, into an ethereal condition, according to the apostle's saying, 'and we shall be changed',³ and will shine with light; or else that when the fashion of those things which are seen passes away⁴ and all their corruptible nature has been banished and purified, and the entire condition of the world we know, in which the spheres of the planets are said to be, is left behind and superseded, there exists above that sphere which is called 'fixed' an abiding place for the pious and blessed, in as it were a 'good land' and a 'land of the living', which the 'meek' and gentle will receive for an inheritance. To this land or earth belongs that heaven which, with its more magnificent circuit, surrounds and confines it, and this is the true heaven and the first to be so called.

In this heaven and earth the end and perfection of all things may find a safe and most sure abode. There, for instance, those who have for their offences endured the sharp reproof of punishments by way of purgation and have fulfilled and discharged every obligation may be found worthy of a dwelling-place in the earth; while those who have been obedient to the word of God and have already here by their submission shown themselves receptive of his wisdom may be said to gain the kingdom of that heaven or heavens. Thus a worthier fulfilment may be found for the saying, 'Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth', and 'Blessed are the poor in spirit, for they shall inherit the kingdom of heaven',⁵ and for what was said in the psalm,

else, just as what is subjected to Christ will with Christ himself be subjected to God and joined into one compact union, so every substance will be resolved into its highest condition and changed into ether, which is of a purer and simpler nature; or else, that that sphere which we have above called the 'fixed' sphere, and all that is comprised within its span, shall be dissolved into nothing, but that the further sphere, by which the lower zone is itself contained and bounded, will be called the "good land", while yet another sphere, which revolves around this same land and is called heaven, will serve as a dwelling-place for the saints. In talking like this (Jerome adds), is he not most plainly following the errors of the nations and foisting the ravings of philosophers on the simplicity of the Christian faith?

¹ See 1 Cor. XV. 27, 28.

² 1 Cor. XV. 52.

³ See St. Matt. V. 5, 3.

⁴ 1 Cor. VI. 17.

⁵ See 1 Cor. VII. 31; 2 Cor. IV. 18.

'He shall exalt thee, that thou shalt inherit the earth'.¹ For we speak of descending to this earth, but of being 'exalted' to that one, which is on high. In this way, therefore, there seems to be opened a road for the progress of the saints from that earth to those heavens, so that they would appear not so much to remain permanently in that earth as to dwell there in the hope of passing on, when they have made the requisite progress, to the inheritance of the 'kingdom of heaven'.

¹ Ps. XXXVII. 34.

CHAPTER IV

GREEK

THAT THERE IS ONE GOD OF THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS AND THAT THE GOD OF THE OLD AND NEW COVENANTS IS THE SAME.¹

LATIN

THAT THE GOD OF THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS, AND THE FATHER OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, IS ONE.

LATIN

1. Now that we have, to the best of our ability, discussed these matters briefly in order, it follows from the plan which we adopted at the beginning that we proceed to refute those who think that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is a different God from him who gave Moses the sayings of the law and sent the prophets, and who is the God of the fathers Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.² For it is of prime necessity that we should be firmly grounded in this article of our faith. We will consider, then, that statement which occurs frequently in the gospels and is attached to various acts of our Lord and Saviour: 'That it might be fulfilled which was spoken through "this or that" prophet,'³ where it is evident that these are prophets of that God who made the world. From this follows the conclusion that he who sent the prophets himself foretold what was to be foretold of Christ, and there is no doubt that it was the Father of Christ, and not some different being, who foretold these things. Further, the fact that illustrations are frequently drawn from the Old Testament by the Saviour and his apostles can only indicate that they both attach authority to the ancient writers. And further, the fact that when urging his disciples to the exercise of kindness, the Saviour says, 'Be ye perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect, who bids his sun rise on the good and on the evil, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust,'⁴ suggests even to a man of the smallest intelligence this most obvious meaning, that he is putting before his disciples

¹ The Greek title of this chapter is taken from Photius *Bibl. Cod.* 8.

² This was the doctrine held by Marcion, a heretical Christian teacher of the earlier half of the second century. He was puzzled by the character attributed to God in the Old Testament and declared that, although that God might be just, he could not be regarded as good or as the Father whom Jesus revealed. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* IV. 11 and Tertullian, *Con. Marc.* passim. Many of the Gnostics adopted the same doctrine, as a means of overcoming the difficulties of the Old Testament and fitting it into their systems.

³ See St. Matt. II. 15; IV. 14; VIII. 17.

⁴ St. Matt. V. 48, 45.

as a pattern for imitation no other God than the maker of heaven and the giver of the rain.

Again, when he says that those who pray must say, 'Our Father, who art in heaven',¹ what does he appear to be indicating, if not that God must be sought for in the better parts of the world, that is, of his own creation? When, too, in laying down those most admirable rules about oaths he says that we are not to swear, 'neither by heaven, because it is God's throne, nor by the earth, because it is the footstool of his feet',² does he not appear to be in most open agreement with the words of the prophet, 'Heaven is my throne, and the earth is the footstool of my feet.' Further, when he cast out of the temple those who were selling 'oxen and sheep and doves' and overturned the 'tables of the moneychangers' and said, 'Take these things hence; and make not my Father's house a house of merchandise',⁴ he was undoubtedly calling that God his Father, to whose name Solomon had built the magnificent temple.

Again, the saying, 'Have ye not read what was said by God to Moses; I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob; he is not the God of the dead, but of the living',⁵ teaches us most clearly that he called the God of the patriarchs, because they were holy and living men, 'the God of the living', the same God indeed who had said in the prophets, 'I am God, and there is no God beside me'.⁶ For if the Saviour, knowing that he who is written of in the law is the God of Abraham, and that it is the same God who says, 'I am God, and there is no God beside me', confesses that this very God who, as the heretics suppose,⁷ is ignorant that there is another God above him, is the Father, he is absurdly declaring that being to be the Father who is ignorant of the existence of a higher God. If, however, God is not ignorant, but is deceiving us when he says, 'There is no God beside me', it is a greater absurdity still, to think that the Saviour should confess that his Father was a liar. From all these considerations the mind is led to this conclusion, that the Saviour knows no other Father except God the founder and creator of all things.

2. It would be a long business if we were to gather out of every passage in the gospels the proofs by which we are taught that the God of the law and the gospels is one and the same. Let us, however, touch briefly on the Acts of the Apostles, where Stephen and the apostles direct their prayers to that God 'who made heaven and earth' and who 'spoke by the mouth of his

¹ St. Matt. VI. 9.

³ Is. LXVI. 1.

⁵ St. Matt. XXII. 31, 32.

⁷ Basileides (see Hippolytus, *Philosophum*, VII. 23) and Valentinus (*ibid.* VI. 33). The Valentinians maintained that the Creator of the world made the statement (Is. XLVI. 9) in ignorance: see Irenaeus, in Epiphanius; Oehler, *Corpus haeres.* II. i., p. 348.

² See St. Matt. V. 34, 35.

⁴ See St. John II. 14-16.

⁶ Is. XLVI. 9.

holy prophets', calling him 'the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob', the God who led his people out of the land of Egypt.¹ These expressions undoubtedly direct our minds to faith in the Creator and implant an affection for him in those who have piously and faithfully accepted this truth about him; in accordance with the words of the Saviour himself who, when he was asked what was 'the greatest commandment in the law', answered, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind.' And a second is like unto it: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself'; to which he added, 'On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets'.² How is it, I ask, that he commends to the man whom he was instructing and leading on to discipleship this commandment above all others, as a means undoubtedly of kindling affection for the God of the old law, since both commandments had been previously laid down by the law in those very words?

Nevertheless, let it be granted in spite of all these most evident proofs that it is about some other and unknown God that the Saviour says, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart', and the rest. Now if the law and the prophets come, as they say,³ from the Creator, that is, from another God than him whom they call good, how can it be logical to add as he does, 'On these two commandments hang the law and the prophets'. For how can that which is strange and foreign to God depend upon him? And when Paul says, 'I give thanks to my God, whom I serve from my forefathers with a pure conscience',⁴ he shows with perfect clearness that in coming to Christ he did not come to any new God. For what other 'forefathers' of Paul can we think of except those of whom he says, 'Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I.'⁵

Further, does not the introduction to his Epistle to the Romans show precisely, to all who know how to understand Paul's letters, the very same thing, namely, what God Paul is preaching? For he says, 'Paul a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God, which he promised before by his prophets in the holy scriptures concerning his Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, but fore-ordained to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of sanctification and the resurrection from the dead of Jesus Christ our Lord',⁶ and the rest. There is also the passage which says, 'Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox when he

¹ See Acts IV. 24, 25; III. 13; V. 30; VII. 2, 32, 34.

² St. Mark XII. 28, 30, 31; St. Matt. XXII. 36, 37, 39, 40.

³ Koetschau refers to Origen, *In Jerem. hom.* XII. 5. 'The heretics say: "You see what the Creator is like. He is the God of the prophets, who says, I will not spare nor have compassion to save them from destruction. How can this God be good?"' See Jerem. XIII. 14.

⁴ 2 Tim. I. 3.

⁵ 2 Cor. XI. 22.

⁶ Rom. I. 1-4.

treadeth out the corn. Is it for the oxen that God careth? Or saith he it altogether for our sake? Yea, for our sake it was written, because he that plougheth ought to plough in hope, and he that thresheth to thresh in hope of partaking.¹ Here he shows clearly that God who gave the law says the words 'Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox when he treadeth out the corn' for our sake, that is, for the sake of the apostles, and that his care was not for the oxen but for the apostles, who were preaching the gospel of Christ. In other passages, too, Paul himself appropriates a promise of the law, speaking as follows: 'Honour thy father and mother, which is the first commandment with promise, that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long in the land, the good land, which the Lord thy God will give thee.'² In these words Paul undoubtedly declares that the law, and the God of the law, and his promises, are pleasing to him.

3. But since the supporters of this heresy are sometimes wont to beguile the hearts of very simple people by certain fallacious sophistries, I think it not unreasonable to bring forward the points raised in their arguments and to refute their deceit and falsehoods. They say that it is written, 'No man hath seen God at any time';³ yet the God whom Moses proclaims was seen by Moses himself and before that by his fathers, whereas the God who is announced by the Saviour has been seen by no one at all. Let us then ask them this question, whether the Being, whom they profess to be God and who they say is different from God the Creator, is visible or invisible. If they should say that he is visible, they will not only be proved to be in opposition to that passage of scripture which says of the Saviour that he is 'the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation',⁴ but besides this, they will run into the absurdity of saying that God has a body.⁵ For in no other way can anything be seen except by its shape and size and colour, which are properties of bodies. And if God is declared to be a body, then, since every body is made of matter, we shall find that God is made of matter too; and if so, then, since matter is undoubtedly corruptible, God will according to them be corruptible. Again, we will ask them this question also. Is matter made or uncreated, that is, not made? If they should say that it is unmade, that is, uncreated, we shall inquire whether one part of matter is God, and another part the world. But if they should answer that matter is made, it will follow undoubtedly that they confess that he whom they call God is made, which certainly neither their reason nor ours will admit.⁶

¹ 1 Cor. IX. 9, 10.

² Eph. VI. 2, 3, cited from Exod. XX. 12.

³ St. John I. 18.

⁴ Col. I. 15.

⁵ Compare with this 1 Pref. 9 (p. 6 above).

⁶ Compare with this Bk. II., I. 4 (p. 79 above).

But they will say, 'God is invisible.' Now what are you to do? If you say that he is invisible by nature, then he ought not to be visible even to the Saviour.¹ Yet in spite of this God the Father of Christ is said to be seen; for Christ says, 'He who hath seen the Son hath seen the Father also'.² This certainly involves you in serious difficulties, whereas we interpret it more correctly as referring not to sight but to understanding. For he who has understood the Son has understood the Father also. It is in this manner then that we must suppose Moses to have seen God, not by looking at him with eyes of flesh, but by understanding him with the vision of the heart and the perception of the mind, and even this in part only. For it is well-known that he, that is, the one who gave the oracles to Moses, says, 'Thou shalt not see my face, but my back'.³ Certainly these statements must be understood by the aid of that symbolism which is appropriate to the understanding of divine sayings, and those old wives' fables, which ignorant people invent on the subject of the front and back parts of God, must be utterly rejected and despised. Nor indeed must anyone suppose that we have entertained some impious thought in saying that the Father is not visible even to the Saviour, but he must consider the exact meaning of the terms we use in controverting the heretics. For we have said that it is one thing to see and be seen, another to perceive and be perceived or to know and be known. To see and be seen is a property of bodies, which it would certainly not be right to apply either to the Father or to the Son or to the Holy Spirit in their relations one with another. For the Trinity by its nature transcends the limits of vision, although it grants to those who are in bodies, that is, to all other creatures, the property of being seen one by another. But incorporeal, and above all intellectual nature is capable of nothing else but to know and be known, as the Saviour himself declares when he says, 'No one knoweth the Son save the Father, neither doth any know the Father save the Son, and he to whom the Son willeth to reveal him'.⁴ It is clear, then, that he did not say, 'No one seeth the Father save the Son', but 'No one knoweth the Father save the Son'.

4. If, however, they think that in those statements which are made in the Old Testament to the effect that God is angry or repents, or is subject to any other human emotion, they are provided with material for refuting us with the assertion that God must be believed to be entirely without passion and destitute of all these emotions, we must show them that similar statements are to be found even in the parables of the gospel, as

¹ See Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 6. 'In the same book he (i.e. Origen) says: Grant that God is invisible. If then he is invisible by nature, he will not be visible even to the Saviour.'

² St. John XIV. 9.

³ Exod. XXXIII. 23.

⁴ St. Matt. XI. 27.

when it says that God 'planted a vine' and 'let it out to husbandmen', which husbandmen killed the servants who were sent to them, and when at last the Son was sent they put him to death too, wherefore God is said to have become angry and to have taken away the vineyard from them and to have delivered the wicked husbandmen to destruction and given the vineyard to others who would 'render him the fruits in their season'.¹ Again, in the case of those citizens who, when the father of the household set out to 'receive for himself a kingdom', 'sent messengers after him saying, We will not have this man to reign over us', on the father's return after having obtained his kingdom he was angry, and commanded them to be slain before him and their city to be burnt by fire.² For ourselves, however, whenever we read of the anger of God, whether in the Old or the New Testament, we do not take such statements literally, but look for the spiritual meaning in them, endeavouring to understand them in a way that is worthy of God. But we dealt with these points, according to our poor ability, when expounding that verse of the second Psalm in which it says, 'Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and trouble them in his fury', where we showed, as best we could, in what way this ought to be understood.³

¹ See St. Matt. XXI. 33-41.

² See St. Luke XIX. 12-27.

³ See Ps. II. 5. We do not possess the explanation to which Origen here refers. In his *Hom. in Jerem.* XVIII. 6 he says: 'If you hear of the anger of God and the wrath of God, do not suppose that this anger and wrath are passions of God.'

CHAPTER V

THE JUST AND THE GOOD

I. But some are influenced by the fact that the leaders of this heresy appear to have made for themselves a distinction, saying that the just is one thing and the good another, and have applied this distinction even to the divine nature, asserting that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is a good God but not just, whereas the God of the law and prophets is just but not good.¹ I think it necessary, therefore, to answer this point as briefly as I can.

They reckon, then, that goodness is that sort of disposition by which one is led to do good to all, even when the recipient of the benefit is unworthy and does not deserve our kindness. But, as it appears to me, they have not rightly applied this definition, for they think that no good is done to him who is visited with any sorrow or hardship. Justice, however, they suppose to be the sort of disposition which renders to every man according to his deserts. Yet here again they do not rightly interpret the meaning of their own definition. For they think that justice is to do evil to the evil and good to the good; that is, according to their meaning, that one who is just will not show himself well disposed to the evil, but will behave towards them with a kind of hatred;² and they collect all the stories they can find in the Old Testament to support this view, such for example, as the story of the flood and the punishment of those who are said to have been drowned in it,³ or how Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed by a devastating rain of fire and brimstone,⁴ or how all the children of Israel died in the desert on account of their sins, so that not one of those who had set out from Egypt was found to enter the promised land except Joshua and Caleb.⁵ From the New Testament, however, they gather those sayings of pity and gentleness which the Saviour uttered when teaching his disciples and in which he is found to declare that 'none is good save one, God the Father'.⁶ Relying on this they have dared to call the Father of our Saviour Jesus Christ the good God, but to say that the God of the world is a different being, whom they are pleased to term just, but not good.

¹ The protagonist of this view was Marcion, whose teaching is described and combated in Tertullian, *Adv. Marcionem*.

² See Plato *Repub.* 331 E-336 A. ³ See Gen. VII. 4, 21-23.

⁴ See Gen. XIX. 24, 25. ⁵ See Num. XIV. 11-24, 30.

⁶ See St. Mark X. 18; St. Luke XVIII. 19.

2. Now first of all we must, I think, demand of these people an answer to the following question. How, according to their own definition, can they show the Creator to be just in punishing according to their deserts those who perished at the time of the flood, or the men of Sodom, or those who set out from Egypt, when we sometimes see far more wicked and heinous crimes committed than those for which the above mentioned people were destroyed, but do not yet see every sinner paying the just penalty of his deeds? Will they say that he who once was just has now become good? Or will they prefer to adopt this opinion, that he is just now, but patiently bears with man's offences, whereas then he was not even just, when he exterminated innocent children and babes at the breast along with monstrous and impious giants?¹

But they believe as they do because they are ignorant how to interpret any passage except literally. If this is not so, let them show how it is just, in a literal sense, for the sins of the parents to be visited on the heads of the children, and on the children's children after them, to the third and fourth generation?² We, however, do not understand such sayings in a literal sense, but as Ezekiel taught when he uttered his well-known 'proverb',³ we inquire what is the inner meaning of the proverb. Further, they ought also to explain this, how he can be just and one who 'rewards every man according to his deserts',⁴ when he punishes earthly-minded men and the devil, though they have committed nothing deserving of punishment; for if, as these men say, they were beings of an evil and ruined nature, they could not do anything good. And as for their calling him a judge, he would seem to be a judge not so much of deeds as of natures, if it be a fact that an evil nature cannot do good nor a good nature evil.

Then in the next place, if he whom they call good is good to all, undoubtedly he is good even to those who are destined to perish. Why then does he not save them? If he is unwilling, then he will not be good; if he is willing but cannot, he will not be almighty. On the other hand let them hear from the gospels how the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ 'prepares fire for the devil and his angels'.⁵ How can a work like that, so punitive and sorrowful, be associated with the good God according to their interpretation? Further, the Saviour himself, the Son of the good God, openly declares that 'if signs and wonders had been done in Tyre and Sidon they would have repented long ago, sitting in sackcloth and ashes'.⁶ Yet when he came quite near to those very towns and had entered into

¹ Gen. VI. 1-7, 17 and VII. 21 ff. Origen is fully alive to the problem of undeserved suffering.

² Exod. XX. 5, XXXIV. 7; Deut. V. 9. ³ See Ezek. XVIII. 2, 3.

⁴ Ps. LXII. 12. ⁵ St. Matt. XXV. 41. ⁶ St. Matt. XI. 21.

their 'borders',¹ why, I ask, did he decline to enter their actual territories and show their people an abundance of 'signs and wonders', if it had been certain that as a result of such actions they would 'repent in sackcloth and ashes'? As he certainly does not do this, without doubt he is abandoning to destruction men whom his very remark in the gospels shows not to have been of an evil and ruined nature; for he points out that they could have repented.

Moreover, in one of the gospel parables, when 'the king enters in to see the guests' who had been invited, he sees 'one not wearing a wedding garment' and says to him, 'Friend, how camest thou in hither not having on a wedding garment?' Then he says to the servants, 'Bind him hand and foot and cast him forth into the outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth'.² Let them tell us; who is this 'king' who entered in to see the guests, and finding one in mean garments commands him to be bound by his servants and thrust into the outer darkness? Is it indeed he whom they call 'just'? If so, why had he ordered 'good and bad' to be invited, and not directed his servants to inquire into their merits? This conduct certainly indicates the disposition not, as they say, of one who is merely just and who 'rewards according to merit',³ but of one who shows impartial kindness to all. If, however, it is necessary to understand this passage as referring to the good God, that is, either to Christ or to the Father of Christ, what more is there to object to even in the just God? Nay, what action is there which they can charge against the God of the law comparable to this, that he commanded the man, who had been invited by the servants sent by himself to call both good and bad, to be bound hand and foot and flung into the outer darkness, because of the mean garments he was wearing?

3. These arguments, which we have drawn from the authority of the scriptures, ought to suffice for the refutation of those points which the heretics are accustomed to urge. It will not seem unfitting, however, if we discuss the matter with them in a few words from the standpoint of logical reasoning also. Let us ask them, therefore, whether they know what theory of virtue and wickedness is held by men, and whether it seems logical to speak of virtues in God, or, as they think, in these two gods. Let them also answer this question: if they think that goodness is one virtue, which I take it they will undoubtedly admit, what do they say about justice? They will certainly never be so foolish, I think, as to deny that justice is a virtue. Therefore, if a virtue is something good, and justice is a virtue, undoubtedly justice is goodness. If, however, they should say that justice is not something good, the alternative is either

¹ See St. Matt. XV. 22.

² See St. Matt. XXII. 11-13.

³ See Ps. LXII. 12.

something bad, or something indifferent. Now I consider it would be stupid to answer men who said that justice was something bad; I should appear to be answering either senseless arguments or men of unsound mind. For how could that be something bad, which, as even our opponents will admit, can render good to those who are good? But if they should say it is a thing indifferent, it follows that, since justice is indifferent, then temperance and prudence and the rest of the virtues will also be accounted indifferent. What then shall we reply to Paul when he says, 'If there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things, which ye both learned and received and heard and saw in me'.¹

Let them, therefore, search the divine scriptures and tell us what the various virtues are, and not hide behind this statement of theirs that the God who 'renders to each man according to his desert' renders ill to the evil out of hatred towards them; when the truth is that those who have sinned need severer remedies for their cure, and it is for this reason that he brings upon them the afflictions which, though aiming at improvement, seem at the moment to convey a sense of pain. They do not read what is written about the hope of those who perished in the flood, of which hope Peter in his first epistle speaks as follows: 'Because Christ was put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit; in which he went and preached to the spirits who were held in prison, who were aforetime disbelieving, when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is eight souls, were saved by water, as also by a like figure baptism now saves you.'²

And in regard to Sodom and Gomorrah, let them tell us whether they believe the words of the prophets to come from God the Creator, from him, that is, who is related to have 'rained upon them a shower of fire and brimstone'.³ What does the prophet Ezekiel say of them? 'Sodom shall be restored to her former estate'.⁴ And when God afflicts those who deserve punishment, how else is it except for their good? It is he who says to the Chaldaean: 'Thou hast coals of fire; sit upon them. They shall be a help to thee'.⁵ Further, let them hear what is related in the seventy-seventh psalm, which is ascribed to Asaph, about those who fell in the desert; it says, 'When he slew them, then they sought him'.⁶ It does not say that some sought him after others had been killed, but that those who were slain perished in such a manner that when put to death they sought God. From all these illustrations it is plain that the just and good God of the law and the gospels is one and the same, and that he does good with justice and punishes in

¹ Phil. IV. 8, 9.

² 1 St. Peter III. 18-21.

³ Gen. XIX. 24.

⁴ Ezek. XVI. 55.

⁵ Is. XLVII. 14, 15 (Sept.).

⁶ Ps. LXXVIII. 34.

kindness, since neither goodness without justice nor justice without goodness can describe the dignity of the divine nature.

Let us add also the following remarks, which are necessitated by their subtle arguments. If the just is different from the good, then since evil is the opposite of good and unjust of just, undoubtedly the unjust will be different from the evil; and as the just man according to you is not good, so neither will the unjust man be evil; and again, as the good man is not just, so also the evil man will not be unjust. And how can it be anything but absurd that the good God should have an opponent who is evil, whereas the just God, whom they say is inferior to the good one, has no opponent? For Satan is called evil, but there is no other corresponding to him who is called unjust. What then shall we do? Let us retrace the steps of our argument to the point from which we started. They will not be able to say that the evil man is not unjust and the unjust man not evil? If, however, in these opposites injustice is inseparably associated with evil and evil with injustice, then undoubtedly the good man will be inseparably associated with the just and the just with the good; so that as we call evil and injustice one and the same wickedness, we should hold goodness and justice to be one and the same virtue.

4. But once again they recall us to the words of scripture, quoting that famous question of theirs. They say: it is written that 'a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can an evil tree bring forth good fruit; for a tree is known by its fruit'.¹ What do you make of this, they say? What sort of a tree the law is, is shown by its fruits, that is, by the words of its precepts. For if the law is found to be good, undoubtedly we shall believe that he who gave it is a good God; if, however, it is just rather than good, we shall think of God as a just lawgiver. But Paul the apostle says in no roundabout terms, 'The law then is good, and the commandment holy and just and good'.² It is plain from this that Paul had not learned the doctrines of those who separate the just from the good, but had been instructed by that God and illuminated by the spirit of that God who is at the same time both 'holy and good and just', and that it was through his spirit that he spoke when he said that 'the commandment of the law is holy and just and good'. And in order to show the more clearly that goodness was in the commandment to a greater degree than justice and holiness, in repeating the passage he used goodness alone instead of the three words, when he says, 'Is then that which is good death to me? God forbid'.³ He knew, of course, that goodness

¹ See Hippolytus' Epitome of the teaching of Marcion and Cerdo in *Philosophum.* X. 19, where the above saying is quoted. For the saying itself see St. Matt. VII. 18; XII. 33.

² Rom. VII. 12.

³ Rom. VII. 13.

is the general term for the virtues, while justice and holiness are particular kinds of goodness; and so, where in his former words he had mentioned the general together with the particular, in repeating the passage he fell back on the general term alone.

Further, in the words that follow Paul says, 'Sin worked death in me through that which is good'.¹ Here he includes in the general term that which before he had described by means of the particular terms. It is in this way also that we must understand the saying, 'the good man out of the good treasure of his heart brings forth good, and the evil man out of his evil treasure brings forth evil';² for here, too, good and evil are taken in the general sense, the term 'good man' undoubtedly indicating both justice and temperance, prudence and piety and everything which can be spoken of or understood as good. Similarly also does it speak of the 'evil man', who undoubtedly would be unjust and impure and everything else that in different ways disfigures the 'evil man'. For just as nobody thinks anyone to be an evil man, nor can he be evil, apart from these works of wickedness, so it is certain that nobody will be thought to be good apart from the opposite virtues.

There still remains to them the passage in the gospel, which they think is as it were specially given to them for a shield, where the Lord said, 'None is good save one, God the Father'.³ This, they say, is the proper description of the Father of Christ, who is a different being from God the creator of all things, to which creator Christ gave no title indicating goodness. Let us see, therefore, whether in the Old Testament the God of the prophets and the creator of the world and the lawgiver is not spoken of as good. What is it that is said in the Psalms, 'How good is God to Israel, to the upright in heart!'⁴ and, 'Let Israel now say that he is good, that his mercy endureth for ever.'⁵ And in the Lamentations of Jeremiah it is written, 'The Lord is good to those who wait for him, to the soul that seeketh him.'⁶ As then God is frequently called good in the Old Testament, so too the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is called just in the gospels. Indeed, in the gospel according to John our Lord himself when praying to the Father says, 'O just Father, the world hath not known thee'.⁷ And lest they should say

¹ Rom. VII. 13.

² St. Luke VI. 45.

³ See St. Mark X. 18; St. Luke XVIII. 18. For the use made of this text see Hippolytus, *Philosophum.* VII. 31. Prepon, a disciple of Marcion, said that 'the just' was a third principle, intermediate between good and evil. Marcion himself, according to Hippolytus, said that Christ, in order to be a mediator, had to be free from all connexion not only with evil but even with good, and adduced this text in support of his doctrine. The Naassenes (*ibid.* V. 7) used the same text to support their doctrine that the primal seed, the generative cause of all existence, was alone good.

⁴ Ps. LXXIII. 1.

⁵ Ps. CXVIII. 2.

⁶ Lam. III. 25.

⁷ St. John XVII. 25.

that it was the creator of the world whom our Lord, because he had taken human flesh, called Father, and that it was he whom he termed just, they are prevented by the sentence which immediately follows; for he says, 'The world hath not known thee'. For according to them it is only the good God whom the world does not know; it most certainly recognises its founder, as the Lord himself says, 'The world loves what is its own'.¹ Clearly, then, he whom they think to be the good God is said in the gospels to be just. And when time permits we shall be able to collect still more passages where in the New Testament the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is called just, and where in the Old Testament the creator of heaven and earth is called good, so that the heretics, convinced by the multitude of proofs, may at length perchance blush for shame.

¹ St. John XV. 19.

CHAPTER VI

GREEK

THE INCARNATION OF THE
SAVIOUR.¹

LATIN

THE INCARNATION OF CHRIST.

LATIN

1. Now that these points have been discussed, it is time to resume our inquiry into the incarnation of our Lord and Saviour, how he became man and dwelt among men. We have considered, to the best of our small ability, the divine nature, from a contemplation of his own works rather than from our feelings, and while beholding his visible creatures we have also by faith contemplated those that are invisible. For human frailty can neither see everything with the eyes nor comprehend everything by reason, since we men are beings weaker and frailer than all other rational creatures, those that dwell in heaven or above the heavens surpassing us in excellence. Our next task is to inquire about him who stands midway between all these creatures and God, that is, the Mediator,² whom the apostle Paul declares to be the 'firstborn of all creation'.³ And when we see what is related in the holy scriptures of his majesty, and perceive that he is called the 'image of the invisible God' and the 'firstborn of all creation', and that 'in him were created all things visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers, all were created through him and in him, and he is before all, and in him all things consist',⁴ who is the 'head of all', having as his head only God the Father, as it is written, 'the head of Christ is God';⁵ and when we see too that it is written, 'No man knoweth the Father save the Son, nor doth any know the Son save the Father'⁶—for who can know what 'wisdom' is, except him who brought it into being; or who knows for certain what 'truth' is, except the Father of truth; who indeed could trace out the universal nature of his 'Word' and of that God who is from God except God alone 'with whom the Word was'?⁷—we ought to hold it as certain that none else save the Father alone knows this Word (or reason, if he should be so called), this wisdom, this truth, of whom it is written, 'I suppose that not even the world itself could contain the books which should be written,'⁸ about the glory, that is, and about the

majesty of the Son of God. For it is impossible to put into writing all that belongs to the Saviour's glory.

When, therefore, we consider these great and marvellous truths about the nature of the Son of God, we are lost in the deepest amazement that such a being, towering high above all, should have 'emptied himself'¹ of his majestic condition and become man and dwelt among men, a fact which is evidenced by the 'grace poured upon his lips'² and by the witness which the heavenly Father bore him,³ and confirmed by the signs and wonders and mighty deeds which he did. And before that personal appearance which he manifested in the body, he sent the prophets as heralds and messengers of his coming; while after his ascension into the heavens he caused the holy apostles, unlearned and ignorant men from the ranks of tax-gatherers or fishermen but filled with his divine power, to travel throughout the world, in order to gather together out of every nation and all races a people composed of devout believers in him.

2. But of all the marvellous and splendid things about him there is one that utterly transcends the limits of human wonder and is beyond the capacity of our weak mortal intelligence to think of or understand, namely, how this mighty power of the divine majesty, the very word of the Father, and the very wisdom of God, in which were created 'all things visible and invisible',⁴ can be believed to have existed within the compass of that man who appeared in Judaea; yes, and how the wisdom of God can have entered into a woman's womb and been born as a little child and uttered noises like those of crying children; and further, how it was that he was troubled, as we are told, in the hour of death, as he himself confesses when he says, 'My soul is sorrowful even unto death';⁵ and how at the last he was led to that death which is considered by men to be the most shameful of all,—even though on the third day he rose again.

When, therefore, we see in him some things so human that they appear in no way to differ from the common frailty of mortals, and some things so divine that they are appropriate to nothing else but the primal and ineffable nature of deity, the human understanding with its narrow limits is baffled, and struck with amazement at so mighty a wonder knows not which way to turn, what to hold to, or whither to betake itself. If it thinks of God, it sees a man; if it thinks of a man, it beholds one returning from the dead with spoils after vanquishing the kingdom of death. For this reason we must pursue our contemplation with all fear and reverence, as we seek to prove how the reality of each nature exists in one and the same person, in such a way that nothing unworthy or unfitting may be thought to reside in that divine and ineffable existence, nor on the other

¹ For the Greek title see Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* 8.

² See 1 Tim. II. 5.

³ Col. I. 15.

⁴ See Col. I. 15-17.

⁵ See 1 Cor. XI. 3.

⁶ St. Matt. XI. 27.

⁷ See St. John I. 1.

⁸ St. John XXI. 25.

¹ Phil. II. 7. ² Ps. XLV. 3. ³ St. Matt. III. 17; St. Luke III. 22.

⁴ Col. I. 16.

⁵ St. Matt. XXVI. 38; St. Mark XIV. 34.

hand may the events of his life be supposed to be the illusions caused by deceptive fantasies.¹ But to utter these things in human ears and to explain them by words far exceeds the powers we possess either in our moral worth or in mind and speech. I think indeed that it transcends the capacity even of the holy apostles; nay more, perhaps the explanation of this mystery lies beyond the reach of the whole creation of heavenly beings. It is then in no spirit of rashness, but solely in response to the demands of our inquiry at this stage, that we shall state in the fewest possible words that we may term the content of our faith concerning him rather than anything which needs to be proved by arguments of human reason, bringing before you our suppositions rather than any clear affirmations.

3. The only-begotten Son of God, therefore, through whom, as the course of our discussion in the previous chapters has shown, 'all things visible and invisible were made',² according to the teaching of scripture both made all things and 'loves what he made'.³ For since he is the invisible 'image' of the 'invisible God',⁴ he granted invisibly to all rational creatures whatsoever a participation in himself, in such a way that each obtained a degree of participation proportionate to the loving affection with which he had clung to him. But whereas, by reason of the faculty of free-will, variety and diversity had taken hold of individual souls, so that one was attached to its author with a warmer and another with a feebler and weaker love, that soul of which Jesus said, 'No man taketh from me my soul',⁵ clinging to God from the beginning of the creation and ever after in a union inseparable and indissoluble, as being the soul of the wisdom and word of God and of the truth and the true light, and receiving him wholly, and itself entering into his light and splendour, was made with him in a pre-eminent degree one spirit, just as the apostle promises to them whose duty it is to imitate Jesus, that 'he who is joined to the Lord is one spirit'.⁶ This soul, then, acting as a medium between God and the flesh (for it was not possible for the nature of God to mingle with a body apart from some medium), there is born, as we said, the God-man, the medium being that existence to whose nature it was not contrary to assume a body. Yet neither, on the other hand, was it contrary to nature for that soul, being as it was a rational existence, to receive God, into whom, as we said above,

¹ i.e. as the various docetic heresies asserted.

² Col. I. 16.

³ See Wis. XI. 24.

⁴ Col. I. 15.

⁵ See Jerome *Ep. ad Avitum* 6 'And lower down he (i.e. Origen) says, No other soul, which has descended into a human body, has revealed in itself so pure and genuine a likeness to its former condition as that of which the Saviour says, No man taketh my soul from me, but I lay it down of myself.' For the text see St. John X. 18.

⁶ 1 Cor. VI. 17.

it had already completely entered by entering into the word and wisdom and truth.

It is therefore right that this soul, either because it was wholly in the Son of God, or because it received the Son of God wholly into itself, should itself be called, along with that flesh which it has taken, the Son of God and the power of God, Christ and the wisdom of God; and on the other hand that the Son of God, 'through whom all things were created', should be termed Jesus and the Son of man. Moreover the Son of God is said to have died, in virtue of that nature which could certainly admit of death, while he of whom it is proclaimed that 'he shall come in the glory of God the Father with the holy angels' is called the Son of man.¹ And for this reason, throughout the whole of scripture, while the divine nature is spoken of in human terms the human nature is in its turn adorned with marks that belong to the divine prerogative. For to this more than to anything else can the passage of Scripture be applied, 'They shall both be in one flesh, and they are no longer two, but one flesh'.² For the Word of God is to be thought of as being more 'in one flesh' with his soul than a man is with his wife. Moreover what could more appropriately be 'one spirit'³ with God than this soul, which joined itself so firmly in love to God as to be worthy of being called 'one spirit' with him?

GREEK

It was⁴ on this account also that the man became Christ, for he obtained this lot by reason of his goodness, as the prophet bears witness when he says, 'Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; wherefore God hath anointed thee, thy God with the oil of gladness above thy fellows'.⁵ It was appropriate that he who had never been separated from the Only-begotten should be called

LATIN

4. To prove that it was the perfection of his love and the sincerity of his true affection which gained for him this inseparable unity with God, so that the taking up of his soul was neither accidental nor the result of personal preference, but was a privilege conferred upon it as a reward for its virtues, listen to the prophet speaking to it thus; 'Thou hast loved righteousness and hated

¹ This is an example of the principle called the *Communicatio idiomatum*, by which qualities that are in strictness only applicable to the divine nature are sometimes predicated of the human, and *vice versa*. For the quotation see St. Matt. XVI. 27; St. Mark VIII. 38; St. Luke IX. 26.

² See St. Matt. XIX. 5, 6, from Gen. II. 24.

³ See 1 Cor. VI. 17.

⁴ Frag. 20 (Koetschau) from Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 528). The translation 'God hath anointed thee' might almost be rendered 'God hath made thee Christ', or 'the Anointed one', which would bring out Origen's meaning more clearly. Rufinus has omitted the last sentence.

⁵ Ps. XLV. 7.

GREEK

by the name of the Only-begotten and glorified together with him.

LATIN

iniquity; wherefore God hath anointed thee, thy God with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.¹

LATIN

As a reward for its love, therefore, it is anointed with the 'oil of gladness', that is the soul with the word of God is made Christ; for to be anointed with the oil of gladness means nothing else but to be filled with the Holy Spirit. And when he says, 'above thy fellows', he indicates that the grace of the Spirit was not given to it as to the prophets, but that the essential 'fulness' of the Word of God himself was within it, as the apostle said, 'In him dwelleth all the fulness of the godhead bodily'.² Finally, this is the reason why he not only said, 'Thou hast loved righteousness', but added, 'and hated iniquity'. For to hate iniquity is the same thing which the scripture says of him: 'He did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth';³ and again, 'He was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin'.⁴ Further, the Lord himself says, 'which of you convicteth me of sin?'⁵ And again he says of himself, 'Lo, the prince of this world cometh and findeth nothing in me'.⁶ All of which shows that no consciousness of sin existed in him. And the prophet, in order the more clearly to point out this fact, that the consciousness of iniquity had never entered his mind, says, 'Before the boy could know how to call for his father or mother, he turned himself from iniquity'.⁷

5. But if the above argument, that there exists in Christ a rational soul, should seem to anyone to constitute a difficulty, on the ground that in the course of our discussion we have often shown that souls are by their nature capable of good and evil,⁸ we shall resolve the difficulty in the following manner. It cannot be doubted that the nature of his soul was the same as that of all souls; otherwise it could not be called a soul, if it were not truly one. But since the ability to choose good or evil is within the immediate reach of all, this soul which belongs to Christ so chose to love righteousness as to cling to it unchangeably and inseparably in accordance with the immensity of its love; the result being that by firmness of purpose, immensity of affection and an inextinguishable warmth of love all susceptibility to change or alteration was destroyed, and what formerly depended upon the will was by the influence of long custom changed into nature. Thus we must believe that there did exist in Christ a human

¹ Ps. XLV. 7.

² Col. II. 9.

³ 1 Peter II. 22.

⁴ Heb. IV. 15.

⁵ St. John VIII. 46.

⁶ St. John XIV. 30.

⁷ Is. VIII. 4; VII. 16.

⁸ See above Bk. I. 8, 3 (p. 69).

and rational soul, and yet not suppose that it had any susceptibility to or possibility of sin.

6. To explain the matter more fully it will not appear absurd if we use an illustration, although on so high and difficult a subject there is but a small supply of suitable examples. However, if we may use this one without offence, the metal iron is susceptible of both cold and heat. Suppose then a lump of iron be placed for some time in a fire. It receives the fire in all its pores and all its veins, and becomes completely changed into fire, provided the fire is never removed from it and itself is not separated from the fire. Are we then to say that this, which is by nature a lump of iron, when placed in the fire and ceaselessly burning can ever admit cold? Certainly not; it is far truer to say of it, what indeed we often detect happening in furnaces, that it has been completely changed into fire, because we can discern nothing else in it except fire. Further, if anyone were to try to touch or handle it, he would feel the power of the fire, not of the iron. In this manner, then, that soul which, like a piece of iron in the fire, was for ever placed in the word, for ever in the wisdom, for ever in God, is God in all its acts and feelings and thoughts; and therefore it cannot be called changeable or alterable, since by being ceaselessly kindled it came to possess unchangeability through its unity with the word of God. And while, indeed, some warmth of the Word of God must be thought to have reached all the saints, in this soul we must believe that the divine fire itself essentially rested, and that it is from this that some warmth has come to all others.

The very fact, too, that it says, 'God anointed thee, thy God with the oil of gladness above thy fellows',¹ shows that that soul is anointed with the 'oil of gladness', that is, with the word of God and with wisdom, in one way, and his 'fellows', that is, the holy prophets and apostles, in another. For the latter are said 'to have run in the odour of his ointments',² but that soul was the vase containing the ointment itself, of whose glowing effluence all the prophets and apostles became worthy partakers. As therefore the odour of the ointment is one thing and the substance of the ointment another, so Christ is one thing and his fellows another. And as the vessel which contains the substance of the ointment can by no means admit any foul smell, whereas it is possible for those who share in its odour, if they move a little farther away from its glowing effluence, to admit any foul smell that meets them, so it was impossible for Christ, who is like the vase itself in which the substance of the ointment lay, to admit an odour of an opposite kind, whereas his fellows

¹ Ps. XLV. 7.

² See Song of Songs I. 3 (Vulg.).

will be partakers and receivers of his odour in proportion to their nearness to the vase.

7. I think, too, that the prophet Jeremiah understood what is the nature of the wisdom of God in him, which was also the nature he had assumed for the salvation of the world, when he said: 'The breath of our countenance is Christ the Lord, of whom we said that we shall live under his shadow among the nations.'¹ For just as the shadow of our body is inseparable from the body and unswervingly undertakes and performs the movements and gestures of the body, so I think the prophet wished to allude to the action and movement of Christ's soul, which was inseparably attached to him and performed everything in accordance with his own movement and volition, and that it was this which he called the 'shadow' of Christ the Lord, under which shadow we were to 'live among the nations'. For the nations which imitate that soul through faith and so reach salvation, live in the mystery of this assumption. Moreover when David says, 'Be mindful of my reproach, O Lord, wherewith they have reproached me in the stead of thy Christ',² he appears to me to allude to the same thing. And what else does Paul mean when he says, 'Our life is hid with Christ in God'.³ Also in another place he says, 'Do you seek a proof of him who speaks in me, that is, Christ?'⁴ Yet again, he says that Christ is 'hid in God'.⁵ Unless the meaning of this expression be something like that which, as we said above, was indicated by the prophet in the phrase 'the shadow of Christ', it probably exceeds the comprehension of the human mind.

We see moreover many other statements in the divine scriptures which bear upon the interpretation of the word 'shadow'; such as that in the gospel according to Luke, where Gabriel says to Mary, 'The Spirit of the Lord shall come upon thee and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee'.⁶ The apostle also, speaking in regard to the law, says that they who hold to the circumcision of the flesh 'serve a copy and shadow of the heavenly things'.⁷ And in another place it says, 'Is not our life on the earth a shadow?'⁸ If then both the law which is on the earth is a 'shadow', and we are to live among the nations in the 'shadow of Christ', we must consider whether the truth of all these shadows will not be learned in that revelation when, no longer 'through a mirror and in a riddle' but 'face to face',⁹ all the saints shall be counted worthy to behold the glory of God and the causes and truth of things. And seeing that a pledge of this truth has already been received through the Holy Spirit¹⁰ the apostle said, 'Even if we have formerly

¹ Lam. IV. 20.

² Ps. LXXXIX (Vulg. LXXXVIII) 51, 52.

³ Col. III. 3.

⁴ 2 Cor. XIII. 3.

⁵ ? Eph. III. 9.

⁶ St. Luke I. 35.

⁷ Heb. VIII. 5.

⁸ See Job VIII. 9.

⁹ See 1 Cor. XIII. 12.

¹⁰ See 2 Cor. V. 5.

known Christ after the flesh, yet henceforth we know him so no more'.¹

In the meantime, these are the thoughts which occur to us at the moment in our discussion of such very difficult subjects as the incarnation and deity of Christ. If there be anyone who can discover something better and prove what he says by clearer statements out of the holy scriptures, let his opinion be accepted in preference to mine.

¹ 2 Cor. V. 16.

CHAPTER VII

GREEK

THAT IT WAS THE SAME SPIRIT
WHO WAS IN MOSES AND THE
REST OF THE PROPHETS AND IN
THE HOLY APOSTLES.¹

THE HOLY SPIRIT.

LATIN

LATIN

1. After the first discussions which, as the subject demanded, we entered into at the beginning concerning the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, it seemed that we ought to go back again and prove that the same God was creator and founder of the world and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that is, that there is one and the same God of the law, the prophets and the gospels. Then also in regard to Christ, who had previously been shown to be the word and wisdom of God, we had to demonstrate in the succeeding chapters how he became man. Our remaining task is to return as briefly as possible to the subject of the Holy Spirit.

It is time, therefore, for us to discuss to the best of our ability a few points about the Holy Spirit, whom our Lord and Saviour in the gospel according to John called the Paraclete.² Now just as it is the same God himself and the same Christ himself, so also it is the same Holy Spirit himself who was in the prophets and the apostles, that is, both in those who believed in God before the coming of Christ and in those who have taken refuge in God through Christ. We have heard of heretics who have dared to say that there are two Gods or two Christs, but we have never heard it maintained by anyone that there are two Holy Spirits.³ For how could they affirm this from the scriptures, or what distinction could they make between one Holy Spirit and the other, even supposing it were possible to discover any definition or description of the Holy Spirit? For granting that Marcion or Valentinus can draw distinctions

¹ For the Greek title see Photius *Bibl. Cod.* 8.

² St. John XIV. 16 etc.

³ In the Apostolic Canons (49) it is enacted that anyone who baptizes into 'three unoriginated beings, or three sons, or three paracletes' shall be deprived of his office. Origen, too, in another place mentions some who affirmed the existence of two Holy Spirits: see *In Ep. ad Titum Frag.* (Lomm. V. 287 f.) 'Moreover if there are any who say that it was one Holy Spirit who was in the prophets, but another who was in the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, they commit one and the same offence of impiety as those who, so far as in them lies, cut and rend the nature of the deity, by saying that there is one God of the law and another of the gospels.'

in regard to deity and describe the nature of the good as one thing and the nature of the just as another, what reasonings or devices will warrant their introducing distinctions into the Holy Spirit? I think they can find nothing that points to any distinction whatsoever.

2. Now we are of opinion that every rational creature receives without any difference a share in the Holy Spirit just as in the wisdom of God and the word of God.¹ I see, however, that the special coming of the Holy Spirit to men is declared to have happened after Christ's ascension into heaven rather than before his coming into the world. Before that time the gift of the Holy Spirit was bestowed on prophets only and on a few others among the people who happened to have proved worthy of it; but after the coming of the Saviour it is written that 'the saying was fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet Joel', namely, that 'it shall come to pass in the last days, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh and they shall prophesy';² which indeed is similar to that other saying, 'All nations shall serve him'.³

Through the grace of the Holy Spirit, then, along with many other results, this most splendid fact is revealed, that whereas the truths written in the prophets and the law of Moses were formerly understood by very few, namely by the prophets alone, and scarcely anywhere was there one out of the whole people who could get beyond the literal meaning and perceive something greater, that is, could detect a spiritual sense in the law and prophets, now there are innumerable multitudes of believers who, although unable to explain logically and clearly the process of their spiritual perception, have yet almost to a man the firm conviction that circumcision ought not to be understood literally, nor the Sabbath rest, nor the pouring out of an animal's blood, nor the fact that oracles were given by God to Moses on these points; and there is no doubt that this discernment is suggested to them all by the power of the Holy Spirit.⁴

¹ See above Bk. I. 3, 5 (p. 34), where the Spirit's operation is said to extend to the saints alone. The Spirit is given potentially to all, but his effective working is confined to the saints, of Old and New Testament times alike.

² Acts II. 16, 17 (Joel II. 28).

³ Ps. LXXII. 11.

⁴ The basis of this 'spiritual' interpretation of the Old Testament is given in *Con. Celsum* VII. 34. 'Walking' with God, having 'ears to hear', or having our 'eyes' opened, are clearly metaphorical expressions, which make nonsense when interpreted literally. Origen, however, with other writers of the school of Alexandria, uses this poetical phraseology to justify an arbitrary treatment of passages where a literal interpretation is demanded. A merely literal interpretation, even of a plain historical narrative, was despised on the ground that it indicated inferiority of spiritual capacity in the commentator. See Origen, *In Matt. Comm. ser.* 27 'for the spiritual and prophetic meaning of scripture is veiled beneath the outward narrative, so that all scripture may be understood literally by inferior readers, but in a mystical way by the spiritual and the perfect.'

3. But just as there are many ways of apprehending Christ, who although he is wisdom, does not exert or possess the power of wisdom in all men, but only in those who apply themselves to wisdom in him; nor, although he is called a physician, does he act as such towards all men, but only towards those who have realised their feeble and sick condition and fly to his compassion in the hope of obtaining health; so, too, I think, is it the case with the Holy Spirit, in whom is every manner of gift. For to some is granted by the Spirit the word of wisdom, to others the word of knowledge, to others faith; and thus to each individual man who is able to receive him the same Spirit becomes and is apprehended as the very thing of which he, who has been deemed worthy to partake of him, stands in need.¹

These divisions and distinctions are unperceived by those who, hearing him called in the gospels the Paraclete,² but not considering from what work or activity he takes this name, have likened him to some common spirits or other and by so doing have tried to disturb the churches of Christ even to the point of arousing no small dissensions among the brethren. But the gospel shows him to be of such power and majesty that it says the apostles could not yet receive those truths which the Saviour wished to teach them until the time 'when the Holy Spirit should come',³ who would pour himself into their souls and to enlighten them concerning the nature and faith of the Trinity. The men in question, however, owing to the poverty of their understanding, which renders them not only incapable of logically setting forth the truth themselves, but unable even to pay proper attention to what is said by us, have entertained low and unworthy views of his deity and so delivered themselves over to errors and deceits under the malign influence of some spirit of error rather than the wise precepts of the Holy Spirit, according to the saying of the apostle, 'Following the doctrine of daemon spirits, who forbid to marry', 'to the ruin and destruction of many', and 'urging to abstain from meats',⁴ in order that by the outward show of stricter observances they may lead astray the souls of the innocent.

4. We must know, therefore, that the Paraclete is the Holy Spirit, who teaches truths greater than can be uttered by the voice, truths which are, if I may so say, 'unspeakable', and which 'it is not lawful for a man to speak',⁵ that is, which cannot be indicated in human language. For the phrase 'not lawful' was spoken, we believe, by Paul as the equivalent of 'not possible', as in the place where he says, 'all things are lawful, but all things do not edify'.⁶ Those things, that is, which are

¹ See 1 Cor. XII. 8, 9.

² St. John XIV. 16 etc.

³ St. John XVI. 12-14.

⁴ See 1 Tim. IV. 1, 3 and St. Luke II. 34 (Vulg.).

⁵ 2 Cor. XII. 4.

⁶ 1 Cor. X. 23.

within our power because we can have them, he speaks of as being 'lawful' for us. But the Paraclete, who is called the Holy Spirit, is so called from his work of 'consolation' (*paraclesis* being termed in Latin *consolatio*); for anyone who has been deemed worthy to partake of the Holy Spirit, when he has learned his unspeakable mysteries, undoubtedly obtains consolation and gladness of heart. Since by the Spirit's guidance he has come to know the reasons for all things that happen, and why and how they happen, his soul can never be in any way disquieted or admit any feeling of sadness;¹ nor is it in anything affrighted, for it clings to God's word and wisdom and 'in the Holy Spirit calls Jesus Lord'.²

We have made mention, then, of the Paraclete and to the best of our ability have explained how we ought to think about him. But in the epistle of John our Saviour is also called a 'paraclete', when it says, 'If any man sin, we have a paraclete with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins'.³ Let us then consider whether perhaps this title 'paraclete' means one thing when applied to the Saviour and another when applied to the Holy Spirit. Now in regard to the Saviour 'paraclete' seems to mean intercessor; for in Greek it bears both meanings, comforter and intercessor, but according to the phrase that follows, in which it says that 'he is the propitiation for our sins',³ it seems that in the case of the Saviour the word 'paraclete' must be understood rather in the sense of intercessor, for he is said to intercede with the Father 'for our sins'. When used of the Holy Spirit, however, the word 'paraclete' ought to be understood as 'comforter', because he provides comfort for the souls to whom he opens and reveals a consciousness of spiritual knowledge.⁴

¹ See St. John XIV. 26, 27.

² See 1 Cor. XII. 3.

³ 1 St. John II. 1, 2.

⁴ Origen appears to have overlooked Rom. VIII. 26, 27.

CHAPTER VIII

THE SOUL¹

1. After this, the course of our inquiry demands that we should deal in a general way with the soul, beginning with souls of a lower and rising to those of a higher order. No one, I suppose, will doubt that all living creatures whatever, even those that live in water, have souls. This view is supported by the general opinion of men and confirmed in addition by the authority of holy scripture, when it says that 'God made great whales and every soul of the living creatures that swim, which the waters brought forth after their kind'.² It is confirmed also, from the common light of reason, by those who lay down a definition of the soul in precise terms. For soul is defined thus, as an existence possessing imagination and desire, which qualities can be expressed in Latin, though the rendering is not so apt as the original, by the phrase, capable of feeling and movement.³ This may be said of all living creatures, including those that live in water, and the same definition of soul may be shown to apply to birds also. Scripture, too, adds the authority of another pronouncement when it says, 'Ye shall not eat the blood, for the soul of all flesh is its blood, and ye shall not eat the soul with the flesh';⁴ in which it most plainly describes the blood of all living creatures as their 'soul'. And if, in regard to the saying that 'the soul of all flesh is its blood', anyone should now raise the question of bees, wasps and ants, as well as those creatures that live in water, oysters, cockles and the rest, which have no blood and yet are most clearly seen to be living creatures, we must reply that the same force which in others is due to the energy of the red blood is exerted in creatures of this kind by that fluid which exists in them, though it be of a different colour; for it matters not at all what colour it is, so long as the substance is endowed with life. As for beasts of burden and cattle, however, even common opinion has no hesitation in admitting that they possess souls. Nevertheless the teaching of scripture is clear, when God says, 'Let the earth bring forth the living soul after its kind, four-footed beasts and creeping things and beasts of

¹ The title in Greek is found in Photius, *Bibl. cod.* 8.

² Gen. I. 21.

³ See Aristotle, *De anima* 3, 9, 1. 'The soul of living creatures is defined by its two powers, that of discernment, which is a function of thought and perception, and that of movement in space'. Philo, *Legis. alleg.* II. 7 (71) 'Soul is a nature that possesses imagination and desire.' See also Tertullian, *De anima* 14-16.

⁴ See Levit. XVII. 14.

the earth after their kind'.¹ Then in regard to man, although no one has any doubt nor could anyone raise a question about it, yet the divine scripture declares that 'God breathed into his face the breath of life, and man became a living soul'.²

It remains for us to inquire concerning the order of angels, whether they too possess souls or are souls, and also concerning the other divine and heavenly beings including the opposing powers. Nowhere do we find any authority of divine scripture for saying that either angels or any other divine beings who are God's 'ministering spirits'³ possess souls or are called souls; and yet they are believed by very many to be endowed with souls. But in regard to God we find it written as follows: 'And I will put my soul upon that soul that has eaten blood, and I will root it out from among my people'.⁴ And again elsewhere: 'Your new moons and sabbaths and great days I will not accept. Your fasts and holidays and feast days my soul hateth'.⁵ And in the twenty-first psalm it speaks thus of Christ—for it is certain that this psalm is composed in the person of Christ, as the gospel bears witness⁶—'But thou, Lord, be not far from my help, look to my defence; deliver my soul from the sword, my beloved one from the hand of the dog'.⁷ There are, however, many other testimonies to the soul that Christ had when he dwelt in the flesh.

2. But all question about the soul of Christ is removed when we consider the nature of the incarnation. For just as he truly had flesh, so also he truly had a soul. As for that, indeed, which is called in the scriptures the 'soul of God',⁸ it is difficult both to think and to state how it ought to be understood; for at the same time we declare that the nature of God is simple and has no intermixture of any additional substance. Still, however we are to think of it, the fact remains that it is apparently called 'the soul of God'. In regard to Christ, however, there is no doubt. And on that account I see no absurdity in holding or expressing some similar view concerning the holy angels and the other heavenly powers, if we grant that the above-mentioned definition of the soul appears to apply to them. For who can rationally deny that they are capable of feeling and of movement? If then the definition, that an existence which is rationally capable of feeling and movement is called a soul, appears to be correct, the same definition appears to apply to the angels also. For what else is there in them but rational feeling and movement? And things which have one definition have also undoubtedly the same substance. The apostle Paul indeed intimates that there is a kind of soul-like man, whom he says 'cannot receive the

¹ Gen. I. 24.

² Gen. II. 7.

³ Heb. I. 14.

⁴ Levit. XVII. 10.

⁵ Is. I. 13, 14.

⁶ See St. Mark XV. 34 and parallels.

⁷ Ps. XXII. (Eng. Vers.) 20, 21.

⁸ Is. I. 14; XLII. 1, etc.

things of the Spirit of God',¹ but to whom the doctrine of the Spirit of God appears foolish, and he cannot understand it because it is 'spiritually discerned'. Also in another place he says: 'It is sown a soul-like body' and rises a 'spiritual body',² thus showing that at the resurrection of the just there will be nothing soul-like in those who have been counted worthy of the life of the blessed.

On this account we ask whether there is not some substance which, in so far as it is soul, is imperfect. But whether it is imperfect for this reason, that it falls away from perfection, or whether it was so made by God, we shall inquire when each separate point begins to be discussed in order. For if the soul-like man 'does not receive the things of the Spirit of God', and just because he is soul-like cannot receive the knowledge of a better nature, namely the divine, here is perhaps the reason why Paul, in his desire to teach us plainly what it is through which we can understand the things of the Spirit, that is, spiritual things, joins and associates the mind rather than the soul with the Holy Spirit. For this is what I suppose him to indicate when he says, 'I will pray with the spirit, I will pray with the mind also. I will sing a psalm with the spirit, I will sing a psalm with the mind also'.³ He does not say, I will pray with the soul, but with the spirit and the mind; not, sing with the soul, but sing with the spirit and the mind.

3. But perhaps it will be asked: If it is the mind, which with the spirit prays and sings, and the mind also which receives perfection and salvation, how is it that Peter says, 'Receiving the end of our faith, the salvation of our souls'?⁴ If the soul neither prays nor sings with the spirit, how shall it hope for salvation? Or, if it should attain to blessedness, will it no longer be called a soul? Let us see whether, perhaps, this point may be answered in the following manner, that

GREEK

just as⁵ the Saviour came to save that which was lost,⁶ but when the lost is saved, it is no longer lost; so, if he came to save the soul, as he came to save that which was lost, the soul when saved remains a soul no longer. We must further

LATIN

just as the Saviour came to save that which was lost,⁶ and then when it is saved, that which was said to be lost is not lost; so also perhaps that which is being saved is called a soul, but when it has been saved it will be called by the name of its more

¹ See 1 Cor. II. 14. The word translated 'natural' is in Greek *psychikos*, from *psyche*, soul.

² 1 Cor. XV. 44.

³ 1 Cor. XIV. 15.

⁴ 1 St. Peter I. 9.

⁵ Frag. 21, Koetschau, from Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 532). Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 6, also quotes the same passage, following the Greek more closely than Rufinus.

⁶ See St. Luke XIX. 10.

GREEK

inquire whether, as there was a time when that which has been lost was not lost, and there will be a time when it will not be lost, so also there was a time when the soul was not a soul and there will be a time when it will not be a soul.

LATIN

perfect part. Some, too, will think that this point can be added, that just as that which was lost, undoubtedly existed before it was lost, when it was something, I know not what, other than lost, and just as there will also certainly be a time when it will not be lost; so the soul, which is said to have become lost, will apparently have been something at a time when it was not yet lost and may have been called a soul from the fact of its becoming lost, but when delivered from its lost condition it can once again be that which it was before it became lost and was called a soul.

LATIN

Further, certain careful investigators have concluded that an interpretation of no slight importance is suggested by the very meaning of the word soul as indicated in its Greek form. For a divine saying speaks of God as a fire, saying, 'Our God is a consuming fire'.¹ Moreover, Scripture also speaks as follows concerning the nature of the angels: 'Who maketh his angels spirits and his ministers a burning fire';² and elsewhere, 'The angel of the Lord appeared in a flame of fire in a bush'.³ In addition we have received a command to be 'fervent in spirit',⁴ by which expression undoubtedly the word of God is proved to be hot and fiery. Further, the prophet Jeremiah hears from him who gave him the oracles, 'Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth as fire'.⁵

As therefore God is 'fire' and the angels 'a flame of fire' and the saints are all 'fervent in spirit', so on the contrary those who have fallen away from the love of God must undoubtedly be said to have cooled in their affection for him and to have become cold. For the Lord also says, 'Because iniquity has multiplied, the love of the many shall grow cold'.⁶ And further, all those things, whatever they may be, which in the holy scripture are likened to the adverse power, you invariably find to be cold. For the devil is called a 'serpent' and a 'dragon',⁷ and what can be found

¹ Heb. XII. 29 (Deut. IV. 24; IX. 3).

² Heb. I. 7 (Ps. CIV. 4).

³ Exod. III. 2.

⁴ Rom. XII. 11.

⁵ Jerem. V. 14.

⁶ St. Matt. XXIV. 12.

⁷ See Rev. XII. 9; XX. 2.

colder than these? Again, a dragon, an allusion, certainly, to one of the wicked spirits, is said to reign in the waters, while a prophet declares him to live in the sea.¹ And elsewhere a prophet says, 'I will draw my holy sword upon the dragon, the flying serpent, upon the dragon, the crooked serpent, and it shall slay him';² and again it says, 'Even though they hide from mine eyes and descend into the depth of the sea, there will I command the dragon and he shall bite them'.³ In Job also he is said to be the 'king of all things which are in the waters'.⁴ A prophet declares that 'evils shall be kindled from the north upon all who dwell on the earth'.⁵ Now the north wind is described in the scriptures as cold, as it is written in Wisdom, 'the cold north wind'.⁶ This then must undoubtedly be understood of the devil. If therefore the things which are holy are termed fire and light and fervent things while their opposites are termed cold, and the love of sinners is said to grow cold, we must ask whether perhaps even the word soul, which in Greek is *psyche*, was not formed from *psychesthai*, with the idea of growing cold after having been in a diviner and better state, and whether it was not derived from thence because the soul seems to have grown cold by the loss of its first natural and divine warmth and on that account to have been placed in its present state with its present designation.⁷

GREEK

For⁸ when the prophet says, 'Before I was humbled, I went wrong',⁹ the saying is uttered in the person of the soul itself, to the effect that formerly in heaven it 'went wrong', before it was 'humbled' in the body. And when it says, 'Turn unto thy rest, O my soul',¹⁰ it means that he who has played a manly part here in good deeds turns to the former 'rest' by reason of the righteousness of his conduct.

¹ See Ezek. XXIX. 3; XXXII. 2. ² Is. XXVII. 1. ³ Amos IX. 3.

⁴ See Job XLI. 25 (26) Sept.

⁵ See Jerem. I. 14.

⁶ Eccles. XLIII. 20. Origen calls Ben Sira's book by the name of Wisdom in *Comm. in Ioh. Frag.* 74 and 136 (Koetschau).

⁷ Aristotle (*De anima* I. 2, 405b) mentions this etymological explanation of the word: 'others say that the soul is the cold element, so called from breathing and cooling (*katapsyxis*). See also Plato, *Cratylus* 399 D-E and Tertullian, *De anima* 25 and 27.

⁸ Fragment 22, Koetschau, from Epiphanius, *Haer.* 64, 4. Cp. Jerome, *Con. Ioh. Hieros. c. 7*: 'The second point' (i.e. taken from the *De Principiis*) 'is that souls are bound in this body as in a prison, and that before the man was formed in paradise, these souls dwelt among the rational creatures in the heavens.' Wherefore afterwards, in order to console itself, the soul says in the Psalms, 'Before I was humbled, I went wrong; and, Turn unto thy rest, O my soul; and, Bring my soul out of prison; and other similar utterances.' Rufinus has omitted most of this passage.

⁹ Ps. CXIX. 67.

¹⁰ Ps. CXVI. 7.

LATIN

Finally, see whether you can easily find in the holy scriptures a place where the soul is described in real terms of praise. Expressions of blame, on the contrary, occur frequently, as here: 'An evil soul destroys him that possesses it',¹ and, 'The soul that sinneth it shall die'.² For after it has been said, 'All souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so the soul of the son is mine',³ it certainly seems to follow that he would say, 'The soul that doeth righteousness, it shall be saved, and the soul that sinneth, it shall die'. Yet in this instance we see that he has associated with the soul the fact of blame, but as to anything worthy of praise he is silent. We must see,⁴ therefore, whether perchance, as we said was made clear by its very name, the *psyche* or soul was so called from its having cooled from the fervour of the righteous⁵ and from its participation in the divine fire, and yet has not lost the power of restoring itself to that condition of fervour in which it was at the beginning. Some such fact the prophet appears to point to when he says, 'Turn unto thy rest, O my soul'.⁶ All these considerations seem to show that when the mind departed from its original condition and dignity it became or was termed a soul, and if ever it is restored and corrected it returns to the condition of being a mind.

GREEK

(ii) [*If anyone shall say that*]⁷ the creation of all rational creatures consisted of minds bodiless and immaterial without any number or name, so that they all formed a unity by reason of the identity of their essence and power and energy and by their union with and knowledge of God the Word; but that they were seized with weariness of the divine love and contemplation, and changed for the worse, each in proportion to his inclination in this direction; and that they took bodies, either fine in substance or grosser, and became possessed of a name, which accounts for the differences of names as well as of bodies among the higher powers; and that thus the cherubim, with the rulers and authorities, the lordships, thrones and angels and all the other

¹ Eccles. VI. 4.

² Ezek. XVIII. 4.

³ Ezek. XVIII. 4.

⁴ Koetschau points out that the passage beginning here and ending with the words 'it returns to the condition of being a mind' (below) are a brief summary of what is contained in the following Greek Fragments and the citation from Jerome *Ep. ad Avitum*: see pp. 125-127.

⁵ See p. 124 above.

⁶ Ps. CXVI. 7; and cp. p. 124 above.

⁷ This and the following paragraphs are the Anathemas (ii. to *viz*) against Origen, decreed by the Second Council of Constantinople in 553. Though they cannot be taken as literal extracts from the *De Principiis*, they express the teaching of this work, doubtless for the most part in Origen's own words. Cp. the Anathemas at the end of Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 533). Koetschau marks these extracts as *Frag.* 23a. See Mansi IX. 396-397.

heavenly orders came into being and received their names, [*let him be anathema*] * * * *

(iii) [*If anyone shall say that*] the sun, the moon and the stars themselves belonged to the same unity of rational beings, and have become what they now are through a declension towards the worse, [*let him be anathema*] * * * *

(iv) [*If anyone shall say that*] the rational beings who grew cool in respect of the divine love and were in consequence called souls were for a punishment clothed with the grosser bodies possessed by us and were given the name of men, while those who proceeded to the extremity of evil-doing were clothed with cold and murky bodies and became what are called daemons or 'spiritual hosts of wickedness'¹ [*let him be anathema*] * * * The soul² received its body as a result of former sins, by way of punishment or vengeance * * *

(v) [*If anyone shall say that*] the soul-like condition comes from the angelic and archangelic condition, and the daemoniac and human from the soul-like; and that conversely from the human come angels and daemons, and that each order of the heavenly powers is made up either wholly from those below or from those above, or else both from those above and those below [*let him be anathema*] * * *

(via) [*If anyone shall say that*] the race of daemons appears two-fold, being composed of human souls and of higher spirits that have fallen to this condition, and that out of all the original unity of rational beings one mind remained steadfast in the divine love and contemplation, and that he, having become Christ and king of all rational beings, created all bodily nature, both heaven and earth and the things that are between them * * [*let him be anathema*] * * *

Those rational³ beings who sinned and on that account fell from the state in which they were, in proportion to their particular sins were enveloped in bodies as a punishment; and when they are purified they rise again to the state in which they formerly were, completely putting away their evil and their bodies. Then again a second or a third or many more times they are enveloped in different bodies for punishment. For it is probable that different worlds have existed and will exist, some in the past and some in the future * * Along with⁴ the falling away and the cooling from life in the spirit came what is now called soul, which is capable nevertheless of an ascent to the state in which it was at the beginning. This I think is spoken of by the

¹ Eph. VI. 12.

² This sentence is inserted here by Koetschau from Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 512 E).

³ Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi 489-492).

⁴ Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 529), Frag 23 b, Koetschau.

prophet in the passage, 'Turn unto thy rest, O my soul';¹ so that this becomes wholly mind.

LATIN

Mind² when it fell was made soul, and soul in its turn when furnished with virtues will become mind. This we can find by considering the soul of Esau,³ who was condemned in a later life for ancient sins. And in regard to the heavenly bodies we must conclude that the sun's soul, or whatever it ought to be called, did not begin to exist at the time the world was made, but at a time before it entered that shining and burning body. Let us think in a similar way of the moon and the stars, that although they have unwillingly been compelled to be 'subject to vanity'⁴ as a result of causes long past, yet it is in the hope of future reward that they do not their own will, but the will of the Creator, by whom they have been appointed to these duties.

4. Now⁵ if this is so, it seems to me that the departure and downward course of the mind must not be thought of as equal in all cases, but as a greater or less degree of change into soul, and that some minds retain a portion of their original vigour, while others retain none or only a very little. This is the reason why some are found right from their earliest years to be of ardent keenness, while others are duller, and some are born extremely dense and altogether unteachable. This statement of ours, however, that mind is changed into soul, or anything else that seems to point in that direction, the reader must carefully consider and work out for himself; for we must not be supposed to put these forward as settled doctrines, but as subjects for inquiry and discussion.

The reader must also take this point into consideration, that of the passages in the gospels which concern the soul of the Saviour, it is noticeable that some refer to it under the name of soul and others under the name of spirit. When scripture wishes to indicate any suffering or trouble that affected him, it does so under the name soul, as when it says: 'Now is my soul troubled',⁶ and 'My soul is sorrowful even unto death',⁷ and 'No one taketh my soul from me, but I lay it down of myself'.⁸ On the other hand he commends 'into his Father's hands' not his soul but his spirit;⁹ and when he says the 'flesh is weak' he does not say the 'soul' is 'willing' but the 'spirit';¹⁰ from which it appears as

¹ Ps. CXVI. 7. See p. 124 f. above.

² Latin quotation taken from Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 6. It is preceded by the words: 'And after much discussion he (i.e. Origen) deals with the question of the soul and speaks as follows. . .'

³ See Malachi I. 2, 3.

⁴ At this point we return to Rufinus.

⁵ St. Matt. XXVI. 38 and parallels.

⁶ See St. Luke XXIII. 46.

⁷ St. Matt. XXVI. 41 and parallels.

⁸ Rom. VIII. 20.

⁹ St. John XII. 27.

¹⁰ St. John X. 18.

if the soul were a kind of medium between the weak flesh and the willing spirit.

5. But perhaps someone may meet us with those objections of which we ourselves have given warning in our own arguments, and may say, 'How then is mention made even of God's soul?'¹ To him we shall reply as follows. Just as in all bodily expressions that are applied to God, such as his fingers or hands or arms or eyes or mouth or feet, we do not mean these parts of the human body, but we indicate by such bodily terms certain of God's powers,² so also we must suppose that there is some other object which is indicated by this term, the soul of God. And if it is lawful for us to dare to say anything further on such a subject, the 'soul of God' may perhaps be understood to mean his only-begotten Son. For as the soul, implanted throughout the whole body, is the source of all movement and directs every operation of the body, so also the only-begotten Son of God, who is his word and wisdom, is in close touch and association with every power of God, being implanted in him. And perhaps it is as an indication of this mystery that God is spoken of or described in the scriptures as a body.³

We must consider, indeed, whether perhaps there may not be this additional reason for understanding God's soul to mean his only-begotten Son, namely, that it was he who came 'to this place of affliction' and 'descended into the vale of tears' and into the place of our humiliation, as it says in the Psalm: 'Because thou hast humiliated us in the place of affliction'.⁴ Finally, I know some who, in expounding the passage which is spoken by the Saviour in the gospel, 'My soul is sorrowful even unto death',⁵ have interpreted it of the apostles, whom he might have termed his soul because they were better than the rest of his body. For they say that 'the multitude of believers is called his body',⁶ and that the apostles, because they are better than the remaining multitude, ought to be regarded as his soul.

These points about the rational soul we have brought forward to the best of our ability rather as matters for discussion by our readers than as definite and settled doctrines. As for the souls of cattle and other dumb creatures, let those remarks suffice which we have made above in general terms.⁷

¹ See p. 121 above.

² See Origen *Comm. in Ioh.* XIII. 22 'When we find eyes, eyelids and ears, hands, arms and feet ascribed to God, yes and even wings, we allegorise these terms, despising those who invest God with a form like that of man.'

³ In his *De Oratore* XXIII. 3 Origen shows that he is alluding to such passages as Gen. III. 8 and Ps. XI. 4.

⁴ See Ps. XLIII. 20 (Sept.) and LXXXIV. 6.

⁵ St. Matt. XXVI. 38 and parallels.

⁶ See 1 Cor. XII. 27; Eph. IV. 12; V. 30.

⁷ See above Book II. Ch. VIII. 1. (p. 120).

CHAPTER IX

THE WORLD, AND THE MOVEMENTS OF RATIONAL CREATURES BOTH GOOD AND EVIL, AND THE CAUSES OF THESE MOVEMENTS

1. Now, however, let us return to the order which we fixed upon for our discussion and contemplate the beginning of creation, so far as it is possible for the mind to contemplate the beginning of God's creative work.

GREEK

In the beginning,¹ as we contemplate it, God created by an act of his will as large a number of intelligent beings * * * as he could control. For we must maintain that even the power of God is finite, and we must not, under pretext of praising him, lose sight of his limitations. For if the divine power were infinite, of necessity it could not even understand itself, since the infinite is by its nature incomprehensible. He made therefore just as many as he could grasp and keep in hand and subject to his providence. In the same way he prepared just as much matter as he could reduce to order * * *

LATIN

We must suppose, therefore, that in the beginning God made as large a number of rational and intelligent beings, or whatever the before-mentioned minds ought to be called, as he foresaw would be sufficient. It is certain that he made them according to some definite number fore-ordained by himself; for we must not suppose, as some would, that there is no end of created beings, since where there is no end there can neither be any comprehension nor limitation. If there had been no end, then certainly created beings could neither have been controlled nor provided for by God. For by its nature whatever is infinite will also be beyond comprehension * * *

LATIN

Moreover when the scripture says that God created all things 'by number and measure',² we shall be right in applying the

¹ Frag. 24 Koetschau, from Justinian *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 489 and 525). Rufinus has toned down Origen's daring assertion that God's power has limits. Cp. Theophilus Alex. *Ep. pasch.* II. 17 (in Jerome *Ep. CXVIII*) 'Origen says: God made as many beings as he could grasp and hold in subjection to himself and control by his providence'. Also Rufinus Palaest. *De fide* 17 'Origen... who spoke thus: God did not make all the beings whom he wished to make, but only those whom he could hold together and grasp.'

² Wis. XI. 20.

term 'number' to rational creatures or minds for this very reason, that they are so many as can be provided for and ruled and controlled by the providence of God; whereas 'measure' will correspondingly apply to bodily matter, which we must believe to have been created by God in such quantity as he knew would be sufficient for the ordering of the world. These then are the objects which we must believe were created by God in the beginning, that is, before everything else. And it is this truth which we may suppose to be indicated also in that beginning which Moses somewhat obscurely introduces when he says, 'In the beginning God made the heaven and the earth'.¹ For it is certain that these words refer not to the 'firmament' nor to the 'dry land', but to that heaven and earth from which the names of the ones we see were afterwards borrowed.²

2. But since these rational beings, which as we said above³ were made in the beginning, were made when before they did not exist, by this very fact that they did not exist and then began to exist they are of necessity subject to change and alteration. For whatever may have been the goodness that existed in their being, it existed in them not by nature but as a result of their Creator's beneficence. What they are, therefore, is something neither their own nor eternal, but given by God. For it did not always exist, and everything that is given can also be withdrawn and taken away. But the cause of the withdrawal will lie in this, that the movements of their minds are not rightly and worthily directed. For the Creator granted to the minds created by him the power of free and voluntary movement, in order that the good that was in them might become their own, since it was preserved by their own free will; but sloth and weariness of taking trouble to preserve the good, coupled with disregard and neglect of better things, began the process of withdrawal from the good. Now to withdraw from the good is nothing else than to be immersed in evil; for it is certain that to be evil means to be lacking in good. Hence it is that in whatever degree one declines from the good, one descends into an equal degree of wickedness. And so each mind, neglecting the good either more or less in proportion to its own movements, was drawn to the opposite of good, which undoubtedly is evil. From this source, it appears, the Creator of all things obtained certain seeds and causes of variety and diversity, in order that, according to the diversity of minds, that is, of rational beings (which diversity they must be supposed to have produced from the causes we have stated above) he might create a world that was various

¹ Gen. I. 1.

² See Gen. I. 6-10 and above Bk. II. Ch. III. 6 (p. 91 f.); also *Con. Celsum* VI. 59.

³ See above Bk. I., Ch. VIII. 3 f. (p. 69).

and diverse. What we mean by various and diverse it is now our wish to explain.¹

3. By the world we now mean all that is above the heavens, or in them, or on the earth, or in what are called the lower regions, or any places that exist anywhere; together with the beings who are said to dwell in them. All this is called the world. In this world some creatures are said to be 'supercelestial',² that is, placed in the more blessed abodes and clothed with the brighter and more heavenly bodies; and among these many differences are revealed, as for instance when the apostle said, 'There is one glory of the sun, another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars, for one star differeth from another star in glory'.³

Some creatures, however, are called 'earthly',⁴ and among these, too, that is, among men, there are no small differences, for some are barbarians, others Greeks, and of the barbarians some are wilder and fiercer, whereas others are more gentle. Some moreover employ laws of the highest excellence, others poorer and ruder ones, while others follow inhuman and savage customs rather than laws. Some men are from the very moment of their birth in a humble position, brought up in subjection and slavery, placed under lords and princes and tyrants; whereas others are brought up with more freedom and under more rational influences. Some have healthy bodies, others from their earliest years are invalids; some are defective in sight, others in hearing and speech; some are born in such a condition, others lose the use of one faculty or another soon after birth or else suffer a like misfortune when fully grown. But what purpose is there in my unfolding and enumerating the tragic tale of human miseries, from which some are free while others are involved in them, when every man can weigh and ponder over all these matters for himself?⁵ There are also certain invisible powers, to which the management of things upon earth is entrusted; and we must believe that among these, too, no small differences exist, just as is found to be the case among men. The apostle Paul indeed intimates that there are also certain

¹ With this paragraph cp. Origen, *In Ioh.* II. 13. 'The evil or the wicked is opposite to the good, and not-being is opposite to being; from which it follows that the wicked and the evil are not-being.' Also *Con. Celsum* IV. 70. 'For admitted that God, while preserving each individual's free-will, makes use of the evil of wicked men in the administration of the world, so disposing them as to conduce to the benefit of the whole, nevertheless such men are deserving of blame. . . . See also Origen *In Num. hom.* XIV. 2 (Lomm. X. 162). Theophilus of Alexandria, *Ep. pasch.* II. 10 (in Jerome, *Ep.* 98) says that Origen affirmed that 'it was through the negligence and movement and descent of the higher rational creatures that God was led to create this world of diversity.'

² See *Con. Celsum* III. 42, 80: V. 4: VI. 59.

³ 1 Cor. XV. 41.

⁴ 1 Cor. XV. 40.

⁵ See above p. 102 and n. 1.

'infernal' powers¹ and among these in like manner a condition of variety must undoubtedly be looked for. As for dumb animals and birds and creatures that live in water, it seems superfluous to inquire about them, since it is certain that they should be regarded as of contingent and not primary importance.

4. Now we are told that all things which were made, were made through Christ and in Christ, as the apostle Paul most clearly intimates when he says, 'For in him and through him were all things created, whether things in heaven or things on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all were created through him and in him'.² Moreover John in the gospel reveals precisely the same 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 was nothing made'.³ Further, in the Psalms it is written, 'Thou hast made all things in wisdom'.⁴

Seeing then that Christ, as he is the Word and wisdom, is also 'righteousness',⁵ it will follow undoubtedly that those things which were made in the Word and in wisdom may be said also to have been made in that 'righteousness' which Christ is; whence it will be apparent that in the things which were made there was nothing unrighteous, nothing accidental, but all will be shown to be such as the principle of equity and righteousness demands. How then this great variety and diversity of things can be understood to be most righteous and equitable it is, I am sure, impossible for human thought or speech to explain, unless as prostrate suplicants we beseech the Word himself, the 'wisdom and righteousness',⁶ who is the only-begotten Son of God, that he, pouring himself by his grace into our minds, may deign to enlighten what is dark, to open what is shut, to reveal what is secret; which he will do if only we are found seeking, or asking, or knocking so worthily as to deserve to receive when we seek, to find when we ask and to have the door opened in response to our knock.⁷ Relying, therefore, not on our own intelligence, but on the help of that wisdom which made all things, and that righteousness which we believe to be implanted in all created beings, even though we are for the moment unable to declare the answer, we shall nevertheless, trusting in his mercy, endeavour to search out and discover how the great variety and diversity of the world is consistent with the whole principle of righteousness. I say principle, of course, in a general sense; for only an ignorant man would demand a special justification for every single case and only a fool would offer to give it.

¹ The inhabitants, presumably, of the 'lower parts of the earth.' Eph. IV. 9.
² Col. I. 16. ³ St. John I. 1. ⁴ Ps. CIV. 24. ⁵ See 1 Cor. I. 30.
⁶ See 1 Cor. I. 30. ⁷ See St. Matt. VII. 7, 8; St. Luke XI. 9, 10.

5. But when we say that the world is arranged in this variety, in which as we have explained above it was made by God,¹ the God whom we call good and righteous and absolutely fair, the following objection is wont to be raised by many, and particularly by those who come from the schools of Marcion, Valentinus and Basilides and who assert that souls are in their natures diverse. They ask how it is consistent with the righteousness of God who made the world that on some he should bestow a habitation in the heavens, and not only give them a better habitation, but also confer on them a higher and more conspicuous rank, favouring some with a 'principality', others with 'powers', to others again allotting 'dominions',² to others presenting the most magnificent seats in the heavenly courts, while others shine with golden light and gleam with starry brilliance, there being 'one glory of the sun, another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars, for one star differeth from another star in glory'.³ To sum it up briefly, they ask what reason there could be, supposing that God the Creator lacks neither the will to desire what is good and perfect nor the power to produce it, that when creating rational natures, that is, beings of whose existence he himself is the cause, he should make some of higher rank and other of second and third and many still lower and less worthy degrees?

Finally, they raise an objection on the score of the differences that exist among men on the earth. Some, they say, inherit at birth a happier lot, as for example the one who springs from Abraham and is born by promise,⁴ and the other, the child of Isaac and Rebecca who, while yet lying in the womb, supplants his brother and is said, before he is born, to be loved by God;⁵ and, speaking generally, one man is born among the Hebrews, with whom he finds instruction in the divine law, another among the Greeks who are themselves men of wisdom and no small learning, another among the Ethiopians, whose custom is to feed on human flesh, others among the Scythians, where parricide is practised as if sanctioned by law, or among the Taurians, where strangers are offered in sacrifice.⁶ If then, they ask us, this great diversity and these various and different conditions of birth, in which certainly the power of free-will has no place—for a man does not choose for himself either where or in what nation or what state of life he shall be born,—if, they say, all this is not caused by a diversity in the natures of souls, that is, a soul with an evil nature is destined for an evil nation and a good one for a good nation, what alternative is there but

¹ See above, Bk. I. Ch. V. 3 and VIII. 2, pp. 45 f. and 68 f.

² See Col. I. 16.

³ See 1 Cor. XV. 41.

⁴ See Gen. XVII. 16; Gal. IV. 23.

⁵ See Gen. XXV. 21-26; Rom. IX. 10-13.

⁶ Cp. Origen *Con. Celsum* V. 27, 34.

to suppose that it is the result of accident or chance? Now if this were admitted, we should no longer believe the world to have been made by God nor to be ruled by his providence, and consequently it would seem that no judgment of God on every man's deeds is to be looked for. But in this matter what is clearly the truth of things is for him alone to know who 'searches all things, even the deep things of God'.¹

6. We, however, speaking simply as men, will, in order not to nourish the insolence of the heretics by being silent, to the best of our ability reply to their objections with such arguments as may occur to us, as follows. We have frequently shown in the preceding chapters, by declarations which we were able to quote from the divine scriptures, that God the Creator of the universe is both good and just and omnipotent.² Now when 'in the beginning'³ he created what he wished to create, that is rational beings, he had no other reason for creating them except himself, that is, his goodness. As therefore he himself, in whom was neither variation nor change nor lack of power, was the cause of all that was to be created, he created all his creatures equal and alike, for the simple reason that there was in him no cause that could give rise to variety and diversity. But since these rational creatures, as we have frequently shown and will show yet again in its proper place,⁴ were endowed with the power of free will, it was this freedom which induced each one by his own voluntary choice either to make progress through the imitation of God or to deteriorate through negligence. This, as we have said before,⁵ was the cause of the diversity among rational creatures, a cause that takes its origin not from the will or judgment of the Creator, but from the decision of the creature's own freedom. God, however, who then felt it just to arrange his creation according to merit, gathered the diversities of minds into the harmony of a single world, so as to furnish, as it were, out of these diverse vessels or souls or minds, one house, in which there must be 'not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and of earth, and some unto honour and some unto dishonour'.⁶

These were the reasons, as I think, which gave rise to the diversity of this world, wherein divine providence arranges all creatures individually in positions corresponding to the variation in their movements and the fixed purpose of their minds. For this reason the Creator will not appear to have been unjust when, according to the above principles, he placed everyone in a position proportionate to his merit; nor will the happiness

¹ 1 Cor. II. 10.

² See above Bk. II. Chs. IV. and V. (pp. 95 ff.).

³ Gen. I. 1.

⁴ See above Bk. I. Ch. V. 3, VI. 3, VIII. 3 (pp. 45 f., 56 f., and 69 f.) and Bk. III. (pp. 157 ff.).

⁵ See p. 130 above.

⁶ 2 Tim. II. 20.

or unhappiness of anyone's birth, or any condition whatever that may fall to his lot, be supposed to be due to chance; nor will it be believed that there are different creators or souls that are diverse by nature.

7. But even holy scripture does not seem to me to be altogether silent on the nature of this secret, as when the apostle Paul, arguing on the subject of Esau and Jacob, says: 'For when they were not yet born and had done nothing either good or evil, that the purpose of God which was formed according to election might stand, not from works but from him who called them, it was said that the elder should serve the younger, as it is written, Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated'.¹ And after this he addresses himself and says: 'What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God?' And in order to give us an occasion of inquiring into these matters and discovering how they are not outside all reason, he replies to himself and says, 'God forbid'.² For, as it appears to me, the same question which faces us in connexion with Esau and Jacob may also be raised in regard to all the heavenly beings and all creatures on earth and in the lower regions; and, it seems to me, just as it says there, 'When they were not yet born and had done nothing either good or evil', so, too, can it be said about all the rest. For 'when they were not yet' created 'and had done nothing either good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand',³ then, as certain men think, some were made heavenly, others of the earth and others of the lower regions, 'not from works', as the aforesaid men think, 'but from him who called them'.⁴ 'What then shall we say', if this is so? 'Is there then unrighteousness with God? God forbid'.⁵

As, therefore, when the scriptures are examined with much diligence in regard to Esau and Jacob, it is found that there is 'no unrighteousness with God' in its being said of them, before they were born or had done anything, in this life of course, that 'the elder should serve the younger', and as it is found that there is no unrighteousness in the fact that Jacob supplanted his brother even in the womb, provided we believe that by reason of his merits in some previous life Jacob had deserved to be loved by God to such an extent as to be worthy of being preferred to his brother, so also it is in regard to the heavenly creatures, provided we note that their diversity is not the original condition of their creation, but that for antecedent causes a different position of service is prepared by the Creator for each one in proportion to the degree of his merit, which depends on the fact that each, in being created by God as a mind or rational spirit, has personally gained for himself, in accordance with the movements of his mind and the disposition of his heart, a greater or

¹ Rom. IX. 11-13.

² Rom. IX. 11-13.

³ Rom. IX. 14.

⁴ Rom. IX. 11.

⁵ Rom. IX. 14.

less share of merit, and has rendered himself either lovable or it may be hateful to God. We must also note, however, that some beings who are of higher merit are ordained to suffer with the rest and to perform a duty to those below them, in order that by this means they themselves may become sharers in the endurance of the Creator, according to the Apostle's own words, 'The creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who subjected it, in hope.'¹

Bearing in mind, then, this sentiment, 'Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid',² which the apostle uttered when expounding the birth of Esau and Jacob, I think it right that the same sentiment should be employed in considering the case of all creatures, since, as we said above, the righteousness of the Creator ought to be apparent in all. And this, it appears to me, will only be shown with real clearness, if each being, whether of heaven or earth or below the earth, may be said to possess within himself the causes of diversity antecedent to his birth in the body. For all things were created by the Word of God and by his wisdom, and were set in order through the operation of his righteousness; and in his gracious compassion he provides for all and exhorts all to be cured by whatever remedies they may, and incites them to salvation.

8. As, then, without any doubt it will happen in the day of judgment that the good will be separated from the evil and the righteous from the unrighteous and every individual soul will by the judgment of God be allotted to that place of which his merits have rendered him worthy, a point which, if God will, we shall prove in the pages that follow,³ so also in the past some such process, I think, has taken place. For we must believe that God rules and arranges the universe by judgment at all times. And the teaching of the apostle, when he says that 'in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and of earth, and some unto honour, and some unto dishonour', with the additional words, 'if a man purge himself, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified and meet for the master's use, prepared unto every good work',⁴ undoubtedly proves this point, that whoever purges himself when placed in this life, will be prepared for every good work in the future, whereas he who does not purge himself will be, in accordance with the extent of his impurity, a 'vessel unto dishonour', that is, an unworthy one.

In this way it is possible for us to understand that even before the present life there were rational vessels, either wholly

¹ Rom. VIII. 20. This sentence, though contrary to Origen's system considered in a strictly logical way, shows that he was not unmindful of the nobility and necessity of sacrifice.

² Rom. IX. 14.

³ See the next chapter.

⁴ 2 Tim. II. 20, 21.

purged or less so, that is, vessels which had purged themselves or had not, and that from this circumstance each vessel received, according to the measure of its purity or impurity, its place or region or condition in which to be born or to fulfil some duty in this world. All these, down to the very least, God supervises by the power of his wisdom and distinguishes by the controlling hand of his judgment; and thus he has arranged the universe on the principle of a most impartial retribution, according as each one deserves for his merit to be assisted or cared for. Herein is displayed in its completeness the principle of impartiality, when the inequality of circumstances preserves an equality of reward for merit. But the grounds of merit in each individual are known with truth and clearness only to God, together with his only-begotten Word and Wisdom and his Holy Spirit.

CHAPTER X

GREEK

RESURRECTION AND PUNISHMENT.¹

LATIN

THE RESURRECTION AND THE JUDGMENT.

LATIN

1. But since our discourse has reminded us of the judgment to come and of retribution and the punishment of sinners, in accordance with the threatenings of the holy scriptures and the contents of the Church's teaching² to the effect that at the time of the judgment 'eternal fire' and 'outer darkness' and a 'prison' and a 'furnace' and other similar things have been prepared for sinners,³ let us see what we ought to believe about these matters also.

Now to approach them in the requisite order we must first, it seems to me, begin a discussion on the resurrection, in order to learn what it is that shall come either to punishment or to rest and blessedness. On this matter we have already argued more fully in the other books which we have written on resurrection⁴ and have shown what were our views about it. Now, however, for the sake of logical continuity in this treatise, it seems not unreasonable to repeat a few of the arguments from our former works, particularly because some make this objection to the faith of the church, that our beliefs about the resurrection are altogether foolish and silly.⁵

The chief objectors are the heretics, who must, I think, be answered in the following manner. If they admit, with us, that there is a resurrection of the dead, let them answer this question: 'What was it that died? Was it not a body?' If so, there will be a resurrection of the body. Then again, let them say whether they believe that we are to possess bodies, or not. I submit

¹ The Greek title is taken from Photius, *Cod.* 8, p. 4, where, as Koetschau rightly points out, it is incorrectly written as two separate titles, 'Concerning Resurrection. Concerning Punishment.'

² See above p. 4.

³ See St. Matt. XXV. 41, VIII. 12; 1 Peter III. 19.

⁴ Only small fragments of these works are extant. See the edition of Lommatsch XVII. 55-64. Origen's views on the Resurrection are clearly set forth in the *Con. Celsum* V. 17-19, VII. 32 and VIII. 49-50. His endeavour to uphold a spiritual doctrine of the resurrection body was misinterpreted by Methodius, Jerome and others as an attack upon the Church's faith.

⁵ Rufinus, (*Apol. in Hieron.* II. 4) claims that in his translation of the *First Principles* he had adhered to the teaching of the Church in the passages dealing with the 'resurrection of the flesh'.

that, seeing that the apostle Paul says, 'It is sown a natural body, it will rise again a spiritual body',¹ these men cannot deny that a body rises or that in the resurrection we are to possess bodies. What then? If it is certain that we are to possess bodies, and if those bodies which have fallen are declared to rise again—and the expression 'rise again' could not properly be used except of that which had previously fallen—then no one can doubt that these bodies rise again in order that at the resurrection we may once more be clothed with them. The one thing, therefore, is bound up with the other. For if bodies rise again, undoubtedly they rise again as a clothing for us, and if it is necessary, as it certainly is, for us to live in bodies, we ought to live in no other bodies but our own. And if it is true that they rise again and do so as 'spiritual', there is no doubt that this means that they rise again from the dead with corruption banished and mortality laid aside; otherwise it would seem vain and useless for a man to rise from the dead in order to die over again. Finally, this can be the more clearly understood by carefully observing what is the quality of the 'natural body' which, when sown in the earth, can reproduce the quality of a 'spiritual body'. For it is from the natural body that the very power and grace of the resurrection evokes the spiritual body, when it transforms it from dishonour to glory.

2. Since the heretics, however, think themselves most learned and wise, we shall ask them whether every body has some form, that is, whether it is fashioned in some shape? If they say there is a body which is not fashioned in some shape, they will show themselves the most ignorant and foolish of men; for no one, except an utter stranger to all learning, will deny that a body has a shape.² But if they give the logical answer and say that every body is fashioned in some definite shape, we shall inquire of them whether they can explain and describe to us the shape of a 'spiritual body'; which they certainly will in no way be able to do. Further, we shall ask them for an explanation of the differences among those who rise again. How will they prove the truth of the saying: 'there is one flesh of birds, another of fishes; there are also bodies celestial and bodies terrestrial; but there is one glory of heavenly beings, another of earthly, one glory of the sun, another glory of the moon, another glory of the stars, for one star differeth from another star in glory; so also is the resurrection of the dead'³ Let them show us, therefore, that the differences of glory among those who rise are comparable to these gradations among the heavenly

¹ 1 Cor. XV. 44.

² See Methodius, *De Resurr.* 25, 2. According to Methodius, Origen taught that in the resurrection men would have the same form as previously, but not a form of flesh.

³ 1 Cor. XV. 39-42.

bodies; and if by any means they have tried to think out some system along the lines of the differences among the heavenly bodies, we shall request them also to mark the differences in the resurrection indicated by the comparison drawn from earthly bodies.

We indeed understand the matter thus: the apostle, when he wished to describe how great were the differences among those who rise in glory, that is, the saints, drew a comparison from the heavenly bodies, saying, 'One glory of the sun, another glory of the moon, another glory of the stars.' When, on the other hand, he wished to teach us the differences among those who shall come to the resurrection without being purified in this life, that is, as sinners, he draws an illustration from earthly creatures and says, 'One flesh of birds, another of fishes'. For heavenly things are worthy of being compared with the saints, and earthly with sinners. Let this be said in opposition to those who deny the resurrection of the dead, that is, the resurrection of bodies.

3. We now direct the discussion to some of our own people, who either from poverty of intellect or from lack of instruction introduce an exceedingly low and mean idea of the resurrection of the body. We ask these men in what manner they think that the 'natural body' will, by the grace of the resurrection, be changed and become 'spiritual'; and in what manner they believe that what is 'sown in weakness' will be 'raised in power', and what is sown 'in dishonour' is to 'rise in glory', and what is sown 'in corruption' is to be transformed into 'incorruption'?¹ Certainly if they believe the apostle, who says that the body, when it rises in glory and in power and in incorruptibility, has already become spiritual, it seems absurd and contrary to his meaning to say that it is still entangled in the passions of flesh and blood, seeing that he says plainly, 'Flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God, neither shall corruption inherit incorruption.'² Further, how do they take the passage in which the apostle says, 'We shall all be changed'?³ This change, the character of which we have before spoken of,⁴ we must certainly look forward to, and we are undoubtedly right in expecting it to consist in some act that is worthy of the divine grace; for we believe that it will be a change of like character to that

¹ See 1 Cor. XV. 42-44.

² 1 Cor. XV. 50. According to Photius, *Ep.* I. 8, 15 (Migne P. G. 102, p. 645), Origen and his followers expressed themselves more clearly than Rufinus will allow on the spiritual nature of the Resurrection. 'They will have it that our bodies do not rise with our souls, but that the latter rise without bodies, thus giving the name resurrection to I do not know what. For it should be a resurrection of that which has fallen and died, and not of something which exists and remains in incorruption for ever, such as the soul is.'

³ 1 Cor. XV. 51.

⁴ See above p. 139.

in which, as the apostle describes it, 'a bare grain of wheat or of some other kind' is sown in the earth, but 'God giveth it a body as it pleased him',¹ after the grain of wheat itself has first died.²

So must we suppose that our bodies, like a grain of corn, fall into the earth, but that implanted in them is the life-principle which contains the essence of the body; and although the bodies die and are corrupted and scattered, nevertheless by the word of God that same life principle which has all along been preserved in the essence of the body raises them up from the earth and restores and refashions them, just as the power which exists in a grain of wheat refashions and restores the grain, after its corruption and death, into a body with stalk and ear.³ And so in the case of those who shall be counted worthy of obtaining an inheritance in the kingdom of the heavens, the life-principle before mentioned, by which the body is refashioned, at the command of God refashions out of the earthly and natural body a spiritual body, which can dwell in the heavens; while to those who have proved of inferior merit, or of something still meaner than this, or even of the lowest and most insignificant grade, will be given a body of glory and dignity corresponding to the dignity of each one's life and soul; in such a way, however, that even for those who are to be destined to 'eternal fire' or to 'punishments'⁴ the body that rises is so incorruptible, through the transformation wrought by the resurrection, that it cannot be corrupted and dissolved even by punishments.⁵ * * *

4. If then this is the character of the body which rises from the dead, let us now see what is the meaning of the threatened 'eternal fire'.⁶ Now we find in the prophet Isaiah that the fire by which each man is punished is described as belonging to himself. For it says, 'Walk in the light of your fire and in the flame which you have kindled for yourselves'.⁷ These words

¹ 1 Cor. XV. 37, 38.

² See St. John XII. 24.

³ See Origen, *Con. Celsum* V. 23. 'We do not, therefore, maintain that the body which has undergone corruption returns to its original nature, any more than the grain of wheat which has undergone corruption returns to the condition of a grain of wheat. What we say is that, just as over the grain of wheat there arises a stalk, so there is implanted in the body a certain life-principle, from which, not being corruptible, the body arises in incorruption.' See also *Con. Celsum* V. 18, 19 and VII. 32.

⁴ See St. Matt. XXV. 41, 46.

⁵ Koetschau assumes a gap here to allow for certain statements made by Origen which Rufinus does not give. See Anathema X of the Second Council of Constantinople: '[If anyone shall say that] the Lord's body after the resurrection was ethereal and spherical in shape, and that after the resurrection all other men's bodies will be the same, and that when the Lord has put away his own body and all men have done likewise, then the nature of bodies will disappear into nonexistence, [let him be anathema].' Also Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam*. Mansi IX 516 D. 'He (i.e. Origen) says that in the resurrection the bodies of men will rise spherical.'

⁶ See St. Matt. XXV. 41, 46.

⁷ Is. L. 11.

seem to indicate that every sinner kindles for himself the flame of his own fire, and is not plunged into a fire which has been previously kindled by some one else or which existed before him. Of this fire the food and material are our sins, which are called by the apostle Paul wood and hay and stubble.¹ And I think that just as in the body an abundance of eatables or food that disagrees with us either by its quality or its quantity gives rise to fevers differing in kind and duration according to the degree in which the combination of noxious elements supplies material and fuel for them—the quality of which material, made up of the diverse noxious elements, being the cause which renders the attack sharper or more protracted—so when the soul has gathered within itself a multitude of evil deeds and an abundance of sins, at the requisite time the whole mass of evil boils up into punishment and is kindled into penalties; at which time also the mind or conscience, bringing to memory through divine power all things the signs and forms of which it had impressed upon itself at the moment of sinning, will see exposed before its eyes a kind of history of its evil deeds, of every foul and disgraceful act and all unholy conduct. Then the conscience is harassed and pricked by its own stings, and becomes an accuser and witness against itself.

This, I think, was what the apostle Paul felt when he said, 'Their thoughts one with another accusing or else excusing them, in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men, according to my gospel, by Jesus Christ'.² From which we understand that in the very essence of the soul certain torments are produced from the harmful desires themselves that lead us to sin.³

5. But to prevent your thinking that this explanation of the matter is somewhat difficult to grasp, we can consider the effect of those faults of passion which often occur in men, as when the soul is burnt up with the flames of love, or tormented by the fires of jealousy or envy, or tossed about with furious anger, or consumed with intense sadness; remembering how some

¹ See 1 Cor. III. 12.

² Rom. II. 15, 16.

³ Origen's doctrine of the purifying nature of 'eternal fire', stated in this and the succeeding paragraphs, is also described in *Con. Celsum* V. 16 and VI. 25, 26. Jerome *Ep. ad Avitum* 7, says: 'As for the fire of Gehenna and the torments, with which holy scripture threatens sinners, Origen does not make them consist in punishments, but in the conscience of sinners, when by the goodness and power of God the whole memory of our offences is placed before our eyes. The entire crop of our sins springs up as it were from seeds which have remained hidden in the soul, and every shameful and impious act that we have done is represented in an image before our eyes, so that the mind, beholding its former acts of self-indulgence is punished by a burning conscience and stung by the pricks of remorse.' So also *Comm. in Ep. ad Ephes.* III. 5 and *Apol. adv. Rufin.* II. 7. Cp. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* VII. 6, 34 (Stahlin III. 27, 5-8). 'We, however, maintain that the fire purifies not flesh, but sinful souls; for we call it not the all-devouring and tormenting, but the discerning fire.'

men, finding the excess of these ills too heavy to bear, have deemed it more tolerable to submit to death than to endure such tortures. You will ask, indeed, whether for men who have been entangled in the ills which arise from the above-mentioned faults and have been unable all the time they were in this life to secure for themselves any amelioration and have so departed from this world, it will be a sufficient punishment that they should be tortured by the long continuance in them of those harmful desires, whose deadly poison was in this life assuaged by no healing remedy; or whether when these desires have been changed they will be tormented by the stings of a general punishment.

Now I think that another species of punishment may be understood to exist; for just as, when the limbs of the body are loosened and torn away from their respective connexions, we feel an intense and excruciating pain, so when the soul is found apart from that order and connexion and harmony in which it was created by God for good action and useful experience and not at concord with itself in the connexion of its rational movements, it must be supposed to bear the penalty and torture of its own want of cohesion and to experience the punishment due to its unstable and disordered condition. But when the soul, thus torn and rent asunder, has been tried by the application of fire, it is undoubtedly wrought into a condition of stronger inward connexion and renewal.

6. There are many other matters, too, which are hidden from us, and are known only to him who is the physician of our souls. For if in regard to bodily health we occasionally find it necessary to take some very unpleasant and bitter medicine as a cure for the ills we have brought on through eating and drinking, and sometimes, if the character of the ill demands it, we need the severe treatment of the knife and a painful operation, yes, and should the disease have extended beyond the reach even of these remedies, in the last resort the ill is burnt out by fire, how much more should we realise that God our physician, in his desire to wash away the ills of our souls, which they have brought on themselves through a variety of sins and crimes, makes use of penal remedies of a similar sort, even to the infliction of a punishment of fire on those who have lost their soul's health.

Allusions to this are found also in the holy scriptures. For instance, in Deuteronomy the divine word threatens that sinners are to be punished with 'fevers and cold and pallor', and tortured with 'feebleness of eyes and insanity and paralysis and blindness and weakness of the reins'.¹ And so if anyone will gather at his leisure from the whole of scripture all the references to sufferings which in threats against sinners are called by the names

¹ See Deut. XXVIII. 22, 28, 29.

of bodily sicknesses, he will find that through them allusion is being made to either the ills or the punishments of souls. And to help us understand that as physicians supply aids to sufferers with the object of restoring them to health through careful treatment, so with the same motive God acts towards those who have lapsed and fallen into sin, there is proof in that passage in which, through the prophet Jeremiah, God's 'cup of fury' is commanded 'to be set before all nations' that 'they may drink it and become mad and spew it out'.¹ In this passage there is a threat which says, 'If anyone refuse to drink, he shall not be cleansed';² from which certainly we understand that the fury of God's vengeance ministers to the purification of souls.

Isaiah teaches that even the punishments which are said to be inflicted by fire are meant to be applied as a help, when he speaks thus about Israel: 'The Lord will wash away the filth of the sons and daughters of Sion, and will purge away the blood from the midst of them by the spirit of judgment and the spirit of burning'.³ And of the Chaldeans he speaks thus: 'Thou hast coals of fire, sit upon them; they shall be to thee for a help',⁴ and in other places he says: 'The Lord shall sanctify them in burning fire',⁵ and in the prophet Malachi it speaks as follows: 'The Lord shall sift and refine his people as gold and silver; he shall refine and purify and pour forth purified the sons of Judah'.⁶

7. Moreover, the saying in the gospel about unjust stewards, who must be 'cut asunder' and 'their portion placed with the unbelievers',⁷ as if the portion which was not theirs were to be sent somewhere else, undoubtedly alludes to some sort of punishment, as it seems to me, which falls on those whose spirit has to be separated from their soul. Now if we are to understand this spirit as belonging to the divine nature, that is, as being the Holy Spirit, we shall perceive that the passage relates to the gift of the Holy Spirit. It tells us that when, whether through baptism or the grace of the Spirit, the 'word of wisdom' or the 'word of knowledge'⁸ or of any other endowment has been given to a man as a gift and not rightly used, that is to say, either 'hidden in the earth' or 'bound up in a napkin',⁹ the gift of the Spirit will surely be withdrawn from his soul, and the portion which remains, namely the essence of the soul, will be placed with the unbelievers, cut asunder and separated from that Spirit with whom, by joining itself to the Lord, it ought to have been 'one spirit'.¹⁰

¹ See Jerem. XXV. 15, 16, 27.

² See Jerem. XXV. 28, 29.

³ Is. IV. 4. ⁴ Is. XLVII. 14, 15 (Sept.) and see above p. 104.

⁵ See Is. LXVI. 16, 17.

⁶ Mal. III. 3.

⁷ See St. Luke XII. 42-46.

⁸ See 1 Cor. XII. 8.

⁹ See St. Matt. XXV. 25; St. Luke XIX. 20.

¹⁰ See 1 Cor. VI. 17.

If, however, we are to understand the spirit as being not the Spirit of God but the nature of the soul itself, then that portion of it will be called the better, which was made in the 'image and likeness' of God,¹ whereas the other portion will be that which afterwards through the misuse of free will was received in a condition contrary to the nature of its original purity; and this portion, as being the friend and beloved companion of the material body, is visited with the fate of the unbelievers. But the cutting asunder may also be understood in a third sense, namely, that whereas each of the faithful, though he be the least in the Church, is we are told attended by an angel who is declared by the Saviour always to 'behold the face of God the Father',² this angel of God, who was certainly one with him over whom he was set, is to be withdrawn from him if by disobedience he becomes unworthy; and in that case 'his portion', that is the portion consisting of his human nature, being torn asunder from God's portion, is to be numbered with the unbelievers, seeing that he did not faithfully observe the warnings of the angel allotted to him by God.³

3. The 'outer darkness',⁴ too, is in my opinion not to be understood as a place with a murky atmosphere and no light at all, but rather as a description of those who through their immersion in the darkness of deep ignorance have become separated from every gleam of reason and intelligence. We must also see whether possibly this expression does not mean that just as the saints will receive back the very bodies in which they have lived in holiness and purity during their stay in this life, but bright and glorious as a result of the resurrection, so, too, the wicked, who in this life have loved the darkness of error and the night of ignorance, will after the resurrection be clothed with murky and black bodies, in order that this very gloom of ignorance, which in the present world has taken possession of the inner parts of their mind, may in the world to come be revealed through the garment of their outward body. (Perhaps,⁵ however, the 'gloom and darkness'⁶ should be taken to mean this coarse and earthly body, through which at the end of this world each man that must pass into another world will receive the beginnings of a fresh birth) * * * The expression 'prison'⁷ must be thought of in a similar way. * * *

¹ See Gen. I. 26.

² See St. Matt. XVIII. 10.

³ See St. Luke XII. 46.

⁴ St. Matt. VIII. 12 etc.

⁵ This passage, taken from Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 7, has been omitted by Rufinus. Jerome adds: 'In so speaking he clearly supports the doctrine of transmigration taught by Pythagoras and Plato.'

⁶ See St. Matt. VIII. 12 etc.

⁷ 1 St. Peter III. 19 and p. 138 above. This sentence belongs to Rufinus.

GREEK

There¹ is a resurrection of the dead, and there is punishment, but not everlasting. For when the body is punished the soul is gradually purified, and so is restored to its ancient rank * * For all wicked men, and for daemons, too, punishment has an end, and both wicked men and daemons shall be restored to their former rank.

LATIN

Let these remarks,² which we have made at this point, to preserve the order of our discourse, in the fewest possible words, suffice for the present.

¹ Fragment 25, Koetschau, the first part taken from Leont. Byz. *De Sectis*, Act. X. 6 (Migne P. G. 86 I, 1265), and the second (beginning, 'For all wicked men . . .') from Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 517). Rufinus has omitted the explicit denial of everlasting punishment.

² This concluding sentence is from Rufinus.

CHAPTER XI

THE PROMISES¹

1. Let us now consider briefly what we ought to believe about the promises.

It is certain that no living creature can be altogether inactive and immovable, but that it is eager for every kind of movement and for continual action and volition; and it is clear, I think, that this nature resides in all living beings. Much more then must a rational being such as man be always engaged in some movement or activity. And if a man forgets himself and is unaware of what befits him, his whole purpose centres round bodily experiences and in all his movements he is occupied with the pleasures and lusts of the body. If, however, he is one who strives to care or provide for the common good, he applies himself either to serving the State or obeying the magistrates or to whatever else may seem to be clearly of benefit to people generally. But if there be a man who can discern something better than these activities, which appear to be connected with the body, and can give diligent attention to wisdom and knowledge, he will undoubtedly direct all his efforts towards studies of this sort, with the object of learning, through inquiry into truth, what are the causes and reason of things.² As therefore in this life one man decides that the highest good is the pleasure of the body, another the service of the State, and another devotion to studies and learning, so we seek to know whether in that life which is the true one, the life which is said to be 'hid with Christ in God',³ that is, in the eternal life, there will be for us any such order or condition of existence.

2. Now some men, who reject the labour of thinking and seek after the outward and literal meaning of the law, or rather give way to their own desires and lusts, disciples of the mere letter, consider that the promises of the future are to be looked for in the form of pleasure and bodily luxury.⁴ And chiefly on this account they desire after the resurrection to have flesh of such a sort that they will never lack the power to eat and drink and to do all things that pertain to flesh and blood, not following the teaching of the apostle Paul about the resurrection of a

¹ For the title see Acts XXVI. 6 and Heb. VI. 12. The Latin agrees with the Greek title, to be found in Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* 8.

² See Virgil, *Georgics* II. 490.

³ See Col. III. 3.

⁴ These simple folk (Lat. *simpliciores*), who took the Scriptures literally, are further described in Origen, *In Matt.* XVII. 35 (Lomm. IV. 167 f.) and *In Cant. Proleg.* (Lomm. XIV. 295).

'spiritual body'.¹ Consequently they go on to say that even after the resurrection there will be engagements to marry and the procreation of children, for they picture to themselves the earthly city of Jerusalem about to be rebuilt with precious stones laid down for its foundations and its walls erected of jasper and its battlements adorned with crystal; it will also have an outer wall composed of different precious stones, namely, jasper, sapphire, chalcedony, emerald, sardius, onyx, chrysolite, chrysoprase, hyacinth and amethyst.² Then, too, they suppose that 'aliens' are to be given them to minister to their pleasures, and that they will have these for 'plowmen' or 'vinedressers' or 'wall-builders',³ so that by them their ruined and fallen city may be raised up again; and they consider that they are to receive the 'wealth of nations' to live on and that they will have control over their riches, so that even the camels of Midian and Ephah will come and bring them 'gold, incense and precious stones'.⁴

All this they try to prove on prophetic authority from those passages of scripture which describe the promises made to Jerusalem; where it is also said that 'they who serve God shall eat and drink, but sinners shall hunger and thirst', and that 'the righteous shall enjoy gladness, but confusion shall possess the wicked'.⁵ From the New Testament, too, they quote the Saviour's saying, in which he makes a promise to his disciples of the gladness that wine brings; 'I will not drink of this cup until the day that I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom'.⁶ They add also the following, that the Saviour calls those blessed, who now hunger and thirst, and promises them that they shall be filled;⁷ and they quote from the scriptures many other illustrations, the force of which they do not perceive must be figurative and spiritual. Then, too, after the fashion of what happens in this life, and of this world's positions of dignity or rank or supreme power, they consider that they will be kings and princes, just like the corresponding earthly rulers, relying on the saying in the gospel, 'Thou shalt have authority over five cities'.⁸ And, to speak briefly, they desire that all things which they look for in the promises should correspond in every detail with the course of this life, that is, that what exists now should exist again. Such are the thoughts of men who believe indeed in Christ, but because they understand the divine scriptures in a Judaistic sense, extract from them nothing that is worthy of the divine promises.

3. Those, however, who accept a view of the scriptures which accords with the meaning of the apostles, do indeed hope that

¹ 1 Cor. XV. 44.

² See Rev. XXI. 10-21; Is. LIV. 12; Ezek. XXVIII. 13.

³ See Is. LXI. 5; LX. 10.

⁴ See Is. LXI. 6; LX. 5, 6.

⁵ See Is. LXV. 13, 14.

⁶ St. Matt. XXVI. 29.

⁷ See St. Matt. V. 6; St. Luke VI. 21.

⁸ See Jerem. XVII. 25; St. Luke XIX. 19.

the saints will eat; but they will eat the 'bread of life',¹ which is to nourish the soul and enlighten the mind with the food of truth and wisdom and to cause it to drink from the cup of divine wisdom, as the divine scripture says: 'Wisdom has prepared her table, she has slain her victims, she has mingled her wine in the bowl and cries with a loud voice, Turn in to me and eat the bread which I have prepared for you, and drink the wine which I have mingled for you'.² The mind, when nourished by this food of wisdom to a whole and perfect state, as man was made in the beginning, will be restored to the 'image and likeness' of God; so that, even though a man may have departed out of this life insufficiently instructed, but with a record of acceptable works, he can be instructed in that Jerusalem, the city of the saints, that is, he can be taught and informed and fashioned into a 'living stone', a 'stone precious and elect',⁴ because he has borne with courage and endurance the trials of life and the struggles after piety. There, too, he will come to a truer and clearer knowledge of the saying already uttered here, that 'man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God'.⁵ Moreover, the princes and rulers must be understood to be those who both rule over the souls of lower condition and also instruct and teach them and initiate them into things divine.

4. But if these considerations seem scarcely able to produce a worthy desire in minds that hope for literal promises, let us continue our inquiry a little, and see how an eager longing for the reality of things is natural to us and implanted in our soul; so that we may at last be able, by following out a spiritual view of scripture, to describe as it were the true forms of the 'bread of life' and the quality of that 'wine' and the characteristics of the 'principalities'.⁶ As, then, in those arts, which are accomplished by manual labour, the design, the why or how or for what uses a thing is made, lies in the mind, but its practical efficacy is unfolded through the help of the work of our hands, so we must believe that in regard to God's works, which have been made by him, their design and meaning remain a secret. Now when our eye sees the works of the craftsman, if it observes an article which has been made with unusual skill, immediately the mind burns to discover of what sort it is and how and for what uses it was made. Much more, and beyond all comparison, does the mind burn with unspeakable longing to learn the design of those things which we perceive to have been made by God. This longing, this love has, we believe, undoubtedly been implanted in us by God; and as the eye

¹ St. John VI. 35.

² See Prov. IX. 2-5.

³ Gen. I. 26.

⁴ See 1 Peter II. 4-6.

⁵ St. Matt. IV. 4 (Deut. VIII. 3).

⁶ See St. John VI. 35; Prov. IX. 2, 5; St. Luke XIX. 17, 19.

naturally demands light and vision and our body by its nature desires food and drink, so our mind cherishes a natural and appropriate longing to know God's truth and to learn the causes of things.

Now we have not received this longing from God on the condition that it should not or could not ever be satisfied; for in that case the 'love of truth'¹ would appear to have been implanted in our mind by God the Creator to no purpose, if its gratification is never to be accomplished. So when even in this life men devote themselves with great labour to sacred and religious studies, although they obtain only some small fragments out of the immeasurable treasures of divine knowledge,² yet [they gain this advantage,]³ that they occupy their mind and understanding with these questions and press onward in their eager desire. Moreover they derive much assistance from the fact that by turning their mind to the study and love of truth they render themselves more capable of receiving instruction in the future. For when a man wishes to paint a picture, if he first sketches with the faint touch of a light pencil the outlines of the proposed figure and inserts suitable marks to indicate features afterwards to be added, this preliminary drawing with its faint outline undoubtedly renders the canvas more prepared to receive the true colours. So it will be with us, if only that faint form and outline is inscribed 'on the tablets of our heart'⁴ by the pencil of our Lord Jesus Christ. This is perhaps the reason why it is said, 'To every one that hath shall be given and added'.⁵ It is clear, then, that to those who have now in this life a kind of outline of truth and knowledge there shall be added in the future the beauty of the perfect image.

5. Such was, I think, the 'desire' indicated by him who said, 'I am in a strait between two, having a desire to depart and be with Christ; for this is far better'.⁶ He knew that when he had gone back to Christ he would learn more clearly the reasons for all things that happen on earth, that is, the reasons which account for man, for his soul or his mind, or whichever of these constitutes man,⁷ and what is the meaning of the 'ruling spirit', and of the 'spirit who works', and of the 'living spirit',⁸ and of the grace of the Holy Spirit which is given to the faithful. Then also he will understand the significance of the name Israel, and of the diversity of races; and also of the twelve tribes contained in Israel, and of the people of each several tribe. He

¹ See 2 Thess. II. 10.

² See Col. II. 2, 3.

³ The sentence is not complete in Latin, and Koetschau suggests inserting the words *lucris habent et*, which are translated above.

⁴ See 2 Cor. III. 3.

⁵ St. Matt. XXV. 29.

⁶ Phil. I. 23.

⁷ See above Bk. II. Ch. VIII. 3, 4, (p. 122 ff.).

⁸ These titles are probably suggested by passages such as Eph. II. 2; 1 Cor. XII. 6, 11; Rom. VIII. 2.

will also understand the reasons for the priests and Levites and for the different priestly orders, and whose type it was that was seen in Moses; and he will learn, too, what is the true meaning in God's sight of the jubilees and the weeks of years. Further, he will see the reason of the feast days and the holy days and will perceive the causes of all the sacrifices and purifications. He will observe the reason for the cleansing after leprosy and for the different kinds of leprosy, and the meaning of the purification of those who suffer an emission of seed. He will learn about the good powers, what they are, and their greatness and qualities, and likewise about the opposite kind, and the explanation of the love which the former bear towards mankind and of the persistent jealousy of the latter.¹ He will perceive what is the reason of souls² and the meaning of the diversity among animals, whether those that live in water, or birds, or beasts; and for what cause each genus is divided into so many species; and what purpose of the Creator or what indication of his wisdom is concealed in each individual thing. Further, he will learn the reason why certain properties are attached to certain roots and herbs; and what is the reason of the fallen angels, and for what cause they are allowed to flatter in some respects those who do not despise them with complete faith and to exist for the purpose of deceiving and leading men astray. He will learn the judgment of divine providence about each individual thing; about things which happen to men, that they happen not by chance or accident, but by a reason so carefully thought out, and so high above us, that it does not overlook even the number of the hairs of our head, and that not of the saints only but probably of all men; the scope of which providence extends even to the 'two sparrows'³ which are sold for a penny, whether 'sparrows' is to be understood spiritually or literally. For now in this present life we seek, but there we shall see plainly.⁴

6. All this leads us to suppose that no small interval of time may pass before the reason merely of things on earth can be shown to worthy and deserving men after their departure from life, in order that through their acquaintance with it all and the grace of full knowledge they may enjoy an indescribable gladness.

So then, if the air between heaven and earth is not devoid of living and even rational beings, as the apostle said, 'Wherein in times past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of this air, the spirit who now worketh in the children of disobedience',⁵ and again, 'We shall be caught up in the clouds to meet Christ in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord',⁶ we must suppose that the saints

¹ See above Bk. I. Ch. V. (p. 44 ff.).

² See above Bk. II. Ch. VIII. (p. 120 ff.).

³ See St. Matt. X. 30, 31.

⁴ Eph. II. 2.

⁵ See 1 Cor. XIII. 12.

⁶ 1 Thess. IV. 17.

will remain there for some time, until they learn the reason of the ordering of all that goes on in the air, in its two-fold form. By two-fold form I mean, for example; when we were on earth we saw animals or trees and we perceived the differences among them and also the very great diversity among men. But when we saw these things we did not understand the reasons for them; but this alone was suggested to us by the very diversity of what we saw, that we should search out and inquire for what reason all these were created diverse and arranged in such variety; and if we have cherished on earth a zeal and love for this kind of knowledge, there will be given to us after death an acquaintance with and understanding of that reason, if indeed the matter turns out as we should wish. When therefore we have comprehended that in its fulness, we shall comprehend in two-fold form the things we saw on earth.

We may speak in some such way also about the abode in the air. I think that the saints as they depart from this life will remain in some place situated on the earth, which the divine scripture calls 'paradise'.¹ This will be a place of instruction and, so to speak, a lecture room or school for souls, in which they may be taught about all that they had seen on earth and may also receive some indications of what is to follow in the future; just as when placed in this life they had obtained certain indications of the future, seen indeed 'through a glass darkly', and yet truly seen 'in part',² which are revealed more clearly and brightly to the saints in their proper times and places. If anyone is 'pure in heart'³ and of unpolluted mind and well-trained understanding he will make swifter progress and quickly ascend to the region of the air, until he reaches the kingdom of the heavens, passing through the series of those 'abiding places',⁴ if I may so call them, which the Greeks have termed spheres, that is, globes, but which the divine scripture calls heavens. In each of these he will first observe all that happens there, and then learn the reason why it happens; and thus he will proceed in order through each stage, following him who has 'entered into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God',⁵ and who has said, 'I will that, where I am, they also may be with me'.⁶ Further, he alludes to this diversity of places when he says, 'In my Father's house are many abiding-places'.⁷ He himself, however, is everywhere and runs through all things; nor are we any longer to

¹ See Gen. II. 8 etc. (Sept.); St. Luke XXIII. 43.

² See 1 Cor. XIII. 12.

³ St. Matt. V. 8.

⁴ See St. John XIV. 2. The Greek idea of the heavens was that of a series of revolving spheres, beginning with that of the moon and ending with the sphere of the fixed stars (see par. 7 below). Philo says (*De somniis* I. 22) that the lower air nearest the earth is the home of disembodied souls.

⁵ Heb. IV. 14.

⁶ St. John XVII. 24.

⁷ St. John XIV. 2.

think of him as being confined within those narrow limits in which he once lived for our sakes, that is, not as being in that circumscribed condition which was his when he dwelt on earth among men in a body like ours, so that it was then possible to think of him as being enclosed in some one place.

7. When the saints have reached the heavenly places, then they will see clearly the nature of the stars, one by one, and will understand whether they are living creatures or whatever may be truth about them.¹ They will also perceive the other reasons for God's works, which he himself shall reveal to them. For now he will show to them, as to sons, the causes of things and the perfection of his creation, teaching them why one star is placed in its particular position in the sky and why it is separated from another by so great an interval of space; what would happen, for example, if it were nearer or farther away; or if this star had been greater than that, how the entire universe would not retain its identity but everything would be changed into another form. And when they have gone through everything connected with the reason of the stars and with those ways of life that exist in heaven they will come to 'the things which are not seen',² or to those whose names alone we have as yet heard, and to the things 'invisible'.³ That there are many of these we learn from Paul the apostle, but what they are or what differences exist among them we cannot even guess with our feeble intellect.

And so the rational being, growing at each successive stage, not as it grew when in this life in the flesh or body and in the soul, but increasing in mind and intelligence, advances as a mind already perfect to perfect knowledge, no longer hindered by its former carnal senses, but developing in intellectual power, ever approaching the pure and gazing 'face to face',⁴ if I may so speak, on the causes of things.⁵ And it attains perfection, first that perfection by which it rises to this condition, and secondly that by which it remains therein, while it has for the food on which it feeds the problems of the meaning of things and the nature of their causes. For as in this bodily life of ours we grew first of all bodily into that which we now are, the increase being supplied in our early years merely by a sufficiency of food, whereas after the process of growth has reached its

¹ See above Bk. I., Ch. VII. 3 (p. 59 ff.).

² 2 Cor. IV. 18.

³ See Rom. I. 20; Col. I. 16.

⁴ See 1 Cor. XIII. 12. Jerome's paraphrase of this passage is as follows (*Ep. ad Avitum* 7): 'And at the end of the second book, in the course of his argument about our final perfection, he says: When we have progressed so far that we are no longer flesh and bodies, and possibly not even souls, but mind and understanding come to perfection and not blinded by any cloud of disturbing passions, we shall see rational and spiritual beings "face to face".'

⁵ See above p. 147.

limit we use food not in order to grow but as a means of preserving life within us; so, too, I think that the mind, when it has come to perfection, still feeds on appropriate and suitable food in a measure which can neither admit of want nor of superfluity. But in all respects this food must be understood to be the contemplation and understanding of God, and its measures to be those that are appropriate and suitable to this nature which has been made and created. These measures will rightly be observed by every one of those who are beginning to 'see God', that is, to understand him through 'purity of heart'.¹

¹ See St. Matt. V. 8.

BOOK III

PREFACE OF RUFINUS

The two former books on 'First Principles' I translated not merely at your request, but at your urgent demand, during the days of Lent. But since in those days, my devout brother Macarius, you were living near me and were more at leisure than you are now, I also worked the more. These latter two, however, I have been slower in interpreting, seeing that you have paid me fewer visits from the furthest part of the city to press forward the work. Now if you remember what I mentioned in my former preface,¹ that certain people would be angry if they did not hear us speak some evil of Origen, this came to pass immediately, as I think you discovered. But if those demons who incite the tongues of men to evil speaking were so incensed against that work, in which he had not yet fully laid bare their secrets, what do you suppose will happen to this, in which he has revealed all the dark and hidden ways by which they creep into the hearts of men and deceive weak and feeble souls? At once you will see everything in confusion, dissensions aroused, clamour raised throughout the city, and condemnation called down upon the man who strove to dispel the diabolical darkness of ignorance by the light of the gospel lamp. Let such things, however, be counted of small moment by everyone who desires, while preserving unimpaired the rule of the Catholic faith, to be trained in divine instruction.

But this I must needs mention, that, as I did in the former books, so in these also I have taken care not to translate such passages as appeared to be contrary to the rest of Origen's teaching and to our own faith, but to omit them as forgeries interpolated by others.² If, however, he appeared to say anything of a novel kind about rational creatures, then, seeing that the essence of the faith is not involved in this, for the sake of knowledge and discussion, on occasions when perchance we had to reply to certain heresies in a similar order, I have not omitted such statements, either in these or in the former books, except perhaps where he wished to repeat in the later books what had been said in the former; in which case I have thought it right for the sake of brevity to cut out some of these repetitions.

Anyone who reads these books with a desire to advance in knowledge and not to raise objections will do better to have them explained to him by skilled teachers. For it is absurd to

¹ See Preface, Bk. I. p. xlii.

² See Preface, Bk. I. p. xli.

have the fictitious songs of the poets and the ridiculous tales in the comedies explained by grammarians, while anyone thinks he can learn without master or interpreter the things which are written about God and the heavenly powers and the entire universe, in which every wicked error whether of pagan philosophers or of heretics is refuted. This is how it comes about that when the discussions concern things difficult and obscure men choose rather to condemn them rashly and ignorantly, than to learn their meaning by study and diligence.

CHAPTER I

GREEK

FREE WILL¹

1. Since the teaching of the church includes the doctrine of the righteous judgment of God, a doctrine which, if believed to be true, summons its hearers to live a good life and by every means to avoid sin—for it assumes that they acknowledge that deeds worthy of praise or of blame lie within our own power—let us now discuss separately a few points on the subject of free will, a problem of the utmost possible urgency. And in order to understand what free will is we must explain its meaning, that when this has been made clear the precise question may lie before us.

2. Of things that move some have the cause of their movement within themselves, while others are moved solely from

LATIN

FREE WILL

1. Such we believe should be our beliefs about the divine promises, when we apply our understanding to the contemplation of that eternal and never-ending age and contemplate its unspeakable joy and blessedness.

Since the teaching of the church includes the doctrine of a future righteous judgment of God, a belief in which summons and persuades men to live a good and blessed life and in every way to avoid sin, and since by this the fact is undoubtedly indicated that it lies within our own power to devote ourselves to a life worthy either of praise or of blame, I consider it necessary in consequence to discuss a few points on the subject of our free will, inasmuch as this question has been dealt with in no unworthy manner by very many writers. And in order the more easily to understand what free will is, let us inquire what is the nature of will and of desire.

2. Of things that move some have the causes of their movements within themselves, while others receive them from

¹ This chapter, marked as Frag. 26, Koetschau, is preserved in Ch. XXI. of the *Philocalia*, a collection of extracts from Origen's works made by Gregory and Basil. See the Edition of J. A. Robinson, Cambridge 1893, p. 152 ff.

GREEK

without.¹ Those, for example, moved solely from without are portable things, such as logs of wood and stones and all matter that is held together simply by its own constitution. Let the view that would regard the flux of bodies as motion be excluded from the present discussion, since there is no need of this for our purpose. Things that have the cause of their movement in themselves are animals and plants and in a word everything that is held together by its nature or by soul. Among these they say are included even metals; and in addition fire is self-moved and perhaps also springs of water. But while all these have the cause of their movement within themselves, some are said to be moved out of themselves, others from within themselves; non-living things out of themselves, living things from within themselves.

LATIN

without. Those, for example, moved solely from without are all lifeless things, such as stones, logs of wood and other things of this kind, which are held together simply by the constitution of their material or by their physical structure. We must of course exclude for the present the view that regards it as motion when bodies dissolve in corruption; for this has no bearing on our immediate purpose. Other things have the cause of their movement in themselves, as animals, trees and all things which are held together either by natural life or by soul. Among these some think that even the veins of metals should be reckoned; and, in addition, fire must be supposed to be self-moved and perhaps also springs of water. But of these which have the cause of their movements within themselves, some are said to be moved out of themselves, others from within themselves; and they are so divided because those which have life but no soul move out of themselves, those which have soul from within themselves.

¹ A similar passage is found in Origen, *De Oratione* VI. 1. 'Of things that move some derive their movement from without, such as non-living things and things that are held together simply by their own constitution, as well as things that are moved by nature and soul when occasionally these move not as such but in a manner similar to that of things held together simply by their own constitution. For instance, stones hewn from the quarry and logs which have lost their power of growth are held together simply by their own constitution and derive their movement from without; and so also do the bodies of animals and the portable fruits of plants which, when changed in position by anyone, change not like animals or plants but like stones or logs which have lost the power of growth. And even if these latter move in virtue of the fact that all bodies are in a state of flux as they decay, nevertheless this movement in the process of decay is inseparably connected with the former kind. A second class of things comprises those that are moved by their inherent nature or soul, which are said, by those

GREEK

Now living things are moved from within themselves when there arises within them an image which calls forth an impulse. And again in certain animals images arise which call forth impulses, the imaginative nature setting the impulse in ordered motion; for instance, in the spider, an image of weaving a web arises and the impulse to weave it follows, the insect's imaginative nature inciting it to accomplish this task in an orderly manner, and beyond this imaginative nature the insect possesses nothing else. So in the bee there is an impulse to produce a honeycomb.

3. The rational animal, however, has something besides its imaginative nature, namely reason, which judges the images. Some it rejects, others it approves of, the object being that the creature may be guided in accordance with these latter images. So it happens that, since there are in the nature of reason possibilities of contemplating good and evil, by following out which and contemplating them both we are led to

LATIN

These latter move when there comes to them an image, that is, a kind of desire or incitement, which impels them to move towards an object. Again, there exists in certain animals such an image, that is, a desire or feeling, which by a natural instinct impels and excites them to ordered and complex motion; as we see in spiders, which by an image, that is, a desire and longing to weave a web, are excited to accomplish in an orderly manner the work of weaving, some natural movement undoubtedly calling forth the impulse to do this kind of work; nor do we find that this insect has any other feeling beyond the natural longing to weave a web. So, too, the bee is impelled to fashion honeycombs and to gather, as they call it, aerial honey.

3. But while the rational animal has in itself these natural movements, it has also, to a greater extent than the other animals, the faculty of reason, by means of which it can judge and discern between the natural movements, disapproving of and rejecting some and approving of and accepting others. So by the judgment of this reason the movements of men may be guided and directed towards an approvable life.

who use words in a very precise manner, to be moved out of themselves. A third kind of movement is that observed in animals, which is called movement from within themselves. And I think that the movement of rational creatures is movement through themselves.' The Greek prepositions used are *ἐξ* (out of), *ἀπὸ* (from within) and *διὰ* (through). For the sources of this fragment of Origen's teaching on Physics see Clem. Alex. *Stromata* II. xx. 110 (Stählin II. 173, 17 ff.) and Von Arnim, *Chrysippi Frag. Phys.* 714.

GREEK

choose good and avoid evil, we are worthy of praise when we devote ourselves to the practice of good, and of blame when we act in the opposite way.

We must not forget, however, that the greater part of the nature assigned to every rational creature is in the animals in varying degree, some having more and some less; so that the instinct in hunting dogs and in war horses comes near, if I may say so, to reason itself. To be subject, then, to a particular external impression which gives rise to such or such an image is admittedly not one of the things lying within our power; but to decide to use what has happened either in this way or in that is the work of nothing else but the reason within us, which, as the alternatives appear, either influences us towards the impulses that incite to what is good and seemly or else turns us aside to the reverse.

LATIN

From which it follows that, since the nature of this reason in man includes a faculty of distinguishing between good and evil, and when man has done this he possesses also the power of choosing that which he has approved of, he is rightly deemed worthy of praise when he chooses what is good, and of blame when he follows what is base and evil.

We must, however, by no means forget that in certain dumb animals, as for instance clever dogs or war horses, there is found a more complex movement than in the rest, so that some men think that these are moved by a kind of rational intelligence. But we must believe that this results not so much from reason as from an instinctive and natural movement bestowed in especially large measure for purposes of this kind.¹ But, as we were saying, since the rational animal is thus constituted, we men are liable to meet with and receive from without, whether through sight or hearing or the other senses, certain impressions which urge and excite us to good movements or the reverse. Now inasmuch as these come from without, it certainly does not lie within our power to avoid meeting and receiving them; but to judge and determine how we ought to use them when they come is the work and business of that reason which is in us, that is of our own judgment. For by the judg-

¹ Rufinus' qualification of Origen's bold statement will be noticed.

GREEK

4. But if anyone should say that the impression from without is of such a sort that it is impossible to resist it whatever it may be, let him turn his attention to his own feeling and movements and see whether there is not an approval, assent and inclination of the controlling faculty towards a particular action on account of some specious attractions.

For instance, when a woman displays herself before a man who has determined to remain chaste and to abstain from sexual intercourse and invites him to act contrary to his purpose, she does not become the absolute cause of the abandonment of that purpose. The truth is that he is first entirely delighted with the sensation and lure of the pleasure and has no wish to resist it nor to strengthen his previous determina-

LATIN

ment of this reason we use the stimuli that meet us from without for whatever purpose the reason itself may approve, directing our natural movements at its bidding to courses that are good or the reverse.

4. But if anyone should say that those impressions from without that call forth our movements are of such a sort that it is impossible to resist them, whether they incite us to good or to evil, let him who thinks thus turn his attention for a little while to himself, carefully examining his own inner movements, and see whether he does not find that, when the attraction of any desire strikes him, nothing is accomplished until the assent of the soul is gained and the bidding of the mind indulges the wicked suggestion. It is as if an appeal were being made on certain plausible grounds from two different sides to a judge dwelling within the tribunal of our heart, in order that when the grounds have been first stated the sentence to act may proceed from the judgment of reason.

Suppose, for instance, that when a man has determined to live a chaste and continent life and to abstain from all sexual intercourse, a woman appears before him and invites and entices him to do something contrary to his purpose, that woman does not become the true and absolute cause or necessity of his perverse conduct, since it is in his power, by calling to mind his resolution, to bridle the incite-

GREEK

tion; and then he commits the licentious act. On the other hand the same experiences may happen to one who has undergone more instruction and discipline; that is, the sensations and incitements are there, but his reason, having been strengthened to a higher degree and trained by practice and confirmed towards the good by right doctrines, or at any rate being near to such confirmation, repels the incitements and gradually weakens the desire.

5. But to throw the blame for what so happens to us on external things and to free ourselves from censure, declaring that we are like stocks and stones, which are dragged along by agents that move them from without, is neither true nor reasonable, but is the argument of a man who desires to contradict the idea of free will. For if we were to ask such a one what free will was, he would say it consisted in this, that when I proposed to do a certain thing no external cause arose which incited me to do the opposite.

Again, to throw the blame simply on our constitution is absurd, for education can take

LATIN

ments to lust and to restrain the delights of the attraction that allures him by the stern rebukes of virtue, so that all desire for the pleasure is put to flight and the firmness and constancy of his determination endures. Finally, if allurements of this kind occur to men of greater learning who have grown strong in divine instruction, they at once remember who they are, calling to mind what they studied and learnt long ago and guarding themselves by the stay of this most holy doctrine; and thus they refuse and reject every attraction the incitement offers and repel the opposing evil desires by the help of the reason implanted within them.

5. Since then it is established by a kind of natural evidence that these things are so, is it not gratuitous to refer the causes of our deeds to what happens to us from without and to remove the blame from ourselves, in whom the entire cause lies, that is, to say that we are like stocks and stones, which have no movement within them but receive the causes of their movement from without? This indeed is neither a true nor a proper assertion, but one invented for the sole purpose of denying the freedom of the will; unless we are to suppose that free will could consist in this, that nothing which happens to us from without could incite us to good or evil.

But if anyone should refer the causes of our faults to the natural unruly constitution of

GREEK

the most intemperate and savage of men and, if they will follow her exhortation, can change them, so that the alteration and change for the better is very great, the most licentious men often becoming better than those who formerly seemed not to be such by their very nature, and the most savage changing to such a degree of gentleness that those who had never at any time behaved savagely yet seem to be savage in comparison with him who has changed to gentleness. We see others also most steady and respectable men, who by perversion to lower ways fall from their respectability and steadiness and change into a condition of licentiousness, often beginning such conduct in middle life and plunging into disorder after the season of youth, which so far as its nature goes is unstable, has passed. Reason therefore shows that external things do not lie within our power; but to use them in this way or the other, since we have received reason as a judge and investigator of the way in which we ought to deal with each of them, that is our task.

6. That it is our own task to live a good life, and that God asks this of us not as his work nor as a thing which comes to

LATIN

the body, this can be shown to be contrary to the experience of all education. For how many do we see who, when they have previously lived an uncontrolled and intemperate life and have been the captives of luxury and lust, and are then perchance incited by the word of teaching and instruction to lead a better life, undergo so great a change that instead of being given to luxurious and disgraceful conduct they become sober and exceedingly chaste, and instead of being fierce and savage they become exceedingly mild and gentle? So on the other hand we see quiet and respectable men who, when they have become associated with turbulent and shameless people, have their 'good manners corrupted by evil conversations'¹ and are turned into men of the same sort as those who are steeped in every kind of wickedness. This sometimes happens to men of mature age, so that they prove to have lived more chastely in youth than when advanced years have granted them the opportunity of a freer life. The result of our reasoning, therefore, is to show that things which happen from without are not in our power, but to use them well or badly, when that reason which is within us discerns and decides how we ought to use them, this lies within our power.

6. But in order to confirm by the authority of the Scriptures the results of our reasoning, namely, that to live rightly or

¹ See 1 Cor. XV. 33.

GREEK

us from somebody else, nor, as some think, from fate, but as our own task, the prophet Micah will bear witness when he says, 'It hath been told thee, O man, what is good, and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justice and to love mercy and to be ready to walk with thy God?'¹

And Moses says, 'I have set before thy face the way of life and the way of death. Choose the good and walk in it'.² And Isaiah: 'If ye are willing and obey me, ye shall eat the good of the land. But if ye are unwilling and disobey me, a sword shall devour you. For the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it'.³ And in the Psalms: 'If my people had hearkened unto me, and if Israel had walked in my ways, I would have humbled their enemies to nothing and laid my hand upon those that afflict them',⁴ where the 'hearkening' and 'walking in the ways' of God are assumed to be in the people's power.

When, too, the Saviour says, 'I say unto you, that ye resist not him that is evil',⁵ and 'Who-soever is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment',⁶ and 'Whosoever looketh upon a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery already

LATIN

otherwise is our task and not a thing that depends on external causes, nor, as some think, on the irresistible pressure of fate, Micah the prophet will bear witness when he says in these words, 'It hath been told thee, O man, what is good, and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justice and to love mercy and to be ready to walk with the Lord thy God?'¹

And Moses speaks thus, 'I have set before thy face the way of life and the way of death. Choose the good and walk in it'.² And Isaiah says, 'If ye are willing and hearken to me, ye shall eat the good of the land. But if ye are unwilling and do not hearken, a sword shall devour you. For the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it'.³ And in the Psalms it is written, 'If my people had hearkened unto me, and if Israel had walked in my ways, I would have humbled their enemies to nothing',⁴ by which he shows that the 'hearkening' and 'walking in the ways' of God were in the people's power.

Further, when the Saviour says, 'But I tell you not to resist him that is evil',⁵ and 'Who-soever is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment',⁶ and 'Whosoever looketh upon a woman to lust after her hath committed adul-

¹ Micah VI. 8.

² Deut. XXX. 15, 19.

³ Is. I. 19, 20.

⁴ Ps. LXXXI. 13, 14. The end of the quotation may have dropped out of the Latin text by accident.

⁵ St. Matt. V. 39.

⁶ St. Matt. V. 22.

GREEK

in his heart',¹ and in any other commandment he gives, he tells us that it lies in our power to observe the injunctions and that we shall with good reason be 'in danger of the judgment' if we transgress them.

This is why he also says, 'Every one who heareth these words of mine and doeth them shall be likened to a wise man who built his house upon the rock',² and the words that follow; but 'he that heareth and doeth them not is like a foolish man who built his house upon the sand',³ and what follows. And when he says to those on the right hand, 'Come to me, ye blessed of my father', and the words that follow, 'for I was hungry and ye gave me to eat; I was thirsty and ye gave me to drink',⁴ with the utmost clearness he gives the promises as to men who are worthy of being praised, whereas on the contrary he says to the others as to men who are blameworthy in comparison with the former, 'Depart, ye cursed, into the everlasting fire'.⁵

Let us see how Paul also reasons with us as being men of free will and ourselves responsible for our destruction or salvation. 'Or despisest thou', he says, 'the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long-

LATIN

tery with her already in his heart',¹ and in any other commandments he gives, what else does he indicate but that it lies in our power to observe what is commanded, and that for this reason we are rightly brought 'in danger of the judgment' if we transgress what we certainly have power to observe?

This is why he also says, 'Everyone who heareth these words of mine and doeth them is like a wise man who built his house upon the rock',² and the rest; and also, 'He that heareth them and doeth them not is like a foolish man who built his house upon the sand',³ and the rest. Further, what he says to those on the right hand, 'Come to me, all ye blessed of my father,' and the rest, 'for I was hungry and ye gave me to eat; I was thirsty and ye gave me to drink',⁴ plainly shows that the issue lay with themselves, whether to be counted worthy of praise for keeping the commandments and receiving the promises, or to be counted worthy of blame like the others, whose desert was to hear and receive the opposite, to whom it is said, 'Depart, ye cursed, into the everlasting fire'.⁵

Let us see how Paul the apostle also speaks to us as having the power of choice and as having in ourselves the causes of our salvation or destruction. 'Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance

¹ St. Matt. V. 28.

² St. Matt. VII. 24.

³ St. Matt. VII. 26.

⁴ St. Matt. XXV. 34, 35.

⁵ St. Matt. XXV. 41.

GREEK

suffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? but after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up for thyself wrath in the day of wrath and revelation and righteous judgment of God, who will render to every man according to his works: to them that by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honour and incorruption, eternal life; but unto them that are factious and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, shall be wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that worketh evil, of the Jew first and also of the Greek; but glory and honour and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first and also to the Greek'.¹ Indeed, there are in the scriptures ten thousand passages which with the utmost clearness prove the existence of free will.

7. But since certain sayings from both the Old and the New Testaments incline us to the opposite conclusion, namely, that it is not in our power whether we keep the commandments and are saved or transgress them and are lost, let us bring forward some of these sayings and see what is the explanation of

LATIN

and longsuffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? but after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up for thyself wrath in the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God, who will render to every man according to his works; to them that by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honour and incorruption, eternal life; but unto them that are factious and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, shall be wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that worketh evil, of the Jew first and also of the Greek; but glory and honour and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first and also to the Greek'.¹ And you can find many other, yes, innumerable passages in the holy scriptures, which clearly show that we have the power of free will. For it would be absurd that we should have commandments given, the keeping of which is to save us and the transgression to condemn, if we do not possess the power to keep them.

7. But since there are found in the divine scriptures certain sayings so laid down that the opposite conclusion appears capable of being understood from them, let us bring them forward and discuss them by the rule of piety² and give the explanations of them. Thus from the few sayings that we now

¹ Rom. II. 4-10.

² A characteristic addition of Rufinus. Cp. Bk. III. Ch. 5, 3 (p. 238).

GREEK

them. Thus from the ones we bring forward, any person who in a similar way selects for himself all the sayings that seem to destroy free will may consider our arguments in explanation of them.

Now many have been troubled by the story of Pharaoh, in dealing with whom God says several times, 'I will harden Pharaoh's heart'.¹ For if he is hardened by God and through being hardened sins, he is not himself responsible for the sin; and if this is so, Pharaoh has no free will. And someone will say that in the same way those who are lost have no free will and will not be lost on their own account. Also the saying in Ezekiel, 'I will take away their stony hearts and will put in them hearts of flesh, that they may walk in my statutes and keep my judgments',² might lead one to suppose that it was God who gave the power to walk in the commandments and to keep the judgments, by his removing the hindrance, the stony heart, and implanting something better, the heart of flesh.

Let us look also at the saying in the gospel, the answer which the Saviour gives to those who ask why he speaks to the multitude in parables.³ 'That seeing they may not see,' he

LATIN

explain, the meaning of the other similar sayings which appear to rule out the power of free will may become clear.

Now many are troubled by the words spoken to Pharaoh by God, who says several times, 'I will harden Pharaoh's heart'.¹ For if he is hardened by God and through being hardened falls into sin, he himself is not the cause of his sin. And if this is so, Pharaoh will appear not to have free will, and consequently men will assert that this example shows that all others who perish do not find the cause of their loss in their own free will. Also the saying in Ezekiel, 'I will take away their stony hearts and will put in them hearts of flesh, that they may walk in my statutes and keep my judgments',² might lead one to suppose that it was God who gave the power to walk in his commandments and to keep his judgments, if it was he who removed the stony heart, which hindered them from keeping the commandments, and who implanted in them the better and more sensitive one, which is here called a heart of flesh.

Let us look also at the nature of the saying with which the Lord and Saviour in the gospel gives answer to those who asked him why he spoke to the multitude in parables.³ He

¹ Exod. IV. 21, VII. 3.

² Ezek. XI. 19, 20.

³ See St. Matt. XIII. 10.

GREEK

says, 'and hearing they may hear and not understand, lest haply they should be converted and it should be forgiven them.'¹ And further, the saying by Paul, that it is 'not of him that willeth nor of him that runneth, but of God that hath mercy';² and elsewhere, 'Both to will and to do are of God';³ and elsewhere, 'So then he hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth. Thou wilt say to me then, Why doth he yet find fault; for who hath resisted his will?'⁴ And, 'The persuasion is of him that calleth',⁵ and not of us.

And again, 'Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why didst thou make me thus? Or hath not the potter a right over the clay, from the same lump to make one part a vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?'⁶ These passages are in themselves sufficient to disturb ordinary people with the thought that man is not a free agent, but that it is God who saves and destroys whom he will.

8. Let us begin therefore with the statements made about Pharaoh, that he was hardened by God in order that he might not let the people go. Along with this we shall examine also the apostle's saying, 'So then

¹ St. Mark IV. 12.

² Rom. IX. 16.

³ See Gal. V. 8. This quotation is missing, probably by accident, from the text of Rufinus.

⁴ Rom. IX. 20, 21.

LATIN

says, 'That seeing they may not see, and hearing they may hear and not understand, lest haply they should be converted and it should be forgiven them.'¹ And further, what was said by Paul the apostle, that it is 'not of him that willeth nor of him that runneth, but of God that hath mercy';² and elsewhere, 'Both to will and to do are of God';³ and again elsewhere, 'So then he hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth. Thou wilt say to me, therefore, why then doth he yet find fault; for who resisteth his will?'⁴

'O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Doth the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why didst thou make me thus? Or hath not the potter a right over the clay, from the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?'⁵ These passages and others like them seem to have no small effect on ordinary people, so that they hesitate to believe that each man has freedom over his own will, but think that it depends on the will of God whether a man is saved or lost.

8. Let us begin therefore with the statements made to Pharaoh, who is said to have been hardened by God in order that he might not let the people go. Along with this we shall also deal with that word of the

¹ See Phil. II. 13.

² Rom. IX. 18, 19.

GREEK

he hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth.'¹ Now these passages are used by some of the heretics, who practically destroy free will by bringing in lost natures, which cannot receive salvation, and on the other hand saved natures, which are incapable of being lost.² Pharaoh, they say, having a lost nature, is in consequence hardened by God, who has mercy on the spiritual men but hardens the earthly.

Let us see, then, what they mean. We shall ask them whether Pharaoh was of an earthly nature. When they answer, we shall say that a man with an earthly nature is completely disobedient to God. But if he is disobedient, what need is there of hardening his heart, and that not once but several times? There is none, unless we assume that it was possible for him to obey and that, since he was not earthly, he would have obeyed completely when put to shame by the portents and signs; but that God, in order to display his mighty works for the salvation of the many, needs Pharaoh to proceed to a further degree of disobedience and hardens his heart on this account.

¹ Rom. IX. 18.

² The heretics are the followers of Marcion, Valentinus and Basilides. Cp. Bk. II. Ch. IX, 5 (p. 133).

LATIN

apostle in which he says, 'So then he hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth.'¹ Now it is on these passages that the heretics chiefly rely, when they say that it is not in our power to be saved, but that the natures of souls are such that they are absolutely lost or saved, and that a soul with an evil nature can by no means become good nor can one with a good nature become evil. So they say that Pharaoh, since he was of a lost nature, was in consequence hardened by God, who hardens those that are of an earthly nature but has mercy on those that are of a spiritual nature.

Let us see, then, what they mean by this assertion; and let us first ask them to tell us whether they mean that Pharaoh had an earthly nature, which they call a lost one. They will doubtless reply: 'An earthly one.' If then he was of an earthly nature he was altogether incapable of believing in God or obeying him, seeing that his nature was opposed to this. But if this disobedience was implanted in him by nature, what further need was there for his heart to be hardened by God, and that not once but several times? There was none, unless we assume that it was possible for him to yield to persuasion. Nor could anyone be said to be hardened by another except a man who in himself was not

GREEK

This will be our answer to them in the first place, for the purpose of overthrowing their supposition that Pharaoh was of a lost nature.

We must return them the same answer in regard to the words spoken by the apostle. For whom does God harden? The lost? Why? Because they would obey if they were not hardened? Then would they not clearly be saved otherwise, since they are not of a lost nature? And on whom does he have mercy? Is it on those who are to be saved? But how is there need of a second mercy for those who have once for all been fashioned for salvation and who by their nature are in any case destined to be blessed? The truth is that, since they are in danger of being lost unless they obtain mercy, they obtain mercy in order that they may not incur that of which they are in danger, namely, being lost, but may be in the position of those who are saved. This is our answer to such persons.

LATIN

hard. But if he was not hard of himself, it follows that he was not of an earthly nature, but of such a sort as to be capable of giving way when amazed by the signs and mighty works. And indeed Pharaoh was necessary to God, in order that for the salvation of the many God might display his power in him during his long resistance and struggle against God's will; and it is on this account that his heart is said to be hardened.

Let this be our answer to them in the first place, in order that their supposition that Pharaoh was by nature lost may be overthrown.

Let us also deal with them in a similar way in regard to the words spoken by the apostle Paul. Whom, according to your opinion, does God harden? Is it those who you say are of a lost nature? They would have acted otherwise, I suppose, if they had not been hardened? But if they come to loss through being hardened, they are lost not by nature but by accident. Then again tell us, on whom does God have mercy? Is it on those who are to be saved? But how is there need of a second mercy for those who once for all were destined by nature for salvation and come to blessedness naturally? The truth is, as even their case shows, that it was possible for the men in question to be lost, and the reason why they obtain mercy is that by this means they may not be lost, but may come to salvation and possess the realms of the holy. Let this be our

GREEK

9. But to those who think they understand the meaning of 'hardened'¹ we must address the further question: What actually do they mean by saying that God in his working hardens the heart, and with what purpose does he do this? Now they must safeguard the idea of God, who is according to sound doctrine just and good; but if they do not admit that, let it be granted them for the moment that he is merely just. Then let them show how he that is good and just, or he that is merely just, is acting justly when he hardens the heart of a man who as a result of this hardening is lost; and how he that is just can be a cause of the loss and disobedience of those who are punished as a result of their hardening and disobedience.

Why, too, does he blame Pharaoh, saying, 'Thou wilt not let my people go; behold, I will smite all the firstborn in Egypt, even thy firstborn',² and all the rest that is recorded as being said by God through Moses to Pharaoh? It is incumbent on him who believes that the

LATIN

answer to those who by fabricated stories bring forward doctrines of natures that are good or evil, that is, spiritual or earthly, which natures, they say, determine the salvation or loss of each individual soul.

9. We must now reply to those who would have it that the God of the law is merely just and not good,¹ asking them: In what way do they suppose that the heart of Pharaoh was hardened by God, by what operation or with what purpose in view? For they must safeguard the view and conception of God, who is according to us just and good, but according to them merely just. Then let them show us how God, whom they themselves admit to be just, is acting justly when he hardens a man's heart in order that through this very hardening the man may sin and be lost; and how God's justice can be defended in this case, where God himself is the cause of the loss of those whom by his authority as judge he will hereafter condemn on the very ground that they were hard and unbelieving.

Why, too, does he blame Pharaoh, saying, 'If thou wilt not let my people go, behold, I will smite all the firstborn in Egypt, even thy firstborn',² and all the rest that is recorded as being said by God through Moses to Pharaoh? It is incumbent on every man who

¹ I.e., the Marcionites and other Gnostics. See above Bk. II. Ch. IX. 5 (p. 133).

² Exod. IV. 23.

GREEK

scriptures are true and that God is just, if he is a thoughtful man, to take pains to show how God, in using such expressions as these, can be clearly conceived to be just. If, however, anyone should rise up and in a barefaced manner¹ champion the doctrine that the Creator is evil,² we should need other arguments to answer him.

10. But since they admit that they look upon God as being just, and our view is that he is good as well as just, let us consider how one who is good and just could harden Pharaoh's heart. See then whether we cannot prove, through an illustration used by the apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that God has mercy on one and hardens another by a single operation; that it is not his purpose to harden, but that he acts with kindly intent, and that the hardening follows as a result of the substance of evil present in the particular evil person, so that God is said to harden him who is already hardened. 'The land', it says, 'which hath drunk the rain that cometh (oft)³ upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them for whose sake it is also tilled, receiveth blessing from God;

¹ Lit. 'with uncovered head', a phrase taken from Plato, *Phaedrus* p. 243 B.

² See Book III, Ch. I. 16 (p. 189 below).

³ This word is missing, probably by accident, from the Greek text. See below p. 173.

LATIN

believes the record of the scriptures to be true and desires to show that the God of the law and the prophets is just, to give an explanation of all this, and to show how no diminution of the justice of God is involved in it; for, even if they deny that he is good, still they admit that the Judge and Creator of the world is just. There is, however, another kind of answer for those who assert that a wicked being, namely the devil, is the Creator of this world.²

10. But since we acknowledge that the God who spoke by Moses is not only just but also good, let us consider carefully how one who is just and good can rightly be said to harden Pharaoh's heart. Let us see whether perchance we may solve this difficult problem by certain examples and illustrations taken from the apostle Paul, showing that God has mercy on one and hardens another by one and the same operation; that God's actions and desires do not aim at hardening the man who is hardened, but that during the time in which he is displaying kindness and forbearance those who treat his kindness and forbearance with contempt and pride have their heart hardened while the punishment of their misdeeds is being deferred, whereas they who receive his kindness and forbearance as an

GREEK

but if it beareth thorns and thistles, it is rejected and nigh unto a curse, whose end is to be burned'.¹ As regards the rain, then, there is one operation, but the land which has been tilled brings forth fruit, while that which is neglected and barren brings forth thorns.

Now it seems almost irreverent to represent the giver of the rain as saying: 'It is I who made the fruits and the thorns that are in the earth'; yet in spite of this it is true. For if there had been no rain, there would have been neither fruits nor thorns, but after the rain has fallen in due time and measure, both spring up. For it says: 'the land which hath drunk the rain that cometh oft upon it, if it beareth thorns and thistles, is rejected and nigh unto a curse'.¹ So then the blessing of the rain comes also on the inferior land, but this, being neglected and untilled, brings forth thorns and thistles. Thus the marvellous works done

LATIN

opportunity of repentance and amendment obtain mercy. To show our meaning more clearly, we take the illustration used by the apostle Paul in the Epistle to the Hebrews. 'The land which hath drunk the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is tilled, shall receive blessing from God; but that which beareth thorns and thistles is rejected and nigh unto a curse, whose end is to be burned'.¹ From these words of Paul which we have quoted it is clearly shown that through one and the same operation of God, by which he bestows rain upon the earth, one piece of land being carefully tilled brings forth good fruits, while another, which is neglected and untilled, produces thorns and thistles.

Now if one were to speak as it were in the person of the showers and say, 'It was I the rain that made the good fruits, and I, too, made the thorns and thistles', although this would seem to be a hard saying it is nevertheless a true one. For if there were no rain, neither fruits nor thorns and thistles would grow; but after the showers have fallen the earth produces both kinds from out of itself. But although the earth has produced both kinds of growth by the blessing of the rain, the diversity of the growth is not to be attributed to the showers, but the blame for an evil crop must fall on those who, when they might have broken

¹ Heb. VI. 7, 8.

GREEK

by God are as it were the rain, while the differing wills of men are like the tilled and the neglected land, though as land they are both of one nature.

LATIN

up the land by frequent ploughing and turned over the dull clods with the heavy mattocks and cut away and rooted out all useless and harmful weeds and cleansed and tilled the fields with all the toil and skill that such cultivation demands and so prepared them for the expected showers, have neglected this and will accordingly reap those most appropriate fruits of their idleness, thorns and thistles. Thus it happens that the goodness and impartiality of the rain visits all lands alike, yet by one and the same operation of the showers that land which has been tilled produces useful fruits with a blessing to its diligent and useful cultivators, whereas that which by the idleness of its cultivators has become hardened brings forth thorns and thistles. Let us therefore take those signs and mighty works which were done by God to be as it were showers provided by him from above. But the purpose and desires of men must be taken to be the land, whether tilled or untilled, which is of one nature as land compared with land, but not of one and the same degree of cultivation.

It follows from this¹ that the will of each person is either hardened by the mighty and wonderful works of God, if it is untilled and fierce and barbarous, so that it becomes

¹ This sentence is not in the Greek text as we have it in the *Philocalia*. Robinson (ed. *Philocalia*, Int., p. XXXIII) regards it as a summary of the preceding argument, due to Rufinus alone. Koetschau (see note *ad. loc.*) thinks it is not an addition by Rufinus.

GREEK

11. So, too, if the sun were to utter a voice and say, 'I melt things and dry them up,' when being melted and being dried up are opposites, he would not be speaking falsely in regard to the point in question, since by the one heat wax is melted and mud dried. Thus the one operation which was performed through Moses revealed the hardness of Pharaoh on the one hand, the result of his wickedness, and on the other hand the persuasibility of the mixed Egyptian multitude who joined the Hebrews when they departed.

And the briefly recorded fact that the heart of Pharaoh experienced a kind of softening when he said: 'But ye shall not proceed far; ye shall go a three days' journey and leave your wives behind',¹ and whatever

LATIN

more savage and thorny than ever, or else it becomes softer and brings itself into obedience with the whole mind, if it has been cleansed from its faults and carefully trained.

11. But to prove the matter more clearly it will not be superfluous to employ yet another illustration. For instance, suppose one were to say that the sun binds and loosens, when binding and loosening are opposites. The statement will not, however, be false, for the sun, by one and the same power of its heat, loosens wax and yet dries up and binds together mud. Not that its power operates one way on mud and another way on wax, but that mud is of one quality and wax of another, though indeed according to nature they are one thing because each comes from the earth. So therefore one and the same operation of God, which worked through Moses in signs and wonders, revealed on the one hand the hardness of Pharaoh, which he had developed by the intensity of his wickedness, and on the other hand proclaimed the obedience of those other Egyptians who were mingled among the Israelites and are said to have gone out of Egypt along with them.

Moreover, in regard to the passage which implies that the heart of Pharaoh was gradually being softened, so that on one occasion he said, 'Ye shall not proceed far; ye shall go a three days' journey, but ye shall leave

¹ See Exod. VIII. 27, 28.

GREEK

else he spoke when yielding before the marvellous works, makes it clear that these signs had some effect even on him, though they did not entirely accomplish their object. Yet not even this would have happened if the idea held by most people about the words, 'I will harden Pharaoh's heart', rightly represented what was wrought by him, that is, by God.²

It is not unreasonable to soften down such expressions even from our common manner of speech.³ For kind masters often say to servants who have been spoiled by their kindness and forbearance, 'It was I who made you wicked', or 'I am to blame for these serious offences'. We must give heed to the character and force of what is said and not misrepresent it through failing to understand the meaning of the expression.

¹ See Exod. VIII. 27, 28; X. 9, 11.

² Origen deals again with the subject of the 'hardening of Pharaoh's heart' in his *Comm. in Exodum* Ch. X. 27. This is preserved in the *Philocalia*, Ch. XXVII. (ed. Robinson, p. 242). The passage, Origen says, presented great difficulty to many readers. Some thought that God had mercy on some and hardened others purely at random. Others felt that here was one of the mysteries which no ingenuity could penetrate, but which must be accepted by faith. Others went further and supposed two Gods, a just one and a good one. Origen's own solution lies in the thought that God, like a good physician, works for the salvation of all, though sometimes by painful remedies.

³ This argument is repeated in the *Comm. in Exod.* (see *Philocalia*, Ch. XXVII., ed. Robinson, p. 252, 18 ff.).

LATIN

your wives and your children and flocks behind',¹ and any other passages there may be in which he appears to be yielding gradually before the signs and wonders, what else do these indicate except that the power of the signs and wonders had some effect on him, although it did not achieve so much as it ought? For if the hardening had been of such a kind as most people think, we should certainly not have found him yielding even in a few points.²

It will not, I think, appear unreasonable to explain even from our common usage the turn and figure of speech which is associated with the expression 'hardening'.³ For kind masters are often wont to say to servants who have grown more insolent and wicked as a result of patient and gentle treatment, 'It was I who made you this; I have spoiled you; my patience has made you good for nothing; I am the cause of your hard and worthless character, because I do not at once punish you for every single fault according to your deserts.' We must first take note of the turn and figure of the speech

GREEK

Accordingly Paul, after clearly examining this question, says to the sinner: 'Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long suffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? but after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up for thyself wrath in the day of wrath and revelation and righteous judgment of God'.¹ Now let that which the apostle says to the sinner be applied to Pharaoh, and it will be perceived to be entirely appropriate when addressed to him who 'according to his hardness and impenitent heart was treasuring up for himself wrath', since his hardness would not have been thus proved and made manifest unless the signs had been performed, and performed on so large and grand a scale.

12. But since such statements are hard to believe and are considered to be forced, let us see from the words of the prophets also what is said by those who have experienced the great kindness of God and have lived a good life, but have afterwards fallen into sin. 'Why didst thou make us to err, O Lord, from thy way? Why didst thou harden our heart that we should

LATIN

and so come to understand the force of the expression, and not misrepresent a word whose inner meaning we have not carefully investigated.

Accordingly Paul the apostle, when clearly dealing with this question, says to the man who remained in sin: 'Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? but after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up for thyself wrath in the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God'.¹ Let us then take that which the apostle says to the man who lives in sin and apply it to Pharaoh, and see whether you will not find it appropriate when spoken concerning him, for he, 'according to his hardness and impenitent heart,' treasured and stored up for himself 'wrath in the day of wrath', since his hardness would never have been thus proved and made manifest unless signs and wonders of such number and grandeur had followed.

12. But if the proofs which we have adduced seem insufficient and the apostolic illustration to be lacking in strength, let us bring forward in addition the witness of prophetic authority and see what the prophets declare about those who by living a good life at the first have deserved to receive very many proofs of God's goodness, but afterwards, as men do, have

¹ Rom. II. 4, 5.

GREEK

not fear thy name? Return for thy servants' sake, the tribes of thine inheritance, that for a little while we may inherit thy holy mountain.¹ And in Jeremiah: 'Thou didst deceive me, O Lord, and I was deceived; thou wast stronger and didst prevail',²

Now the sentence, 'Why didst thou harden our heart, that we should not fear thy name?' spoken by those who are praying for mercy, is spoken in a special sense as follows. Why didst thou spare us so long, not visiting us for our sins, but abandoning us until our transgressions have grown to greatness?

For God abandons most men by leaving them unpunished, in order that from the things that lie within our power the character of each person may be proved

¹ Is. LXIII. 17, 18.

² Jerem. XX. 7.

³ The illustrations of the horse and the lad are apparently added by Rufinus.

LATIN

fallen into sin. The prophet, making himself one with them, says, 'Why, Lord, didst thou make us to err from thy way? And why didst thou harden our heart that we should not fear thy name? Return for thy servant's sake, the tribes of thine inheritance, that we, too, may receive for a little while some inheritance of thy holy mountain.'¹ And Jeremiah speaks in the same way: 'Thou didst deceive us, O Lord, and we were deceived; thou hast held us and hast prevailed.'²

Now the sentence, 'Why, Lord, didst thou harden our heart, that we should not fear thy name', spoken by those who were praying for mercy, must be taken in a special sense, as if it said, Why hast thou spared us so long and not visited us when we sinned, but hast abandoned us, so that our wickedness has grown greater and our freedom to sin has extended because thy punishment ceased? For so a horse,³ if it does not continually feel the spur of its rider and have its mouth rubbed by the rough bit, becomes hardened. So a young lad, if not continually subdued by flogging, will grow up into an insolent youth, a ready prey to vices.

God therefore abandons and neglects those whom he judges to be unworthy of chastisement. 'For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth and punisheth; and

GREEK

and the better ones may become manifest as a result of the test applied to them; while the others remain unnoticed, not indeed by God, for he knows all things before they come to be,¹ but by the rational creation and themselves, in order that they may find the way of healing at a later time; for they would not have known the benefit, unless they had condemned themselves.

This method is of advantage to each, that he may become aware of his own individual

LATIN

scourgeth every son whom he receiveth'.² We must suppose from this that those men are already received into the rank and affection of sons, who have deserved to be scourged and punished by God in order that through endurance of trials and tribulations they may be able to say in their own persons, 'Who shall separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus? Shall tribulation or anguish or famine or nakedness or peril or sword?'³ For through all these is brought out and made manifest the will of each person; and the steadfastness of his perseverance is indicated, not so much to God, who knows all things before they come to be,¹ as to the rational and heavenly powers, who have been appointed as it were helpers and servants of God in the work of bringing to pass the salvation of men.⁴ As for the others, who do not yet offer themselves to God with such constancy and affection and are not ready to yield themselves to his service and prepare their souls for trial, these are said to be abandoned by God, that is, not to be instructed, since they are not ready for instruction, their treatment and healing being undoubtedly reserved for a later time.

For these indeed do not know what they obtain from God, unless they first come to the

¹ See Susanna V. 42; Eccius. XLII. 18.

² Heb. XII. 6. This quotation and the one that follows are added by Rufinus.

³ Rom. VIII. 35.

⁴ See Bk. I. Ch. VIII. 1 (p. 66 above).

GREEK

nature and of the grace of God. The man who is not aware of his own weakness and of the divine grace, even if he receives a benefit before he has had experience of himself or condemned himself, will think that what is supplied to him by the grace of heaven is due to his own good works. This produces conceit and pride, and will prove a cause of his downfall, as we believe happened in the case of the devil, who attributed to himself the privileges which he enjoyed when he lived blamelessly. 'For every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled, and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.'¹ And observe that for this reason divine things 'have been hidden from the wise and understanding',² in order that, as the apostle says, 'no flesh should glory before God',³ and have been 'revealed unto babes',⁴ who after their babyhood have risen to higher things and have remembered that it is not from their own effort so much as from the unspeakable goodness of God that they have reached the uttermost limit of blessedness.

LATIN

point of desiring to obtain a benefit; which will only happen thus, when a man has previously learned to know himself and to feel what is lacking in himself and to understand from whom he should and can seek the supply of what is lacking. For he who does not first understand his infirmity and sickness is unable to seek a physician; or at any rate the man who has not learned the dangerous nature of his illness will not be grateful to the physician when he has recovered his health. So, too, if a man has not first learned the defects of his soul and the wickedness of his sins and confessed them openly with his own mouth he cannot be cleansed and absolved; otherwise he might be unaware that what he receives is a gift of grace and might think that the divine liberality was a blessing that belonged to him. This would undoubtedly give rise again to arrogance and pride of heart and become once more the cause of his downfall, as we must believe happened in the case of the devil, who thought that the privileges which he enjoyed when he lived blamelessly were his own and not given to him by God. And in him was fulfilled the saying that 'every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled'.¹ It is for this reason, it seems to me, that the divine mysteries

¹ St. Luke XIV. 11, XVIII. 14.

² St. Matt. XI. 27; St. Luke X. 21.

³ 1 Cor. I. 29.

⁴ St. Matt. XI. 27; St. Luke X. 21.

GREEK

LATIN

have been 'hidden from the prudent and wise',² in order, as the scripture says, 'that no flesh should glory before God',³ and have been 'revealed unto babes',² that is, to those who, after becoming infants and babes, or in other words returning to the simplicity of babes, then make progress, and when they reach perfection remember that they have obtained their blessedness not so much by their own virtues as by the grace and mercy of God.

13. The man who is abandoned is abandoned therefore by the divine judgment, and towards certain sinners God is longsuffering, not without reason, but because in regard to the immortality of the soul and the eternal world it will be to their advantage that they should not be helped quickly to salvation but should be brought to it more slowly after having experienced many ills. For physicians also,¹ even though they may be able to heal a man quickly, yet act in a contrary way whenever they suspect the existence of a hidden poison in the body. They do this because they wish to heal the patient more surely, considering it better to let him remain in his fever and sickness for a long time in order that he may regain permanent health, rather than appear to restore him quickly to strength and afterwards to see him relapse and this quicker cure prove only temporary.

13. The man therefore who must needs be abandoned is abandoned by the judgment of God, and God is longsuffering towards certain sinners, though not without a definite reason. For this very fact that he is longsuffering makes for their advantage, since the soul, whose healing and oversight are his concern, is immortal; and being an immortal and eternal thing it is not, even though it be not quickly healed, thereby shut out from salvation, which is only delayed until more convenient times. Moreover it is perhaps expedient for those who have been more deeply infected with the passion of wickedness to attain salvation slowly. For physicians also,¹ when they could very quickly cover the scars of a wound, yet sometimes prevent and defer its immediate healing with a view to ensuring better and sounder health; since they know that it

¹ See Origen, *Philocalia*, Ch. XXVII. (ed. Robinson, p. 246, 24 ff. and 251, 22 ff.), and p. 176 above.

² St. Matt. XI. 27; St. Luke X. 21.

³ 1 Cor. I. 29.

GREEK

In the same way God, who knows the secrets of the heart and foreknows the future, perhaps in his longsuffering allows the hidden evil to remain while he draws it out by means of external circumstances, with the object of purifying him who owing to carelessness has received into himself the seeds of sin, that having vomited them out when they come to the surface the sinner, even though he has proceeded far in evil deeds, may in the end be able to obtain purification after his evil life and be renewed. For God deals with souls not in view of the fifty years, so to speak, of our life here, but in view of the endless world.¹ He has made our intellectual nature immortal and akin to himself, and the rational soul is not shut out from healing, as if this life were all.

¹ See Bk. I. Ch. VI. 3 (p. 57 above).

LATIN

is preferable to cause delay in wounds that fester, and to allow the malignant humour to flow for a while, rather than to hasten to a superficial cure and to shut up within the veins the inflamed and poisonous matter, which when cut off from its usual outlets will undoubtedly creep into the interior of the body and penetrate to the vital parts themselves, so as to bring on not merely bodily disease but actual loss of life.

In the same way also God, who knows the secrets of the heart and foreknows the future, in his great longsuffering allows some things to happen which, coming upon men from without, encourage the passions and faults that are concealed within to emerge and proceed into the light, so that by means of these events men who owing to great negligence and carelessness have received into themselves the roots and seeds of sin may be purified and healed, the seeds being cast up and brought to the surface in order that they may be in a manner vomited forth and dispersed. And thus, even though a man may appear to be involved in very serious evils, suffering convulsions in all his members, he may yet be able in the end to obtain rest and relief, to reach the limit of satiety in his evils and so after many troubles to be restored to his original state. For God deals with souls not in view of the short time of our life here, which is confined to some sixty

GREEK

14. Come then, and let us use the following illustration from the gospel. There is a certain rock, whose surface is covered with a little earth, into which if seeds fall they spring up quickly; but having sprung up, because they have no root, 'when the sun arises they are scorched and wither away'.³ Now this rock is the soul of man, hardened through carelessness and made stony through evil. For no one's heart was created stony by God, but it becomes such from wickedness.

If then one were to criticize the farmer for not casting his seed more quickly on the rocky ground, when one saw that other rocky ground which has received seed was flourishing, the farmer would reply: 'I shall sow this ground more slowly, putting in seeds that will be

¹ See Bk. I. Ch. VI. 3 (p. 57 above).

² See St. Matt. XIII. 5, 6 and parallels.

LATIN

or a few more years, but in view of the everlasting and eternal age, exercising his providential care over souls that are immortal, just as he himself is eternal and immortal.¹ For he made our rational nature, which he created 'in his own image and likeness',² incorruptible, and therefore the soul, which is immortal, is not shut out by the shortness of our present life from the divine healing and remedies.

14. But let us take from the gospels also some illustrations of the matters we speak about. It is related that there is a certain rock covered with a small and scanty depth of earth, into which if seed falls it is said to spring up quickly; but after it has sprung up, because it does not take root deeply, the plant is said 'to be scorched and to wither away' when the sun arises.³ Now this rock undoubtedly stands for the soul of man, hardened through its own carelessness and made stony by wickedness. For no one has a 'stony heart' created by God, but each person's heart is said to become stony through his own wickedness and disobedience.

If then one were to criticize the farmer for not casting his seed more quickly on the rocky ground when one saw that other rocky ground which has received seed was quickly flourishing, the farmer would certainly say in reply: 'I sow this land more slowly for this

² See Gen. I. 26.

GREEK

able to endure, the slower method being better for this ground and safer than is the case with the ground which has received its seed more quickly but superficially'; and we should agree that the farmer spoke reasonably and had acted like a wise man. So, too, the great Farmer of all nature delays the benefit which we should consider quick, for fear lest it should prove superficial.

But it is likely that some one will meet us with the objection, 'Why does some of the seed fall upon the soul that has the superficial soil, that which is as it were a rock?' To this we must answer that it was better for the soul that desired the higher things too hastily and not by the way that led to them to obtain what it desired, in order that when it had condemned itself for this it might patiently endure to receive a long time afterwards the cultivation that is in accordance with nature.

LATIN

reason, that it may retain the seeds it has received. For it is better for ground like this to be sown later, lest perhaps the crop should spring up too rapidly, and coming from the very top of a thin soil should be unable to endure the heat of the sun'. Would not he who at first criticized now acknowledge the reason and skill of the farmer and agree that what formerly seemed to him illogical was in fact done with good reason? In the same way therefore God, who is a most skilful farmer of his entire creation, prevents and delays, undoubtedly till some future time, the restoration of health in cases where we think it should be more quickly restored, for fear lest the cure should prove superficial rather than internal.

But if some one meets us with the objection, 'Why do certain seeds fall upon the rocky ground, that is, upon a hard and rocky soul?' we must answer to this that not even such an event can take place apart from the ordering of divine providence; for unless by this means a knowledge was gained of the great self-condemnation which follows a heedlessness in hearing and a wickedness in examining the divine commands, it would certainly be unknown what useful purpose was served by an orderly training. And so it comes to pass that the soul becomes aware of its fault and casts the blame upon itself and reserves and yields itself up for the process of cultivation that is to follow; that is, the soul sees

GREEK

For souls are, so to speak, innumerable, and their habits are innumerable, and equally so are their movements, their purposes, their inclinations and their impulses, of which there is only one perfect superintendent, who has full knowledge both of the times and the appropriate aids and the paths and the ways, namely, the God and Father of the universe. He knows how by means of the great plagues and the drowning in the sea he is leading even Pharaoh; and his superintending care for him does not stop at this point. For when he was drowned he was not destroyed. 'For in the hand of God are both we and our words, and all understanding and knowledge of crafts'.¹ This, then, is a fair defence of the statement that 'Pharaoh's heart was hardened'² and of the other statement that 'he hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth'.³

LATIN

for itself that its faults must first be removed and that it must then undergo instruction in wisdom.

Since, therefore, souls are innumerable, and equally so are their habits, their purposes, their different individual movements, their inclinations and impulses, the variety of which is quite beyond the capacity of the human mind to consider, we must accordingly leave the skill and power and knowledge necessary for their superintendence to God alone, for he only can know the remedies for each individual soul and determine the time for its healing. He, then, who alone, as we have said, is acquainted with the ways of each mortal man, knows by what way he ought to lead even Pharaoh, 'in order that through him his name might be named in all the earth,'⁴ chastising him with many plagues and then leading him on to be drowned in the sea. And we must certainly not think that in this drowning the providential care of God for Pharaoh came to an end; for we must not suppose that, because he was drowned, he went immediately out of existence. 'For in the hand of God are both we and our words, and all understanding and knowledge of crafts',¹ as the scripture says. These, then, are the arguments we put forth to the best of our ability, in discussing the passage of scripture in which God is said to have hardened Pharaoh's

¹ Wis. VII. 16.

² Rom. IX. 18.

³ See Exod. X. 20.

⁴ See Rom. IX. 17 (Exod. IX. 16).

GREEK

15. Let us also look at Ezekiel's statement in which he says, 'I will take away from them their stony hearts and I will put in them hearts of flesh, that they may walk in my judgments and keep my ordinances'.¹ Now if God, when he wills, 'takes away the hearts of stone' and implants 'hearts of flesh', so that men keep his ordinances and observe his commandments, it is not in our power to put away wickedness, for the taking away of 'hearts of stone' is nothing else than the removal, from him for whom God wills it, of the wickedness by reason of which a man is hardened. And the insertion of a 'heart of flesh', in order that a man may 'walk in the ordinances of God and keep his commandments', what else is this than to become yielding and unopposed to the truth and to be capable of practising the virtues?

But if God promises to do this, and if we do not lay aside our 'stony hearts' before he takes them away, it is clear that it is not in our power to put away wickedness. And if we ourselves do nothing to implant within us the 'heart of flesh', but it is the work of God, then to live a virtuous life will not be our work, but something due entirely to the divine grace.

¹ Ezek. XI. 19, 20.² See Exod. X. 20.³ Rom. IX. 18.

LATIN

heart,² and the other statement that 'he hath mercy on whom he will and whom he will he hardeneth'.³

15. Let us now also look at the statement of Ezekiel in which he says, 'I will take away from them their stony heart and I will put in them a heart of flesh, that they may walk in my judgments and keep my ordinances'.¹ Now if God, when he wills, takes away the 'heart of stone' and puts in a 'heart of flesh', so that men may keep his ordinances and observe his commandments, it will be seen that it is neither in our power to put away wickedness—for the taking away of a 'heart of stone' would appear to be nothing else than the removal, from him for whom God wills it, of the wickedness by which a man is hardened—nor to insert a 'heart of flesh', that a man may 'walk in God's ordinances and keep his commandments', which indeed is nothing else but to become obedient to God and unopposed to the truth and capable of practising the virtues.

If then God promises to do this, and if, before he takes away our 'stony heart' we are not able of our own selves to lay it aside, it follows that it is not in our power to cast off wickedness, but in God's. And again, if it is not by our own act that there comes into us the 'heart of flesh', if it is the work of God alone, then to live a virtuous life will not be our work,

GREEK

Now this is what will be said by the man who, arguing from the bare words, would destroy our free will. We, however, shall reply that these words must be understood in the following manner. It is as when a man who suffers from ignorance and want of education, and becomes conscious of his personal defects either from the exhortation of his teacher or from his own reflection, entrusts himself to one whom he believes to be capable of leading him on to education and virtue. When he so entrusts himself, his instructor promises to take away his lack of education and to implant in him education, not as if it counted for nothing in regard to his being educated and escaping from his ignorance that he should have brought himself to be cured, but because the instructor promises to improve one who desires improvement.

So the divine word promises to take away the wickedness which it calls a 'stony heart', from those who come to it, not if they are unwilling, but if they submit themselves to the physician of the sick; just as in the gospels the sick are found coming to the Saviour and asking

LATIN

but in all respects the work of God's grace.

Now this is what is said by those who wish to prove by the authority of scripture that nothing lies within our own power. We shall reply to them that these words must not be understood in that sense, but as follows. It is as if an uneducated and uninstructed man, becoming conscious of the disgrace of his condition, whether by being stirred at the exhortation of another or by a desire to rival those who are wise, should entrust himself to one by whom he is confident that he can be carefully trained and competently instructed. If then he, who had formerly hardened himself in ignorance, entrusts himself, as we have said, with full purpose of mind to a master and promises to obey him in everything, the master, on seeing clearly his purpose and determination, will on his part undertake to take away from him his lack of education and to implant in him education, not promising, however, to do this if the disciple withholds his assent and co-operation¹ but only if he offers and pledges himself to entire obedience.

So, too, the divine word promises to take away the 'stony heart' from those who come to it, not indeed from those who do not listen to it, but from those who submit to the precepts of its teaching; just as in the gospels we find the sick coming to the Saviour, asking

¹ Rufinus has misunderstood the Greek.

GREEK

to obtain healing and being healed. And, so to speak, to give sight to the blind is,¹ so far as concerns the request of those who believe they can be healed, a work of the sufferers, but so far as concerns the restoration of sight it is a work of our Saviour. This then is the way by which the word of God promises to implant knowledge in those who come to it, taking away the stony and hard heart, which signifies wickedness, to enable them to walk in the divine commandments and to keep the divine ordinances.

16. After this there is the passage from the gospel, where the Saviour said that he spoke to those that are without in parables for this reason, that 'seeing they may not see and hearing they may not understand, lest they should turn and it should be forgiven them'.² Now our opponent will say: 'If when they have heard a clearer message some people certainly do turn, and turn in such a way as to become worthy of the forgiveness of sins, and if the hearing of this clearer message does not rest with them but with their teacher, and he does not proclaim it to them for this reason, lest they should see and understand, then salvation does not lie in their power; and if this is so, we are not free as regards salvation and destruction'.

LATIN

to obtain health and so being healed. And when, for example, the blind are healed¹ and receive sight, it is, so far as concerns the fact that they made request to the Saviour and believed that they could be healed by him, a work of those who were healed; but so far as concerns the fact that their sight was restored, it is a work of the Saviour. In this way also does the divine word promise to give instruction by taking away the stony heart, that is, by banishing wickedness, in order that men may thus be able to walk in the divine ordinances and keep the commandments of the law.

16. After this there comes before us the passage from the gospel, where the Saviour said, 'For this reason I speak to them that are without in parables', 'that seeing they may see and not perceive, and hearing they may hear and not understand, lest haply they should be turned and it should be forgiven them'.² In regard to this our opponent will reply: 'If they who hear more clearly are certainly corrected and turned, and turned in such a way as to become worthy of the forgiveness of sins, and if the hearing of this clear message does not rest with them but entirely with their teacher, whose work it is to teach them more openly and clearly, but who says that he does not preach the word to them clearly for this reason,

¹ See St. Matt. XI. 5.

² See St. Matt. X. 10, 13; St. Mark IV. 11, 12; St. Luke VIII. 10.

GREEK

Now there would be a convincing answer to this, if it were not for the addition, 'lest they should turn, and it should be forgiven them'; namely, that the Saviour did not wish those who would not become noble and good to understand the deeper mysteries, and that this was why he spoke to them in parables. But as it stands, with the words 'lest they should turn, and it should be forgiven them', the answer is more difficult.

In the first place we must note the passage as an argument against the heretics,¹ who hunt out similar passages from the Old Testament, in which there is revealed, as they are bold enough to say, the cruelty of the Creator or his revengeful and punitive attitude, or whatever they choose to call the quality in question, in regard to the wicked; their sole purpose being to deny that there is any goodness in him who formed the world. With the New Testament, however, they do not deal in a similar way, nor even candidly, but pass over statements closely resembling those which they consider open to criticism in the Old Testament.

LATIN

"lest haply they should hear and understand and be turned" and be saved, then their salvation will certainly not rest with themselves; and if this is so, we shall have no freedom as regards either salvation or destruction.'

Now if it were not for the addition, 'lest they should be turned, and it should be forgiven them', there would be a very simple answer, namely, to say that the Saviour did not wish those whom he foresaw would not be good to understand the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven and that he spoke to them in parables on that account. But as it stands, with the addition, 'lest haply they should be turned, and it should be forgiven them', the explanation is rendered more difficult.

And in the first place we must note what a defence this passage furnishes against the heretics,¹ who are accustomed to hunt out from the Old Testament any expressions which may appear to them, as they understand them, to point to some severe and cruel quality in God the Creator, as when he is described as moved with the desire or whatever name they choose to call the quality in question, for vengeance or punishment; their object being to deny that there is any goodness in the Creator. In regard to the gospels, however, they do not pass judgment with the same mental bias or the same feeling, nor do they observe

¹ See Book II, Chs. IV. and V. (pp. 95 ff. above).

GREEK

For even according to the gospel the Saviour is clearly shown, as they themselves assert in regard to the former writings, to refrain from speaking plainly on this account, lest men should turn, and having turned should become worthy of the forgiveness of sins; a statement which of itself is in no way less than the similar ones from the Old Testament which are attacked. If they seek for a defence of the gospel statement, we must ask them whether they are not to be blamed for dealing in different ways with similar problems; for they do not take offence at the New Testament but seek to defend it, whereas in regard to the Old Testament, in similar passages which they ought to defend equally with those of the New, they make an attack. From these considerations we shall force them to admit that on account of their resemblances the scriptures must all be regarded as coming from one God. But come now, and let us provide, to the best of our ability, a defence to the question before us.

17. We said when investigating the case of Pharaoh that sometimes it does not turn out to the advantage of those who are healed that they should be healed quickly,¹ if, that is, they have fallen of themselves into difficulties and are then easily released from the conditions into

LATIN

that some such passages as they condemn and censure in the Old Testament are to be found also in the gospels.

For clearly in this chapter the Saviour is shown, as they themselves say, not speaking openly for this reason, lest men should be turned and when turned should receive forgiveness of sins. Now certainly if this is understood according to the mere letter, it will be in no way less than those passages which are attacked in the Old Testament. If, however, it seems, even to them, to call for an explanation, when passages of such a sort are found in the New Testament, it will follow necessarily that the passages in the Old Testament which are attacked shall be cleared from censure by a similar explanation, so that by this means the writings of each Testament may be proved to come from one and the same God. But let us turn, to the best of our ability, to the question before us.

17. We said before when discussing the case of Pharaoh that sometimes it does not turn out to advantage for one to be healed quickly,¹ especially if the disease be thereby shut up in the internal organs and so rage more fiercely. Therefore God, who is the perceiver of secret

¹ See p. 181 above.

GREEK

which they have fallen; for despising the evil as being easy of cure and taking no precautions against falling into it they will find themselves in it a second time. In dealing with such persons, therefore, the eternal God, the perceiver of secret things, who knows all things before they come to be,¹ in his goodness refrains from sending them the quicker help and, if I may say so, helps them by not helping them, since this course is for their profit.

It is probable, then, that those 'who are without',² concerning whom we are now speaking, were foreseen by the Saviour, according to our supposition, as being not likely to prove steadfast in their conversion, if they were to hear more explicitly the message that was spoken. They were therefore destined by the Lord not to hear the deeper teachings more clearly, lest after having quickly turned and been healed by obtaining forgiveness they should despise the wounds of their wickedness as being slight and easy of cure and should very quickly fall into them again. Perhaps, too, though they had paid the penalty for their former sins which they committed against virtue when they abandoned her, they had not yet fulfilled the appropriate time in which to be themselves abandoned by the divine superintendence and to be filled more and more

LATIN

things and who knows all things before they come to be,¹ in his great goodness delays the healing of such persons and defers the remedy to a more distant time and, if I may say so, heals them by not healing them, lest a premature recovery of health should render them incurable.

It is possible, therefore, in regard to those whom the word of our Lord and Saviour addressed as being 'without',² that since he perceived by his power of 'searching the hearts and reins'³ that they were not yet fit to receive his teaching in clearer terms, he covered up the deeper mysteries of the faith in veiled speech. For he feared that if they were speedily converted and healed, that is, if the forgiveness of their sins were quickly obtained, they might easily fall again into the same disease of sin which they had found could be cured without any difficulty. And if this should happen, no one can doubt that the penalty would be doubled and the quantity of evil continually increased, when there is not only a repetition of sins which had appeared to be forgiven, but even the court of virtue is polluted by the tread

¹ Susanna V. 42 and p. 179 above.

² St. Mark IV. 11; see 1 Cor. V. 13.

³ Ps. VII. 10, Sept. (R. V. 9).

GREEK

with the particular evils whose seeds they had sown and then afterwards to be called to a more enduring repentance, such as would prevent them from quickly falling again into the sins into which they had previously fallen when they mocked at the high worth of noble things and gave themselves up to all that was worse.

Those therefore who are spoken of as being 'without', plainly by comparison with those 'within',² are not altogether far away from those within, since while those within hear distinctly, they hear indistinctly because it is spoken to them in parables; nevertheless they hear. But as for the rest of those who are without, those called the Tyrians, although it was foreknown that 'they would have repented long ago, sitting in sackcloth and ashes',³ had the

LATIN

of deceitful-minded and corrupted men, full within of hidden wickedness. And what remedy can there ever be for such persons, who after partaking of the impure and filthy food of wickedness have tasted the pleasure of virtue and received its sweetness into their mouths and have then turned over again to the poisonous and deadly food of iniquity? Who doubts that it is better for them to be put off and abandoned for a time, in order that if one day they should happen to have had their fill of wickedness and be able to shudder at the filthy ways in which they now delight, then at last the word of God may be effectively revealed to them, with the result that what is holy is not given to the dogs nor pearls cast before swine who will trample them under their feet and then turn round and rend and attack those who have preached to them the word of God?¹

These then are they who are said to be 'without', doubtless by comparison with those who are said to be 'within'² and to hear the word of God more plainly. Those, however, who are 'without' also hear the word, although it is covered up in parables and darkened by proverbs. But there are others besides those who are 'without', those namely who are called Tyrians, who do not hear at all; and in spite of the fact that the Saviour foreknew that 'they

¹ See St. Matt. VII. 6. ² See St. Mark IV. 11; 1 Cor. V. 12, 13.

³ See St. Matt. XI. 21, 22; St. Luke X. 13.

GREEK

Saviour come within their borders, these do not even hear what the others hear, for the reason, probably, that they are much farther distant in respect of merit. The purpose is, however, that at some other time, after it has been 'more tolerable'¹ for them than for those who refused to receive the word, in whose presence he mentioned the Tyrians, these may find a more opportune moment to hear and may experience a more enduring repentance.

See, however, whether in addition to our investigation of the truth we are not striving even more to preserve in every way an attitude of piety towards God and his Christ, since we endeavour to explain completely how in passages of such importance and difficulty relating to the manifold providence of God he is taking thought for the immortal soul.

¹ See St. Matt. XI. 22.

² See St. Matt. XI. 21, 22; St. Luke X. 13.

³ Acts II. 4.

⁴ The difference between Rufinus and Origen is well illustrated at this point. Origen is anxious to prove the absolute goodness of God; Rufinus to keep the reader in touch with the faith of the Church. See above Bk. I, Ch. V., 4 (p. 47) and Bk. III, Ch. I., 7 (p. 166).

LATIN

would have repented long ago, sitting in sackcloth and ashes', 'if the mighty works had been done among them which were done among others',² yet still they do not hear, not even the things which those 'without' hear. The reason for this is, I believe, that the condition of these people was far inferior and worse in the matter of wickedness than that of those who are said to be 'without', that is, not far from those 'within', and who have deserved to hear the word though only in parables; and that probably their healing was reserved for the time when it will be 'more tolerable' for them 'in the day of judgment'¹ than for those among whom had been performed those mighty works which are recorded. Thus at last, relieved from the weight of their evil deeds they will walk more easily and enduringly in the way of salvation.

But I wish to remind those who read these pages of the following point, namely, that in dealing with most difficult and obscure passages like these we are striving with the utmost earnestness not so much to argue out clearly the solutions of the problems—for this every one will do as the Spirit gives him utterance³—but by the cautiousness of our statements to preserve the rule of piety.⁴ It is our endeavour to show

GREEK

If, for instance, one were to inquire in reference to the things which are objected to, namely, that while those who saw wonders and heard divine words are not benefited, the Tyrians would have repented if such things had been done and spoken among them, and were to say, 'Why, pray, did the Saviour preach to such people to their hurt, in order that their sin might be accounted heavier?'—we should answer him thus: that he who knows the hearts of all who find fault with his providence on the ground that they did not believe because it had not given them the chance of seeing what it had allowed others to behold and had not arranged for them to hear what others had heard to their profit, in his desire to prove that the excuse was not reasonable gives them the things which they who blame his administration asked for. The intention is that after they have received these advantages and have been convicted

LATIN

that the providence of God which governs the universe with justice also rules immortal souls on the most equitable principles in accordance with the merits and motives of each individual. For God's dealings with men are not confined within the life of this age, but a previous state of merit always furnishes the cause of the state that is to follow; and so by an immortal and eternal law of equity and by the control of divine providence the immortal soul is brought to the height of perfection.

If, however, one were to attack us in reference to our statement that the word of the preaching was deliberately rejected by certain very depraved and wicked men, and to ask why it was preached to them when the Tyrians, who were certainly despised, are preferable in comparison, especially as the sin of these men was thereby increased and their condemnation rendered more serious by the fact that they heard the word and were not open to believe it, we must answer, it would seem, in the following manner. God, who knows the hearts of all, foreknew the complaints made about his providence particularly by those who say: 'How could we believe, when we neither saw what others saw nor heard what was preached to others? So far are we from being at fault, that those to whom the word was proclaimed and the signs displayed made no delay at all but amazed at the very power of

GREEK

none the less of the utmost impiety in that they have not even then given themselves up to be benefited, they may cease from such audacity, and when their minds have been set free on this point they may learn that God is sometimes long and slow in doing good to men, not allowing them to see and hear things, the seeing and hearing of which merely reveals their sin to be heavier and more grievous if after such great and wonderful experiences they do not believe.

18. Let us also look at the passage, 'So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that hath mercy'.¹ Now the objectors say: If it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that hath mercy, then salvation does not come

¹ Rom. IX. 16.

LATIN

the miracles became believers.' Wishing therefore to rule out all excuse for complaints of this sort and to show that it was not the delay of the divine providence but the will of each human mind that was the cause of its ruin, God conferred the grace of his benefits even upon unworthy and unbelieving men, in order that 'every mouth may be stopped'² and the mind of man may know that the failure is entirely on its own part and in no way due to him. At the same time, when he who has despised the divine benefits conveyed to him is condemned more severely than he who has not deserved to obtain them or hear of them at all, we may understand and know that this too is a mark of the divine mercy and of God's most equitable government, which sometimes delays to give men the opportunity of seeing or hearing the mysteries of the divine power, lest after the power of the miracles has been seen and the mysteries of his wisdom have been heard and known they should despise and neglect them and so be visited with a heavier punishment for this impiety.

18. Let us also look at the saying, 'It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that hath mercy'.¹ Now our opponents say: If it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but that that man is saved on whom God has mercy, then

² Rom. III. 19.

GREEK

from what lies in our power but from the constitution we have received from him who constituted us what we are or from the will of him who has mercy when he pleases.

We must ask these persons the following question: Is it a good or a bad thing to will what is good? And is it a matter for praise or for blame that one should run with the desire to reach the goal in an eager haste for what is good? If they should say, for blame, they would be answering against all reason, since the saints will and run and clearly in this are doing nothing worthy of blame. But if they should say that it is a good thing to will the good and to run towards it we shall ask them how a lost nature can will better things. That would be like a bad tree bearing good fruit,¹ if to will better things is good. They may answer in a third way that to will the good and to run towards it is one of the things indifferent and neither good nor bad. To this we must reply that if to will the good and to run towards it is a thing indifferent, then the opposite of this, namely, to will the evil and to run towards that, is also a thing indifferent. But to will the evil and to run towards it is not a thing indifferent. Nor is it indifferent, therefore, to will the good and to run towards the good.

See St Matt. VII. 18.

LATIN

salvation is not in our power. For either our nature is such that we can be saved or cannot be saved, or else it depends solely on the will of him who has mercy and saves us if he pleases.

We must first ask these persons the following question: Is it a good or a bad thing to will what is good? And is it a matter for praise or for blame that he who runs should eagerly haste to the goal of what is good? If they should say, for blame, they would clearly be mad; for all the saints will the good and run towards it and certainly they are not worthy of blame. What then if he who is not saved is of an evil nature, and wills the good and runs towards it but does not find it? For they say that a bad tree does not bear good fruit,¹ yet to will the good is good fruit, and how does the fruit of a bad tree become good? But if they should say that to will the good and to run towards it is a thing indifferent, that is, neither good nor bad, let us answer them: If to will the good and to run towards it is a thing indifferent, then the opposite of this, namely, to will the evil and to run towards that, will also be a thing indifferent. But it is certain that to will the evil and to run towards it is not a thing indifferent, but plainly a bad thing. It is clear, then, that to will the good and to run towards the good is not a thing indifferent, but a good thing.

GREEK

19. Such then is the explanation which I think we can offer in regard to the saying, 'So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that hath mercy'.¹ Now Solomon says in the Book of Psalms—for the Song of Ascents, from which we shall quote the words, is his—'Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain'.² In this he is not dissuading us from building or teaching us not to keep awake in order to guard the city in our soul, but he is showing us that what is built without God and what does not receive its guard from him is built in vain and protected to no purpose, since God may reasonably be regarded as the lord of the building and the Master of the universe as the ruler of the guard for the city.

So then, if we were to say, This building is not the work of the builder but of God, or, it is owing to the efforts not of the guard but of God the Ruler of all that this city has suffered no harm from its enemies, we should not be in error; it being understood that some part of the work had been done by man but that the happy result was to be gratefully attributed to God who brought it to pass.

¹ Rom. IX. 16.

² Ps. CXXXVII. 1. The Psalms of Ascents were sung by pilgrims as they went up to the feasts at Jerusalem. See Exod. XXXIV. 24; 1 Kings XII. 27; Is. XXX. 29.

LATIN

19. Having then routed our opponents with the above answer let us hasten now to explain the passage in question, in which it says, 'It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that hath mercy'.¹ In the Book of Psalms in the Songs of Ascents, which are attributed to Solomon, it is written thus: 'Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain'.² By these words he is certainly not suggesting that we ought to cease from building or from keeping awake in order to guard that city which is within us, but he is showing us that what is built without God and what is guarded without God is built in vain and protected to no purpose. For in everything that is built well and preserved well the Lord is regarded as the author both of the building and of its safe preservation.

For example, if we were to see a splendid work such as a large and magnificent building reared with architectural beauty, should we not rightly and deservedly say that it was not constructed by human power but by divine help and influence. This, however, would not signify that the labour and toil of human endeavour had ceased and performed nothing at all. Or, again, suppose we were to see

GREEK

In the same way, since human will is not sufficient to enable us to attain the end, nor is the running of those who are, as it were, athletes sufficient to enable them to gain 'the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus'¹—for these things are accomplished by God's assistance—it is well said that 'it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that hath mercy'.² Just as if one were to say about farming, as indeed it is actually written, 'I planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase; so that neither is he that planteth anything, nor he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase';³ and we could not piously say that the production of full crops was the work of the farmer or the work of the waterer, but the work of God.

¹ Phil. III. 14.² Rom. IX. 16.³ 1 Cor. III. 6, 7.

LATIN

a city hemmed in by a strict blockade of its enemies, with threatening engines brought up to its walls and a pressing attack made by means of a rampart with weapons, fire and all the other death-dealing instruments of war; then if the enemy should be repulsed and put to flight, it is right and proper for us to say that deliverance was granted by God to the liberated city. Yet by this we do not mean that the sentinels' night watches, the young men's readiness for battle and the guards' vigilance were lacking. The apostle must therefore be understood to have spoken in this sense, that the will of man is not by itself sufficient to the accomplishment of salvation, nor is any mortal running able to attain the heavenly promises and to receive 'the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus',¹ unless this good will of ours and our ready purpose and whatever industry we may possess is both helped and strengthened by the divine assistance. The apostle therefore said very logically, 'It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that hath mercy',² just as if we were to say in connection with farming that which actually is written, 'I planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase; so that neither is he that planteth anything, nor he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase'.³

GREEK

So, too, our perfection does not come to pass without our doing anything, and yet it is not completed as a result of our efforts, but God performs the greater part of it. And in order to produce a clearer conviction that this is the meaning of the passage we will take an illustration from the art of navigation. To what extent should we say that the navigator's art helps in bringing the ship back to the harbour, when compared with the force of the winds and the favourable state of the atmosphere and the shining of the stars, all of which co-operate to preserve those who sail? Why, even the sailors themselves from feelings of reverence do not often venture to claim that they have saved the ship but attribute it all to God; not that they have performed nothing, but that the efforts of God's providence are very much in excess of the effects of their art.

So indeed with our salvation the effects of God's work are very much in excess of the effects of what we can do.

LATIN

As therefore when a field has brought forth good and rich crops to perfect maturity, no one could piously or logically say that the farmer made these fruits, but all would acknowledge that they were bestowed by God, so, too, our perfection is not effected while we rest and do nothing, nor on the other hand is its completion to be attributed to us, but rather to God, who performs the greater part of it. In the same way when a ship has escaped from the dangers of the sea, although the result is achieved by the exercise of much labour on the part of the sailors and by the complete use of the navigator's art, together with the diligence and industry of the pilot, the direction of the winds and the positions of the stars being also carefully noted, nevertheless when at last after being tossed by the waves and strained by the billows the ship reaches the harbour in safety, no one in his sober senses would attribute its safe return to anything but the mercy of God. Further, not even the sailors themselves nor the pilot would venture to say, 'I caused the ship to be saved', but they refer it all to the mercy of God; not that they suppose that they contributed nothing in the way of art or labour to the ship's safety, but that they know that while the labour was provided by them, the ship's safety was due to God.

So also in the journey of our life it is we who must expend labour and zeal and supply diligent toil, but the salvation which

GREEK

This, I believe, is the reason why it was said, 'It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that hath mercy'¹ For if we are to take the passage, 'It is not of him that willeth nor of him that runneth, but of God that hath mercy',¹ in the sense that our opponents suggest, the commandments are superfluous, and it is in vain when Paul himself blames some for having fallen away and approves of others for remaining steadfast and gives directions to the churches; it is useless, too, for us to yield ourselves up to willing what is better, useless also for us to try to run. But it is not in vain when Paul gives all his advice, and when he blames some and approves of others, nor is it in vain when we yield ourselves up to willing what is better and to desiring eagerly the things that are excellent. Our opponents, therefore have not rightly explained the meaning of the passage.

20. In addition to these there is the passage, 'To will and to work are of God'.² Now some say, If to will is from God, and to work is from God, then even if we will badly and work badly, these come to us from God; and if this is so, we have no free will. Again, when we will what is better and work deeds that are excellent, since to will and to work are from God it is not we who have done the excellent deeds; we seemed to do them, but it was God who bestowed

¹ Rom. IX. 16.

LATIN

is the fruit of our labour we must look to receive from God. Otherwise, if God demands none of our work, the commandments will certainly appear to be superfluous; and it is in vain when Paul himself blames some who have fallen away from the truth and praises others for standing fast in the faith, and to no purpose when he also delivers certain precepts and directions to the churches; in vain, too, that we ourselves either will or run towards the good. But it is certain that these things do not happen in vain, and it is certain that the apostles do not deliver precepts in vain, nor does the Lord give laws to no purpose. It remains then for us to declare that the vanity lies rather with the heretics, when they give a false meaning to these good words.

20. After this follows the question, that 'both to will and to work are of God'.² Now they say, If to will is from God, and to work is from God, then whether we will or work well or badly, it is from God; and if this is so, we have no free will.

² Phil. II. 13.

GREEK

them on us, and so even in this we have no free will.

In reply to this we must say that the statement of the apostle does not assert that to will what is evil is of God or that to will what is good is of God; nor that to work deeds that are better or worse is of God; but to will in general and to work in general. For as we have it from God that we are living beings and that we are men, so also we have from him the power of willing in general, as I said, and the power of movement in general. And just as we, because we are living beings, possess the power of movement and can move, for instance, these limbs of ours, hands or feet, and yet we could not reasonably say that we have from God the particular power of moving to strike, or to destroy, or to take away another's goods, but what we received from God was the power of movement in general and it is we who use this power for the worse or for the better, so we have received from God the power of working, by virtue of our being living creatures, and from the Creator the power of willing, but it is we who use the power of willing either for the noblest purposes or for the opposite ones, and likewise the power of working.

21. Still, the saying of the apostle in the passage where he suggests an objection against himself will appear to tend to the conclusion that we are not possessed of free will. He says, 'So then he hath mercy on

LATIN

To this we must reply that the statement of the apostle does not assert that to will what is evil is from God or that to will what is good is from God; nor that to work either good or evil is from God; but it says in a general way that 'to will and to work are of God'. For as we have it from God that we are men, that we breathe and that we move, so also we have from God the power of willing; just as if we were to say that our power of movement is from God, or the fact that each of our members performs its proper function and movements is from God. But it must certainly not be understood from this that if the hand moves, for instance, to strike someone unjustly or to steal, this is from God; for only the power of movement is from God, and it is our part to direct those movements, the power of exercising which we have from God, either to good or to evil purposes. Thus what the apostle says is, that we receive from God the power of willing, but it is we who use the will either for good or for evil desires. We must apply similar reasoning to our works.

21. But there is also the passage where the apostle said, 'So then he hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth. Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he still find fault? For who

GREEK

whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth. Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he still find fault? For who withstandeth his will? Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why didst thou make me thus? Or hath not the potter a right over the clay, from the same lump to make one part a vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?¹

Now someone will say, If, just as the potter from the same lump makes some vessels for honour and some for dishonour, so God makes some creatures for salvation and some for destruction, then salvation or destruction does not rest with us nor are we possessed of free will. We must ask the man who interprets the words thus, whether it is possible to imagine the apostle contradicting himself; and I do not believe that anyone will dare to say that it is. If then the apostle does not speak in contrary ways, how according to the man who accepts the passage in this sense is he reasonable in imputing blame to the fornicator at Corinth or to those who had fallen away and had not repented of the licentiousness and impurity of their deeds?² How, too, can he bless for having acted well those whom he praises, as for instance the house of Onesiphorus, in these words: 'The Lord grant mercy unto the house of Onesiphorus;

LATIN

withstandeth his will? Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why didst thou make me thus? Or hath not the potter a right over the clay, from the same lump to make one part a vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?¹

Now someone may perhaps say, If, just as the potter from the same lump makes some vessels for honour and some for dishonour, so God makes some men for salvation and some for destruction, then salvation or destruction does not rest with us; which makes it clear that we have no free will. We must reply therefore to those who interpret the words thus, and ask whether it is possible that the apostle could contradict himself. And if we cannot think this of the apostle, how according to them will it seem just for him to blame those at Corinth who had committed fornication, or those who had fallen away and had not repented of their deeds of licentiousness and fornication and impurity?² How, too, can he praise those who had acted rightly, as for instance the house of Onesiphorus, saying: 'The Lord grant mercy unto the house of Onesiphorus; for he oft refreshed me and was not ashamed of my chain; but when he came to

¹ Rom. IX. 18-21.² See 1 Cor. V. 1-5; 2 Cor. XII. 21.

GREEK

for he oft refreshed me and was not ashamed of my chain; but when he was in Rome he sought me diligently and found me. The Lord grant unto him to find mercy of the Lord in that day.¹ It is not like the same apostle to blame the sinner as if he was worthy of blame and to approve as if worthy of praise him who had acted well, and yet on the other hand to assert, as if nothing lay in our power, that it is due to the intention of the Creator that one vessel is made 'unto honour' and another 'unto dishonour'.

And in regard to the statement that 'we must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ, that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad',² how is this correct, if those who have done evil have come to this kind of conduct because they were created 'vessels of dishonour', and if those who have lived virtuously have done good because they were from the beginning fashioned for this purpose and are 'vessels of honour'?

And further, is there not a conflict between this view, which they gather from the words we have quoted, that it is due to the intention of the Creator that a vessel is honourable or the reverse, and the saying found elsewhere: 'In a great house there are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of

LATIN

Rome he sought me diligently and found me. The Lord grant unto him to find mercy of the Lord in that day.¹ It is not consistent with the seriousness of the apostle to blame the man who is worthy of blame, that is, the man who has sinned, and to praise the man who is worthy of praise for his good work, and on the other hand to say, as if it were in no one's power to do anything good or evil, that it is the Creator's doing that each man acts either well or ill, since he makes 'one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour'.

And how could he also add the saying that 'we must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ, that each one of us may receive in his body according to what he has done, whether it be good or bad'?² For what return of good is due to him who could do no evil, because he was fashioned for good by the Creator? Or what penalty could properly be demanded of him who by the very act of his Maker was unable to do good?

Finally, is there not a contradiction between this assertion and what is said elsewhere: 'In a great house there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some unto honour, and some unto dishonour. If therefore a man purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto

¹ 2 Tim. I. 16-18.² 2 Cor. V. 10.

GREEK

wood and of earth; and some unto honour, and some unto dishonour. If therefore a man purge himself, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified and meet for the master's use, prepared unto every good work.¹ For if he who 'purges himself' becomes a 'vessel unto honour', and he who allows himself to remain unpurged becomes a 'vessel unto dishonour', so far as these words go the Creator is in no way responsible. For the Creator makes 'vessels of honour and vessels of dishonour' not from the beginning by his foreknowledge, since he does not condemn or justify beforehand by that, but he makes those who purge themselves 'vessels of honour' and those who allow themselves to remain unpurged 'vessels of dishonour'; so that it comes from causes older than the fashioning of vessels unto honour and unto dishonour that one was made 'unto honour' and another 'unto dishonour'.

22. But if we once admit² that there are certain older causes to account for the 'vessel of honour' and the 'vessel of dishonour', what is there absurd

¹ 2 Tim. II. 20, 21.

² This paragraph is quoted by Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 8. 'In the third book also the following errors are found: If we once admit that it is from previous causes that one vessel was created for honour and another for dishonour; why should we not recur to the secret history of the soul and conclude that it is loved in one man and hated in another by reason of deeds long past, in Jacob's case before he became a supplanter and in Esau's case before his heel was grasped by his brother?'

LATIN

honour, sanctified and meet for the master's use, prepared unto every good work.¹ If therefore a man purges himself, he becomes a 'vessel unto honour'; but he who has disdained to purge himself from his impurities becomes a 'vessel unto dishonour'. In view of these declarations the cause of our deeds can by no means, in my opinion, be referred to the Creator. For God the Creator makes some vessels 'unto honour' and he makes other vessels 'unto dishonour'; but it is that vessel which has purged itself from all impurity that he makes a 'vessel unto honour', while the one which has stained itself with low vices he makes a 'vessel unto dishonour'. And so we conclude from this that the cause of each man's activities goes back into the past and that each was made by God a vessel of honour or of dishonour in accordance with his merits. Each vessel has therefore from its own self provided the Creator with the causes and occasions in virtue of which it was formed by him either 'unto honour' or 'unto dishonour'.

22. But if this statement appears to be just, as it certainly is just and in harmony with all piety, namely, that each vessel is fashioned by God for honour

GREEK

in our recurring to the subject of the soul and recognising that the older reasons why Jacob was loved and Esau hated lie with Jacob before he came into the body and with Esau before he entered Rebecca's womb?¹

At the same time it is made quite clear in regard to their fundamental nature that just as it is one clay which is in the hands of the potter, from a lump of which come vessels 'unto honour and unto dishonour', so every soul in God's hands is of one nature and all rational beings come, if I may say so, from one lump, though certain older causes have made some to be for honour and others for dishonour.

But if the language of the apostle conveys a rebuke when he says, 'Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?'² it probably teaches us that he who has confidence towards God by reason of his faithful and good life would not hear the words, 'Who art thou that repliest against God?' A man like Moses, for example—'for Moses spake, and God answered him with a voice';³ and as God answers Moses, so also the saint answers God. But he who has

LATIN

or for dishonour as a result of pre-existing causes, it does not seem absurd for us, when discussing the older causes in the same order and by the same method, to apply the same principle to souls, and to believe that this was the reason why Jacob was loved even before he was born into this world, and Esau was hated while still enclosed in his mother's womb.¹

Further, the saying that 'from the same lump' is made both a vessel of honour and one of dishonour will not cause us difficulty, for we say that there is one nature for all rational souls, just as one lump of clay is described as being in the hands of the potter. Since then there is one nature for all rational creatures, out of this one nature God formed and created, as the potter does out of one lump of clay, 'some men to honour and others to dishonour', in accordance with pre-existing grounds of merit.

But in regard to the apparent rebuke conveyed by the apostle's language when he says, 'O man, who art thou that repliest against God?',² I think that what he teaches here is this, that such a rebuke does not refer to one who is faithful and lives a good and righteous life and has confidence towards God, that is, to a man like Moses, of whom the scripture says that 'Moses spake, and God answered him with a voice';³ and as God answered Moses, so also the

¹ See Mal. I. 2, 3; Gen. XXV. 25, 26.

² Exod. XIX. 19.

³ Rom. IX. 20.

GREEK

not obtained this confidence, for the clear reason that he is either lost or else makes these inquiries with a desire not to learn but to cause contention, and who says, 'Why doth he still find fault? For who withstandeth his will?' from such motives, this man would deserve the rebuke contained in the words, 'Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?'¹

23. To those, however, who bring in diverse natures and use this passage in support we must answer as follows. If they retain the doctrine that the lost and the saved come 'from one lump'² and that the Creator of the saved is also the Creator of the lost, and if he who makes not only the spiritual but also the earthy is good (for this follows from their reasonings), it is none the less possible for one who has become at the present time a vessel of honour in consequence of certain former righteous deeds and yet has not acted similarly here nor in a way befitting a vessel of honour, to become in another age a vessel of dishonour; just as on the other hand it is possible for one who by reason of acts older than this life has become here a

¹ Rom. IX. 20.

LATIN

saint will answer God. But the man who is unfaithful and loses his confidence in answering before God by the unworthiness of his life and conduct, who makes these inquiries with a desire not to learn and advance, but to cause strife and contention, the kind of man who can say what the apostle indicates in the words, 'Why then doth he still find fault? For who withstandeth his will?'—this is the man to whom is rightly directed the rebuke conveyed by the apostle's words, 'O man, who art thou that repliest against God?'¹ This rebuke, then, is not for the faithful and the saints, but for the unfaithful and impious.

23. As for those, however, who bring in diverse natures of souls and adduce this statement of the apostle in support of their doctrine, we must answer them as follows. If they agree with us that the apostle says that both those who are made for honour and those who are made for dishonour, whom they call the persons of saved and of lost natures, come 'from one lump',² then the natures of souls will not be diverse, but there will be one nature for all. And if they admit that one and the same potter undoubtedly indicates one Creator, then there will not be different Creators for those who are saved and for those who are lost. Now let them choose whether they wish the passage to be interpreted as indicating a good God who creates evil and

² Rom. IX. 21.

GREEK

vessel of dishonour to become, if he amends his ways in the 'new creation',¹ a 'vessel of honour sanctified and meet for the master's use, prepared unto every good work'.²

And perhaps the present Israelites will be deprived of their racial position for not having lived worthily of their noble birth, being changed as it were from vessels of honour into vessels of dishonour; while many of the present Egyptians

LATIN

lost men, or a God not good who creates men that are good and prepared for honour. The necessity of giving an answer will extract from them one of these two alternatives. But according to our contention that God makes vessels to honour or to dishonour by reason of pre-existing causes, the proof of God's righteousness is in no way compromised. For it is possible that one vessel, which from previous causes has in this world been fashioned for honour, may in another age, if it has acted carelessly here, become a vessel of dishonour in accordance with the deserts of its conduct; just as on the other hand if a man has from pre-existing causes been formed by the Creator as a vessel of dishonour in this life, and yet has amended his ways and purged himself from all his faults and low vices, he may in that new age become a 'vessel unto honour, sanctified and meet for the master's use, prepared unto every good work'.

Finally, those who were formed by God to be Israelites in this age, and have lived a life unworthy of their noble birth and fallen away from their high descent, will in the age to come, for their unbelief, be changed as it were from vessels of honour

¹ See Gal. VI. 15 (R. V. Marg.).

² Jerome translates the foregoing lines as follows. *Ep. ad Avitum* 8. 'And in another place: But according to us a vessel which has by reason of pre-existing merits been fashioned for honour may, if it fails to do work worthy of its title, become in another age a vessel of dishonour; and on the other hand a vessel which as a result of former sin has received a name of dishonour may, if in the present life it has willed to receive correction, become in the new creation a vessel sanctified and useful to the Lord, prepared unto every good work.'

GREEK

and Idumaeans who have come near to Israel¹ will, when they have borne more fruit, 'enter into the church of the Lord', no longer being reckoned as Egyptians or Idumaeans but for the future becoming Israelites.² Thus according to this view some men by the exercise of their wills make progress from worse to better, while others fall from better to worse; others, too, are preserved in their good deeds or rise from good to better, while others again continue in their evil deeds and, if the evil flows on, from being bad become still worse.

* * * * *

LATIN

into vessels of dishonour; while on the other hand many who in this life have been reckoned among the Egyptian or Idumaeans but have embraced the faith and conduct of the Israelites shall 'enter into the church of the Lord' and exist as vessels of honour 'at the revelation of the sons of God.'³ Thus it is more agreeable to the rule of piety⁴ to believe that every rational creature, according to his will and conduct, is changed at one time from bad to good and at another falls from good to bad; that some continue in good, and some even advance to what is better and ever ascend to higher things until they reach the highest stage of all; while others continue in evil or, if the evil within them begins to overflow, go on to a worse condition and are at last overwhelmed in the lowest depths of wickedness.

We must suppose from this that it is possible for some who have begun at first with small sins to be so given over to wickedness and to go to such lengths of evil that their iniquity equals even that of the oppos-

¹ The thought of connecting Egyptians with Idumaeans is suggested by Kings XI. 14 ff and Deut. XXIII. 7, 8. See *Philocalia* Ch. XIII. 3.

² See Deut. XXIII. 7, 8.

³ See Deut. XXIII. 7, 8; Rom. VIII. 19.

⁴ See above p. 193.

⁵ This paragraph was omitted, for obvious reasons, by the compilers of the *Philocalia*. It adds nothing new, and yet was likely to cause unnecessary offence by its detailed inferences from the preceding argument. Jerome has quoted it for the purposes of condemnation in his *Ep. ad Avitum* 8. 'And he (i.e. Origen) immediately adds: I think it possible for some men who have begun with small faults to reach such a degree of wickedness, if they refuse to change for the better and to amend their sinful life by penitence, that they even become opposing powers; and on the other hand for some so to apply a remedy to their wounds over long spaces of time and to check the offences that formerly flowed on that they pass to the condition

GREEK

LATIN

ing powers; and that on the other hand, if, through many severe punishments and most bitter chastisements they are able at last to recover their senses and by degrees endeavour to find a remedy for their wounds, they may when their wickedness has ended be restored to what is good. This leads us to the opinion that since, as we have frequently said, the soul is immortal and eternal, it is possible that in the many and endless periods throughout diverse and immeasurable ages it may either descend from the highest good to the lowest evil or be restored from the lowest evil to the highest good.

24. In one place, then, the apostle claims that it is not in God's power whether we become vessels unto honour or unto dishonour, but he attributes it entirely to us when he says, 'If therefore a man purge himself, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified and meet for the master's use, prepared unto every good work'.¹ In another place, however, he claims that it is not in our power, but appears to attribute it entirely to God when he says, 'The potter hath a right over the clay, from the same lump to make one part a vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour'.²

of the best. We have frequently said that in the infinite and unceasing ages during which the soul remains in existence some are so carried downwards towards what is worse that they come to the last degree of evil, while others make such progress that from the last degree of evil they reach the perfection and consummation of virtue. In these words, Jerome adds, 'he tries to prove that men, that is, souls, can become daemons, and that on the other hand daemons may be restored to the dignity of angels.'

¹ 2 Tim. II. 21.

² Rom. IX. 21.

GREEK

Now these sayings of his are not contradictory, but must be taken together and one perfect explanation drawn from them both. It is, then, neither in our power to make progress apart from the knowledge of God, nor does the knowledge of God compel us to do so unless we ourselves contribute something towards the good result; nor does our power apart from the knowledge of God and the full use of the power that deservedly belongs to us cause a man to be created for honour or for dishonour; nor does the power of God by itself fashion a man for honour or for dishonour, but God finds a ground of difference in our will, as it inclines to the better or to the worse.

Let these arguments, which we have provided on the subject of free will, be sufficient.

LATIN

Now we must not take these passages to be contradictory to one another, but the meaning of each must be combined into one and a single interpretation drawn from the two; that is, that we are not to think that the things which are in the power of our will can be performed without the help of God, nor that those which are in God's hands can be brought to completion apart from our acts and earnest endeavours and purpose. For indeed we do not have it in our own will either to desire or to perform anything without being bound to recognize that this very power of desiring and performing was given to us by God, subject to the distinction which we spoke of above.¹ Nor again are we to think that when God fashions vessels, some for honour and some for dishonour, he regards our wills or purposes or merits as a cause of the honour or dishonour, as if they were a kind of matter out of which he may fashion each one of us either for honour or for dishonour. The truth is that the very movement of the soul and purpose of the mind of itself suggests to him, to whom the heart and the thoughts of the soul are not hidden, whether the vessel should be fashioned for honour or for dishonour.

But let these arguments, which we have discussed to the best of our ability on the questions that arise out of free will, be sufficient.

¹ See p. 201.

CHAPTER II

GREEK

HOW THE DEVIL AND THE OPPOSING POWERS ARE, ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES, AT WAR WITH THE HUMAN RACE.¹

LATIN

THE OPPOSING POWERS.

LATIN

1. We must now see how, according to the scriptures, the opposing powers and the devil himself are engaged in a struggle with the human race, provoking and inciting men to sin. First, a serpent is described in Genesis as having seduced Eve;² and in regard to this serpent, in the Ascension of Moses, a book which the apostle Jude mentions in his epistle, Michael the archangel when disputing with the devil about the body of Moses says that the serpent was inspired by the devil and so became the cause of the transgression of Adam and Eve.³ Further, the question is asked by some, who is the angel that speaks from heaven to Abraham and says, 'Now I know that thou fearest God, and for my sake hast not withheld thy beloved son, whom thou lovedst'.⁴ For clearly it is an angel who is described and who says that he knew now that Abraham feared God and had not withheld his beloved son, as the scripture runs, yet he did not declare that it was for God's sake, but for his own sake, that is, for the sake of him who was speaking. We must also inquire who that being was of whom it is said in Exodus that he wished to kill Moses because he was setting out for Egypt.⁵ And afterwards, who is it that is called the 'destroying angel',⁶ and who also is he who in Leviticus is described as Apopompeus, that is, the Averter, of whom the scripture speaks thus: 'One lot for the Lord, and one lot for Apopompeus'?⁷

¹ The Greek title comes from Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* 8, p. 4.

² See Gen. III. 1-6.

³ The Epistle of Jude (Ver. 9) alludes to the *Assumption* (Gr. *Analepsis* or *Anabasis*) of Moses, but does not mention its title. See Charles, *Assumption of Moses*; and the same author's *Apoc. and Pseudep. of O. T.* II. 421 ff.

⁴ Gen. XXII. 12.

⁵ See Exod. IV. 24.

⁶ Exod. XII. 23.

⁷ See Lev. XVI. 8. The true meaning of the Hebrew Azazel is unknown. He was an evil spirit dwelling in the wilderness, who was supposed to receive the sins of the people transmitted through the scape-goat on the day of Atonement. The Sept. renders it *Apopompeus*, the Vulgate simply describes the goat, *capra emissarius*, and Rufinus translates Origen's *Apopompeus* by the neutral *transmissor*. For want of a more suitable term I have used Gesenius' suggestion *Averter* (see Hastings' *Dic. of the Bible*, Art. Azazel, S. R. Driver, Vol. I, p. 208a), which probably indicates the true function of Azazel.

Further, in the first book of the Kings an evil spirit is said to suffocate Saul;¹ and in the third book Micaiah the prophet says, 'I saw the God of Israel sitting upon his throne, and all the host of heaven stood round about him on his right hand and on his left. And the Lord said, Who shall entice Ahab king of Israel, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth Gilead? And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner. And there came forth a spirit, and stood before the Lord and said, I will entice him. And the Lord said unto him, Where-with? And he said, I will go forth, and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said, Thou shalt entice him, and shalt prevail also; go forth, and do so. And now the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all thy prophets; and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee.'² This account clearly shows that a certain spirit by his own will and choice elected to entice and to practise deceit, and that God makes use of this spirit to compass the death of Ahab, who deserved that fate.

Also in the first book of the Chronicles it says, 'The devil raised up Satan in Israel, and moved David to number the people'.³ In the Psalms an evil angel is said to persecute certain men.⁴ In Ecclesiastes, too, Solomon says, 'If the spirit of one that hath power rise up against thee, leave not thy place, for healing will restrain many transgressions'.⁵ And in Zechariah we read of the devil standing at Joshua's right hand and resisting him.⁶ Isaiah also says that the sword of God rises up against 'the dragon, the crooked serpent'.⁷ And what shall I say of Ezekiel, who in his second vision prophesies most clearly to the prince of Tyre about an opposing power and who says, too, that the dragon dwells in the rivers of Egypt?⁸ And as for the entire book that is written about Job, what else does it contain but an account of the devil seeking for power to be given him over all Job's possessions, and over his sons, and finally over his body? He is conquered, however, through Job's patience. In this book the Lord has by his answers taught us much about the power of that dragon which opposes us. Let these examples from the Old Testament, so far as we can call

¹ See 1 Sam. XVIII. 10. As this verse is not in the Sept. it is impossible to say what word of Origen's it is that Rufinus translates by *offocare* (v. l. *effocare, suffocare*). The Vulgate has *invasit*.

² 1 Kings XXII. 19-23.

³ See 1 Chron. XXI. 1. The passage has been confused with 1 Kings XI. 14, where 'Satan' means simply an adversary. This was probably Origen's meaning here, misunderstood by Rufinus.

⁴ See Ps. XXXV. 5, 6.

⁵ Eccles. X. 4. Rufinus' *sanitas* answers to the Greek *ἰαμα* healing. The meaning is probably, a healing spirit, as opposed to a spirit of provocation.

⁶ See Zech. III. 1.

⁷ See Is. XXVII. 1.

⁸ See Ezk. XXIX. 3 and above Bk. I. Ch. V, 4 (p. 47).

them to memory at the moment, he now quoted to prove that the opposing powers are both named in the scriptures and are said to be adversaries of the human race and reserved for future punishment.

But let us look also at the New Testament, where Satan comes to the Saviour, tempting him;¹ and where evil spirits and impure daemons, which had taken possession of very many, were put to flight by the Saviour from the bodies of the sufferers, who are said also to have been set free by him.² Moreover, Judas, when the devil had now put it into his heart to betray Christ, afterwards received Satan wholly into himself; for it is written that 'after the sop Satan entered into him.'³ Paul the apostle teaches us that we should not 'give place to the devil'⁴ but, he says, 'Put on the armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil',⁵ pointing out that the saints' wrestling 'is not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of this world's darkness, against spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places'.⁶ Further, he says that the Saviour was crucified by 'the princes of this world', who are 'coming to nought', whose 'wisdom', he adds, he does not speak.⁷ Through all these instances, therefore, the divine scripture teaches us that there are certain invisible enemies fighting against us, and it tells us that we must be armed to meet them. This leads the simpler sort of believers in Christ the Lord to suppose that all the sins that men have committed come from the persistent influence of the contrary powers on the sinners' minds, because in this invisible contest the powers are found to be superior. But if, so to speak, there were no devil, no man would ever sin at all.

2. We however, who look more carefully into the reason of things, do not think that this is so; especially when we consider the acts that arise clearly from the necessities of our body. Are we to suppose that the devil is the cause of our being hungry or thirsty? I suppose there is no one who would venture to maintain this. If then he is not the cause of our being hungry or thirsty, what of that condition when an individual has attained the age of puberty and this period has called forth the exciting movements of the natural heat? It follows without a doubt that, as the devil is not the cause of our being hungry or thirsty, so neither is he the cause even of that impulse which is naturally called forth at the time of maturity, that is, of the desire for sexual intercourse. It is certain that this impulse is by no means always aroused by the devil, so as to lead us to suppose that if there were no devil our bodies would not have the desire for such intercourse.

¹ St. Matt. IV. 1-11 and parallels.

² See St. Mark I. 23 ff., 32-34; V. 1 ff.

³ See St. John XIII. 2, 27.

⁴ See Eph. IV. 27.

⁵ Eph. VI. 11.

⁶ Eph. VI. 12.

⁷ See 1 Cor. II. 6-8.

Then again let us consider in regard to food,—if it be true, as we have shown above, that this is not sought for by men at the instance of the devil, but from a natural instinct—whether human experience, supposing there were no devil, could possibly employ such great self-control in partaking of food as absolutely never to exceed the limit, that is, never to take anything but what the occasion demanded or more than reason permitted, and that it should never happen that men went astray in the observance of due measure and moderation in their food. I for my part do not think that, even if there were no impulse from the devil to urge men on, this rule could be so observed by them that no one would exceed due measure and moderation in partaking of food, not at any rate before they had learned this lesson by long practise and experience. What then? In regard to foods and drink it would be possible for us to go wrong even apart from the instigation of the devil, if we happened to be caught at an intemperate or careless moment; and are we to suppose that in regard to the control of the sexual appetite and the natural desires we should not be affected in a similar way? My own opinion is that the same process of reasoning can also be applied to the rest of the natural emotions, such as covetousness, anger, sorrow or any others whatever, which by the fault of intemperance exceed the limits of their natural measure.

The fact is therefore clear that, just as in regard to things that are good the mere human will is by itself incapable of completing the good act,—for this is in all cases brought to perfection by divine help—so also in regard to things of the opposite kind we derive the beginnings and what we may call the seeds of sin from those desires which are given to us naturally for our use. But when we indulge these to excess and offer no resistance to the first movements towards intemperance, then the hostile power, seizing the opportunity of this first offence, incites and urges us on in every way, striving to extend the sins over a larger field; so that while we men supply the occasions and beginnings of our sins, the hostile powers spread them far and wide and if possible endlessly. It is thus that the fall into avarice at last takes place, men first longing for a little money and then increasing in greed as the vice grows. Afterwards their passion is succeeded by a mental blindness and, with the hostile powers stimulating and urging them on, money is now not merely longed for but even seized by force or acquired through the shedding of human blood.

A sure proof that these vast excesses of sin come from the daemons can easily be observed from the following fact, that those who are under the influence of immoderate love or uncontrolled anger or exceptional sorrow suffer no less than those who are tormented in body by daemons. Further, it is related in certain histories that some men have become insane from love, others even for sorrow or excessive joy; and this happens,

I think, because these opposing powers, that is, the daemons, have been allowed to occupy a place in their minds, a place which intemperance has first laid open, and have then taken complete possession of their intelligence, especially as no thought of the glory of virtue aroused them to resistance.

3. That there are, however, certain sins which do not come from the opposing powers but take their beginning from the natural instincts of the body is most clearly declared by the apostle Paul in the place where he says, 'The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would'.¹ If then the 'flesh lusteth against the spirit', and the 'spirit against the flesh', we have at some time to 'wrestle against flesh and blood',² that is, when we are 'men' and 'walk according to the flesh',³ and when we cannot be tempted with temptations beyond what are human, when it is said of us that 'no temptation hath taken you, except such as is human; but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able'.⁴

For just as those who preside over the games do not allow the competitors to oppose one another indiscriminately or by chance in the contests, but after a careful examination match them in equal pairs according to size and years, this one with that and this one with that, boys, that is, with boys and men with men as they are suited to one another by close resemblance in age or strength, so also must we understand in regard to the divine providence, that it treats all who descend into the struggles of human life with the most impartial care, according to the nature of each individual's virtue, which he alone knows who alone beholds the hearts of men. One, therefore, fights against one kind of flesh, another against another kind; one for so long a time, another for so long; one is incited by the flesh to this or that, another to something else; one struggles against this or that hostile power, another against two or three at once, or now against one and now against another, and at one particular time against one and at another against another; or after certain acts a man fights against certain powers, after other acts against different ones. For consider whether some such arrangement is not indicated by the saying of the apostle, 'But God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able',⁴ that is, because each one is tempted in proportion to the degree and possibilities of the strength he possesses.

It must not be supposed, however, that because we said that by the righteous decision of God each man is tempted in proportion to the degree of his strength, the tempted man ought

¹ Gal. V. 17.

² Eph. VI. 12.

³ 1 Cor. III. 4; 2 Cor. X. 2.

⁴ 1 Cor. X. 13.

therefore by all means to be victorious; for the competitor in the games cannot by all means be victorious, even though he may be paired with his opponent in an equal match. But unless the powers of the combatants are equal, the victor's palm will not be justly won nor may the vanquished be justly blamed. For this reason God allows us to be tempted, yet not 'above that we are able'; for we are tempted in proportion to our powers. Nor is it written that in temptation God will also make a way to escape from bearing it, but a way to escape that we may be able to bear it. And this possibility that he has given us it is in our hands to utilise either vigorously or feebly. There is no doubt that in every temptation we are given a power of bearing it, if only we use to the full the power thus granted. For to have the power to conquer is not the same thing as to conquer, as the apostle pointed out in carefully chosen language when he said that 'God will give a way of escape, that ye may be able to bear it',¹ not, that ye may bear it. Many do not bear it, but are conquered by temptation. But what God gives us is not the certainty that we shall bear it, in which case there would appear to be no struggle at all, but the possibility 'that we may be able to bear it'.

This strength, therefore, which is given to us in order that we may be able to conquer, we by the exercise of our free will either use diligently and conquer or feebly and suffer defeat. For if it were given to us in such completeness as to ensure our victory by all means, that is, to prevent us from being by any possibility conquered, what reason for struggling would remain to him who could not be conquered? Or what merit in gaining the palm when our adversary is deprived of the chance of conquering? But if the possibility of conquering is conferred equally upon us all, while the way in which we should use this possibility, that is, either vigorously or feebly, is a thing that lies in our own power, then it will be just to blame the vanquished and give the palm to the victor. From these considerations, therefore, which we have urged to the best of our ability, I think it is clearly apparent that there are some offences which we commit quite apart from the influence of the evil powers, and others which are carried to excessive and immoderate lengths at their instigation. It follows that we must now inquire how these opposing powers produce the aforementioned incitements within us.

4. We find that the 'thoughts which proceed out of the heart',² whether they are a memory of deeds we have done or a contemplation of any things or causes whatsoever, proceed sometimes from ourselves, sometimes are aroused by the opposing powers, and occasionally also are implanted in us by God or by the holy angels. This would perhaps seem fabulous if it were not proved by the witness of divine scripture. That a

¹ 1 Cor. X. 13.

² See St. Matt. XV. 18, 19; St. Mark VII. 21.

thought may arise from ourselves is seen from the witness of David in the Psalms: 'For the thought of man shall confess thee, and the residue of his thoughts shall hold a festival day to thee'.¹ That it may come also from the contrary powers is seen from the witness of Solomon in Ecclesiastes, as follows: 'If the spirit of one that hath power rise up against thee, leave not thy place, for healing will restrain many transgressions.'² And Paul the apostle will bear his witness on the same matter when he says: 'Casting down thoughts and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of Christ.'³

That on the other hand a thought may come from God is seen from the witness of David in the Psalms, as follows: 'Blessed is the man whose acceptance is with thee, O Lord; thy ascents are in his heart.'⁴ And the apostle says that 'God put it into the heart of Titus'.⁵ That some thoughts are suggested to men's hearts by either good or bad angels is shown both by the angel that accompanied Tobias⁶ and by the language of the prophet when he says, 'And the angel who was speaking in me replied'.⁷ Moreover the book of the Shepherd asserts the same thing, teaching that two angels attend each human being, and saying that whenever good thoughts arise in our heart they are suggested by the good angel, and whenever thoughts of the opposite kind they are the inspiration of the bad angel.⁸ The same thing, too, is asserted by Barnabas in his epistle, where he says that there are two ways, one of light and the other of darkness, over which preside certain angels, the angels of God over the way of light and Satan's angels over the way of darkness.⁹

We must bear in mind, however, that nothing else happens to us as a result of these good or evil thoughts which are suggested to our heart but a mere agitation and excitement which urges us on to deeds either of good or of evil. It is possible for us, when an evil power has begun to urge us on to a deed of evil, to cast away the wicked suggestions and to resist the low enticements and to do absolutely nothing worthy of blame; and it is possible on the other hand when a divine power has urged us on to better things not to follow its guidance, since our faculty of free will is preserved to us in either case.

Now we said in the preceding paragraph¹⁰ that certain memories either of good or of evil deeds are also suggested to us, whether through divine providence or through the opposing powers. This is shown in the book of Esther, when Artaxerxes did not remember the benefits he had received from the righteous man Mordecai,

¹ Ps. LXXVI. 10 (Sept.).

² Eccles. X. 4. See note p. 212 above.

³ 2 Cor. X. 5.

⁴ 2 Cor. VIII. 16.

⁵ Zech. I. 14 (Sept.).

⁶ See Ep. Barnabas, 18.

⁷ Ps. LXXXIV. 5 (Sept.).

⁸ Tobit V. 4 ff.

⁹ See Hermas, Mand. VI. 2.

¹⁰ See above par. 4 (p. 216).

and during a weary and sleepless night an idea came into his mind from God that he should send for the records of great deeds that were written in the archives. By these he was reminded of Mordecai's services and ordered his enemy Haman to be hanged, while to Mordecai himself he granted splendid honours and the safety of the whole race of the saints who were then in imminent peril.¹ On the contrary we must suppose that it was some power of the devil who suggested to the mind of the priests and scribes the remark which they made when they came to Pilate: 'Sir, we have remembered that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again.'²

Moreover the thought of Judas concerning the Saviour's betrayal was not one which came solely from the wickedness of his own mind. For the scripture bears witness that the devil had put it into his heart to betray him.³ On this account Solomon rightly utters the precept, 'Keep thy heart with all diligence';⁴ and Paul the apostle says, 'We ought to give more earnest heed to the things that we heard, lest haply we drift away';⁵ and when he says, 'Give not place to the devil',⁶ he shows that by a certain kind of action or a certain kind of inaction a 'place' in the mind is given to the devil with the result that, when once he has entered our heart he either takes possession of us, or at any rate pollutes the soul if he cannot take entire possession of it, by hurling at us his 'fiery darts',⁷ with which we are sometimes merely inflamed, but sometimes pierced and wounded deeply. In rare cases, indeed, and by a few persons these 'fiery darts' of his are 'quenched',⁷ so that they fail to find the place for a wound; that is, when a man has been covered with the strong and defensive 'shield of faith'. But in regard to the statement in the epistle to the Ephesians, 'For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places',⁸ we shall be right in understanding the apostle's word 'our' as meaning I, Paul, myself and you Ephesians and whoever else has not to wrestle with flesh and blood; for these have their struggle 'against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world', as was not the case among the Corinthians, whose struggle was still against 'flesh and blood' and whom 'no temptation had taken but such as was human'.⁹

¹ Esther, Chs. VI-VIII.

² See St. John XIII. 2.

³ Heb. II. 1.

⁴ See Eph. VI. 16.

⁵ 1 Cor. X. 13. A fragment of Origen (*In Eph. VI. 12*; see Cramer, *Catenae Graec. Patr. in N.T. VI. 215*) preserves a similar statement in Greek. 'I consider that the temptations against flesh and blood are the temptations which are said by him to be human.'

⁶ St. Matt. XXVII. 63.

⁷ Prov. IV. 23.

⁸ Eph. IV. 27.

⁹ Eph. VI. 12.

5. We must not suppose, however, that each person struggles against all these powers. It would, I think, be impossible for any man, however holy he might be, to carry on a struggle against all these at once. If, however, that which in fact cannot happen should by any chance come to pass, it would be utterly impossible for human nature to endure it without being completely overwhelmed. And just as, for example, if fifty soldiers were to say that a struggle was about to take place between them and fifty other soldiers, we should not understand from this that one of them was going to fight against fifty, and yet each one of them might rightly say that 'we have to fight against fifty', meaning all against all; so, too, we must interpret the apostle's saying in this way, that the whole body of Christ's athletes and soldiers are engaged in a wrestling and struggle against all those powers which have been enumerated; that all will take part in the struggle, but individuals will either be matched against individuals, or at any rate will fight in such a way as shall be approved by God, who is the just president of this contest.

For I think that human nature has definite limitations, even though there is a Paul of whom it is said, 'He is a chosen vessel unto me',¹ or a Peter against whom 'the gates of hell shall not prevail',² or a Moses, 'the friend of God';³ for not even one of these could face the whole crowd of opposing powers at once without destruction to himself, except perhaps on the condition that there was working within him the power of him who said, 'Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world'.⁴ In reliance on him Paul affirmed with confidence, 'I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me';⁵ and again, 'And I laboured more abundantly than they all, yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me'.⁶

It was therefore because he had this power, which certainly is not human, working and speaking in him, that Paul could say: 'For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor strength, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord'.⁷ For human nature by itself alone cannot, I think, maintain the struggle against 'angels' and 'heights and depths' and any 'other creature'; but when it has felt the Lord to be present and dwelling within, it will say in confidence of receiving the divine help, 'The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the protector of my life; of whom shall I be afraid? When evil-doers came upon me to eat up my flesh, even my enemies who

¹ Acts IX. 15.

² See Exod. XXXIII. 11.

³ Phil. IV. 13.

⁴ See St. Matt. XVI. 18.

⁵ St. John XVI. 33.

⁶ 1 Cor. XV. 10. ⁷ Rom. VIII. 38, 39.

persecute me, they stumbled and fell. Though a host should encamp against me, my heart shall not fear; though war should rise against me, I will put my trust in him.¹

So I think that a man can probably never by himself overcome an opposing power, but only by the use of divine help. That is why an angel is said to have wrestled with Jacob. Now we understand the passage in this way, that to wrestle with Jacob does not mean to wrestle against Jacob, but that the angel, who was present in order to save him, and who after learning of the progress he had made gave him the additional name of Israel, wrestled together with him, that is, was on his side in the contest and helped him in the struggle; for undoubtedly it was some other against whom Jacob was fighting and against whom his struggle was being waged.² And Paul indeed did not tell us that our wrestling was with principalities or with powers, but against principalities and against powers. If therefore Jacob also wrestled, he wrestled undoubtedly against one of these powers, which Paul enumerates as opposing and making attacks on the human race and especially on the saints. Finally, it is for this reason that scripture speaks of him as having wrestled with the angel and having had 'power with God', namely, that while the course of the struggle is sustained by the angel's help, the palm of achievement leads the conqueror to God.

6. Nor indeed must we suppose that struggles like Jacob's are carried on by means of bodily strength and the exercise of the art of wrestling, but that the fight is one of spirit against spirit, in the same way as Paul points out that our present struggle is 'against principalities and powers and the rulers of the darkness of this world'.³ This kind of struggle must be understood as follows; that when losses and dangers, insults and accusations are raised up against us, the opposing powers do not do this with the mere object of making us endure these sufferings, but of provoking us by means of them to fierce anger or excessive sorrow or the depths of despair, or indeed, what is more serious, of inducing us when wearied out and overcome by these annoyances to complain against God on the ground that he does not control human life fairly and righteously. Their aim is that by these efforts our faith may be weakened or that we may lose hope or be driven to abandon the true doctrines and persuaded to accept some impious belief about God.

For some such aim is recorded in the case of Job, when the devil had asked God for power over his goods. The story of Job also teaches us that it is not by chance attacks that we are

¹ Ps. XXVII. 1-3.

² See Gen. XXXII. 22-30. Koetschau refers to Origen, *Sel. in Gen.* (ed. Lommatsch VIII. 82 f): 'Who else is he who is called both a man and a god, who wrestles and struggles with Jacob, but he who by divers portions and in diverse manners spoke to the fathers, the holy Word of God?'

³ Eph. VI. 12.

assailed, if ever such losses of property come upon us, nor is it by chance that any one of us is made captive or that our houses fall into ruins, in which some of our dear ones are crushed to death.¹ In all these circumstances every believer must say, 'Thou wouldst have no power against me, except it were given thee from above'.² For observe that Job's house would not have fallen upon his sons unless the devil had first obtained power against them; nor would the horsemen have made a raid in three bands to seize his camels and oxen and other cattle unless they had been instigated by that spirit to whom they had surrendered themselves as servants by their obedience to his will. Nor would that which appeared to be fire and has been supposed to be a thunderbolt have fallen upon Job's sheep before the devil had said to God, 'Hast thou not made a hedge about all that is without and all that is within his house, and the rest of his goods? But now put forth thine hand, and touch all that he hath, and see if he will not curse thee to thy face.'³

7. From these considerations it is shown that all those events that happen in this world, which are regarded as things indifferent,⁴ whether calamities like the above or events of any other kind whatever, happen neither by God's doing nor yet without God. For when evil and hostile powers wish to bring to pass such events God does not only not prevent them but even gives permission, restricting it, however, to definite times and persons. Thus even in regard to Job himself it is said that at a definite time he was ordained to fall into the power of others and to have his house plundered by wicked men. It is for this reason that divine scripture teaches us to accept all things that happen to us as sent by God, because we know that nothing happens without him. That such is the case, namely, that nothing happens without God, how can we doubt, when our Lord and Saviour clearly declares: 'Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing, and not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father which is in heaven?'

¹ See Job I. 6-19.

² St. John XIX. 11.

³ Job I. 10, 11.

⁴ Rufinus has *media*, which may be a translation of either μέσα or ἀδιάφορα. The reference is to the Stoic doctrine that all external things and events were indifferent, virtue alone being a good and vice alone an evil. Cp. Zeno's saying, preserved in Stobaeus, II. 7, 5a (quoted by Arnold, *Roman Stoicism* p. 289). 'Some things are good, some are evil, some indifferent. Good are wisdom, temperance, justice, fortitude, everything that is virtue or an aspect of virtue; evil are folly, intemperance, injustice, cowardice, everything that is vice or an aspect of vice. Indifferent are life and death, glory and disgrace, pain and pleasure, riches and wealth, disease, health and so forth.'

⁵ St. Matt. X. 29.

But necessity has led us into a somewhat lengthy digression on the question of the struggle which the opposing powers maintain against men, while we have also discussed the more sorrowful events which happen to the human race, namely, the trials of this life, as Job says, 'Is not the whole life of man upon earth a trial?'¹ Our object has been to expound more clearly how these things happen and what is the pious belief that we ought to hold about them. Let us now see how men slip into the sin of false knowledge, and with what purpose the opposing powers are wont to stir up strife against us on this matter also.

¹ Job VII. 1.

CHAPTER III

THE THREEFOLD WISDOM

1. When the holy apostle is desirous of teaching us a great and hidden truth concerning knowledge and wisdom he says in the first epistle to the Corinthians: 'Howbeit we speak a wisdom among the perfect; yet a wisdom not of this world nor of the rulers of this world, which are coming to nought; but we speak God's wisdom in a mystery, the hidden wisdom which God fore-ordained before the worlds unto our glory, which none of the rulers of this world knew. For had they known it, they would never have crucified the Lord of Glory.'¹ Here, in his desire to show that there are different kinds of wisdom, he describes one as a 'wisdom of this world', one as a 'wisdom of the rulers of this world' and another as God's wisdom. Moreover, when he uses the phrase, 'wisdom of the rulers of this world', I do not think he means that there is one wisdom for all the rulers of this world, but he seems to me to indicate a particular kind of wisdom for each individual ruler.

And again, when he says, 'But we speak God's wisdom in a mystery, the hidden wisdom which God foreordained before the worlds unto our glory,' we must inquire whether he means that this wisdom of God, which has been hidden and in other times and generations has not been made known to the sons of men as it is now revealed to his holy apostles and prophets, is the same as that wisdom of God which existed before the Saviour's coming, the wisdom by which Solomon became wise. But the Saviour by his own word declares that his teaching is greater than Solomon's, when he says, 'And behold, a greater than Solomon is here',² in which declaration it is shown that those who were taught by the Saviour were taught something more than Solomon knew.

For if anyone says that the Saviour did indeed know more than Solomon, but did not impart this knowledge to others, how will this agree logically with what he says in the following words, 'The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment and shall condemn the men of this generation, for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and behold, a greater than Solomon is here?'³ There is therefore a 'wisdom of this world' and there is also probably a wisdom belonging to each individual 'ruler of this world'. But as for the wisdom of the one God, we believe it refers to that wisdom which was at work to a lesser extent in the men of old, but was more fully

¹ 1 Cor. II. 6-8.

² St. Matt. XII. 42.

³ St. Matt. XII. 42.

and more clearly revealed through Christ. We shall, however, investigate the wisdom of God in the proper place.¹

2. At the moment our task is to treat of the opposing powers² and to ask how they originate those hostile movements by which false knowledge is implanted in men's minds and souls are led astray while supposing that they have discovered wisdom. It is therefore, I think, necessary to discern and distinguish between the 'wisdom of this world' and the wisdom of the 'rulers of this world', that by so doing we may be able to discover who are the fathers of this wisdom, or indeed of these kinds of wisdom. I think, then, as we said above,³ that the 'wisdom of this world' is a different one from those varieties of wisdom which belong to the 'rulers of this world', and that in this wisdom there appears to be understood and included all things that belong to this world. Now this wisdom contains in itself nothing which can enable it to decide on questions of the divine nature, or of the cause of the world, or of any higher matters whatsoever, or of the principles of a good and blessed life; but is such, for instance, as deals wholly with the arts of poetry, grammar, rhetoric, geometry and music, to which we should probably add the art of medicine. In all these arts we must suppose that the 'wisdom of this world' is present.

As for the wisdom of the 'rulers of this world', we understand this to be what they call the secret and hidden philosophy of the Egyptians and the astrology of the Chaldeans and Indians, who profess a knowledge of high things, and further the manifold and diverse opinions of the Greeks concerning the divine nature. Accordingly we find in the holy scriptures that there are rulers over individual nations, as for instance, we read in Daniel of a certain 'prince of the kingdom of the Persians' and another 'prince of the kingdom of the Greeks'⁴ who, as is clearly shown by the sense of the passage itself, are not men but powers. Moreover in the prophet Ezekiel the 'prince of Tyre'⁵ is most plainly pictured as a certain spiritual power. When these, therefore, and other similar princes of this world, each having his own individual wisdom and formulating his own doctrines and peculiar opinions, saw our Lord and Saviour promising and proclaiming that he had come into the world for the purpose of destroying all the doctrines, whatever they might be, of the 'knowledge falsely so called',⁶ they immediately laid snares for him, not knowing who was concealed within him. For 'the kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord and against his Christ'.⁷ But their snares became known and the plots which they had contrived

¹ See below Bk. IV. Ch. III. 14 (pp. 310 ff.).

² See above Ch. II. (pp. 211 ff.).

³ See preceding paragraph.

⁴ See Ezek. XXVIII and Bk. I Ch. V., 4. (p. 47) above.

⁵ 1 Tim. VI. 20.

⁶ See Daniel X. 13, 20.

⁷ See Ps. II. 2.

against the Son of God were understood when they 'crucified the Lord of glory'. Therefore the apostle says, 'We speak a wisdom among the perfect; yet a wisdom not of this world, nor of the rulers of this world, which are coming to nought, . . .¹ a wisdom which none of the rulers of this world knew. For had they known it, they would never have crucified the Lord of glory.'²

3. The question indeed arises whether these varieties of wisdom which belong to the rulers of this world and with which they strive to indoctrinate men are introduced into our minds by the opposing powers with the desire of ensnaring and injuring us, or whether they are offered to us simply in consequence of an error, that is, not with a view to injuring men but because the 'rulers of this world' themselves think their wisdom to be true and are therefore anxious to teach others what in their opinion is the truth. The latter is, I think, more likely. For example, just as Greek authors or the leaders of the various heresies have themselves first erroneously accepted a false doctrine for the truth and decided in their own mind that it was the truth, and then afterwards have tried to persuade others to adopt this same doctrine which they have determined is the true one, so we must suppose the 'rulers of this world' also to have acted, those beings, namely, that are called by this title because they are spiritual powers who have been appointed to exercise rule over certain definite nations in this world.³

There are also, besides these rulers, certain special energies of this world, that is, certain spiritual powers who control definite activities which they have themselves by their own free will chosen as their task, among whom are those spirits who control the 'wisdom of this world'; for instance, there is a particular energy or power who is the inspirer of poetry, another of geometry, and in the same way a particular power is the originator of every such art and subject of instruction.⁴ Finally, many

¹ Part of the quotation appears to be missing.

² See 1 Cor. II. 6-8. The interpretation of this passage and of Ps. II. 2 as referring to the spiritual powers is found also in Origen's comment on Lamentations IV. 12. See Klostermann's edition, p. 273 Frag. CVII.

³ See above Bk. I., Ch. VIII. 1, 2 (pp. 66 ff.).

⁴ Koetschau quotes here, as a possible extract from the original work at this point, the passage from Theophilus Alex. *Ep. Synod.* c. 2. 'And the foreknowledge of events, which belongs to the Lord alone, he (i.e. Origen) attributes to the motions of the stars, namely, that from their courses and the variety of their forms daemons can tell the future and either bring things to pass or else require them to be brought to pass by the stars. It is quite clear from this that he approves of idolatry and astrology and of the various deceits of the fraudulent divination practised by the Gentiles.' With this Koetschau compares the extract from an anonymous writer quoted in Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* 117, stating the charges which were made (according to this writer falsely) against Origen: 'And (Origen teaches) that the doctrines of the Magi are not evil, and that astronomy is able to bring events to pass.' It is probable that Rufinus has omitted some things here, but it is not likely that Theophilus has reproduced them fairly.

Greeks have been of the opinion that the art of poetry cannot exist apart from madness, and accordingly in their histories it is often recorded that those whom they call seers were suddenly filled with the spirit of a kind of madness.¹ And what is to be said also of those persons whom they call divine, who through the control of the daemons that are over them utter responses in verses formed according to the rules of the poetic art?²

Further, those men whom they call magi, or the malevolent,³ have often, by invoking daemons over boys of tender years, caused them to recite poems in verse to the wonder and amazement of all. We must suppose that these effects are produced in the following manner. Just as holy and stainless souls, when they have devoted themselves to God with entire affection and entire purity and have kept themselves apart from all contact with daemons and purified themselves by much abstinence and have been steeped in pious and religious exercises, acquire thereby a communion with the divine nature and win the grace of prophecy and of the other divine gifts, so, too, must we think that those who show themselves fit subjects for the opposing powers, that is, those who adopt a work and manner of life and purpose agreeable to them, receive their inspiration and become participators in their wisdom and doctrine. The result of this is that they are filled with the operations of those spirits to whose service they have once subjected themselves.

4. Then in regard to those who teach another doctrine of Christ than that which the rule of scripture allows, it is not superfluous to consider whether it is with treacherous intentions that the opposing powers, in their efforts to check the faith of Christ, have devised certain fabulous and at the same time impious dogmas, or whether in fact even they, after hearing the word of Christ, have been unable either to banish it from the secret recesses of their consciousness or to retain it in a pure and holy form, and so have introduced, through the agency of vessels that suited their purpose and, if I may so call them, through their own prophets, different kinds of error contrary to the rule of Christian truth. The more likely supposition is, that the apostate and exiled powers which have departed from God compose these errors and deceits of false doctrine either from the pure wickedness of their mind and will or else from envy of those for whom, once they have learned the truth, there is prepared a way of ascent to that station from which the powers have fallen, and from a desire to prevent any such progress.

It is, then, clearly demonstrated by many proofs that the soul of man, while in the body, can admit different energies, that is,

¹ See Plato, *Io* 533 E-534 D; *Phaedrus* 245 A.

² The best known instance is that of the priestess of the Delphic oracle. See Origen, *Con. Celsum* III. 25, VII. 3.

³ This epithet is doubtless due to Rufinus, not to Origen.

controlling influences, of spirits either good or bad. Now the bad spirits work in two ways; that is, they either take whole and entire possession of the mind, so that they allow those in their power neither to understand nor to think, as is the case, for example, with those who are popularly called 'possessed', whom we see to be demented and insane, such as the men who are related in the Gospel to have been healed by the Saviour; or they deprave the soul, while it still thinks and understands, through harmful suggestion by means of different kinds of thoughts and evil inducements, as for example Judas was incited to the crime of the betrayal by the devil's putting the thought into him, according to the statement of scripture, 'But when the devil had already put it into the heart of Judas Iscariot to betray him'.¹

On the other hand a man admits the energy and control of a good spirit when he is moved and incited to what is good and inspired to strive towards things heavenly and divine; just as the holy angels and God himself worked in the prophets, inciting and exhorting them by holy suggestions to strive towards better things, though certainly in such a way that it rested with the man's own will and judgment whether or no he was willing to follow God's call to the heavenly and divine. From this we learn to discern clearly when the soul is moved by the presence of a spirit of the better kind, namely, when it suffers no mental disturbance or aberration whatsoever as a result of the immediate inspiration and does not lose the free judgment of the will. Such for example were the prophets and apostles, who attended upon the divine oracles without any mental disturbance. We have shown, moreover, in previous examples, when we mentioned Mordecai and Artaxerxes,² that by the suggestions of a good spirit a man's memory is incited to the recollection of better things.

5. It follows, I think, that we must also inquire what are the causes which lead the soul of man to be influenced at one time by good spirits and at another time by bad.³ I suspect that this is due to certain causes which are older even than our birth in this body, as John indicated by his leaping and rejoicing in his mother's womb when the voice of Mary's salutation sounded in the ears of his mother Elizabeth, and as is declared by the prophet Jeremiah who, 'before he was formed in his mother's belly' was known by God and 'before he came forth from the

¹ St. John XIII. 2.

² See p. 217 above.

³ Cp. the parallel passage in Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 8, 'And in the same book he says: Moreover we must also inquire why the soul of man is influenced in different directions now by one group of powers and now by another. And he supposes that the souls of some people have previously acquired merit before they came into bodies, as was the case with John, who leaped for joy in his mother's womb when at the voice of Mary's salutation Elizabeth confessed herself to be unworthy of conversing with her.' See St. Luke I. 41-44.

womb' was sanctified by him, and while yet a boy received the gift of prophecy.¹ On the other hand² it is clearly proved that some people are possessed right from their earliest years, that is, are born with an accompanying daemon,³ while others are declared by the testimony of histories to have been under supernatural control from boyhood, and others still have from their earliest years been indwelt by a daemon whom they term a python,⁴ that is, a spirit of ventriloquism.

In the face of these examples, those who maintain that everything in this world is governed by the providence of God, a doctrine which is also part of our faith, can give no other answer, as it seems to me, which will prove divine providence to be free from all suspicion of injustice, except to say that there were certain pre-existent causes which led these souls, before they were born into the body, to contract some degree of guilt in their sensitive or emotional nature, in consequence of which divine providence has judged them worthy of enduring these sufferings. For the soul always possesses free will, both when in the body and when out of the body; and the will's freedom always moves in the direction either of good or of evil, nor can the rational sense, that is, the mind or soul, ever exist without some movement either good or evil. It is probable that these movements furnish grounds for merit even before the souls do anything in this world, so that in accordance with such causes or merits they are ordained by the divine providence right from their birth, yes, and even before it, if I may so speak, to endure conditions either good or evil.⁵

6. Let these assertions, then, be made concerning those events which appear to happen to men right from their birth or even before they emerge into this light. In regard, however, to the suggestions made to the soul, that is, to men's thoughts,

¹ See Jerem. I. 5, 6.

² This passage also has a parallel in Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 8. 'And immediately following this he adds: On the other hand little boys and almost infants are sometimes possessed by evil spirits, and diviners and soothsayers are inspired to such a degree that some are possessed by a daemon python right from their earliest years. That these should be abandoned by the providence of God, when they have done nothing to warrant this kind of madness, cannot be maintained by him who believes that nothing happens apart from God and that all things are governed by his justice.'

³ See St. Mark VII. 25 ff.; IX. 17 ff.

⁴ See Acts XVI. 16.

⁵ On this point Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* III., iii, 20; Stählin II. 204, 27 ff.) quotes Plato, *Politicus* 273 B C and (*Stromata* IV., xii, 83; Stählin II. 285, 3 ff.) Basileides, of whom he says: 'The hypothesis of Basileides is that the soul undergoes punishment here for sins committed in another life'. See Jerome *Ep. ad Hedibiam*, 10: 'We must not say, as do Pythagoras and Plato and their disciples, who under the name of Christians introduce the doctrines of the gentiles, that souls have fallen from heaven and in accordance with the diversity of their merits pay the penalties for ancient sins in bodies of one sort or another.'

by different spirits, and which incite men to good or to its opposite, we must suppose that even for these there sometimes exist causes prior to our bodily birth. But sometimes a mind that is watchful and that casts away from itself whatever is evil calls to its side the assistance of the good; whereas on the contrary one that is negligent and slothful, being less cautious, gives a place to those spirits which, like robbers lying in ambush, contrive to rush into the minds of men whenever they see a place offered to them through slackness, as Peter the apostle says; 'Your adversary the devil as a roaring lion walketh about, seeking whom he may devour'.¹ On this account a strict guard must be kept over our heart day and night and no place must be given to the devil,² but all our actions must be such that God's ministers, that is, 'the spirits who have been sent forth to minister to them' who have been called to 'inherit salvation',³ may find a place within us and may delight to enter the guest-chamber of our soul; and dwelling in us, that is, in our heart, may rule us with the better counsels, if so be they shall find the habitation of our heart adorned by the practice of virtue and holiness.

Let these arguments, which we have set out to the best of our ability, be sufficient in regard to those powers which are opposed to the human race.

¹ 1 St. Peter V. 8.

² See Ephes. IV. 27.

³ See Heb. I. 14.

CHAPTER IV

WHETHER THE STATEMENT MADE BY SOME IS TRUE,
THAT EACH INDIVIDUAL HAS TWO SOULS

1. And now, I think, we must not pass over in silence the 'human temptations',¹ those which occasionally arise from 'flesh and blood', or from 'the wisdom of flesh and blood', which is said to be at enmity with God;² for we have already dealt with the temptations that are said to be more than human, that is, with the struggles we maintain 'against the principalities and powers and against the rulers of the darkness of this world and the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places',³ and with those that befall us against evil spirits and impure daemons.

In this connection we must, I think, if we are to be logical, inquire whether there is in us, that is, in men who consist of soul and body and 'vital spirit',⁴ something else besides which possesses a peculiar inclination and movement in the direction of evil. A question of this kind is accustomed to be raised by some, namely, whether we ought to say that there is in us as it were two souls, the one divine and heavenly and the other of a lower sort; or whether from the very fact that we are joined to bodies (which bodies are in their own proper nature dead and utterly lifeless, since it is from us, that is, from our souls, that the material body derives its life, whereas in itself it is certainly opposed and hostile to the spirit⁵) we are drawn and incited to those evils which are pleasing to the body; or whether in the third place, as some Greeks have supposed, our soul though one in its essence is nevertheless composed of several parts, namely, one part that is called rational and another irrational, while that part which they call irrational is again divided into the two emotional elements of appetite and passion.⁶

¹ The allusion is to 1 Cor. X. 13.

² See Ephes. VI. 12; 2 Cor. I. 12; Rom. VIII. 7, 8.

³ Ephes. VI. 12.

⁴ See Wisd. XV. 11; 1 Thess. V. 23.

⁵ For the deadness of the body apart from the soul see Justin, *De Resurr.* X. 2: 'The soul is in the body; but the body without the soul is not alive, and when the soul leaves it, it no longer exists.' See also Plato, *Cratylus* 399 D E. Marcion and Basileides taught that the soul alone was saved, not the body (Ireneus, *Adv. haer.* I. xxv. 2 and I. xix. 3). Origen's remark on the hostility of body and spirit to each other alludes to such scriptural passages as Rom. VIII. 6, 10; Gal. V. 17; St. John VI. 63, but the term 'flesh' in St. Paul's writings is quite different in meaning from the term 'body' as used above. See below p. 231 f.

⁶ This is Plato's division of the soul. See Plato *Repub.* IV. 436 A-441C; *Timaeus* 42 A.

Now we have found each of the three above-mentioned opinions about the soul held by some. The one of them, however, which we said was approved by certain Greek philosophers, that the soul consists of three parts, I do not observe to be strongly confirmed by the authority of divine scripture, whereas in regard to the remaining two a certain number of passages may be found in the divine writings which appear capable of being applied to them.

2. Of these theories let us first discuss the one which some are accustomed to frame, that we have within us one soul that is good and heavenly and another that is lower and earthly; and that the soul which is superior is implanted from heaven, like the soul which gave to Jacob while still in the womb the prize of victory against his brother Esau whom he supplanted, or the soul which was sanctified in Jeremiah from the womb, or in the case of John was from the womb filled with the Holy Spirit.¹ But that which they call the lower soul is, they maintain, produced along with the body from the bodily seed, and consequently they deny that it can live or subsist apart from the body; which is the reason, they say, why it is frequently termed the flesh.² For the passage, 'The flesh lusteth against the spirit',³ they do not take to be spoken of the actual flesh, but of this soul, which is properly the soul of the flesh.

Moreover they endeavour by these arguments to corroborate the passage in Leviticus which runs as follows: 'The soul of all flesh is its blood'.⁴ For from the fact that the blood by being diffused throughout the flesh endows the flesh with life, they say that this soul, which is called 'the soul of all flesh', resides in the blood. And as for the saying, 'The flesh wars against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh',⁵ and the other saying, 'The soul of all flesh is its blood',⁶ they assert that we have here the same thing which is called in other words 'the wisdom of the flesh',⁷ namely, a certain material spirit, which is not subject to the law of God nor indeed can be subject to it, because it possesses earthly wishes and bodily desires.⁸ It is about this that they suppose the apostle to be

¹ See Gen. XXV. 22-25; Jerem. I. 5; St. Luke I. 41, and above pp. 205 and 227.

² See above p. 230.

³ Gal. V. 17.

⁴ Lev. XVII. 14.

⁵ Gal. V. 17.

⁶ Levit. XVII. 14.

⁷ Rom. VIII. 7 (Vulg.).

⁸ See Clem. Alex. *Excerpta ex Theodoto* 50, 1 (Stählin III. 123, 9 ff.). 'Taking dust from the earth, not from the dry earth, but a portion of the diverse and manifold matter, God created an earthly and material soul, irrational and similar to that of the beasts. This is the man formed "according to the image". But the man formed "according to the likeness" of the Creator himself is he whom the Creator breathed into and implanted in the first man.' The 'irrational spirit' or 'bodily spirit' is also mentioned by Clement in *Stromata* VI. 136, 1 and VII. 79, 6. Cp. also the Valentinian doctrine in Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* I. v. 5). For the scriptural reference see Rom. VIII. 7.

speaking when he says, 'But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity under the law of sin which is in my members'.¹

But if one were to object to them that these statements are made about the body which in its own proper nature is a dead thing and which is only said to possess a mind or a wisdom which is 'at enmity with God'² or which 'wars against the spirit'³ in the same way as if one were to say that the actual flesh has a voice which protests against being hungry or thirsty or cold, or against enduring discomfort in any respect whatever, whether through excess or through want, they would endeavour to combat and solve this difficulty by showing that the soul has many other passions which in no way at all take their origin from the flesh, and yet the spirit is contrary to these, as for instance ambition, avarice, jealousy, envy, pride and others like them; and seeing that the mind or spirit of man is in conflict with these, they would lay down as the cause of all such evils nothing else but this bodily soul, as it were, of which we have spoken above, and which is generated by the transmission of the seed.⁴

To this statement they are accustomed to add also the witness of the apostle, where he says, 'But the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousies, wraths, factions, divisions, heresies, envyings, drunkenness, revellings and such like';⁵ for they assert that not all of these take their origin from the use or enjoyment of the flesh in such a way that we could suppose all such passions to be part of that substance which has no soul, that is, the actual flesh. Moreover, when he says, 'Ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many among you are wise after the flesh',⁶ it would seem to point to this, that there is apparently a wisdom that is peculiarly fleshly and material, and that the wisdom which is after the spirit is a different one; and certainly the former could not be called wisdom unless there existed a soul of the flesh to possess that wisdom which is termed the wisdom of the flesh. To this they also add the following; if 'the flesh warreth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh, so that we may not do the things that we will to do',⁷ what things are they of which he says, 'we may not do what we will to do'? It is certain, they say, that it does not mean things of the spirit, for the will of the spirit is not forbidden; nor is it things of the flesh, for if the flesh does not possess a soul of its own it will undoubtedly not possess a will. It remains, therefore, that it means the will of

¹ Rom. VII. 23.

² See Rom. VIII. 7.

³ See Gal. V. 17.

⁴ See pp. 4 and 231, above.

⁵ Gal. V. 19, 21.

⁶ 1 Cor. I. 26.

⁷ Gal. V. 17.

this soul, for that can have its own proper will which is certainly opposed to the will of the spirit.

If this is so, it is plain that the will of this soul is something intermediate between the flesh and the spirit, undoubtedly serving and obeying one of the two, whichever it has chosen to obey.¹ If it gives itself up to the delights of the flesh, it makes men fleshly; if, however, it joins itself to the spirit, it causes a man to be 'in the spirit' and on this account to be called spiritual. It is this that the apostle seems to indicate when he says, 'Ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit'.²

We must inquire, therefore, what exactly this will is, which is intermediate between the flesh and the spirit, above and beyond the will which is said to belong to the flesh or to the spirit. For of a certainty we should hold that everything which is said to belong to the spirit is due to the will of the spirit and whatever deeds are called 'works of the flesh' are due to the will of the flesh.³ What then above and beyond these is the will of the soul, which is given a separate name and which the apostle wishes us not to do when he says, 'So that ye may not do the things that ye will to do'?⁴ It seems to be here indicated that this will must be attached to neither of these two, that is, neither to the flesh nor to the spirit. But some one may say that just as it is better for the soul to do its own will than to do the will of the flesh, so again it is better for it to do the will of the spirit than its own will. Why then does the apostle say, 'So that ye may not do the things that ye will to do'?⁴—since in that contest which is waged between the flesh and the spirit, the spirit is by no means certain of victory; for it is clear that in many cases the flesh obtains the mastery.

3. We have entered here upon a very deep discussion, in which it is necessary to investigate the possible arguments from every aspect. Let us see, therefore, whether at this point we may not perhaps establish some such conclusion as the following; that as it is better for the soul to follow the spirit at the time when the spirit has obtained the victory over the flesh, so, too, even though it appears worse for it to follow the flesh when this is warring against the spirit and desiring to call the soul to its side, yet perhaps it may turn out to be more advantageous for the soul to be mastered by the flesh than to remain

¹ Cp. Origen *Com. in Ioh.* XXXII. 18, 'I observe in the whole of scripture a distinction made between the soul and the spirit, the soul being indifferent in character and receptive of either virtue or vice.' So, too, *In Ep. ad Rom.* I. 18, 'When it is said that the flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh, the middle position is undoubtedly occupied by the soul, which either acquiesces in the longings of the spirit or else inclines to the lusts of the flesh. If it joins itself to the flesh, the body becomes one with it in impurity and lust, but if it associates with the spirit, the spirit will become one with it.'

² Rom. VIII. 9.

³ See Gal. V. 22, 19.

⁴ Gal. V. 17.

within the sphere of its own will. For so long as it continues in its own will, then is the time when it is said to be 'neither hot nor cold';¹ but remaining in a sort of lukewarm condition it may find conversion a slow and somewhat difficult process. If, however, it attaches itself to the flesh, it will be satiated and filled after a time with those very evils which it endures as a result of the vices of the flesh and will be wearied out as it were by the very heavy burdens of luxury and lust, and so may be the more easily and quickly converted from low material desires to a longing for heavenly things and to spiritual grace. And we must suppose that the apostle uttered the saying, 'The spirit warreth against the flesh and the flesh against the spirit, so that we may not do the things that we will to do',²—the things referred to being undoubtedly those which are apart from the will of the spirit and apart from the will of the flesh—meaning, if we were to say it in other words, that it is better for a man to be in a state of virtue or in a state of wickedness rather than in neither of these; and that before the soul turns to the spirit and is made one with it, during the time it is attached to the body and occupied with fleshly thoughts, it appears to be neither in a state of goodness nor yet clearly in a state of wickedness, but to be, if I may so say, like an animal. It is better, if it be possible, that it should attach itself to the spirit and become spiritual. If, however, this is not possible, it is more expedient for it to follow even the wickedness of the flesh than by remaining fixed in the sphere of its own will to occupy the position of an irrational animal.³

We have dealt with these points because we were desirous of discussing every opinion that is put forward; and we have gone further afield than was our wish in order that it may not be supposed that we are unaware of the questions commonly raised by those who ask whether there exists within us, besides the heavenly and rational soul, another one which is by its nature contrary to the first and which is called either the flesh, or the wisdom of the flesh, or the soul of the flesh.⁴

4. Let us now see what answer is given to the above arguments by those who maintain that there is in us a single movement and a single life of one and the same soul, whose salvation or loss is properly to be attributed to itself as the result of its own actions. And let us first see what is the nature of the passions of the mind to which we are subject whenever we feel within us that we are being dragged in one direction and another, when a conflict of thoughts arises in our heart and certain images

¹ Rev. III. 15.

² Gal. V. 17.

³ This is a bold piece of ethical reasoning. It should be compared with the account of the soul on p. 73 above, where we have a Greek fragment, not necessarily a literal one, taken from Gregory of Nyssa.

⁴ See Rom. VIII. 6, 7 (Vulg.).

are suggested to us which incline us now this way and now that and by which we stand at one time reprov'd and at another time self-approved.¹

Now it is nothing remarkable if we say that evil natures have a judgment that is variable and conflicting, and out of harmony with itself; since this is found to be the case with all men, whenever a doubtful matter comes into consideration and they look ahead and deliberate which is the better or more useful choice to make. It is in no way surprising, therefore, that if two images occur to a man in turn and suggest contrary modes of action they should drag the mind in different directions. For example, if a man's thought invites him to the faith and fear of God, it cannot then be said that the flesh is warring against the spirit; but so long as it is uncertain what is the true and useful course, the mind is dragged in different ways. So, too, when we think of the flesh as inciting a man to lust, while a better counsel opposes this sort of allurements, it must not be supposed that there is one life acting in opposition to another, but that the conflict is due to the nature of the body, which is striving to empty out and exhaust the places filled with seminal fluid. Neither must it be supposed that it is any opposing influence or the life of another soul which excites thirst in us and impels us to drink or which causes us to become hungry and urges us to take food; but just as these things are alike desired and evacuated through natural movements of the body, so also the moisture of the natural seed collecting from time to time in its appointed regions strives to find an issue and outlet, a result which is so far from never happening except at the impulse of some external excitement that sometimes the seed is even spontaneously emitted.

When therefore it is said that 'the flesh warreth against the spirit',² these persons understand the passage thus, that the use or the needs or delights of the flesh excite a man and draw and entice him away from divine and spiritual things. For when we are drawn away by reason of the needs of the body we are not allowed leisure for things that are divine and profitable for eternity; just as on the other hand when a soul has leisure for divine and spiritual things and is united with the Spirit of God it is said to war against the flesh, for it does not allow itself to become relaxed through indulgences and to be tossed about by the pleasures in which it takes a natural delight. This is the meaning they give to the saying, 'The wisdom of the flesh is enmity against God';³ not that the flesh really has a soul or wisdom of its own, but just as we are accustomed to say by a peculiar use of language that the ground is thirsty and wishes to drink water,—where we certainly use the word, 'wish' not in a literal but in a peculiar sense, as if, again, we were

¹ See Rom. II. 15.

² Gal. V. 17.

³ Rom. VIII. 7 (Vulg.).

to say that a house 'wants' rebuilding, and many other similar expressions—so, too, must we interpret the phrase 'wisdom of the flesh', and the saying, 'the flesh lusteth against the spirit'.

They are accustomed also to add to these the saying, 'The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground'.¹ For what cries to God is not the actual blood that was shed, but by a peculiar use of language the blood is said to cry out when vengeance is demanded from God upon the shedder of the blood. Moreover when the apostle says, 'I see another law in my members',² they understand it as if he had said that the man who desires to apply himself to God's word is distracted and diverted and hindered from this purpose by the bodily needs and functions, which exist as a kind of 'law' in the body, and that these prevent him from applying himself to the 'wisdom of God'³ and so being able more earnestly to behold the divine mysteries.

5. In regard, however, to the fact that heresies, envyings, strifes and other things are included in the list of 'works of the flesh',⁴ they interpret it in this way. When the sensitiveness of the soul has grown duller through its subservience to the passions of the body, it is weighed down by the mass of its vices and becomes sensitive to nothing refined or spiritual. It is then said to become flesh, taking a name from that element in which it exercises the greater part of its vigour and effective purpose. They also put the following question: 'Whom can we find, or whom shall we speak of as being the maker of this evil mind, which is called the mind of the flesh?' For they maintain the belief that there is no other creator of soul and flesh but God. If we should say that the good God in his own creation made something at enmity with himself it will certainly appear absurd. If then it is written that 'the wisdom of the flesh is enmity against God'⁵ and if we are to say that this is a result of the creation, then God himself will appear to have made a certain nature that is at enmity with himself, a nature that cannot be subject to him or to his law, in which case indeed we should suppose it to be an animal of which these statements are made. But if the passage is to be understood in this way, what pray will be our difference from those men who say that souls are created diverse in their natures, so as to be destined by nature either for salvation or for destruction? This is certainly satisfactory to none but the heretics, who because they cannot defend the justice of God by pious reasoning compose impious inventions like this.

We have brought forward, then, to the best of our ability, in the person of each of the parties, the arguments that can be used in discussion concerning each opinion in turn. It is for the reader to choose which of them deserves the preference.

¹ Gen. IV. 10.

² Rom. VII. 23.

³ See 1 Cor. I. 21, 24.

⁴ See Gal. V. 19, 21.

⁵ Rom. VIII. 7 (Vulg.).

CHAPTER V

GREEK

THAT THE WORLD IS ORIGINATED
AND SUBJECT TO DECAY, SINCE IT
TOOK ITS BEGINNING IN TIME.¹

LATIN

THAT THE WORLD TOOK ITS
BEGINNING IN TIME.¹

LATIN

1. After the foregoing discussion, since one of the dogmas of the Church, held chiefly in consequence of our belief in the truth of our records, is that this world was made and began to exist at a definite time and that as a result of the consummation of the age to which all things are subject it must be dissolved through its own corruption,² there appears to be nothing unreasonable in bringing up afresh a few points relating thereto. And so far as the matter concerns our belief in the scriptures the discussion seems to be a very easy one. Indeed even the heretics, divided as they are on many other matters, yet seem on this point to agree with one another in submitting to the authority of scripture.

In regard, then, to the creation of the world, what other book of scripture is more able to enlighten us than that which was written by Moses concerning its origin?³ This account may well enshrine certain deeper truths than the mere record of the history seems to reveal and may contain a spiritual meaning in many passages, using the letter as a kind of veil⁴ for profound and mystical doctrines; nevertheless the language of the narrator certainly indicates this, that all visible things were created at a definite time. And as for the consummation of the world, Jacob is the first to refer to this when, in giving his testament to his sons he says, 'Gather to me, ye sons of Jacob, that I may tell you what shall be in the last days', or, 'after the last days'.⁵ If then there are 'last days', or a time 'after the last days', it follows of necessity that the days which had a beginning also come to an end. David also says: 'The heavens shall perish, but thou shalt remain; and they all shall grow old as a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail'.⁶ And when our Lord and Saviour says, 'He who created in the beginning made them male and female',⁷ he himself bears witness that the world was made; whereas when he says that

¹ For the Greek title see Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* 8, p. 4.

² See pp. 4 f. above. ³ i.e. Genesis.

⁴ See 2 Cor. III. 14 f.

⁵ Gen. XLIX. 1 (Sept.).

⁶ Ps. CII. 26, 27.

⁷ St. Matt. XIX. 4.

'heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away,'¹ he shows that it is corruptible and destined to come to an end.

Moreover, the saying of the apostle, 'The creation was subjected to vanity, not willingly, 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 children of God'² clearly asserts the end of the world, as when he says again, 'The fashion of this world passeth away';³ while in the very fact that he says 'the creation was subjected to vanity' he points also to its beginning. For if the creation was subjected to vanity by reason of a certain hope, it was certainly so subjected from a cause, and what proceeds from a cause must necessarily have a beginning; since apart from some beginning the creation could not have been subjected to vanity nor could it hope to be 'delivered from the bondage of corruption' if it had never begun to be a servant of corruption. Moreover, anyone who looks for them at his leisure can find in the divine scriptures very many other sayings of this sort, which assert that the world both had a beginning and is expecting an end.

2. If, however, there is anyone who in this matter would oppose either the authority or the credibility of our scripture, let us ask him the question, whether he asserts that God can comprehend all things or that he cannot? Now to say that he cannot is clearly impious. If, however, he should say, as he must, that God comprehends all things, it follows from this very fact that they can be comprehended that they are understood to have both a beginning and an end. For that which is absolutely without any beginning can in no way be comprehended. However far the understanding may reach out, so far is the ability to comprehend withdrawn and removed endlessly, when there is held to be no beginning.

3. But they are accustomed to meet us with this objection: 'If the world had a beginning in time, what was God doing before the world began?' For it is alike impious and absurd to say that God's nature is to be at ease and never to move, or to suppose that there was a time when goodness did not do good and omnipotence did not exercise its power.⁴ They raise this objection when we say that this world began at a definite time and when in accordance with our belief in scripture we also calculate how many years old it is. To these propositions I do not think that any of the heretics can easily give an answer that will accord with the nature of their own doctrine.

We, however, will give a logical answer that preserves the rule of piety, by saying that God did not begin to work for

¹ St. Matt. XXIV. 35 and parallels.

³ 1 Cor. VII. 31.

² Rom. VIII. 20, 21.

⁴ See above Bk. I., Ch. IV. 3 (pp. 41 f.).

the first time when he made this visible world, but that just as after the dissolution of this world there will be another one, so also we believe that there were others before this one existed.¹ Both of these beliefs will be confirmed by the authority of divine scripture. For Isaiah teaches that there will be another world after this, when he says, 'There shall be a new heaven and a new earth, which I will cause to endure in my sight, saith the Lord'.² And that there were other worlds before this one Ecclesiastes shows when he says, 'What is it that hath been? Even that which shall be. And what is it that hath been created? That very thing that is to be created; and there is nothing at all new under the sun. If one should speak and say, 'See, this is new; it hath been already, in the ages which were before us'.³ By these testimonies each proposition is proved at the same time, namely, that there were ages in the past and that there will be others hereafter. We must not suppose, however, that several worlds existed at the same time, but that after this one another will exist in its turn. But it is not necessary to go through these questions again in detail now, since we have already done this in a former chapter.⁴

4. Still, there is a point which I do not think we ought lightly to pass by, and that is that the holy scriptures call the foundation of the world by a new and peculiar name, terming it *katabole*. This word is very incorrectly translated into Latin by *constitutio*, or foundation, for *katabole* in Greek has rather the significance of *deicere*, that is, to cast downwards, and is, as we have said, incorrectly rendered into Latin by *constitutio*.⁵ An example occurs

¹ The passage beginning with the sentence and ending at 'will exist in its turn' has a parallel in Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 9. 'And again in regard to the world (Origen says): Our opinion is that before this world there existed another and that another will exist after it. Would you learn that after the dissolution of this world another will come into existence? Hear the words of the prophet Isaiah: "There shall be a new heaven and a new earth, which I will cause to endure in my sight". Would you know that before the construction of this world other worlds existed in the past? Listen to Ecclesiastes: "What is it that hath been? Even that which shall be. And what is it that hath been made? The very thing that shall be. And there is nothing new under the sun, nothing which can speak and say, Behold this is new. For it hath been already, in the ages of old which were before us". This testimony proves the existence not only of past but also of future worlds, not all existing side by side at the same time, but one after another.'

² Is. LXVI. 22.

³ Eccl. I. 9, 10.

⁴ See Bk. II., Ch. III. 1-5 (pp. 83-89).

⁵ Origen used the word *katabole* as proof of his belief that the present world is a descent from a more perfect condition which preceded it, and that the souls of most men were enclosed in bodies and sent here as a punishment for former sins, a few great ones like St. Paul being allowed to come as guides and teachers of the rest. See Origen's comment on St. John XVII. 24 in his *Comm. in Ioh.* XIX. 22, where he maintains that this meaning must be attached to *katabole*, otherwise *kthis* would have been used. Jerome, in his Commentary on Ephesians, in which, as the preface admits, he relied largely on Origen, gives the same interpretation of

in the gospel according to John, when the Saviour says, 'And there shall be tribulation in those days, such as hath not been from the foundation of the world'.¹ Here 'foundation' stands for *katabole*, the meaning of which term must be taken to be as we have explained it above. Moreover the apostle used the same word in the epistle to the Ephesians, when he says, 'Who chose us before the foundation of the world';² for here, too, 'foundation' represents *katabole*, which must be taken to have the same meaning as that given in our interpretation above. It seems worth while, therefore, to inquire what it is that is indicated by this new name.

Now I think³ that since the end and consummation of the saints will happen in those worlds that are not seen and are eternal,⁴ we must suppose, from a contemplation of this end, as we have frequently shown in former chapters, that rational creatures have also had a similar beginning.⁵ And if they had a beginning that was such as they expect their end to be, they have undoubtedly existed right from their beginning in those worlds 'that are not seen and are eternal'.⁴ If this is so, there has been a descent from higher to lower conditions not only on the part of those souls who have by the variety of their own movements deserved it, but also on the part of those who have been brought down, even against their will, from those higher invisible conditions to these lower visible ones, in order to be of

Eph. I. 4 ('before the foundation of the world'). This furnishes a handle to Rufinus, when in his Apology (see Bk. I. Chs. 25-27) he attacks Jerome for his Origenistic teaching.

¹ St. Matt. XXIV. 21. The illustration is probably an addition by Rufinus. It is from St. Matthew, not St. John, and it does not contain the word *katabole*, but *arche* (beginning). *Katabole* occurs in St. Matt. XXV. 34.

² Eph. I. 4.

³ With the passage beginning here and ending at 'the present visible world was instituted' compare the parallel in Jerome *Ep. ad Avitum* 9. Jerome's version is nearer the original than that of Rufinus. 'And immediately after this he (i.e. Origen) adds: I think we must believe that there is in the regions above a more divine dwelling-place and a true rest, where rational creatures used to live before they descended to these lower regions and travelled from invisible to visible surroundings, and where, before they were cast down to the earth and forced to wear gross bodies, they enjoyed a primeval blessedness. And, so, God the Creator made for them bodies appropriate to their lowly stations, and fashioned this visible world, and sent into it ministers to work for the correction and salvation of those who had fallen. Of these ministers some obtained fixed positions and became obedient to the necessities of the world, while others zealously performed the duties laid upon them at the various times which are known to God the Artificer. To the former class belong the sun, moon and stars, which are called by the apostle "the creation", and these have been given their place in the higher regions of the universe. This "creation" has been subjected to vanity by being clothed in gross bodies and made visible to sight. Nevertheless it was subjected to vanity not of its own will, but by the will of him who subjected it "in hope".'

⁴ 2 Cor. IV. 18.

⁵ See above pp. 53, 76 f., 78.

service to the whole world. For indeed 'the creation was subjected to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who subjected the same in hope',¹ the hope being that both sun and moon and stars and the angels of God should fulfil an obedient service for the world; and it was for those souls which on account of their excessive spiritual defects required these grosser and more solid bodies and also for the sake of those others for whom this arrangement was necessary that the present visible world was instituted.

A descent, therefore, of all alike from higher to lower conditions appears to be indicated by the meaning of this word *katabole*. Nevertheless the entire creation cherishes a hope of liberty, a hope of being 'delivered from the bondage of corruption'² when the 'children of God', who had both fallen and become scattered, have been gathered into one,³ and when the others have fulfilled in this world the rest of their duties, which are known solely to God, the Artificer of all things.⁴ We must recognise, however, that the world was made of such a size and character as to be able to hold all those souls which were destined to undergo discipline in it⁵ and also those powers which were appointed to be at hand to serve and assist them. Moreover it is proved by many declarations that all rational creatures are of one nature, and it is only on this ground that the justice of God in all his dealings with them can be defended, namely, when each contains within himself the reasons why he has been placed in this or in that rank of life.

5. This arrangement,⁶ therefore, which God established afterwards, when he had already from the beginning of the world

¹ Rom. VIII. 20.

² Rom. VIII. 21.

³ See St. John XI. 52.

⁴ See Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 9 (following the last passage quoted). 'And again: Others, however, in their various places and times, which the Artificer alone knows, undertake the governance of the world. These we believe to be the angels.'

⁵ See Vergil, *Aeneid* VI. 739 f.

⁶ For the first part of this paragraph see Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 9. 'And a little way further on: This system of things, the universe in its entirety, is ruled by the providence of God, in such a way that some powers fall suddenly from the higher spheres, while others glide gradually to the earth, some descend of their own free will, while others are hurled down against their will, some freely undertake the duty of stretching out a hand to those who are falling, while others are forced without their own consent to continue to perform an allotted task for a certain definite period. And again: From which it follows that these different movements result in the creation of different worlds, and after this world in which we live there will arise another world quite unlike it. And no one can estimate the precise worth of those who in different degrees fall or rise, or the rewards due for virtue or the punishments for sin, either in the present or the future or in any time whatever either past or to come, nor can anyone bring the universe once again to a single end, except God alone the Creator of all, who knows the reasons why he allows some to perform their own will and to sink gradually from the higher spheres to the lowest, while others he begins to visit and gives them a helping hand in order to lead them slowly back to their original condition and to set them once again on high.' Rufinus has greatly abbreviated this.

foreseen the thoughts and motives both of those who through spiritual defect deserved to descend into bodies and of those who were carried away by their eager desire for visible things, and also of those who were compelled whether willingly or unwillingly by him who subjected them 'in hope' to perform certain duties for such as had fallen into this condition,—this arrangement, I say, some men have not understood; and because they have not perceived that this variety of arrangement has been instituted by God as a result of previous causes arising from free will, they have supposed that everything in this world is governed either by chance movements or by a fateful necessity and that nothing is within the power of our will. As a result they have been unable to free God's providence from the imputation of blame.

6. But just as we said that all souls that have dwelt in this world have stood in need of many ministers and rulers and helpers, so in the last times, when the end of the world was near at hand and the whole human race was hastening towards its final destruction, and when weakness had overtaken not only those that were ruled but those also to whom the care of ruling had been committed, then there arose the need not of such help as this nor of defenders like these, but the aid of the author and creator himself was demanded in order to restore to the first the capacity to obey and to the second the capacity to rule, which in both cases had been corrupted and profaned. And so the only-begotten Son of God, who was the word and wisdom of the Father, when he lived with the Father in that glory which he had before the word was,¹ emptied himself, and taking the form of a servant became obedient even unto death² in order to teach them obedience who could in no other way obtain salvation except through obedience; and also restored the corrupted laws of ruling and of reigning in that he 'subdues all enemies under his feet';³ and by the fact that he must reign till he puts his enemies under his feet he teaches the rulers themselves the arts of control.

Because then he had come, as we have said, to renew the capacity not only for ruling and reigning but also for obeying, he first fulfilled in himself what he wished to be fulfilled by others and not only became obedient to the Father 'even unto the death of the cross',⁴ but also at the consummation of the age, by his including in himself all those whom he subjected to the Father and who through him come to salvation, he himself with them and in them is also said to be 'subjected' to the Father, when 'all things' shall 'subsist in him' and he shall be the 'head of all things' and in him shall be the 'fullness' of those who obtain salvation. This then is what the apostle says

¹ See St. John XVII. 5.

² 1 Cor. XV. 27.

³ See Phil. II. 7, 8.

⁴ Phil. II. 8.

of him: 'When all things have been subjected unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subjected unto him that did subject all things unto him, that God may be all in all'.¹

7. But the heretics, not understanding, I cannot tell why, the apostle's meaning contained in these words, deprecate using the term subjection in regard to the Son; though if the propriety of its ascription to him be questioned, the truth may easily be discovered by assuming the contrary. For if to be subjected is not good, it follows that the contrary, that is, not to be subjected, is good. Moreover the language of the apostle as they would interpret it, appears to prove this when it says 'When all things have been subjected unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subjected unto him that did subject all things to him',² as if he who now is not subjected to the Father will then be subjected when the Father has first subjected the universe to him.

But I wonder how this can be the meaning, that he who when all things are not yet subjected to him is not himself subjected should then, when all things have been subjected to him, when he is king over all and holds power over the universe, be thought worthy of being subjected although he was not subjected before. Such men do not understand that the subjection of Christ to the Father reveals the blessedness of our perfection and announces the crowning glory of the work undertaken by him, since he offers to the Father not only the sum total of all ruling and reigning which he has amended throughout the entire universe but also the laws, corrected and renewed, of the obedience and subjection due from the human race. If therefore that subjection by which the Son is said to be subjected to the Father is taken to be good and salutary, it is a sure and logical consequence that the subjection of his enemies which is said to happen to the Son of God should also be understood to be salutary and useful; so that, just as when the Son is said to be subjected to the Father the perfect restoration of the entire creation is announced, so when his enemies are said to be subjected to the Son of God we are to understand this to involve the salvation of those subjected and the restoration of those that have been lost.

8. But this subjection will be accomplished through certain means and courses of discipline and periods of time; that is, the whole world will not become subject to God by the pressure of some necessity that compels it into subjection, nor by the use of force, but by word, by reason, by teaching, by the exhortation to better things, by the best methods of education, and also by such merited and appropriate threatenings as

¹ See 1 Cor. XV. 28; Col. I. 17-19; Eph. I. 22 f.

² 1 Cor. XV. 28.

are justly held over the heads of those who contemptuously neglect to care for their own salvation and advantage and their spiritual health. For even we men, in training slaves or children, restrain them by means of threats and fear so long as their age renders them incapable of listening to reason; but when they have acquired an understanding of what is good, profitable and honourable then the fear of blows may cease and they can be persuaded by word and by reason to acquiesce in everything that is good.

But how, consistently with the preservation of free will in all rational creatures, each person ought to be dealt with, that is, who they are whom the Word of God discovers to be prepared and capable and so instructs; who they are whom he puts off for a time; who they are from whom the word is utterly hidden and who are destined to be far away from the hearing of it;¹ who again they are that despise the word when it is declared and preached to them and consequently are visited with God's corrections and chastisements and pressed into salvation and whose conversion is as it were compelled and extorted; who they are for whom God even provides special occasions for salvation, so that sometimes a man has obtained an assured salvation when his faith was revealed by a mere answer;² from what causes or on what occasions these things happen, or what the divine wisdom sees as it looks into these men or what movements of theirs will lead God to arrange all these things thus, is known to God alone and to his only-begotten Son, through whom all things were created and restored, and to the Holy Spirit, through whom all things are sanctified, who proceedeth from the Father himself,³ to whom is the glory for ever and ever, Amen.

¹ See Prov. XV. 29.

² Origen has in mind such an incident as St. Luke XVIII. 41 f.

³ See St. John XV. 26.

CHAPTER VI

GREEK

THE END.¹

LATIN

THE CONSUMMATION OF THE WORLD.

1. In regard to the end and consummation of all things we have already in a previous chapter discussed to the best of our ability, so far as the authority of divine scripture allowed us, those points which we consider sufficient for purposes of instruction.² Now, however, we call to mind a few further points, since the course of our inquiry has brought us again to that topic. The highest good, towards which all rational nature is progressing, and which is also called the end of all things, is defined by very many even among philosophers in the following way, namely, that the highest good is to become as far as possible like God.³ But this definition is not so much, I think, a discovery of their own, as something taken by them out of the divine books. For Moses, before all others, points to it when in recording the first creation of man he says, 'And God said, Let us make man in our own image and likeness'.⁴ Then he adds afterwards, 'And God made man; in the image of God made he him; male and female made he them, and he blessed them.'⁵

Now the fact that he said, 'He made him in the image of God', and was silent about the likeness, points to nothing else but this, that man received the honour of God's image in his first creation, whereas the perfection of God's likeness was reserved for him at the consummation.⁶ The purpose of this was that man should acquire it for himself by his own earnest efforts to imitate God, so that while the possibility of attaining perfection was given to him in the beginning through the honour of the 'image', he should in the end through the accomplishment of these works obtain for himself the perfect 'likeness'. More openly and unmistakably the apostle John lays down that such is the case when he makes this declaration: 'Little children, we know not yet what we shall be; but if he shall be revealed'—

¹ The Greek title is given in Photius *Bibl. Cod.* 8, p. 4, where, however, it is said to come at the beginning of Book IV.

² See Bk. II. Chs. X and XI. (pp. 138-154 above).

³ Plato, *Theaetetus* 176 B. This was a favourite passage of Clement of Alexandria: see *Protrepticus* XII. 122, 4; *Stromata* II. 97, 1; 100, 3.

⁴ Gen. I. 26.

⁵ Gen. I. 27, 28.

⁶ For the distinction drawn between the 'image' and the 'likeness' see Origen *Con. Celsum* IV. 30, *In Ep. ad Rom.* IV. 5; Irenaeus *Adv. Haer.* V. 6; Clem. Alex. *Stromata* II. 38, 5.

speaking undoubtedly of the Saviour—'we shall be like him'.¹ Here he most certainly indicates that we are to hope both for the end of all things, the nature of which he says is still unknown to him, and also for the likeness to God which will be conferred on us in proportion to the perfection of our merits. The Lord himself also in the gospel points out that these things will not only come to pass but will come to pass by his own intercession, when he deigns to make this request to the Father for his disciples: 'Father, I will that, where I am, they also may be with me', and, 'as I and thou art one, so they may be one in us'.² Here indeed the likeness seems, if we may say so, to make an advance and from being something similar to become 'one thing'; for this reason undoubtedly, that in the consummation or end God is 'all in all'.³

In this connexion⁴ the question is asked by some whether the essence of our bodily nature, however perfectly purified it may be and rendered completely spiritual, does not appear to offer an obstacle both to the honour of our likeness to God and to our fitness for union with him. For it does not seem possible to say that the nature which is in a body can either be like the divine nature, which is certainly above all things incorporeal, or that it can be truly and rightly described as becoming one with it; especially⁵ since the fact of the Son being 'one with the Father'⁶ is shown by the true doctrine of our faith to refer to that nature which is peculiar to him. * * *

(And further,⁷ when the same apostle says that 'the whole creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the sons of God', we understand it in such a way as to say that the first creation of rational creatures was also an incorporeal one, which was not meant to be in

¹ 1 St. John III. 2. ² St. John XVII. 24, 21. ³ 1 Cor. XV. 28.

⁴ For this paragraph, which has been toned down by Rufinus, see the parallel in Jerome *Ep. ad Avitum* 9a. 'And when he enters upon a discussion of the end, he speaks as follows: Because, as we have frequently said before, a fresh beginning arises out of the end, we must inquire whether there will then be bodies, or whether we are to live without bodies since these will have been reduced to nothing; and whether we must believe that the life of incorporeal beings is incorporeal, such as we know the life of God to be. Now there can be no doubt that, if all bodies belong to this sensible world which is called by the apostle the world of "things visible" the life of incorporeal beings will be an incorporeal one.' This statement formed one of the grounds of Origen's condemnation. See Anathema XI. of the Second Council of Constantinople, 553: '[If anyone shall say] that the judgment to come signifies the complete destruction of bodies and that the end of the story is an immaterial essence, and that nothing material will thereafter exist, but only mind [let him be anathema].' So Theophilus Alex. *Ep. Synod.* 2; and cp. Bk. II. Ch. III. 2 (p. 84) above.

⁵ Koetschau regards this sentence as being added by Rufinus.

⁶ See St. John X. 30.

⁷ Koetschau inserts here these two paragraphs from Jerome, *Ep. ad Avitum* 9a. Following Schnitzer, he thinks that they fill up gaps left by Rufinus at this point. The reader will have very little doubt that this is so.

bondage to corruption for the reason that it was not clothed with bodies; for wherever bodies are, corruption follows immediately. But it will afterwards be 'delivered from the bondage of corruption' when it has received the glory of the Son of God and when 'God shall be all in all'.¹

We are also led to believe that the end of all things will be incorporeal by the statement of our Saviour, in which he says, 'That as I and thou are one, so they also may be one in us'.² For we ought to know what God is and what the Saviour will be in the end, and how the likeness of the Father and the Son has been promised to the saints, so that as the Father and the Son are one in themselves, so, too, the saints may be one in them. For we must either suppose that the God of the universe is clothed with a body and enveloped with some sort of matter in the same way as we are with flesh, in order that the likeness of God's life may in the end be brought to the level of the saints; or, if this view is unseemly, as it most certainly is to those who desire even in the smallest degree to dwell on the majesty of God and to apprehend the glory of his unbegotten and all-surpassing nature, then we are compelled to accept one of two alternatives and either despair of ever attaining the likeness of God if we are destined always to have bodies, or else, if there is promised to us a blessedness of the same life that God has, then we must live in the same condition in which God lives).³

GREEK

2. Now when⁴ God is said to become 'all in all',⁵ just as we cannot include evil, when God becomes all in all, nor irrational animals, lest God should come to be in evil and in irrational animals; nor lifeless things, lest God, when he becomes all, should even come to be in them, so neither can we include bodies,⁶ which in their own nature are lifeless.

LATIN

2. Now when it is promised that in the end God is 'all in all',⁵ we must not imagine, in strictly logical wise, that animals, either cattle or wild beasts, will come to that end, lest it should be implied that God dwells even in animals, whether cattle or wild beasts; neither will stocks and stones, lest it should be said that God dwells in them also. So, too, we must not suppose that any

¹ See Rom. VIII. 21 and 1 Cor. XV. 28.

² St. John XVII. 21.

³ The quotation from Jerome ends here. Origen's doctrine was condemned for its Platonism, in denying the resurrection of the body. Cp. Plato, *Phaedo* 114 C. 'Those who are thoroughly purified by philosophy live entirely without bodies in the age to come.'

⁴ Fragment 27, Koetschau, from Justinian, *Ep. ad Mennam* (Mansi IX. 529).

⁵ See 1 Cor. XV. 28.

⁶ Rufinus has omitted this.

evil reaches that end, lest when it is said that 'God is in all' he should be said to dwell even in some vessel of evil.

For although we say that even now God is everywhere and in all things, for the reason that nothing can be empty of God, still we do not say it so as to mean that he now actually is all things in which he is present. Hence we must look more carefully to see what this condition is which marks the perfection of blessedness, and the end of things, in which God is said not only to be in all things but even to be all things. Let us inquire, therefore, what are these 'all things' which God shall be 'in all things'.¹

3. Now I myself think that when it is said that God is 'all in all',¹ it means that he is also all things in each individual person. And he will be all things in each person in such a way that everything which the rational mind, when purified from all the dregs of its vices and utterly cleared from every cloud of wickedness, can feel or understand or think will be all God and that the mind will no longer be conscious of anything besides or other than God, but will think God and see God and hold God and God will be the mode and measure of its every movement; and in this way God will be all to it. For there will no longer be any contrast of good and evil, since evil nowhere exists; for God, whom evil never approaches, is then all things to it; nor will one who is always in the good and to whom God is all things desire any longer to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.²

If then the end is renewed after the pattern of the origin and the issue of things made to resemble their beginning and that condition restored which rational nature once enjoyed when it had no need to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil,² so that all consciousness of evil has departed and given place to what is sincere and pure and he alone who is the one good God becomes all things to the soul and he himself is all things not in some few or in many things but in all things, when there is nowhere any death, nowhere any sting of death,³ nowhere any evil at all, then truly God will be all in all. But some think that this perfection and blessedness of rational natures can only remain in the condition which we have described above, that is, the condition in which all things possess God and God is all things to them, if they are in no way impeded by union with a bodily nature. Otherwise, if there were any intermingling

¹ See 1 Cor. XV. 28.

² Gen. II. 17.

³ See 1 Cor. XV. 55 f.

of a material substance, they consider that the glory of the highest blessedness would be prevented.¹ On this subject the arguments that may be raised have been fully dealt with and discussed by us in a previous chapter.²

4. But now, since we find the apostle Paul making mention of a 'spiritual body',³ let us inquire to the best of our ability what sort of idea we ought to form from this passage about such a body. So far then as our understanding can grasp it, we believe that the quality of a spiritual body is something such as will make a fitting habitation not only for all saints and perfected souls but also for that 'whole creation' which is to be 'delivered from the bondage of corruption'.⁴ Of this body the same apostle has also said that 'we have a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens',⁵ that is, in the dwelling-places of the blest. From this statement we may then form a conjecture of what great purity, what extreme fineness, what great glory is the quality of that body, by comparing it with those bodies which, although heavenly and most splendid, are yet made with hands and visible. For of that body it is said that it is a house not made with hands but 'eternal in the heavens'.⁶ Now since 'the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal',⁷ all those bodies which we see whether on earth or in the heavens, which are capable of being seen and are made with hands and not eternal, are

¹ Here again Rufinus has greatly abbreviated the original, as will be seen from a comparison with Jerome *Ep. ad Avitum* 10. 'And again, when he is arguing for a variety of worlds and maintaining that angels may become daemons and daemons angels or men, or that on the contrary men may become daemons and any being may become any other, he confirms his opinion by concluding in the following way: Nor can we doubt that after certain periods of time matter will exist again and bodies will be created and a world of diversity constructed in conformity with the varying wills of rational creatures, who after becoming perfect in blessedness at the end of all things have gradually fallen to lower levels and have admitted evil to so great an extent as to be turned into the opposite of what they were, by reason of their unwillingness to preserve their first estate and to retain their blessedness uncorrupted. And this, too, we must know, that many rational creatures preserve their first estate to the second or third or fourth world, giving no occasion for a change in their condition; others will fall so little from their original state that they appear to have lost scarcely anything; while some have to be hurled in complete ruin into the lowest pit. And God the dispenser of all things alone knows how to make use of each class in the creation of new worlds, in conformity with merit and opportunity and motives, so that they may be the means of initiating and sustaining the course of the world; and one who has surpassed all others in wickedness and has completely lowered himself to the level of the earth may in another world, afterwards to be constructed, become a devil, "the beginning of the creation of God", to be a laughing-stock to the angels who have lost their primeval virtue.' For the last sentence see Job. XL. 14 (Sept.).

² See above Bk. II., Ch. III. 2, 3 (p. 84 ff.).

³ See 1 Cor. XV. 44.

⁴ See 2 Cor. V. 1. ⁵ See Rom. VIII. 21.

⁶ See 2 Cor. V. 1. ⁷ 2 Cor. IV. 18.

very greatly surpassed in excellence by that which is neither visible nor made with hands but is eternal.

From this comparison we may gain an idea how great is the beauty, how great the splendour and how great the brightness of a spiritual body, and how true is the saying that 'eye hath not seen nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive what things God hath prepared for them that love him'.¹ But we must not doubt that the nature of this present body of ours may, through the will of God who made it what it is, be developed by its Creator into the quality of that exceedingly refined and pure and splendid body, according as the condition of things shall require and the merits of the rational being shall demand. Finally, when the world was in need of variety and diversity, matter lent itself to the fashioning of the diverse aspects and classes of things in wholly obedient service to the Maker, as to its Lord and Creator, that from it he might produce the diverse forms of things heavenly and earthly. But when events have begun to hasten towards the ideal of all being one as the Father is one with the Son,² we are bound to believe as a logical consequence that where all are one there will no longer be any diversity.³

5. It is on this account, moreover, that the last enemy, who is called death, is said to be destroyed;⁴ in order, namely, that there may be no longer any sadness when there is no death nor diversity when there is no enemy. For the destruction of the last enemy must be understood in this way, not that its substance which was made by God shall perish, but that the hostile purpose and will which proceeded not from God but from itself will come to an end. It will be destroyed, therefore, not in the sense of ceasing to exist, but of being no longer an enemy and no

¹ 1 Cor. II. 9.

² See St. John XVII. 21, X. 30.

³ Rufinus has apparently omitted some of Origen's statements about the final unity of all spiritual beings. See the four last Anathemas of the Second Council of Constantinople, which condemn all who assert the following doctrines. XII. 'That the heavenly powers and all men and the devil and the spiritual hosts of wickedness are as unchangeably united to the Word of God as the Mind itself which is by them called Christ and which was in the form of God and, as they assert, emptied itself; and that there will be an end to the kingdom of Christ.' XIII. is similar. XIV. runs as follows: 'That all rational creatures will form one unity, hypostases and numbers alike being destroyed when bodies are destroyed; and that the knowledge of purely rational creatures will be accompanied by a dissolution of the worlds, an abandonment of bodies and an abolition of names; and that there will be an identity between knowledge and hypostases; and that in what they call the restoration only the bare spirits will exist.' XV: 'That the life of spirits will be the same as it formerly was, when they had not yet descended or fallen, so that the beginning is the same as the end, and the end is the measure of the beginning.'

⁴ See 1 Cor. XV. 26.

longer death.¹ For to the Almighty nothing is impossible,² nor is anything beyond the reach of cure by its Maker; for it was on this account that he made all things, that they might exist, and those things which were made in order to exist cannot cease to exist. Consequently they will suffer change and difference of such a kind as to be placed in a better or worse position in accordance with their merits; but things which were made by God for the purpose of permanent existence cannot suffer a destruction of their substance. Those things which in the opinion of the common people are believed to perish have not really perished, as the principles of our faith and of the truth alike agree.

Our flesh indeed is considered by the uneducated and by unbelievers to perish so completely after death that nothing whatever of its substance is left. We, however, who believe in its resurrection, know that death only causes a change in it and that its substance certainly persists and is restored to life again at a definite time by the will of its Creator and once more undergoes a transformation; so that what was at first flesh, 'of the earth earthy',³ and was then dissolved through death and again made 'dust and ashes',⁴—for 'dust thou art', it is written, 'and unto dust shalt thou return'⁵—is raised again from the earth and afterwards, as the merits of the 'indwelling soul' shall demand, advances to the glory of a 'spiritual body'.⁶

6. Into this condition, therefore, we must suppose that the entire substance of this body of ours will develop at the time when all things are restored and become one and when 'God shall be all in all'.⁷ We must not think, however, that it will happen all of a sudden, but gradually and by degrees, during the lapse of infinite and immeasurable ages, seeing that the improvement and correction will be realised slowly and separately in each individual person. Some will take the lead and hasten with swifter speed to the highest goal, others will follow them at a close interval, while others will be left far behind; and so the process will go on through the innumerable ranks of those who are making progress and becoming reconciled to God from their

¹ Origen's reference here is to the devil, though this is concealed by Rufinus. See Theophilus Alex. *Ep. pasch.* Gr. Frag. 16 (in *Doctrina patrum* ed. Dickamp, p. 180, 12): 'He has dared to pay great honour to the devil, saying that when he is freed from all sin he will be restored to his ancient rank, and that the kingdom of Christ will come to an end and that Jesus will then together with the devil be reigned over by God.' See also Theophilus Alex. *Ep. pasch.* I. 8 (Migne P L 22, p. 779); *Ep. Synod.* 2, in Jerome, *Ep.* 92 (Migne P L 22, p. 762); Jerome, *In Dan. proph.* c. 3 (Migne P L 25, p. 521); and Bk. I., Ch. VI., 3 above (p. 56 f.).

² See Job XLII. 2.

³ See 1 Cor. XV. 47.

⁴ See Gen. XVIII. 27.

⁵ Gen. III. 19.

⁶ See 1 Cor. XV. 44. For Origen's doctrine of the Resurrection see Bk. II., Ch. X. (p. 138 ff. above) and *Con. Celsum* V. 18-23.

⁷ 1 Cor. XV. 28.

state of enmity, until it reaches even to the last enemy, who is called death,¹ in order that he, too, may be destroyed and remain an enemy no longer.

When therefore all rational souls have been restored to a condition like this, then also the nature of this body of ours will develop into the glory of a 'spiritual body'.² For just as in the case of rational natures we see that there is not one kind which on account of its sins has lived in dishonour and another kind which on account of its merits has been summoned to blessedness, but that these are the same natures, which were formerly sinful and afterwards through being converted and reconciled to God were recalled to blessedness; so, too, in regard to our bodily nature we must understand that there is not one body which we now use in lowliness and corruption and weakness, and a different one which we are to use hereafter in incorruption and power and glory, but that this same body, having cast off the weaknesses of its present existence, will be transformed into a thing of glory and made spiritual, with the result that what was a vessel of dishonour shall itself be purified and become a vessel of honour and a habitation of blessedness.³ And we must believe that in this condition it remains for ever unchangeably by the will of the Creator, of which fact we are made certain by the statement of the apostle Paul in which he says, 'We have a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens'.⁴

For the faith of the Church does not accept the opinion derived from certain Greek philosophers, that besides this body which is composed of the four elements, there is a fifth body which is entirely other than and diverse from our present body;⁵ since we can neither produce from the holy scriptures the least suspicion of such an opinion, nor can its acceptance be allowed as a logical inference, particularly as the holy apostle clearly lays it down that no new bodies are to be given to those who rise from the dead but that they are to receive the same ones which they possessed during life, only transformed from a worse to a better condition. For he says: 'It is sown a natural body, it will rise a spiritual body', and, 'it is sown in corruption, it will rise in incorruption; it is sown in weakness, it will rise in power; it is sown in dishonour, it will rise in glory'.⁶ As therefore man

¹ See 1 Cor. XV. 26, and pp. 250-251 above. ² See 1 Cor. XV. 44.

³ See Rom. IX. 21. ⁴ 2 Cor. V. 1.

⁵ I. e. Aristotle's *aether*. See Zeller, *Aristotle and the earlier Peripatetics*, (Eng. trans. Costelloe and Muirhead 1897), pp. 475-477. See also Cicero, *Academica* I. 7, 26: 'There is also a fifth element, out of which the stars and minds are constituted, which Aristotle maintained to have a nature of its own and to be something quite different from the four which I have mentioned above'. Origen again states his objection to the hypothesis of this 'fifth body', in *Con. Celsum* IV. 60.

⁶ See 1 Cor. XV. 42-44.

makes a kind of progress, so that although he is first a 'natural man,' who does not understand the 'things of the Spirit of God', he arrives by means of instruction at the stage of becoming spiritual and of 'judging all things while he himself is judged of no man';¹ so also in regard to the condition of the body we must suppose that this same body which now on account of its service to the soul is called a soul-like or natural body will advance through a kind of progress, when the soul has been joined to God and made 'one spirit'² with him and the body then as it were renders service to the spirit, into a spiritual condition and quality, especially since the bodily nature, as we have often shown, was so made by the Creator that it could easily pass into whatever quality he should wish or the circumstances should demand.³

7. The whole argument, then, comes to this, that God has created two universal natures, a visible, that is, a bodily one, and an invisible one, which is incorporeal.⁴ These two natures each undergo their own different changes. The invisible, which is also the rational nature, is changed through the action of the mind and will by reason of the fact that it has been endowed with freedom of choice; and as a result of this it is found existing sometimes in the good and sometimes in its opposite. The bodily nature, however, admits of a change in substance, so that God the Artificer of all things, in whatever work of design or construction or restoration he may wish to engage, has at hand the service of this material for all purposes, and can transform and transfer it into whatever forms and species he desires, as the merits of things demand. It is to this, clearly, that the prophet points when he says, 'God who makes and transforms all things'.⁵

8. And now we must certainly ask whether in the consummation of all things, when 'God shall be all in all',⁶ the whole of bodily nature will consist of one species and whether the only quality of body will be that which will shine with that unspeakable glory which we must believe will belong to the spiritual body. Now if we interpret correctly the passage which Moses writes in the forefront of his book namely, 'In the beginning God made the heaven and the earth',⁷ as referring to the beginning of the entire creation, it is appropriate that the end and consummation of all things should consist of a return to this beginning;⁸ that is, that the heaven and earth there spoken of should exist as a dwelling place and rest for the pious, so that the saints and the meek may be the first to obtain an

¹ See 1 Cor. II. 14, 15.

² See above pp. 78 f., 81, 87.

³ Amos V. 8 (Sept.).

⁴ Gen. I. 1.

⁵ See 1 Cor. VI. 17.

⁶ See Plato, *Phaedo* 79 A.

⁷ See 1 Cor. XV. 28.

⁸ See above p. 53.

inheritance in that earth;¹ for this is the teaching of both the law and the prophets and the gospel. In that earth there exists, I believe, the true and living forms of that divine service which Moses handed down through the 'shadow' of the law.² For it is said of them, that is, of those who served under the law, that 'they serve that which is a copy and shadow of the heavenly things'.³ Moreover it was said to Moses himself, 'See that thou make all things according to the form and likeness which was shown thee in the mount'.⁴ It seems to me, therefore, that as in this earth the law was a kind of schoolmaster to those who by it were appointed to be led to Christ⁵ and to be instructed and trained in order that after their training in the law they might be able with greater facility to receive the more perfect precepts of Christ, so also that other earth, when it receives all the saints, first imbues and educates them in the precepts of the true and eternal law in order that they may with greater facility accept the precepts of heaven which are perfect and to which nothing can ever be added. And in heaven will truly exist what is called the 'eternal gospel' and the testament that is always new, which can never grow old.⁶

9. This, then, is how we must suppose that events happen in the consummation and restitution of all things, namely, that souls, advancing and ascending little by little in due measure and order, first attain to that other earth and the instruction that is in it, and are there prepared for those better precepts to which nothing can ever be added. For in the place of 'stewards' and 'governors'⁷ Christ the Lord, who is King of all, will himself take over the kingdom; that is, he himself will instruct those who are able to receive him in his character of wisdom, after their preliminary training in the holy virtues, and will reign in them until such time as he subjects them to the Father who subjected all things to him;⁸ or in other words, when they have been rendered capable of receiving God, then God will be to them 'all in all'.⁹ It follows of necessity that then even their bodily nature will assume that supreme condition to which nothing can ever be added.¹⁰

¹ See above Bk. II., Ch. III. 7 (p. 93 f.), and Deut. IV. 38; Ps. XXXVII. 11; St. Matt. V. 4; Heb. IV. 9.

² See Heb. X. 1.

³ Exod. XXV. 40.

⁴ See Rev. XIV. 6; Heb. IX. 15, XII. 24, VIII. 13.

⁵ See Gal. IV. 2.

⁶ Origen's inference from 1 Cor. XV. 28, that Christ's kingdom would one day come to an end, was one of the many charges made against him. See Theophilus Alex. *Ep. pasch.* (Jerome, *Ep.* 96) and *Ep. synod.* (Jerome *Ep.* 92); and also p. 250 above, note 3.

⁷ 1 Cor. XV. 28.

¹⁰ With this sentence cp. Jerome *Ep. ad Avitum* 10 'And after a very long discussion, in which he asserts that all bodily nature must be changed into spiritual bodies of extreme fineness and that the whole of matter must

So far, then, we have discussed the question of our bodily nature and of the spiritual body. We leave it to the reader's judgment to choose which of the two opinions he decides to be the better. For our part we shall here bring the third book to a conclusion.

be transformed into a single body of the utmost purity, clearer than all brightness and of such a quality as the human mind cannot conceive, at the close he states: And God shall be all in all, so that the whole of bodily nature may be resolved into that substance which is superior to all others, namely, into the divine nature, than which nothing can be better.'