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Editor's Preface

------------------------

This fourth volume of St. Augustin's Works contains his polemical

writings in vindication of the Catholic Church against the heresy of

the Manich�ans, and the schism of the Donatists. The former are

contained in Tom. II. and VIII., the latter in Tom. IX., of the

Benedictine edition.

Like the preceding volumes, this also is more than a reprint of older

translations, and contains important additions not previously

published.

I.--Seven Writings Against the Manich�an Heresy. Four of these were

translated by the Rev. Richard Stothert, of Bombay, for Dr. Dods'

edition, published by T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1872, and revised by

Dr. Albert H. Newman, of Toronto, for the American edition. The other

three treatises are translated, I believe for the first time, by Dr.

Newman for this edition. (See Contents.)

The Edinburgh translation, especially of the first two treatises, is

sufficiently faithful and idiomatic, and needed very little alteration

by the American editor, who compared it sentence by sentence with the

Latin original, and made changes only where they seemed necessary.

This part of the volume is also enriched by an introductory essay of

Dr. Newman, which embodies the literature and the results of the most

recent as well as the earlier researches concerning that anti-Christian

heresy.

II.--The Writings Against the Donatists. These were well translated by

the Rev. J. R. King, of Oxford, and are slightly revised by Dr.

Hartranft, of Hartford, after a careful comparison with the Latin.

The literary introduction of Dr. Hartranft, in connection with the

translator's historical preface, will place the reader in the situation

of the controversy between the Catholic Church and the Donatists at the

time of St. Augustin.

In both sections the treatises are arranged in chronological order.

The fifth volume will contain the writings of St. Augustin against the

Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians. It is in the hands of the printer and

will be published in October.

Philip Schaff.

New York, June, 1887.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Contents.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Preface.

I. THE ANTI-MANICH�AN WRITINGS.

Translated by the Rev. RICHARD STOTHERT, M.A., Bombay, and Prof. Albert

H. Newman, D.D., LL.D., Toronto

Introductory essay on the Manich�an heresy.

By Dr. Newman.

On the Morals of the Catholic Church

(De Moribus Ecclesi� Catholic�),

A.D. 388.

Translated by the Rev. Richard Stothert.

On the Morals of the Manich�ans

(De Moribus Manich�orum),

A.D. 388.

Translated by the Rev. Richard Stothert.

On Two Souls, against the Manich�ans

(De Duabus Animabus, contra Manich�os),

A.D. 391.

Translated by Dr. Newman.

Acts or Disputation against Fortunatus the Manich�an

(Acta seu Disputatio contra Fortunatum Manich�um),

A.D. 392.

Translated by Dr. Newman.

Against the Epistle of Manich�us called Fundamental

(Contra Epistolam Manich�i quam vocant Fundamenti),

A.D. 397.

Translated by the Rev. R. Stothert.

Reply to Faustus the Manich�an

(Contra Faustus Manich�um, Libri XXXIII ),

A.D. 400.

Translated by the Rev. R. Stothert.

Concerning the nature of good, against the Manich�ans

(De Natura Boni contra Manich�os),

A.D. 404.

Translated by Dr. Newman.

II. THE ANTI-donatist WRITINGS.

Translated by the Rev. J.R. King, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's in the

East, Oxford, and late Fellow and Tutor of Merton College, Oxford.

The Translation revised, with additional annotations, by the Rev.

Chester D. Hartranft, D.D., Professor of Biblical and Ecclesiastical

History in the Theological Seminary at Hartford, Connecticut.

Introductory to the Anti-Donatist Writings.

By Dr. Hartranft.

On Baptism, against the Donatists

(De Baptismo, contra Donatistas, Libri VII ),

Circa, A.D. 400.

Answer to Letters of Petilian, Bishop of Cirta

(Contra Litteras Petiliani Donatist� Cirtensis Episcopi, Libri III ),

A.D. 400.

The Correction of the Donatists

(De Correctione Donatistarum Liber seu Epistola CLXXXV ),

Circa, A.D. 417.

Index to the Anti-Manich�an Writings.

Index to the Anti-Donatist Writings.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

w r I t I n g s

in connection with the

Manich�an controversy

translated by the

Rev. Richard Stothert, M.A.,

Bombay;

and

Albert H. Newman, D.D., LL.D.

Professor of Church History and Comparative Religion, in Toronto

Baptist (Theological) College, Toronto, Canada.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Introductory Essay on the Manich�an Heresy,

By Albert H. Newman, D.D., LL.D.

------------------------

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter I.--Literature.
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I. Sources.

The following bibliography of Manich�ism is taken from Schaff's History

of the Christian Church, vol. II. pp. 498-500 (new edition). Additions

are indicated by brackets.

1. Oriental Sources: The most important, though of comparatively late

date.

(a) Mohammedan (Arabic): Kit�b al Fihrist. A history of Arabic

literature to 987, by an Arab of Bagdad, usually called Ibn Abi Jakub

An-Nad�m; brought to light by Fl�gel, and published after his death by

R�diger and M�ller, in 2 vols. Leipz. 1871-'72. Book IX. section

first, treats of Manich�ism. Fl�gel's translation, see below. Kessler

calls the Fihrist a "F�ndst�tte allerersten Ranges." Next to it comes

the relation of the Mohammedan philosopher, Al-Shahrastani (d. 1153),

in his History of Religious Parties and Philosophical Sects, Ed.

Cureton, Lond. 1842, 2 vols. (I. 188-192); German translation by

Haarbr�cker, Halle, 1851. On other Mohammedan sources, see Kessler in

Herzog, IX., 225 sq.

(b) Persian Sources: relating to the life of Mani, the Sh�hn�meh (the

King's Book) of Firdausi; ed. by Jul. Mohl, Paris, 1866 (V. 472-475).

See Kessler, ibid. 225.

[Albiruni's Chronology of Ancient Nations, tr. by E. Sachau, and

published by the Oriental Translation Fund, Lond. 1879. Alb�run� lived

973-1048, and is said to have possessed vast literary resources no

longer available to us. His work seems to be based on early Manich�an

sources, and strikingly confirms the narrative preserved by the

Fihrist. See also articles by West and Thomas in Journal of the

Asiatic Society, 1868, 1870, 1871.]

(c) Christian Sources: In Arabic, the Alexandrian Patriarch Eutychius

(d. 916). Annales, ed. Pococke, Oxon. 1628; Barhebr�us (d. 1286), in

his Historia Dynastiarum, ed. Pococke. In Syriac: Ephraem Syrus (d.

393), in various writings. Esnig or Esnik, an Armenian bishop of the

5th Century, who wrote against Marcion and Mani (German translation

from the Armenian by C. Fr. Neumann, in Illgen's Zeitschrift f�r die

Hist. Theologie, 1834, pp.77-78).

2. Greek Sources: [Alexander of Lycopolis: The Tenets of the

Manich�ans (first published by Combefis, with a Latin version, in the

Auctararium Novissimum, Bibl. S. S. Patrum; again by Gallandi, in his

Bibl. Patrum, vol. IV. p. 73 sq. An English translation by Rev. James

B.H. Hawkins, M .A ., appeared in Clark's Ante-Nicene Library, Vol.

XIV. p. 236 sq.; Am. ed. vol. VI. p. 237 sq. Alexander represents

himself as a convert from Paganism to Manich�ism, and from Manich�ism

to Orthodoxy. He claims to have learned Manich�ism from those who were

intimately associated with Mani himself, and is, therefore, one of the

earliest witnesses. [1] ] Eusebius (H. E. VII. 31, a brief account).

Epiphanius (Haer. 66). Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. VI. 20 sq.). Titus

of Bostra (pros Manichaious, ed P. de Lagarde, 1859). Photius: Adv.

Manich�os (Cod. 179, Biblioth.). John of Damascus: De Haeres. and

Dial. [Petrus Siculus, Hist. Manich�orum.]

3. Latin Sources: Archelaus (Bishop of Cascar in Mesopotamia, d.

about 278): Acta Disputationis cum Manete H�resiarcha; first written

in Syriac, and so far belonging to the Oriental Christian Sources

(Comp. Jerome, de Vir. Ill. 72), but extant only in a Latin

translation, which seems to have been made from the Greek, edited by

Zacagni (Rome, 1698), and Routh (in Reliqui� Sacr�, vol. V. 3-206);

Eng. transl. in Clark's Ante-Nicene Library (vol. XX. 272-419). [Am.

ed. vol. VI. p. 173 sq.]. These Acts purport to contain the report of

a disputation between Archelaus and Mani before a large assembly, which

was in full sympathy with the orthodox bishop, but (as Beausobre first

proved), they are in form a fiction from the first quarter of the

fourth century (about 320), by a Syrian ecclesiastic (probably of

Edessa), yet based upon Manich�an documents, and containing much

information about Manich�an doctrines. They consist of various pieces,

and were the chief source of information to the West. Mani is

represented (ch. 12), as appearing in a many-colored cloak and

trousers, with a sturdy staff of ebony, a Babylonian book under his

left arm, and with a mien of an old Persian master. In his defense he

quotes freely from the N.T. At the end, he makes his escape to Persia

(ch. 55). Comp. H. V. Zittwitz: Die Acta Archelai et Manetis

untersucht, in Kahnis' Zeitschrift f�r d. Hist. Theol. 1873, No. IV.

Oblasinski: Acta Disput. Arch., etc. Lips. 1874 (inaugural dissert.).

Ad. Harnack: Die Acta Archelai und das Diatessaron Tatians, in Texte

und Untersuchungen zur Gesch. der altchristl. Lit. vol. I. Heft 3

(1883), p. 137-153. Harnack tries to prove that the Gospel variations

of Archelaus are taken from Tatian's Diatessaron.

St. Augustin (d. 430, the chief Latin authority next to the translation

of Archelaus). [Besides the treatises published in Clark's series,

Contra Fortunatum quendam Manich�orum Presbyterum Disput. I. et II.,

Contra Adimantum Manich�i discipulum, Contra Secundinum Manich�um, De

Natura Boni, De duabus Animabus, De Utilitate Credendi, De Haeres.

XLVI. Of these, De duabus Animabus, Contra Fortunatum, and De Natura

Boni are added in the present edition, and De Utilitate Credendi has

been included among Augustin's shorter theological treatises in vol.

III. of the present series. In the Confessions and the Letters,

moreover, the Manich�ans figure prominently. The treatises included in

the present series may be said to fairly represent Augustin's manner of

dealing with Manich�ism. The Anti-Manich�an writings are found chiefly

in vol. VIII. of the Benedictine edition, and in volumes I. and XI. of

the Migne reprint. Augustin's personal connection with the sect

extending over a period of nine years, and his consummate ability in

dealing with this form of error, together with the fact that he quotes

largely from Manich�an literature, render his works the highest

authority for Manich�ism as it existed in the West at the close of the

fifth century.] Comp. also the Acts of Councils against the Manich�ans

from the fourth century onwards, in Mansi and Hefele [and Hardouin].
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[1] Baur discredits this claim on internal grounds (Das Manich.

Religionssystem, p. 7).
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II. Modern Works.

Isaac de Beausobre (b. 1659 in France, pastor of the French church in

Berlin, d. 1738): Histoire Crit. de Manich�e et du Manich�isme, Amst.

1634 and '39, 2 vols. 4to. Part of the first volume is historical, the

second doctrinal. Very full and scholarly. He intended to write a

third volume on the later Manich�ans. F. Chr. Baur: Das Manich�ische

Religions-system nach den Quellen neu untersucht und entwickelt, T�b.

1831 (500 pages). A comprehensive, philosophical and critical view.

He calls the Manich. system a "gl�hend pr�chtiges Natur-und

Weltgedicht." [An able critique of Baur's work by Schneckenburger

appeared in the "Theol. Studien u. Kritiken," 1833, p. 875 sq.

Schneckenburger strives to make it appear that Baur unduly minifies the

Christian element in Manich�ism. Later researches have tended to

confirm Baur's main position. The Oriental sources employed by Fl�gel

and Kessler have thrown much light upon the character of primitive

Manich�ism, and have enabled us to determine more precisely than

Beausobre and Baur were able to do the constituent elements of Mani's

system. A.V. Wegnern: Manich�orum Indulgenti�, Lips. 1827. Wegnern

points out the resemblance between the Manich�an system, in accordance

with which the "hearers" participate in the merits of the "elect"

without subjecting themselves to the rigorous asceticism practiced by

the latter, and the later doctrine and practice of indulgences in the

Roman Catholic church.] Trechsel: Ueber Kanon, Kritik und Exegese der

Manich�er, Bern, 1832. D. Chwolson: Die Ssabier und der Ssabismus,

Petersb. 1856, 2 vols. G. Flugel: Mani, seine Lehre und seine

Scriften. Aus dem Fihrist des Ab� Jakub an-Nad�m (987), Leipz. 1862.

Text, translation and commentary, 440 pages. [Of the highest value,

the principal document on which the work is based being, probably, the

most authentic exposition of primitive Manich�an doctrine.] K.

Kessler: Untersuchungen zur Genesis des Manich. Rel. Systems, Leipz.

1876. By the same: M�n� oder Beitr�ge zur Kenntniss der

Religionsmischung im Semitismus, Leipz. 1887. See also his thorough

article, M�n� und die Manich�r, in "Herzog," new ed. vol. IX. 223-259

(abridged in Schaff's "Encyclop." II. 1396-1398). [Kessler has done

more than any other writer to establish the relation between the

Manich�ans and the earlier Oriental sects, and between these and the

old Babylonian religion. The author of this introduction wishes to

express his deep obligation to Kessler. The article on the "Mand�er"

in "Herzog," by the same author, is valuable in this connection, though

his attempt to exclude all historical connection between this

Babylonian Gnostic sect and Palestine can hardly be pronounced a

success. J. B. Mozley: Ruling Ideas in Early Ages; lecture on "The

Manich�ans and the Jewish Fathers," with special reference to

Augustin's method of dealing with the cavils of the Manich�ans.] G. T.

Stokes: Manes and Manich�ans, in "Smith and Wace," III. 792-801. A.

Harnack: Manich�ism in 9th ed. of the "Encycl. Britannica," vol. XV.

(1883), 481-487. [Also in German, as a Beigabe to his Lehrbuch d.

Dogmengeschichte, vol. I. p. 681 sq. Harnack follows Kessler in all

essential particulars. Of Kessler's article in "Herzog" he says:

"This article contains the best that we possess on Manich�ism." In

this we concur. W. Cunningham: S. Austin and his Place in the History

of Christian Thought, Hulsean Lectures, 1885, p. 45-72, and passim,

Lond. 1886. This treatise is of considerable value, especially as it

regards the philosophical attitude of Augustin towards Manich�ism.]

The accounts of Mosheim, Lardner, Schr�ckh, Walch, Neander, Gieseler

[and Wolf].
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Chapter II.--Philosophical Basis, and Antecedents of Manich�ism.

"About 500 years before the commencement of the Christian era," writes

Professor Monier Williams, [2] "a great stir seems to have taken place

in Indo-Aryan, as in Grecian minds, and indeed in thinking minds

everywhere throughout the then civilized world. Thus when Buddha arose

in India, Greece had her thinkers in Pythagoras, Persia in Zoroaster,

and China in Confucius. Men began to ask themselves earnestly such

questions as--What am I? Whence have I come? Whither am I going? How

can I explain my consciousness of personal existence? What is the

relationship between my material and immaterial nature? What is the

world in which I find myself? did a wise, good and all-powerful Being

create it out of nothing? or did it evolve out of an eternal germ? or

did it come together by the combination of eternal atoms? If created

by a Being of infinite wisdom, how can I account for the inequality of

condition in it--good and evil, happiness and misery. Has the Creator

form or is he formless? Has he any qualities or none?"

It is true that such questions pressed themselves with special

importunity upon the thinkers of the age mentioned, but we should be

far astray if we should think for a moment that now for the first time

they suggested themselves and demanded solution. The fact is that the

earliest literary records of the human race bear evidence of high

thinking on the fundamental problems of God, man, and the world, and

the relations of these to each other. Recent scholars have brought to

light facts of the utmost interest with reference to the pre-Babylonian

(Accadian) religion. A rude nature-worship, with a pantheistic basis,

but assuming a polytheistic form, seems to have prevailed in

Mesopotamia from a very early period. "Spirit everywhere dispersed

produced all the phenomena of nature, and directed and animated all

created beings. They caused evil and good, guided the movements of the

celestial bodies, brought back the seasons in their order, made the

wind to blow and the rain to fall, and produced by their influence

atmospheric phenomena both beneficial and destructive; they also

rendered the earth fertile, and caused plants to germinate and to bear

fruit, presided over the births and preserved the lives of living

beings, and yet at the same time sent death and disease. There were

spirits of this kind everywhere, in the starry heavens, in the earth,

and in the intermediate region of the atmosphere; each element was full

of them, earth, air, fire and water; and nothing could exist without

them...As evil is everywhere present in nature side by side with good,

plagues with favorable influences, death with life, destruction with

fruitfulness; an idea of dualism as decided as in the religion of

Zoroaster pervaded the conceptions of the supernatural world formed by

the Accadian magicians, the evil beings of which they feared more than

they valued the powers of good. There were essentially good spirits,

and others equally bad. These opposing troops constituted a vast

dualism, which embraced the whole universe and kept up a perpetual

struggle in all parts of the creation." [3] This primitive Turanian

quasi-dualism (it was not dualism in the strictest sense of the term)

was not entirely obliterated by the Cushite and Semitic civilizations

and cults that successively overlaid it. So firmly rooted had this

early mode of viewing the world become that it materially influenced

the religions of the invaders rather than suffered extermination. In

the Babylonian religion of the Semitic period the dualistic element was

manifest chiefly in the magical rites of the Chaldean priests who long

continued to use Accadian as their sacred language. "Upon this

dualistic conception rested the whole edifice of sacred magic, of magic

regarded as a holy and legitimate intercourse established by rites of

divine origin, between man and the supernatural beings surrounding him

on all sides. Placed unhappily in the midst of this perpetual struggle

between the good and bad spirits, man felt himself attacked by them at

every moment; his fate depended upon them....He needed then some aid

against the attacks of the bad spirits, against the plagues and

diseases which they sent upon him. This help he hoped to find in

incantations, in mysterious and powerful words, the secret of which was

known only to the priests of magic, in their prescribed rites and their

talismans...The Chaldeans had such a great idea of the power and

efficacy of their formul�, rites and amulets, that they came to regard

them as required to fortify the good spirits themselves in their combat

with the demons, and as able to give them help by providing them with

invincible weapons which should ensure success." [4] A large number

of magical texts have been preserved and deciphered, and among them

"the favorable Alad,' the favorable Lamma,' and the favorable Utuq,'

are very frequently opposed...to the evil Alad,' the evil Lamma,' the

evil Utuq.'" [5] It would be interesting to give in detail the results

of the researches of George Smith, Lenormant, A.H. Sayce, E. Schrader,

Friedrich Delitzsch and others, with reference to the elaborate

mythological and cosmological systems of the Babylonians. Some of the

features thereof will be brought out further on by way of comparison

with the Manich�an mythology and cosmology. Suffice it to say that the

dualistic element is everywhere manifest, though not in so consistent

and definite a form as in Zoroastrianism, to say nothing of Manich�ism.

The Medo-Persian invasion brought into Babylonia the Zoroastrian

system, already modified, no doubt, by the Elamitic (Cushite) cult.

Yet the old Babylonian religion was too firmly rooted to be supplanted,

even by the religion of such conquerors as Darius and Cyrus.

Modifications, however, it undoubtedly underwent. The dualism inherent

in the system became more definite. The influence of the Jews in

Mesopotamia upon the ancient population cannot have been

inconsiderable, especially as many of the former, including probably

most of the captives of the Northern tribes, were absorbed by the

latter. As a result of this blending of old Babylonian, Persian, and

Hebrew blood, traditions, and religious ideas, there was developed in

Mesopotamia a type of religious thought that furnished a philosophical

basis and a mythological and cosmological garnishing for the Manich�an

system. Dualism, therefore, arising from efforts of the unaided human

mind to account for the natural phenomena that appear beneficent and

malignant, partly of old Babylonian origin and partly of Persian, but

essentially modified by Hebrew influence more or less pure, furnished

to Mani the foundation of his system. We shall attempt at a later

stage of the discussion to determine more accurately the relations of

Manich�ism to the various systems with which correctly or incorrectly

it has been associated. Suffice it to say, at present, that no new

problem presented itself to Mani, and that he furnished no essentially

new solution of the problems that had occupied the attention of his

countrymen for more than 2500 years. Before proceeding to institute a

comparison between Manich�ism and the various systems of religious

thought to which it stands related, it will be advantageous to have

before us an exposition of the Manich�an system itself, based upon the

most authentic sources.
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[2] Indian Wisdom, 3rd ed. (1876), p. 49.

[3] Lenormant, Chaldean Magic (1877), p. 144-145.

[4] Ibid. p. 146-147.

[5] Ibid. p. 148.
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Chapter III.--The Manich�an System.

Earlier writers on Manich�ism have, for the most part, made the Acta

Disp. Archelai et Manetis and the anti-Manich�an writings of Augustin

the basis of their representations. For later Manich�ism in the West,

Augustin is beyond question the highest authority, and the various

polemical treatises which he put forth exhibit the system under almost

every imaginable aspect. The "Acts of the Disputation of Archelaus and

Manes," while it certainly rests upon a somewhat extensive and

accurative knowledge of early Manich�ism, is partially discredited by

its generally admitted spuriousness--spuriousness in the sense that it

is not a genuine record of a real debate. It is highly probable that

debates of this kind occurred between Mani and various Christian

leaders in the East, and so Mani may at one time or other have given

utterance to most of the statements that are attributed to him in this

writing; or these statements may have been derived, for substance, from

his numerous treatises, and have been artfully adapted to the purposes

of the writer of the "Acts." It is certain that most of the

representations are correct. But we can no longer rely upon it as an

authentic first-hand authority. Since Fl�gel published the treatise

from the Fihrist entitled "The Doctrines of the Manich�ans, by Muhammad

ben Ish�k," with a German translation and learned annotations, it has

been admitted that this treatise must be made the basis for all future

representations of Manich�ism. Kessler, while he has had access to

many other Oriental documents bearing upon the subject, agrees with

Fl�gel in giving the first place to this writing. On this exposition

of the doctrines of the Manich�ans, therefore, as expounded by Fl�gel

and Kessler, we must chiefly rely. The highly poetical mythological

form which Mani gave to his speculations renders it exceedingly

difficult to arrive at assured results with reference to fundamental

principles. If we attempt to state in a plain matter-of-fact way just

what Mani taught we are in constant danger of misrepresenting him. In

fact one of the favorite methods employed against Mani's doctrines by

the writer of the "Acts of the Disputation," etc., as well as by

Augustin and others, was to reduce Mani's poetical fancies to plain

language and thus to show their absurdity. The considerations which

have led experts like Fl�gel and Kessler to put so high an estimate

upon this document, and the discussions as to the original language in

which the sources of the document were written, are beyond the scope of

this essay. Suffice it to say, that so far as we are able to form a

judgment on the matter, the reasons for ascribing antiquity and

authenticity to the representation of Manich�ism contained in the

document are decisive.

1. Mani's Life. According to the Fihrist, Mani's father, a Persian by

race, resided at Coche on the Tigris, about forty miles north of

Babylon. Afterwards he removed into Babylonia and settled at Modein,

where he frequented an idol-temple like the rest of the people. He

next became associated with a party named Mugtasila (Baptizers),

probably identical with or closely related to the Mand�ans and Sabeans,

both of which parties made much of ceremonial bathings. Mani, who was

born after the removal to Babylonia, is related to have been the

recipient of angelic visitations at the age of twelve. Even at this

time he was forewarned that he must leave the religion of his father at

the age of twenty-four. At the appointed time the angel At-Taum

appeared again and announced to him his mission. "Hail, Mani, from me

and the Lord, who has sent me to thee and chosen thee for his mission.

But he commands thee to invite men to thy doctrine and to proclaim the

glad tidings of truth that comes from him, and to bestow thereon all

thy zeal." Mani entered upon his work, according to Fl�gel's careful

computation, April 1, 238, or, according to calculations based on

another statement, in 252. Mani maintained that he was the Paraclete

promised by Jesus. He is said, in this document, to have derived his

teaching from the Magi and the Christians, and the characters in which

he wrote his books, from the Syriac and the Persian. After travelling

in many lands for forty years and disseminating his doctrines in India,

China, and Turkestan, he succeeded in impressing his views upon F�r�z,

brother of King Sapor, who had intended to put him to death. Sapor

became warmly attached to Mani and granted toleration to his

followers. Afterwards, according to some accounts, Mani was imprisoned

by Sapor and liberated by his successor Hormizd. He is said to have

been crucified by order of King Bahra�m I. (276-'7), and his skin

stuffed with straw is said to have been suspended at the city gate.

Eusebius (H. E. VII. 31) describes Mani as "a barbarian in life, both

in speech and conduct, who attempted to form himself into a Christ, and

then also proclaimed himself to be the very Paraclete and the Holy

Spirit. Then, as if he had been Christ, he selected twelve disciples,

the partners of his new religion, and after patching together false and

ungodly doctrines collected from a thousand heresies long since

extinct, he swept them off like a deadly poison from Persia, upon this

part of the world." The account given in the Acta Archel (written

probably about 330-'40), is far more detailed than that of the Fihrist

and differs widely therefrom. It contains much that is highly

improbable. Mani is represented as having for his predecessors one

Scythianus, an Egyptian heretic of Apostolic times, and Terebinthus,

who went with him to Palestine and after the death of Scythianus

removed to Babylonia. The writings of Terebinthus or Scythianus came

into the possession of a certain widow, who purchased Mani when seven

years of age (then named Cubricus) and made him heir of her property

and books. He changed his name to Mani (Manes), and, having become

imbued with the teachings of the books, began at about sixty years of

age to promulgate their teachings, choosing three disciples, Thomas,

Addas and Hermas, to whom he entrusted the writings mentioned above,

along with some of his own. Up to this time he knew little of

Christianity, but having been imprisoned by the king for failure in a

promised cure of the king's son, he studied the Christian Scriptures

and derived therefrom the idea of the Paraclete, which he henceforth

applied to himself. After his escape the famous dialogue with

Archelaus and that with Diodorus occurred. Returning to Arabion he was

arrested, carried to Persia, flayed alive, and his skin stuffed and

suspended as above. Some additional facts from an Oriental source used

by Beausobre have more or less verisimilitude. According to this, Mani

was born of Magian parents about 240 A.D. He became skilled in music,

mathematics, geography, astronomy, painting, medicine, and in the

Scriptures. The account of his ascendancy over Sapor and his

subsequent martyrdom is substantially the same as that of the Fihrist.

Alb�run�'s work (see bibliography preceding) confirms the account given

by the Fihrist. The conversion of Sapor to Manich�ism (in A.D. 261) is

said to be confirmed by Sassanian inscriptions (see Journal of Asiat.

Soc. 1868 p. 310-'41, and ibid. p. 376, and 1871 p. 416).

The Fihrist's account contains a long list of the works of Mani, which

is supplemented by other Oriental and Western notices. The list is

interesting as showing the wide range of Mani's literary activity, or

at least of the literature that was afterwards connected with his name.

2. Mani's System. As the life of Mani has been the subject of

diversified and contradictory representations, so also have his

doctrines. Here, too, we must make the account given by the Fihrist

fundamental. It will be convenient to treat the subject under the

following heads: Theology, Cosmogony, Anthropology, Soteriology,

Cultus, Eschatology, and Ethics.

(1.) Theology. Mani taught dualism in the most unqualified sense.

Zoroastrianism is commonly characterized as dualistic, yet it is so in

no such sense as is Manich�ism. According to the Fihrist, "Mani

teaches: Two subsistences form the beginning of the world, the one

light the other darkness; the two are separated from each other. The

light is the first most glorious being, limited by no number, God

himself, the King of the Paradise of Light. He has five members:

meekness, knowledge, understanding, mystery, insight; and five other

spiritual members: love, faith, truth, nobleness, and wisdom. He

maintained furthermore that the God of light, with these his

attributes, is without beginning, but with him two equally eternal

things likewise exist, the one the atmosphere, the other the earth.

Mani adds: and the members of the atmosphere are five [the first

series of divine attributes mentioned above are enumerated]; and the

members of the earth are five [the second series]. The other being is

the darkness, and his members are five: cloud, burning, hot wind,

poison, and darkness. Mani teaches: that the light subsistence

borders immediately on the dark subsistence, without a dividing wall

between them; the light touches with its (lowest) side the darkness,

while upwards to the right and left it is unbounded. Even so the

darkness is endless downwards and to the right and left."

This represents Mani's view of the eternally existent status quo,

before the conflict began, and the endless state after the conflict

ceases. What does Mani mean, when he enumerates two series of five

attributes each as members of God, and straightway postulates the

co-eternity of atmosphere and earth and divides these self-same

attributes between the latter? Doubtless Mani's theology was

fundamentally pantheistic, i.e., pantheistic within the limits of each

member of the dualism. The God of Light himself is apparently

conceived of as transcending thought. Atmosphere and Earth (not the

atmosphere and earth that we know, but ideal atmosphere and earth) are

the �ons derived immediately from the Ineffable One and co�ternal with

him. The ten attributes are �ons which all belong primarily to the

Supreme Being and secondarily to the two great �ons, half to each. The

question may arise, and has been often discussed, whether Mani meant to

identify God (the Prince of Light) with the Kingdom of Light? His

language, in this treatise, is wavering. He seems to struggle against

such a representation, yet without complete success.

What do the other sources teach with reference to the absoluteness of

the dualism and with reference to the identification of the Prince of

Light with the Kingdom of Light? According to the Acts of the

Disputation of Archelaus and Manes, [6] Manes "worships two deities,

unoriginated, self-existent, eternal, opposed the one to the other. Of

them he represents the one as good, and the other as evil, and assigned

the name of Light to the former, and that of Darkness to the latter."

Again, Manes is represented as saying: "I hold that there are two

natures, one good and another evil; and that the one which is good

dwells in a certain part proper to it, but that the evil one is this

world as well as all things in it, which are placed there like objects

imprisoned in the portion of the wicked one" (1 John 5, 19). According

to Alexander of Lycopolis, [7] "Mani laid down two principles, God and

matter (Hyle). God he called good, and matter he affirmed to be evil.

But God excelled more in good than matter in evil." Alexander goes on

to show how Mani used the word Hyle, comparing the Manich�an with the

Platonic teaching. Statements of substantially the same purport might

be multiplied. As regards the identification of God (the King of

Light) with the Kingdom of Light, and of Satan (the King of Darkness)

with the Kingdom of Darkness, the sensuous poetical way in which Mani

expressed his doctrines may leave us in doubt. The probability is,

however, that he did pantheistically identify each element of the

dualism with his Kingdom. He personifies the Kingdom of Light and the

Kingdom of Darkness, and peoples these Kingdoms with fanciful beings,

which are to be regarded as personified attributes of the principles of

darkness and light.

A word on the Manich�an conception of matter or Hyle may not be out of

place in this connection. It would seem that the Manich�ans

practically identified Hyle or matter with the Kingdom of Darkness. At

any rate Hyle is unoriginated and belongs wholly to this Kingdom.

(2.) Cosmogony. So much for the Manich�an idea of the Kingdom of

Light and the Kingdom of Darkness before the great conflict that

resulted in the present order of things. Why did not they remain

separate? Let us learn from the Fihrist's narrative: "Mani teaches

further: Out of this dark earth [the Kingdom of Darkness] arose Satan,

not that he was in himself eternal from the beginning, yet were his

substances in his elements unoriginated. These substances now united

themselves out of his elements and went forth as Satan, his head as the

head of a lion, his body as the body of a dragon, his wings as the

wings of a bird, his tail as the tail of a great fish, and his four

feet as the feet of creeping animals. When this Satan under the name

Iblis, the (temporally considered) eternal (primeval), had arisen out

of the darkness, he devoured and consumed everything, spread

destruction right and left, and plunged into the deep, in all these

movements bringing down from above desolation and annihilation. Then

he strove for the height, and descried the beams of light; but they

were opposed to him. When he saw later how exalted these were, he was

terrified, shrivelled up, and merged himself in his elements. Hereupon

he strove anew with such violence after the height, that the land of

light descried the doings of Satan and how he was bent upon murder and

destruction. After they had been apprised thereof, the world of

Insight learned of it, then the world of Knowledge, then the world of

Mystery, then the world of Understanding, then the world of Meekness.

When at last, he further teaches, the King of the Paradise of Light had

also learned of it, he thought how he might suppress Satan, and, Mani

adds, those hosts of his would have been mighty enough to overpower

Satan. Yet he desired to do this by means of his own might.

Accordingly, he produced by means of the spirit of his right hand

[i.e., the Gentle Breeze], his five worlds, and his twelve elements, a

creature, and this is the (temporally considered) Eternal Man

[Primordial Man], and summoned him to do battle with the Darkness. But

Primordial Man, Mani adds, armed himself with the five races [natures],

and these are the five gods, the Gentle Breeze, the Wind, the Light,

the Water and the Fire. Of them he made his armor, and the first that

he put on was the Gentle Breeze. He then covered the Gentle Breeze

with the burning Light as with a mantle. He drew over the Light Water

filled with atoms, and covered himself with the blowing Wind. Hereupon

he took the Fire as a shield and as a lance in his hand, and

precipitated himself suddenly out of Paradise until he reached the

border of the region that is contiguous to the battle-field. The

Primordial Devil also took his five races [natures]: Smoke, Burning,

Darkness, Hot Wind and Cloud; armed himself with them; made of them a

shield for himself; and went to meet Primordial Man. After they had

fought for a long time the Primordial Devil vanquished the Primordial

Man, devoured some of his light, and surrounded him at the same time

with his races and elements. Then the King of the Paradise of Light

sent other gods, freed him, and vanquished the Darkness. But he who

was sent by the King of Light to rescue Primordial Man is called the

Friend of the Light. This one made a precipitate descent, and

Primordial Man was freed from the hellish substances, along with that

which he had snatched from the spirit of Darkness and which had adhered

to him. When, therefore, Mani proceeds, Joyfulness and the Spirit of

Life drew near to the border, they looked down into the abyss of this

deep hell and saw Primordial Man and the angels [i.e., the races or

natures with which he was armed], how Iblis, the Proud Oppressors, and

the Dark Life surrounded them. And the Spirit of Life, says Mani,

called Primordial Man with a loud voice as quick as lightning and

Primordial Man became another god. When the Primordial Devil had

ensnared Primordial Man in the battle, Mani further teaches, the five

parts of the Light were mingled with the five parts of the Darkness."

Let us see if we can get at the meaning of this great cosmological poem

as far as we have gone. The thing to be accounted for is the mixture

of good and evil. The complete separation of the eternally existent

Kingdoms of Light and Darkness has been posited. How now are we to

account for the mixture of light and darkness, of good and evil, in the

present order of things? Mani would account for it by supposing that a

conflict had occurred between an insufficiently equipped representative

of the King of Light and the fully equipped ruler of the Kingdom of

Darkness. His view of the vastly superior power of the King of Light

would not allow him to suppose that the King of Light fully equipped

had personally contended with the King of Darkness, and suffered the

loss and contamination of his elements. Yet he only clumsily obviates

this difficulty; for Primordial Man is produced and equipped by the

King of Light for the very purpose of combating the King of Darkness,

and Mani saves the King of Light from personal contamination only by

impugning his judgment.

We have now reached the point where, as a result of the conflict, good

and evil are blended. We must beware of supposing that Mani meant to

ascribe any kind of materiality to the members of the Kingdom of

Light. The Kingdom of Light, on the contrary, he regarded as purely

spiritual; the Kingdom of Darkness as material. We have now the

conditions for the creation of the present order of things, including

man. How does Mani picture the process and the results of this mixing

of the elements?

"The smoke (or vapor) was mingled with the gentle breeze (zephyr), and

the present atmosphere resulted. So that whatever of agreeableness and

power to quicken the soul and animal life is found in it [resultant

air], is from the zephyr, and whatever of destructiveness and

noisomeness is found in it, proceeds from the smoke. The burning was

mingled with the fire; therefore whatever of conflagration, destruction

and ruin is found, is from the burning, but whatever of brightness and

illumination is in it [the resultant fire], springs from the fire. The

light mingled itself with the darkness; therefore in dense bodies as

gold, silver and the like, whatever of brightness, beauty, purity and

other useful qualities occurs, is from the light, and whatever of

tarnish, impurity, density and hardness occurs, springs from the

darkness. The hot wind was mingled with the wind; whatever now is

useful and agreeable in this [resultant wind] springs from the wind,

and whatever of uneasiness, hurtfulness and deleterious property is

found in it [resultant wind] is from the hot wind. Finally, the mist

was mingled with the water, so that what is found in this [resultant

water] of clearness, sweetness, and soul-satisfying property, is from

the water; whatever, on the contrary, of overwhelming, suffocating, and

destroying power, of heaviness, and corruption, is found in it, springs

from the mist."

But we must from this point abbreviate the somewhat prolix account.

Primordial Man, after the blending of the elements, ascended on high

accompanied by "one of the angels of this intermingling;" in other

words, snatching away a part of the imprisoned elements of the Kingdom

of Light.

The next step is the creation of the present world, which Mani ascribes

to the King of the World of Light, the object being to provide for the

escape of the imprisoned elements of Light. Through an angel he

constructed ten heavens and eight earths, an angel being appointed to

hold heavens and earths in their places. A description of the

stairways, doors, and halls of the heavens is given in the Fihrist's

narrative. The stairways lead to the "height of heaven." The air was

used as a medium for connecting heaven and earth. A pit was formed to

be the receptacle of darkness from which the light should be

liberated. The sun and the moon were created to be the receptacles of

the light that should be liberated from the darkness, the sun for light

that has been mingled with "hot devils," the moon for that which had

been mingled with "cold devils." The moon is represented as collecting

light during the first half-month, and during the second pouring it

into the sun. When the sun and moon have liberated all the light they

are able, there will be a fire kindled on the earth which will burn for

1468 years, when there will be no light left. The King of Darkness and

his hosts will thereupon withdraw into the pit prepared for them.

(3.) Anthropology. So much for the liberation of the imprisoned

light, which, according to Mani, was the sole object of creation. As

yet we have heard nothing of the creation of living creatures. What

place do man, the lower animals, and plants sustain in the Manich�an

economy? We are to keep constantly in mind that Primordial Man was not

Adam, but a divine �on, and that he ascended into the heights

immediately after the blending of parts of his armor with darkness.

The creation of earthly man was an altogether different affair. We

must give the account of man's creation in Mani's own words, as

preserved by the Fihrist: "Hereupon one of those Arch-fiends and [one]

of the Stars, and Overmastering Violence, Avarice, Lust, and Sin,

copulated, and from their copulation sprang the first man, who is Adam,

two Arch-fiends, a male and a female, directing the process. A second

copulation followed and from this sprang the beautiful woman who is

Eve."

Man, therefore, unlike the world, is the creature of demons, the aim of

the demons being to imprison in man, through the propagation of the

race, as much as possible of the light, and so to hinder the separating

process by the sun and the moon. Avarice is represented as having

secretly seized some of the divine light and imprisoned it in man. The

part played by the Star in the production of man is somewhat obscure in

the narrative, yet the Star could hardly have been regarded as wholly

evil. Probably the Star was thought of as a detached portion of the

light that had not entered into the sun or the moon. "When, therefore,

the five Angels saw what had taken place, they besought the Messenger

of Joyful Knowledge, the Mother of Life, Primordial Man and the Spirit

of Life, to send some one to liberate and save man, to reveal to him

knowledge and righteousness, and to free him from the power of the

devils. They sent, accordingly, Jesus, whom a god accompanied. These

seized the two Arch-fiends, imprisoned them and freed the two creatures

(Adam and Eve.)"

Jesus warned Adam of Eve's violent importunity, and Adam obeyed his

injunction not to go near her. One of the Arch-fiends, however, begat

with her a son named Cain, who in turn begat Abel of his mother, and

afterwards two maidens Worldly wise and Daughter-of-Avarice. Cain took

the first to wife and gave the other to Abel. An angel having begotten

of Worldly-wise two beautiful daughters (Raufarj�d and Barfarj�d), Abel

accused Cain of the act. Cain enraged by the false accusation slew

Abel and took Worldly-wise to wife. So far Adam had kept himself pure,

but Eve was instructed by a demon in the art of enchanting, and she was

enabled to excite his lust and to entrap him. By Adam she bore a

beautiful son, whom the demon urged Eve to destroy. Adam stole the

child away and brought it up on cow's milk and fruit. This son was

named Seth (Schatil). Adam once more yielded to Eve's fascinations,

but through Seth's exhortations was induced to flee "eastward to the

light and the wisdom of God." Adam, Seth, Raufarj�d, Barfarj�d, and

Worldly-wise died and went to Paradise; while Eve, Cain, and

Daughter-of-Avarice went into Hell. This fantastic perversion of the

Biblical narrative of the creation and fall of man has many parallels

in Rabbinic literature, and doubtless Mani first became acquainted with

the narrative in a corrupted form. The teaching, however, of this

mythologizing evidently is that the indulgence of the flesh and the

begetting of children furnish the chief obstacle to the separation of

light from darkness. Adam is represented as striving to escape from

the allurements of Eve, but Eve is aided by demonic craft in overcoming

him. Yet Adam does not become enslaved to lust, and so at last is

saved. Eve, lustful from the beginning, is lost along with those of

like disposition.

(4.) Soteriology. Such was, apparently, Mani's conception of the

creation of man, and of the attempts to liberate the light that was in

him. What were his practical teachings to men of his time as to the

means of escape from the Kingdom of Darkness into the Kingdom of

Light? What view did Mani take of the historical Jesus? The Jesus who

warned Adam against the seductions of Eve was evidently not the Jesus

of the New Testament. According to the narrative of the Fihrist, Mani

"maintained that Jesus is a devil." Such a statement occurs nowhere

else, so far as we are aware, in the literature of Manich�ism. The

sources, however, are unanimous in ascribing to Mani a completely

docetical view of the person of Christ. In using this blasphemous

language, he probably referred to the representations of Jesus as God

manifest in the flesh, which he regarded as Jewish and abominable. The

New Testament narratives Mani [or at least his followers] regarded as

interpolated in the interest of Judaism. Later Manich�ans, under the

influence of Marcionism (and orthodoxy) gave to Jesus a far more

prominent place in the economy of man's salvation than did Mani

himself.

How then is man to be saved according to Mani? It is by rigorous

asceticism, and by the practice of certain ceremonial observances.

Mani does not rise above the plane of ordinary heathenism in his plan

of salvation. "It is incumbent upon him who will enter into the

religion that he prove himself, and that if he sees that he is able to

subdue lust and avarice, to leave off the eating of all kinds of flesh,

the drinking of wine, and connubial intercourse, and to withhold

himself from what is injurious in water, fire, magic and hypocrisy, he

may enter into the religion; but if not let him abstain from entering.

But if he loves religion, yet is not able to repress sensuality and

avarice, yet he may make himself serviceable for the maintenance of

religion and of the Truthful [i.e. the Elect'], and may meet (offset)

his corrupt deeds through the use of opportunities where he wholly

gives himself up to activity, righteousness, zealous watchfulness,

prayer and pious humiliation; for this suffices him in this transitory

world and in the future eternal world, and his form in the last day

will be the second form, of which, God willing, we shall treat further

below."

The doctrine of indulgences of which the germs appeared in the Catholic

church even before the time of Mani, is here seen fully developed.

What the Greek and Latin sources call the Elect or Perfect and the

Hearers, are undoubtedly indicated here by those who are able to devote

themselves to rigidly ascetical living, and those who, without such

qualifications, are willing to exert themselves fully on behalf of the

cause. These latter evidently become partakers of the merits of those

who carry out the ascetical regulations. That this is primitive

Manich�an doctrine is abundantly proved by the general agreement of

ancient writers of all classes. It is noteworthy that nothing

Christian appears among the conditions of Manich�an discipleship. It

is not faith in Christ, but the ability to follow a particular kind of

outward life that confers standing in the Manich�an society.

(5.) Cultus. Let us next look at the precepts of Mani to the

initiated: "Mani imposed upon his disciples commandments, namely, ten

commandments, and to these are attached three seals, and fasts of seven

days in each month. The commandments are: Faith in the four most

glorious essences: God, his Light, his Power, and his Wisdom. But

God, whose name is glorious, is the King of the Paradise of Light; his

Light is the sun and the moon, his Power the five angels: Gentle

Breeze, Wind, Light, Water and Fire; and his Wisdom the Sacred

Religion. This embraces five ideas: that of teachers, the sons of

Meekness; that of those enlightened by the Sun, sons of Knowledge; that

of the presbyters, sons of Reason; that of the Truthful, sons of

Mystery; that of Hearers, sons of Insight. The ten commandments are:

Abandoning of prayer to idols, of lies, avarice, murder, adultery,

theft, of the teaching of jugglery and magic, of duplicity of mind,

which betrays doubt on religion, of drowsiness and inertness in

business; and the commandment of four or seven prayers. In prayer one

is to stand upright, rub himself with flowing water or with something

else, and turn while standing to the great light (the Sun), then

prostrate himself and in this position pray: Blessed be our Leader,

the Paraclete, the Ambassador of the Light, blessed be his angels, the

Guardians, and highly praised be his resplendent hosts.... In the

second prostration let him say: Thou highly praised, O thou

enlightening one, Mani, our Leader, thou root of enlightenment, stem of

honorableness, thou great tree who art altogether the means of

salvation. In the third prostration let him say: I fall down and

praise with pure heart and upright tongue the great God, the Father of

Light, and their element, highly praised, Blessed One, thou and thy

whole glory and thy blessed world, which thou hast called into being.

For he praises thee who praises thy Host, thy Righteous Ones, thy Word,

thy Glory, and thy Good Pleasure, because thou art the God who is

wholly truth, life and righteousness. In the fourth prostration let

him say: I praise and fall down before all the gods, all the

enlightening angels, before all Light and all Hosts, who are from the

great God. In the fifth prostration let him say: I fall down and

praise the great Host and the enlightening Gods, who with their wisdom

assail the Darkness, drive it out and triumph over it. In the sixth

prostration let him say: I fall down and praise the Father of Glory,

the Exalted One, the Enlightening One, who has come forth from the two

sciences (see note in Fl�gel p. 310), and so on to the twelfth

prostration. \* \* The first prayer is accomplished at mid-day, the

second between this hour and sunset; then follows the prayer at

eventide, after sunset, and hereupon the prayer in the first quarter of

the night, three hours after sunset.

"As regards fasting, when the sun is in Sagittarius, and the moon has

its full light, fasting is to take place for two days without

interruption, also when the new moon begins to appear; likewise when

the moon first becomes visible again after the sun has entered into the

sign of Capricorn; then when the new moon begins to appear, the sun

stands in Aquarius and from the moon eight days have flowed, a fast of

thirty days occurs, broken, however, daily at sunset. The common

Manich�ans celebrate Sunday, the consecrated ones (the Elect') Monday."

Here we have a somewhat detailed account of the cultus of the early

Manich�ans. The forms of invocation do not differ materially from

those of the Zoroastrians, of the early Indians, of the Babylonians,

and of the Egyptians. There is not the slightest evidence of Christian

influence. The times of worship and of fasting are determined by the

sun and the moon, and practically these are the principal objects of

worship. It is certain that Mani himself was regarded by his followers

as the most perfect revealer of God that had ever appeared among men,

and, according to this account, he taught his followers to worship

him. We cannot fail to see in this Manich�an cult the old Oriental

pantheism modified by a dualism, of which the most fully developed form

was the Persian, but which, as we have seen, was by no means confined

to Zoroastrianism.

(6.) Eschatology. We must conclude our exposition of the doctrines of

the Manich�ans by quoting from the Fihrist Mani's teachings on

eschatology.

"When death approaches a Truthful One (Elect'), teaches Mani,

Primordial Man sends a Light-God in the form of a guiding Wise One, and

with him three gods, and along with these the water-vessel, clothing,

head-gear, crown, and garland of light. With them comes the maiden,

like the soul of this Truthful One. There appears to him also the

devil of avarice and lust, along with other devils. As soon as the

Truthful Man sees these he calls the goddess who has assumed the form

of the Wise One and the three other gods to his help, and they draw

near him. As soon as the devils are aware of their presence they turn

and flee. The former, however, take this Truthful One, clothe him with

the crown, the garland and the robe, put the water-vessel in his hand

and mount with him upon the pillars of promise to the sphere of the

moon, to Primordial Man, and to Nahnaha, the Mother of the Living, to

the position in which he was at first in the Paradise of Light. But

his body remains lying as before in order that the sun, the moon, and

the gods of Light may withdraw from it the powers, i.e., the water, the

fire and the gentle breeze, and he rises to the sun and becomes a god.

But the rest of his body, which is wholly darkness, is cast into hell."

In the case of Manich�ans of the lower order, described above, the same

divine personages appear at his summons. "They free him also from

devils, but he ceases not to be like a man in the world, who in his

dreams sees frightful forms and sinks into filth and mire. In this

condition he remains, until his light and his spirit are liberated and

he has attained to the place of union with the Truthful, and after a

long period of wandering to and fro puts on their garments."

To the sinful man, on the other hand, the divine personages appear, not

to free him from the devils that are tormenting him, but rather to

"overwhelm him with reproaches, to remind him of his deeds, and

strikingly to convince him that he has renounced help for himself, from

the side of the Truthful. Then wanders he round about in the world,

unceasingly chased by torments, until this order of things ceases, and

along with the world he is cast into hell."

There is nothing original about the eschatology of Mani, and scarcely

anything Christian. We see in it a fully developed doctrine of

purgatory, somewhat like the Platonic, and still more like that of the

later Catholic church. Salvation consists simply in the liberation of

the light from the darkness. In the case of the Elect this takes place

immediately after death; in the case of adherents who have not

practiced the prescribed forms of asceticism, it takes place only after

considerable torment. In the case of the ordinary sensual man, there

is no deliverance. Doubtless Mani would have held that in his case,

too, whatever particles of light may have been involved in his animal

structure are liberated from the dead body.

(7.) Ethics. As regards ceremonies we find little that enlightens us

in the Fihrist's account. Water (that is, water apart from the

deleterious elements that have become blended with it) was regarded by

Mani as one of the divine elements. The ablutions in running water

mentioned above in connection with the prayers may have sustained some

relation to baptism, but can hardly be ascribed to Christian

influence. The connection of the Manich�ans with the Mand�ans, who

made much of ceremonial bathing, will be considered below. It is

certain that Mani's father was connected with a baptizing party, viz.,

the Mugtasilah. According to the Fihrist Mani was the author of an

Epistle on Baptism. The question whether Mani and his followers

practised water-baptism or not is by no means an easy one to solve.

The passage cited by Giesseler from Augustin to prove that the "Elect"

were initiated by baptism is inconclusive. Augustin acknowledges that

God and the Manich�ans themselves alone know what takes place in the

secret meetings of the "Elect." Whatever ceremonies they performed,

whether baptism or the Lord's supper, or some other, were matters of

profound secrecy, and so we need not wonder at the lack of definite

information. From a passage quoted by Augustin in his report of a

discussion with Felix the Manich�an, we should certainly infer that

both ordinances were practised in some form by the Manich�ans of the

West. But Augustin himself says that Manich�ans deny the saving

efficacy of baptism, maintain that it is superfluous, do not require it

of those whom they win to their views, etc. It is certain, therefore,

that if they practised baptism and the Lord's supper at all, they

attached to it a meaning radically different from that of Augustin. It

is possible that a ceremonial anointing with oil took the place of

baptism. (Baur, p. 277 sq.). Augustin mentions a disgusting ceremony

in which human semen was partaken of by the Elect in order to deliver

the imprisoned light contained therein (De Haeres. 46), and he calls

this ceremony a sort of Eucharist. But his confessed ignorance of the

doings of the "Elect" discredits in some measure this accusation.

The Fihrist gives us no definite information about the three

signacula. The seals (not signs) of the mouth, the hand (or hands),

and of the bosom. In these are contained symbolically the Manich�an

moral system. In the book Sadder (Hyde, p. 492) we read: "It is

taught [by the Manich�ans] to abstain from every sin, to eliminate

every sin from hand, and tongue and thought." Augustin explains the

signacula more fully and represents the Manich�ans as attaching great

importance to them: "When I name the mouth, I mean all the senses that

are in the head; when I name the hand I mean every operation; when I

name the bosom I mean every seminal lust."

It is confidently believed that the foregoing account of the Manich�an

system, based upon the Arabic narratives preserved by the Fihrist,

supplemented by the principal Eastern and Western sources, contains the

essential facts with reference to this strange system of religious

thought. Our next task will to be to ascertain, as precisely as

possible, the relations that Manich�ism sustained to the various

religious systems with which it has commonly been associated.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[6] Ante-Nicene Library, Am. ed. vol. vi. pp. 182 and 188.

[7] Ibid. p. 241.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter IV.--Relation of Manich�ism to Zoroastrianism.

The very close connection of these two systems has commonly been

presupposed, and is undeniable. In fact Manich�ism has frequently been

represented as Zoroastrian dualism, slightly modified by contact with

Christianity and other systems. No one could possibly gain even a

superficial view of the two systems without being strongly impressed

with their points of resemblance. A closer examination, however, will

reveal points of antagonism just as striking, and will enable us to

account for the fact that Mani was put to death by a zealous

Zoroastrian ruler on account of his recognized hostility to the state

religion. The leading features of the Manich�an system are already

before us. Instead of quoting at length from the Zend-Avesta, which is

now happily accessible in an excellent English translation, we may for

the sake of brevity quote Tiele's description of Zoroastrian dualism as

a basis of comparison: [8]

"Parsism is decidedly dualistic, not in the sense of accepting two

hostile deities, for it recognizes no worship of evil beings, and

teaches the adoration only of Ahura Mazda and the spirits subject to

him; but in the sense of placing in hostility to each other two sharply

divided kingdoms, that of light, of truth, and of purity, and that of

darkness, of falsehood, and of impurity. This division is carried

through the whole creation, organic and inorganic, material and

spiritual. Above, in the highest sphere, is the domain of the

undisputed sovereignty of the All-wise God; beneath, in the lowest

abyss, the kingdom of his mighty adversary; midway between the two lies

this world, the theatre of the contest.... This dualism further

dominates the cosmogony, the cultus, and the entire view of the moral

order of the world held by the Mazda worshippers. Not only does

Anro-Ma�nyus (Ahriman) spoil by his counter-creations all the good

creations of Ahura-Mazda (Ormuzd), but by slaying the protoplasts of

man and beast, he brings death into the world, seduces the first pair

to sin, and also brings forth noxious animals and plants. Man finds

himself, in consequence, surrounded on all sides by the works of the

spirits of darkness and by his hosts. It is the object of worship to

secure the pious against their influence."

Let us bring in review some of the points of resemblance between the

two systems. Both are in a sense dualistic. In both the kingdoms of

Light and Darkness are set over against each other in the sharpest

antagonism. In both we have similar emanations from these kingdoms (or

kings). Yet, while in the Manich�an system the dualism is absolute and

eternal, in the later Zoroastrian system (as in the Jewish and

Christian doctrine of Satan), Ahriman (Satan) if not merely a fallen

creature [9] of Ormuzd (the good and supreme God) was at least an

immeasurably inferior being. The supreme control of the universe, to

which it owes its perfect order, was ascribed by Zoroastrianism to

Ormuzd. The struggle between good and evil, beneficent and malevolent,

was due to the opposition of the mighty, but not almighty, Ahriman.

Whatever form of Mazdeism (Zoroastrianism) we take for purposes of

comparison, we are safe in saying that the Manich�an dualism was by far

the more absolute.

In both systems each side of the dualism is represented by a series (or

rather several series) of personified principles. These agree in the

two systems in some particulars. Yet the variations are quite as

noticeable as the agreements. There is much in common between the

Manich�an and the Zoroastrian delineations of the fearful conflict

between the Kingdom of Light and the Kingdom of Darkness, yet the

beginning of the conflict is quite differently conceived of in the two

systems. In Manich�ism the creation is accounted for by the conflict

in which Primordial Man was beaten by the powers of Darkness and

suffered the mixing of his elements with the elements of darkness. The

actual world was made by the good God, or rather by his subordinates,

as a means of liberating the imprisoned light. The creation of man is

ascribed, on the other hand, to the King of Darkness (or his

subordinates), with a view to hindering the escape of the mingled light

by diffusion thereof through propagation. Mazdeism derives the

creation solely from Ormuzd, from whose hand it issued "as pure and

perfect as himself" (Lenormant, Anc. Hist. II. p. 30). It was the work

of Ahriman to "spoil it by his evil influence." The appellation "Maker

of the material world" is constantly applied to Ormuzd in the Vend�d�d

and other sacred books. The most instructive Mazdean account of the

creation that has come down to us is that contained in the Vend�d�d,

Fargard I. Ahura Mazda (Ormuzd) is represented here as naming one by

one the sixteen good lands that he had created. Angra Mainyu (Ahriman)

is represented as coming to each, one by one, and creating in it

noxious things. Examples of these counter-creations are, the serpents,

winter, venomous flies, sinful lusts, mosquitoes, pride, unnatural sin,

burying the dead, witchcraft, the sin of unbelief, the burning of

corpses, abnormal issues in women, oppression of foreign rulers,

excessive heat, etc. This jumble of physical evils and sins is

characteristic of Mazdeism.

According to Mani matter is inherently evil, and it only ceases to be

absolutely evil by the mixture with it of the elements of the Kingdom

of Light. Creation is a process forced upon the King of Light by the

ravages of the King of Darkness, and is at best only partially good.

Zoroastrianism looked upon earth, fire, water, as sacred elements, to

defile which was sin of the most heinous kind. Manich�ism regarded

actual fire and water as made up of a mixture of elements of light and

darkness, and so, as by no means wholly pure. Manich�ans regarded

earth, so far as it consisted of dead matter, with the utmost

contempt. The life-giving light in it was alone thought of with

respect. Zoroastrianism somewhat arbitrarily divided animals and

plants between the kingdoms of Ormuzd and Ahriman; but the idea that

all material things, so far as they are material, are evil, seems never

to have occurred to the early Mazdeists. Manich�ans agreed with

Mazdeists in their veneration for the sun, but the principles

underlying this veneration seem to have been widely different in the

two cases. The most radical opposition of the two systems is seen in

their views of human propagation. Mani regarded the procreation of

children as ministering directly to the designs of the King of Darkness

to imprison the light, and so absolutely condemned it. The Zend-Avesta

says: (Vend�d�d, Fargard IV.): "Verily I say unto thee, O Spitama

Zarathustra; the man who has a wife is far above him who begets no

sons; he who keeps a house is far above him who has none; he who has

children is far above a childless man." Mani made great merit of

voluntary poverty. The Zend-Avesta (ibid.) says: "He who has riches

is far above him who has none." Mani forbade the use of animal food as

preventing the escape of the light contained in the bodies of animals.

The Zend-Avesta (ibid.): "And of two men, he who fills himself with

meat is filled with the good spirit much more than he who does not do

so; the latter is all but dead; the former is above him by the worth of

an Asperena, by the worth of a sheep, by the worth of an ox, by the

worth of a man." [10]

The eschatology of the two systems might be shown to present just as

striking contrasts, and just as marked resemblances. In both systems

the consummation of the age is effected by means of a conflagration,

the aim of the conflagration in Mazdeism being the punishment and the

purging of wicked men, the destruction of wicked spirits, the

renovation of the earth, and the inauguration of the sole sovereignty

of Ormuzd, while in Manich�ism the aim of the conflagration is to

liberate the portions of light which the processes of animal and

vegetable growth, with the aid of sun and the moon have proved unable

to liberate.

But enough has been said to make it evident that Manich�ism was by no

means a slightly altered edition of Zoroastrianism. The points of

similarity between the two are certainly more apparent than real,

though the historical relationship can by no means be denied.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[8] Outlines of the Hist. of Religion (1877), p. 173. Cf. J.

Darmsteter, Introduction to the Zend-Avesta, p. xliii., xliv., lvi.,

lxxii., lxxiv. sq.; and his article in the Contemporary Review (Oct.

1879), on "The Supreme God in the Indo-European Mythology."

[9] This is confidently asserted by Kessler (Art. Mani in Herzog's RE,

2d ed. vol. IX. p. 258), and after him by Harnack, Encyclop�dia

Britannica, art. Manich�ism. On the other hand, Lenormant (Anc. Hist.

II. p. 30), says: "Ahriman had been eternal in the past, he had no

beginning, and proceeded from no former being \* \* \* . This being who

had no beginning would come to an end. \* \* \* . Evil then should be

finally conquered and destroyed, the creation should become as pure as

on its first day, and Ahriman should disappear forever." Such,

doubtless, was the original doctrine, but the form probably in vogue in

the time of Mani was more pantheistic or monotheistic, both Ormuzd and

Ahriman proceeding from boundless time (Zrvan akarana). See on this

matter, Darmsteter: Introd. to the Zend-Avesta, p. lxxii, etc., and

his art. in Contemp. Review; and Lenormant: Anc. Hist. as above.

[10] That meat is used in the sense of flesh may be inferred from

Darmsteter's comment on this passage, which he suggests may be a bit of

religious polemics against Manich�ism. See his Introd. to the

Zend-Avesta, p. xl. sq.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter V.--The Relation of Manich�ism to the Old Babylonian Religion

as Seen in Mand�ism and Sabeanism.

It would have been strange indeed if the old Babylonian religion, after

dominating the minds of the inhabitants of Mesopotamia for so many

centuries, had given place completely to the religion of the

Medo-Persian conquerors of the country. Magism itself was a mixture of

old Babylonian, Medic and Persian elements. But there is much reason

for believing that the primitive Babylonian faith, in a more or less

pure form, persisted until long after the time of Mani, nay, that it

has maintained its ground even till the present day. The researches of

Chwolson, N�ldeke, Kessler and others, in the literature and history of

the Mand�ans and the Sabeans, combined in the last case at least with

accurate knowledge of old Babylonian literature and religion, have

rendered it highly probable that representatives of the old Babylonian

faith were numerous in Mesopotomia and the adjoining regions at the

time of Mani, and that Mani himself was more or less closely connected

with it. The Mand�ans were a Gnostic sect of the Ophitic type, without

Christian elements. It is the opinion of Kessler, who has devoted much

attention to this sect and to the relations of occult religious matters

in general in Mesopotomia, that "the source of all Gnosis, and

especially the immediate source of Ophitic Gnosis, is not the doctrine

of the Persian Zoroaster, not Phoenicean heathenism, not the theory and

practise of Greek mysteries, but the old Babylonian-Chaldaic national

religion, which maintained itself in Mesopotomia and Babylonia, the

abode of the Ophites, Perates, Mand�ans, until the post-Christian

centuries, and was now opposed by the Gentiles in a mystical-ascetical

form to Christianity." The close connection of the Mand�ans with the

Ophites, and of both with the old Babylonian religion, would seem to be

established beyond question. The relation of Manich�ism to Mand�ism

has been by no means so clearly shown. Let us look at some of the

supposed points of contact. Mani's connection with the Mugtasilah sect

(or Baptizers) has already been mentioned. Kessler seeks to identify

this party with the Mand�ans, or at least to establish a community of

origin and of fundamental principles in the two parties. He would

connect with the old Babylonian sect, of which ceremonial baptism seems

to have been a common characteristic, the Palestinian Hemero-baptists,

Elkesaites, Nazareans, Ebionites, etc. There is nothing improbable

about this supposition. Certainly we find elements in Palestinian

heresy during the early Christian centuries, which we can hardly

suppose to have been indigenous. And there is no more likely source of

occult religious influence than Babylonia, unless it be Egypt, and

there is much reason for supposing that even in Alexandria Babylonian

influences were active before and after the beginning of the Christian

era. Besides, a large number of Gnostic elements different from these

can be traced to Egypt. How far the Mand�ans of modern times, and as

they are described in extant literature, correspond with

representatives of the old Babylonian religion in the third century,

cannot be determined with complete certainty. Yet there is much about

this party that has a primitive appearance, and the tenacity with which

it has held aloof from Judaism, Manich�ism, Mohammedanism, and Oriental

Christianity, during centuries of conflict and oppression, says much

for its conservatism. It would extend this chapter unduly to describe

the elaborate cosmogony, mythology, hierarchy, ceremonial, etc., of

this interesting party. For the illustration of Christian Gnosticism

the facts that have been brought out are of the utmost value. As

compared with Manich�ism, there is a remarkable parallelism between the

two kingdoms and their subordinates or �ons; the conflict between

Primordial Man and the King of Darkness has its counterpart in

Mand�ism. The close connection of the Mand�an and the Manich�an

cosmogony, together with similar views about water in the two parties,

would make it highly probable that the Manich�ans, like the Mand�ans,

practised some kind of ceremonial ablutions.

What, now, are the grounds on which the connection of these systems

with the old Babylonian religion is based? The dualistic element in

the old Babylonian system was pointed out above. Kessler seeks to

establish an almost complete parallelism between the Mand�an and

Manich�an cosmological and mythological systems on the one hand, and

the old Babylonian on the other. That there are points of striking

resemblance it is certain. There is ground to suspect, however, that

he has been led by partiality for a theory of his own to minimize

unduly the Zoroastrian and Buddhist influence and to magnify unduly the

old Babylonian. Be that as it may, there remains an important residuum

of solid fact which must be taken account of by all future students of

Manich�ism. There is reason to hope that future work along the lines

of Kessler's researches will bring to light much additional material.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter VI.-- The Relation of Manich�ism to Buddhism.

The extent of Mani's dependence on Buddhism is a matter that has been

much disputed. The attention of scholars was first directed to this

possible source of Manich�ism by the discovery of important features

that are radically opposed to Zoroastrianism, Judaism and Christianity,

and by the traditional historical connection of Mani with India and

Turkestan. The antagonism of spirit and matter, of light and darkness,

the mixture of spirit and light with matter and darkness in the

formation of the world, the final catastrophe in which complete

simplicity shall be re-established, only inert matter and darkness

remaining to represent the Kingdom of Darkness, abstinence from bloody

sacrifices, from marriage, from killing or eating animals--points in

which Manich�ism differs widely from the other systems with which it

stands historically related--find their counterpart in Buddhism. It is

certain, moreover, that they were fully developed in Buddhism centuries

before the time of Mani. Baur, [11] though not the first to suggest a

connection of the two systems, was the first to show by a somewhat

detailed comparison the close parallelism that exists between

Manich�ism and Buddhism. Baur's reasonings were still further

elaborated and confirmed by Neander. [12] External grounds in favor

of Mani's dependence on Buddhism are the traditions of Mani's journey

to India and China, and of his prolonged stay in Turkestan, where

Buddhism flourished at that time. But it is on internal grounds that

we chiefly rely.

If space permitted we could illustrate the close parallelism that

undoubtedly exists between Manich�ism and Buddhism, from Buddhist

documents which have been made accessible through Professor Max M�ller

and his collaborators in The Sacred Book of the East, far more

completely than was possible to Baur and Neander. It is certain that

parallels can be found in Buddhism for almost every feature of

Manich�ism that is sharply antagonistic to Zoroastrianism. The

Buddhist view of matter as antagonistic to spirit is fundamental. It

is the world of matter that deludes. It is the body and its passions

that prevent the longed-for Nirvana. Buddhist asceticism is the direct

outgrowth of the doctrine of the evil and delusive nature of matter.

The Buddhist doctrine of metempsychosis has its precise counterpart in

Manich�ism, but it should be said that this doctrine was widely

diffused in the West, through Pythagoreanism, before the time of Mani.

The Buddhist tenderness for animal and plant life is paralleled by the

Manich�an. But there is considerable difference between the views on

which this tenderness is based. The Buddhist feeling was based, in

part at least, upon the doctrine of metempsychosis, animals and plants

being regarded as the abodes of human spirits awaiting their release

into Nirvana. The Manich�an looked upon the elements of light (life)

contained in animals and plants as particles of God, and any injury

done to them as a hindrance to the escape of these elements, to be

conveyed away into the Kingdom of Light. Both looked upon sexual

intercourse as among the greatest of evils, though the theory in the

two cases was slightly different. So of the drinking of wine, the

eating of animal food, etc. The final state was conceived of in

substantially the same way in the two systems. Nirvana, the blowing

out of man's life as an individual entity, is quite paralleled by the

Manich�an view of the gradual escape of the imprisoned particles of

light into the Kingdom of Light. In both cases the divine pleroma is

to be restored in such a way as to destroy individual consciousness.

The Buddhist Bhikkhus (or ascetical monks) correspond very closely with

the Manich�an Truthful Ones (Elect), and the relations of these to

ordinary adherents of the parties was much the same in the two cases.

Both systems (like Christianity) had the proselyting spirit fully

developed. The position of Mani as a preacher or prophet corresponds

with the Buddhist idea of the manifestations of Buddha. The statement

is attributed to Mani that "as Buddha came in the land of India,

Zoroaster in the land of Persia, and Jesus in the land of the West, so

at last in the epoch of the present this preaching came through me

[Mani] in the land of Babylonia." In the interest of his theory, which

makes the old Babylonian religion the chief source of Manich�ism,

Kessler has attempted to detract from the significance of the Buddhist

influence. Yet he grants that the morality of the Manich�ans

(including many of the features mentioned above) was Buddhist. The

close connection of the two systems cannot, it would seem, be

successfully gainsaid. [13]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[11] Das Manich�ische Religionssystem, p. 433 sq.

[12] Church Hist. vol. I.

[13] Cunningham, St. Austin and his Place in the History of Christian

Thought (1886), has these remarks on the relation of Mani to Buddhism:

"Mani was indeed a religious reformer: deeply impregnated with the

belief and practice which Buddhist monks were spreading in the East, he

tried with some success to reform the religion of Zoroaster in Persia

[i.e. the Persian Empire], his native land. While his fundamental

doctrine, the root of his system, was of Persian origin, and he figured

the universe to himself as if it were given over to the unending

conflict between the Powers of Light and Darkness, in regard to

discipline his system very closely resembles that founded by Buddha;

the elect of the Manich�ans correspond to the Buddhist monks: the

precepts about abstinence from meat and things of sense are, if not

borrowed from the rules Gotama gave for the conduct of his followers,

the outcome of the same principles about the nature of man." Harnack,

art. Manich�ism in Ency. Britannica, follows Kessler in attaching

slight importance to the Buddhist influence on Manich�ism, preferring,

with him, to derive nearly all of the features ascribed by Baur,

Neander and others to Buddhist influence, to the old Babylonian

religion, the precise character of which, in the time of Mani, is

imperfectly understood. Harnack's (and Kessler's) statements must

therefore be taken with some allowance. There is no objection,

however, to supposing that Mani derived from the old Babylonian party

or parties with which he came in contact religious principles which

were wrought out in detail under the influence of Buddhism. This is in

fact what probably occurred.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter VII.--The Relation of Manich�ism to Judaism.

So far as a relation existed it was one of the intensest hostility.

Like the Gnostics in general, Manich�ism looked upon the God of the Old

Testament as an evil, or at least imperfect being. On this matter we

do not learn so much from the Oriental as from the Western sources, but

even from the former the radical antagonism is manifest.

The statement in the Fihrist's narrative, that "Mani treated all the

prophets disparagingly in his books, degraded them, accused them of

lying, and maintained that devils had possessed them and that these

spoke out of their mouths; nay, he goes so far as expressly to assert

in some passages of his books that the prophets were themselves

devils," is precisely in the line of the later Manich�an polemics

against the Judaistic element in Christianity.

The Manich�an account of the creation shows some acquaintance with the

Jewish Scriptures or with Jewish tradition, yet the complete perversion

of the Biblical account is one of the clearest indications of

hostility. It may be said in general that it is impossible to conceive

of two systems of religion that have less in common, or more that is

sharply antagonistic. One of the principal points of controversy

between Manich�ans and Christians was the defense of the Jewish

Scriptures and religion by the latter. The Manich�an demanded the

elimination from the current Christianity, and from the New Testament

itself, of every vestige of Judaism. Their objections to the Old

Testament Scriptures and religion were in general substantially the

same as those made by other Gnostics, especially by the Marcionites.

The Old Testament anthropomorphic representations seem to have been

offensive to them, notwithstanding their own crude conceptions of the

conflict between light and darkness, of the creation, etc. The

relation of God to the conquest of Canaan is a point that those

inclined to cavil have never failed to make the most of. The Old

Testament encouragement of race propagation, the narratives of polygamy

as practised by those that enjoyed the favor of the God of the Old

Testament, the seeming approval of prevarication in several well-known

cases, the institution of animal sacrifices, the allowing of the use of

animal food, were among the standard objections that they raised

against Judaism and against Christians who accepted the Old Testament.

Judaism had, since the captivity, had many representatives in

Mesopotamia, and Mani was doubtless brought up to abominate the Jews.

Some of his extreme positions may have been primarily due to his

radical anti-Judaistic tendencies. We shall see hereafter how Augustin

met the Manich�an objections to the Old Testament.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter VIII.--The Relation of Manich�ism to Christianity.

Far more superficial are the relations of Manich�ism to Christianity

than to any of the heathen systems to which we have adverted. In fact

no Christian idea has been introduced into the system without being

completely perverted. If Christian language is used, it is utterly

emptied of its meaning. If Christian practices are introduced, a

completely different motive lies at the basis. Indeed the wildest of

the Christian Gnostic systems kept immeasurably nearer to historical

Christianity than did the Manich�ans. While he blasphemed against the

historical Jesus, Mani claimed to believe in Christ, a purely spiritual

and divine manifestation, whose teachings had been sadly perverted by

the Jews. It is scarcely possible to determine with any certainty what

view Mani actually took of New Testament history. That he claimed to

be a follower of Christ, and the Paraclete whom Christ had promised to

send, or at least the organ of the Paraclete, Eastern and Western

authorities agree. Mani is said, by Augustin, to have begun his

Fundamental Epistle as follows: "Manich�us, an Apostle of Jesus

Christ, by the providence of God the Father. These are wholesome words

from the perennial and living fountain." So also in the Act. Archel.,

Mani is represented as introducing a letter: "Manich�us, an Apostle of

Jesus Christ, and all the saints who are with me, and the virgins, to

Marcellus, my beloved son: Grace, mercy, and peace be with you from

God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ." There can be no doubt

but that Mani and his followers, whether from designed imposture or

from less sinister motives, attempted to palm themselves off as

Christians, nay, as the only true Christians. It is certain, moreover,

that in this guise they gained many proselytes from the Christian

ranks. As previously remarked, Mani and his followers professed to

accept the New Testament Scriptures, yet they treated them in a purely

subjective manner, eliminating as Judaistic interpolation whatever they

could not reconcile with their own tenets. Their adherence to the New

Testament, as well as their adherence to Christ, was, therefore,

virtually a mere pretence. In common with Christianity, Manich�ism

laid much stress on redemption, yet there was nothing in common between

the Christian idea of redemption through the atoning suffering of Jesus

Christ and the Manich�an notion of redemption through the escape of

imprisoned light. Manich�ans and Christians were at one in advocating

self-denial and the due subordination of the flesh. It need not be

pointed out how radically different the Christian view was from the

Manich�an view, already expounded. Yet pagan ascetical ideas had

already invaded the Church long before the time of Mani, and many

Christians were in a position to be attracted strongly by the Manich�an

theory and practice. The later asceticism as it appeared in the hermit

life of the fourth and following centuries was essentially pagan and

had much in common with the Manich�an. Still more manifest is the

anatagonism between Manich�ism and Christianity on the great

fundamental principles of religion. The Manich�an and Christian ideas

of God are mutually contradictory. Christianity holds fast at the same

time to the unity, the omnipotence, the omniscience, the perfect

wisdom, the holiness and the goodness of God. If He permits sin to

exist in the world it is not because He looks upon it with complacency,

nor because He lacked wisdom to provide against its rise or power to

annihilate it at once when it appeared, nor because He did not foresee

its rise and its ravages, but because the permission of sin forms part

of His all-wise plan for the education of moral and spiritual beings.

If the forces of nature are under certain circumstances hurtful or

destructive to man, Christianity does not regard them as the operations

of a malevolent power thwarting God's purposes, but it sees underneath

the destructive violence purposes of goodness and of grace; or if it

fails to see them in any given instance it yet believes that God doeth

all things well. Christianity admits the existence of evil in men and

in demons, yet of evil that ministers to the purposes of the Most

High. Christianity is the only religion that has been able to arrive

at a perfectly satisfactory theology, cosmology, anthropology, and

eschatology, and this is because Christianity alone has a true and

satisfying soteriology. It is God manifest in the flesh that meets all

the conditions for the solution of the problem of human existence.

Manich�ism openly antagonized Christianity in its adherence to Old

Testament revelation, including the Jewish and Christian monotheism.

The good God could not, they maintained, be the creator of this world

and of the universe of being. That God should be looked upon as in any

sense the creator of the devil and his angels, and of the material

world, was in their view an absurdity--a monstrosity. The unchristian

character of the Manich�an view of matter, leading to unchristian

asceticism, has already been sufficiently indicated. The reader will

only need to compare the principles and practices of Manich�ism, as

delineated above, with those of Christianity as they are delineated in

the New Testament and in the evangelical churches of to-day, to be

impressed with the completely anti-Christian character of the former.

How then, it may well be asked, could Manich�ism succeed as it did in

fascinating so many intelligent members of the Catholic Church during

the third, fourth and fifth centuries? In attempting to answer this

question it should be premised that the later Western Manich�ism took

far more account of historical Christianity than did Mani and his

immediate followers. In the West, at least, Manich�ism set itself up

as the only genuine exponent of Christianity. The Jewish-Alexandrian

philosophy, and Gnosticism its product, had done much towards

discrediting the Old Testament Scriptures, and the moral and religious

teachings therein contained. Devout Jewish and Christian thinkers who

had adopted this mode of thought, had attempted by means of the

allegorical method of interpretation to reconcile the seeming

antagonism between Judaism and philosophy. But the process was so

forced that its results could not be expected to satisfy those that

felt no special interest in the removal of the difficulties.

Marcionism represents a stern refusal to apply the allegory, and a

determination to exhibit the antagonism between Judaism and current

thought, and especially the seeming antagonism between Judaism and

Christianity, in the harshest manner. Marcionism was still vigorous in

the East when Manich�ism arose, and through this party unfavorable

views of the Old Testament were widely disseminated. Many Christians

doubtless felt that the Old Testament and its religion were burdensome

and trammelling to Christianity. The very fact that Mani set aside so

summarily every element of Judaism that he encountered in the current

Christianity, doubtless commended his views to a large and influential

element in the East and the West alike. Mani claimed to set forth a

spiritual religion as opposed to a carnal. The asceticism of

Manich�ism was in the line of a wide-spread popular ascetical movement

that was already in progress, and so commended it to many. The

question as to the origin of evil, and as to the relation of the good,

wise and powerful God to the evil that appears in the world, in man and

in demons was never asked with more interest than during the early

Christian centuries, and any party that should advance a moderately

plausible theory was sure to receive its share of public attention.

Mani professed to have a solution and the only possible solution of

questions of this class, and however fantastic may have been the forms

in which his speculations were set forth, they were doubtless all the

more acceptable on this account in that semi-pagan age to many

intelligent people. The fact that these forms satisfied so able a

thinker as Mani undoubtedly was, would guarantee their acceptance by a

large number both East and West. There was in the West at this time,

and had been for centuries, a hankering after Oriental theosophy, the

more extravagant the better. The wide-spread worship of Mithra was an

excellent preparation for the more complete system of Mani. Manich�ism

and Neo-Platonism antagonized the Christianity of the fourth and fifth

centuries from opposite sides, and those minds for whom Platonism had

no charms were almost sure to be attracted by the theosophy of Mani.

"How are we to explain," asks Harnack, [14] "the rapid spread of

Manich�ism, and the fact that it really became one of the great

religions? Our answer is, that Manich�ism was the most complete

Gnosis, the richest, most consequent and most artistic system formed on

the basis of the ancient Babylonian religion.... What gave strength to

Manich�ism was... that it united its ancient mythology and a

thorough-going materialistic dualism with an exceedingly simple

spiritual worship and a strict morality. On comparing it with the

Semitic religions of nature, we perceive that it retained their

mythologies, after transforming them into doctrines, but abolished all

their sensuous cultus, substituting instead a spiritual worship as well

as a strict morality. Manich�ism was thus able to satisfy the new

wants of an old world. It offered revelation, redemption, moral

virtue, and immortality [this last is very doubtful, if conscious

immortality be meant], spiritual benefits on the basis of the religion

of nature. A further source of strength lay in the simple, yet firm

social organization which was given by Mani himself to his new

institution. The wise man and the ignorant, the enthusiast and the man

of the world, could all find acceptance here, and there was laid on no

one more than he was able and willing to bear."

The question as to the secret of the fascination that Manich�ism was

able to exercise even over the most intelligent Western minds, may

receive a more concrete answer from the autobiographical account of

Augustin's own relations to the party. What was it that attracted and

enthralled, for nine years, him who was to become the greatest

theologian of the age? In his Confessions (Book III. ch. 6) he gives

this impassioned account of his first connection with Manich�ism:

"Therefore I fell among men proudly railing, very carnal and voluble,

in whose mouth were the snares of the devil--the bird lime being

composed of a mixture of the syllables of Thy Name, and of our Lord

Jesus Christ, and of the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, the Comforter.

These names departed not out of their mouths, but so far forth as the

sound and clatter of the tongue; for the heart was empty of truth.

Still they cried Truth, Truth,' and spoke much about it to me, yet it

was not in them, but they spake falsely not of Thee only--who, verily

art the Truth--but also of the elements of this world, Thy creatures...

O Truth, Truth! how inwardly even then did the marrow of my soul pant

after Thee, when they frequently and in a multiplicity of ways, and in

numerous and huge books, sounded out Thy Name to me, though it was but

a voice. And these were the dishes in which to me, hungering for Thee,

they, instead of Thee, served up the sun and the moon, Thy beauteous

works--but yet Thy works, not Thyself, nay, nor Thy first works...Woe,

woe, by what steps was I dragged down to the depths of hell!--toiling

and turmoiling through want of Truth, when I sought after Thee, my

God,--to Thee I confess it, who hadst mercy on me when I had not yet

confessed, sought after Thee not according to the understanding of the

mind in which Thou desiredst that I should excel the beasts, but

according to the sense of the flesh."
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[14] Encyclop�dia Britannica, art. Manich�ism.
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Chapter IX.--Augustin and the Manich�ans.

In the preceding Chapter we have given in Augustin's own words some

account of the process by which he became ensnared in Manich�an error.

In reading Augustin's account of his experience among the Manich�ans,

we can not escape the conviction that he was never wholly a Manich�an,

that he never surrendered himself absolutely to the system. He held it

rather as a matter of opinion than as a matter of heart-attachment.

Doubtless the fact that he continued to occupy himself with rhetorical

and philosophical studies prevented his complete enthrallment. His

mind was not naturally of an Oriental cast, and the study of the hard,

common-sense philosophy of Aristotle, and of the Eclecticism of Cicero,

could hardly have failed to make him more or less conscious of the

absurdity of Manich�ism. The influence of scientific studies on his

mind is very manifest from Confessions, Book V. ch. 3, where he

compares the accurate astronomical knowledge with which he had become

acquainted, with the absurd cosmological fancies of Faustus, the great

Manich�an teacher who appeared at Carthage in Augustin's twenty-ninth

year. "Many truths, however, concerning the creation did I retain from

these men [the philosophers], and the cause appeared to confirm

calculations, the succession of seasons, and the visible manifestations

of the stars; and I compared them with the sayings of Manich�us, who in

his frenzy has written most extensively on these subjects, but

discovered not any account either of the solstices, or the equinoxes,

the eclipses of the luminaries, or anything of the kind I had learned

in the books of secular philosophy. But therein I was ordered to

believe, and yet it corresponded not with those rules acknowledged by

calculation and by our light, but was far different."

From this time Augustin's faith was shaken, and he was soon able to

throw off completely the yoke that had become too grievous to be

borne. But to reject Manich�ism was not necessarily to become an

orthodox Christian. Augustin finds himself still greatly perplexed

about the nature of God and the origin of evil, problems the somewhat

plausible Manich�an solutions of which had ensnared him. It was

through Platonism, or rather Neo-Platonism, that he was led to more

just and satisfying views, and through Platonism, along with other

influences, he was enabled at last to find peace in the bosom of the

Catholic church. "And Thou, willing to show me how Thou resistest the

proud, but givest grace unto the humble,' and by how great an act of

mercy Thou hadst pointed out to men the path of humility, in that Thy

Word was made flesh and dwelt among men,'--Thou procuredst for me, by

the instrumentality of one inflated with monstrous pride, certain books

of the Platonists, translated from Greek into Latin. And therein I

read not indeed in the same words but to the self-same effect, enforced

by many and divers reasons, that 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 by Him; and without Him was not

anything made that was made.'" [15] In other words, Augustin thought

that he discerned complete harmony between the prologue of John's

gospel and the teachings of the Platonists, and in this teaching, thus

corroborated, he found the solution of the problem that had caused him

such anguish of soul. In this connection Augustin points out in some

detail the features that Platonism and Christianity have in common.

Thus Neo-Platonism, not blindly followed, but adapted to his Christian

purpose, became not only a means of deliverance to Augustin himself,

but a mighty weapon for the combating of Manich�an error.

Neo-Platonism enters so largely and influentially into Augustin's

polemics against Manich�ism that it will be apposite here to inquire

into the extent and the nature of Augustin's dependence on this system

of thought. Much has been written on this subject, especially by

German and French scholars. A brief statement of some of the more

important points of contact is all that is allowable in an essay like

this. Premising, therefore, that Platonism essentially influenced the

entire circle of Augustin's theological and philosophical thinking, let

us first examine the Neo-Platonic and Augustinian conceptions of God.

With Augustin God is absolutely simple and immutable, incomprehensible

by men in their present state of existence, exalted above all human

powers of thought or expression. All things may be said of God, and

yet nothing worthily; God is honored more by reverential silence than

by any human voice. He is better known by not being known; it is

easier to say what He is not, than what He is. God is wanting in

qualities; has no variety and multitude of properties and attributes;

is absolutely simple. By no means is God to be called substance, for

the word substance pertains to a certain accident; nor is it allowable

to think of Him as composed of substance and of accidents. Divine

qualities are therefore purely subjective. There is no discrimination

in God of substance and accidents, of potency and act, of matter and

form, of universal and singular, of superior and inferior. To know, to

will, to do, to be, are in God equivalent and identical. Eternity

itself is the substance of God, which has nothing mutable, nothing

past, nothing future. God makes new things, without being Himself new,

unchangeable He makes changeable things, He always works and always

rests. The changes that take place in the world do not fall in the

will of God, but solely in the things moved by God. God changes them

out of His unchangeable counsel. For nearly every one of these

statements an almost exact parallel can be pointed out in the writings

of Plotinus, the Neo-Platonic writer with whom Augustin was most

conversant. [16] It would be easy to point out that Augustin here

goes to a dangerous extreme, and narrowly escapes fatalism on the one

hand, and denial of the true personality of God on the other. But the

effectiveness of this type of teaching against Manich�ism is what

chiefly interests us in this connection. Readers of the following

treatises will have no difficulty in seeing for themselves how

confidently and with what telling effect Augustin employs this view of

God against the crudities of Manich�ism, which thought of God as

mutable, as capable of being successfully assailed by evil, as rent

asunder, as suffering miserable contamination and imprisonment by

mixture with matter, as painfully struggling for freedom, as suffering

with the suffering of plants and animals, as liberated by their decay

and by the digestive operations of the faithful, etc., etc.

Again, while still a Manich�an Augustin had thought and written much

about beauty. On this point also, the throwing off of Manich�ism and

the adoption of a Platonizing Christianity brought about a revolution

in his conceptions. The exactness with which he has followed Plotinus

in his ideas of the beauty of God and of his creatures is remarkable.

This we could fully illustrate by the citation of parallel passages.

But we must content ourselves with remarking that Augustin himself

acknowledged his indebtedness, and that his idea of beauty was an

important factor in his polemics against Manich�ism. According to

Augustin (and Plotinus) God is the most beautiful and splendid of all

beings. He is the beauty of all beauties; all the beautiful things

that are the objects of our vision and love He Himself made. If these

are beautiful what is He? All beauty is from the highest beauty, which

is God. Augustin follows Plato and Plotinus even in neglecting the

distinction between the good and the beautiful. The idea of Divine

beauty Augustin applies to Christ also. He speaks of Him as beautiful

God, beautiful Word with God, beautiful on earth, beautiful in the

womb, beautiful in the hands of his parents, beautiful in miracles,

beautiful in being scourged, beautiful when inciting to life, beautiful

when not caring for death, beautiful when laying down his life,

beautiful when taking it up again, beautiful in the sepulchre,

beautiful in Heaven. The beauty of the creation, which is simply a

reflection of the beauty of God, is not even disturbed by evil or sin.

Beauty is with Augustin (and the Platonists) a comprehensive term, and

is almost equivalent to perfect harmony or symmetry of parts, perfect

adaptation of beings to the ends for which they exist.

It is patent that this view of the beauty of God and His creation is

diametrically opposed to the crude conceptions of Mani, with reference

to the disorder of the universe, a disorder not confined even to the

Kingdom of Darkness, but invading the Realm of light itself. So also

Augustin's Platonizing views of the creation must be taken into

consideration in judging of his attitude towards Manich�ism. It goes

without saying that from Augustin's theological point of view, to

account for creation is a matter of grave difficulty. How can there be

a relation between the infinite and the finite? Any substantial

connection is unthinkable. The only thing left is a relation of

causality. The finite, according to Plotinus, is an accident, an image

and shadow of God. It is constituted, established, sustained, and

nourished by the Divine potency, and is therefore absolutely dependent

upon God. The power that flows from God permeates each and every

finite thing. God as one, whole, and indivisible, is perpetually

present with his eternal process, to everything, everywhere. When

Augustin teaches that God of his own free will, subject to no

necessity, by His own Word created the world out of nothing, this

statement might be taken in connection with his view of the absolute

simplicity of God and the consequent denial of distinction between

being, willing, doing, etc. The easiest way to get over the difficulty

involved in creation was to maintain the simultaneous creation of all

things. The six days of creation in Genesis are an accommodation to

human modes of thinking. In some expressions Augustin approaches the

Platonic doctrine of the ideal or archetypal world. Finite things, so

far as they exist, are essence, i.e., God; so far as they are not

essence they do not exist at all. Thus the distinction between God and

the world is almost obliterated. Again, whatever is finite and

derivative is subject to negation or nothingness. Thus he goes along

with Plato and Plotinus to the verge of denying the reality of derived

existence, and so narrowly escapes pantheism.

It is easy to see how effectively this conception of creation might be

employed against the Manich�an notion of the creation as something

forced upon God by the powers of evil, and as a mere expedient for the

gradual liberation of his imprisoned elements. The Manich�an

limitation of God and his domain by the bordering Kingdom of Darkness,

was in sheer opposition to Augustin's view of the indivisibility of God

and his presence as a whole everywhere and always. Augustin's theory

that nature or essence, as far as it has existence is God, is quite the

antithesis of Mani's dualism, especially of his supposition that the

Kingdom of Darkness is essentially and wholly evil. Augustin argued

that even the inhabitants of the Kingdom of Darkness, and the King of

Darkness himself, according to Mani's own representations, are good so

far as they have essence or nature, and evil only so far as they are

non-existent.

With Augustin's Platonizing view of creation is closely connected his

theory of evil and his doctrine of divine providence. Evil with him,

as with the Platonists, has no substantial existence. It is only

privation of good. It is wanting in essence, substance, truth,--is in

short mere negation, and so cannot have God for its efficient cause or

author, or be referred to God. God would not have permitted evil

unless by His own supreme power he had been able to make good use of

it. He attempts, with some success, to show the advantages of the

permission of evil in the world. God made all things good from the

angels of heaven to the lowest beasts and herbs of the earth. Augustin

delighted, with the Platonists, in dwelling upon the goodness of nature

as shown in the animal and vegetable worlds, as well as in the great

cosmical phenomena. Each creature of God has its place, some a higher,

some a lower, but all so far as they conform to the idea of their

creation, or to their nature, are good. So far as they fall short of

this idea they are evil.

This principle Augustin applied with great force to the confutation of

the Manich�an view of the substantiality and permanence of evil. This

may be regarded as the central point in Augustin's controversies with

the Manich�ans. He evidently felt that the Manich�an view of evil was

the citadel of their system, and he never wearied of assailing it. It

would be beyond the scope of the present essay to inquire whether and

how far Augustin himself became involved in error, in his efforts to

dislodge the Manich�ans. Far less satisfactory than his confutation of

the fundamental principles of the Manich�an system were his answers to

the Manich�an cavils against the Old Testament. If we may judge from

the prominence given in the extant literature to the Old Testament

question, this must have been the favorite point of attack with the

Manich�ans. The importance of the questions raised and the necessity

of answering them was fully recognized by Augustin. His principal

reliance is the allegorical or typological method of interpretation.

It would be hard to find examples of more perverse allegorizing than

Augustin's Anti-Manich�an treatises furnish. It will not be needful to

adduce instances here, as readers of the treatises will discover them

in abundance. Nothing more wearisome and disgusting in Biblical

interpretation can well be conceived of than certain sections of The

Reply to Faustus, the Manich�an. Yet Augustin did not fail entirely to

recognize the distinction between Old Testament times and New, and he

even suggests the theory "that God could in a former age and to a

people of a lower moral standard, give commands to do actions, which we

should think it wrong to do now.... There was a certain inward want, an

unenlightenment, a rudeness of moral conception, in those to whom such

commands were given; otherwise they would not have been given. God

would not have given a command to slaughter a whole nation to an

enlightened people." [17]

Yet with all the defects of Augustin's polemics against the Manich�ans,

they seem to have been adapted to the needs of the time. Well does

Canon Mozley declare Augustin to have been "the most marvellous

controversial phenomenon which the whole history of the Church from

first to last presents.... Armed with superabundant facility of

expression,--so that he himself observes that one who had written so

much must have a good deal to answer for,--he was able to hammer any

point of view which he wanted, and which was desirable as a

counteracting one to a pervading heresy, with endless repetition upon

the ear of the Church; at the same time varying the forms of speech

sufficiently to please and enliven." Certainly he was one of the

greatest debaters of any age. He doubtless deserves the credit of

completely checking the progress of Manich�ism in the West, and of

causing its gradual but almost complete overthrow. His arguments were

probably more effective in guarding Christians against perversion by

Manich�an proselytizers, than in converting those that were already

ensnared by Manich�an error. Other controversies of a completely

different character, especially the Pelagian, caused Augustin to look

to other aspects of truth and so led to certain modifications in his

own statements, nay led him on some occasions to the verge of Manich�an

error itself. But we are chiefly interested at present in knowing that

his earnest efforts against the Manich�ans from A.D. 388, the year of

his baptism, to A.D. 405, were not in vain. [18]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[15] Confessions, Book. VII. ch. 9, vol. 1. p. 108, of the present

series.

[16] See G. Loesche: De Augustino Plotinizante in Doctrina de Deo

Disserenda, Jen�, 1880. Also, Dorner: Augustinus, Zeller, Ueberweg,

Ritter, and Erdmann: Histories of Philosophy, sections on Augustin and

Neo-Platonism.

[17] See J. B. Mozley's Ruling Ideas in Early Ages, art. The Manich�ans

and the Jewish Fathers. The sentence quoted above is Mozley's.

[18] For an account of the controversies in which Augustin was engaged

with the Manich�ans, and for the chronological order of the

Anti-Manich�an treatises, see the Preface of the Edinburgh editor. Cf.

Bindemann, on the various controversies, in his Der h. Augustinus,

passim. See also, a good chronological list of St. Augustin's works in

Cunningham: St. Austin, p. 277 sq.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter X.--Outline of Manich�an History. [19]

In the East Mani's followers were involved in the persecution that

resulted in his death, and many of them fled to Transoxiania. Their

headquarters and the residence of the chief of the sect continued to be

Babylon. They returned to Persia in 661, but were driven back,

908-32. They seem to have become very numerous in the Transoxiania.

Alb�r�n�, 973-1048, speaks of the Manich�ans as still existing in large

numbers throughout all Mohammedan lands, and especially in the region

of Samarkand, where they were known as Sabeans. He also relates that

they were prevalent among the Eastern Turks, in China, Thibet and

India. In Armenia and Cappadocia they gained many followers, and

thence made their way into Europe. The Paulicians are commonly

represented as a Manich�an party, but the descriptions that have come

down to us would seem to indicate Marcionitic rather than Manich�an

elements. Yet contemporary Catholic writers such as Peter Siculus and

Photius constantly assail them as Manich�ans.

In the West we have traces of their existence from 287 onwards.

Diocletian, according to a somewhat doubtful tradition, condemned its

leaders to the stake, and its adherents to decapitation with

confiscation of goods. The edict is supposed to have been directed to

the pro-consul of Africa where Manich�ans were making great progress.

According to an early account, Mani sent a special envoy to Africa.

Valentinian (372) and Theodosius (381) issued bloody edicts against

them, yet we find them still aggressive in the time of Augustin. From

Africa Manich�ism spread into Spain, Gaul and Aquitaine. Leo the Great

and Valentinian III. took measures against them in Italy (440 sq.).

They appear, however, to have continued their work, for Gregory the

Great mentions them (590 sq.). From this time onwards their influence

is to be traced in such parties as the Euchites, Enthusiasts,

Bogomiles, Catharists, Beghards, etc. But it is not safe to attach too

much importance to the mere fact that these parties were stigmatized as

Manich�ans by their enemies. Even in the Reformation time and since,

individuals and small parties have appeared which in some features

strongly resembled the ancient Manich�ans. Manich�ism was a product of

the East, and in the East it met with most acceptance. To the spirit

of the West it was altogether foreign, and only in a greatly modified

form could it ever have flourished there. It might persist for

centuries as a secret society, but it could not endure the light.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[19] Compare Professor George T. Stokes' excellent article Manich�ans,

in Smith and Wace: Dict. of Chr. Biography, vol. III. p. 798 sq.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Preface to the Anti-Manich�an Writings.

------------------------

No reader of the accompanying volume can be expected to take a very

lively interest in its contents, unless he has before his mind some

facts regarding the extraordinary genius to whom the heresy of

Manich�ism owes its origin and its name. His history is involved in

considerable obscurity, owing to the suspicious nature of the documents

from which it is derived, and the difficulty of constructing a

consistent and probable account out of the contradictory statements of

the Asiatics and the Greeks. The ascertained facts, therefore, are

few, and may be briefly stated. [20]

According to the Chronicle of Edessa, Mani was born A.D. 240. [21]

From his original name, Corbicius or Carcubius, Beausobre conjectures

that he was born in Carcub, a town of Chald�a. He belonged to a Magian

family, and while still a youth won a distinguished place among the

sages of Persia. He was master of all the lore peculiar to his class,

and was, besides, so proficient a mathematician and geographer, that he

was able to construct a globe. He was a skilled musician, and had some

knowledge of the Greek language,--an accomplishment rare among his

countrymen. But his fame, and even his ultimate success as a teacher,

was due in great measure to his skill in painting, which was so

considerable as to earn for him among the Persians the distinctive

title, Mani the painter. His disposition was ardent and lively but

patient and self-restrained. His appearance was striking, as he wore

the usual dress of a Persian sage: the high-soled shoes, the one red,

the other green; the mantle of azure blue, that changed color as he

moved; the ebony staff in his right hand, and the Babylonish book under

his left arm.

The meaning of his name, Mani, Manes, or Manich�us, has been the

subject of endless conjectures. Epiphanius supposes that he was

providentially so named, that men might be warned against the mania of

his heresy. [22] Hyde, whose opinion on any Oriental subject must

have weight, tells us that in Persian mani means painter, and that he

was so called from his profession. Archbishop Usher conjectured that

it was a form of Manaem or Menahem, which means Paraclete or Comforter;

founding this conjecture on the fact that Sulpicius Severus calls the

Israelitish king Menahem, [23] Mane. Gataker supplements this idea by

the conjecture that Mani took this name at his own instance, and in

pursuance of his claim to be the Paraclete. It is more probable that,

if his name was really given on account of this meaning, he received it

from the widow who seems to have adopted him when a boy, and may have

called him her Consolation. But it is also possible that Mani was not

an uncommon Persian name, and that he adopted it for some reason too

trifling to discover. [24]

While still a young man he was ordained as a Christian priest, and

distinguished himself in that capacity by his knowledge of Scripture,

and the zeal with which he discharged his sacred functions. [25] His

heretical tendencies, however, were very soon manifested, stimulated,

we may suppose, by his anxiety to make the Christian religion more

acceptable to those who adhered to the Eastern systems. Excommunicated

from the Christian Church, Mani found asylum with Sapor, and won his

confidence by presenting only the Magian side of his system. But no

sooner did he permit the Christian element to appear, and call himself

the apostle of the Lord, and show a desire to reform Magianism, than

his sovereign determined to put him to death as a revolutionist.

Forced to flee, he took refuge in Turkestan, and gained influence

there, partly by decorating the temples with paintings. To lend his

doctrines the appearance of divine authority, he adopted the same

device as Zoroaster and Mohammed. Having discovered a cave through

which there ran a rill of water, he laid up in it a store of

provisions, and retired there for a year, giving out that he was on a

visit to heaven. In this retirement he produced his Gospel, [26] --a

work illustrated with symbolical drawings the ingenuity of which has

been greatly praised. This book Mani presented to Hormizdas, the son

and successor of Sapor, who professed himself favorable to his

doctrine, and even built him a castle as a place of shelter and

retirement. Unfortunately for Mani, Hormizdas died in the second year

of his reign; and though his successor, Varanes, was at first willing

to shield him from persecution, yet, finding that the Magians were

alarmed for their religion, he appointed a disputation to be held

between the opposing parties. Such trials of dialectic in Eastern

courts have not unfrequently resulted in very serious consequences to

the parties engaged in them. In this instance the result was fatal to

Mani. Worsted in argument, he was condemned to die, and thus perished

in some sense as a martyr. The mode of his death is uncertain, [27]

but it seems that his skin was stuffed with chaff, and hung up in

public in terrorem. This occurred in the year 277, and the anniversary

was commemorated as the great religious festival of the Manich�ans.

This is not the place to attempt any account or criticism of the

strange eclecticism of Mani. [28] An adequate idea of the system may

be gathered from the accompanying treatises. It may, however, be

desirable to give some account of the original sources of information

regarding it.

We study the systems of heresiarchs at a disadvantage when our only

means of ascertaining their opinions is from the fragmentary quotations

and hostile criticism which occur in the writings of their

adversaries. Such, however, is our only source of information

regarding the teaching of Mani. Originally, indeed, this heresy was

specially active in a literary direction, assailing the Christian

Scriptures with an ingenuity of unbelief worthy of a later age, and

apparently ambitious of promulgating a rival canon. Certainly the

writings of its early supporters were numerous; [29] and from the care

and elegance with which they were transcribed, the sumptuous character

of the manuscripts, and the mysterious emblems with which they were

adorned, we should fancy it was intended to inspire the people with

respect for an authoritative though as yet undefined code. It is,

indeed, nowhere said or implied that the sacred books of the Manich�ans

were reserved for the eye only of the initiated or elect; and their

reception of the New Testament Scriptures (subject to their own

revision and emendation) would make it difficult for them to establish

any secret code apart from these writings. They were certainly,

however, doctrines of an esoteric kind, which were not divulged to the

catechumens or hearers; and many of their books, being written in

Persian, Syriac, or Greek, were practically unavailable for the

instruction of the Latin speaking population. It was not always easy,

therefore, to obtain an accurate knowledge of their opinions.

Commentaries on the whole of the Old and New Testaments were written by

Hierax; [30] a Theosophy by Aristocritus; a book of memoirs, or rather

Memorabilia, of Mani, and other works, by Heraclides, Aphthonius, Adas,

and Agapius. Unfortunately all of these books have perished, whether

in the flames to which the Christian authorities commanded that all

Manich�an books should be consigned, or by the slower if not more

critical and impartial processes of time.

Mani himself was the author of several works: a Gospel, the Treasury

of Life (and probably an abridgment of the same), the Mysteries, the

Foundation Fpistle, a book of Articles or heads of doctrine, one or two

works on astronomy or astrology, and a collection of letters so

dangerous, that Manich�ans who sought restoration to the Church were

required to anathematize them.

Probably the most important of these writings was the Foundation

Epistle, so called because it contained the leading articles of

doctrine on which the new system was built. This letter was written in

Greek or Syriac; but a Latin version of it was current in Africa, and

came into the hands of Augustin, who undertook its refutation. To

accomplish this with the greater precision and effect, he quotes the

entire text of each passage of the Epistle before proceeding to

criticise it. Had Augustin accomplished the whole of his task, we

should accordingly have been in possession of the whole of this

important document. Unfortunately, for reasons unknown, Augustin stops

short at an early point in the Epistle; and though he tells us he had

notes on the remainder, and would some day expand and publish them,

this promise lay unredeemed for thirty years till the day of his

death. Extracts from the same Epistle and from the Treasury are also

given by Augustin in the treatise De Natura Boni. [31]

Next, we have in the Opus Imperfectum of Augustin some extracts from a

letter of Mani to Menoch, which Julian had unearthed and republished to

convict Augustin of being still tainted with Manich�an sentiments.

These extracts give us some insight into the heresiarch's opinions

regarding the corruption of nature and the evils of sexual love.

Again, we have Mani's letter to Marcel, preserved by Epiphanius, and

given in full by Beausobre; [32] which, however, merely reiterates two

of the doctrines most certainly identified with Mani,--the assertion of

two principles, and the tenet that the Son of God was man only in

appearance.

Finally, Fabricius has inserted in the fifth volume of his Bibliotheca

Gr�ca the fragments, such as they are, collected by Grabe.

Such is the fragmentary character of the literary remains of Mani: for

fuller information regarding his opinions we must depend on Theodoret,

Epiphanius, Alexander of Lycopolis, Titus of Bostra, and Augustin.

Beausobre is of opinion that the Fathers derived all that they knew of

Manich�us from the Acts of Archelaus. [33] This professes to be a

report of a disputation held between Manes and Archelaus, bishop of

Caschar in Mesopotamia. Grave doubts have been cast on the

authenticity of this document, and Burton and Milman seem inclined to

consider it an imaginary dialogue, and use it on the understanding that

while some of its statements are manifestly untrustworthy, a

discriminating reader may gather from it some reliable material. [34]

In the works of Augustin there are some other pieces which may well be

reckoned among the original sources. In the reply to Faustus, which is

translated in this volume, the book of Faustus is not indeed

reproduced; but there is no reason for doubting that his arguments are

fairly represented, and we think there is evidence that even the

original expression of them is preserved. [35] Augustin had been

acquainted with Faustus for many years. He first met him at Carthage

in 383, and found him nothing more than a clever and agreeable talker,

making no pretension to science or philosophy, and with only slender

reading. [36] His cleverness is sufficiently apparent in his debate

with Augustin; the objections he leads are plausible, and put with

acuteness, but at the same time with a flippancy which betrays a want

of earnestness and real interest in the questions. In his reply to

Faustus, Augustin is very much on the defensive, and his statements are

apologetic rather than systematic. [37]

But in an age when the ability to read was by no means commensurate

with the interest taken in theological questions, written discussions

were necessarily supplemented by public disputations. These

theological contests seem to have been a popular entertainment in North

Africa; the people attending in immense crowds, while reporters took

down what was said on either side for the sake of appeal as well as for

the information of the absent. In two such disputations Augustin

engaged in connection with Manich�ism. [38] The first was held on the

28th and 29th of August, 392, with a Manich�an priest, Fortunatus. To

this encounter Augustin was invited by a deputation of Donatists and

Catholics, [39] who were alike alarmed at the progress which this

heresy was making in the district of Hippo. Fortunatus at first showed

some reluctance to meet so formidable an antagonist, but was prevailed

upon by his own sectaries, and shows no nervousness during the debate.

His incompetence, however, was manifest to the Manich�ans themselves;

and so hopeless was it to think of any further proselytizing in Hippo,

that he left that city, and was too much ashamed of himself ever to

return. The character of his reasoning is shifty; he evades Augustin's

questions and starts fresh ones. Augustin pushes his usual and

fundamental objection to the Manich�an system. If God is impassable

and incorruptible, how could He be injured by the assaults of the

kingdom of darkness? In opposition to the statement of Fortunatus,

that the Almighty produces no evil, he explains that God made no nature

evil, but made man free, and that voluntary sin is the grand original

evil. The most remarkable circumstance in the discussion is the desire

of Fortunatus to direct the conversation to the conduct of the

Manich�ans, and the refusal of Augustin to make good the charges which

had been made against them, or to discuss anything but the doctrine.

[40]

Twelve years after this, a similar disputation was held between

Augustin and one of the elect among the Manich�ans, who had come to

Hippo to propagate his religion. This man, Felix, is described by

Augustin [41] as being ill-educated, but more adroit and subtle than

Fortunatus. After a keen discussion, which occupied two days, the

proceedings terminated by Felix signing a recantation of his errors in

the form of an anathema on Mani, his doctrines, and the seducing spirit

that possessed him. These two disputations are valuable, as exhibiting

the points of the Manich�an system to which its own adherents were

accustomed to direct attention, and the arguments on which they

specially relied for their support.

The works given in the accompanying volume comprehend by no means the

whole of Augustin's writings against this heresy. Before his

ordination he wrote five anti-Manich�an books, entitled, De Libero

Arbitrio, De Genesi contra Manich�os, De Moribus Ecclesi� Catholic�, De

Moribus Manich�orum, and De Vera Religione. These Paulinus called his

anti-Manich�an Pentateuch. After his ordination he was equally

diligent, publishing a little treatise in the year 391, under the title

De Utilitate Credendi, [42] which was immediately followed by a small

work, De Duabus Animabus. In the following year the report of the

Disputatio contra Fortunatum was published; and after this, at short

intervals, there appeared the books Contra Adimantum, Contra Epistolam

Manich�i quam vocant Fundamenti, Contra Faustum, Disputatio contra

Felicem, De Naturo Boni, and Contra Secundinum.

Besides these writings, which are exclusively occupied with Manich�ism,

there are others in which the Manich�an doctrines are handled with more

or less directness. These are the Confessions, the 79th and 236th

Letters, the Lecture on Psalm 140, Sermons 1, 2, 12, 50, 153, 182, 237,

the Liber de Agone Christiano, and the De Continentia.

Of these writings, Augustin himself professed a preference for the

reply to the letter of Secundinus. [43] It is a pleasing feature of

the times, that a heretic whom he did not know even by sight should

write to Augustin entreating him to abstain from writing against the

Manich�ans, and reconsider his position, and ally himself with those

whom he had till now fancied to be in error. His language is

respectful, and illustrates the esteem in which Augustin was held by

his contemporaries; though he does not scruple to insinuate that his

conversion from Manich�ism was due to motives not of the highest kind.

We have not given this letter and its reply, because the preference of

Augustin has not been ratified by the judgment of his readers.

The present volume gives a fair sample of Augustin's controversial

powers. His nine years' personal experience of the vanity of

Manich�ism made him thoroughly earnest and sympathetic in his efforts

to disentangle other men from its snares, and also equipped him with

the knowledge requisite for this task. No doubt the Pelagian

controversy was more congenial to his mind. His logical acuteness and

knowledge of Scripture availed him more in combating men who fought

with the same weapons, than in dealing with a system which threw around

its positions the mist of Gnostic speculation, or veiled its doctrine

under a grotesque mythology, or based itself on a cosmogony too

fantastic for a Western mind to tolerate. [44] But however Augustin

may have misconceived the strange forms in which this system was

presented, there is no doubt that he comprehended and demolished its

fundamental principles; [45] that he did so as a necessary part of his

own personal search for the truth; and that in doing so he gained

possession, vitally and permanently of ideas and principles which

subsequently entered into all he thought and wrote. In finding his way

through the mazes of the obscure region into which Mani had led him, he

once for all ascertained the true relation subsisting between God and

His creatures, formed his opinion regarding the respective provinces of

reason and faith, and the connection of the Old and New Testaments, and

found the root of all evil in the created will.

The Editor.

Some knowledge of the Magianism of the time of Mani may be obtained

from the sacred books of the Parsis, especially from the Vendidad Sade,

an account of which is given by Dr. Wilson, of Bombay, in his book on

the Parsi Religion.--Tr.

------------------------
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[20] Beausobre (Histoire Critique de Manich�e et du Manich�isme, Amst.

1734, 2 vols.) has collected everything that is known of Mani. The

original sources are here sifted with unusual acuteness, and with great

and solid learning, though the author's strong "bias in favor of a

heretic" frequently leads him to make unwarranted statements. Burton's

estimate of this entertaining and indispensable work (Heresies of

Apostol. Age, p. xxi.), is much fairer than Pusey's (Aug. Conf. p.

314). A brief account of Mani and his doctrines is given by Milman

with his usual accuracy, impartiality and lucidity (Hist. of

Christianity, ii. 259, ed. 1867). For any one who wishes to

investigate the subject further, ample references are there given. A

specimen of the confusion that involves the history of Mani will be

found in the account given by Socrates (Hist. i. 22).

[21] [For the Oriental accounts of Mani's parentage and youth, see the

Introductory Essay, and the works there referred to.--A.H.N.]

[22] See also Eusebius: Hist. Eccl. vii. 31, with Heinichen's note.

[23] 2 Kings xv. 14.

[24] "Peut-�tre cherchons nous du mystere, ou il n'y en a

point."--Beausobre, i. 79.

[25] [This is in the highest degree improbable.--A.H.N.]

[26] Called Erteng or Arzeng, i.e., according to Renaudot, an

illustrated book.

[27] B�hringer adopts the more horrible tradition. "Sein Schicksal

war, dass er von den Christen, von den Magiern verfolgt, nach mannig

fachem Wechsel unter Bahram lebendig geschunden wurde" (p. 386).

[28] B�hringer characterizes it briefly in the words: "Es ist der alte

heidnische Dualismus mit seiner Naturtheologie, der in Mani's Systeme

seine letzten Kr�fte sammelt und unter der gleissenden H�lle

christlicher Worte und Formen an den reinen Monotheismus des

Christenthums und dessen reine Ethik sich heranwagt "

[29] Aug. c. Faustum, xiii. 6 and 18. [See full list of Mani's

writings in Kessler's art. in Herzog, R.E.--A.H.N.]

[30] Lardner, however, seems to prove that Hierax was not a Manich�an,

though some of his opinions approximated to this heresy. The whole

subject of the Manich�an literature is treated by Lardner (Works, iii.

p. 374), with the learning of Beausobre and more than Beausobre's

impartiality.

[31] The De Natura Boni, written in the year 405, is necessarily very

much a reproduction of what is elsewhere affirmed, that all natures are

good, and created by God, who alone is immutable and incorruptible. It

presents concisely the leading positions of Augustin in this

controversy, and concludes with an eloquent prayer that his efforts may

be blessed to the conversion of the heretics,--not the only passage

which demonstrates that he wrote not for the glory of victory so much

as for the deliverance of men from fatal error.

[32] Histoire, i. 91.

[33] Published by Zaccagni in his Collectanea Monumentorum Veterum,

Rom�, 1698; and by Routh his Reliqui� Sacr�, vol. v., in which all the

material for forming an opinion regarding it is collected.

[34] Any one who consults Beausobre on this point will find that

historical criticism is not of so recent an origin as some persons seem

to think. It is worth transcribing his own account of the spirit in

which he means to do his work: "Je traiterai mon sujet en Critique,

suivant la Regle de S. Paul, Examinez toutes choses, et ne retenez que

ce qui est bon. L'Histoire en general, et l'Histoire Ecclesiastique en

particulier, n'est bien souvent qu'un m�lange confus de faux et de

vrai, entasse par des Ecrivains mal instruits, credules ou passionez.

Cela convient surtout a l'Histoire des Heretiques et des Heresies.

C'est au Lecteur attentif et judicieux d'en faire le discernement, a

l'aide d'une critique, qui ne soit trop timide, ni temeraire. Sans le

secours de cet art, on erre dans l'Histoire comme un Pilote sur les

mers, lorsqu'il n'a ni boussole, ni carte marine" (i. 7).

[35] Beausobre and Cave suppose that we have the whole of Faustus' book

embodied in Augustin's review of it. Lardner is of opinion that the

commencement, and perhaps the greater part, of the work is given, but

not the whole.

[36] See the interesting account of Faustus in the Confessions, v. 10.

[37] [This estimate of Faustus is somewhat too disparaging. For fuller

bibliography, see Introductory Essay.--A.H.N.]

[38] His willingness to do so, and the success with which he

encountered the most renowned champions of this heresy, should have

prevented Beausobre from charging him with misunderstanding or

misrepresenting the Manich�an doctrine. The retractation of Felix

tells strongly against this view of Augustin's incompetence to deal

with Manich�ism.

[39] Possidius. Vita Aug. vi.

[40] This cannot but make us cautious in receiving the statements of

the tract, On the Morals of the Manich�ans. There can be little doubt

that many of the Manich�ans practiced the ascetic virtues, and were

recognizable by the gauntness and pallor of their looks, so that

Manich�an became a by-word for any one who did not appreciate the

felicity of good living. Thus Jerome says of a certain class of women,

"quam viderint pallentem atque tristem, Miseram, Monacham, et Manich�an

vocant" (De Custod. Virg. Ep. 18). Lardner throws light on the

practices of the Manich�ans, and effectually disposes of some of the

calumnies uttered regarding them. Pusey's appendix to his translation

of the Confessions may also be referred to with advantage.

[41] Retract. ii. 8.

[42] Epist. August. xxv.

[43] Retract. ii. 10: "quod, mea sententia, omnibus quoe adversus

illam pestem scribere potui, facile pr�pono." The reason of this

preference is explained by Bindemann, Der heilige Augstinus, iii. 168.

[44] "Wo Entwickelungen, dialektische Begriffe sein sollten, stellt

sich ein Bild, ein Mythus ein."--B�hringer, p. 390.

[45] Some have thought Augustin more successful here than elsewhere.

Cassiodorus may have thought so when he said: "diligentius atque

vivacius adversus eos quam contra h�reses alias disseruit" (Instit. i.

quoted by Lardner).
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\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

St. AUGUSTIN:

on the

morals of the catholic church.

[de moribus ecclesi� catholic�].

A.D. 388.

translated by the

rev. richard stothert, m.a.,

bombay

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Of the Morals of the Catholic Church. [46]

[De Moribus Ecclesi� Catholic�]. a.d. 388.

It is laid down at the outset that the customs of the holy life of the

Church should be referred to the chief good of man, that is, God. We

must seek after God with supreme affection; and this doctrine is

supported in the Catholic Church by the authority of both Testaments.

The four virtues get their names from different forms of this love.

Then follow the duties of love to our neighbor. In the Catholic Church

we find examples of continence and of true Christian conduct.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[46] Written in the year 388. In his Retractations (i. 7) Augustin

says: "When I was at Rome after my baptism, and could not bear in

silence the vaunting of the Manich�ans about their pretended and

misleading continence or abstinence, in which, to deceive the

inexperienced, they claim superiority over true Christians, to whom

they are not to be compared, I wrote two books, one on the morals of

the Catholic Church, the other on the morals of the Manich�ans."

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 1.--How the Pretensions of the Manich�ans are to Be Refuted.

Two Manich�an Falsehoods.

1. Enough, probably, has been done in our other books [47] in the way

of answering the ignorant and profane attacks which the Manich�ans make

on the law, which is called the Old Testament, in a spirit of

vainglorious boasting, and with the approval of the uninstructed.

Here, too, I may shortly touch upon the subject. For every one with

average intelligence can easily see that the explanation of the

Scriptures should be sought for from those who are the professed

teachers of the Scriptures; and that it may happen, and indeed always

happens, that many things seem absurd to the ignorant, which, when they

are explained by the learned, appear all the more excellent, and are

received in the explanation with the greater pleasure on account of the

obstructions which made it difficult to reach the meaning. This

commonly happens as regards the holy books of the Old Testament, if

only the man who meets with difficulties applies to a pious teacher,

and not to a profane critic, and if he begins his inquiries from a

desire to find truth, and not in rash opposition. And should the

inquirer meet with some, whether bishops or presbyters, or any

officials or ministers of the Catholic Church, who either avoid in all

cases opening up mysteries, or, content with simple faith, have no

desire for more recondite knowledge, he must not despair of finding the

knowledge of the truth in a case where neither are all able to teach to

whom the inquiry is addressed, nor are all inquirers worthy of learning

the truth. Diligence and piety are both necessary: on the one hand,

we must have knowledge to find truth, and, on the other hand, we must

deserve to get the knowledge.

2. But as the Manich�ans have two tricks for catching the unwary, so

as to make them take them as teachers,--one, that of finding fault with

the Scriptures, which they either misunderstand or wish to be

misunderstood, the other, that of making a show of chastity and of

notable abstinence,--this book shall contain our doctrine of life and

morals according to Catholic teaching, and will perhaps make it appear

how easy it is to pretend to virtue, and how difficult to possess

virtue. I will refrain, if I can, from attacking their weak points,

which I know well, with the violence with which they attack what they

know nothing of; for I wish them, if possible, to be cured rather than

conquered. And I will quote such testimonies from the Scriptures as

they are bound to believe, for they shall be from the New Testament;

and even from this I will take none of the passages which the

Manich�ans when hard pressed are accustomed to call spurious, but

passages which they are obliged to acknowledge and approve. And for

every testimony from apostolic teaching I will bring a similar

statement from the Old Testament, that if they ever become willing to

wake up from their persistent dreams, and to rise towards the light of

Christian faith, they may discover both how far from being Christian is

the life which they profess, and how truly Christian is the Scripture

which they cavil at.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[47] [This is commonly supposed to have been the first work of any

importance written by the Author against Manich�ism. What he here

refers to it is not easy to conjecture.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 2.--He Begins with Arguments, in Compliance with the Mistaken

Method of the Manich�ans.

3. Where, then, shall I begin? With authority, or with reasoning? In

the order of nature, when we learn anything, authority precedes

reasoning. For a reason may seem weak, when, after it is given, it

requires authority to confirm it. But because the minds of men are

obscured by familiarity with darkness, which covers them in the night

of sins and evil habits, and cannot perceive in a way suitable to the

clearness and purity of reason, there is most wholesome provision for

bringing the dazzled eye into the light of truth under the congenial

shade of authority. But since we have to do with people who are

perverse in all their thoughts and words and actions, and who insist on

nothing more than on beginning with argument, I will, as a concession

to them, take what I think a wrong method in discussion. For I like to

imitate, as far as I can, the gentleness of my Lord Jesus Christ, who

took on Himself the evil of death itself, wishing to free us from it.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 3.--Happiness is in the Enjoyment of Man's Chief Good. Two

Conditions of the Chief Good: 1st, Nothing is Better Than It; 2d, It

Cannot Be Lost Against the Will.

4. How then, according to reason, ought man to live? We all certainly

desire to live happily; and there is no human being but assents to this

statement almost before it is made. But the title happy cannot, in my

opinion, belong either to him who has not what he loves, whatever it

may be, or to him who has what he loves if it is hurtful or to him who

does not love what he has, although it is good in perfection. For one

who seeks what he cannot obtain suffers torture, and one who has got

what is not desirable is cheated, and one who does not seek for what is

worth seeking for is diseased. Now in all these cases the mind cannot

but be unhappy, and happiness and unhappiness cannot reside at the same

time in one man; so in none of these cases can the man be happy. I

find, then, a fourth case, where the happy life exists,--when that

which is man's chief good is both loved and possessed. For what do we

call enjoyment but having at hand the objects of love? And no one can

be happy who does not enjoy what is man's chief good, nor is there any

one who enjoys this who is not happy. We must then have at hand our

chief good, if we think of living happily.

5. We must now inquire what is man's chief good, which of course

cannot be anything inferior to man himself. For whoever follows after

what is inferior to himself, becomes himself inferior. But every man

is bound to follow what is best. Wherefore man's chief good is not

inferior to man. Is it then something similar to man himself? It must

be so, if there is nothing above man which he is capable of enjoying.

But if we find something which is both superior to man, and can be

possessed by the man who loves it, who can doubt that in seeking for

happiness man should endeavor to reach that which is more excellent

than the being who makes the endeavor. For if happiness consists in

the enjoyment of a good than which there is nothing better, which we

call the chief good, how can a man be properly called happy who has not

yet attained to his chief good? or how can that be the chief good

beyond which something better remains for us to arrive at? Such, then,

being the chief good, it must be something which cannot be lost against

the will. For no one can feel confident regarding a good which he

knows can be taken from him, although he wishes to keep and cherish

it. But if a man feels no confidence regarding the good which he

enjoys, how can he be happy while in such fear of losing it?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 4.--Man--What?

6. Let us then see what is better than man. This must necessarily be

hard to find, unless we first ask and examine what man is. I am not

now called upon to give a definition of man. The question here seems

to me to be,--since almost all agree, or at least, which is enough,

those I have now to do with are of the same opinion with me, that we

are made up of soul and body,--What is man? Is he both of these? or is

he the body only, or the soul only? For although the things are two,

soul and body, and although neither without the other could be called

man (for the body would not be man without the soul, nor again would

the soul be man if there were not a body animated by it), still it is

possible that one of these may be held to be man, and may be called

so. What then do we call man? Is he soul and body, as in a double

harness, or like a centaur? Or do we mean the body only, as being in

the service of the soul which rules it, as the word lamp denotes not

the light and the case together, but only the case, yet it is on

account of the light that it is so called? Or do we mean only the

mind, and that on account of the body which it rules, as horseman means

not the man and the horse, but the man only, and that as employed in

ruling the horse? This dispute is not easy to settle; or, if the proof

is plain, the statement requires time. This is an expenditure of time

and strength which we need not incur. For whether the name man belongs

to both, or only to the soul, the chief good of man is not the chief

good of the body; but what is the chief good either of both soul and

body, or of the soul only, that is man's chief good.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 5.--Man's Chief Good is Not the Chief Good of the Body Only,

But the Chief Good of the Soul.

7. Now if we ask what is the chief good of the body, reason obliges us

to admit that it is that by means of which the body comes to be in its

best state. But of all the things which invigorate the body, there is

nothing better or greater than the soul. The chief good of the body,

then, is not bodily pleasure, not absence of pain, not strength, not

beauty, not swiftness, or whatever else is usually reckoned among the

goods of the body, but simply the soul. For all the things mentioned

the soul supplies to the body by its presence, and, what is above them

all, life. Hence I conclude that the soul is not the chief good of

man, whether we give the name of man to soul and body together, or to

the soul alone. For as according to reason, the chief good of the body

is that which is better than the body, and from which the body receives

vigor and life, so whether the soul itself is man, or soul and body

both, we must discover whether there is anything which goes before the

soul itself, in following which the soul comes to the perfection of

good of which it is capable in its own kind. If such a thing can be

found, all uncertainty must be at an end, and we must pronounce this to

be really and truly the chief good of man.

8. If, again, the body is man, it must be admitted that the soul is

the chief good of man. But clearly, when we treat of morals,--when we

inquire what manner of life must be held in order to obtain

happiness,--it is not the body to which the precepts are addressed, it

is not bodily discipline which we discuss. In short, the observance of

good customs belongs to that part of us which inquires and learns,

which are the prerogatives of the soul; so, when we speak of attaining

to virtue, the question does not regard the body. But if it follows,

as it does, that the body which is ruled over by a soul possessed of

virtue is ruled both better and more honorably, and is in its greatest

perfection in consequence of the perfection of the soul which

rightfully governs it, that which gives perfection to the soul will be

man's chief good, though we call the body man. For if my coachman, in

obedience to me, feeds and drives the horses he has charge of in the

most satisfactory manner, himself enjoying the more of my bounty in

proportion to his good conduct, can any one deny that the good

condition of the horses, as well as that of the coachman, is due to

me? So the question seems to me to be not, whether soul and body is

man, or the soul only, or the body only, but what gives perfection to

the soul; for when this is obtained, a man cannot but be either

perfect, or at least much better than in the absence of this one thing.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 6.--Virtue Gives Perfection to the Soul; The Soul Obtains

Virtue by Following God; Following God is the Happy Life.

9. No one will question that virtue gives perfection to the soul. But

it is a very proper subject of inquiry whether this virtue can exist by

itself or only in the soul. Here again arises a profound discussion,

needing lengthy treatment; but perhaps my summary will serve the

purpose. God will, I trust, assist me, so that, notwithstanding our

feebleness, we may give instruction on these great matters briefly as

well as intelligibly. In either case, whether virtue can exist by

itself without the soul, or can exist only in the soul, undoubtedly in

the pursuit of virtue the soul follows after something, and this must

be either the soul itself, or virtue, or something else. But if the

soul follows after itself in the pursuit of virtue, it follows after a

foolish thing; for before obtaining virtue it is foolish. Now the

height of a follower's desire is to reach that which he follows after.

So the soul must either not wish to reach what it follows after, which

is utterly absurd and unreasonable, or, in following after itself while

foolish, it reaches the folly which it flees from. But if it follows

after virtue in the desire to reach it, how can it follow what does not

exist? or how can it desire to reach what it already possesses?

Either, therefore, virtue exists beyond the soul, or if we are not

allowed to give the name of virtue except to the habit and disposition

of the wise soul, which can exist only in the soul, we must allow that

the soul follows after something else in order that virtue may be

produced in itself; for neither by following after nothing, nor by

following after folly, can the soul, according to my reasoning, attain

to wisdom.

10. This something else then, by following after which the soul

becomes possessed of virtue and wisdom, is either a wise man or God.

But we have said already that it must be something that we cannot lose

against our will. No one can think it necessary to ask whether a wise

man, supposing we are content to follow after him, can be taken from us

in spite of our unwillingness or our persistence. God then remains, in

following after whom we live well, and in reaching whom we live both

well and happily. If any deny God's existence, why should I consider

the method of dealing with them, when it is doubtful whether they ought

to be dealt with at all? At any rate, it would require a different

starting-point, a different plan, a different investigation from what

we are now engaged in. I am now addressing those who do not deny the

existence of God, and who, moreover, allow that human affairs are not

disregarded by Him. For there is no one, I suppose, who makes any

profession of religion but will hold that divine Providence cares at

least for our souls.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 7.--The Knowledge of God to Be Obtained from the Scripture.

The Plan and Principal Mysteries of the Divine Scheme of Redemption.

11. But how can we follow after Him whom we do not see? or how can we

see Him, we who are not only men, but also men of weak understanding?

For though God is seen not with the eyes but with the mind, where can

such a mind be found as shall, while obscured by foolishness, succeed

or even attempt to drink in that light? We must therefore have

recourse to the instructions of those whom we have reason to think

wise. Thus far argument brings us. For in human things reasoning is

employed, not as of greater certainty, but as easier from use. But

when we come to divine things, this faculty turns away; it cannot

behold; it pants, and gasps, and burns with desire; it falls back from

the light of truth, and turns again to its wonted obscurity, not from

choice, but from exhaustion. What a dreadful catastrophe is this, that

the soul should be reduced to greater helplessness when it is seeking

rest from its toil! So, when we are hasting to retire into darkness,

it will be well that by the appointment of adorable Wisdom we should be

met by the friendly shade of authority, and should be attracted by the

wonderful character of its contents, and by the utterances of its

pages, which, like shadows, typify and attemper the truth.

12. What more could have been done for our salvation? What can be

more gracious and bountiful than divine providence, which, when man had

fallen from its laws, and, in just retribution for his coveting mortal

things, had brought forth a mortal offspring, still did not wholly

abandon him? For in this most righteous government, whose ways are

strange and inscrutable, there is, by means of unknown connections

established in the creatures subject to it, both a severity of

punishment and a mercifulness of salvation. How beautiful this is, how

great, how worthy of God, in fine, how true, which is all we are

seeking for, we shall never be able to perceive, unless, beginning with

things human and at hand, and holding by the faith and the precepts of

true religion, we continue without turning from it in the way which God

has secured for us by the separation of the patriarchs, by the bond of

the law, by the foresight of the prophets, by the witness of the

apostles, by the blood of the martyrs, and by the subjugation of the

Gentiles. From this point, then, let no one ask me for my opinion, but

let us rather hear the oracles, and submit our weak inferences to the

announcements of Heaven. [48]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[48] [Augustin's transition from his fine Platonizing discussion of

virtue, the chief good, etc., to the patriarchs, the law, and the

prophets is very fine rhetorically and apologetically.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 8.--God is the Chief Good, Whom We are to Seek After with

Supreme Affection.

13. Let us see how the Lord Himself in the gospel has taught us to

live; how, too, Paul the apostle,--for the Manich�ans dare not reject

these Scriptures. Let us hear, O Christ, what chief end Thou dost

prescribe to us; and that is evidently the chief end after which we are

told to strive with supreme affection. "Thou shalt love," He says,

"the Lord thy God." Tell me also, I pray Thee, what must be the

measure of love; for I fear lest the desire enkindled in my heart

should either exceed or come short in fervor. "With all thy heart," He

says. Nor is that enough. "With all thy soul." Nor is it enough

yet. "With all thy mind." [49] What do you wish more? I might,

perhaps, wish more if I could see the possibility of more. What does

Paul say on this? "We know," he says, "that all things issue in good

to them that love God." Let him, too, say what is the measure of

love. "Who then," he says, "shall separate us from the love of Christ?

shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or

nakedness, or peril, or the sword?" [50] We have heard, then, what

and how much we must love; this we must strive after, and to this we

must refer all our plans. The perfection of all our good things and

our perfect good is God. We must neither come short of this nor go

beyond it: the one is dangerous, the other impossible.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[49] Matt. xxii. 37.

[50] Rom. viii. 28, 35.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 9.--Harmony of the Old and New Testament on the Precepts of

Charity. [51]

14. Come now, let us examine, or rather let us take notice,--for it is

obvious and can be seen, at once,--whether the authority of the Old

Testament too agrees with those statements taken from the gospel and

the apostle. What need to speak of the first statement, when it is

clear to all that it is a quotation from the law given by Moses? For

it is there written, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy

heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." [52] And not to

go farther for a passage of the Old Testament to compare with that of

the apostle, he has himself added one. For after saying that no

tribulation, no distress, no persecution, no pressure of bodily want,

no peril, no sword, separates us from the love of Christ, he

immediately adds, "As it is written, For Thy sake we are in suffering

all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter." [53]

The Manich�ans are in the habit of saying that this is an

interpolation,--so unable are they to reply, that they are forced in

their extremity to say this. But every one can see that this is all

that is left for men to say when it is proved that they are wrong.

15. And yet I ask them if they deny that this is said in the Old

Testament, or if they hold that the passage in the Old Testament does

not agree with that of the apostle. For the first, the books will

prove it; and as for the second, those prevaricators who fly off at a

tangent will be brought to agree with me, if they will only reflect a

little and consider what is said, or else I will press upon them the

opinion of those who judge impartially. For what could agree more

harmoniously than these passages? For tribulation, distress,

persecution, famine, nakedness, peril, cause great suffering to man

while in this life. So all these words are implied in the single

quotation from the law, where it is said, "For Thy sake we are in

suffering." [54] The only other thing is the sword, which does not

inflict a painful life, but removes whatever life it meets with.

Answering to this are the words, "We are accounted as sheep for the

slaughter." And love could not have been more plainly expressed than

by the words, "For Thy sake." Suppose, then, that this testimony is

not found in the Apostle Paul, but is quoted by me, must you not prove,

you heretic, either that this is not written in the old law, or that it

does not harmonize with the apostle? And if you dare not say either of

these things (for you are shut up by the reading of the manuscript,

which will show that it is written, and by common sense, which sees

that nothing could agree better with what is said by the apostle), why

do you imagine that there is any force in accusing the Scriptures of

being corrupted? And once more, what will you reply to a man who says

to you, This is what I understand, this is my view, this is my belief,

and I read these books only because I see that everything in them

agrees with the Christian faith? Or tell me at once if you will

venture deliberately to tell me to the face that we are not to believe

that the apostles and martyrs are spoken of as having endured great

sufferings for Christ's sake, and as having been accounted by their

persecutors as sheep for the slaughter? If you cannot say this, why

should you bring a charge against the book in which I find what you

acknowledge I ought to believe?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[51] [The most satisfactory feature of Augustin's apology for the Old

Testament Scriptures is his demonstration of the substantial agreement

of the Old Testament with undisputed portions of the New

Testament.--A.H.N.]

[52] Deut. vi. 5.

[53] Rom. viii. 36; cf. Ps. xliv. 22.

[54] Retract. i. 7, � 2:--"In the book on the morals of the Catholic

Church, where I have quoted the words, For Thy sake we are in suffering

all day long, we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter,' the

inaccuracy of my manuscript misled me; for my recollection of the

Scriptures was defective from my not being at that time familiar with

them. For the reading of the other manuscripts has a different

meaning: not, we suffer, but we suffer death, or, in one word, we are

killed. That this is the true reading is shown by the Greek text of

the Septuagint, from which the Old Testament was translated into

Latin. I have indeed made a good many remarks on the words, For thy

sake we suffer,' and the things said are not wrong in themselves; but,

as regards the harmony of the Old and New Testaments, this case

certainly does not prove it. The error originated in the way mentioned

above, and this harmony is afterwards abundantly proved from other

passages."

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 10.--What the Church Teaches About God. The Two Gods of the

Manich�ans.

16. Will you say that you grant that we are bound to love God, but not

the God worshipped by those who acknowledge the authority of the Old

Testament? In that case you refuse to worship the God who made heaven

and earth, for this is the God set forth all through these books. And

you admit that the whole of the world, which is called heaven and

earth, had God and a good God for its author and maker. For in

speaking to you about God we must make a distinction. For you hold

that there are two gods, one good and the other bad.

But if you say that you worship and approve of worshipping the God who

made heaven and earth, but not the God supported by the authority of

the Old Testament, you act impertinently in trying, though vainly, to

attribute to us views and opinions altogether unlike the wholesome and

profitable doctrine we really hold. Nor can your silly and profane

discourses be at all compared with the expositions in which learned and

pious men of the Catholic Church open up those Scriptures to the

willing and worthy. Our understanding of the law and the prophets is

quite different from what you suppose. Mistake us no longer. We do

not worship a God who repents, or is envious, or needy, or cruel, or

who takes pleasure in the blood of men or beasts, or is pleased with

guilt and crime, or whose possession of the earth is limited to a

little corner of it. These and such like are the silly notions you are

in the habit of denouncing at great length. Your denunciation does not

touch us. The fancies of old women or of children you attack with a

vehemence that is only ridiculous. Any one whom you persuade in this

way to join you shows no fault in the teaching of the Church, but only

proves his own ignorance of it.

17. If, then, you have any human feeling,--if you have any regard for

your own welfare,--you should rather examine with diligence and piety

the meaning of these passages of Scripture. You should examine,

unhappy beings that you are; for we condemn with no less severity and

copiousness any faith which attributes to God what is unbecoming Him,

and in those by whom these passages are literally understood we correct

the mistake of ignorance, and look upon persistence in it as absurd.

And in many other things which you cannot understand there is in the

Catholic teaching a check on the belief of those who have got beyond

mental childishness, not in years, but in knowledge and

understanding--old in the progress towards wisdom. For we learn the

folly of believing that God is bounded by any amount of space, even

though infinite; and it is held unlawful to think of God, or any part

of Him, as moving from one place to another. And should any one

suppose that anything in God's substance or nature can suffer change or

conversion, he will be held guilty of wild profanity. There are thus

among us children who think of God as having a human form, which they

suppose He really has, which is a most degrading idea; and there are

many of full age to whose mind the majesty of God appears in its

inviolableness and unchangeableness as not only above the human body,

but above their own mind itself. These ages, as we said, are

distinguished not by time, but by virtue and discretion. [55] Among

you, again, there is no one who will picture God in a human form; but

neither is there one who sets God apart from the contamination of human

error. As regards those who are fed like crying babies at the breast

of the Catholic Church, if they are not carried off by heretics, they

are nourished according to the vigor and capacity of each, and arrive

at last, one in one way and another in another, first to a perfect man,

and then to the maturity and hoary hairs of wisdom, when they may get

life as they desire, and life in perfect happiness.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[55] [Augustin's virtus takes the place of the Greek duuameis and the

Vulgate virtutes. It is not quite certain what meaning he attached to

the expression. He seems to waver between the idea of power and that

of virtue in the ethical sense, and finally settles down to the use of

the term in the latter sense. That this does not accord with the

meaning of the Apostle is evident.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 11.--God is the One Object of Love; Therefore He is Man's Chief

Good. Nothing is Better Than God. God Cannot Be Lost Against Our

Will.

18. Following after God is the desire of happiness; to reach God is

happiness itself. We follow after God by loving Him; we reach Him, not

by becoming entirely what He is, but in nearness to Him, and in

wonderful and immaterial contact with Him, and in being inwardly

illuminated and occupied by His truth and holiness. He is light

itself; we get enlightenment from Him. The greatest commandment,

therefore, which leads to happy life, and the first, is this: "Thou

shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and soul, and mind."

For to those who love the Lord all things issue in good. Hence Paul

adds shortly after, "I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor

angels, nor virtue, nor things present, nor things future, 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." [56] If, then,

to those who love God all things issue in good, and if, as no one

doubts, the chief or perfect good is not only to be loved, but to be

loved so that nothing shall be loved better, as is expressed in the

words, "With all thy soul, with all thy heart, and with all thy mind,"

who, I ask, will not at once conclude, when these things are all

settled and most surely believed, that our chief good which we must

hasten to arrive at in preference to all other things is nothing else

than God? And then, if nothing can separate us from His love, must not

this be surer as well as better than any other good?

19. But let us consider the points separately. No one separates us

from this by threatening death. For that with which we love God cannot

die, except in not loving God; for death is not to love God, and that

is when we prefer anything to Him in affection and pursuit. No one

separates us from this in promising life; for no one separates us from

the fountain in promising water. Angels do not separate us; for the

mind cleaving to God is not inferior in strength to an angel. Virtue

does not separate us; for if what is here called virtue is that which

has power in this world, the mind cleaving to God is far above the

whole world. Or if this virtue is perfect rectitude of our mind

itself, this in the case of another will favor our union with God, and

in ourselves will itself unite us with God. Present troubles do not

separate us; for we feel their burden less the closer we cling to Him

from whom they try to separate us. The promise of future things does

not separate us; for both future good of every kind is surest in the

promise of God, and nothing is better than God Himself, who undoubtedly

is already present to those who truly cleave to Him. Height and depth

do not separate us; for if the height and depth of knowledge are what

is meant, I will rather not be inquisitive than be separated from God;

nor can any instruction by which error is removed separate me from Him,

by separation from whom it is that any one is in error. Or if what is

meant are the higher and lower parts of this world, how can the promise

of heaven separate me from Him who made heaven? Or who from beneath

can frighten me into forsaking God, when I should not have known of

things beneath but by forsaking Him? In fine, what place can remove me

from His love, when He could not be all in every place unless He were

contained in none?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[56] Rom. viii. 38, 39.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 12.--We are United to God by Love, in Subjection to Him.

20. "No other creature," he says, separates us. O man of profound

mysteries! He thought it not enough to say, no creature: but he says

no other creature; teaching that with which we love God and by which we

cleave to God, our mind, namely, and understanding, is itself a

creature. Thus the body is another creature; and if the mind is an

object of intellectual perception, and is known only by this means, the

other creature is all that is an object of sense, which as it were

makes itself known through the eyes, or ears, or smell, or taste, or

touch, and this must be inferior to what is perceived by the intellect

alone. Now, as God also can be known by the worthy, only

intellectually, [57] exalted though He is above the intelligent mind as

being its Creator and Author, there was danger lest the human mind,

from being reckoned among invisible and immaterial things, should be

thought to be of the same nature with Him who created it, and so should

fall away by pride from Him to whom it should be united by love. For

the mind becomes like God, to the extent vouchsafed by its subjection

of itself to Him for information and enlightenment. And if it obtains

the greatest nearness by that subjection which produces likeness, it

must be far removed from Him by that presumption which would make the

likeness greater. It is this presumption which leads the mind to

refuse obedience to the laws of God, in the desire to be sovereign, as

God is.

21. The farther, then, the mind departs from God, not in space, but in

affection and lust after things below Him, the more it is filled with

folly and wretchedness. So by love it returns to God,--a love which

places it not along with God, but under Him. And the more ardor and

eagerness there is in this, the happier and more elevated will the mind

be, and with God as sole governor it will be in perfect liberty. Hence

it must know that it is a creature. It must believe what is the

truth,--that its Creator remains ever possessed of the inviolable and

immutable nature of truth and wisdom, and must confess, even in view of

the errors from which it desires deliverance, that it is liable to

folly and falsehood. But then again, it must take care that it be not

separated by the love of the other creature, that is, of this visible

world, from the love of God Himself, which sanctifies it in order to

lasting happiness. No other creature, then,--for we are ourselves a

creature,--separates us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus

our Lord.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[57] [I.e. only by the use of the mental faculty of which God Himself

is the Creator and Author; not by any independently existing power "of

the same nature with Him who created it."--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 13.--We are Joined Inseparably to God by Christ and His Spirit.

22. Let this same Paul tell us who is this Christ Jesus our Lord. "To

them that are called," he says, "we preach Christ the virtue of God,

and the wisdom of God." [58] And does not Christ Himself say, "I am

the truth?" [59] If, then, we ask what it is to live well,--that is,

to strive after happiness by living well,--it must assuredly be to love

virtue, to love wisdom, to love truth, and to love with all the heart,

with all the soul, and with all the mind; virtue which is inviolable

and immutable, wisdom which never gives place to folly, truth which

knows no change or variation from its uniform character. Through this

the Father Himself is seen; for it is said, "No man cometh unto the

Father but by me." To this we cleave by sanctification. For when

sanctified we burn with full and perfect love, which is the only

security for our not turning away from God, and for our being conformed

to Him rather than to this world; for "He has predestinated us," says

the same apostle, "that we should be conformed to the image of His

Son." [60]

23. It is through love, then, that we become conformed to God; and by

this conformation, and configuration, and circumcision from this world

we are not confounded with the things which are properly subject to

us. And this is done by the Holy Spirit. "For hope," he says, "does

not confound us; for the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by

the Holy Spirit, which is given unto us." [61] But we could not

possibly be restored to perfection by the Holy Spirit, unless He

Himself continued always perfect and immutable. And this plainly could

not be unless He were of the nature and of the very substance of God,

who alone is always possessed of immutability and invariableness. "The

creature," it is affirmed, not by me but by Paul, "has been made

subject to vanity." [62] And what is subject to vanity is unable to

separate us from vanity, and to unite us to the truth. But the Holy

Spirit does this for us. He is therefore no creature. For whatever

is, must be either God or the creature.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[58] 1 Cor. i. 23, 24.

[59] John xiv. 6.

[60] Rom. viii. 29.

[61] Rom. v. 5.

[62] Rom. viii. 20.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 14.--We Cleave to the Trinity, Our Chief Good, by Love.

24. We ought then to love God, the Trinity in unity, Father, Son, and

Holy Spirit; for this must be said to be God Himself, for it is said of

God, truly and in the most exalted sense, "Of whom are all things, by

whom are all things, in whom are all things." Those are Paul's words.

And what does he add? "To Him be glory." [63] All this is exactly

true. He does not say, To them; for God is one. And what is meant by,

To Him be glory, but to Him be chief and perfect and widespread

praise? For as the praise improves and extends, so the love and

affection increases in fervor. And when this is the case, mankind

cannot but advance with sure and firm step to a life of perfection and

bliss. This, I suppose, is all we wish to find when we speak of the

chief good of man, to which all must be referred in life and conduct.

For the good plainly exists; and we have shown by reasoning, as far as

we were able, and by the divine authority which goes beyond our

reasoning, that it is nothing else but God Himself. For how can any

thing be man's chief good but that in cleaving to which he is blessed?

Now this is nothing but God, to whom we can cleave only by affection,

desire, and love.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[63] Rom. xi. 36.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 15.--The Christian Definition of the Four Virtues.

25. As to virtue leading us to a happy life, I hold virtue to be

nothing else than perfect love of God. For the fourfold division of

virtue I regard as taken from four forms of love. For these four

virtues (would that all felt their influence in their minds as they

have their names in their mouths!), I should have no hesitation in

defining them: that temperance is love giving itself entirely to that

which is loved; fortitude is love readily bearing all things for the

sake of the loved object; justice is love serving only the loved

object, and therefore ruling rightly; prudence is love distinguishing

with sagacity between what hinders it and what helps it. The object of

this love is not anything, but only God, the chief good, the highest

wisdom, the perfect harmony. So we may express the definition thus:

that temperance is love keeping itself entire and incorrupt for God;

fortitude is love bearing everything readily for the sake of God;

justice is love serving God only, and therefore ruling well all else,

as subject to man; prudence is love making a right distinction between

what helps it towards God and what might hinder it. [64]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[64] [It would be difficult to find in Christian literature a more

beautiful and satisfactory exposition of love to God. The Neo-Platonic

influence is manifest, but it is Neo-Platonism thoroughly

Christianized.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 16.--Harmony of the Old and New Testaments.

26. I will briefly set forth the manner of life according to these

virtues, one by one, after I have brought forward, as I promised,

passages from the Old Testament parallel to those I have been quoting

from the New Testament. For is Paul alone in saying that we should be

joined to God so that there should be nothing between to separate us?

Does not the prophet say the same most aptly and concisely in the

words, "It is good for me to cleave to God?" [65] Does not this one

word cleave express all that the apostle says at length about love?

And do not the words, It is good, point to the apostle's statement,

"All things issue in good to them that love God?" Thus in one clause

and in two words the prophet sets forth the power and the fruit of

love.

27. And as the apostle says that the Son of God is the virtue of God

and the wisdom of God,--virtue being understood to refer to action, and

wisdom to teaching (as in the gospel these two things are expressed in

the words, "All things were made by Him," which belongs to action and

virtue; and then, referring to teaching and the knowledge of the truth,

he says, "The life was the light of men" [66] ),--could anything agree

better with these passages than what is said in the Old Testament [67]

of wisdom, "She reaches from end to end in strength, and orders all

things sweetly?" For reaching in strength expresses virtue, while

ordering sweetly expresses skill and method. But if this seems

obscure, see what follows: "And of all," he says, "God loved her; for

she teaches the knowledge of God, and chooses His works." Nothing more

is found here about action; for choosing works is not the same as

working, so this refers to teaching. There remains action to

correspond with the virtue, to complete the truth we wish to prove.

Read then what comes next: "But if," he says, "the possession which is

desired in life is honorable, what is more honorable than wisdom, which

works all things?" Could anything be brought forward more striking or

more distinct than this, or even more fully expressed? Or, if you wish

more, hear another passage of the same meaning. "Wisdom," he says,

"teaches sobriety, and justice, and virtue." [68] Sobriety refers, I

think, to the knowledge of the truth, or to teaching; justice and

virtue to work and action. And I know nothing comparable to these two

things, that is, to efficiency in action and sobriety in contemplation,

which the virtue of God and the wisdom of God, that is, the Son of God,

gives to them that love Him, when the same prophet goes on to show

their value; for it is thus stated: "Wisdom teaches sobriety, and

justice, and virtue, than which nothing is more useful in life to man."

[69]

28. Perhaps some may think that those passages do not refer to the Son

of God. What, then, is taught in the following words: "She displays

the nobility of her birth, having her dwelling with God?" [70] To

what does birth refer but to parentage? And does not dwelling with the

Father claim and assert equality? Again, as Paul says that the Son of

God is the wisdom of God, [71] and as the Lord Himself says, "No man

knoweth the Father save the only-begotten Son," [72] what could be more

concordant than those words of the prophet: "With Thee is wisdom which

knows Thy works, which was present at the time of Thy making the world,

and knew what would be pleasing in Thine eyes?" [73] And as Christ is

called the truth, which is also taught by His being called the

brightness of the Father [74] (for there is nothing round about the sun

but its brightness which is produced from it), what is there in the Old

Testament more plainly and obviously in accordance with this than the

words, "Thy truth is round about Thee?" [75] Once more, Wisdom

herself says in the gospel, "No man cometh unto the Father but by me;"

[76] and the prophet says, "Who knoweth Thy mind, unless Thou givest

wisdom?" and a little after, "The things pleasing to Thee men have

learned, and have been healed by wisdom." [77]

29. Paul says, "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the

Holy Spirit which is given unto us;" [78] and the prophet says, "The

Holy Spirit of knowledge will shun guile." [79] For where there is

guile there is no love. Paul says that we are "conformed to the image

of the Son of God;" [80] and the prophet says, "The light of Thy

countenance is stamped upon us." [81] Paul teaches that the Holy

Spirit is God, and therefore is no creature; and the prophet says,

"Thou sendest Thy Spirit from the higher." [82] For God alone is the

highest, than whom nothing is higher. Paul shows that the Trinity is

one God, when he says, "To Him be glory;" [83] and in the Old Testament

it is said, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one God." [84]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[65] Ps. lxxiii. 28.

[66] John i. 3, 4.

[67] [Augustin seems to make no distinction between Apocryphal and

Canonical books. The book of Wisdom was evidently a favorite with him,

doubtless on account of its decided Platonic quality.--A.H.N.]

[68] Wisd. viii. 1, 4, 7.

[69] Retract. i. 7, � 3:--"The quotation from the book of Wisdom is

from my manuscript, where the reading is, Wisdom teaches sobriety,

justice, and virtue.' From these words I have made some remarks true

in themselves, but occasioned by a false reading. It is perfectly true

that wisdom teaches truth of contemplation, as I have explained

sobriety; and excellence of action, which is the meaning I give to

justice and virtue. And the reading in better manuscripts has the same

meaning: It teaches sobriety, and wisdom, and justice, and virtue.'

These are the names given by the Latin translator to the four virtues

which philosophers usually speak about. Sobriety is for temperance,

wisdom for prudence, virtue for fortitude, and justice only has its own

name. It was long after that we found these virtues called by their

proper names in the Greek text of this book of Wisdom."

[70] Wisd. viii. 3.

[71] 1 Cor. i. 24.

[72] Matt. xi. 27.

[73] Wisd. ix. 9.

[74] Heb. i. 3.

[75] Ps. lxxxix. 8.

[76] John xiv. 6.

[77] Wisd. ix. 17-19.

[78] Rom. v. 5.

[79] Wisd. i. 5.

[80] Rom. viii. 29.

[81] Ps. iv. 6.

[82] Wisd. ix. 17.

[83] Rom. xi. 36.

[84] Deut. vi. 4.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 17.--Appeal to the Manich�ans, Calling on Them to Repent.

30. What more do you wish? Why do you resist ignorantly and

obstinately? Why do you pervert untutored minds by your mischievous

teaching? The God of both Testaments is one. For as there is an

agreement in the passages quoted from both, so is there in all the

rest, if you are willing to consider them carefully and impartially.

But because many expressions are undignified, and so far adapted to

minds creeping on the earth, that they may rise by human things to

divine, [85] while many are figurative, that the inquiring mind may

have the more profit from the exertion of finding their meaning, and

the more delight when it is found, you pervert this admirable

arrangement of the Holy Spirit for the purpose of deceiving and

ensnaring your followers. As to the reason why divine Providence

permits you to do this, and as to the truth of the apostle's saying,

"There must needs be many heresies, that they which are approved may be

made manifest among you," [86] it would take long to discuss these

things, and you, with whom we have now to do, are not capable of

understanding them. I know you well. To the consideration of divine

things, which are far higher than you suppose, you bring minds quite

gross and sickly, from being fed with material images.

31. We must therefore in your case try not to make you understand

divine things, which is impossible, but to make you desire to

understand. This is the work of the pure and guileless love of God,

which is seen chiefly in the conduct, and of which we have already said

much. This love, inspired by the Holy Spirit, leads to the Son, that

is, to the wisdom of God, by which the Father Himself is known. For if

wisdom and truth are not sought for with the whole strength of the

mind, it cannot possibly be found. But when it is sought as it

deserves to be, it cannot withdraw or hide itself from its lovers.

Hence its words, which you too are in the habit of repeating, "Ask, and

ye shall receive; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be

opened unto you:" [87] "Nothing is hid which shall not be revealed."

[88] It is love that asks, love that seeks, love that knocks, love

that reveals, love, too, that gives continuance in what is revealed.

From this love of wisdom, and this studious inquiry, we are not

debarred by the Old Testament, as you always say most falsely, but are

exhorted to this with the greatest urgency.

32. Hear, then, at length, and consider, I pray you, what is said by

the prophet: "Wisdom is glorious, and never fadeth away; yea, she is

easily seen of them that love her, and found of such as seek her. She

preventeth them that desire her, in making herself first known unto

them. Whoso seeketh her early shall have no great travail; for he

shall find her sitting at his doors. To think, therefore, upon her is

perfection of wisdom; and whoso watcheth for her shall quickly be

without care. For she goeth about seeking such as are worthy of her,

showeth herself favorably unto them in the ways, and meeteth them in

every thought. For the very true beginning of her is the desire of

discipline; and the care of discipline is love; and love is the keeping

of her laws; and the giving heed unto her laws is the assurance of

incorruption; and incorruption maketh us near unto God. Therefore the

desire of wisdom bringeth to a kingdom." [89] Will you still continue

in dogged hostility to these things? Do not things thus stated, though

not yet understood, make it evident to every one that they contain

something deep and unutterable? Would that you could understand the

things here said! Forthwith you would abjure all your silly legends

and your unmeaning material imaginations, and with great alacrity,

sincere love, and full assurance of faith, would betake yourselves

bodily to the shelter of the most holy bosom of the Catholic Church.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[85] [Here we have the key to all that is best in Augustin's defense of

the anthropomorphisms and the seemingly imperfect ethical

representations of the Old Testament. See Mozley's essay on "The

Manich�ans and the Jewish Fathers," in his Ruling Ideas in Early Ages.

The entire volume represents an attempt to account for the elements in

the Old Testament that offend the Christian consciousness.--A.H.N.]

[86] 1 Cor. xi. 19.

[87] Matt. vii. 7.

[88] Matt. x. 26.

[89] Wisd. vi. 12-20.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 18.--Only in the Catholic Church is Perfect Truth Established

on the Harmony of Both Testaments.

33. I could, according to the little ability I have, take up the

points separately, and could expound and prove the truths I have

learned, which are generally more excellent and lofty than words can

express; but this cannot be done while you bark at it. For not in vain

is it said, "Give not that which is holy to dogs." [90] Do not be

angry. I too barked and was a dog; and then, as was right, instead of

the food of teaching, I got the rod of correction. But were there in

you that love of which we are speaking, or should it ever be in you as

much as the greatness of the truth to be known requires, may God

vouchsafe to show you that neither is there among the Manich�ans the

Christian faith which leads to the summit of wisdom and truth, the

attainment of which is the true happy life, nor is it anywhere but in

the Catholic teaching. Is not this what the Apostle Paul appears to

desire when he says, "For this cause I bow my knees to the Father of

our Lord Jesus Christ, from whom the whole family in heaven and earth

is named, that He would grant unto you, according to the riches of His

glory, to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man:

that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted

and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is

the height, and length, and breadth, and depth, and to know the love of

Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye may be filled with all the

fullness of God?" [91] Could anything be more plainly expressed?

34. Wake up a little, I beseech you, and see the harmony of both

Testaments, making it quite plain and certain what should be the manner

of life in our conduct, and to what all things should be referred. To

the love of God we are incited by the gospel, when it is said, "Ask,

seek, knock;" [92] by Paul, when he says, "That ye, being rooted and

grounded in love, may be able to comprehend;" [93] by the prophet also,

when he says that wisdom can easily be known by those who love it, seek

for it, desire it, watch for it, think about it, care for it. The

salvation of the mind [94] and the way of happiness is pointed out by

the concord of both Scriptures; and yet you choose rather to bark at

these things than to obey them. I will tell you in one word what I

think. Do you listen to the learned men of the Catholic Church with as

peaceable a disposition, and with the same zeal, that I had when for

nine years I attended on you: [95] there will be no need of so long a

time as that during which you made a fool of me. In a much, a very

much, shorter time you will see the difference between truth and

vanity.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[90] Matt. vii. 6.

[91] Eph. iii. 14-19.

[92] Matt. vii. 7.

[93] Eph. iii. 7.

[94] [Animi not mentis.--A.H.N.]

[95] From his 19th to his 28th year.
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Chapter 19.--Description of the Duties of Temperance, According to the

Sacred Scriptures.

35. It is now time to return to the four virtues, and to draw out and

prescribe a way of life in conformity with them, taking each

separately. First, then, let us consider temperance, which promises us

a kind of integrity and incorruption in the love by which we are united

to God. The office of temperance is in restraining and quieting the

passions which make us pant for those things which turn us away from

the laws of God and from the enjoyment of His goodness, that is, in a

word, from the happy life. For there is the abode of truth; and in

enjoying its contemplation, and in cleaving closely to it, we are

assuredly happy; but departing from this, men become entangled in great

errors and sorrows. For, as the apostle says, "The root of all evils

is covetousness; which some having followed, have made shipwreck of the

faith, and have pierced themselves through with many sorrows." [96]

And this sin of the soul is quite plainly, to those rightly

understanding, set forth in the Old Testament in the transgression of

Adam in Paradise. Thus, as the apostle says, "In Adam we all die, and

in Christ we shall all rise again." [97] Oh, the depth of these

mysteries! But I refrain; for I am now engaged not in teaching you the

truth, but in making you unlearn your errors, if I can, that is, if God

aid my purpose regarding you.

36. Paul then says that covetousness is the root of all evils; and by

covetousness the old law also intimates that the first man fell. Paul

tells us to put off the old man and put on the new. [98] By the old

man he means Adam who sinned, and by the new man him whom the Son of

God took to Himself in consecration for our redemption. For he says in

another place, "The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man

is from heaven, heavenly. As is the earthy, such are they also that

are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are

heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, let us also

bear the image of the heavenly," [99] --that is, put off the old man,

and put on the new. The whole duty of temperance, then, is to put off

the old man, and to be renewed in God,--that is, to scorn all bodily

delights, and the popular applause, and to turn the whole love to

things divine and unseen. Hence that following passage which is so

admirable: "Though our outward man perish, our inward man is renewed

day by day." [100] Hear, too, the prophet singing, "Create in me a

clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me." [101] What

can be said against such harmony except by blind barkers?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[96] 1 Tim. vi. 10.

[97] 1 Cor. xv. 22.

[98] Col. iii. 9, 10.

[99] 1 Cor. xv. 47-49.

[100] 2 Cor. iv. 16.

[101] Ps. li. 10.
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Chapter 20.--We are Required to Despise All Sensible Things, and to

Love God Alone.

37. Bodily delights have their source in all those things with which

the bodily sense comes in contact, and which are by some called the

objects of sense; and among these the noblest is light, in the common

meaning of the word, because among our senses also, which the mind uses

in acting through the body, there is nothing more valuable than the

eyes, and so in the Holy Scriptures all the objects of sense are spoken

of as visible things. Thus in the New Testament we are warned against

the love of these things in the following words: "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." [102] This shows how far from being Christians

those are who hold that the sun and moon are to be not only loved but

worshipped. For what is seen if the sun and moon are not? But we are

forbidden to regard things which are seen. The man, therefore, who

wishes to offer that incorrupt love to God must not love these things

too. This subject I will inquire into more particularly elsewhere.

Here my plan is to write not of faith, but of the life by which we

become worthy of knowing what we believe. God then alone is to be

loved; and all this world, that is, all sensible things, are to be

despised,--while, however, they are to be used as this life requires.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[102] 2 Cor. iv. 18.
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Chapter 21.--Popular Renown and Inquisitiveness are Condemned in the

Sacred Scriptures.

38. Popular renown is thus slighted and scorned in the New Testament:

"If I wished," says St. Paul, "to please men, I should not be the

servant of Christ." [103] Again, there is another production of the

soul formed by imaginations derived from material things, and called

the knowledge of things. In reference to this we are fitly warned

against inquisitiveness to correct which is the great function of

temperance. Thus it is said, "Take heed lest any one seduce you by

philosophy." And because the word philosophy originally means the love

and pursuit of wisdom, a thing of great value and to be sought with the

whole mind, the apostle, with great prudence, that he might not be

thought to deter from the love of wisdom, has added the words, "And the

elements of this world." [104] For some people, neglecting virtues,

and ignorant of what God is, and of the majesty of nature which remains

always the same, think that they are engaged in an important business

when searching with the greatest inquisitiveness and eagerness into

this material mass which we call the world. This begets so much pride,

that they look upon themselves as inhabitants of the heaven of which

they often discourse. The soul, then, which purposes to keep itself

chaste for God must refrain from the desire of vain knowledge like

this. For this desire usually produces delusion, so that the soul

thinks that nothing exists but what is material; or if, from regard to

authority, it confesses that there is an immaterial existence, it can

think of it only under material images, and has no belief regarding it

but that imposed by the bodily sense. We may apply to this the precept

about fleeing from idolatry.

39. To this New Testament authority, requiring us not to love anything

in this world, [105] especially in that passage where it is said, "Be

not conformed to this world," [106] --for the point is to show that a

man is conformed to whatever he loves,--to this authority, then, if I

seek for a parallel passage in the Old Testament, I find several; but

there is one book of Solomon, called Ecclesiastes, which at great

length brings all earthly things into utter contempt. The book begins

thus: "Vanity of the vain, saith the Preacher, vanity of the vain; all

is vanity. What profit hath a man of all his labor which he taketh

under the sun?" [107] If all these words are considered, weighed, and

thoroughly examined, many things are found of essential importance to

those who seek to flee from the world and to take shelter in God; but

this requires time and our discourse hastens on to other topics. But,

after this beginning, he goes on to show in detail that the vain [108]

are those who are deceived by things of this sort; and he calls this

which deceives them vanity,--not that God did not create those things,

but because men choose to subject themselves by their sins to those

things, which the divine law has made subject to them in well-doing.

For when you consider things beneath yourself to be admirable and

desirable, what is this but to be cheated and misled by unreal goods?

The man, then, who is temperate in such mortal and transient things has

his rule of life confirmed by both Testaments, that he should love none

of these things, nor think them desirable for their own sakes, but

should use them as far as is required for the purposes and duties of

life, with the moderation of an employer instead of the ardor of a

lover. These remarks on temperance are few in proportion to the

greatness of the theme, but perhaps too many in view of the task on

hand.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[103] Gal. i. 10.

[104] Col. ii. 8.

[105] 1 John ii. 15.

[106] Rom. xii. 2.

[107] Eccles. i. 2, 3.

[108] Retract. i. 7, � 3: --"I found in many manuscripts the reading,

Vanity of the vain.' But this is not in the Greek, which has Vanity of

vanities.' This I saw afterwards. And I found that the best Latin

manuscripts had vanities and not vain. But the truths I have drawn

from this false reading are self-evident."

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 22.--Fortitude Comes from the Love of God.

40. On fortitude we must be brief. The love, then, of which we speak,

which ought with all sanctity to burn in desire for God, is called

temperance, in not seeking for earthly things, and fortitude in bearing

the loss of them. But among all things which are possessed in this

life, the body is, by God's most righteous laws, for the sin of old,

man's heaviest bond, which is well known as a fact but most

incomprehensible in its mystery. Lest this bond should be shaken and

disturbed, the soul is shaken with the fear of toil and pain; lest it

should be lost and destroyed, the soul is shaken with the fear of

death. For the soul loves it from the force of habit, not knowing that

by using it well and wisely its resurrection and reformation will, by

the divine help and decree, be without any trouble made subject to its

authority. But when the soul turns to God wholly in this love, it

knows these things, and so will not only disregard death, but will even

desire it.

41. Then there is the great struggle with pain. But there is nothing,

though of iron hardness, which the fire of love cannot subdue. And

when the mind is carried up to God in this love, it will soar above all

torture free and glorious, with wings beauteous and unhurt, on which

chaste love rises to the embrace of God. Otherwise God must allow the

lovers of gold, the lovers of praise, the lovers of women, to have more

fortitude than the lovers of Himself, though love in those cases is

rather to be called passion or lust. And yet even here we may see with

what force the mind presses on with unflagging energy, in spite of all

alarms, towards that it loves; and we learn that we should bear all

things rather than forsake God, since those men bear so much in order

to forsake Him.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 23.--Scripture Precepts and Examples of Fortitude.

42. Instead of quoting here authorities from the New Testament, where

it is said, "Tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience and

experience, hope;" [109] and where, in addition to these words, there

is proof and confirmation of them from the example of those who spoke

them; I will rather summon an example of patience from the Old

Testament, against which the Manich�ans make fierce assaults. Nor will

I refer to the man who, in the midst of great bodily suffering, and

with a dreadful disease in his limbs, not only bore human evils, but

discoursed of things divine. Whoever gives considerate attention to

the utterances of this man, will learn from every one of them what

value is to be attached to those things which men try to keep in their

power, and in so doing are themselves brought by passion into bondage,

so that they become the slaves of mortal things, while seeking

ignorantly to be their masters. This man, in the loss of all his

wealth, and on being suddenly reduced to the greatest poverty, kept his

mind so unshaken and fixed upon God, as to manifest that these things

were not great in his view, but that he was great in relation to them,

and God to him. [110] If this mind were to be found in men in our

day, we should not be so strongly cautioned in the New Testament

against the possession of these things in order that we may be perfect;

for to have these things without cleaving to them is much more

admirable than not to have them at all. [111]

43. But since we are speaking here of bearing pain and bodily

sufferings, I pass from this man, great as he was, indomitable as he

was: this is the case of a man. But these Scriptures present to me a

woman of amazing fortitude, and I must at once go on to her case. This

woman, along with seven children, allowed the tyrant and executioner to

extract her vitals from her body rather than a profane word from her

mouth, encouraging her sons by her exhortations, though she suffered in

the tortures of their bodies, and was herself to undergo what she

called on them to bear. [112] What patience could be greater than

this? And yet why should we be astonished that the love of God,

implanted in her inmost heart, bore up against tyrant, and executioner,

and pain, and sex, and natural affection? Had she not heard, "Precious

in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints?" [113] Had she

not heard, "A patient man is better than the mightiest?" [114] Had

she not heard, "All that is appointed thee receive; and in pain bear

it; and in abasement keep thy patience: for in fire are gold and

silver tried?" [115] Had she not heard, "The fire tries the vessels

of the potter, and for just men is the trial of tribulation?" [116]

These she knew, and many other precepts of fortitude written in these

books, which alone existed at that time, by the same divine Spirit who

writes those in the New Testament.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[109] Rom. v. 3, 4.

[110] Job. i. 2.

[111] [It is interesting to observe how remote Augustin was from

attaching superior merit to voluntary poverty, or to other forms of

asceticism as ends in themselves. What he prized was the ability to

use without abusing, to have without cleaving to the good things which

God provides.--A.H.N.]

[112] 2 Mac. vii.

[113] Ps. cxvi. 15.

[114] Prov. xvi. 32.

[115] Ecclus. ii. 4, 5.

[116] Ecclus. xxvii. 6.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 24.--Of Justice and Prudence.

44. What of justice that pertains to God? As the Lord says, "Ye

cannot serve two masters," [117] and the apostle denounces those who

serve the creature rather than the Creator, [118] was it not said

before in the Old Testament, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and

Him only shalt thou serve?" [119] I need say no more on this, for

these books are full of such passages. The lover, then, whom we are

describing, will get from justice this rule of life, that he must with

perfect readiness serve the God whom he loves, the highest good, the

highest wisdom, the highest peace; [120] and as regards all other

things, must either rule them as subject to himself, or treat them with

a view to their subjection. This rule of life, is, as we have shown,

confirmed by the authority of both Testaments.

45. With equal brevity we must treat of prudence, to which it belongs

to discern between what is to be desired and what to be shunned.

Without this, nothing can be done of what we have already spoken of.

It is the part of prudence to keep watch with most anxious vigilance,

lest any evil influence should stealthily creep in upon us. Thus the

Lord often exclaims, "Watch;" [121] and He says, "Walk while ye have

the light, lest darkness come upon you." [122] And then it is said,

"Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?" [123]

And no passage can be quoted from the Old Testament more expressly

condemning this mental somnolence, which makes us insensible to

destruction advancing on us step by step, than those words of the

prophet, "He who despiseth small things shall fall by degrees." [124]

On this topic I might discourse at length did our haste allow of it.

And did our present task demand it, we might perhaps prove the depth of

these mysteries, by making a mock of which profane men in their perfect

ignorance fall, not certainly by degrees, but with a headlong

overthrow.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[117] Matt. vi. 24.

[118] Rom. i. 25.

[119] Deut. vi. 13.

[120] A name given by Augustin to the Holy Spirit, v. xxx.

[121] Matt. xxiv. 42.

[122] John xii. 35.

[123] 1 Cor. v. 6.

[124] Ecclus. xix. 1.
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Chapter 25.--Four Moral Duties Regarding the Love of God, of Which Love

the Reward is Eternal Life and the Knowledge of the Truth.

46. I need say no more about right conduct. For if God is man's chief

good, which you cannot deny, it clearly follows, since to seek the

chief good is to live well, that to live well is nothing else but to

love God with all the heart, with all the soul, with all the mind; and,

as arising from this, that this love must be preserved entire and

incorrupt, which is the part of temperance; that it give way before no

troubles, which is the part of fortitude; that it serve no other, which

is the part of justice; that it be watchful in its inspection of things

lest craft or fraud steal in, which is the part of prudence. This is

the one perfection of man, by which alone he can succeed in attaining

to the purity of truth. This both Testaments enjoin in concert; this

is commended on both sides alike. Why do you continue to cast

reproaches on Scriptures of which you are ignorant? Do you not see the

folly of your attack upon books which only those who do not understand

them find fault with, and which only those who find fault fail in

understanding? For neither can an enemy know them, nor can one who

knows them be other than a friend to them.

47. Let us then, as many as have in view to reach eternal life, love

God with all the heart, with all the soul, with all the mind. For

eternal life contains the whole reward in the promise of which we

rejoice; nor can the reward precede desert, nor be given to a man

before he is worthy of it. What can be more unjust than this, and what

is more just than God? We should not then demand the reward before we

deserve to get it. Here, perhaps, it is not out of place to ask what

is eternal life; or rather let us hear the Bestower of it: "This," He

says, "is life eternal, that they should know Thee, the true God, and

Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." [125] So eternal life is the

knowledge of the truth. See, then, how perverse and preposterous is

the character of those who think that their teaching of the knowledge

of God will make us perfect, when this is the reward of those already

perfect! What else, then, have we to do but first to love with full

affection Him whom we desire to know? [126] Hence arises that

principle on which we have all along insisted, that there is nothing

more wholesome in the Catholic Church than using authority [127] before

argument.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[125] John xvii. 3.

[126] Retract. i. 7. � 4:--"I should have said sincere affection rather

than full; or it might be thought that the love of God will be no

greater when we shall see Him face to face. Full, then, must be here

understood as meaning that it cannot be greater while we walk by

faith. There will be greater, yea, perfect fullness, but only by

sight."

[127] [By authority Augustin does not mean the authority of the Church

or of Scripture, but he refers to the loving recognition of the

authority of God as the condition of true discipleship.--A.H.N.]
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Chapter 26.--Love of Ourselves and of Our Neighbor.

48. To proceed to what remains. It may be thought that there is

nothing here about man himself, the lover. But to think this, shows a

want of clear perception. For it is impossible for one who loves God

not to love himself. For he alone has a proper love for himself who

aims diligently at the attainment of the chief and true good; and if

this is nothing else but God, as has been shown, what is to prevent one

who loves God from loving himself? And then, among men should there be

no bond of mutual love? Yea, verily; so that we can think of no surer

step towards the love of God than the love of man to man.

49. Let the Lord then supply us with the other precept in answer to

the question about the precepts of life; for He was not satisfied with

one as knowing that God is one thing and man another, and that the

difference is nothing less than that between the Creator and the thing

created in the likeness of its Creator. He says then that the second

precept is, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." [128] Now you

love yourself suitably when you love God better than yourself. What,

then, you aim at in yourself you must aim at in your neighbor, namely,

that he may love God with a perfect affection. For you do not love him

as yourself, unless you try to draw him to that good which you are

yourself pursuing. For this is the one good which has room for all to

pursue it along with thee. From this precept proceed the duties of

human society, in which it is hard to keep from error. But the first

thing to aim at is, that we should be benevolent, that is, that we

cherish no malice and no evil design against another. For man is the

nearest neighbor of man.

50. Hear also what Paul says: "The love of our neighbor," he says,

"worketh no ill." [129] The testimonies here made use of are very

short, but, if I mistake not, they are to the point, and sufficient for

the purpose. And every one knows how many and how weighty are the

words to be found everywhere in these books on the love of our

neighbor. But as a man may sin against another in two ways, either by

injuring him or by not helping him when it is in his power, and as it

is for these things which no loving man would do that men are called

wicked, all that is required is, I think, proved by these words, "The

love of our neighbor worketh no ill." And if we cannot attain to good

unless we first desist from working evil, our love of our neighbor is a

sort of cradle of our love to God, so that, as it is said, "the love of

our neighbor worketh no ill," we may rise from this to these other

words, "We know that all things issue in good to them that love God."

[130]

51. But there is a sense in which these either rise together to

fullness and perfection, or, while the love of God is first in

beginning, the love of our neighbor is first in coming to perfection.

For perhaps divine love takes hold on us more rapidly at the outset,

but we reach perfection more easily in lower things. However that may

be, the main point is this, that no one should think that while he

despises his neighbor he will come to happiness and to the God whom he

loves. And would that it were as easy to seek the good of our

neighbor, or to avoid hurting him, as it is for one well trained and

kind-hearted to love his neighbor! These things require more than mere

good-will, and can be done only by a high degree of thoughtfulness and

prudence, which belongs only to those to whom it is given by God, the

source of all good. On this topic--which is one, I think, of great

difficulty--I will try to say a few words such as my plan admits of,

resting all my hope in Him whose gifts these are.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[128] Matt. xxii. 39.

[129] Rom. xiii. 10.

[130] Rom. viii. 28.
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Chapter 27.--On Doing Good to the Body of Our Neighbor.

52. Man, then, as viewed by his fellow-man, is a rational soul with a

mortal and earthly body in its service. Therefore he who loves his

neighbor does good partly to the man's body, and partly to his soul.

What benefits the body is called medicine; what benefits the soul,

discipline. Medicine here includes everything that either preserves or

restores bodily health. It includes, therefore, not only what belongs

to the art of medical men, properly so called, but also food and drink,

clothing and shelter, and every means of covering and protection to

guard our bodies against injuries and mishaps from without as well as

from within. For hunger and thirst, and cold and heat, and all

violence from without, produce loss of that health which is the point

to be considered.

53. Hence those who seasonably and wisely supply all the things

required for warding off these evils and distresses are called

compassionate, although they may have been so wise that no painful

feeling disturbed their mind in the exercise of compassion. [131] No

doubt the word compassionate implies suffering in the heart of the man

who feels for the sorrow of another. And it is equally true that a

wise man ought to be free from all painful emotion when he assists the

needy, when he gives food to the hungry and water to the thirsty, when

he clothes the naked, when he takes the stranger into his house, when

he sets free the oppressed, when, lastly, he extends his charity to the

dead in giving them burial. Still the epithet compassionate is a

proper one, although he acts with tranquillity of mind, not from the

stimulus of painful feeling, but from motives of benevolence. There is

no harm in the word compassionate when there is no passion in the case.

54. Fools, again, who avoid the exercise of compassion as a vice,

because they are not sufficiently moved by a sense of duty without

feeling also distressful emotion, are frozen into hard insensibility,

which is very different from the calm of a rational serenity. God, on

the other hand, is properly called compassionate; and the sense in

which He is so will be understood by those whom piety and diligence

have made fit to understand. There is a danger lest, in using the

words of the learned, we harden the souls of the unlearned by leading

them away from compassion instead of softening them with the desire of

a charitable disposition. As compassion, then, requires us to ward off

these distresses from others, so harmlessness forbids the infliction of

them.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[131] Retract. i. 7. � 4:--"This does not mean that there are actually

in this life wise men such as are here spoken of. My words are not,

although they are so wise,' but although they were so wise.'"

[Augustin's ideal wise man was evidently the "Gnostic" of Clement of

Alexandria. The conception is Stoical and Neo-Platonic.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 28.--On Doing Good to the Soul of Our Neighbor. Two Parts of

Discipline, Restraint and Instruction. Through Good Conduct We Arrive

at the Knowledge of the Truth.

55. As regards discipline, by which the health of the mind is

restored, without which bodily health avails nothing for security

against misery, the subject is one of great difficulty. And as in the

body we said it is one thing to cure diseases and wounds, which few can

do properly, and another thing to meet the cravings of hunger and

thirst, and to give assistance in all the other ways in which any man

may at any time help another; so in the mind there are some things in

which the high and rare offices of the teacher are not much called

for,--as, for instance, in advice and exhortation to give to the needy

the things already mentioned as required for the body. To give such

advice is to aid the mind by discipline, as giving the things

themselves is aiding the body by our resources. But there are other

cases where diseases of the mind, many and various in kind, are healed

in a way strange and indescribable. Unless His medicine were sent from

heaven to men, so heedlessly do they go on in sin, there would be no

hope of salvation; and, indeed, even bodily health, if you go to the

root of the matter, can have come to men from none but God, who gives

to all things their being and their well-being.

56. This discipline, then, which is the medicine of the mind, as far

as we can gather from the sacred Scriptures, includes two things,

restraint and instruction. Restraint implies fear, and instruction

love, in the person benefited by the discipline; for in the giver of

the benefit there is the love without the fear. In both of these God

Himself, by whose goodness and mercy it is that we are anything, has

given us in the two Testaments a rule of discipline. For though both

are found in both Testaments, still fear is prominent in the Old, and

love in the New; which the apostle calls bondage in the one, and

liberty in the other. Of the marvellous order and divine harmony of

these Testaments it would take long to speak, and many pious and

learned men have discoursed on it. The theme demands many books to set

it forth and explain it as far as is possible for man. He, then, who

loves his neighbor endeavors all he can to procure his safety in body

and in soul, making the health of the mind the standard in his

treatment of the body. And as regards the mind, his endeavors are in

this order, that he should first fear and then love God. This is true

excellence of conduct, and thus the knowledge of the truth is acquired

which we are ever in the pursuit of.

57. The Manich�ans agree with me as regards the duty of loving God and

our neighbor, but they deny that this is taught in the Old Testament.

How greatly they err in this is, I think, clearly shown by the passages

quoted above on both these duties. But, in a single word, and one

which only stark madness can oppose, do they not see the

unreasonableness of denying that these very two precepts which they

commend are quoted by the Lord in the Gospel from the Old Testament,

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy

soul, and with all thy mind;" and the other, "Thou shalt love thy

neighbor as thyself?" [132] Or if they dare not deny this, from the

light of truth being too strong for them, let them deny that these

precepts are salutary; let them deny, if they can, that they teach the

best morality; let them assert that it is not a duty to love God, or to

love our neighbor; that all things do not issue in good to them that

love God; that it is not true that the love of our neighbor worketh no

ill (a two-fold regulation of human life which is most salutary and

excellent). By such assertions they cut themselves off not only from

Christians, but from mankind. But if they dare not speak thus, but

must confess the divinity of the precepts, why do they not desist from

assailing and maligning with horrible profanity the books from which

they are quoted?

58. Will they say, as they often do, that although we find these

precepts in the books, it does not follow that all is good that is

found there? How to meet and refute this quibble I do not well see.

Shall I discuss the words of the Old Testament one by one, to prove to

stubborn and ignorant men their perfect agreement with the New

Testament? But when will this be done? When shall I have time, or

they patience? What, then, is to be done? Shall I desert the cause,

and leave them to escape detection in an opinion which, though false

and impious, is hard to disprove? I will not. God will Himself be at

hand to aid me; nor will He suffer me in those straits to remain

helpless or forsaken.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[132] Deut. vi. 5; Lev. xix. 18; Matt. xxii. 37, 39.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 29.--Of the Authority of the Scriptures.

59. Attend, then, ye Manich�ans, if perchance there are some of you of

whom your superstition has hold so as to allow you yet to escape.

Attend, I say, without obstinacy, without the desire to oppose,

otherwise your decision will be fatal to yourselves. No one can doubt,

and you are not so lost to the truth as not to understand that if it is

good, as all allow, to love God and our neighbor, whatever hangs on

these two precepts cannot rightly be pronounced bad. What it is that

hangs on them it would be absurd to think of learning from me. Hear

Christ Himself; hear Christ, I say; hear the Wisdom of God: "On these

two commandments," He says, "hang all the law and the prophets." [133]

60. What can the most shameless obstinacy say to this? That these are

not Christ's words? But they are written in the Gospel as His words.

That the writing is false? Is not this most profane blasphemy? Is it

not most presumptuous to speak thus? Is it not most foolhardy? Is it

not most criminal? The worshippers of idols, who hate even the name of

Christ, never dared to speak thus against these Scriptures. For the

utter overthrow of all literature will follow, and there will be an end

to all books handed down from the past, if what is supported by such a

strong popular belief and established by the uniform testimony of so

many men and so many times, is brought into such suspicion, that it is

not allowed to have the credit and the authority of common history. In

fine, what can you quote from any writings of which I may not speak in

this way if it is quoted against my opinion and my purpose? [134]

61. And is it not intolerable that they forbid us to believe a book

widely known and placed now in the hands of all, while they insist on

our believing the book which they quote? If any writing is to be

suspected, what should be more so than one which has not merited

notoriety, or which may be throughout a forgery, bearing a false name?

If you force such a writing on me against my will, and make a display

of authority to drive me into belief, shall I, when I have a writing

which I see spread far and wide for a length of time, and sanctioned by

the concordant testimony of churches scattered over all the world,

degrade myself by doubting, and, worse degradation, by doubting at your

suggestion? Even if you brought forward other readings, I should not

receive them unless supported by general agreement; and this being the

case, do you think that now, when you bring forward nothing to compare

with the text except your own silly and inconsiderate statement,

mankind are so unreasonable and so forsaken by divine Providence as to

prefer to those Scriptures not others quoted by you in refutation, but

merely your own words? You ought to bring forward another manuscript

with the same contents, but incorrupt and more correct, with only the

passage wanting which you charge with being spurious. For example, if

you hold that the Epistle of Paul to the Romans is spurious, you must

bring forward another incorrupt, or rather another manuscript with the

same epistle of the same apostle, free from error and corruption. You

say you will not, lest you be suspected of corrupting it. This is your

usual reply, and a true one. Were you to do this, we should assuredly

have this very suspicion; and all men of any sense would have it too.

See then what you are to think of your own authority; and consider

whether it is right to believe your words against these Scriptures,

when the simple fact that a manuscript is brought forward by you makes

it dangerous to put faith in it.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[133] Matt. xxii. 40.

[134] [The strong testimony borne by Augustin against the perverse

subjective criticism of the Manich�ns has an important application to

the present time.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 30.--The Church Apostrophised as Teacher of All Wisdom.

Doctrine of the Catholic Church.

62. But why say more on this? For who but sees that men who dare to

speak thus against the Christian Scriptures, though they may not be

what they are suspected of being, are at least no Christians? For to

Christians this rule of life is given, that we should love the Lord Our

God with all the heart, with all the soul, and with all the mind, and

our neighbor as ourselves; for on these two commandments hang all the

law and the prophets. Rightly, then, Catholic Church, most true mother

of Christians, dost thou not only teach that God alone, to find whom is

the happiest life, must be worshipped in perfect purity and chastity,

bringing in no creature as an object of adoration whom we should be

required to serve; and from that incorrupt and inviolable eternity to

which alone man should be made subject, in cleaving to which alone the

rational soul escapes misery, excluding everything made, everything

liable to change, everything under the power of time; without

confounding what eternity, and truth, and peace itself keeps separate,

or separating what a common majesty unites: but thou dost also contain

love and charity to our neighbor in such a way, that for all kinds of

diseases with which souls are for their sins afflicted, there is found

with thee a medicine of prevailing efficacy.

63. Thy training and teaching are childlike for children, forcible for

youths, peaceful for the aged, taking into account the age of the mind

as well as of the body. Thou subjectest women to their husbands in

chaste and faithful obedience, not to gratify passion, but for the

propagation of offspring, [135] and for domestic society. Thou givest

to men authority over their wives, not to mock the weaker sex, but in

the laws of unfeigned love. Thou dost subordinate children to their

parents in a kind of free bondage, and dost set parents over their

children in a godly rule. Thou bindest brothers to brothers in a

religious tie stronger and closer than that of blood. Without

violation of the connections of nature and of choice, thou bringest

within the bond of mutual love every relationship of kindred, and every

alliance of affinity. Thou teachest servants to cleave to their

masters from delight in their task rather than from the necessity of

their position. Thou renderest masters forbearing to their servants,

from a regard to God their common Master, and more disposed to advise

than to compel. Thou unitest citizen to citizen, nation to nation,

yea, man to man, from the recollection of their first parents, not only

in society but in fraternity. Thou teachest kings to seek the good of

their peoples; thou counsellest peoples to be subject to their kings.

Thou teachest carefully to whom honor is due, to whom regard, to whom

reverence, to whom fear, to whom consolation, to whom admonition, to

whom encouragement, to whom discipline, to whom rebuke, to whom

punishment; showing both how all are not due to all, and how to all

love is due, and how injury is due to none. [136]

64. Then, after this human love has nourished and invigorated the mind

cleaving to thy breast, and fitted it for following God, when the

divine majesty has begun to disclose itself as far as suffices for man

while a dweller on the earth, such fervent charity is produced, and

such a flame of divine love is kindled, that by the burning out of all

vices, and by the purification and sanctification of the man, it

becomes plain how divine are these words, "I am a consuming fire,"

[137] and, "I have come to send fire on the earth." [138] These two

utterances of one God stamped on both Testaments, exhibit with

harmonious testimony, the sanctification of the soul, pointing forward

to the accomplishment of that which is also quoted in the New Testament

from the Old: "Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is

thy sting? Where, O death, is thy contest?" [139] Could these

heretics understand this one saying, no longer proud but quite

reconciled, they would worship God nowhere but with thee and in thy

bosom. In thee, as is fit, divine precepts are kept by

widely-scattered multitudes. In thee, as is fit, it is well understood

how much more heinous sin is when the law is known than when it is

unknown. For "the sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is

the law," [140] which adds to the force with which the consciousness of

disregard of the precept strikes and slays. In thee it is seen, as is

fit, how vain is effort under the law, when lust lays waste the mind,

and is held in check by fear of punishment, instead of being overborne

by the love of virtue. Thine, as is fit, are the many hospitable, the

many friendly, the many compassionate, the many learned, the many

chaste, the many saints, the many so ardent in their love to God, that

in perfect continence and amazing indifference to this world they find

happiness even in solitude.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[135] [This view of the marriage relation seems to have been almost

universal in the ancient Church. Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria

are fond of dwelling upon it. For Augustin's views more fully stated

see his De Bono Conjugali, 6. See also an interesting excursus on

"Continence in Married Life" in Cunningham's St. Austin, p. 168.

sq.--A.H.N.]

[136] [If this apostrophe had been addressed to "Christianity" rather

than to the "Catholic Church," no Christian could fail to see in it one

of the noblest tributes ever bestowed on the religion of Christ.

Augustin identified Christianity with the organized body which was far

from realizing the ideal that he here sets forth. As an apostrophe to

ideal Christianity nothing could be finer.--A.H.N.]

[137] Deut. iv. 24. Retract. i. 7, � 5:--"The Pelagians may think that

I have spoken of perfection as attainable in this life. But they must

not think so. For the fervor of charity which is fitted for following

God, and of force enough to consume all vices, can have its origin and

growth in this life; but it does not follow that it can here accomplish

the purpose of its origin, so that no vice shall remain in the man;

although this great effect is produced by this same fervor of charity,

when and where this is possible, that as the laver of regeneration

purifies from the guilt of all the sins which attach to man's birth, or

come from his evil conduct, so this perfection may purify him from all

stain from the vices which necessarily attend human infirmity in this

world. So we must understand the words of the apostle: Christ loved

the Church, and gave himself for it; cleansing it with the washing of

water by the word, that He might present it to Himself a glorious

Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing' (Eph. v.

25-27). For in this world there is the washing of water by the word

which purifies the Church. But as the whole Church, as long as it is

here, says, Forgive us our debts,' it certainly is not while here

without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but from that which it

here receives, it is led on to the glory which is not here, and to

perfection."

[138] Luke xii. 49.

[139] Hos. xiii. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 54, 55.

[140] 1 Cor. xv. 56.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 31.--The Life of the Anachoretes and Coenobites Set Against the

Continence of the Manich�ans.

65. What must we think is seen by those who can live without seeing

their fellow-creatures, though not without loving them? It must be

something transcending human things in contemplating which man can live

without seeing his fellow-man. Hear now, ye Manich�ans, the customs

and notable continence of perfect Christians, who have thought it right

not only to praise but also to practise the height of chastity, that

you may be restrained, if there is any shame in you, from vaunting your

abstinence before uninstructed minds as if it were the hardest of all

things. I will speak of things of which you are not ignorant, though

you hide them from us. For who does not know that there is a daily

increasing multitude of Christian men of absolute continence spread all

over the world, especially in the East and in Egypt, as you cannot help

knowing?

66. I will say nothing of those to whom I just now alluded, who, in

complete seclusion from the view of men, inhabit regions utterly

barren, content with simple bread, which is brought to them

periodically, and with water, enjoying communion with God, to whom in

purity of mind they cleave, and most blessed in contemplating His

beauty, which can be seen only by the understanding of saints. I will

say nothing of them, because some people think them to have abandoned

human things more than they ought, not considering how much those may

benefit us in their minds by prayer, and in their lives by example,

whose bodies we are not permitted to see. But to discuss this point

would take long, and would be fruitless; for if a man does not of his

own accord regard this high pitch of sanctity as admirable and

honorable, how can our speaking lead him to do so? Only the

Manich�ans, who make a boast of nothing, should be reminded that the

abstinence and continence of the great saints of the Catholic Church

has gone so far, that some think it should be checked and recalled

within the limits of humanity,--so far above men, even in the judgment

of those who disapprove, have their minds soared.

67. But if this is beyond our tolerance, who can but admire and

commend those who, slighting and discarding the pleasures of this

world, living together in a most chaste and holy society, unite in

passing their time in prayers, in readings, in discussions, without any

swelling of pride, or noise of contention, or sullenness of envy; but

quiet, modest, peaceful, their life is one of perfect harmony and

devotion to God, an offering most acceptable to Him from whom the power

to do those things is obtained? No one possesses anything of his own;

no one is a burden to another. They work with their hands in such

occupations as may feed their bodies without distracting their minds

from God. The product of their toil they give to the decans or

tithesmen,--so called from being set over the tithes,--so that no one

is occupied with the care of his body, either in food or clothes, or in

anything else required for daily use or for the common ailments. These

decans, again, arranging everything with great care, and meeting

promptly the demands made by that life on account of bodily

infirmities, have one called "father," to whom they give in their

accounts. These fathers are not only more saintly in their conduct,

but also distinguished for divine learning, and of high character in

every way; and without pride they superintend those whom they call

their children, having themselves great authority in giving orders, and

meeting with willing obedience from those under their charge. At the

close of the day they assemble from their separate dwellings before

their meal to hear their father, assembling to the number of three

thousand at least for one father; for one may have even a much larger

number than this. They listen with astonishing eagerness in perfect

silence, and give expression to the feelings of their minds as moved by

the words of the preacher, in groans, or tears, or signs of joy without

noise or shouting. Then there is refreshment for the body, as much as

health and a sound condition of the body requires, every one checking

unlawful appetite, so as not to go to excess even in the poor,

inexpensive fare provided. So they not only abstain from flesh and

wine, in order to gain the mastery over their passions, but also from

those things which are only the more likely to whet the appetite of the

palate and of the stomach, from what some call their greater cleanness,

which often serves as a ridiculous and disgraceful excuse for an

unseemly taste for exquisite viands, as distant from animal food.

Whatever they possess in addition to what is required for their support

(and much is obtained, owing to their industry and frugality), they

distribute to the needy with greater care than they took in procuring

it for themselves. For while they make no effort to obtain abundance,

they make every effort to prevent their abundance remaining with

them,--so much so, that they send shiploads to places inhabited by poor

people. I need say no more on a matter known to all. [141]

68. Such, too, is the life of the women, who serve God assiduously and

chastely, living apart and removed as far as propriety demands from the

men, to whom they are united only in pious affection and in imitation

of virtue. No young men are allowed access to them, nor even old men,

however respectable and approved, except to the porch, in order to

furnish necessary supplies. For the women occupy and maintain

themselves by working in wool, and hand over the cloth to the brethren,

from whom, in return, they get what they need for food. Such customs,

such a life, such arrangements, such a system, I could not commend as

it deserves, if I wished to commend it; besides, I am afraid that it

would seem as if I thought it unlikely to gain acceptance from the mere

description of it, if I considered myself obliged to add an ornamental

eulogium to the simple narrative. Ye Manich�ans, find fault here if

you can. Do not bring into prominence our tares before men too blind

to discriminate.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[141] [This picture of coenobitic life, even in its purest form, is

doubtless idealized. It is certain that the monasteries very soon

became hot-beds of vice, and the refuge of the scum of

society.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 32.--Praise of the Clergy.

69. There is not, however, such narrowness in the moral excellence of

the Catholic Church as that I should limit my praise of it to the life

of those here mentioned. For how many bishops have I known most

excellent and holy men, how many presbyters, how many deacons, and

ministers of all kinds of the divine sacraments, whose virtue seems to

me more admirable and more worthy of commendation on account of the

greater difficulty of preserving it amidst the manifold varieties of

men, and in this life of turmoil! For they preside over men needing

cure as much as over those already cured. The vices of the crowd must

be borne with in order that they may be cured, and the plague must be

endured before it is subdued. To keep here the best way of life and a

mind calm and peaceful is very hard. Here, in a word, we are among

people who are learning to live. There they live.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 33.--Another Kind of Men Living Together in Cities. Fasts of

Three Days.

70. Still I would not on this account cast a slight upon a

praiseworthy class of Christians,--those, namely, who live together in

cities, quite apart from common life. I saw at Milan a lodging-house

of saints, in number not a few, presided over by one presbyter, a man

of great excellence and learning. At Rome I knew several places where

there was in each one eminent for weight of character, and prudence,

and divine knowledge, presiding over all the rest who lived with him,

in Christian charity, and sanctity, and liberty. These, too, are not

burdensome to any one; but, in the Eastern fashion, and on the

authority of the Apostle Paul, they maintain themselves with their own

hands. I was told that many practised fasts of quite amazing severity,

not merely taking only one meal daily towards night, which is

everywhere quite common, but very often continuing for three days or

more in succession without food or drink. And this among not men only,

but women, who also live together in great numbers as widows or

virgins, gaining a livelihood by spinning and weaving, and presided

over in each case by a woman of the greatest judgment and experience,

skilled and accomplished not only in directing and forming moral

conduct, but also in instructing the understanding. [142]

71. With all this, no one is pressed to endure hardships for which he

is unfit; nothing is imposed on any one against his will; nor is he

condemned by the rest because he confesses himself too feeble to

imitate them: for they bear in mind how strongly Scripture enjoins

charity on all: they bear in mind "To the pure all things are pure,"

[143] and "Not that which entereth into your mouth defileth you, but

that which cometh out of it." [144] Accordingly, all their endeavors

are concerned not about the rejection of kinds of food as polluted, but

about the subjugation of inordinate desire and the maintenance of

brotherly love. They remember, "Meats for the belly, and the belly for

meats; but God shall destroy both it and them;" [145] and again,

"Neither if we eat shall we abound, nor if we refrain from eating shall

we be in want;" [146] and, above all, this: "It is good, my brethren,

not to eat flesh, nor drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother is

offended;" for this passage shows that love is the end to be aimed at

in all these things. "For one man," he says, "believes that he can eat

all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs. He that eateth, let

him not despise him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not

judge him that eateth: for God hath approved him. Who art thou that

thou shouldest judge another man's servant? To his own master he

stands or fails; but he shall stand: for God is able to make him to

stand." And a little after: "He that eateth, to the Lord he eateth,

and giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth

not, and giveth God thanks." And also in what follows: "So every one

of us shall give account of himself to God. Let us not, then, any more

judge one another: but judge this rather, that ye place no

stumbling-block, or cause of offence, in the way of a brother. I know,

and am confident in the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing common in

itself: but to him that thinketh anything to be common, to him it is

common." Could he have shown better that it is not in the things we

eat, but in the mind, that there is a power able to pollute it, and

therefore that even those who are fit to think lightly of these things,

and know perfectly that they are not polluted if they take any food in

mental superiority, without being gluttons, should still have regard to

charity? See what he adds: "For if thy brother be grieved with thy

meat, now walkest thou not charitably." [147]

72. Read the rest: it is too long to quote all. You will find that

those able to think lightly of such things,--that is, those of greater

strength and stability,--are told that they must nevertheless abstain,

lest those should be offended who from their weakness are still in need

of such abstinence. The people I was describing know and observe these

things; for they are Christians, not heretics. They understand

Scripture according to the apostolic teaching, not according to the

presumptuous and fictitious name of apostle. [148] Him that eats not

no one despises; him that eats no one judges; he who is weak eats

herbs. Many who are strong, however, do this for the sake of the weak;

with many the reason for so doing is not this, but that they may have a

cheaper diet, and may lead a life of the greatest tranquillity, with

the least expensive provision for the support of the body. "For all

things are lawful for me," he says; "but I will not be brought under

the power of any." [149] Thus many do not eat flesh, and yet do not

superstitiously regard it as unclean. And so the same people who

abstain when in health take it when unwell without any fear, if it is

required as a cure. Many drink no wine; but they do not think that

wine defiles them; for they cause it to be given with the greatest

propriety and moderation to people of languid temperament, and, in

short, to all who cannot have bodily health without it. When some

foolishly refuse it, they counsel them as brothers not to let a silly

superstition make them weaker instead of making them holier. They read

to them the apostle's precept to his disciple to "take a little wine

for his many infirmities." [150] Then they diligently exercise piety;

bodily exercise, they know, profiteth for a short time, as the same

apostle says. [151]

73. Those, then who are able, and they are without number, abstain

both from flesh and from wine for two reasons: either for the weakness

of their brethren, or for their own liberty. Charity is principally

attended to. There is charity in their choice of diet, charity in

their speech, charity in their dress, charity in their looks. Charity

is the point where they meet, and the plan by which they act. To

transgress against charity is thought criminal, like transgressing

against God. Whatever opposes this is attacked and expelled; whatever

injures it is not allowed to continue for a single day. They know that

it has been so enjoined by Christ and the apostles; that without it all

things are empty, with it all are fulfilled.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[142] [Augustin ascribes a broadmindedness and charitableness to the

ascetics of his time which was doubtless quite subjective. The

ascetics of that age with whose history we are acquainted were not of

this type. Jerome is an example.--A.H.N.]

[143] Tit. i. 15.

[144] Matt. xv. 11.

[145] 1 Cor. vi. 13.

[146] 1 Cor. viii. 8.

[147] Rom. xiv. 2-21.

[148] See title of the Epistle of Manich�us, Contra Faust. xiii. 4.

[149] 1 Cor. vi. 12.

[150] 1 Tim. v. 23.

[151] 1 Tim. iv. 8.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 34.--The Church is Not to Be Blamed for the Conduct of Bad

Christians, Worshippers of Tombs and Pictures.

74. Make objections against these, ye Manich�ans, if you can. Look at

these people, and speak of them reproachfully, if you dare, without

falsehood. Compare their fasts with your fasts, their chastity with

yours; compare them to yourselves in dress, food, self-restraint, and,

lastly, in charity. Compare, which is most to the point, their

precepts with yours. Then you will see the difference between show and

sincerity, between the right way and the wrong, between faith and

imposture, between strength and inflatedness, between happiness and

wretchedness, between unity and disunion; in short, between the sirens

of superstition and the harbor of religion.

75. Do not summon against me professors of the Christian name, who

neither know nor give evidence of the power of their profession. [152]

Do not hunt up the numbers of ignorant people, who even in the true

religion are superstitious, or are so given up to evil passions as to

forget what they have promised to God. I know that there are many

worshippers of tombs and pictures. I know that there are many who

drink to great excess over the dead, and who, in the feasts which they

make for corpses, bury themselves over the buried, and give to their

gluttony and drunkenness the name of religion. I know that there are

many who in words have renounced this world, and yet desire to be

burdened with all the weight of worldly things, and rejoice in such

burdens. Nor is it surprising that among so many multitudes you should

find some by condemning whose life you may deceive the unwary and

seduce them from Catholic safety; for in your small numbers you are at

a loss when called on to show even one out of those whom you call the

elect who keeps the precepts, which in your indefensible superstition

you profess. How silly those are, how impious, how mischievous, and to

what extent they are neglected by most, nearly all of you, I have shown

in another volume.

76. My advice to you now is this: that you should at least desist

from slandering the Catholic Church, by declaiming against the conduct

of men whom the Church herself condemns, seeking daily to correct them

as wicked children. Then, if any of them by good will and by the help

of God are corrected, they regain by repentance what they had lost by

sin. Those, again, who with wicked will persist in their old vices, or

even add to them others still worse, are indeed allowed to remain in

the field of the Lord, and to grow along with the good seed; but the

time for separating the tares will come. [153] Or if, from their

having at least the Christian name, they are to be placed among the

chaff rather than among thistles, there will also come One to purge the

floor and to separate the chaff from the wheat, and to assign to each

part (according to its desert) the due reward. [154]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[152] ^ [Augustin says nothing of the encouragement given to such

pagan practices by men regarded in that age as possessed of almost

superhuman sanctity, such as Sulpicius Severus, Paulinus of Nola, etc.

He speaks of corruptions as if they were exceptional, whereas they seem

to have been the rule. Yet there is force in his contention that

Christianity be judged by its best products rather than by the worst

elements associated with it.--A.H.N.]

[153] [Augustin's ideal representation of Christianity and his

identification of the organized Catholic Church with Christianity is

quite inconsistent with the practice of the Church which he here seeks

to justify. No duty is more distinctly enjoined upon believers in the

New Testament than separation from unbelievers and evil doers. But

such separation is impracticable in an established Church such as that

to which Augustin rejoiced to belong.--A.H.N.]

[154] Matt. iii. 13, and xiii. 24-43.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 35.--Marriage and Property Allowed to the Baptized by the

Apostles.

77. Meanwhile, why do you rage? why does party spirit blind your

eyes? Why do you entangle yourselves in a long defence of such great

error? Seek for fruit in the field, seek for wheat in the floor: they

will be found easily, and will present themselves to the inquirer. Why

do you look so exclusively at the dross? Why do you use the roughness

of the hedge to scare away the inexperienced from the fatness of the

garden? There is a proper entrance, though known to but a few; and by

it men come in, though you disbelieve it, or do not wish to find it.

In the Catholic Church there are believers without number who do not

use the world, and there are those who "use it," in the words of the

apostle, "as not using it," [155] as was proved in those times when

Christians were forced to worship idols. For then, how many wealthy

men, how many peasant householders, how many merchants, how many

military men, how many leading men in their own cities, and how many

senators, people of both sexes, giving up all these empty and

transitory things, though while they used them they were not bound down

by them, endured death for the salutary faith and religion, and proved

to unbelievers that instead of being possessed by all these things they

really possessed them?

78. Why do you reproach us by saying that men renewed in baptism ought

no longer to beget children, or to possess fields, and houses, and

money? Paul allows it. For, as cannot be denied, he wrote to

believers, after recounting many kinds of evil-doers who shall not

possess the kingdom of God: "And such were you," he says: "but ye are

washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the

Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God." By the washed and

sanctified, no one, assuredly, will venture to think any are meant but

believers, and those who have renounced this world. But, after showing

to whom he writes, let us see whether he allows these things to them.

He goes on: "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not

expedient: all things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought

under the power of any. Meat for the belly, and the belly for meats:

but God will destroy both it and them. Now the body is not for

fornication, but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body. But God

raised up the Lord, and will raise us up also by His own power. Know

ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? shall I then take

the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot? God

forbid. Know ye not that he which is joined to an harlot is made one

body? for the twain, saith He, shall be one flesh. But he that is

joined to the Lord is one spirit. Flee fornication. Whatever sin a

man doeth is without the body: but he that committeth fornication

sinneth against his own body. Know ye not that your members are the

temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye

are not your own? For ye are bought with a great price: glorify God,

and carry Him in your body." [156] "But of the things concerning

which ye wrote to me: it is good for a man not to touch a woman.

Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife,

and let every woman have her own husband. Let the husband render unto

the wife due benevolence: and likewise also the wife unto the

husband. The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband:

and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the

wife. Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a

time, that ye may have leisure for prayer; and come together again,

that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency. But I speak this by

permission, and not of commandment. For I would that all men were even

as I myself: but every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this

manner, and another after that." [157]

79. Has the apostle, think you, both shown sufficiently to the strong

what is highest, and permitted to the weaker what is next best? Not to

touch a woman he shows is highest when he says, "I would that all men

were even as I myself." But next to this highest is conjugal chastity,

that man may not be the prey of fornication. Did he say that these

people were not yet believers because they were married? Indeed, by

this conjugal chastity he says that those who are united are sanctified

by one another, if one of them is an unbeliever, and that their

children also are sanctified. "The unbelieving husband," he says, "is

sanctified by the believing wife, and the unbelieving woman by the

believing husband: otherwise your children would be unclean; but now

are they holy." [158] Why do you persist in opposition to such plain

truth? Why do you try to darken the light of Scripture by vain

shadows?

80. Do not say that catechumens are allowed to have wives, but not

believers; that catechumens may have money, but not believers. For

there are many who use as not using. And in that sacred washing the

renewal of the new man is begun so as gradually to reach perfection, in

some more quickly, in others more slowly. The progress, however, to a

new life is made in the case of many, if we view the matter without

hostility, but attentively. As the apostle says of himself, "Though

the outward man perish, the inward man is renewed day by day." [159]

The apostle says that the inward man is renewed day by day that it may

reach perfection; and you wish it to begin with perfection! And it

were well if you did wish it. In reality, you aim not at raising the

weak, but at misleading the unwary. You ought not to have spoken so

arrogantly, even if it were known that you are perfect in your childish

precepts. But when your conscience knows that those whom you bring

into your sect, when they come to a more intimate acquaintance with

you, will find many things in you which nobody hearing you accuse

others would suspect, is it not great impertinence to demand perfection

in the weaker Catholics, to turn away the inexperienced from the

Catholic Church, while you show nothing of the kind in yourself to

those thus turned away? But not to seem to inveigh against you without

reason, I will now close this volume, and will proceed at last to set

forth the precepts of your life and your notable customs.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[155] 1 Cor. vii. 31.

[156] 1 Cor. vi. 11-20.

[157] 1 Cor. vii. 1-7.

[158] 1 Cor. vii. 14.

[159] 2 Cor. iv. 16.
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\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

On the Morals of the Manich�ans.

[De Moribus Manich�orum.] a.d. 388.

Containing a particular refutation of the doctrine of these heretics

regarding the origin and nature of evil; an exposure of their pretended

symbolical customs of the mouth, of the hands, and of the breast; and a

condemnation of their superstitious abstinence and unholy mysteries.

Lastly, some crimes brought to light among the Manich�ans are

mentioned.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 1.--The Supreme Good is that Which is Possessed of Supreme

Existence.

1. Every one, I suppose, will allow that the question of things good

and evil belongs to moral science, in which such terms are in common

use. It is therefore to be wished that men would bring to these

inquiries such a clear intellectual perfection as might enable them to

see the chief good, than which nothing is better or higher, next in

order to which comes a rational soul in a state of purity and

perfection. [160] If this were clearly understood, it would also

become evident that the chief good is that which is properly described

as having supreme and original existence. For that exists in the

highest sense of the word which continues always the same, which is

throughout like itself, which cannot in any part be corrupted or

changed, which is not subject to time, which admits of no variation in

its present as compared with its former condition. This is existence

in its true sense. For in this signification of the word existence

there is implied a nature which is self-contained, and which continues

immutably. Such things can be said only of God, to whom there is

nothing contrary in the strict sense of the word. For the contrary of

existence is non-existence. There is therefore no nature contrary to

God. But since the minds with which we approach the study of these

subjects have their vision damaged and dulled by silly notions, and by

perversity of will, let us try as we can to gain some little knowledge

of this great matter by degrees and with caution, making our inquiries

not like men able to see, but like men groping the dark.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[160] This statement has a complete parallel in Clement of Alexandria,

and along with what follows, is Neo-Platonic.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 2.--What Evil is. That Evil is that Which is Against Nature.

In Allowing This, the Manich�ans Refute Themselves.

2. You Manich�ans often, if not in every case, ask those whom you try

to bring over to your heresy, Whence is evil? Suppose I had now met

you for the first time, I would ask you, if you please, to follow my

example in putting aside for a little the explanation you suppose

yourselves to have got of these subjects, and to commence this great

inquiry with me as if for the first time. You ask me, Whence is evil?

I ask you in return, What is evil? Which is the more reasonable

question? Are those right who ask whence a thing is, when they do not

know what it is; or he who thinks it necessary to inquire first what it

is, in order to avoid the gross absurdity of searching for the origin

of a thing unknown? Your answer is quite correct, when you say that

evil is that which is contrary to nature; for no one is so mentally

blind as not to see that, in every kind, evil is that which is contrary

to the nature of the kind. But the establishment of this doctrine is

the overthrow of your heresy. For evil is no nature, if it is contrary

to nature. Now, according to you, evil is a certain nature and

substance. Moreover, whatever is contrary to nature must oppose nature

and seek its destruction. For nature means nothing else than that

which anything is conceived of as being in its own kind. Hence is the

new word which we now use derived from the word for being,--essence

namely, or, as we usually say, substance,--while before these words

were in use, the word nature was used instead. Here, then, if you will

consider the matter without stubbornness, we see that evil is that

which falls away from essence and tends to non-existence.

3. Accordingly, when the Catholic Church declares that God is the

author of all natures and substances, those who understand this

understand at the same time that God is not the author of evil. For

how can He who is the cause of the being of all things be at the same

time the cause of their not being,--that is, of their falling off from

essence and tending to non-existence? For this is what reason plainly

declares to be the definition of evil. Now, how can that race of evil

of yours, which you make the supreme evil, be against nature, that is,

against substance, when it, according to you, is itself a nature and

substance? For if it acts against itself, it destroys its own

existence; and when that is completely done, it will come at last to be

the supreme evil. But this cannot be done, because you will have it

not only to be, but to be everlasting. That cannot then be the chief

evil which is spoken of as a substance. [161]

4. But what am I to do? I know that many of you can understand

nothing of all this. I know, too, that there are some who have a good

understanding and can see these things, and yet are so stubborn in

their choice of evil,--a choice that will ruin their understanding as

well,--that they try rather to find what reply they can make in order

to impose upon inactive and feeble minds, instead of giving their

assent to the truth. Still I shall not regret having written either

what one of you may come some day to consider impartially, and be led

to abandon your error, or what men of understanding and in allegiance

to God, and who are still untainted with your errors, may read and so

be kept from being led astray by your addresses.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[161] [On Augustin's view of negativity of evil and on the relation of

this view to Neo-Platonism, see Introduction, chapter IX. Augustin's

view seems to exclude the permanence of evil in the world, and so

everlasting punishment and everlasting rebellion against God.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 3.--If Evil is Defined as that Which is Hurtful, This Implies

Another Refutation of the Manich�ans.

5. Let us then inquire more carefully, and, if possible, more

plainly. I ask you again, What is evil? If you say it is that which

is hurtful, here, too, you will not answer amiss. But consider, I pray

you; be on your guard, I beg of you; be so good as to lay aside party

spirit, and make the inquiry for the sake of finding the truth, not of

getting the better of it. Whatever is hurtful takes away some good

from that to which it is hurtful; for without the loss of good there

can be no hurt. What, I appeal to you, can be plainer than this? what

more intelligible? What else is required for complete demonstration to

one of average understanding, if he is not perverse? But, if this is

granted, the consequence seems plain. In that race which you take for

the chief evil, nothing can be liable to be hurt, since there is no

good in it. But if, as you assert, there are two natures,--the kingdom

of light and the kingdom of darkness; since you make the kingdom of

light to be God, attributing to it an uncompounded nature, [162] so

that it has no part inferior to another, you must grant, however

decidedly in opposition to yourselves, you must grant, nevertheless,

that this nature, which you not only do not deny to be the chief good,

but spend all your strength in trying to show that it is so, is

immutable, incorruptible, impenetrable, inviolable, for otherwise it

would not be the chief good; for the chief good is that than which

there is nothing better, and for such a nature to be hurt is

impossible. Again, if, as has been shown, to hurt is to deprive of

good, there can be no hurt to the kingdom of darkness, for there is no

good in it. And as the kingdom of light cannot be hurt, as it is

inviolable, what can the evil you speak of be hurtful to?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[162] [It is probable that Mani thought of the Kingdom of Light

pantheistically, and that the principles personified in his

mythological system were the result of efforts on his part to connect

the infinite with the finite.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 4.--The Difference Between What is Good in Itself and What is

Good by Participation.

6. Now, compare with this perplexity, from which you cannot escape,

the consistency of the statements in the teaching of the Catholic

Church, according to which there is one good which is good supremely

and in itself, and not by the participation of any good, but by its own

nature and essence; and another good which is good by participation,

and by having something bestowed. Thus it has its being as good from

the supreme good, which, however, is still self-contained, and loses

nothing. This second kind of good is called a creature, which is liable

to hurt through falling away. But of this falling away God is not the

author, for He is author of existence and of being. Here we see the

proper use of the word evil; for it is correctly applied not to

essence, but to negation or loss. We see, too, what nature it is which

is liable to hurt. This nature is not the chief evil, for when it is

hurt it loses good; nor is it the chief good, for its falling away from

good is because it is good not intrinsically, but by possessing the

good. And a thing cannot be good by nature when it is spoken of as

being made, which shows that the goodness was bestowed. Thus, on the

one hand, God is the good, and all things which He has made are good,

though not so good as He who made them. For what madman would venture

to require that the works should equal the workman, the creatures the

Creator? What more do you want? Could you wish for anything plainer

than this?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 5.--If Evil is Defined to Be Corruption, This Completely

Refutes the Manich�an Heresy.

7. I ask a third time, What is evil? Perhaps you will reply,

Corruption. Undeniably this is a general definition of evil; for

corruption implies opposition to nature, and also hurt. But corruption

exists not by itself, but in some substance which it corrupts; for

corruption itself is not a substance. So the thing which it corrupts

is not corruption, is not evil; for what is corrupted suffers the loss

of integrity and purity. So that which has no purity to lose cannot be

corrupted; and what has, is necessarily good by the participation of

purity. Again, what is corrupted is perverted; and what is perverted

suffers the loss of order, and order is good. To be corrupted, then,

does not imply the absence of good; for in corruption it can be

deprived of good, which could not be if there was the absence of good.

Therefore that race of darkness, if it was destitute of all good, as

you say it was, could not be corrupted, for it had nothing which

corruption could take from it; and if corruption takes nothing away, it

does not corrupt. Say now, if you dare, that God and the kingdom of

God can be corrupted, when you cannot show how the kingdom of the

devil, such as you make it, can be corrupted.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 6.--What Corruption Affects and What It is.

8. What further does the Catholic light say? What do you suppose, but

what is the actual truth, that it is the created substance which can be

corrupted, for the uncreated, which is the chief good, is

incorruptible; and corruption, which is the chief evil, cannot be

corrupted; besides, that it is not a substance? But if you ask what

corruption is, consider to what it seeks to bring the things which it

corrupts; for it affects those things according to its own nature. Now

all things by corruption fall away from what they were, and are brought

to non-continuance, to non-existence; for existence implies

continuance. Thus the supreme and chief existence is so called because

it continues in itself, or is self-contained. In the case of a thing

changing for the better, the change is not from continuance, but from

perversion to the worse, that is, from falling away from essence; the

author of which falling away is not He who is the author of the

essence. So in some things there is change for the better, and so a

tendency towards existence. And this change is not called a

perversion, but reversion or conversion; for perversion is opposed to

orderly arrangement. Now things which tend towards existence tend

towards order, and, attaining order they attain existence, as far as

that is possible to a creature. For order reduces to a certain

uniformity that which it arranges; and existence is nothing else than

being one. Thus, so far as anything acquires unity, so far it exists.

For uniformity and harmony are the effects of unity, and by these

compound things exist as far as they have existence. For simple things

exist by themselves, for they are one. But things not simple imitate

unity by the agreement of their parts; and so far as they attain this,

so far they exist. This arrangement is the cause of existence,

disorder of non-existence; and perversion or corruption are the other

names for disorder. So whatever is corrupted tends to non-existence.

You may now be left to reflect upon the effect of corruption, that you

may discover what is the chief evil; for it is that which corruption

aims at accomplishing.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 7.--The Goodness of God Prevents Corruption from Bringing

Anything to Non-Existence. The Difference Between Creating and

Forming.

9. But the goodness of God does not permit the accomplishment of this

end, but so orders all things that fall away that they may exist where

their existence is most suitable, till in the order of their movements

they return to that from which they fell away. [163] Thus, when

rational souls fall away from God, although they possess the greatest

amount of free-will, He ranks them in the lower grades of creation,

where their proper place is. So they suffer misery by the divine

judgment, while they are ranked suitably to their deserts. Hence we

see the excellence of that saying which you are always inveighing

against so strongly, "I make good things, and create evil things."

[164] To create is to form and arrange. So in some copies it is

written, "I make good things and form evil things." To make is used of

things previously not in existence; but to form is to arrange what had

some kind of existence, so as to improve and enlarge it. Such are the

things which God arranges when He says, "I form evil things," meaning

things which are falling off, and so tending to non-existence,--not

things which have reached that to which they tend. For it has been

said, Nothing is allowed in the providence of God to go the length of

non-existence. [165]

10. These things might be discussed more fully and at greater length,

but enough has been said for our purpose in dealing with you. We have

only to show you the gate which you despair of finding, and make the

uninstructed despair of it too. You can be made to enter only by

good-will, on which the divine mercy bestows peace, as the song in the

Gospel says, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of

good-will." [166] It is enough, I say, to have shown you that there

is no way of solving the religious question of good and evil, unless

whatever is, as far as it is, is from God; while as far as it falls

away from being it is not of God, and yet is always ordered by Divine

Providence in agreement with the whole system. If you do not yet see

this, I know nothing else that I can do but to discuss the things

already said with greater particularity. For nothing save piety and

purity can lead the mind to greater things.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[163] In Retract. i. 7, � 6, it is said: "This must not be understood

to mean that all things return to that from which they fell away, as

Origen believed, but only those which do return. Those who shall be

punished in everlasting fire do not return to God, from whom they fell

away. Still they are in order as existing in punishment where their

existence is most suitable." [This does not really meet the difficulty

suggested on a preceding page.--A.H.N.]

[164] Isa. xlv. 7.

[165] [That is to say nothing is absolutely evil, and conversely what

is absolutely evil is ipso facto non-existent.--A.H.N.]

[166] Luke ii. 14.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 8.--Evil is Not a Substance, But a Disagreement Hostile to

Substance.

11. For what other answer will you give to the question, What is evil?

but either that it is against nature, or that it is hurtful, or that it

is corruption, or something similar? But I have shown that in these

replies you make shipwreck of your cause, unless, indeed, you will

answer in the childish way in which you generally speak to children,

that evil is fire, poison, a wild beast, and so on. For one of the

leaders of this heresy, whose instructions we attended with great

familiarity and frequency, used to say with reference to a person who

held that evil was not a substance, "I should like to put a scorpion in

the man's hand, and see whether he would not withdraw his hand; and in

so doing he would get a proof, not in words but in the thing itself,

that evil is a substance, for he would not deny that the animal is a

substance." He said this not in the presence of the person, but to us,

when we repeated to him the remark which had troubled us, giving, as I

said, a childish answer to children. For who with the least tincture

of learning or science does not see that these things hurt by

disagreement with the bodily temperament, while at other times they

agree with it, so as not only not to hurt, but to produce the best

effects? For if this poison were evil in itself, the scorpion itself

would suffer first and most. In fact, if the poison were quite taken

from the animal, it would die. So for its body it is evil to lose what

it is evil for our body to receive; and it is good for it to have what

it is good for us to want. Is the same thing then both good and evil?

By no means; but evil is what is against nature, for this is evil both

to the animal and to us. This evil is the disagreement, which

certainly is not a substance, but hostile to substance. Whence then is

it? See what it leads to, and you will learn, if any inner light lives

in you. It leads all that it destroys to non-existence. Now God is

the author of existence; and there is no existence which, as far as it

is existing, leads to non-existence: Thus we learn whence disagreement

is not; as to whence it is, nothing can be said.

12. We read in history of a female criminal in Athens, who succeeded

in drinking the quantity of poison allotted as a fatal draught for the

condemned with little or no injury to her health, by taking it at

intervals. So being condemned, she took the poison in the prescribed

quantity like the rest, but rendered it powerless by accustoming

herself to it, and did not die like the rest. And as this excited

great wonder, she was banished. If poison is an evil, are we to think

that she made it to be no evil to her? What could be more absurd than

this? But because disagreement is an evil, what she did was to make

the poisonous matter agree with her own body by a process of

habituation. For how could she by any amount of cunning have brought

it about that disagreement should not hurt her? Why so? Because what

is truly and properly an evil is hurtful both always and to all. Oil

is beneficial to our bodies, but very much the opposite to many

six-footed animals. And is not hellebore sometimes food, sometimes

medicine, and sometimes poison. Does not every one maintain that salt

taken in excess is poisonous? And yet the benefits to the body from

salt are innumerable and most important. Sea-water is injurious when

drunk by land animals, but it is most suitable and useful to many who

bathe their bodies in it and to fish it is useful and wholesome in both

ways. Bread nourishes man, but kills hawks. And does not mud itself,

which is offensive and noxious when swallowed or smelt, serve as

cooling to the touch in hot weather, and as a cure for wounds from

fire? What can be nastier than dung, or more worthless than ashes?

And yet they are of such use to the fields, that the Romans thought

divine honors due to the discoverer, Stercutio, from whose name the

word for dung [stercus] is derived.

13. But why enumerate details which are countless? We need not go

farther than the four elements themselves, which, as every one knows,

are beneficial when there is agreement, and bitterly opposed to nature

when there is disagreement in the objects acted upon. We who live in

air die under earth or under water, while innumerable animals creep

alive in sand or loose earth, and fish die in our air. Fire consumes

our bodies, but, when suitably applied, it both restores from cold, and

expels diseases without number. The sun to which you bow the knee, and

than which, indeed, there is no fairer object among visible things,

strengthens the eyes of eagles, but hurts and dims our eyes when we

gaze on it; and yet we too can accustom ourselves to look upon it

without injury. Will you, then, allow the sun to be compared to the

poison which the Athenian woman made harmless by habituating herself to

it? Reflect for once, and consider that if a substance is an evil

because it hurts some one, the light which you worship cannot be

acquitted of this charge. See the preferableness of making evil in

general to consist in this disagreement, from which the sun's ray

produces dimness in the eyes, though nothing is pleasanter to the eyes

than light. [167]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[167] [The reasoning here is admirably adapted to Augustin's purpose,

which is to refute the Manich�an notion of the evil nature of material

substance.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 9.--The Manich�an Fictions About Things Good and Evil are Not

Consistent with Themselves.

14. I have said these things to make you cease, if that is possible,

giving the name of evil to a region boundless in depth and length; to a

mind wandering through the region; to the five caverns of the

elements,--one full of darkness, another of waters, another of winds,

another of fire, another of smoke; to the animals born in each of these

elements,--serpents in the darkness, swimming creatures in the waters,

flying creatures in the winds, quadrupeds in the fire, bipeds in the

smoke. For these things, as you describe them, cannot be called evil;

for all such things, as far as they exist, must have their existence

from the most high God, for as far as they exist they are good. If

pain and weakness is an evil, the animals you speak of were of such

physical strength that their abortive offspring, after, as your sect

believes, the world was formed of them, fell from heaven to earth,

according to you, and could not die. If blindness is an evil, they

could see; if deafness, they could hear. If to be nearly or altogether

dumb is an evil, their speech was so clear and intelligible, that, as

you assert, they decided to make war against God in compliance with an

address delivered in their assembly. If sterility is an evil, they

were prolific in children. If exile is an evil, they were in their own

country, and occupied their own territories. If servitude is an evil,

some of them were rulers. If death is an evil, they were alive, and

the life was such that, by your statement, even after God was

victorious, it was impossible for the mind ever to die.

15. Can you tell me how it is that in the chief evil so many good

things are to be found, the opposites of the evils above mentioned? and

if these are not evils, can any substance be an evil, as far as it is a

substance? If weakness is not an evil, can a weak body be an evil? If

blindness is not an evil, can darkness be an evil? If deafness is not

an evil, can a deaf man be an evil? If dumbness is not an evil, can a

fish be an evil? If sterility is not an evil, how can we call a barren

animal an evil? If exile is not an evil, how can we give that name to

an animal in exile, or to an animal sending some one into exile? If

servitude is not an evil, in what sense is a subject animal an evil, or

one enforcing subjection? If death is not an evil, in what sense is a

mortal animal an evil, or one causing death? Or if these are evils,

must we not give the name of good things to bodily strength, sight,

hearing, persuasive speech, fertility, native land, liberty, life, all

which you hold to exist in that kingdom of evil, and yet venture to

call it the perfection of evil?

16. Once more, if, as has never been denied, unsuitableness is an

evil, what can be more suitable than those elements to their respective

animals,--the darkness to serpents, the waters to swimming creatures,

the winds to flying creatures, the fire to voracious animals, the smoke

to soaring animals? Such is the harmony which you describe as existing

in the race of strife; such the order in the seat of confusion. If

what is hurtful is an evil, I do not repeat the strong objection

already stated, that no hurt can be suffered where no good exists; but

if that is not so clear, one thing at least is easily seen and

understood as following from the acknowledged truth, that what is

hurtful is an evil. The smoke in that region did not hurt bipeds: it

produced them, and nourished and sustained them without injury in their

birth, their growth, and their rule. But now, when the evil has some

good mixed with it, the smoke has become more hurtful, so that we, who

certainly are bipeds, instead of being sustained by it, are blinded,

and suffocated, and killed by it. Could the mixture of good have given

such destructiveness to evil elements? Could there be such confusion

in the divine government?

17. In the other cases, at least, how is it that we find that

congruity which misled your author and induced him to fabricate

falsehoods? Why does darkness agree with serpents, and waters with

swimming creatures, and winds with flying creatures, though the fire

burns up quadrupeds, and smoke chokes us? Then, again, have not

serpents very sharp sight, and do they not love the sunshine, and

abound most where the calmness of the air prevents the clouds from

gathering much or often? How very absurd that the natives and lovers

of darkness should live most comfortably and agreeably where the

clearest light is enjoyed! Or if you say that it is the heat rather

than the light that they enjoy, it would be more reasonable to assign

to fire serpents, which are naturally of rapid motion, than the

slow-going asp. [168] Besides, all must admit that light is agreeable

to the eyes of the asp, for they are compared to an eagle's eyes. But

enough of the lower animals. Let us, I pray, attend to what is true of

ourselves without persisting in error, and so our minds shall be

disentangled from silly and mischievous falsehoods. For is it not

intolerable perversity to say that in the race of darkness, where there

was no mixture of light, the biped animals had so sound and strong, so

incredible force of eyesight, that even in their darkness they could

see the perfectly pure light (as you represent it) of the kingdom of

God? for, according to you, even these beings could see this light, and

could gaze at it, and study it, and delight in it, and desire it;

whereas our eyes, after mixture with light, with the chief good, yea,

with God, have become so tender and weak, that we can neither see

anything in the dark, nor bear to look at the sun, but, after looking,

lose sight of what we could see before.

18. The same remarks are applicable if we take corruption to be an

evil, which no one doubts. The smoke did not corrupt that race of

animals, though it corrupts animals now. Not to go over all the

particulars, which would be tedious, and is not necessary, the living

creatures of your imaginary description were so much less liable to

corruption than animals are now, that their abortive and premature

offspring, cast headlong from heaven to earth, both lived and were

productive, and could band together again, having, forsooth, their

original vigor, because they were conceived before good was mixed with

the evil; for, after this mixture, the animals born are, according to

you, those which we now see to be very feeble and easily giving way to

corruption. Can any one persist in the belief of error like this,

unless he fails to see these things, or is affected by your habit and

association in such an amazing way as to be proof against all the force

of reasoning?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[168] ^ [The text has asinum in this sentence but aspidem in the

next. The former is a mistake.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 10.--Three Moral Symbols Devised by the Manich�ans for No Good.

19. Now that I have shown, as I think, how much darkness and error is

in your opinions about good and evil things in general, let us examine

now those three symbols which you extol so highly, and boast of as

excellent observances. What then are those three symbols? That of the

mouth, that of the hands, and that of the breast. What does this

mean? That man, we are told, should be pure and innocent in mouth, in

hands, and in breast. But what if he sins with eyes, ears, or nose?

What if he hurts some one with his heels, or perhaps kills him? How

can he be reckoned criminal when he has not sinned with mouth, hands,

or breast? But, it is replied, by the mouth we are to understand all

the organs of sense in the head; by the hands, all bodily actions; by

the breast, all lustful tendencies. To what, then, do you assign

blasphemies? To the mouth or to the hand? For blasphemy is an action

of the tongue. And if all actions are to be classed under one head,

why should you join together the actions of the hands and the feet, and

not those of the tongue. Do you wish to separate the action of the

tongue, as being for the purpose of expressing something, from actions

which are not for this purpose, so that the symbol of the hands should

mean abstinence from all evil actions which are not for the purpose of

expressing something? But then, what if some one sins by expressing

something with his hands, as is done in writing or in some significant

gesture? This cannot be assigned to the tongue and the mouth, for it

is done by the hands. When you have three symbols of the mouth, the

hands, and the breast, it is quite inadmissible to charge against the

mouth sins found in the hands. And if you assign action in general to

the hands, there is no reason for including under this the action of

the feet and not that of the tongue. Do you see how the desire of

novelty, with its attendant error, lands you in great difficulties?

For you find it impossible to include purification of all sins in these

three symbols, which you set forth as a kind of new classification.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 11.--The Value of the Symbol of the Mouth Among the Manich�ans,

Who are Found Guilty of Blaspheming God.

20. Classify as you please, omit what you please, we must discuss the

doctrines you insist upon most. You say that the symbol of the mouth

implies refraining from all blasphemy. But blasphemy is speaking evil

of good things. So usually the word blasphemy is applied only to

speaking evil of God; for as regards man there is uncertainty, but God

is without controversy good. If, then, you are proved guilty of saying

worse things of God than any one else says, what becomes of your famous

symbol of the mouth? The evidence is not obscure, but clear and

obvious to every understanding, and irresistible, the more so that no

one can remain in ignorance of it, that God is incorruptible,

immutable, liable to no injury, to no want, to no weakness, to no

misery. All this the common sense of rational beings perceives, and

even you assent when you hear it.

21. But when you begin to relate your fables, that God is corruptible,

and mutable, and subject to injury, and exposed to want and weakness,

and not secure from misery, this is what you are blind enough to teach,

and what some are blind enough to believe. And this is not all; for,

according to you, God is not only corruptible, but corrupted; not only

changeable, but changed; not only subject to injury, but injured; not

only liable to want, but in want; not only possibly, but actually weak;

not only exposed to misery, but miserable. You say that the soul is

God, or a part of God. I do not see how it can be part of God without

being God. A part of gold is gold; of silver silver; of stone stone;

and, to come to greater things, part of earth is earth, part of water

is water, and of air air; and if you take part from fire, you will not

deny it to be fire; and part of light can be nothing but light. Why

then should part of God not be God? Has God a jointed body, like man

and the lower animals? For part of man is not man.

22. I will deal with each of these opinions separately. If you view

God as resembling light, you must admit that part of God is God.

Hence, when you make the soul part of God, though you allow it to be

corrupted as being foolish, and changed as having once been wise, and

in want as needing health, and feeble as needing medicine, and

miserable as desiring happiness, all these things you profanely

attribute to God. Or if you deny these things of the mind, it follows

that the Spirit is not required to lead the soul into truth, since it

is not in folly; nor is the soul renewed by true religion, since it

does not need renewal; nor is it perfected by your symbols, since it is

already perfect; nor does God give it assistance, since it does not

need it; nor is Christ its physician, since it is in health; nor does

it require the promise of happiness in another life. Why then is Jesus

called the deliverer, according to His own words in the Gospel, "If the

Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed?" [169] And the

Apostle Paul says, "Ye have been called to liberty." [170] The soul,

then, which has not attained this liberty is in bondage. Therefore,

according to you, God, since part of God is God, is both corrupted by

folly, and is changed by falling, and is injured by the loss of

perfection, and is in need of help, and is weakened by disease, and

bowed down with misery, and subject to disgraceful bondage.

23. Again, if part of God is not God, still He is not incorrupt when

His part is corrupted, nor unchanged when there is change in any part,

nor uninjured when He is not perfect in every part, nor free from want

when He is busily endeavoring to recover part of Himself, nor quite

whole when He has a weak part, nor perfectly happy when any part is

suffering misery, nor entirely free when any part is under bondage.

These are conclusions to which you are driven, because you say that the

soul, which you see to be in such a calamitous condition, is part of

God. If you can succeed in making your sect abandon these and many

similar opinions, then you may speak of your mouth being free from

blasphemies. Better still, leave the sect; for if you cease to believe

and to repeat what Manich�us has written, you will be no longer

Manich�ans.

24. That God is the supreme good, and that than which nothing can be

or can be conceived better, we must either understand or believe, if we

wish to keep clear of blasphemy. There is a relation of numbers which

cannot possibly be impaired or altered, nor can any nature by any

amount of violence prevent the number which comes after one from being

the double of one. This can in no way be changed; and yet you

represent God as changeable! This relation preserves its integrity

inviolable; and you will not allow God an equality even in this! Let

some race of darkness take in the abstract the number three, consisting

of indivisible units, and divide it into two equal parts. Your mind

perceives that no hostility could effect this. And can that which is

unable to injure a numerical relation injure God? If it could not,

what possible necessity could there be for a part of him to be mixed

with evil, and driven into such miseries?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[169] John viii. 36.

[170] Gal. v. 13.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 12.--Manich�an Subterfuge.

25. For this gives rise to the question, which used to throw us into

great perplexity even when we were your zealous disciples, nor could we

find any answer,--what the race of darkness would have done to God,

supposing He had refused to fight with it at the cost of such calamity

to part of Himself. For if God would not have suffered any loss by

remaining quiet, we thought it hard that we had been sent to endure so

much. Again, if He would have suffered, His nature cannot have been

incorruptible, as it behoves the nature of God to be. Sometimes the

answer was, that it was not for the sake of escaping evil or avoiding

injury, but that God in His natural goodness wished to bestow the

blessing of order on a disturbed and disordered nature. This is not

what we find in the Manich�an books: there it is constantly implied

and constantly asserted that God guarded against an invasion of His

enemies. But supposing this answer, which was given from want of a

better, to represent the opinion of the Manich�ans, is God, in their

view, vindicated from the charge of cruelty or weakness? For this

goodness of His to the hostile race proved most pernicious to His own

subjects. Besides, if God's nature could not be corrupted nor changed,

neither could any destructive influence corrupt or change us; and the

order to be bestowed on the race of strangers might have been bestowed

without robbing us of it.

26. Since those times, however, another answer has appeared which I

heard recently at Carthage. For one, whom I wish much to see brought

out of this error, when reduced to this same dilemma, ventured to say

that the kingdom had its own limits, which might be invaded by a

hostile race, though God Himself could not be injured. But this is a

reply which your founder would never consent to give; for he would be

likely to see that such an opinion would lead to a still speedier

demolition of his heresy. And in fact any one of average intellect,

who hears that in this nature part is subject to injury and part not,

will at once perceive that this makes not two but three natures,--one

violable, a second inviolable, and a third violating.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 13.--Actions to Be Judged of from Their Motive, Not from

Externals. Manich�an Abstinence to Be Tried by This Principle.

27. Having every day in your mouth these blasphemies which come from

your heart, you ought not to continue holding up the symbol of the

mouth as something wonderful, to ensnare the ignorant. But perhaps you

think the symbol of the mouth excellent and admirable because you do

not eat flesh or drink wine. But what is your end in this? For

according as the end we have in view in our actions, on account of

which we do whatever we do, is not only not culpable but also

praiseworthy, so only can our actions merit any praise. If the end we

have regard to in any performance is unlawful and blameworthy, the

performance itself will be unhesitatingly condemned as improper.

28. We are told of Catiline that he could bear cold, thirst, and

hunger. [171] This the vile miscreant had in common with our

apostles. What then distinguishes the parricide from our apostles but

the precisely opposite end which he followed? He bore these things in

order to gratify his fierce and ungoverned passions; they, on the other

hand, in order to restrain these passions and subdue them to reason.

You often say, when you are told of the great number of Catholic

virgins, a she-mule is a virgin. This, indeed, is said in ignorance of

the Catholic system, and is not applicable. Still, what you mean is

that this continence is worthless unless it leads, on right principles,

to an end of high excellence. Catholic Christians might also compare

your abstinence from wine and flesh to that of cattle and many small

birds, as likewise of countless sorts of worms. But, not to be

impertinent like you, I will not make this comparison prematurely, but

will first examine your end in what you do. For I suppose I may safely

take it as agreed on, that in such customs the end is the thing to look

to. Therefore, if your end is to be frugal and to restrain the

appetite which finds gratification in eating and drinking, I assent and

approve. But this is not the case.

29. Suppose, what is quite possible, that there is one so frugal and

sparing in his diet, that, instead of gratifying his appetite or his

palate, he refrains from eating twice in one day, and at supper takes a

little cabbage moistened and seasoned with lard, just enough to keep

down hunger; and quenches his thirst, from regard to his health, with

two or three draughts of pure wine; and this is his regular diet:

whereas another of different habits never takes flesh or wine, but

makes an agreeable repast at two o'clock on rare and foreign

vegetables, varied with a number of courses, and well sprinkled with

pepper, and sups in the same style towards night; and drinks

honey-vinegar, mead, raisin-wine, and the juices of various fruits, no

bad imitation of wine, and even surpassing it in sweetness; and drinks

not for thirst but for pleasure; and makes this provision for himself

daily, and feasts in this sumptuous style, not because he requires it,

but only gratifying his taste;--which of these two do you regard as

living most abstemiously in food and drink? You cannot surely be so

blind as not to put the man of the little lard and wine above this

glutton!

30. This is the true view; but your doctrine sounds very differently.

For one of your elect distinguished by the three symbols may live like

the second person in this description, and though he may be reproved by

one or two of the more sedate, he cannot be condemned as abusing the

symbols. But should he sup with the other person, and moisten his lips

with a morsel of rancid bacon, or refresh them with a drink of spoilt

wine, he is pronounced a transgressor of the symbol, and by the

judgment of your founder is consigned to hell, while you, though

wondering, must assent. Will you not discard these errors? Will you

not listen to reason? Will you not offer some little resistance to the

force of habit? Is not such doctrine most unreasonable? Is it not

insanity? Is it not the greatest absurdity that one, who stuffs and

loads his stomach every day to gratify his appetite with mushrooms,

rice, truffles, cake, mead, pepper, and assafoetida, and who fares thus

every day, cannot be convicted of transgressing the three symbols, that

is, the rule of sanctity; whereas another, who seasons his dish of the

commonest herbs with some smoky morsel of meat, and takes only so much

of this as is needed for the refreshment of his body, and drinks three

cups of wine for the sake of keeping in health, should, for exchanging

the former diet for this, be doomed to certain punishment?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[171] Sallust, in prolog. Catilin. � 3.
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Chapter 14.--Three Good Reasons for Abstaining from Certain Kinds of

Food.

31. But, you reply, the apostle says, "It is good, brethren, neither

to eat flesh, nor to drink wine." [172] No one denies that this is

good, provided that it is for the end already mentioned, of which it is

said, "Make not provision for the flesh to fulfill the lusts thereof;"

[173] or for the ends pointed out by the apostle, namely, either to

check the appetite, which is apt to go to a more wild and

uncontrollable excess in these things than in others, or lest a brother

should be offended, or lest the weak should hold fellowship with an

idol. For at the time when the apostle wrote, the flesh of sacrifices

was often sold in the market. And because wine, too, was used in

libations to the gods of the Gentiles, many weaker brethren, accustomed

to purchase such things, preferred to abstain entirely from flesh and

wine rather than run the risk of having fellowship, as they considered

it, with idols, even ignorantly. And, for their sakes, even those who

were stronger, and had faith enough to see the insignificance of these

things, knowing that nothing is unclean except from an evil conscience,

and holding by the saying of the Lord, "Not that which entereth into

your mouth defileth you, but that which cometh out of it," [174] still,

lest these weaker brethren should stumble, were bound to abstain from

these things. And this is not a mere theory, but is clearly taught in

the epistles of the apostle himself. For you are in the habit of

quoting only the words, "It is good, brethren, neither to eat flesh,

nor to drink wine," without adding what follows, "nor anything whereby

thy brother stumbleth, or is offended or is made weak." These words

show the intention of the apostle in giving the admonition.

32. This is evident from the preceding and succeeding context. The

passage is a long one to quote, but, for the sake of those who are

indolent in reading and searching the sacred Scriptures, we must give

the whole of it. "Him that is weak in the faith," says the apostle,

"receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. For one believeth that

he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not

him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him that

eateth not judge him that eateth, for God hath received him. Who art

thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth

or falleth; yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him

stand. One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth

every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He

that regardeth the day, regardeth it to the Lord. He that eateth,

eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not,

to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks. For none of us

liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live,

we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord:

whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. For to this end

Christ both lived, and died and rose again, that He might be Lord both

of the dead and living. But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why

dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the

judgment-seat of God. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord,

every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.

[175] So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.

Let us not, therefore, judge one another any more: but judge this

rather, that no man put a stumbling-block, or occasion to fall, in his

brother's way. I know, and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus, that there

is nothing common of itself: but to him that esteemeth anything to be

common, to him it is common. But if thy brother be grieved with thy

meat, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat,

for whom Christ died. Let not then our good be evil spoken of. For

the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace,

and joy in the Holy Ghost. For he who in this serveth Christ is

acceptable to God, and approved of men. Let us therefore follow after

the things which make for peace, and things whereby one may edify

another. For meat destroys not the work of God. All things indeed are

pure; but it is evil for that man who eateth with offense. It is good

neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy

brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak. Hast thou faith?

have it to thyself before God. Happy is he who condemneth not himself

in that thing which he alloweth. And he that distinguishes is damned

if he eats, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of

faith is sin. We then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of

the weak, and not to please ourselves. Let every one of us please his

neighbor for his good to edification. For even Christ pleased not

Himself." [176]

33. Is it not clear that what the apostle required was, that the

stronger should not eat flesh nor drink wine, because they gave offense

to the weak by not going along with them, and made them think that

those who in faith judged all things to be pure, did homage to idols in

not abstaining from that kind of food and drink? This is also set

forth in the following passage of the Epistle to the Corinthians: "As

concerning, therefore, the eating of those things that are offered in

sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and

that there is none other God but one. For though there be that are

called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, but to us there is but one

God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in Him; and one Lord

Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by Him. Howbeit there is

not in every man that knowledge: for some, with conscience of the idol

unto this hour, eat it as a thing offered to an idol; and their

conscience being weak is defiled. But meat commendeth us not to God:

for neither, if we eat, shall we abound; neither, if we eat not, shall

we suffer want. But take heed, lest by any means this liberty of yours

become a stumbling-block to them that are weak. For if any man see one

who has knowledge sit at meat in the idol's temple, shall not his

conscience being weak be emboldened to eat those things which are

offered to idols; and through thy knowledge shall the weak brother

perish, for whom Christ died? But when ye sin so against the brethren,

and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ. Wherefore, if

meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh forever, lest I

make my brother to offend." [177]

34. Again, in another place: "What say I then? that the idol is

anything? or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is anything?

But the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils,

and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with

devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils:

ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of devils.

Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? are we stronger than He? All

things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient: all things

are lawful for me, but all things edify not. Let no man seek his own,

but every man what is another's. Whatsoever is sold in the shambles,

that eat, asking no question for conscience sake. But if any man say

unto you, This is offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not for his sake

that shows it, and for conscience sake: conscience, I say, not thine

own, but another's: for why is my liberty judged of another man's

conscience? For if I be a partaker with thanksgiving, why am I evil

spoken of for that for which I give thanks? Whether, therefore, ye eat

or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God. Give none

offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Greeks, nor to the Church of

God: even as I please all men in all things not seeking mine own

profit, but the profit of many that they may be saved. Be ye followers

of me, even as I also am of Christ." [178]

35. It is clear, then, I think, for what end we should abstain from

flesh and wine. The end is threefold: to check indulgence, which is

mostly practised in this sort of food, and in this kind of drink goes

the length of intoxication; to protect weakness, on account of the

things which are sacrificed and offered in libation; and, what is most

praiseworthy of all, from love, not to offend the weakness of those

more feeble than ourselves, who abstain from these things. You, again,

consider a morsel of meat unclean; whereas the apostle says that all

things are clean, but that it is evil to him that eateth with offence.

And no doubt you are defiled by such food, simply because you think it

unclean. For the apostle says, "I know, and am persuaded by the Lord

Jesus, that there is nothing common of itself: but to him that

esteemeth anything common, to him it is common." And every one can see

that by common he means unclean and defiled. But it is folly to

discuss passages of Scripture with you; for you both mislead people by

promising to prove your doctrines, and those books which possess

authority to demand our homage you affirm to be corrupted by spurious

interpolations. Prove then to me your doctrine that flesh defiles the

eater, when it is taken without offending any one, without any weak

notions, and without any excess. [179]
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[172] Rom. xiv. 21.

[173] Rom. xiii. 14.

[174] Matt. xv. 2.

[175] Isa. xlv. 23, 24.

[176] Rom. xiv. and xv. 1-3.

[177] 1 Cor. viii. 4, etc.

[178] 1 Cor. x. 19-25 and 28, xi. 1.

[179] [Augustin's comparison of Manich�an with Christian asceticism is

thoroughly just and admirable.--A.H.N.]
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Chapter 15.--Why the Manich�ans Prohibit the Use of Flesh.

36. It is worth while to take note of the whole reason for their

superstitious abstinence, which is given as follows:--Since, we are

told, the member of God has been mixed with the substance of evil, to

repress it and to keep it from excessive ferocity,--for that is what

you say,--the world is made up of both natures, of good and evil, mixed

together. But this part of God is daily being set free in all parts of

the world, and restored to its own domain. But in its passage upwards

as vapor from earth to heaven, it enters plants, because their roots

are fixed in the earth, and so gives fertility and strength to all

herbs and shrubs. From these animals get their food, and, where there

is sexual intercourse, fetter in the flesh the member of God, and,

turning it from its proper course, they come in the way and entangle it

in errors and troubles. So then, if food consisting of vegetables and

fruits comes to the saints, that is, to the Manich�ans by means of

their chastity, and prayers, and psalms, whatever in it is excellent

and divine is purified, and so is entirely perfected, in order to

restoration, free from all hindrance, to its own domain. Hence you

forbid people to give bread or vegetables, or even water, which would

cost nobody anything, to a beggar, if he is not a Manich�an, lest he

should defile the member of God by his sins, and obstruct its return.

37. Flesh, you say, is made up of pollution itself. For, according to

you, some portion of that divine part escapes in the eating of

vegetables and fruits: it escapes while they undergo the infliction of

rubbing, grinding, or cooking, as also of biting or chewing. It

escapes, too, in all motions of animals, in the carriage of burdens, in

exercise, in toil, or in any sort of action. It escapes, too, in our

rest, when digestion is going on in the body by means of internal

heat. And as the divine nature escapes in all these ways, some very

unclean dregs remain, from which, in sexual intercourse, flesh is

formed. These dregs, however, fly off, in the motions above mentioned,

along with what is good in the soul; for though it is mostly, it is not

entirely good. So, when the soul has left the flesh, the dregs are

utterly filthy, and the soul of those who eat flesh is defiled.
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Chapter 16.--Disclosure of the Monstrous Tenets of the Manich�ans.

38. O the obscurity of the nature of things! How hard to expose

falsehood! Who that hears these things, if he is one who has not

learned the causes of things, and who, not yet illuminated by any ray

of truth, is deceived by material images, would not think them true,

precisely because the things spoken of are invisible, and are presented

to the mind under the form of visible things, and can be eloquently

expressed? Men of this description exist in numbers and in droves, who

are kept from being led away into these errors more by a fear grounded

on religious feeling than by reason. I will therefore endeavor, as God

may please to enable me, so to refute these errors, as that their

falsehood and absurdity will be manifest not only in the judgment of

the wise, who reject them on hearing them, but also to the intelligence

of the multitude.

39. Tell me then, first, where you get the doctrine that part of God,

as you call it, exists in corn, beans, cabbage, and flowers and

fruits. From the beauty of the color, say they, and the sweetness of

the taste; this is evident; and as these are not found in rotten

substances, we learn that their good has been taken from them. Are

they not ashamed to attribute the finding of God to the nose and the

palate? But I pass from this. For I will speak, using words in their

proper sense; and, as the saying is, this is not so easy in speaking to

you. Let us see rather what sort of mind is required to understand

this; how, if the presence of good in bodies is shown by their color,

the dung of animals, the refuse of flesh itself, has all kinds of

bright colors, sometimes white, often golden; and so on, though these

are what you take in fruits and flowers as proofs of the presence and

indwelling of God. Why is it that in a rose you hold the red color to

be an indication of an abundance of good, while the same color in blood

you condemn? Why do you regard with pleasure in a violet the same

color which you turn away from in cases of cholera, or of people with

jaundice, or in the excrement of infants? Why do you believe the

light, shining appearance of oil to be a sign of a plentiful admixture

of good, which you readily set about purifying by taking the oil into

your throats and stomachs, while you are afraid to touch your lips with

a drop of fat, though it has the same shining appearance as oil? Why

do you look upon a yellow melon as part of the treasures of God, and

not rancid bacon fat or the yolk of an egg? Why do you think that

whiteness in a lettuce proclaims God, and not in milk? So much for

colors, as regards which (to mention nothing else) you cannot compare

any flower-clad meadow with the wings and feathers of a single peacock,

though these are of flesh and of fleshly origin.

40. Again, if this good is discovered also by smell, perfumes of

excellent smell are made from the flesh of some animals. And the smell

of food, when cooked along with flesh of delicate flavor, is better

than if cooked without it. Once more, if you think that the things

that have a better smell than others are therefore cleaner, there is a

kind of mud which you ought to take to your meals instead of water from

the cistern; for dry earth moistened with rain has an odor most

agreeable to the sense, and this sort of mud has a better smell than

rain-water taken by itself. But if we must have the authority of taste

to prove the presence in any object of part of God, he must dwell in

dates and honey more than in pork, but more in pork than in beans. I

grant that He dwells more in a fig than in a liver; but then you must

allow that He is more in liver than in beet. And, on this principle,

must you not confess that some plants, which none of you can doubt to

be cleaner than flesh, receive God from this very flesh, if we are to

think of God as mixed with the flavor? For both cabbages taste better

when cooked along with flesh; and, while we cannot relish the plants on

which cattle feed, when these are turned into milk we think them

improved in color, and find them very agreeable to the taste.

41. Or must we think that good is to be found in greater quantity

where the three good qualities--a good color, and smell, and taste--are

found together? Then you must not admire and praise flowers so much,

as you cannot admit them to be tried at the tribunal of the palate. At

least you must not prefer purslain to flesh, since flesh when cooked is

superior in color, smell, and taste. A young pig roasted (for your

ideas on this subject force us to discuss good and evil with you as if

you were cooks and confectioners, instead of men of reading or literary

taste) is bright in color, and agreeable in smell, and pleasant in

taste. Here is a perfect evidence of the presence of the divine

substance. You are invited by this threefold testimony, and called on

to purify this substance by your sanctity. Make the attack. Why do

you hold back? What objection have you to make. In color alone the

excrement of an infant surpasses lentils; in smell alone a roast morsel

surpasses a soft green fig; in taste alone a kid when slaughtered

surpasses the plant which it fed on when alive: and we have found a

kind of flesh in flavor of which all three give evidence. What more do

you require? What reply will you make? Why should eating meat make

you unclean, if using such monstrosities in discussion does not? And,

above all, the rays of the sun, which you surely think more of than all

animal or vegetable food, have no smell or taste, and are remarkable

among other substances only by their eminently bright color; which is a

loud call to you, and an obligation, in spite of yourselves, to place

nothing higher than a bright color among the evidences of an admixture

of good.

42. Thus you are forced into this difficulty, that you must

acknowledge the part of God as dwelling more in blood, and in the

filthy but bright-colored animal refuse which is thrown out in the

streets, than in the pale leaves of the olive. If you reply, as you

actually do, that olive leaves when burnt give out a flame, which

proves the presence of light, while flesh when burnt does not, what

will you say of oil, which lights nearly all the lamps in Italy? What

of cow dung (which surely is more unclean than the flesh), which

peasants use when dry as fuel, so that the fire is always at hand, and

the liberation of the smoke is always going on? And if brightness and

lustre prove a greater presence of the divine part, why do you

yourselves not purify it, why not appropriate it, why not liberate it?

For it is found chiefly in flowers, not to speak of blood and countless

things almost the same as blood in flesh or coming from it, and yet you

cannot feed on flowers. And even if you were to eat flesh, you would

certainly not take with your gruel the scales of fish, or some worms

and flies, though these all shine with a light of their own in the

dark.

43. What then remains, but that you should cease saying that you have

in your eyes, nose, and palate sufficient means of testing the presence

of the divine part in material objects? And, without these means, how

can you tell not only that there is a greater part of God in plants

than in flesh, but that there is any part in plants at all? Are you

led to think this by their beauty--not the beauty of agreeable color,

but that of agreement of parts? An excellent reason, in my opinion.

For you will never be so bold as to compare twisted pieces of wood with

the bodies of animals, which are formed of members answering to one

another. But if you choose the testimony of the senses, as those must

do who cannot see with their mind the full force of existence, how do

you prove that the substance of good escapes from bodies in course of

time, and by some kind of attrition, but because God has gone out of

it, according to your view, and has left one place for another? The

whole is absurd. But, as far as I can judge, there are no marks or

appearances to give rise to this opinion. For many things plucked from

trees, or pulled out of the ground, are the better of some interval of

time before we use them for food, as leeks and endive, lettuce, grapes,

apples, figs, and some pears; and there are many other things which get

a better color when they are not used immediately after being plucked,

besides being more wholesome for the body, and having a finer flavor to

the palate. But these things should not possess all these excellent

and agreeable qualities, if, as you say, they become more destitute of

good the longer they are kept after separation from their mother

earth. Animal food itself is better and more fit for use the day after

the animal is killed; but this should not be, if, as you hold, it

possessed more good immediately after the slaughter than next day, when

more of the divine substance had escaped.

44. Who does not know that wine becomes purer and better by age? Nor

is it, as you think, more tempting to the destruction of the senses,

but more useful for invigorating the body,--only let there be

moderation, which ought to control everything. The senses are sooner

destroyed by new wine. When the must has been only a short time in the

vat, and has begun to ferment, it makes those who look down into it

fall headlong, affecting their brain, so that without assistance they

would perish. And as regards health, every one knows that bodies are

swollen up and injuriously distended by new wine? Has it these bad

properties because there is more good in it? Are they not found in

wine when old because a good deal of the divine substance has gone? An

absurd thing to say, especially for you, who prove the divine presence

by the pleasing effect produced on your eyes, nose, and palate! And

what a contradiction it is to make wine the poison of the princes of

darkness, and yet to eat grapes! Has it more of the poison when in the

cup than when in the cluster? Or if the evil remains unmixed after the

good is gone, and that by the process of time, how is it that the same

grapes, when hung up for awhile, become milder, sweeter, and more

wholesome? or how does the wine itself, as already mentioned, become

purer and brighter when the light has gone, and more wholesome by the

loss of the beneficial substance?

45. What are we to say of wood and leaves, which in course of time

become dry, but cannot be the worse on that account in your

estimation? For while they lose that which produces smoke, they retain

that from which a bright flame arises; and, to judge by the clearness,

which you think so much of, there is more good in the dry than in the

green. Hence you must either deny that there is more of God in the

pure light than in the smoky one, which will upset all your evidences;

or you must allow it to be possible that, when plants are plucked up,

or branches plucked off, and kept for a time, more of the nature of

evil may escape from them than of the nature of good. And, on the

strength of this, we shall hold that more evil may go off from plucked

fruits; and so more good may remain in animal food. So much on the

subject of time.

46. As for motion, and tossing, and rubbing, if these give the divine

nature the opportunity of escaping from these substances, many things

of the same kind are against you, which are improved by motion. In

some grains the juice resembles wine, and is excellent when moved

about. Indeed, as must not be overlooked, this kind of drink produces

intoxication rapidly; and yet you never called the juice of grain the

poison of the princes of darkness. There is a preparation of water,

thickened with a little meal, which is the better of being shaken, and,

strange to say, is lighter in color when the light is gone. The pastry

cook stirs honey for a long time to give it this light color, and to

make its sweetness milder and less unwholesome: you must explain how

this can come from the loss of good. Again, if you prefer to test the

presence of God by the agreeable effects on the hearing, and not sight,

or smell, or taste, harps get their strings and pipes their bones from

animals; and these become musical by being dried, and rubbed, and

twisted. So the pleasures of music, which you hold to have come from

the divine kingdom, are obtained from the refuse of dead animals, and

that, too, when they are dried by time, and lessened by rubbing, and

stretched by twisting. Such rough treatment, according to you, drives

the divine substance from living objects; even cooking them, you say,

does this. Why then are boiled thistles not unwholesome? Is it

because God, or part of God, leaves them when they are cooked?

47. Why mention all the particulars, when it is difficult to enumerate

them? Nor is it necessary; for every one knows how many things are

sweeter and more wholesome when cooked. This ought not to be, if, as

you suppose, things lose the good by being thus moved about. I do not

suppose that you will find any proof from your bodily senses that flesh

is unclean, and defiles the souls of those who eat it, because fruits,

when plucked and shaken about in various ways, become flesh; especially

as you hold that vinegar, in its age and fermentation, is cleaner than

wine, and the mead you drink is nothing else than cooked wine, which

ought to be more impure than wine, if material things lose the divine

members by being moved about and cooked. But if not, you have no

reason to think that fruits, when plucked, kept, handled, cooked, and

digested, are forsaken by the good, and therefore supply most unclean

matter for the formation of bodies.

48. But if it is not from their color and appearance, and smell and

taste, that you think the good to be in these things, what else can you

bring forward? Do you prove it from the strength and vigor which those

things seem to lose when they are separated from the earth and put to

use? If this is your reason (though its erroneousness is seen at once,

from the fact that the strength of some things is increased after their

separation from the earth, as in the case already mentioned of wine,

which becomes stronger from age),--if the strength, then, is your

reason, it would follow that the part of God is to be found in no food

more abundantly than in flesh. For athletes, who especially require

vigor and energy, are not in the habit of feeding on cabbage and fruit

without animal food.

49. Is your reason for thinking the bodies of trees better than our

bodies, that flesh is nourished by trees and not trees by flesh. You

forget the obvious fact that plants, when manured with dung, become

richer and more fertile and crops heavier, though you think it your

gravest charge against flesh that it is the abode of dung. This then

gives nourishment to things you consider clean, though it is, according

to you, the most unclean part of what you consider unclean. But if you

dislike flesh because it springs from sexual intercourse, you should be

pleased with the flesh of worms, which are bred in such numbers, and of

such a size, in fruits, in wood, and in the earth itself, without any

sexual intercourse. But there is some insincerity in this. For if you

were displeased with flesh because it is formed from the cohabitation

of father and mother, you would not say that those princes of darkness

were born from the fruits of their own trees; for no doubt you think

worse of these princes than of flesh, which you refuse to eat.

50. Your idea that all the souls of animals come from the food of

their parents, from which confinement you pretend to liberate the

divine substance which is held bound in your viands, is quite

inconsistent with your abstinence from flesh, and makes it a pressing

duty for you to eat animal food. For if souls are bound in the body by

those who eat animal food, why do you not secure their liberation by

being beforehand in eating the food? You reply, it is not from the

animal food that the good part comes which those people bring into

bondage, but from the vegetables which they take with their meat. What

will you say then of the souls of lions, who feed only on flesh? They

drink, is the reply, and so the soul is drawn in from the water and

confined in flesh. But what of birds without number? What of eagles,

which eat only flesh, and need no drink? Here you are at a loss, and

can find no answer. For if the soul comes from food, and there are

animals which neither drink anything nor have any food but flesh, and

yet bring forth young, there must be some soul in flesh; and you are

bound to try your plan of purifying it by eating the flesh. Or will

you say that a pig has a soul of light, because it eats vegetables, and

drinks water; and that the eagle, because it eats only flesh, has a

soul of darkness, though it is so fond of the sun? [180]

51. What a confusion of ideas! What amazing fatuity! All this you

would have escaped, if you had rejected idle fictions, and had followed

what truth sanctions in abstinence from food, which would have taught

you that sumptuous eating is to be avoided, not to escape pollution, as

there is nothing of the kind, but to subdue the sensual appetite. For

should any one, from inattention to the nature of things, and the

properties of the soul and body, allow that the soul is polluted by

animal food, you will admit that it is much much more defiled by

sensuality. Is it reasonable, then, or rather, is it not most

unreasonable, to expel from the number of the elect a man who, perhaps

for his health's sake, takes some animal food without sensual appetite;

while, if a man eagerly devours peppered truffles, you can only reprove

him for excess, but cannot condemn him as abusing your symbol? So one

who has been induced, not by sensuality, but for health, to eat part of

a fowl, cannot remain among your elect; though one may remain who has

yielded voluntarily to an excessive appetite for comfits and cakes

without animal matter. You retain the man plunged in the defilements

of sensuality, and dismiss the man polluted, as you think, by the mere

food; though you allow that the defilement of sensuality is far greater

than that of meat. You keep hold of one who gloats with delight over

highly-seasoned vegetables, unable to keep possession of himself; while

you shut out one who, to satisfy hunger, takes whatever comes, if

suitable for nourishment, ready either to use the food, or to let it

go. Admirable customs! Excellent morals! Notable temperance!

52. Again, the notion that it is unlawful for any one but the elect to

touch as food what is brought to your meals for what you call

purification, leads to shameful and sometimes to criminal practices.

For sometimes so much is brought that it cannot easily be eaten up by a

few; and as it is considered sacrilege to give what is left to others,

or, at least, to throw it away, you are obliged to eat to excess, from

the desire to purify, as you call it, all that is given. Then, when

you are full almost to bursting, you cruelly use force in making the

boys of your sect eat the rest. So it was charged against some one at

Rome that he killed some poor children, by compelling them to eat for

this superstitious reason. This I should not believe, did I not know

how sinful you consider it to give this food to those who are not

elect, or, at any rate, to throw it away. So the only way is to eat

it; and this leads every day to gluttony, and may sometimes lead to

murder.

53. For the same reason you forbid giving bread to beggars. By way of

showing compassion, or rather of avoiding reproach, you advise to give

money. The cruelty of this is equalled by its stupidity. For suppose

a place where food cannot be purchased: the beggar will die of

starvation, while you, in your wisdom and benevolence, have more mercy

on a cucumber than on a human being! This is in truth (for how could

it be better designated) pretended compassion, and real cruelty. Then

observe the stupidity. What if the beggar buys bread for himself with

the money you give him? Will the divine part, as you call it, not

suffer the same in him when he buys the food as it would have suffered

if he had taken it as a gift from you? So this sinful beggar plunges

in corruption part of God eager to escape, and is aided in this crime

by your money! But you in your great sagacity think it enough that you

do not give to one about to commit murder a man to kill, though you

knowingly give him money to procure somebody to be killed. Can any

madness go beyond this? The result is, that either the man dies if he

cannot get food for his money, or the food itself dies if he gets it.

The one is true murder; the other what you call murder: though in both

cases you incur the guilt of real murder. Again, there is the greatest

folly and absurdity in allowing your followers to eat animal food,

while you forbid them to kill animals. If this food does not defile,

take it yourselves. If it defiles, what can be more unreasonable than

to think it more sinful to separate the soul of a pig from its body

than to defile the soul of a man with the pig's flesh.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[180] [Much of the foregoing, as well as of what follows, seems to the

modern reader like mere trifling, but Augustin's aim was by introducing

many familiar illustrations to show the utter absurdity of the

Manich�an distinctions between clean and unclean. It must be confessed

that he does this very effectively.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 17.--Description of the Symbol of the Hands Among the

Manich�ans.

54. We must now notice and discuss the symbol of the hands. And, in

the first place, your abstaining from the slaughter of animals and from

injuring plants is shown by Christ to be mere superstition; for, on the

ground that there is no community of rights between us and brutes and

trees, He both sent the devils into an herd of swine, [181] and

withered by His curse a tree in which He had found no fruit. [182]

The swine assuredly had not sinned, nor had the tree. We are not so

insane as to think that a tree is fruitful or barren by its own

choice. Nor is it any reply to say that our Lord wished in these

actions to teach some other truths; for every one knows that. But

assuredly the Son of God would not commit murder to illustrate truth,

if you call the destruction of a tree or of an animal murder. The

signs which Christ wrought in the case of men, with whom we certainly

have a community of rights, were in healing, not in killing them. And

it would have been the same in the case of beasts and trees, if we had

that community with them which you imagine.

55. I think it right to refer here to the authority of Scripture,

because we cannot here enter on a profound discussion about the soul of

animals, or the kind of life in trees. But as you preserve the right

to call the Scriptures corrupted, in case you should find them too

strongly opposed to you,--although you have never affirmed the passages

about the tree and the herd of swine to be spurious,--still, lest some

day you should wish to say this of them too, when you find how much

they are against you, I will adhere to my plan, and will ask you, who

are so liberal in your promises of evidence and truth, to tell me first

what harm is done to a tree, I say not by plucking a leaf or an

apple,--for which, however, one of you would be condemned at once as

having abused the symbol, if he did it intentionally, and not

accidentally,--but if you tear it up by the root. For the soul in

trees, which, according to you, is a rational soul, is, in your theory,

freed from bondage when the tree is cut down,--a bondage, too, where it

suffered great misery and got no profit. For it is well known that

you, in the words of your founder, threaten as a great, though not the

greatest punishment, the change from a man to a tree; and it is not

probable that the soul in a tree can grow in wisdom as it does in a

man. There is the best reason for not killing a man, in case you

should kill one whose wisdom or virtue might be of use to many, or one

who might have attained to wisdom, whether by the advice of another

without himself, or by divine illumination in his own mind. And the

more wisdom the soul has when it leaves the body, the more profitable

is its departure, as we know both from well-grounded reasoning and from

wide-spread belief. Thus to cut down a tree is to set free the soul

from a body in which it makes no progress in wisdom. You--the holy

men, I mean--ought to be mainly occupied in cutting down trees, and in

leading the souls thus emancipated to better things by prayers and

psalms. Or can this be done only with the souls which you take into

your belly, instead of aiding them by your understanding?

56. And you cannot escape the admission that the souls in trees make

no progress in wisdom while they are there, when you are asked why no

apostle was sent to teach trees as well as men, or why the apostle sent

to men did not preach the truth to trees also. Your reply must be,

that the souls while in such bodies cannot understand the divine

precepts. But this reply lands you in great difficulties; for you

declare that these souls can hear your voices and understand what you

say, and see bodies and their motions, and even discern thoughts. If

this is true, why could they learn nothing from the apostle of light?

Why could they not learn even much better than we, since they can see

into the mind? Your master, who, as you say, has difficulty in

teaching you by speech, might have taught these souls by thought; for

they could see his ideas in his mind before he expressed them. But if

this is untrue, consider into what errors you have fallen.

57. As for your not plucking fruits or pulling up vegetables

yourselves, while you get your followers to pluck and pull and bring

them to you, that you may confer benefits not only on those who bring

the food but on the food which is brought, what thoughtful person can

bear to hear this? For, first, it matters not whether you commit a

crime yourself, or wish another to commit it for you. You deny that

you wish this! How then can relief be given to the divine part

contained in lettuce and leeks, unless some one pull them and bring

them to the saints to be purified. And again, if you were passing

through a field where the right of friendship permitted you to pluck

anything you wished, what would you do if you saw a crow on the point

of eating a fig? Does not, according to your ideas, the fig itself

seem to address you and to beg of you piteously to pluck it yourself

and give it burial in a holy belly, where it may be purified and

restored, rather than that the crow should swallow it and make it part

of his cursed body, and then hand it over to bondage and torture in

other forms? If this is true, how cruel you are! If not, how silly!

What can be more contrary to your opinions than to break the symbol?

What can be more unkind to the member of God than to keep it?

58. This supposes the truth of your false and vain ideas. But you can

be shown guilty of plain and positive cruelty flowing from the same

error. For were any one lying on the road, his body wasted with

disease, weary with journeying, and half-dead from his sufferings, and

able only to utter some broken words, and if eating a pear would do him

good as an astringent, and were he to beg you to help him as you passed

by, and were he to implore you to bring the fruit from a neighboring

tree, with no divine or human prohibition to prevent your doing so,

while the man is sure to die for the want of it, you, a Christian man

and a saint, will rather pass on and abandon a man thus suffering and

entreating, lest the tree should lament the loss of its fruit, and you

should be doomed to the punishment threatened by Manich�us for breaking

the symbol. Strange customs, and strange harmlessness!

59. Now, as regards killing animals, and the reasons for your opinion,

much that has been said will apply also to this. For what harm will be

done to the soul of a wolf by killing the wolf, since the wolf, as long

as it lives, will be a wolf, and will not listen to any preacher, or

give up, in the least, shedding the blood of sheep; and, by killing it,

the rational soul, as you think, will be set free from its confinement

in the body? But you make this slaughter unlawful even for your

followers; for you think it worse than that of trees. And in this

there is not much fault to be found with your senses,--that is, your

bodily senses. For we see and hear by their cries that animals die

with pain, although man disregards this in a beast, with which, as not

having a rational soul, we have no community of rights. But as to your

senses in the observation of trees, you must be entirely blind. For

not to mention that there are no movements in the wood expressive of

pain, what is clearer than that a tree is never better than when it is

green and flourishing, gay with flowers, and rich in fruit? And this

comes generally and chiefly from pruning. But if it felt the iron, as

you suppose, it ought to die of wounds so many, so severe, instead of

sprouting at the places, and reviving with such manifest delight.

60. But why do you think it a greater crime to destroy animals than

plants, although you hold that plants have a purer soul than animals?

There is a compensation, we are told, when part of what is taken from

the fields is given to the elect and the saints to be purified. This

has already been refuted; and it has, I think, been proved sufficiently

that there is no reason for saying that more of the good part is found

in vegetables than in flesh. But should any one support himself by

selling butcher-meat, and spend the whole profit of his business in

purchasing food for your elect, and bring larger supplies for those

saints than any peasant or farmer, will he not plead this compensation

as a warrant for his killing animals? But there is, we are told, some

other mysterious reason; for a cunning man can always find some

resource in the secrets of nature when addressing unlearned people.

The story, then, is that the heavenly princes who were taken from the

race of darkness and bound, and have a place assigned them in this

region by the Creator of the world, have animals on the earth specially

belonging to them, each having those coming from his own stock and

class; and they hold the slaughterers of those animals guilty, and do

not allow them to leave the earth, but harass them as much as they can

with pains and torments. What simple man will not be frightened by

this, and, seeing nothing in the darkness shrouding these things, will

not think that the fact is as described? But I will hold to my

purpose, with God's help, to rebut mysterious falsehood by the plainest

truth.

61. Tell me, then, if animals on land and in water come in regular

succession by ordinary generation from this race of princes, since the

origin of animal life is traced to the abortive births in that

race;--tell me, I say, whether bees and frogs, and many other creatures

not sprung from sexual intercourse, [183] may be killed with impunity.

We are told they cannot. So it is not on account of their relation to

certain princes that you forbid your followers to kill animals. Or if

you make a general relationship to all bodies, the princes would be

equally concerned about trees, which you do not require your followers

to spare. You are brought back to the weak reply, that the injuries

done in the case of plants are atoned for by the fruits which your

followers bring to your church. For this implies that those who

slaughter animals, and sell their flesh in the market, if they are your

followers, and if they bring to you vegetables bought with their gains,

may think nothing of the daily slaughter, and are cleared of any sin

that may be in it by your repasts.

62. But if you say that, in order to expiate the slaughter, the thing

must be given as food, as in the case of fruits and vegetables,--which

cannot be done, because the elect do not eat flesh, and so your

followers must not slaughter animals,--what reply will you give in the

case of thorns and weeds, which farmers destroy in clearing their

fields, while they cannot bring any food to you from them? How can

there be pardon for such destruction, which gives no nourishment to the

saints? Perhaps you also put away any sin committed, for the benefit

of the fruits and vegetables, by eating some of these. What then if

the fields are plundered by locusts, mice, or rats, as we see often

happen? Can your rustic follower kill these with impunity, because he

sins for the good of his crops? Here you are at a loss; for you either

allow your followers to kill animals, which your founder prohibited, or

you forbid them to be cultivators, which he made lawful. Indeed, you

sometimes go so far as to say that an usurer is more harmless than a

cultivator,--you feel so much more for melons than for men. Rather

than hurt the melons, you would have a man ruined as a debtor. Is this

desirable and praiseworthy justice, or not rather atrocious and

damnable error? Is this commendable compassion, or not rather

detestable barbarity?

63. What, again, of your not abstaining yourselves from the slaughter

of lice, bugs, and fleas? You think it a sufficient excuse for this to

say that these are the dirt of our bodies. But this is clearly untrue

of fleas and bugs; for every one knows that these animals do not come

from our bodies. Besides, if you abhor sexual intercourse as much as

you pretend to do, you should think those animals all the cleaner which

come from our bodies without any other generation; for although they

produce offspring of their own, they are not produced in ordinary

generation from us. Again, if we must consider as most filthy the

production of living bodies, still worse must be the production of dead

bodies. There must be less harm, therefore, in killing a rat, a snake,

or a scorpion, which you constantly say come from our dead bodies. But

to pass over what is less plain and certain, it is a common opinion

regarding bees that they come from the carcases of oxen; so there is no

harm in killing them. Or if this too is doubted, every one allows that

beetles, at least, are bred in the ball of mud which they make and

bury. [184] You ought therefore to consider these animals, and others

that it would be tedious to specify, more unclean than your lice; and

yet you think it sinful to kill them, though it would be foolish not to

kill the lice. Perhaps you hold the lice cheap because they are

small. But if an animal is to be valued by its size, you must prefer a

camel to a man.

64. Here we may use the gradation which often perplexed us when we

were your followers. For if a flea may be killed on account of its

small size, so may the fly which is bred in beans. And if this, so

also may one of a little larger size, for its size at birth is even

less. Then again, a bee may be killed, for its young is no larger than

a fly. So on to the young of a locust, and to a locust; and then to

the young of a mouse, and to a mouse. And, to cut short, it is clear

we may come at last to an elephant; so that one who thinks it no sin to

kill a flea, because of its small size, must allow that it would be no

sin in him to kill this huge creature. But I think enough has been

said of these absurdities.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[181] Matt. viii. 32.

[182] Matt. xxi. 19.

[183] [This is, of course, a physiological blunder, but Augustin

doubtless states what was the common view at the time.--A.H.N.]

[184] V. Retract. i. 7. � 6, where Augustin allows that this is

doubtful, and that many have not even heard of it.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 18.--Of the Symbol of the Breast, and of the Shameful Mysteries

of the Manich�ans.

65. Lastly, there is the symbol of the breast, in which your very

questionable chastity consists. For though you do not forbid sexual

intercourse, you, as the apostle long ago said, forbid marriage in the

proper sense, although this is the only good excuse for such

intercourse. No doubt you will exclaim against this, and will make it

a reproach against us that you highly esteem and approve perfect

chastity, but do not forbid marriage, because your followers--that is,

those in the second grade among you--are allowed to have wives. After

you have said this with great noise and heat, I will quietly ask, Is it

not you who hold that begetting children, by which souls are confined

in flesh, is a greater sin than cohabitation? Is it not you who used

to counsel us to observe as much as possible the time when a woman,

after her purification, is most likely to conceive, and to abstain from

cohabitation at that time, lest the soul should be entangled in flesh?

This proves that you approve of having a wife, not for the procreation

of children, but for the gratification of passion. In marriage, as the

marriage law declares, the man and woman come together for the

procreation of children. Therefore whoever makes the procreation of

children a greater sin than copulation, forbids marriage, and makes the

woman not a wife, but a mistress, who for some gifts presented to her

is joined to the man to gratify his passion. Where there is a wife

there must be marriage. But there is no marriage where motherhood is

not in view; therefore neither is there a wife. In this way you forbid

marriage. Nor can you defend yourselves successfully from this charge,

long ago brought against you prophetically by the Holy Spirit.

66. Moreover, when you are so eager in your desire to prevent the soul

from being confined in flesh by conjugal intercourse, and so eager in

asserting that the soul is set free from seed by the food of the

saints, do you not sanction, unhappy beings, the suspicion entertained

about you? For why should it be true regarding corn and beans and

lentils and other seeds, that when you eat them you wish to set free

the soul, and not true of the seeds of animals? For what you say of

the flesh of a dead animal, that it is unclean because there is no soul

in it, cannot be said of the seed of the animal; for you hold that it

keeps confined the soul which will appear in the offspring, and you

avow that the soul of Manich�us himself is thus confined. And as your

followers cannot bring these seeds to you for purification, who will

not suspect that you make this purification secretly among yourselves,

and hide it from your followers, in case they should leave you? [185]

If you do not these things, as it is to be hoped you do not, still you

see how open to suspicion your superstition is, and how impossible it

is to blame men for thinking what your own profession suggests, when

you maintain that you set free souls from bodies and from senses by

eating and drinking. I wish to say no more about this: you see

yourselves what room there is here for denunciation. But as the matter

is one rather to repress than to invite remark, and also as throughout

my discourse my purpose appears of exaggerating nothing, and of keeping

to bare facts and arguments, we shall pass on to other matters.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[185] [Compare what is said about the disgusting ceremonial of Ischas

by Cyril of Jerusalem (Cat. vi.), Augustin (Haeres. xlvi.), Pope Leo X.

(Serm. V. de Jejuniis, X. Mens.). These charges were probably

unfounded, though they are not altogether out of harmony with the

Manich�an principles.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 19.--Crimes of the Manich�ans.

67. We see then, now, the nature of your three symbols. These are

your customs. This is the end of your notable precepts, in which there

is nothing sure, nothing steadfast, nothing consistent, nothing

irreproachable, but all doubtful, or rather undoubtedly and entirely

false, all contradictory, abominable, absurd. In a word, evil

practices are detected in your customs so many and so serious, that one

wishing to denounce them all, if he were at all able to enlarge, would

require at least a separate treatise for each. Were you to observe

these, and to act up to your profession, no childishness, or folly, or

absurdity would go beyond yours; and when you praise and teach these

things without doing them, you display craft and deceit and malevolence

equal to anything that can be described or imagined.

68. During nine full years that I attended you with great earnestness

and assiduity, I could not hear of one of your elect who was not found

transgressing these precepts, or at least was not suspected of doing

so. Many were caught at wine and animal food, many at the baths; but

this we only heard by report. Some were proved to have seduced other

men's wives, so that in this case I could not doubt the truth of the

charge. But suppose this, too, a report rather than a fact. I myself

saw, and not I only, but others who have either escaped from that

superstition, or will, I hope, yet escape,--we saw, I say, in a square

in Carthage, on a road much frequented, not one, but more than three of

the elect walking behind us, and accosting some women with such

indecent sounds and gestures as to outdo the boldness and insolence of

all ordinary rascals. And it was clear that this was quite habitual,

and that they behaved in this way to one another, for no one was

deterred by the presence of a companion, showing that most of them, if

not all, were affected with this evil tendency. For they did not all

come from one house, but lived in quite different places, and quite

accidentally left together the place where they had met. It was a

great shock to us, and we lodged a complaint about it. But who thought

of inflicting punishment,--I say not by separation from the church, but

even by severe rebuke in proportion to the heinousness of the offence?

69. All the excuse given for the impunity of those men was that, at

that time, when their meetings were forbidden by law, it was feared

that the persons suffering punishment might retaliate by giving

information. What then of their assertion that they will always have

persecution in this world, for which they suppose that they will be

thought the more of? for this is the application they make of the words

about the world hating them. [186] And they will have it that truth

must be sought for among them, because, in the promise of the Holy

Spirit, the Paraclete, it is said that the world cannot receive Him.

[187] This is not the place to discuss this question. But clearly,

if you are always to be persecuted, even to the end of the world, there

will be no end to this laxity, and to the unchecked spread of all this

immorality, from your fear of giving offence to men of this character.

70. This answer was also given to us, when we reported to the very

highest authorities that a woman had complained to us that in a

meeting, where she was along with other women, not doubting of the

sanctity of these people, some of the elect came in, and when one of

them had put out the lamp, one, whom she could not distinguish, tried

to embrace her, and would have forced her into sin, had she not escaped

by crying out. How common must we conclude the practice to have been

which led to the misdeed on this occasion! And this was done on the

night when you keep the feast of vigils. Forsooth, besides the fear of

information being given, no one could bring the offender before the

bishop, as he had so well guarded against being recognized. As if all

who entered along with him were not implicated in the crime; for in

their indecent merriment they all wished the lamp to be put out.

71. Then what wide doors were opened for suspicions, when we saw them

full of envy, full of covetousness, full of greed for costly foods,

constantly at strife, easily excited about trifles! We concluded that

they were not competent to abstain from the things they professed to

abstain from, if they found an opportunity in secret or in the dark.

There were two of sufficiently good character, of active minds, and

leaders in their debates, with whom we had a more particular and

intimate acquaintance than with the rest. One of them was much

associated with us, because he was also engaged in liberal studies; he

is said to be now an elder there. These two were very jealous of one

another, and one accused the other--not openly, but in conversation, as

he had opportunity, and in whispers--of having made a criminal assault

on the wife of one of the followers. He again, in clearing himself to

us, brought the same charge against another of the elect, who lived

with this follower as his most trusted friend. He had, going in

suddenly, caught this man with the woman, and his enemy and rival had

advised the woman and her paramour to raise this false report about

him, that he might not be believed if he gave any information. We were

much distressed, and took it greatly to heart, that although there was

a doubt about the assault on the woman, the jealous feeling in those

two men, than whom we found none better in the place, showed itself so

keenly, and inevitably raised a suspicion of other things. [188]

72. Another thing was, that we very often saw in theatres men

belonging to the elect, men of years and, it was supposed, of

character, along with a hoary-headed elder. We pass over the youths,

whom we used to come upon quarrelling about the people connected with

the stage and the races; from which we may safely conclude how they

would be able to refrain in secret, when they could not subdue the

passion by which they were exposed in the eyes of their followers,

bringing on them disgrace and flight. In the case of the saint, whose

discussions we attended in the street of the fig-sellers, would his

atrocious crime have been discovered if he had been able to make the

dedicated virgin his wife without making her pregnant? The swelling

womb betrayed the secret and unthought-of iniquity. When her brother,

a young man, heard of it from his mother, he felt keenly the injury,

but refrained, from regard to religion, from a public accusation. He

succeeded in getting the man expelled from that church, for such

conduct cannot always be tolerated; and that the crime might not be

wholly unpunished, he arranged with some of his friends to have the man

well beaten and kicked. When he was thus assailed, he cried out that

they should spare him, from regard to the authority of the opinion of

Manich�us, that Adam the first hero had sinned, and was a greater saint

after his sin.

73. This, in fact, is your notion about Adam and Eve. [189] It is a

long story; but I will touch only on what concerns the present matter.

You say that Adam was produced from his parents, the abortive princes

of darkness; that he had in his soul the most part of light, and very

little of the opposite race. So while he lived a holy life, on account

of the prevalence of good, still the opposite part in him was stirred

up, so that he was led away into conjugal intercourse. Thus he fell

and sinned, but afterwards lived in greater holiness. Now, my

complaint is not so much about this wicked man, who, under the garb of

an elect and holy man, brought such shame and reproach on a family of

strangers by his shocking immorality. I do not charge you with this.

Let it be attributed to the abandoned character of the man, and not to

your habits. I blame the man for the atrocity, and not you. Still

there is this in you all that cannot, as far as I can see, be admitted

or tolerated, that while you hold the soul to be part of God, you still

maintain that the mixture of a little evil prevailed over the superior

force and quantity of good. Who that believes this, when incited by

passion, will not find here an excuse, instead of checking and

controlling his passion?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[186] John xv. 18.

[187] John xiv. 17.

[188] Doubtless Augustin exaggerates the immorality of the Manich�ans;

but there must have been a considerable basis of fact for his

charges.--A.H.N.]

[189] Compare the account from the Fihrist, in our Introduction,

Chapter III.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 20.--Disgraceful Conduct Discovered at Rome.

74. What more shall I say of your customs? I have mentioned what I

found myself when I was in the city when the things were done. To go

through all that happened at Rome in my absence would take a long

time. I will, however, give a short account of it; for the matter

became so notorious, that even the absent could not remain in ignorance

of it. And when I was afterwards in Rome, I ascertained the truth of

all I had heard, although the story was told me by an eye-witness whom

I knew so well and esteemed so highly, that I could not feel any doubt

about it. One of your followers, then, quite equal to the elect in

their far-famed abstinence, for he was both liberally educated, and was

in the habit of defending your sect with great zeal, took it very ill

that he had cast in his teeth the vile conduct of the elect, who lived

in all kinds of places, and went hither and thither for lodging of the

worst description. He therefore desired, if possible, to assemble all

who were willing to live according to the precepts into his own house,

and to maintain them at his own expense; for he was above the average

in carelessness as to spending money, besides being above the average

in the amount he had to spend. He complained that his efforts were

hindered by the remissness of the bishops, whose assistance he required

for success. At last one of your bishops was found,--a man, as I know,

very rude and unpolished, but somehow, from his very moroseness, the

more inclined to strict observance of morality. The follower eagerly

lays hold of this man as the person he had long wished for and found at

last, and relates his whole plan. He approves and assents, and agrees

to be the first to take up his abode in the house. When this was done,

all the elect who could be at Rome were assembled there. The rule of

life in the epistle of Manich�us was laid before them. Many thought it

intolerable, and left; not a few felt ashamed, and stayed. They began

to live as they had agreed, and as this high authority enjoined. The

follower all the time was zealously enforcing everything on everybody,

though never, in any case, what he did not undertake himself.

Meanwhile quarrels constantly arose among the elect. They charged one

another with crimes, all which he lamented to hear, and managed to make

them unintentionally expose one another in their altercations. The

revelations were vile beyond description. Thus appeared the true

character of those who were unlike the rest in being willing to bend to

the yoke of the precepts. What then is to be suspected, or rather,

concluded, of the others? To come to a close, they gathered together

on one occasion and complained that they could not keep the

regulations. Then came rebellion. The follower stated his case most

concisely, that either all must be kept, or the man who had given such

a sanction to such precepts, which no one could fulfill, must be

thought a great fool. But, as was inevitable, the wild clamor of the

mob prevailed over the opinion of one man. The bishop himself gave way

at last, and took to flight with great disgrace; and he was said to

have got in provisions by stealth, contrary to rule, which were often

discovered. He had a supply of money from his private purse, which he

carefully kept concealed.

75. If you say these things are false, you contradict what is too

clear and public. But you may say so if you like. For, as the things

are certain, and easily known by those who wish to know them, those who

deny that they are true show what their habit of telling the truth is.

But you have other replies with which I do not find fault. For you

either say that some do keep your precepts, and that they should not be

mixed up with the guilty in condemning the others; or that the whole

inquiry into the character of the members of your sect is wrong, for

the question is of the character of the profession. Should I grant

both of these (although you can neither point out those faithful

observers of the precepts, nor clear your heresy of all those

frivolities and iniquities), still I must insist on knowing why you

heap reproaches on Christians of the Catholic name on seeing the

immoral life of some, while you either have the effrontery to repel

inquiry about your members, or the still greater effrontery not to

repel it, wishing it to be understood that in your scanty membership

there are some unknown individuals who keep the precepts they profess,

but that among the multitudes in the Catholic Church there are none.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

St. AUGUSTIN:

on two souls,

against the manich�ans.

[de duabus animabus contra manich�os].

A.D. 391.

translated by

albert h. newman, d.d., ll.d.,

professor of church history and comparative religion, in toronto

baptist (theological) college, toronto, canada.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Concerning Two Souls, Against the Manich�ans.

[De Duabus Animabus Contra Manich�os.] a.d. 391. [190]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

One Book.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 1.--By What Course of Reasoning the Error of the Manich�ans

Concerning Two Souls, One of Which is Not from God, is Refuted. Every

Soul, Inasmuch as It is a Certain Life, Can Have Its Existence Only

from God the Source of Life.

1. Through the assisting mercy of God, the snares of the Manich�ans

having been broken to pieces and left behind, having been restored at

length to the bosom of the Catholic Church, I am disposed now at least

to consider and to deplore my recent wretchedness. For there were many

things that I ought to have done to prevent the seeds of the most true

religion wholesomely implanted in me from boyhood, from being banished

from my mind, having been uprooted by the error and fraud of false and

deceitful men. For, in the first place, if I had soberly and

diligently considered, with prayerful and pious mind, those two kinds

of souls to which they attributed natures and properties so distinct

that they wished one to be regarded as of the very substance of God,

but were not even willing that God should be accepted as the author of

the other; perhaps it would have appeared to me, intent on learning,

that there is no life whatsoever, which, by the very fact of its being

life and in so far as it is life at all, does not pertain to the

supreme source and beginning of life, [191] which we must acknowledge

to be nothing else than the supreme and only and true God. Wherefore

there is no reason why we should not confess, that those souls which

the Manich�ans call evil are either devoid of life and so not souls,

neither will anything positively or negatively, neither follow after

nor flee from anything; or, if they live so that they can be souls, and

act as the Manich�ans suppose, in no way do they live unless by life,

and if it be an established fact, as it is, that Christ has said: "I

am the life," [192] that all souls seeing that they cannot be souls

except by living were created and fashioned by Christ, that is, by the

Life.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[190] Scarcely any one of his earlier treatises was more unsatisfactory

to Augustin in his later Anti-Pelagian years than that Concerning Two

Souls. In his Retractations, Book I., chapter xv., he recognizes the

rashness of some of his statements and points out the sense in which

they are tenable or the reverse. As regards the occasion of the

writing, the following may be quoted: "After this book [De Utilitate

Credendi] I wrote, while still a presbyter, against the Manich�ans

Concerning Two Souls, of which they say that one part is of God, the

other from the race of darkness, which God did not found, and which is

coeternal with God, and they rave about both these souls, the one good,

the other evil, being in one man, saying forsooth that the evil soul on

the one hand belongs to the flesh, which flesh also they say is of the

race of darkness; but that the good soul is from the part of God that

came forth, combated the race of darkness, and mingled with the latter;

and they attribute all good things in man to that good soul, and all

evil things to that evil soul."--A.H.N.]

[191] In his Retractations, Augustin explains this proposition as

follows: "I said this in the sense in which the creature is known to

pertain to the Creator, but not in the sense that it is of Him, so as

to be regarded as part of Him."--A.H.N.

[192] John xiv. 6.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 2.--If the Light that is Perceived by Sense Has God for Its

Author, as the Manich�ans Acknowledge, Much More The Soul Which is

Perceived by Intellect Alone.

2. But if at that time [193] my thought was not able to bear and

sustain the question concerning life and partaking of life, which is

truly a great question, and one that requires much calm discussion

among the learned, I might perchance have had power to discover that

which to every man considering himself, without a study of the

individual parts, is perfectly evident, namely, that everything we are

said to know and to understand, we comprehend either by bodily sense or

by mental operation. That the five bodily senses are commonly

enumerated as sight, hearing, smell, taste, touch, than all of which

intellect is immeasurably more noble and excellent, who would have been

so ungrateful and impious as not to concede to me; which being

established and confirmed, we should have seen how it follows, that

whatsoever things are perceived by touch or sight or in any bodily

manner at all, are by so much inferior to those things that we

comprehend intellectually as the senses are inferior to the intellect.

Wherefore, since all life, and so every soul, can be perceived by no

bodily sense, but by the intellect alone, whereas while yonder sun and

moon and every luminary that is beheld by these mortal eyes, the

Manich�ans themselves also say must be attributed to the true and good

God, it is the height of madness to claim that that belongs to God

which we observe bodily; but, on the other hand, to think that what we

receive not only by the mind, but by the highest form of mind, [194]

namely, reason and intellect, [195] that is life, whatsoever it may be

called, nevertheless life, should be deprived and bereft of the same

God as its author. For if having invoked God, I had asked myself what

living is, how inscrutable it is to every bodily sense, how absolutely

incorporeal it is, could not I have answered? Or would not the

Manich�ans also confess not only that the souls they detest live, but

that they live also immortally? and that Christ's saying: "Send the

dead to bury their dead," [196] was uttered not with reference to those

not living at all, but with reference to sinners, which is the only

death of the immortal soul; as when Paul writes: "The widow that

giveth herself to pleasure is dead while she liveth," [197] he says

that she at the same time is dead, and alive. Wherefore I should have

directed attention not to the great degree of contamination in which

the sinful soul lives, but only to the fact itself that it lives. But

if I cannot perceive except by an act of intelligence, I believe it

would have come into the mind, that by as much as any mind whatever is

to be preferred to the light which we see through these eyes, by so

much we should give to intellect the preference over the eyes

themselves.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[193] It will aid the reader in following the thread of Augustin's

argument, if he will bear in mind that throughout this treatise the

writer considers the points of antagonism between Manich�ism and

Catholicism from the point of view of his early entanglement in

Manich�an error. Considering the opportunities that he had for knowing

the truth, the helps to have been expected from God in answer to

prayer, the capacities of the unperverted intellect to arrive at truth,

he inquires how he should have guarded himself from the insinuation of

Manich�an error, how he should have defended the truth, and how he

should have been the means of liberating others.--A.H.N.

[194] Sublimitate animi.

[195] Mente atque intelligentia.

[196] Matt. viii. 22.

[197] 1 Tim. v. 6.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 3.--How It is Proved that Every Body Also is from God. That

the Soul Which is Called Evil by the Manich�ans is Better Than Light.

They also affirm that the light is from the Father of Christ: should I

then have doubted that every soul is from Him? But not even then, as a

man forsooth so inexperienced and so youthful as I was, should I have

been in doubt as to the derivation not only of the soul, but also of

the body, nay of everything whatsoever, from Him, if I had reverently

and cautiously reflected on what form is, or what has been formed, what

shape is and what has been endued with shape.

3. But not to speak at present concerning the body, I lament

concerning the soul, concerning spontaneous and vivid movement,

concerning action, concerning life, concerning immortality; in fine, I

lament that I, miserable, should have believed that anything could have

all these properties apart from the goodness of God, which properties,

great as they are, I sadly neglected to consider; this I think, should

be to me a matter of groaning and of weeping. I should have inwardly

pondered these things, I should have discussed them with myself, I

should have referred them to others, I should have propounded the

inquiry, what the power of knowing is, seeing there is nothing in man

that we can compare to this excellency? And as men, if only they had

been men, would have granted me this, I should have inquired whether

seeing with these eyes is knowing? In case they had answered

negatively, I should first have concluded, that mental intelligence is

vastly inferior to ocular sensation; then I should have added, that

what we perceive by means of a better thing must needs be judged to be

itself better. Who would not grant this? I should have gone on to

inquire, whether that soul which they call evil is an object of ocular

sensation or of mental intelligence? They would have acknowledged that

the latter is the case. All which things having been agreed upon and

confirmed between us, I should have shown how it follows, that that

soul forsooth which they execrate, is better than that light which they

venerate, since the former is an object of mental knowledge, the latter

an object of corporeal sense perception. But here perhaps they would

have halted, and would have refused to follow the lead of reason, so

great is the power of inveterate opinion and of falsehood long defended

and believed. But I should have pressed yet more upon them halting,

not harshly, not in puerile fashion, not obstinately; I should have

repeated the things that had been conceded, and have shown how they

must be conceded. I should have exhorted that they consult in common,

that they may see clearly what must be denied to us; whether they think

it false that intellectual perception is to be preferred to these

carnal organs of sight, or that what is known by means of the

excellency of the mind is more excellent than what is known by vile

corporeal sensation; whether they would be unwilling to confess that

those souls which they think heterogenous, can be known only by

intellectual perception, that is, by the excellency itself of the mind;

whether they would wish to deny that the sun and the moon are made

known to us only by means of these eyes. But if they had replied that

no one of these things could be denied otherwise than most absurdly and

most impudently, I should have urged that they ought not to doubt but

that the light whose worthiness of worship they proclaim, is viler than

that soul which they admonish men to flee.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 4.--Even the Soul of a Fly is More Excellent Than the Light.

4. And here, if perchance in their confusion they had inquired of me

whether I thought that the soul even of a fly [198] surpasses that

light, I should have replied, yes, nor should it have troubled me that

the fly is little, but it should have confirmed me that it is alive.

For it is inquired, what causes those members so diminutive to grow,

what leads so minute a body here and there according to its natural

appetite, what moves its feet in numerical order when it is running,

what regulates and gives vibration to its wings when flying? This

thing whatever it is in so small a creature towers up so prominently to

one well considering, that it excels any lightning flashing upon the

eyes.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[198] Neither Augustin nor the Manich�ans seem to have recognized the

distinction in kind between the human soul and animal life.--A.H.N.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 5.--How Vicious Souls, However Worthy of Condemnation They May

Be, Excel the Light Which is Praiseworthy in Its Kind.

Certainly nobody doubts that whatever is an object of intellectual

perception, by virtue of divine laws surpasses in excellence every

sensible object and consequently also this light. For what, I ask, do

we perceive by thought, if not that it is one thing to know with the

mind, and another thing to experience bodily sensations, and that the

former is incomparably more sublime than the latter, and so that

intelligible things must needs be preferred to sensible things, since

the intellect itself is so highly exalted above the senses?

5. Hence this also I should perchance have known, which manifestly

follows, since injustice and intemperance and other vices of the mind

are not objects of sense, but of intellect, how it comes about that

these too which we detest and consider condemnable, yet in as much as

they are objects of intellect, can outrank this light however

praiseworthy it may be in its kind. For it is borne in upon the mind

subjecting itself well to God, that, first of all, not everything that

we praise is to be preferred to everything that we find fault with.

For in praising the purest lead, I do not therefore put a higher value

upon it than upon the gold that I find fault with. For everything must

be considered in its kind. I disapprove of a lawyer ignorant of many

statutes, yet I so prefer him to the most approved tailor, that I

should think him incomparably superior. But I praise the tailor

because he is thoroughly skilled in his own craft, while I rightly

blame the lawyer because he imperfectly fulfills the functions of his

profession. Wherefore I should have found out that the light which in

its own kind is perfect, is rightly to be praised; yet because it is

included in the number of sensible things, which class must needs yield

to the class of intelligible things, it must be ranked below unjust and

intemperate souls, since these are intelligible; although we may

without injustice judge these to be most worthy of condemnation. For

in the case of these we ask that they be reconciled to God, not that

they be preferred to that lightning. Wherefore, if any one had

contended that this luminary is from God, I should not have opposed;

but rather I should have said, that souls, even vicious ones, not in so

far as they are vicious, but in so far as they are souls, must be

acknowledged to be creatures of God.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 6.--Whether Even Vices Themselves as Objects of Intellectual

Apprehension are to Be Preferred to Light as an Object of Sense

Perception, and are to Be Attributed to God as Their Author. Vice of

the Mind and Certain Defects are Not Rightly to Be Counted Among

Intelligible Things. Defects Themselves Even If They Should Be Counted

Among Intelligible Things Should Never Be Put Before Sensible Things.

If Light is Visible by God, Much More is the Soul, Even If Vicious,

Which in So Far as It Lives is an Intelligible Thing. Passages of

Scripture are Adduced by the Manich�ans to the Contrary.

At this point, in case some one of them, cautious and watchful, now

also more studious than pertinacious, had admonished me that the

inquiry is not about vicious souls but about vices themselves, which,

seeing that they are not known by corporeal sense, and yet are known,

can only be received as objects of intellectual apprehension, which if

they excel all objects of sense, why can we not agree in attributing

light to God as its author, but only a sacrilegious person would say

that God is the author of vices; I should have replied to the man, if

either on the spur of the moment, as is customary to the worshippers of

the good God, a solution of this question had darted like lightning

from on high, or a solution had been previously prepared. If I had not

deserved or was unable to avail myself of either of these methods, I

should have deferred the undertaking, and should have confessed that

the thing propounded was difficult to discern and arduous. I should

have withdrawn to myself, prostrated myself before God, groaned aloud

asking Him not to suffer me to halt in mid space, when I should have

moved forward with assured arguments, asking Him that I might not be

compelled by a doubtful question either to subordinate intelligible

things to sensible, and to yield, or to call Himself the author of

vices; since either of these alternatives would have been absolutely

full of falsehood and impiety. I can by no means suppose that He would

have deserted me in such a frame of mind. Rather, in His own ineffable

way, He would have admonished me to consider again and again whether

vices of mind concerning which I was so troubled should be reckoned

among intelligible things. But that I might find out, on account of

the weakness of my inner eye, which rightly befell me on account of my

sins, I should have devised some sort of stage for gazing upon

spiritual things in visible things themselves, of which we have by no

means a surer knowledge, but a more confident familiarity. Therefore I

should straightway have inquired, what properly pertains to the

sensation of the eyes. I should have found that it is the color, the

dominion of which the light holds. For these are the things that no

other sense touches, for the motions and magnitudes and intervals and

figures of bodies, although they also can be perceived by the eyes, yet

to perceive such is not their peculiar function, but belongs also to

touch. Whence I should have gathered that by as much as yonder light

excels other corporeal and sensible things, by so much is sight more

noble than the other senses. The light therefore having been selected

from all the things that are perceived by bodily sense, by this [light]

I should have striven, and in this of necessity I should have placed

that stage of my inquiry. I should have gone on to consider what might

be done in this way, and thus I should have reasoned with myself: If

yonder sun, conspicuous by its brightness and sufficing for day by its

light, should little by little decline in our sight into the likeness

of the moon, would we perceive anything else with our eyes than light

however refulgent, yet seeking light by reason of not seeing what had

been, and using it for seeing what was present? Therefore we should

not see the decline, but the light that should survive the decline.

But since we should not see, we should not perceive; for whatever we

perceive by sight must necessarily be seen; wherefore if that decline

were perceived neither by sight nor by any other sense, it cannot be

reckoned among objects of sense. For nothing is an object of sense

that cannot be perceived by sense. Let us apply now the consideration

to virtue, by whose intellectual light we most fittingly say the mind

shines. Again, a certain decline from this light of virtue, not

destroying the soul, but obscuring it, is called vice. Therefore also

vice can by no means be reckoned among objects of intellectual

perception, as that decline of light is rightly excluded from the

number of objects of sense perception. Yet what remains of soul, that

is that which lives and is soul is just as much an object of

intellectual perception as that is an object of sense perception which

should shine in this visible luminary after any imaginable degree of

decline. And so the soul, in so far as it is soul and partakes of

life, without which it can in no way be soul, is most correctly to be

preferred to all objects of sense perception. Wherefore it is most

erroneous to say that any soul is not from God, from whom you boast

that the sun and moon have their existence.

7. But if now it should be thought fit to designate as objects of

sense perception not only all those things that we perceive by the

senses, but also all those things that though not perceiving by the

senses we judge of by means of the body, as of darkness through the

eyes, of silence through the ears,--for not by seeing darkness and not

by hearing silence do we know of their existence,--and again, in the

case of objects of intellectual perception, not those things only which

we see illuminated by the mind, as is wisdom itself, but also those

things which by the illumination itself we avoid, such as foolishness,

which I might fittingly designate mental darkness; I should have made

no controversy about a word, but should have dissolved the whole

question by an easy division, and straightway I should have proved to

those giving good attention, that by the divine law of truth

intelligible subsistences are to be preferred to sensible subsistences,

not the decline of these subsistences, even though we should choose to

call these intelligible, those sensible. Wherefore, that those who

acknowledge that these visible luminaries and those intelligible souls

are subsistences, are in every way compelled to grant and to attribute

the sublimer part to souls; but that defects of either kind cannot be

preferred the one to the other, for they are only privative and

indicate nonexistence, and therefore have precisely the same force as

negations themselves. For when we say, It is not gold, and, It is not

virtue, although there is the greatest possible difference between gold

and virtue, yet there is no difference between the negations that we

adjoin to them. But that it is worse indeed not to be virtue than not

to be gold, no sane man doubts. Who does not know that the difference

lies not in the negations themselves, but in the things to which they

are adjoined? For by as much as virtue is more excellent than gold, by

so much is it more wretched to be in want of virtue than of gold.

Wherefore, since intelligible things excel sensible things, we rightly

feel greater repugnance towards defect in intelligible than in sensible

things, esteeming not the defects, but the things that are deficient

more or less precious. From which now it appears, that defect of

light, which is intelligible, is far more wretched than defect of the

sensible light, because, forsooth, life which is known is by far more

precious than yonder light which is seen.

8. This being the case, who will dare, while attributing sun and moon,

and whatever is refulgent in the stars, nay in this fire of ours and in

this visible earthly life, to God, to decline to grant that any souls

whatsoever, which are not souls except by the fact of their being

perfectly alive, since in this fact alone life has the precedence of

light, are from God. And since he speaks truth who says, In as far as

a thing shines it is from God, would I speak falsely, mighty God, if I

should say, In so far as a thing lives it is from God? Let not, I

beseech thee, blindness of intellect and perversions of mind be

increased to such an extent that men may fail to know these things.

But however great their error and pertinacity might have been, trusting

in these arguments and armed therewith, I believe that when I should

have laid the matter before them thus considered and canvassed, and

should have calmly conferred with them, I should have feared lest any

one of them should have seemed to me to be of any consequence, should

he endeavor to subordinate or even to compare to bodily sense, or to

those things that pertain to bodily sense as objects of knowledge,

either intellect or those things that are perceived (not by way of

defect) by the intellect. Which point having been settled, how would

he or any other have dared to deny that such souls as he would consider

evil, yet since they are souls, are to be reckoned in the number of

intelligible things, nor are objects of intellectual perception by way

of defect? This is on the supposition that souls are souls only by

being alive. For if they were intellectually perceived as vicious

through defect, being vicious by lack of virtue, yet they are perceived

as souls not through defect, for they are souls by reason of being

alive. Nor can it be maintained that presence of life is a cause of

defect, for by as much as anything is defective, by so much is it

severed from life.

9. Since therefore it would have been every way evident that no souls

can be separated from that Author from whom yonder light is not

separated, whatever they might have now adduced I should not have

accepted, and should rather have admonished them that they should

choose with me to follow those who maintain that whatever is, since it

is, and in whatever degree it is, has its existence from the one God.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 7.--How Evil Men are of God, and Not of God.

They might have cited against me those words of the gospel: "Ye

therefore do not hear, because ye are not of God;" "Ye are of your

father the devil." [199] I also should have cited: "All things were

made by Him and without Him was not anything made," [200] and this of

the Apostle: "One God of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus

Christ through whom are all things," [201] and again from the same

Apostle: "Of whom are all things, through whom are all things, in whom

are all things, to Him be glory." [202] I should have exhorted those

men (if indeed I had found them men), that we should presume upon

nothing as if we had found it out, but should rather inquire of the

masters who would demonstrate the agreement and harmony of those

passages that seem to be discordant. For when in one and the same

Scriptural authority we read: "All things are of God," [203] and

elsewhere: "Ye are not of God," since it is wrong rashly to condemn

books of Scripture, who would not have seen that a skilled teacher

should be found who would know a solution of this problem, from whom

assuredly if endowed with good intellectual powers, and a "spiritual

man," as is said by divine inspiration [204] (for he would necessarily

have favored the true arguments concerning the intelligible and

sensible nature, which, as far as I can, I have conducted and handled,

nay he would have disclosed them far better and more convincingly); we

should have heard nothing else concerning this problem, except, as

might happen, that there is no class of souls but has its existence

from God, and that it is yet rightly said to sinners and unbelievers:

"Ye are not of God." For we also, perchance, Divine aid having been

implored, should have been able easily to see, that it is one thing to

live and another to sin, and (although life in sin may be called death

in comparison with just life, [205] and while in one man it may be

found, that he is at the same time alive and a sinner) that so far as

he is alive, he is of God, so far as he is a sinner he is not of God.

In which division we use that alternative that suits our sentiment; so

that when we wish to insist upon the omnipotence of God as Creator, we

may say even to sinners that they are of God. For we are speaking to

those who are contained in some class, we are speaking to those having

animal life, we are speaking to rational beings, we are speaking

lastly--and this applies especially to the matter in hand--to living

beings, all which things are essentially divine functions. But when

our purpose is to convict evil men, we rightly say: "Ye are not of

God." For we speak to them as averse to truth, unbelieving, criminal,

infamous, and, to sum up all in one term--sinners, all of which things

are undoubtedly not of God. Therefore what wonder is it, if Christ

says to sinners, convicting them of this very thing that they were

sinners and did not believe in Him: "Ye are not of God;" and on the

other hand, without prejudice to the former statement: "All things

were made through Him," and "All things are of God?" For if not to

believe Christ, to repudiate Christ's advent, not to accept Christ, was

a sure mark of souls that are not of God; and so it was said: "Ye

therefore hear not, because ye are not of God;" how would that saying

of the apostle be true that occurs in the memorable beginning of the

gospel: "He came unto his own things, and his own people did not

receive him?" [206] Whence his own if they did not receive him; or

whence therefore not his own because they did not receive him, unless

that sinners by virtue of being men belong to God, but by virtue of

being sinners belong to the devil? He who says: "His own people

received him not" had reference to nature; but he who says: "Ye are

not of God." had reference to will; for the evangelist was commending

the works of God, Christ was censuring the sins of men.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[199] John viii. 47 and 44.

[200] John i. 3.

[201] 1 Cor. viii. 6.

[202] Rom. xi. 36.

[203] 1 Cor. xi. 12.

[204] 1 Cor. ii. 15.

[205] 1 Tim. v. 6.

[206] John i. 11.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 8.--The Manich�ans Inquire Whence is Evil and by This Question

Think They Have Triumphed. Let Them First Know, Which is Most Easy to

Do, that Nothing Can Live Without God. Consummate Evil Cannot Be Known

Except by the Knowledge of Consummate Good, Which is God.

Here perchance some one may say: Whence are sins themselves, and

whence is evil in general? If from man, whence is man? if from an

angel, whence is the angel? When it is said, however truly and

rightly, that these are from God, it nevertheless seems to those

unskillful and possessed of little power to look into recondite

matters, that evils and sins are thereby connected, as by a sort of

chain, to God. By this question they think themselves triumphant, as

if forsooth to ask were to know;--would it were so, for in that case no

one would be more knowing than myself. Yet very often in controversy

the propounder of a great question, while impersonating the great

teacher, is himself more ignorant in the matter concerning which he

would frighten his opponent, than he whom he would frighten.

These therefore suppose that they are superior to the common run,

because the former ask questions that the latter cannot answer. If

therefore when I most unfortunately was associated with them, not in

the position in which I have now for some time been, they had raised

these objections when I had brought forward this argument, I should

have said: I ask that you meanwhile agree with me, which is most easy,

that if nothing can shine without God, much less can anything live

without God. Let us not persist in such monstrous opinions as to

maintain that any souls whatsoever have life apart from God. For

perchance it may so happen that with me you are ignorant as to this

thing, namely whence is evil, let us then learn either simultaneously

or in any order, I care not what. For what if knowledge of the

perfection of evil is impossible to man without knowledge of the

perfection of good? For we should not know darkness if we were always

in darkness. But the notion of light does not allow its opposite to be

unknown. But the highest good is that than which there is nothing

higher. But God is good and than Him nothing can be higher. God

therefore is the highest good. Let us therefore together so recognize

God, and thus what we seek too hastily will not be hidden from us. Do

you suppose then that the knowledge of God is a matter of small account

or desert. For what other reward is there for us than life eternal,

which is to know God? For God the Master says: "But this is life

eternal, that they might know Thee the only and true God, and Jesus

Christ whom thou hast sent." [207] For the soul, although it is

immortal, yet because aversion from the knowledge of God is rightly

called its death, when it is converted to God, the reward of eternal

life to be attained is that knowledge; so that this is, as has been

said, eternal life. But no one can be converted to God, except he turn

himself away from this world. This for myself I feel to be arduous and

exceedingly difficult, whether it is easy to you, God Himself would

have seen. I should have been inclined to think it easy to you, had I

not been moved by the fact, that, since the world from which we are

commanded to turn away is visible, and the apostle says: "The things

that are seen are temporal, but the things that are unseen are

eternal," [208] you ascribe more importance to the judgment of these

eyes than to that of the mind, asserting and believing as you do that

there is no shining feather that does not shine from God; and that

there are living souls that do not live from God. These and like

things I should either have said to them or considered with myself, for

even then, supplicating God with all my bowels, so to speak, and

examining as attentively as possible the Scriptures, I should perchance

have been able either to say such things or to think them, so far as

was necessary for my salvation.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[207] John xvii. 3.

[208] 2 Cor. iv. 18.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 9.--Augustin Deceived by Familiarity with the Manich�ans, and

by the Succession of Victories Over Ignorant Christians Reported by

Them. The Manich�ans are Likewise Easily Refuted from the Knowledge of

Sin and the Will.

But two things especially, which easily lay hold upon that unwary age,

urged me through wonderful circuits. One of these was familiarity,

suddenly, by a certain false semblance of goodness, wrapped many times

around my neck as a certain sinuous chain. The other was, that I was

almost always noxiously victorious in arguing with ignorant Christians

who yet eagerly attempted, each as he could, to defend their faith.

[209] By which frequent success the ardor of youth was kindled, and

by its own impulse rashly verged upon the great evil of stubbornness.

For this kind of wrangling, after I had become an auditor among them,

whatever I was able to do either by my own genius, such as it was, or

by reading the works of others, I most gladly devoted to them alone.

Accordingly from their speeches ardor in disputations was daily

increased, from success in disputations love for them [the

Manich�ans]. Whence it resulted that whatever they said, as if

affected by certain strange disorders, I approved of as true, not

because I knew it to be true, but because I wished it to be. So it

came about that, however slowly and cautiously, yet for a long time I

followed men that preferred a sleek straw to a living soul.

12. So be it, I was not able at that time to distinguish and discern

sensible from intelligible things, carnal forsooth from spiritual. It

did not belong to age, nor to discipline, nor even to any habit, nor,

finally, to any deserts; for it is a matter of no small joy and

felicitation: had I not thus been able at length even to grasp that

which in the judgment of all men nature itself by the laws of the most

High God has established?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[209] Nothing is more certain than that Christianity has suffered more

at the hands of injudicious and ignorant defenders than from its most

astute and determined foes. Little attention would be paid to the

blatant infidels of the present day were it not for the interest

aroused and sustained by weak attempts to refute their arguments. And

as the youthful, ardent Augustin was encouraged and confirmed in his

errors by the inability of his opponents, so are errors confirmed at

the present day. The philosophical defence of Christianity is a matter

of the utmost delicacy, and should be undertaken with fear and

trembling.--A.H.N.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 10.--Sin is Only from the Will. His Own Life and Will Best

Known to Each Individual. What Will is.

For let any men whatever, if only no madness has broken them loose from

the common sense of the human race, bring whatever zeal they like for

judging, whatever ignorance, nay whatever slowness of mind, I should

like to find out what they would have replied to me had I asked,

whether a man would seem to them to have sinned by whose hand while he

was asleep another should have written something disgraceful? Who

doubts that they would have denied that it is a sin, and have exclaimed

against it so vehemently that they might perchance have been enraged

that I should have thought them proper objects of such a question? Of

whom reconciled and restored to equanimity, as best I could do it, I

should have begged that they would not take it amiss if I asked them

another thing just as manifest, just as completely within the knowledge

of all. Then I should have asked, if some stronger person had done

some evil thing by the hand of one not sleeping but conscious, yet with

the rest of his members bound and in constraint, whether because he

knew it, though absolutely unwilling, he should be held guilty of any

sin? And here all marvelling that I should ask such questions, would

reply without hesitation, that he had absolutely not sinned at all.

Why so? Because whoever has done anything evil by means of one

unconscious or unable to resist, the latter can by no means be justly

condemned. And precisely why this is so, if I should inquire of the

human nature in these men, I should easily bring out the desired

answer, by asking in this manner: Suppose that the sleeper already

knew what the other would do with his hand, and of purpose

aforethought, having drunk so much as would prevent his being awakened,

should go to sleep, in order to deceive some one with an oath. Would

any amount of sleep suffice to prove his innocence? What else than a

guilty man would one pronounce him? But if he has also willingly been

bound that he may deceive some one by this pretext, in what respect

then would those chains profit as a means of relieving him of sin?

Although bound by these he was really not able to resist, as in the

other case the sleeper was absolutely ignorant of what he was then

doing. Is there therefore any possibility of doubting that both should

be judged to have sinned? Which things having been conceded, I should

have argued, that sin is indeed nowhere but in the will, [210] since

this consideration also would have helped me, that justice holds guilty

those sinning by evil will alone, although they may have been unable to

accomplish what they willed.

13. For who could have said that, in adducing these considerations, I

was dwelling upon obscure and recondite things, where on account of the

fewness of those able to understand, either fraud or suspicion of

ostentation is accustomed to arise? Let that distinction between

intelligible and sensible things withdraw for a little: let me not be

found fault with for following up slow minds with the stimuli of subtle

disputations. Permit me to know that I live, permit me to know that I

will to live. If in this the human race agrees, as our life is known

to us, so also is our will. Nor when we become possessed of this

knowledge, is there any occasion to fear lest any one should convince

us that we may be deceived; for no one can be deceived as to whether he

does not live, or wishes nothing. I do not think that I have adduced

anything obscure, and my concern is rather lest some should find fault

with me for dwelling on things that are too manifest. But let us

consider the bearing of these things.

14. Sinning therefore takes place only by exercise of will. But our

will is very well known to us; for neither should I know that I will,

if I did not know what will itself is. Accordingly, it is thus

defined: will is a movement of mind, no one compelling, either for not

losing or for obtaining something. [211] Why therefore could not I

have so defined it then? Was it difficult to see that one unwilling is

contrary to one willing, just as the left hand is contrary to the

right, not as black to white? For the same thing cannot be at the same

time black and white. But whoever is placed between two men is on the

left hand with reference to one, on the right with reference to the

other. One man is both on the right hand and on the left hand at the

same time, but by no means both to the one man. So indeed one mind may

be at the same time unwilling and willing, but it cannot be at the same

time unwilling and willing with reference to one and the same thing.

For when any one unwillingly does anything; if you ask him whether he

wished to do it, he says that he did not. Likewise if you ask whether

he wished not to do it, he replies that he did. So you will find him

unwilling with reference to doing, willing with reference to not doing,

that is to say, one mind at the same time having both attitudes, but

each referring to different things. Why do I say this? Because if we

should again ask wherefore though unwilling he does this, he will say

that he is compelled. For every one also who does a thing unwillingly

is compelled, and every one who is compelled, if he does a thing, does

it only unwillingly. It follows that he that is willing is free from

compulsion, even if any one thinks himself compelled. And in this

manner every one who willingly does a thing is not compelled, and

whoever is not compelled, either does it willingly or not at all.

Since nature itself proclaims these things in all men whom we can

interrogate without absurdity, from the boy even to the old man, from

literary sport even to the throne of the wise, why then should I not

have seen that in the definition of will should be put, "no one

compelling," which now as if with greater experience most cautiously I

have done. But if this is everywhere manifest, and promptly occurs to

all not by instruction but by nature, what is there left that seems

obscure, unless perchance it be concealed from some one, that when we

wish for something, we will, and our mind is moved towards it, and we

either have it or do not have it, and if we have it we will to retain

it, if we have it not, to acquire it? Wherefore everyone who wills,

wills either not to lose something or to obtain it. Hence if all these

things are clearer than day, as they are, nor are they given to my

conception alone, but by the liberality of truth itself to the whole

human race, why could I not have said even at that time: Will is a

movement of the mind, no one compelling, either for not losing or for

obtaining something?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[210] The Pelagians used this statement with considerable effect in

their polemics against its author. In his Retractations Augustin has

this to say by way of explanation: "The Pelagians may think that thus

was said in their interest, on account of young children whose sin

which is remitted to them in baptism they deny on the ground that they

do not yet use the power of will. As if indeed the sin, which we say

they derive originally from Adam, that is, that they are implicated in

his guilt and on this account are held obnoxious to punishment, could

ever be otherwise than in will, by which will it was committed when the

transgression of the divine precept was accomplished. Our statement,

that there is never sin but in will,' may be thought false for the

reason that the apostle says: If what I will not this I do, it is no

longer I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.' For this sin is to

such an extent involuntary, that he says: What I will not this I do.'

How, therefore, is there never sin but in the will? But this sin

concerning which the apostle has spoken is called sin, because by sin

it was done, and it is the penalty of sin; since this is said

concerning carnal concupiscence, which he discloses in what follows

saying: I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good; for

to will is present to me, but to accomplish that which is good, is

not.' (Rom. vii. 16-18). Since the perfection of good is, that not

even the concupiscence of sin should be in man, to which indeed when

one lives well the will does not consent; nevertheless man does not

accomplish the good because as yet concupiscence is in him, to which

the will is antagonistic, the guilt of which concupiscence is loosed by

baptism, but the infirmity remains, against which until it is healed

every believer who advances well most earnestly struggles. But sin,

which is never but in will, must especially be known as that which is

followed by just condemnation. For this through one man entered into

the world; although that sin also by which consent is yielded to

concupiscence is not committed but by will. Wherefore also in another

place I have said: Not therefore except by will is sin

committed.'"--A.H.N. On this matter Augustin's still earlier treatise

De Libero Arbitrio, and his interesting Retractations on the same,

should be compared. The reader of these earlier treatises in

comparison with the Anti-Pelagian treatises can hardly fail to

recognize a marked change of base on Augustin's part. His efforts to

show the consistency of his earlier with his later modes of thought are

to be pronounced only partially successful. The fact is, that in the

Anti-Manich�an time he went too far in maintaining the absolute freedom

of the will and the impossibility of sin apart from personal will in

the sinner; while in the Anti-Pelagian time he ventured too near to the

fatalism that he so earnestly combated in the Manich�ans.--A.H.N.

[211] This dictum also Augustin thought it needful to explain: "This

was said that by this definition a willing person might be

distinguished from one not willing, and so the intention might be

referred to those who first in Paradise were the origin of evil to the

human race, by sinning no one compelling, that is by sinning with free

will, because also knowingly they sinned against the command, and the

tempters persuaded, did not compel, that this should be done. For he

who ignorantly sinned may not incongruously be said to have sinned

unwillingly, although not knowing what he did, yet willingly he did

it. So not even the sin of such a one could be without will, which

will assuredly, as it has been defined, was a movement of the mind, no

one compelling, either for not losing or for obtaining something.' For

he was not compelled to do what if he had been unwilling he would not

have done. Because he willed, therefore he did it, even if he did not

sin because he willed, being ignorant that what he did is sin. So not

even such a sin could be without will, but by will of deed not by will

of sin, which deed was yet sin; for this deed is what ought not to have

taken place. But whoever knowingly sins, if he can without sin resist

the one compelling him to sin, yet resists not, assuredly sins

willingly. For he who can resist is not compelled to yield. But he

who cannot by good will resist cogent covetousness, and therefore does

what is contrary to the precepts of righteousness, this now is sin in

the sense of being the penalty of sin. Wherefore it is most true that

sin cannot be apart from will." It is needless to say that such

reasoning would not have answered Augustin's purpose in writing against

the Manich�ans.--A.H.N.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 11.--What Sin is.

Some one will say: What assistance would this have furnished you

against the Manich�ans? Wait a moment; permit me first also to define

sin, which, every mind reads divinely written in itself, cannot exist

apart from will. Sin therefore is the will to retain and follow after

what justice forbids, and from which it is free to abstain. [212]

Although if it be not free, it is not will. But I have preferred to

define more roughly than precisely. Should I not also have carefully

examined those obscure books, whence I might have learned that no one

is worthy of blame or punishment who either wills what justice does not

prohibit him from willing, or does not do what he is not able to do?

Do not shepherds on mountains, poets in theatres, unlearned in social

intercourse, learned in libraries, masters in schools, priests in

consecrated places, and the human race throughout the whole world, sing

out these things? But if no one is worthy of blame and condemnation,

who either does not act against the prohibition of justice, or who does

not do what he cannot do, yet every sin is blameworthy and condemnable,

who doubts then that it is sin, when willing is unjust, and not willing

is free. And hence that definition is both true and easy to

understand, and not only now but then also could have been spoken by

me: Sin is the will of retaining or of obtaining, what justice

forbids, and whence it is free to abstain?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[212] Here also Augustin guards himself in his Retractations: "The

definition is true, inasmuch as that is defined which is only sin, and

not also that which is the penalty of sin."--A.H.N.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 12.--From the Definitions Given of Sin and Will, He Overthrows

the Entire Heresy of the Manich�ans. Likewise from the Just

Condemnation of Evil Souls It Follows that They are Evil Not by Nature

But by Will. That Souls are Good By Nature, to Which the Pardon of

Sins is Granted.

16. Come now, let us see in what respect these things would have aided

us. Much every way, so that I should have desired nothing more; for

they end the whole cause; for whoever consulting in the inner mind,

where they are more pronounced and assured, the secrets of his own

conscience, and the divine laws absolutely imposed upon nature, grants

that these two definitions of will and sin are true, condemns without

any hesitation by the fewest and the briefest, but plainly the most

invincible reasons, the whole heresy of the Manich�ans. Which can be

thus considered. They say that there are two kinds of souls, the one

good, which is in such a way from God, that it is said not to have been

made by Him out of any material or out of nothing, but to have

proceeded as a certain part from the very substance itself of God; the

other evil, which they believe and strive to get others to believe

pertains to God in no way whatever; and so they maintain that the one

is the perfection of good, but the other the perfection of evil, and

that these two classes were at one time distinct but are now

commingled. The character and the cause of this commingling I had not

yet heard; but nevertheless I could have inquired whether that evil

kind of souls, before it was mingled with the good, had any will. For

if not, it was without sin and innocent, and so by no means evil. [213]

But if evil in such a way, that though without will, as fire, yet if

it should touch the good it would violate and corrupt it; how impious

it is to believe that the nature of evil is powerful enough to change

any part of God, and that the Highest Good is corruptible and

violable! But if the will was present, assuredly there was present, no

one compelling, a movement of the mind either towards not losing

something or obtaining something. But this something was either good,

or was thought to be good, for not otherwise could it be earnestly

desired. But in supreme evil, before the commingling which they

maintain, there never was any good. Whence then could there be in it

either the knowledge or the thought of good? Did they wish for nothing

that was in themselves, and earnestly desire that true good which was

without? That will must truly be declared worthy of distinguished and

great praise by which is earnestly desired the supreme and true good.

Whence then in supreme evil was this movement of mind most worthy of so

great praise? Did they seek it for the sake of injuring it? In the

first place, the argument comes to the same thing. For he who wishes

to injure, wishes to deprive another of some good for the sake of some

good of his own. There was therefore in them either a knowledge of

good or an opinion of good, which ought by no means to belong to

supreme evil. In the second place, whence had they known, that good

placed outside of themselves, which they designed to injure, existed at

all. If they had intellectually perceived it, what is more excellent

than such a mind? Is there anything else for which the whole energy of

good men is put forth except the knowledge of that supreme and sincere

good? What therefore is now scarcely conceded to a few good and just

men, was mere evil, no good assisting, then able to accomplish? But if

those souls bore bodies and saw the supreme good with their eyes, what

tongues, what hearts, what intellects suffice for lauding and

proclaiming those eyes, with which the minds of just men can scarcely

be compared? How great good things we find in supreme evil! For if to

see God is evil, God is not a good; but God is a good; therefore to see

God is good; and I know not what can be compared to this good. Since

to see anything is good, whence can it be made out that to be able to

see is evil? Therefore whatever in those eyes or in those minds

brought it about, that the divine essence could be seen by them,

brought about a great thing and a good thing most worthy of ineffable

praise. But if it was not brought about, but it was such in itself and

eternal, it is difficult to find anything better than this evil.

17. Lastly, that these souls may have nothing of these praiseworthy

things which by the reasonings of the Manich�ans they are compelled to

have, I should have asked, whether God condemns any or no souls. If

none, there is no judgment of rewards and punishments, no providence,

and the world is administered by chance rather than by reason, or

rather is not administered at all. For the name administration must

not be given to chances. But if it is impious for all those that are

bound by any religion to believe this, it remains either that there is

condemnation of some souls, or that there are no sins. But if there

are no sins, neither is there any evil. Which if the Manich�ans should

say, they would slay their heresy with a single blow. Therefore they

and I agree that some souls are condemned by divine law and judgment.

But if these souls are good, what is that justice? If evil, are they

so by nature, or by will? But by nature souls can in no way be evil.

Whence do we teach this. From the above definitions of will and sin.

For to speak of souls, and that they are evil, and that they do not

sin, is full of madness; but to say that they sin without will, is

great craziness, and to hold any one guilty of sin for not doing what

he could not do, belongs to the height of iniquity and insanity.

Wherefore whatever these souls do, if they do it by nature not by will,

that is, if they are wanting in a movement of mind free both for doing

and not doing, if finally no power of abstaining from their work is

conceded to them; we cannot hold that the sin is theirs. [214] But

all confess both that evil souls are justly, and souls that have not

sinned are unjustly condemned; therefore they confess that those souls

are evil that sin. But these, as reason teaches, do not sin.

Therefore the extraneous class of evil souls of the Manich�ans,

whatever it may be, is a non-entity.

18. Let us now look at that good class of souls, which again they

exalt to such a degree as to say that it is the very substance of God.

But how much better it is that each one should recognize his own rank

and merit, nor be so puffed up with sacrilegious pride as to believe

that as often as he experiences a change in himself it is the substance

of that supreme good, which devout reason holds and teaches to be

unchangeable! For behold! since it is manifest that souls do not sin

in not being such as they cannot be; it follows that these

supposititious souls, whatever they may be, do not sin at all, and

moreover that they are absolutely non-existent; it remains that since

there are sins, they find none to whom to attribute them except the

good class of souls and the substance of God. But especially are they

pressed by Christian authority; for never have they denied that

forgiveness of sins is granted when any one has been converted to God;

never have they said (as they have said of many other passages) that

some corrupter has interpolated this into the divine Scriptures. To

whom then are sins attributed? If to those evil souls of the alien

class, these also can become good, can possess the kingdom of God with

Christ. Which denying, they [the Manich�ans] have no other class

except those souls which they maintain are of the substance of God. It

remains that they acknowledge that not only these latter also, but

these alone sin. But I make no contention about their being alone in

sinning; yet they sin. But are they compelled to sin by being

commingled with evil? If so compelled that there was no power of

resisting, they do not sin. If it is in their power to resist, and

they voluntarily consent, we are compelled to find out through their

[the Manich�an] teaching, why so great good things in supreme evil, why

this evil in supreme good, unless it be that neither is that which they

bring into suspicion evil, nor is that which they pervert by

superstition supreme good?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[213] In his Retractations, Augustin replies to the Pelagian denial of

the sinfulness of infants, in support of which they had quoted the

above sentence. "They [infants] are held guilty not by propriety of

will but by origin. For what is every earthly man in origin but

Adam?" The will of the whole human race was in Adam, and when Adam

sinned the whole race voluntarily sinned, seems to be his

meaning.--A.H.N.

[214] In his Retractations, Augustin explains that by nature is to be

understood the state in which we were created without vice. He

transfers the entire argument from the actual condition of man to the

primitive Adamic condition. It is evident, however, that this was not

his meaning when he combated the Manich�ans. The question of infant

sinfulness arises here also, and is discussed in the usual

Anti-Pelagian way.--A.H.N.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 13.--From Deliberation on the Evil and on the Good Part It

Results that Two Classes of Souls are Not to Be Held to. A Class of

Souls Enticing to Shameful Deeds Having Been Conceded, It Does Not

Follow that These are Evil by Nature, that the Others are Supreme Good.

19. But if I had taught, or at any rate had myself learned, that they

rave and err regarding those two classes of souls, why should I have

thenceforth thought them worthy of being heard or consulted about

anything? That I might learn hence, that these two kinds of souls are

pointed out, which in the course of deliberation assent puts now on the

evil side, now on the good? Why is not this rather the sign of one

soul which by free will can be borne here and there, swayed hither and

thither? For it was my own experience to feel that I am one,

considering evil and good and choosing one or the other, but for the

most part the one pleases, the other is fitting, placed in the midst of

which we fluctuate. Nor is it to be wondered at, for we are now so

constituted that through the flesh we can be affected by sensual

pleasure, and through the spirit by honorable considerations. Am I not

therefore compelled to acknowledge two souls? Nay, we can better and

with far less difficulty recognize two classes of good things, of which

neither is alien from God as its author, one soul acted upon from

diverse directions, the lower and the higher, or to speak more

correctly, the external and the internal. These are the two classes

which a little while ago we considered under the names sensible and

intelligible, which we now prefer to call more familiarly carnal and

spiritual. But it has been made difficult for us to abstain from

carnal things, since our truest bread is spiritual. For with great

labor we now eat this bread. For neither without punishment for the

sin of transgression have we been changed from immortal into mortal.

So it happens, that when we strive after better things, habit formed by

connection with the flesh and our sins in some way begin to militate

against us and to put obstacles in our way, some foolish persons with

most obtuse superstition suspect that there is another kind of souls

which is not of God.

20. However even if it be conceded to them that we are enticed to

shameful deeds by another inferior kind of souls, they do not thence

make it evident that those enticing are evil by nature, or those

enticed, supremely good. For it may be, the former of their own will,

by striving after what was not lawful, that is, by sinning, from being

good have become evil; and again they may be made good, but in such

manner that for a long time they remain in sin, and by a certain occult

suasion traduce to themselves other souls. Then, they may not be

absolutely evil, but in their own kind, however inferior, they may

exercise their own functions without any sin. But those superior souls

to whom justice, the directress of things, has assigned a far more

excellent activity, if they should wish to follow and to imitate those

inferior ones, become evil, not because they imitate evil souls, but

because they imitate in an evil way. By the evil souls is done what is

proper to them, by the good what is alien to them is striven after.

Hence the former remain in their own grade, the latter are plunged into

a lower. It is as when men copy after beasts. For the four-footed

horse walks beautifully, but if a man on all fours should imitate him,

who would think him worthy even of chaff for food? Rightly therefore

we generally disapprove of one who imitates, while we approve of him

whom he imitates. But we disapprove not because he has not succeeded,

but for wishing to succeed at all. For in the horse we approve of that

to which by as much as we prefer man, by so much are we offended that

he copies after inferior creatures. So among men, however well the

crier may do in sending forth his voice, would not the senator be

insane, if he should do it even more clearly and better than the

crier? Take an illustration from the heavenly bodies: The moon when

shining is praised, and by its course and its changes is quite pleasing

to those that pay attention to such things. But if the sun should wish

to imitate it (for we may feign that it has desires of this sort [215]

), who would not be greatly and rightly displeased. From which

illustrations I wish it to be understood, that even if there are souls

(which meanwhile is left an open question [216] ) devoted to bodily

offices not by sin but by nature, and even if they are related to us,

however inferior they may be, by some inner affinity, they should not

be esteemed evil simply because we are evil ourselves in following them

and in loving corporeal things. For we sin by loving corporeal things,

because by justice we are required and by nature we are able to love

spiritual things, and when we do this we are, in our kind, the best and

the happiest. [217]

21. Wherefore what proof does deliberation, violently urged in both

directions, now prone to sin, now borne on toward right conduct,

furnish, that we are compelled to accept two kinds of souls, the nature

of one of which is from God, of the other not; when we are free to

conjecture so many other causes of alternating states of mind? But

that these things are obscure and are to no purpose pried into by

blear-eyed minds, whoever is a good judge of things sees. Wherefore

those things rather which have been said regarding the will and sin,

those things, I say, that supreme justice permits no man using his

reason to be ignorant of, those things which if they were taken from

us, there is nothing whence the discipline of virtue may begin, nothing

whence it may rise from the death of vices, those things I say

considered again and again with sufficient clearness and lucidity

convince us that the heresy of the Manich�ans is false.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[215] Augustin's carefulness to explain that he is only indulging in

personification is doubtless due to the fact that with the Manich�ans

the sun and the moon were objects of worship.--A.H.N.

[216] In his Retractations, Augustin explains that he did not really

regard this as an open question, but speaks of it as such only so far

as this particular discussion is concerned. He simply declines to

enter upon a consideration of it in this connection.--A.H.N.

[217] Here also the use of the word "nature" gave Augustin trouble in

his later years. He claims in the Retractations that he uses the word

in the sense of "nature that has been healed" and that "cannot be

vitiated," and seeks to show that he did not mean to exclude divine

grace.--A.H.N.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 14.--Again It is Shown from the Utility of Repenting that Souls

are Not by Nature Evil. So Sure a Demonstration is Not Contradicted

Except from the Habit of Erring.

22. Like the foregoing considerations is what I shall now say about

repenting. For as among all sane people it is agreed, and this the

Manich�ans themselves not only confess but also teach, that to repent

of sin is useful. Why shall I now, in this matter, collect the

testimonies of the divine Scriptures, which are scattered throughout

their pages? It is also the voice of nature; notice of this thing has

escaped no fool. We should be undone, if this were not deeply imbedded

in our nature. Some one may say that he does not sin; but no barbarity

will dare to say, that if one sins he should not repent of it. This

being the case, I ask to which of the two kinds of souls does repenting

pertain? I know indeed that it can pertain neither to him who does ill

nor to him who cannot do well. Wherefore, that I may use the words of

the Manich�ans, if a soul of darkness repent of sin, it is not of the

substance of supreme evil, if a soul of light, it is not of the

substance of supreme good; that disposition of repenting which is

profitable testifies alike that the penitent has done ill, and that he

could have done well. How, therefore, is there from me nothing of

evil, if I have acted unadvisedly, or how can I rightly repent if I

have not so done? Hear the other part. How is there from me nothing

of good, if in me there is good will, or how do I rightly repent if

there is not? Wherefore, either let them deny that there is great

utility in repenting, so that they may be driven not only from the

Christian name, but from every even imaginary argument for their views,

or let them cease to say and to teach that there are two kinds of

souls, one of which has nothing of evil, the other nothing of good; for

that whole sect is propped up by this two-headed [218] or rather

headlong [219] variety of souls.

23. And to me indeed it is sufficient thus to know that the Manich�ans

err, that I know that sin must be repented of; and yet if now by right

of friendship I should accost some one of my friends who still thinks

that they are worthy of being listened to, and should say to him: Do

you not know that it is useful, when any one has sinned, to repent?

Without hesitation he will swear that he knows. If then I shall have

convinced you that Manich�ism is false, will you not desire anything

more? Let him reply what more he can desire in this matter. Very

well, so far. But when I shall have begun to show the sure and

necessary arguments which, bound to it with adamantine chains, as the

saying is, follow that proposition, and shall have conducted to its

conclusion the whole process by which that sect is overthrown, he will

deny perhaps that he knows the utility of repenting, which no learned

man, no unlearned, is ignorant of, and will rather contend, when we

hesitate and deliberate, that two souls in us furnish each its own

proper help to the solution of the different parts of the question. O

habit of sin! O accompanying penalty of sin! Then you turned me away

from the consideration of things so manifest, but you injured me when I

did not discern. But now, among my most familiar acquaintances who do

not discern, you wound and torment me discerning.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[218] Bicipiti.

[219] Pr�cipiti.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 15.--He Prays for His Friends Whom He Has Had as Associates in

Error.

24. Give heed to these things, I beseech you, dearly beloved. Your

dispositions I have well known. If you now concede to me the mind and

the reason of any sort of man, these things are far more certain than

the things that we seemed to learn or rather were compelled to

believe. Great God, God omnipotent, God of supreme goodness, whose

right it is to be believed and known to be inviolable and

unchangeable. Trinal Unity, whom the Catholic Church worships, as one

who have experienced in myself Thy mercy, I supplicate Thee, that Thou

wilt not permit those with whom from boyhood I have lived most

harmoniously in every relation to dissent from me in Thy worship. I

see how it was especially to be expected in this place that I should

either even then have defended the Catholic Scriptures attacked by the

Manich�ans, if as I say, I had been cautious; or I should now show that

they can be defended. But in other volumes God will aid my purpose,

for the moderate length of this, as I suppose, already asks to be

spared. [220]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[220] This purpose Augustin accomplished in several works. See

especially Contra Adimantum, and Contra Faustum Manich�um. On

Augustin's defense of the Old Testament Scriptures, see Mozley's Ruling

Ideas in Early Ages, last chapter.--A.H.N.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

St. AUGUSTIN:

acts or disputation

against

fortunatus the manich�an.

[acta seu disputatio contra fortunatum manich�um].

A.D. 392.

translated by

albert h. newman, d.d., ll.d.,

professor of church history and comparative religion, in toronto

baptist (theological) college, toronto, canada.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Acts or Disputation

Against Fortunatus, the Manich�an.

[Acta Seu Disputatio Contra Fortunatum Manich�um.] a.d. 392. [221]

Disputation of the First Day.

On the fifth of September, the most renowned men Arcadius Augustus (the

second time) and Rufinus being consuls, a disputation against

Fortunatus, an elder of the Manich�ans, was held in the city of Hippo

Regius, in the baths of Sossius, in the presence of the people.

1. Augustin said: I now regard as error what formerly I regarded as

truth. I desire to hear from you who are present whether my

supposition is correct. First of all I regard it as the height of

error to believe that Almighty God, in whom is our one hope, is in any

part either violable, or contaminable, or corruptible. This I know

your heresy affirms, not indeed in the words that I now use; for when

you are questioned you confess that God is incorruptible, and

absolutely inviolable, and incontaminable; but when you begin to

expound the rest of your system, we are compelled to declare Him

corruptible, penetrable, contaminable. For you say that another race

of darkness, whatever it may be, has rebelled against the kingdom of

God; but that Almighty God, when He saw what ruin and desolation

threatened his domains, unless he should make some opposition to the

adverse race and resist it, sent this virtue, from whose commingling

with evil and the race of darkness the world was framed. Hence it is

that here good souls labor, serve, err, are corrupted: that they may

see the need of a liberator, who should purge them from error, loose

them from this commingling with evil, and liberate them from

servitude. I think it impious to believe that Almighty God ever feared

any adverse race, or was under necessity to precipitate us into

afflictions.

Fortunatus said: Because I know that you have been in our midst, that

is, have lived as an adherent among the Manich�ans, these are the

principles of our faith. The matter now to be considered is our mode

of living, the falsely alleged crimes for which we are maltreated.

Therefore let the good men present hear from you whether these things

with which we are charged and which we have thrown in our teeth are

true or false. For from your instruction, and from your exposition and

explanation, they will have been able to gain more correct information

about our mode of life, if it shall have been set forth by you.

2. Augustin said: I was among you, but faith and morals are different

questions. I proposed to discuss faith. But if those present prefer

to hear about morals, I do not decline that question.

Fortunatus said: I wish first to purge myself in your conscience in

which we are polluted, by the testimony of a competent man, (who even

now is competent for me), and in view of the future examination of

Christ, the just judge, whether he saw in us, or himself practiced by

imitation, the things that are now thrown in our teeth?

3. Augustin said: You call me to something else, when I had proposed

to discuss faith, but concerning your morals only those who are your

Elect can fully know. But you know that I was not your Elect, but an

Auditor. Hence though I was present at your prayer meetings, [222] as

you have asked (whether separately among yourselves you have any prayer

meetings, God alone and yourselves can know); yet in your prayer

meetings where I have been present I have seen nothing shameful take

place; but only that the faith that I afterwards learned and approved

is denounced, and that you perform your services facing the sun.

Besides this I found out nothing new in your meetings, but whoever

raises any question of morals against you, raises it against your

Elect. But what you who are Elect do among yourselves, I have no means

of knowing. For I have often heard from you that you receive the

Eucharist. But since the time of receiving it was concealed from me,

how could I know what you receive? [223] So keep the question about

morals, if you please, for discussion among your Elect, if it can be

discussed. You gave me a faith that I today disapprove. This I

proposed to discuss. Let a response be made to my proposition.

Fortunatussaid: And our profession is this very thing: that God is

incorruptible, lucid, unapproachable, intenible, impassible, that He

inhabits His own eternal lights, that nothing corruptible proceeds from

Him, neither darkness, demons, Satan, nor anything adverse can be found

in His kingdom. But that He sent forth a Saviour like Himself; that

the Word born from the foundation of the world, when He had formed the

world, after the formation of the world came among men; that He has

chosen souls worthy of Himself according to His own holy will,

sanctified by celestial command, imbued with the faith and reason of

celestial things; that under His leadership those souls will return

hence again to the kingdom of God according to the holy promise of Him

who said: "I am the way, the truth, and the door;" [224] and "No one

can come unto the Father, except through me." These things we believe

because otherwise, that is, through another mediator, souls cannot

return to the kingdom of God, unless they find Him as the way, the

truth, and the door. For Himself said: "He that hath seen me, hath

seen my Father also;" [225] and "whosoever shall have believed on me

shall not taste death forever, but has passed from death unto life, and

shall not come into judgment." [226] These things we believe and this

is the reason of our faith, and according to the strength of our mind

we endeavor to act according to His commandments, following after the

one faith of this Trinity, Father and Son and Holy Spirit. [227]

4. Augustin said: What was the cause of those souls being

precipitated into death, whom you confess come through Christ from

death to life?

Fortunatus said: Hence now deign to go on and to contradict, if there

is nothing besides God.

5. Augustin said: Nay, do you deign to answer the question put to

you: What cause has given these souls to death?

Fortunatus said: Nay but do you deign to say whether there is anything

besides God, or all things are in God.

6. Augustin said: This I can reply, that the Lord wished me to know

that God cannot suffer any necessity, nor be violated or corrupted in

any part. Which, since you also acknowledge, I ask by what necessity

He sent hither souls that you say return through Christ?

Fortunatus said: What you have said: that thus far God has revealed

to you, that He is incorruptible, as He has also revealed to me; the

reason must be sought, how and wherefore souls have come into this

world, so that now of right God should liberate them from this world

through his Son only begotten and like Himself, if besides Himself

there is nothing?

7. Augustin said: We ought not to disappoint those present, being men

of note, and from the question proposed for discussion go to another.

So we both confess, so we concede to ourselves, that God is

incorruptible and inviolable, and could have in no way suffered. From

which it follows, that your heresy is false, which says that God, when

He saw desolation and ruin threaten His kingdom, sent forth a power

that should do battle with the race of darkness, and that out of this

commingling our souls are laboring. My argument is brief, and as I

suppose, perfectly clear to any one. If God could have suffered

nothing from the race of darkness because He is inviolable, without

cause He sent us hither that we might here suffer distress. But if

anything can suffer, it is not inviolable, and you deceive those to

whom you say that God is inviolable. For this your heresy denies when

you expound the rest of it.

Fortunatussaid: We are of that mind in which the Apostle Paul

instructs us, who says: "Let this mind be in you that was also in

Christ Jesus, who when He had been constituted in the form of God,

thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but emptied Himself

receiving the form of a servant, having been made in the likeness of

men, and having been found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and

was made obedient even unto death." [228] We have this mind therefore

about ourselves, which we have also about Christ, who when He was

constituted in the form of God, was made obedient even unto death that

He might show the similitude of our souls. And like as He showed in

Himself the similitude of death, and having been raised from the midst

of the dead showed that He was from the Father, in the same manner we

think it will be with our souls, because through Him we shall have been

able to be freed from this death, which is either alien from God, or if

it belongs to God, His mercy ceases, and the name of liberator, and the

works of Him who liberates. [229]

8. Augustin said: I ask how we came into death, and you tell how we

may be liberated from death.

Fortunatus said: So the apostle said that we ought to have that mind

concerning ourselves which Christ has shown us. If Christ was in

suffering and death, so also are we.

9. Augustin said: It is known to all that the Catholic faith is to

the effect that our Lord, that is the Power and Wisdom of God, [230]

and the Word through whom all things have been made and without whom

was not anything made, [231] took upon Himself man to liberate us. In

the man whom He took upon Himself, He demonstrated those things that

you spoke of. But we now ask concerning the substance of God Himself

and of Unspeakable Majesty, whether anything can injure it or not. For

if anything can injure it, He is not inviolable. If nothing can injure

the substance of God, what was the race of darkness about to do to it,

against which you say war was waged by God before the foundation of the

world; in which war you assert that we, that is souls that are now

manifestly in need of a liberator, have been commingled with every evil

and implicated in death. For I return to that very brief statement:

If He could be injured, He is not inviolable; if He could not, He acted

cruelly in sending us hither to suffer these things.

Fortunatus said: Does the soul belong to God, or not?

10. Augustin said: If it is just that you should fail to respond to

my questions, and that I should be questioned, I will reply.

Fortunatus said: Does the soul act independently? This I ask of you.

11. Augustin said: I indeed will tell what you have asked; only

remember this, that while you have refused to respond to my questions,

I have responded to yours. If you ask whether the soul descended from

God, it is indeed a great question; but whether it descends from God or

not, I make this reply concerning the soul, that it is not God; that

God is one thing, the soul another. That God is inviolable,

incorruptible, and impenetrable, and incontaminable, who also could be

corrupted in no part and to whom no injury can be done in any part.

But we see also that the soul is sinful, and is conversant with misery,

and seeks the truth, and is in want of a liberator. This changing

condition of the soul shows me that the soul is not God. For if the

soul is the substance of God, the substance of God errs, the substance

of God is corrupted, the substance of God is violated, the substance of

God is deceived; which it is impious to say.

Fortunatus said: Therefore you have denied that the soul is of God, so

long as it serves sins, and vices, and earthly things, and is led by

error, because it cannot happen that either God or His substance should

suffer this thing. For God is incorruptible and His substance

immaculate and holy. But here it is inquired of you whether the soul

is of God, or not? Which we confess, and show from the advent of the

Saviour, from His holy preaching, from His election; while He pitied

souls, and the soul is said to have come according to His will, that He

might free it from death and might bring it to eternal glory, and

restore it to the Father. But what do you say and hope concerning the

soul; is it from God or not? Can the substance of God, from which you

deny that the soul has its being, be subject to no passions?

12. Augustin said: I have denied that the soul is the substance of

God in the sense of its being God; but yet I hold that it is from God

as its author, because it was made by God. The Maker is one thing, the

thing made is another. He who made cannot be corruptible at all, but

what He made cannot be at all equal to Him who made it.

Fortunatus said: Nor have I said that the soul is like God. But

because you have said that the soul is an artificial thing, and that

there is nothing besides God, I ask whence then God invented the

substance of the soul?

13. Augustin said: Only bear in mind that I reply to your

interrogations, but that you do not reply to mine. I say that the soul

was made by God as all other things that were made by God; and that

among the things that God Almighty made the principal place was given

to the soul. But if you ask whence God made the soul, remember that

you and I agree in confessing that God is almighty. But he is not

almighty who seeks the assistance of any material whence he may make

what he will. From which it follows, that according to our faith, all

things that God made through His Word and Wisdom, He made out of

nothing. For so we read: "He ordered and they were made; He commanded

and they were created." [232]

Fortunatus said: Do all things have their existence from God's

command?

14. Augustin said: So I believe, but all things which were made.

Fortunatus said: As things made they agree, but because they are

unsuitable to themselves, therefore on this account it follows, that

there is not one substance, although from the same order of the One

they came to the composition and fashioning of this world. But it is

plain in the things themselves that there is no similarity between

darkness and light, truth and falsehood, death and life, soul and body,

and other similar things which differ from each other both in names and

appearances. And for good reason did our Lord say: "The tree which my

heavenly Father has not planted shall be rooted up and cast into the

fire, because it brings not forth good fruit:" [233] ^ and that the

tree has been rooted up. Hence truly it follows from the reason of

things that there are two substances in this world which agree in forms

and in names, of which one belongs to corporeal natures, but the other

is the eternal substance of the omnipotent Father, which we believe to

be God's substance.

15. Augustin said: Those contrary things that move you so that we

think adversely, have happened on account of our sin, that is, on

account of the sin of man. For God made all things good, and ordered

them well; but He did not make sin, and our voluntary sin is the only

thing that is called evil. There is another kind of evil, which is the

penalty of sin. Since therefore there are two kinds of evil, sin and

the penalty of sin, sin does not pertain to God; the penalty of sin

pertains to the avenger. For as God is good who constituted all

things, so He is just in taking vengeance on sin. Since therefore all

things are ordered in the best possible way, which seem to us now to be

adverse, it has deservedly happened to fallen man who was unwilling to

keep the law of God. For God gave free will to the rational soul which

is in man. For thus it would have been possible to have merit, if we

should be good voluntarily and not of necessity. Since therefore it

behooves us to be good not of necessity but voluntarily, it behooved

God to give to the soul free will. But to this soul obeying His laws,

He subjected all things without adversity, so that the rest of the

things that God made should serve it, if also the soul itself had

willed to serve God. But if it should refuse to serve God, those

things that served it should be converted into its punishment.

Wherefore if all things are rightly ordered by God, and are good,

neither does God suffer evil.

Fortunatus said: He does not suffer, but prevents evil.

16. Augustin said: From whom then was He about to suffer it?

Fortunatus said: This is my point, that He wished to prevent it, not

rashly, but by power and prescience. But deny evil to be apart from

God, when other precepts can be shown which are done apart from His

will. A precept is not introduced, unless where there is contrariety.

The free faculty of living is not given except where there is a fall

according to the argument of the apostle who says: "And you did he

quicken, when ye were dead in your trespasses and sins, wherein

aforetime ye walked according to the rulership of this world, according

to the prince of the power of the air, of the spirit that now worketh

in the souls of disobedience; among whom we also all once lived in the

lusts of our flesh, doing the desires of the counsels of the flesh, and

were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest: but God, who is

rich in all mercy, had mercy on us. And when we were dead by sins,

quickened us together in Christ, by whose grace ye have been saved; and

at the same time also raised us up, and made us to sit with Him in the

heavenly places with Christ Jesus, that in the ages to come He might

show the exceeding riches of his grace in kindness toward us in Christ

Jesus. For by grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of

yourselves, for it is a gift of God; not of works, lest any one should

glory. For we are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus in good

works, which God prepared that we should walk in them. Wherefore

remember, that aforetime ye were Gentiles in the flesh, who are called

uncircumcision, by that which is called circumcision in flesh made by

hands, because ye were at that time without Christ, alienated from the

commonwealth of Israel, and strangers of the covenant, having no hope

of the promise, and without God in this world. But now in Christ

Jesus, ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ.

For He is our peace, who made both one, and breaking down the middle

wall of partition, the enmities in His flesh, making void by His

decrees the law of commandments, that in Himself He might unite the two

into one new man, making peace, that He might reconcile them both in

one body unto God through the cross, slaying the enmities in Himself.

And He came and preached peace unto you that were far off, and peace to

them that were nigh. For through Him we both have our access in one

Spirit unto the Father." [234]

17. Augustin said: This passage from the apostle, which you have

thought fit to recite, if I mistake not, makes very strongly for my

faith and against yours. In the first place, because free will itself,

on which I have said that the possibility of the soul's sinning

depends, is here sufficiently expressed, when sins are mentioned, and

it is said that our reconciliation with God takes place through Jesus

Christ. For by sinning we were brought into opposition to God; but by

holding to the precepts of Christ we are reconciled to God; so that we

who were dead in sins may be made alive by keeping His precepts, and

may have peace with Him in one Spirit, from whom we were alienated, by

failure to keep His precepts; as is set forth in our faith concerning

the man who was first created. I ask of you, therefore, according to

that passage which has been read, how can we have sins if contrary

nature compels us to do what we do? For he who is compelled by nature

to do anything, does not sin. But he who sins, sins by free will.

Wherefore would repentance be enjoined upon us, if we have done nothing

evil, but only the race of darkness? Likewise, I ask, to whom is

forgiveness of sins granted, to us or to the race of darkness? If to

the race of darkness, their race will also reign with Him, receiving

the forgiveness of sin; but if to us it is manifest that we have sinned

voluntarily. For it is the height of folly for him to be pardoned who

has done no evil. But he has done no evil, who has done nothing of his

own will. Therefore the soul that today promises itself forgiveness of

sins and reconciliation to God, if it should cease to sin, and repent

of past sins: if it should answer according to your faith and should

say: In what have I sinned? In what am I guilty? Why hast Thou

expelled me from Thy domains, that I might do battle with some sort of

race? I have been trodden under foot, I have been mixed up, I have

been corrupted, I am worn out, [235] my free will has not been

preserved. Thou knowest the necessity by which I am preserved: Why

dost Thou impute to me the wounds that I have received? Wherefore dost

Thou compel me to repentance when Thou art the cause of my wounds; when

Thou knowest what I have suffered, what the race of darkness has done

against me, Thou being the author who couldst suffer no harm and yet

wishing to save the domains which nothing could injure, Thou didst

thrust me down into these miseries. If indeed I am a part of Thee, who

have proceeded from Thy bowels, if I am from Thy kingdom and Thy mouth,

I ought not to suffer anything in this race of darkness, so that I

being uncorrupted that race should be subjected, if I was a part of the

Lord. But now since it cannot be controlled except by my corruption,

how can I either be said to be a part of Thee, or Thou remain

inviolable, or not be cruel in wishing me to suffer for those domains,

that could in no way be injured by that race of darkness? Respond to

this if you please, and deign also to explain to me how it was said by

the apostle, "We were by nature children of wrath," who, he says, have

been reconciled to God. If therefore they were by nature children of

wrath, how do you say that the soul is by nature a daughter and portion

of God?

Fortunatussaid: If with regard to the soul the apostle had said that

we are by nature children of wrath, the soul would have been alienated

by the mouth of the apostle from God. From this argument you only show

that the soul does not belong to God, because, the apostle says, "We

are by nature children of wrath." But if it is said in view of the

fact that the apostle [236] was held by the law, descending as he

himself testifies, from the seed of Abraham, it follows that he has

said corporeally, that we [i.e., Jews] were children of wrath even as

the rest of mankind. But he shows that the substance of the soul is of

God, and that the soul cannot otherwise be reconciled to God than

through the Master, who is Christ Jesus. For the enmity having been

slain, the soul seemed to God unworthy to have existed. But that it

was sent, this we confess, by God yet omnipotent, both deriving its

origin from Him and sent for the sealing of His will. In the same way

we believe also that Christ the Saviour came from heaven to fulfill the

will of the Father. Which will of the Father was this, to free our

souls from the same enmity, this enmity having been slain, which if it

had not been opposed to God could neither be called enmity where there

was unity, nor could slaying be spoken of or take place where there was

life.

18. Augustin said: Remember that the apostle said that we are

alienated from God by our manner of life.

Fortunatus said: I submit, that there were two substances. In the

substance of light, as we have above said, God is to be held

incorruptible; but that there was a contrary nature of darkness, that

which I also today confess is vanquished by the power of God, and that

Christ has been sent forth as a Saviour for my restoration, as

previously the same apostle says.

19. Augustin said: That we should discuss on rational grounds the

belief in two natures, has been made obligatory by those who are

hearing us. But inasmuch as you have again betaken yourself to the

Scriptures, I descend to them, and demand that nothing be passed by,

lest using certain statements we should bring confusion into the minds

of those to whom the Scriptures are not well known. Let us therefore

consider a statement that the apostle has in his epistle to the

Romans. For on the first page is what is strongly against you. For he

says: "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle,

separated unto the gospel of God, which He promised aforetime by His

prophets in the Holy Scriptures, concerning his Son, who was made unto

Him of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was predestinated

to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness

from the resurrection from the dead of our Lord Jesus Christ." [237]

We see that the apostle teaches us concerning our Lord Jesus Christ

that before the flesh he was predestinated by the power of God, and

according to the flesh was made unto Him of the seed of David. Since

you have always denied and always will deny this, how do you so

earnestly demand the Scriptures that we should discuss rather according

to them.

Fortunatussaid: You assert that according to the flesh Christ was of

the seed of David, when it should be asserted that he was born of a

virgin, [238] and should be magnified as Son of God. For this cannot

be, unless as what is from spirit may be held to be spirit, so also

what is from flesh may be known to be flesh. [239] Against which is

the authority of the Gospel in which it is said, that "flesh and blood

shall not inherit the kingdom of God, neither shall corruption inherit

incorruption." [240]

Here a clamor was made by the audience who wished the argument to be

conducted on rational grounds, because they saw that Fortunatus was not

willing to receive all things that are written in the Codex of the

apostle. Then little discussions began to be held here and there by

all, until Fortunatus said that the Word of God has been fettered in

the race of darkness. At which, when those present had expressed their

horror, the meeting was closed. [241]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[221] This Disputation seems to have occurred shortly after the writing

of the preceding treatise. It appears from the Retractations that

Fortunatus had lived for a considerable time at Hippo, and had secured

so large a number of followers that it was a delight to him to dwell

there. The Disputation is supposed to be a verbatim report of what

Augustin and Fortunatus said during a two days' discussion. The

subject is the origin of evil. Augustin maintains that evil, so far as

man is concerned, has arisen from a free exercise of the will on man's

part; Fortunatus, on the other hand, maintains that the nature of evil

is co-eternal with God. Fortunatus shows considerable knowledge of the

New Testament, but no remarkable dialectic powers. He appears at great

disadvantage beside his great antagonist. In fact, he is far from

saying the best that can be said in favor of dualism. We may say that

he was fairly vanquished in the argument, and at the close confessed

himself at a loss what to say, and expressed an intention of more

carefully examining the problems discussed, in view of what Augustin

had said. Augustin is more guarded in this treatise than in the

preceding in his statements about free will. He found little occasion

here, therefore, to retract or explain. Fortunatus often expresses

himself vaguely and obscurely. If some sentences are difficult to

understand in the translation, they will be found equally so in the

Latin.--A.H.N.

[222] The word used is oratio, by which is evidently meant the

religious services to which Auditors were admitted, prayer (oratio)

being the prominent feature.--A.H.N.

[223] The allusion here is doubtless to the probably slanderous charge

that the Manich�ans were accustomed to partake of human semen as a

Eucharist. The Manich�an view of the relation of the substance

mentioned to the light, and their well-known opposition to procreation,

give a slight plausibility to the charge. Compare the Morals of the

Manich�ans, ch. xviii., where Augustin expresses his suspicions of

Manich�an shamelessness. See also further references in the

Introduction.--A.H.N.

[224] This is, of course, a mixture of two passages of

Scripture.--A.H.N.

[225] John xiv. 8, 9.

[226] John v. 24.

[227] As remarked in the Introduction, the Manich�ans of the West, in

Augustin's time, sustained a far more intimate relation to Christianity

than did Mani and his immediate followers. Far as Fortunatus may have

been from using the above language in the ordinary Christian sense, yet

he held, by profession at least, enough of Christian truth to beguile

the unwary.--A.H.N.

[228] Philipp. ii. 5-8.

[229] Fortunatus could not surely have used this language with any

proper conception of its meaning. He seems, against Mani, to have

identified in some sense the Jesus that suffered with Christ. Yet even

in this statement his docetism is manifest.--A.H.N.

[230] 1 Cor. i. 24.

[231] John i. 3.

[232] Ps. cxlviii. 5.

[233] Matt. xv. 13, and iii. 10.

[234] Eph. ii. 1-18. There are several somewhat important variations

from the Greek text in this long extract. The attentive reader can get

a good idea of the nature of the variations by comparing this literal

translation with the revised English version.--A.H.N.

[235] There are three readings here, "wearied out," "deceived," and

"worn out." The latter is preferred by the Benedictine

editors.--A.H.N.

[236] Rom. xi. 1.

[237] Rom. i. 1-4.

[238] Isa. vii. 14.

[239] John iii. 6.

[240] 1 Cor. xv. 50.

[241] This little side remark lends reality to the discussion, and

enables us to form a vivid conception of what doctrinal debates were in

the age of Augustin.--A.H.N.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Disputation of the Second Day.

The next day, a notary having again been summoned, the discussion was

conducted as follows:

Fortunatus said: I say that God Almighty brings forth from Himself

nothing evil, and that the things that are His remain incorrupt, having

sprung and being born from an inviolable source; but other contrary

things which have their being in this world, do not flow from God nor

have appeared in this world with God as their author; that is to say,

they do not derive their origin from God. These things therefore we

have received in the belief that evil things are foreign to God.

20. Augustin said: And our faith is this, that God is not the

progenitor of evil things, neither has He made any evil nature. But

since both of us agree that God is incorruptible and incontaminable, it

is the part of the prudent and faithful to consider, which faith is

purer and worthier of the majesty of God; that in which it is asserted

that either the power of God, or some part of God, or the Word of God,

can be changed, violated, corrupted, fettered; or that in which it is

said that Almighty God and His entire nature and substance can never be

corrupted in any part, but that evils have their being by the voluntary

sin of the soul, to which God gave free will. Which free will if God

had not given, there could be no just penal judgment, nor merit of

righteous conduct, nor divine instruction to repent of sins, nor the

forgiveness of sins itself which God has bestowed upon us through our

Lord Jesus Christ. Because he who sins not voluntarily, sins not at

all. This I suppose to be open and perspicuous to all. Wherefore it

ought not to trouble us if according to our deserts we suffer some

inconveniences in the things God has made. For as He is good, that He

should constitute all things; so He is just, that He may not spare

sins, which sins, as I have said, unless free will were in us, would

not be sins. For if any one, so to speak, should be bound by some one

in his other members, and with his hand something false should be

written without his own will, I ask whether if this were laid open

before a judge, he could condemn this one for the crime of falsehood.

Wherefore, if it is manifest that there is no sin where there is not

free exercise of will, [242] I wish to hear what evil the soul which

you call either part, or power, or word, or something else, of God, has

done, that it should be punished by God, or repent of sin, or merit

forgiveness, since it has in no way sinned?

Fortunatus said: I proposed concerning substances, that God is to be

regarded as creator only of good things, but as the avenger of evil

things, for the reason that evil things are not of Him. Therefore for

good reason I think this, and that God avenges evil things because they

are not of Himself. But if they were from Him, either He would give

them license to sin, as you say that God has given free will, He would

be already found a participator in my fault, because He would be the

author of my fault; or ignorant what I should be, he left me whom he

did not constitute worthy of Himself. This therefore is proposed by

me, and what I ask now is, whether God instituted evil or not? and

whether He Himself instituted the end of evils. For it appears from

these things, and the evangelical faith teaches, that the things which

we have said were made by God Himself as God the Creator, as having

been created and begotten by Him, are to be esteemed incorruptible.

These things I also proposed which belong to our belief, and which can

be confirmed by you in that profession of ours, without prejudice to

the authority of the Christian faith. And because I can in no way show

that I rightly believe, unless I should confirm that belief by the

authority of the Scriptures, this is therefore what I have insinuated,

what I have said. Either if evil things have appeared in the world

with God as their author, deign to say so yourself; or if it is right

to believe that evil things are not of God, this also the contemplation

of those present ought to honor and receive. I have spoken about

substances, not about sin that dwells in us. For if what we think to

make faults had no origin, we should not be compelled to come to sin or

to fault. For because we sinned unwillingly, and are compelled by a

substance contrary and hostile to ourselves, therefore we follow the

knowledge of things. By which knowledge the soul admonished and

restored to pristine memory, recognizes the source from which it

derives its existence, in what evil it dwells, by what good works

emending again that in which unwillingly it sinned, it may be able

through the emendation of its faults, for the sake of good works, to

secure for itself the merit of reconciliation with God, our Saviour

being the author of it, who teaches us also to practice good things and

to flee from evil. For you ask us to believe that not by some contrary

nature, but by his own choice, man either serves righteousness or

becomes involved in sins; since, no contrary race existing, if the

soul, to which as you say God has given free will, having been

constituted in the body, dwells alone, it would be without sin, nor

would it become involved in sins.

21. Augustin said: I say it is not sin, if it be not committed by

one's own will; hence also there is reward, because of our own will we

do right. Or if he who sins unwillingly deserves punishment, he who

unwillingly does well ought to deserve reward. But who doubts that

reward is only bestowed upon him who does something of good will? From

which we know that punishment also is inflicted upon him who does

something of ill will. But since you recall me to primordial natures

and substances, my faith is that God Almighty--which must especially be

attended to and fixed in the mind--that God Almighty has made good

things. But the things made by Him cannot be such as is He who made

them. For it is unjust and foolish to believe that works are equal to

the workman, things made to the maker. Wherefore if it is reverential

to believe that God made all good things, than which nevertheless He is

by far more excellent and by far more pre-eminent; the origin and head

of evil is sin, as the apostle said: "Covetousness is the root of all

evils; which some following after have made shipwreck of the faith, and

have pierced themselves through with many sorrows." [243] For if you

seek the root of all evils, you have the apostle saying that

covetousness is the root of all evils. But the root of a root I cannot

seek. Or if there is another evil, whose root covetousness is not,

covetousness will not be the root of all evils. But if it is true that

covetousness is the root of all evils, in vain do we seek some other

kind of evil. But as regards that contrary nature of yours which you

introduce, since I have responded to your objections, I ask that you

deign to tell me whether it is wholly evil, whether there can be no sin

apart from it, whether by this alone punishment is deserved, not by the

soul by which no sin has been committed. But if you say that this

contrary nature alone deserves punishment, and not the soul, I ask to

which is repentance, which is commanded, vouchsafed. If the soul is

commanded to repent, sin is from the soul, and the soul has sinned

voluntarily. For if the soul is compelled to do evil, that which it

does is not evil. Is it not foolish and most absurd to say that the

race of darkness has sinned and that I repent of the sins. Is it not

most absurd to say that the race of darkness has sinned and that

forgiveness of sins is vouchsafed to me, who according to your faith

may well say: What have I done? What have I committed? I was with

Thee, I was in a state of integrity, I was contaminated with no

pollution. Thou didst send me hither, Thou didst suffer necessity,

Thou didst protect Thy domains when great pollution and desolation

threatened them. Since therefore Thou knowest the necessity by which I

have been here oppressed, by reason of which I could not breathe, which

I could not resist; why dost Thou accuse me as if sinning? or why dost

Thou promise forgiveness of sins? Reply to this without evasion, if

you please, as I have replied to you.

Fortunatussaid: We say this, that the soul is compelled by contrary

nature to transgress, for which transgression you maintain there is no

root save the evil that dwells in us; for it is certain that apart from

our bodies evil things dwell in the whole world. For not those things

alone that we have in our bodies, dwell in the whole world, and are

known by their names as good; an evil root also inheres. For your

dignity said that this covetousness that dwells in our bodies is the

root of evils; since therefore there is no desire of evil out of our

bodies, from that source contrary nature dwells in the whole world.

For the apostle designated that, namely covetousness, as the root of

evils, not one evil which you have called the root of all evils. But

not in one manner is covetousness, which you have said is the root of

all evils, understood, as if of that which dwells in our bodies alone;

for it is certain that this evil which dwells in us descends from an

evil author and that this root as you call it is a small portion of

evil, so that it is not the root itself, but is a small portion of

evil, of that evil which dwells everywhere. Which root and tree our

Lord called evil, as never bearing good fruit, which his Father did not

plant, and which is deservedly rooted up and cast into the fire. [244]

For as you say, that sin ought to be imputed to the contrary nature,

that nature belongs to evil; and that this is sin of the soul, if after

the warning of our Saviour and his wholesome instruction, the soul

shall have segregated itself from its contrary and hostile race,

adorning itself also with purer things; that otherwise it cannot be

restored to its own substance. For it is said: "If I had not come and

spoken unto them, they had not had sin. But now that I have come and

spoken, and they have refused to believe me, they shall have no excuse

for their sin." [245] Whence it is perfectly plain, that repentance

has been given after the Saviour's advent, and after this knowledge of

things, by which the soul can, as if washed in a divine fountain from

the filth and vices as well of the whole world as of the bodies in

which the same soul dwells, be restored to the kingdom of God whence it

has gone forth. For it is said by the apostle, that "the mind of the

flesh is hostile to God; is not subject to the law of God, neither

indeed can be." [246] Therefore it is evident from these things that

the good soul seems to sin not voluntarily, but by the doing of that

which is not subject to the law of God. For it likewise follows that

"the flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh;

so that ye may not do the things that ye will." [247] Again: "I see

another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind and

leading me captive in the law of sin and of death. Therefore I am a

miserable man; who shall deliver me from the body of this death, unless

it be the grace of God through our Lord Jesus Christ," [248] "through

whom the world has been crucified to me and I to the world?" [249]

22. Augustin said: I recognize and embrace the testimonies of the

divine Scriptures, and I will show in a few words, as God may deign to

grant, how they are consistent with my faith. I say that there was

free exercise of will in that man who was first formed. He was so made

that absolutely nothing could resist his will, if he had willed to keep

the precepts of God. But after he voluntarily sinned, we who have

descended from his stock were plunged into necessity. But each one of

us can by a little consideration find that what I say is true. For

today in our actions before we are implicated by any habit, we have

free choice of doing anything or not doing it. But when by that

liberty we have done something and the pernicious sweetness and

pleasure of that deed has taken hold upon the mind, by its own habit

the mind is so implicated that afterwards it cannot conquer what by

sinning it has fashioned for itself. We see many who do not wish to

swear, but because the tongue has already become habituated, they are

not able to prevent those things from going forth from the mouth which

we cannot but ascribe to the root of evil. For that I may discuss with

you those words, which as they do not withdraw from your mouth so may

they be understood by your heart: you swear by the Paraclete. If

therefore you wish to find out experimentally whether what I say is

true, determine not to swear. You will see, that that habit is borne

along as it has become accustomed to be. And this is what wars against

the soul, habit formed in the flesh. This is indeed the mind of the

flesh, which, as long as it cannot thus be subject to the law of God,

so long is it the mind of the flesh; but when the soul has been

illuminated it ceases to be the mind of the flesh. For thus it is said

the mind of the flesh cannot be subject to the law of God, just as if

it were said, that snow cannot be warm. For so long as it is snow, it

can in no way be warm. But as the snow is melted by heat, so that it

may become warm, so the mind of the flesh, that is, habit formed with

the flesh, when our mind has become illuminated, that is, when God has

subjected for Himself the whole man to the choice of the divine law,

instead of the evil habit of the soul, makes a good habit. Accordingly

it is most truly said by the Lord of the two trees, the one good and

the other evil, which you have called to mind, that they have their own

fruits; that is, neither can the good tree yield evil fruit, nor the

evil tree good fruit, but so long as it is evil. Let us take two men,

a good and a bad. As long as he is good he cannot yield evil fruit; as

long as he is bad he cannot yield good fruit. But that you may know

that those two trees are so placed by the Lord, that free choice may be

there signified, that these two trees are not natures but our wills, He

Himself says in the gospel: "Either make the tree good, or make the

tree evil." [250] Who is it that can make nature? If therefore we

are commanded to make a tree either good or evil, it is ours to choose

what we will. Therefore concerning that sin of man and concerning that

habit of soul formed with the flesh the apostle says: "Let no one

seduce you;" [251] "Every creature that has been made by God is good."

[252] The same apostle whom you also have cited says: "As through

the disobedience of the one the many were constituted sinners; so also

through the obedience of the one the many are constituted righteous."

[253] "Since through man is death, through man also is resurrection

of the dead." As long therefore as we bear the image of the earthly

man, [254] that is, as long as we live according to the flesh, which is

also called the old man, we have the necessity of our habit, so that we

may not do what we will. But when the grace of God has breathed the

divine love into us and has made us subject to His will, to us it is

said: "Ye are called for freedom," [255] and "the grace of God has

made me free from the law of sin and of death." [256] But the law of

sin is that whoever has sinned shall die. From this law we are freed

when we have begun to be righteous. The law of death is that by which

it was said to man: "Earth thou art and into earth thou shalt go."

[257] For from this very fact we are all so born, because we are

earth, and from the fact that we are all so born because we are earth,

we shall all go into earth on account of the desert of the sins of the

first man. But on account of the grace of God, which frees us from the

law of sin and of death, having been converted to righteousness we are

freed; so that afterwards this same flesh tortures us with its

punishment so long as we remain in sins, is subjected to us in

resurrection, and shakes us by no adversity from keeping the law of God

and His precepts. Whence, since I have replied to your questions,

deign to reply as I desire, how it can happen, that if nature is

contrary to God, sin should be imputed to us, who were sent into that

nature not voluntarily, but by God Himself, whom nothing could injure?

Fortunatussaid: Just as also the Lord said to His disciples: "Behold

I send you as sheep in the midst of wolves." [258] Hence it must be

known that not with hostile intent did our Saviour send forth His

lambs, that is His disciples, into the midst of wolves, unless there

had been some contrariety, which He would indicate by the similitude of

wolves, where also He had sent His disciples; that the souls which

perchance might be deceived in the midst of wolves might be recalled to

their proper substance. Hence also may appear the antiquity of our

times to which we return, and of our years, that before the foundation

of the world souls were sent in this way against the contrary nature,

that subjecting the same by their passion, victory might be restored to

God. For the same apostle said, that not only there should be a

struggle against flesh and blood, but also against principalities and

powers, and the spiritual things of wickedness, and the domination of

darkness." [259] If therefore in both places evils dwell and are

esteemed wickednesses, not only now is evil in our bodies, but in the

whole world, where souls appear to dwell, which dwell beneath yonder

heaven and are fettered.

23. Augustin said: The Lord sent His lambs into the midst of wolves,

that is, just men into the midst of sinners for the preaching of the

gospel received in the time of man from the inestimable divine Wisdom,

that He might call us from sin to righteousness. But what the apostle

says, that our struggle is not against flesh and blood, but against

principalities and powers, and the other things that have been quoted,

this signifies that the devil and his angels, as also we, have fallen

and lapsed by sin, and have secured possession of earthly things, that

is, sinful men, who, as long as we are sinners, are under their yoke,

just as when we shall be righteous, we shall be under the yoke of

righteousness; and against them we have a struggle, that passing over

to righteousness we may be freed from their dominion. Do you also

therefore deign to reply to the one question that I ask: Could God

suffer injury, or not? But I ask you to reply: He could not.

Fortunatus said: He could not suffer injury.

24. Augustin said: Wherefore then did He send us hither, according to

your faith?

Fortunatus said: My profession is this, that God could not be injured,

and that He directed us hither. But since this is contrary to your

view, do you tell how you account for the soul being here, which our

God desires to liberate both by His commandments and by His own Son

whom He has sent.

25. Augustin said: Since I see that you cannot answer my inquiries,

and wish to ask me something, behold I satisfy you, provided only that

you bear in mind that you have not replied to my question. Why the

soul is here in this world involved in miseries has been explained by

me not just now, but again and again a little while ago. The soul

sinned, and therefore is miserable. It accepted free choice, used free

choice, as it willed; it fell, was cast out from blessedness, was

implicated in miseries. As bearing upon this I recited to you the

testimony of the apostle who says: "As through one man death, so also

through one man came the resurrection of the dead." What more do you

ask? Hence do you reply, wherefore did He, who could not suffer

injury, send us hither?

Fortunatus said: The cause must be sought, why the soul came hither,

or wherefore God desires hence to liberate the soul that lives in the

midst of evils?

26. Augustin said: This cause I ask of you, that is, if God could not

suffer injury, wherefore He sent us hither?

Fortunatus said: It is inquired of us, if evil cannot injure God,

wherefore the soul was sent hither, or for what reason was it mingled

with the world? Which is manifest in what the apostle says: "Shall

the thing formed say to him that formed it, why hast thou formed me

thus?" [260] If therefore this cause must be pleaded, He must be

asked, why He sent the soul, no necessity compelling Him. But if there

was necessity for sending the soul, of right is there also the will of

liberating it.

27. Augustin said: Then God is pressed by necessity, is He?

Fortunatus said: Now this is it. Do not seek to bring odium upon what

has been said because we do not make God subject to necessity, but to

have voluntarily sent the soul.

28. Augustin said: Recall what was said above. And it runs: "But if

there was necessity for sending the soul, of right is there also the

will of liberating it. Augustin said: We have heard: But if there

was necessity for sending the soul, of right is there also the will of

liberating it." You, therefore, said that there was necessity for

sending the soul. But if you only wish to say "a will to send," I add

this also: He who could suffer no injury, had the cruel will to send

the soul to so great miseries. Because I speak for the sake of

refuting this statement, I ask pardon from the mercy of that One in

whom we have hope of liberation from all the errors of heretics.

Fortunatus said: You asseverate that we say that God is cruel in

sending the soul, but that God made man, breathed into him a soul which

assuredly He foreknew to be involved in future misery, and not to be

able by reason of evils to be restored to its inheritance. This

belongs either to one who is ignorant, or who gives the soul up to

these aforesaid evils. This I have cited because you said not long

since, that God adopted the soul, not that it is from Him; for to adopt

is a different matter.

29. Augustin said: Concerning adoption I remember that I spoke some

days ago according to the testimony of the apostle, who says that we

have been called into the adoption of sons. [261] This was not my

reply, therefore, but the apostle's, concerning which thing, that is,

that adoption, we may inquire, if we please, in its own time; and

concerning that I will reply without delay, when you shall have

answered my objections.

Fortunatus said: I say that there was a going forth of the soul

against a contrary nature, which nature could not injure God.

30. Augustin said: What need was there for that going forth, when God

whom nothing could injure had nothing to protect?

Fortunatus said: Do you conscientiously hold that Christ came from

God?

31. Augustin said: Again you are questioning me. Reply to my

inquiries.

Fortunatus said: So I have received in faith, that by the will of God

He came hither.

32. Augustin said: And I say: Why did God, omnipotent, inviolable,

immutable, whom nothing could injure, send hither the soul, to

miseries, to error, to those things that we suffer?

Fortunatussaid: For it has been said: "I have power to lay down my

soul and I have power to take it again." [262] Now He said that by

the will of God the soul went forth.

33. Augustin said: I ask for the reason why God, when He can in no

way suffer injury, sent the soul hither?

Fortunatus said: We have already said that God can in no way suffer

injury, and we have said that the soul is in a contrary nature,

therefore that it imposes a limit on the contrary nature. The

restraint having been imposed on the contrary nature, God takes the

same. For He Himself said, "I have power to lay down my soul and power

to take it." The Father gave to me the power of laying down my soul,

and of taking it. To what soul, therefore, did God who spoke in the

Son refer? Evidently our soul, which is held in these bodies,which

came of His will, and of His will is again taken up.

34. Augustin said: Why our Lord said: "I have power to lay down my

soul and power to take it," is known to all; because He was about to

suffer and to rise again. But I ask of you again and again, If God

could in no way suffer injury, why did he send souls hither?

Fortunatus said: To impose a limit on contrary nature.

35. Augustin said: And did God omnipotent, merciful and supreme, that

He might impose a restraint on contrary nature, wish it to be limited

so that He might make us unrestrained?

Fortunatus said: But so He calls us back to Himself.

36. Augustin said: If He recalls to Himself from an unrestrained

state, if from sin, from error, from misery, what need was there for

the soul to suffer so great evils through so long a time till the world

ends? since God by whom you say it was sent could in no way suffer

injury.

Fortunatus said: What then am I to say?

37. Augustin said: I know that you have nothing to say, and that I,

when I was among you, never found anything to say on this question, and

that I was thus admonished from on high to leave that error and to be

converted to the Catholic faith or rather to recall it, by the

indulgence of Him who did not permit me to inhere forever in this

fallacy. But if you confess that you have nothing to reply, I will

expound the Catholic faith to all those hearing and investigating,

seeing that they are believers, if they permit and wish.

Fortunatus said: Without prejudice to my profession I might say: when

I shall have reconsidered with my superiors the things that have been

opposed by you, if they fail to respond to this question of mine, which

is now in like manner proposed to me by you, it will be in my

contemplation (since I desire my soul to be liberated by an assured

faith) to come to the investigation of this thing that you have

proposed to me and that you promise you will show.

Augustin said: Thanks be to God.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
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[245] John xv. 22.

[246] Rom. viii. 7.

[247] Gal. v. 17.

[248] Rom. vii. 23-25.

[249] Gal. v. 14.
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[251] Eph. v. 6.
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Against the Epistle of Manich�us Called Fundamental. [263]

[Contra Epistolam Manich�i Quam Vocant Fundamentum.] a.d. 397.

Chapter 1.--To Heal Heretics is Better Than to Destroy Them.

1. My prayer to the one true, almighty God, of whom, and through whom,

and in whom are all things, has been, and is now, that in opposing and

refuting the heresy of you Manich�ans, as you may after all be heretics

more from thoughtlessness than from malice, He would give me a mind

calm and composed, and aiming at your recovery rather than at your

discomfiture. For while the Lord, by His servants, overthrows the

kingdoms of error, His will concerning erring men, as far as they are

men, is that they should be amended rather than destroyed. And in

every case where, previous to the final judgment, God inflicts

punishment, whether through the wicked or the righteous, whether

through the unintelligent or through the intelligent, whether in secret

or openly, we must believe that the designed effect is the healing of

men, and not their ruin; while there is a preparation for the final

doom in the case of those who reject the means of recovery. Thus, as

the universe contains some things which serve for bodily punishment, as

fire, poison, disease, and the rest, and other things, in which the

mind is punished, not by bodily distress, but by the entanglements of

its own passions, such as loss, exile, bereavement, reproach, and the

like; while other things, again, without tormenting are fitted to

comfort and soothe the languishing, as, for example, consolations,

exhortations, discussions, and such things; in all these the supreme

justice of God makes use sometimes even of wicked men, acting in

ignorance, and sometimes of good men, acting intelligently. It is

ours, accordingly, to desire in preference the better part, that we

might attain our end in your correction, not by contention, and strife,

and persecutions, but by kindly consolation, by friendly exhortation,

by quiet discussion; as it is written, "The servant of the Lord must

not strive; but be gentle toward all men, apt to teach, patient; in

meekness instructing those that oppose themselves." [264] It is ours,

I say, to desire to obtain this part in the work; it belongs to God to

give what is good to those who desire it and ask for it.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[263] Written about the year 397. In his Retractations (ii. 2)

Augustin says: "The book against the Epistle of Manich�us, called

Fundamental, refutes only its commencement; but on the other parts of

the epistle I have made notes, as required, refuting the whole, and

sufficient to recall the argument, had I ever had leisure to write

against the whole." [The Fundamental Epistle seems to have been a sort

of hand-book for Manich�an catechumens or Auditors. In making this

document the basis of his attack, Augustin felt that he had selected

the best-known and most generally accepted standard of the Manich�an

faith. The tone of the work is conciliatory, yet some very sharp

thrusts are made at Manich�an error. The claims of Mani to be the

Paraclete are set aside, and the absurd cosmological fancies of Mani

are ruthlessly exposed. Dualism is combated with substantially the

same weapons as in the treatise Concerning Two Souls. We could wish

that the author had found time to finish the treatise, and had thus

preserved for us more of the Fundamental Epistle itself. This work was

written after the author had become Bishop of Hippo.--A.H.N.]

[264] 2 Tim. ii. 24, 25.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 2.--Why the Manich�ans Should Be More Gently Dealt with.

2. Let those rage against you who know not with what labor the truth

is to be found and with what difficulty error is to be avoided. Let

those rage against you who know not how rare and hard it is to overcome

the fancies of the flesh by the serenity of a pious disposition. Let

those rage against you who know not the difficulty of curing the eye of

the inner man that he may gaze upon his Sun,--not that sun which you

worship, and which shines with the brilliance of a heavenly body in the

eyes of carnal men and of beasts,--but that of which it is written

through the prophet, "The Sun of righteousness has arisen upon me;"

[265] and of which it is said in the gospel, "That was the true Light,

which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." [266] Let those

rage against you who know not with what sighs and groans the least

particle of the knowledge of God is obtained. And, last of all, let

those rage against you who have never been led astray in the same way

that they see that you are.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[265] Mal. iv. 2.

[266] John i. 9.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 3.--Augustin Once a Manich�an.

3. For my part, I,--who, after much and long-continued bewilderment,

attained at last, to the discovery of the simple truth, which is

learned without being recorded in any fanciful legend; who, unhappy

that I was, barely succeeded, by God's help, in refuting the vain

imaginations of my mind, gathered from theories and errors of various

kinds; who so late sought the cure of my mental obscuration, in

compliance with the call and the tender persuasion of the all-merciful

Physician; who long wept that the immutable and inviolable Existence

would vouchsafe to convince me inwardly of Himself, in harmony with the

testimony of the sacred books; by whom, in fine, all those fictions

which have such a firm hold on you, from your long familiarity with

them, were diligently examined, and attentively heard, and too easily

believed, and commended at every opportunity to the belief of others,

and defended against opponents with determination and boldness,--I can

on no account rage against you; for I must bear with you now as

formerly I had to bear with myself, and I must be as patient towards

you as my associates were with me, when I went madly and blindly astray

in your beliefs.

4. On the other hand, all must allow that you owe it to me, in return,

to lay aside all arrogance on your part too, that so you may be the

more disposed to gentleness, and may not oppose me in a hostile spirit,

to your own hurt. Let neither of us assert that he has found truth;

let us seek it as if it were unknown to us both. For truth can be

sought with zeal and unanimity if by no rash presumption it is believed

to have been already found and ascertained. But if I cannot induce you

to grant me this, at least allow me to suppose myself a stranger now

for the first time hearing you, for the first time examining your

doctrines. I think my demand a just one. And it must be laid down as

an understood thing that I am not to join you in your prayers, or in

holding conventicles, or in taking the name of Manich�us, unless you

give me a clear explanation, without any obscurity, of all matters

touching the salvation of the soul.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 4.--Proofs of the Catholic Faith.

5. For in the Catholic Church, not to speak of the purest wisdom, to

the knowledge of which a few spiritual men attain in this life, so as

to know it, in the scantiest measure, indeed, because they are but men,

still without any uncertainty (since the rest of the multitude derive

their entire security not from acuteness of intellect, but from

simplicity of faith,)--not to speak of this wisdom, which you do not

believe to be in the Catholic Church, there are many other things which

most justly keep me in her bosom. The consent of peoples and nations

keeps me in the Church; so does her authority, inaugurated by miracles,

nourished by hope, enlarged by love, established by age. The

succession of priests keeps me, beginning from the very seat of the

Apostle Peter, to whom the Lord, after His resurrection, gave it in

charge to feed His sheep, down to the present episcopate. And so,

lastly, does the name itself of Catholic, which, not without reason,

amid so many heresies, the Church has thus retained; so that, though

all heretics wish to be called Catholics, yet when a stranger asks

where the Catholic Church meets, no heretic will venture to point to

his own chapel or house. Such then in number and importance are the

precious ties belonging to the Christian name which keep a believer in

the Catholic Church, as it is right they should, though from the

slowness of our understanding, or the small attainment of our life, the

truth may not yet fully disclose itself. But with you, where there is

none of these things to attract or keep me, the promise of truth is the

only thing that comes into play. Now if the truth is so clearly proved

as to leave no possibility of doubt, it must be set before all the

things that keep me in the Catholic Church; but if there is only a

promise without any fulfillment, no one shall move me from the faith

which binds my mind with ties so many and so strong to the Christian

religion.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 5.--Against the Title of the Epistle of Manich�us.

6. Let us see then what Manich�us teaches me; and particularly let us

examine that treatise which he calls the Fundamental Epistle, in which

almost all that you believe is contained. For in that unhappy time

when we read it we were in your opinion enlightened. The epistle

begins thus:--"Manich�us, an apostle of Jesus Christ, by the providence

of God the Father. These are wholesome words from the perennial and

living fountain." Now, if you please, patiently give heed to my

inquiry. I do not believe Manich�us to be an apostle of Christ. Do

not, I beg of you, be enraged and begin to curse. For you know that it

is my rule to believe none of your statements without consideration.

Therefore I ask, who is this Manich�us? You will reply, An apostle of

Christ. I do not believe it. Now you are at a loss what to say or do;

for you promised to give knowledge of the truth, and here you are

forcing me to believe what I have no knowledge of. Perhaps you will

read the gospel to me, and will attempt to find there a testimony to

Manich�us. But should you meet with a person not yet believing the

gospel, how would you reply to him were he to say, I do not believe?

For my part, I should not believe the gospel except as moved by the

authority of the Catholic Church. [267] So when those on whose

authority I have consented to believe in the gospel tell me not to

believe in Manich�us, how can I but consent? Take your choice. If you

say, Believe the Catholics: their advice to me is to put no faith in

you; so that, believing them, I am precluded from believing you;--If

you say, Do not believe the Catholics: you cannot fairly use the

gospel in bringing me to faith in Manich�us; for it was at the command

of the Catholics that I believed the gospel;--Again, if you say, You

were right in believing the Catholics when they praised the gospel, but

wrong in believing their vituperation of Manich�us: do you think me

such a fool as to believe or not to believe as you like or dislike,

without any reason? It is therefore fairer and safer by far for me,

having in one instance put faith in the Catholics, not to go over to

you, till, instead of bidding me believe, you make me understand

something in the clearest and most open manner. To convince me, then,

you must put aside the gospel. If you keep to the gospel, I will keep

to those who commanded me to believe the gospel; and, in obedience to

them, I will not believe you at all. But if haply you should succeed

in finding in the gospel an incontrovertible testimony to the

apostleship of Manich�us, you will weaken my regard for the authority

of the Catholics who bid me not to believe you; and the effect of that

will be, that I shall no longer be able to believe the gospel either,

for it was through the Catholics that I got my faith in it; and so,

whatever you bring from the gospel will no longer have any weight with

me. Wherefore, if no clear proof of the apostleship of Manich�us is

found in the gospel, I will believe the Catholics rather than you. But

if you read thence some passage clearly in favor of Manich�us, I will

believe neither them nor you: not them, for they lied to me about you;

nor you, for you quote to me that Scripture which I had believed on the

authority of those liars. But far be it that I should not believe the

gospel; for believing it, I find no way of believing you too. For the

names of the apostles, as there recorded, [268] do not include the name

of Manich�us. And who the successor of Christ's betrayer was we read

in the Acts of the Apostles; [269] which book I must needs believe if I

believe the gospel, since both writings alike Catholic authority

commends to me. The same book contains the well-known narrative of the

calling and apostleship of Paul. [270] Read me now, if you can, in

the gospel where Manich�us is called an apostle, or in any other book

in which I have professed to believe. Will you read the passage where

the Lord promised the Holy Spirit as a Paraclete, to the apostles?

Concerning which passage, behold how many and how great are the things

that restrain and deter me from believing in Manich�us.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[267] [This is one of the earliest distinct assertions of the

dependence of the Scriptures for authority on the Church.--A.H.N.]

[268] Matt. x. 2-4; Mark iii. 13-19; Luke vi. 13-18.

[269] Acts i. 26.

[270] Acts ix.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 6.--Why Manich�us Called Himself an Apostle of Christ.

7. For I am at a loss to see why this epistle begins, "Manich�us, an

apostle of Jesus Christ," and not Paraclete, an apostle of Jesus

Christ. Or if the Paraclete sent by Christ sent Manich�us, why do we

read, "Manich�us, an apostle of Jesus Christ," instead of Manich�us, an

apostle of the Paraclete? If you say that it is Christ Himself who is

the Holy Spirit, you contradict the very Scripture, where the Lord

says, "And I will send you another Paraclete." [271] Again, if you

justify your putting of Christ's name, not because it is Christ Himself

who is also the Paraclete, but because they are both of the same

substance,--that is, not because they are one person, but one existence

[non quia unus est, sed quia unum sunt],--Paul too might have used the

words, Paul, an apostle of God the Father; for the Lord said, "I and

the Father are one." [272] Paul nowhere uses these words; nor does

any of the apostles write himself an apostle of the Father. Why then

this new fashion? Does it not savor of trickery of some kind or

other? For if he thought it made no difference, why did he not for the

sake of variety in some epistles call himself an apostle of Christ, and

in others of the Paraclete? But in every one that I know of, he

writes, of Christ; and not once, of the Paraclete. What do we suppose

to be the reason of this, but that pride, the mother of all heretics,

impelled the man to desire to seem to have been sent by the Paraclete,

but to have been taken into so close a relation as to get the name of

Paraclete himself? As the man Jesus Christ was not sent by the Son of

God, that is, the power and wisdom of God--by which all things were

made, but, according to the Catholic faith, was taken into such a

relation as to be Himself the Son of God--that is, that in Himself the

wisdom of God was displayed in the healing of sinners,--so Manich�us

wished it to be thought that he was so taken up by the Holy Spirit,

whom Christ promised, that we are henceforth to understand that the

names Manich�us and Holy Spirit alike signify the apostle of Jesus

Christ,--that is, one sent by Jesus Christ, who promised to send him.

Singular audacity this! and unutterable sacrilege!

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[271] John xiv. 16.

[272] John x. 30.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 7.--In What Sense the Followers of Manich�us Believe Him to Be

the Holy Spirit.

8. Besides, you should explain how it is that, while the Father, Son,

and Holy Spirit are united in equality of nature, as you also

acknowledge, you are not ashamed to speak of Manich�us, a man taken

into union with the Holy Spirit, as born of ordinary generation; and

yet you shrink from believing that the man taken into union with the

only-begotten Wisdom of God was born of a Virgin. If human flesh, if

generation [concubitus viri], if the womb of a woman could not

contaminate the Holy Spirit, how could the Virgin's womb contaminate

the Wisdom of God? This Manich�us, then, who boasts of a connection

with the Holy Spirit, and of being spoken of in the gospel, must

produce his claim to either of these two things,--that he was sent by

the Spirit, or that he was taken into union with the Spirit. If he was

sent, let him call himself the apostle of the Paraclete; if taken into

union, let him allow that He whom the only-begotten Son took upon

Himself had a human mother, since he admits a human father as well as

mother in the case of one taken up by the Holy Spirit. Let him believe

that the Word of God was not defiled by the virgin womb of Mary, since

he exhorts us to believe that the Holy Spirit could not be defiled by

the married life of his parents. But if you say that Manich�us was

united to the Spirit, not in the womb or before conception, but after

his birth, still you must admit that he had a fleshly nature derived

from man and woman. And since you are not afraid to speak of the blood

and the bodily substance of Manich�us as coming from ordinary

generation, or of the internal impurities contained in his flesh, and

hold that the Holy Spirit, who took on Himself, as you believe, this

human being, was not contaminated by all those things, why should I

shrink from speaking of the Virgin's womb and body undefiled, and not

rather believe that the Wisdom of God in union with the human being in

his mother's flesh still remained free from stain and pollution?

Wherefore, as, whether your Manich�us professes to be sent by or to be

united with the Paraclete, neither statement can hold good, I am on my

guard, and refuse to believe either in his mission or in his

susception.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 8.--The Festival of the Birth-Day of Manich�us.

9. In adding the words, "by the providence of God the Father," what

else did Manich�us design but that, having got the name of Jesus

Christ, whose apostle he calls himself, and of God the Father, by whose

providence he says he was sent by the Son, we should believe himself,

as the Holy Spirit, to be the third person? His words are:

"Manich�us, an apostle of Jesus Christ, by the providence of God the

Father." The Holy Spirit is not named, though He ought specially to

have been named by one who quotes to us in favor of his apostleship the

promise of the Paraclete, that he may prevail upon ignorant people by

the authority of the gospel. In reply to this, you of course say that

in the name of the Apostle Manich�us we have the name of the Holy

Spirit, the Paraclete, because He condescended to come into Manich�us.

Why then, I ask again, should you cry out against the doctrine of the

Catholic Church, that He in whom divine Wisdom came was born of a

virgin, when you do not scruple to affirm the birth by ordinary

generation of him in whom you say the Holy Spirit came? I cannot but

suspect that this Manich�us, who uses the name of Christ to gain access

to the minds of the ignorant, wished to be worshipped instead of Christ

Himself. I will state briefly the reason of this conjecture. At the

time when I was a student of your doctrines, to my frequent inquiries

why it was that the Paschal feast of the Lord was celebrated generally

with no interest, though sometimes there were a few languid

worshippers, but no watchings, no prescription of any unusual fast,--in

a word, no special ceremony,--while great honor is paid to your Bema,

that is, the day on which Manich�us was killed, when you have a

platform with fine steps, covered with precious cloth, placed

conspicuously so as to face the votaries,--the reply was, that the day

to observe was the day of the passion of him who really suffered, and

that Christ, who was not born, but appeared to human eyes in an unreal

semblance of flesh, only feigned suffering, without really bearing it.

Is it not deplorable, that men who wish to be called Christians are

afraid of a virgin's womb as likely to defile the truth, and yet are

not afraid of falsehood? But to go back to the point, who that pays

attention can help suspecting that the intention of Manich�us in

denying Christ's being born of a woman, and having a human body, was

that His passion, the time of which is now a great festival all over

the world, might not be observed by the believers in himself, so as to

lessen the devotion of the solemn commemoration which he wished in

honor of the day of his own death? For to us it was a great attraction

in the feast of the Bema that it was held during Pascha, since we used

all the more earnestly to desire that festal day [the Bema], that the

other which was formerly most sweet had been withdrawn.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 9.--When the Holy Spirit Was Sent.

10. Perhaps you will say to me, When, then, did the Paraclete promised

by the Lord come? As regards this, had I nothing else to believe on

the subject, I should rather look for the Paraclete as still to come,

than allow that He came in Manich�us. But seeing that the advent of

the Holy Spirit is narrated with perfect clearness in the Acts of the

Apostles, where is the necessity of my so gratuitously running the risk

of believing heretics? For in the Acts it is written as follows: "The

former treatise have we made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began

both to do and teach, in the day in which He chose the apostles by the

Holy Spirit, and commanded them to preach the gospel. By those to whom

He showed Himself alive after His passion by many proofs in the

daytime, He was seen forty days, teaching concerning the kingdom of

God. And how He conversed with them, and commanded them that they

should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the

Father, which, saith He, ye have heard of me. For John indeed baptized

with water, but ye shall begin to be baptized with the Holy Spirit,

whom also ye shall receive after not many days, that is, at Pentecost.

When they had come, they asked him, saying, Lord, wilt Thou at this

time manifest Thyself? And when will be the kingdom of Israel? And He

said unto them, No one can know the time which the Father hath put in

His own power. But ye shall receive the power of the Holy Ghost coming

upon you, and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in

all Jud�a, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."

[273] Behold you have here the Lord reminding His disciples of the

promise of the Father, which they had heard from His mouth, of the

coming of the Holy Spirit. Let us now see when He was sent; for

shortly after we read as follows: "And when the day of Pentecost was

fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly

there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it

filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto

them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them.

And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with

other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. And there were

dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under

heaven. And when the sound was heard, the multitude came together, and

were confounded, because every man heard them speak in his own

language. And they were all amazed, and marvelled, saying one to

another, Are not all these which speak Galil�ans? and how heard we

every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born? Parthians, and

Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, in Armenia, and

in Cappadocia, in Pontus, Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and

in the regions of Africa about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews,

natives, Cretes, and Arabians, they heard them speak in their own

tongues the wonderful works of God. And they were all amazed, and were

in doubt on account of what had happened, saying, What meaneth this?

But others, mocking, said, These men are full of new wine." [274] You

see when the Holy Spirit came. What more do you wish? If the

Scriptures are credible, should not I believe most readily in these

Acts, which have the strongest testimony in their support, and which

have had the advantage of becoming generally known, and of being handed

down and of being publicly taught along with the gospel itself, which

contains the promise of the Holy Spirit, which also we believe? On

reading, then, these Acts of the Apostles, which stand, as regards

authority, on a level with the gospel, I find that not only was the

Holy Spirit promised to these true apostles, but that He was also sent

so manifestly, that no room was left for errors on this subject.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[273] Acts i. 1-8.

[274] Acts ii. 1-13.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 10.--The Holy Spirit Twice Given.

11. For the glorification of our Lord among men is His resurrection

from the dead and His ascension to heaven. For it is written in the

Gospel according to John: "The Holy Ghost was not yet given, because

that Jesus was not yet glorified." [275] Now if the reason why He was

not given was that Jesus was not yet glorified, He was given

immediately on the glorification of Jesus. And since that

glorification was twofold, as regards man and as regards God, twice

also was the Holy Spirit given: once, when, after His resurrection

from the dead, He breathed on the face of His disciples, saying,

"Receive ye the Holy Ghost;" [276] and again, ten days after His

ascension to heaven. This number ten signifies perfection; for to the

number seven which embraces all created things, is added the trinity of

the Creator. [277] On these things there is much pious and sober

discourse among spiritual men. But I must keep to my point; for my

business at present is not to teach you, which you might think

presumptuous, but to take the part of an inquirer, and learn from you,

as I tried to do for nine years without success. Now, therefore, I

have a document to believe on the subject of the Holy Spirit's advent;

and if you bid me not to believe this document, as your usual advice is

not to believe ignorantly, without consideration, [278] much less will

I believe your documents. Away, then, with all books, and disclose the

truth with logical clearness, so as to leave no doubt in my mind; or

bring forward books where I shall find not an imperious demand for my

belief, but a trustworthy statement of what I may learn. Perhaps you

say this epistle is also of this character. Let me, then, no longer

stop at the threshold: let us see the contents.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[275] John vii. 39.

[276] John xx. 22.

[277] [This is, of course, fanciful; but is quite in accordance with

the exegetical methods of the time.--A.H.N.]

[278] [The Manich�ans assumed the role of rationalists, and scorned the

credulity of ordinary believers. Yet they required in their followers

an amount of credulity which only persons of a peculiar turn of mind

could furnish. The same thing applies to modern rationalistic

anti-Christian systems. The fact is, that it requires infinitely less

credulity to believe in historical Christianity than to disbelieve in

it.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 11.--Manich�us Promises Truth, But Does Not Make Good His Word.

12. "These," he says, "are wholesome words from the perennial and

living fountain; and whoever shall have heard them, and shall have

first believed them, and then shall have observed the truths they set

forth, shall never suffer death, but shall enjoy eternal life in

glory. For he is to be judged truly blessed who has been instructed in

this divine knowledge, by which he is made free and shall abide in

everlasting life." And this, as you see, is a promise of truth, but

not the bestowal of it. And you yourselves can easily see that any

errors whatever might be dressed up in this fashion, so as under cover

of a showy exterior to steal in unawares into the minds of the

ignorant. Were he to say, These are pestiferous words from a poisonous

fountain; and whoever shall have heard them, and shall have first

believed them, and then have observed what they set forth, shall never

be restored to life, but shall suffer a woful death as a criminal: for

assuredly he is to be pronounced miserable who falls into this infernal

error, in which he will sink so as to abide in everlasting

torments;--were he to say this, he would say the truth; but instead of

gaining any readers for his book, he would excite the greatest aversion

in the minds of all into whose hands the book might come. Let us then

pass on to what follows; nor let us be deceived by words which may be

used alike by good and bad, by learned and unlearned. What, then,

comes next?

13. "May the peace," he says, "of the invisible God, and the knowledge

of the truth, be with the holy and beloved brethren who both believe

and also yield obedience to the divine precepts." Amen, say we. For

the prayer is a most amiable and commendable one. Only we must bear in

mind that these words might be used by false teachers as well as by

good ones. So, if he said nothing more than this, all might safely

read and embrace it. Nor should I disapprove of what follows: "May

also the right hand of light protect you, and deliver you from every

hostile assault, and from the snares of the world." In fact, I have no

fault to find with the beginning of this epistle, till we come to the

main subject of it. For I wish not to spend time on minor points.

Now, then, for this writer's plain statement of what is to be expected

from him.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 12.--The Wild Fancies of Manich�us. The Battle Before the

Constitution of the World.

14. "Of that matter," he says, "beloved brother of Patticus, of which

you told me, saying that you desired to know the manner of the birth of

Adam and Eve, whether they were produced by a word or sprung from

matter, I will answer you as is fit. For in various writings and

narratives we find different assertions made and different descriptions

given by many authors. Now the real truth on the subject is unknown to

all peoples, even to those who have long and frequently treated of it.

For had they arrived at a clear knowledge of the generation of Adam and

Eve, they would not have remained liable to corruption and death."

Here, then, is a promise to us of clear knowledge of this matter, so

that we shall not be liable to corruption and death. And if this does

not suffice, see what follows: "Necessarily," he says, "many things

have to be said by way of preface, before a discovery of this mystery

free from all uncertainty can be made." This is precisely what I asked

for, to have such evidence of the truth as to free my knowledge of it

from all uncertainty. And even were the promise not made by this

writer himself, it was proper for me to demand and to insist upon this,

so that no opposition should make me ashamed of becoming a Manich�an

from a Catholic Christian, in view of such a gain as that of perfectly

clear and certain truth. Now, then, let us hear what he has to state.

15. "Accordingly," he says, "hear first, if you please, what happened

before the constitution of the world, and how the battle was carried

on, that you may be able to distinguish the nature of light from that

of darkness." Such are the utterly false and incredible statements

which this writer makes. Who can believe that any battle was fought

before the constitution of the world? And even supposing it credible,

we wish now to get something to know, not to believe. For to say that

the Persians and Scythians long ago fought with one another is a

credible statement; but while we believe it when we read or hear it, we

cannot know it as a fact of experience or as a truth of the

understanding. So, then, as I would repudiate any such statement on

the ground that I have been promised something, not that I must believe

on authority, but that I shall understand without any ambiguity; still

less will I receive statements which are not only uncertain, but

incredible. But what if he have some evidence to make these things

clear and intelligible? Let us hear, then, if we can, what follows

with all possible patience and forbearance.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 13.--Two Opposite Substances. The Kingdom of Light. Manich�us

Teaches Uncertainties Instead of Certainties.

16. "In the beginning, then," he says, "these two substances were

divided. The empire of light was held by God the Father, who is

perpetual in holy origin, magnificent in virtue, true in His very

nature, ever rejoicing in His own eternity, possessing in Himself

wisdom and the vital senses, by which He also includes the twelve

members of His light, which are the plentiful resources of his

kingdom. Also in each of His members are stored thousands of untold

and priceless treasures. But the Father Himself, chief in praise,

incomprehensible in greatness, has united to Himself happy and glorious

worlds, incalculable in number and duration, along with which this holy

and illustrious Father and Progenitor resides, no poverty or infirmity

being admitted in His magnificent realms. And these matchless realms

are so founded on the region of light and bliss, that no one can ever

move or disturb them." [279]

17. Where is the proof of all this? And where did Manich�us learn

it? Do not frighten me with the name of the Paraclete. For, in the

first place, I have come not to put faith in unknown things, but to get

the knowledge of undoubted truths, according to the caution enjoined on

me by yourselves. For you know how bitterly you taunt those who

believe without consideration. And what is more, this writer, who here

begins to tell of very doubtful things, himself promised a little

before to give complete and well-grounded knowledge.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[279] [Compare the fuller account from the Fihrist in the

Introduction.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 14.--Manich�us Promises the Knowledge of Undoubted Things, and

Then Demands Faith in Doubtful Things.

In the next place, if faith is what is required of me, I should prefer

to keep to the Scripture, which tells me that the Holy Spirit came and

inspired the apostles, to whom the Lord had promised to send Him. You

must therefore prove, either that what Manich�us says is true, and so

make clear to me what I am unable to believe; or that Manich�us is the

Holy Spirit, and so lead me to believe in what you cannot make clear.

For I profess the Catholic faith, and by it I expect to attain certain

knowledge. Since, then, you try to overthrow my faith, you must supply

me with certain knowledge, if you can, that you may convict me of

having adopted my present belief without consideration. You make two

distinct propositions,--one when you say that the speaker is the Holy

Spirit, and another when you say that what the speaker teaches is

evidently true. I might fairly ask undeniable proof for both

propositions. But I am not greedy and require to be convinced only of

one. Prove this person to be the Holy Spirit, and I will believe what

he says to be true, even without understanding it; or prove that what

he says is true, and I will believe him to be the Holy Spirit, even

without evidence. Could anything be fairer or kinder than this? But

you cannot prove either one or other of these propositions. You can

find nothing better than to praise your own faith and ridicule mine.

So, after having in my turn praised my belief and ridiculed yours, what

result do you think we shall arrive at as regards our judgment and our

conduct, but to part company with those who promise the knowledge of

indubitable things, and then demand from us faith in doubtful things?

while we shall follow those who invite us to begin with believing what

we cannot yet fully perceive, that, strengthened by this very faith, we

may come into a position to know what we believe by the inward

illumination and confirmation of our minds, due no longer to men, but

to God Himself.

18. And as I have asked this writer to prove these things to me, I ask

him now where he learned them himself. If he replies that they were

revealed to him by the Holy Spirit, and that his mind was divinely

enlightened that he might know them to be certain and evident, he

himself points to the distinction between knowing and believing. The

knowledge is his to whom these things are fully made known as proved;

but in the case of those who only hear his account of these things,

there is no knowledge imparted, but only a believing acquiescence

required. Whoever thoughtlessly yields this becomes a Manich�an, not

by knowing undoubted truth, but by believing doubtful statements. Such

were we when in our inexperienced youth we were deceived. Instead,

therefore, of promising knowledge, or clear evidence, or the settlement

of the question free from all uncertainty, Manich�us ought to have said

that these things were clearly proved to him, but that those who hear

his account of them must believe him without evidence. But were he to

say this, who would not reply to him, If I must believe without

knowing, why should I not prefer to believe those things which have a

widespread notoriety from the consent of learned and unlearned, and

which among all nations are established by the weightiest authority?

From fear of having this said to him, Manich�us bewilders the

inexperienced by first promising the knowledge of certain truths, and

then demanding faith in doubtful things. And then, if he is asked to

make it plain that these things have been proved to himself, he fails

again, and bids us believe this too. Who can tolerate such imposture

and arrogance?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 15.--The Doctrine of Manich�us Not Only Uncertain, But False.

His Absurd Fancy of a Land and Race of Darkness Bordering on the Holy

Region and the Substance of God. The Error, First of All, of Giving to

the Nature of God Limits and Borders, as If God Were a Material

Substance, Having Extension in Space.

19. What if I shall have shown, with the help of God and of our Lord,

that this writer's statements are false as well as uncertain? What

more unfortunate thing can be found than that superstition which not

only fails to impart the knowledge and the truth which it promises, but

also teaches what is directly opposed to knowledge and truth? This

will appear more clearly from what follows: "In one direction on the

border of this bright and holy land there was a land of darkness deep

and vast in extent, where abode fiery bodies, destructive races. Here

was boundless darkness, flowing from the same source in immeasurable

abundance, with the productions properly belonging to it. Beyond this

were muddy turbid waters with their inhabitants; and inside of them

winds terrible and violent with their prince and their progenitors.

Then again a fiery region of destruction, with its chiefs and peoples.

And similarly inside of this a race full of smoke and gloom, where

abode the dreadful prince and chief of all, having around him

innumerable princes, himself the mind and source of them all. Such are

the five natures of the pestiferous land."

20. To speak of God as an aerial or even as an ethereal body is absurd

in the view of all who, with a clear mind, possessing some measure of

discernment, can perceive the nature of wisdom and truth as not

extended or scattered in space, but as great, and imparting greatness

without material size, nor confined more or less in any direction, but

throughout co-extensive with the Father of all, nor having one thing

here and another there, but everywhere perfect, everywhere present.

[280]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[280] [This exalted view of God Augustin held in common with the

Neo-Platonists.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 16.--The Soul, Though Mutable, Has No Material Form. It is All

Present in Every Part of the Body.

But why speak of truth and wisdom which surpass all the powers of the

soul, when the nature of the soul itself, which is known to be mutable,

still has no kind of material extension in space? For whatever

consists of any kind of gross matter must necessarily be divisible into

parts, having one in one place, and another in another. Thus, the

finger is less than the whole hand, and one finger is less than two;

and there is one place for this finger, and another for that, and

another for the rest of the hand. And this applies not to organized

bodies only, but also to the earth, each part of which has its own

place, so that one cannot be where the other is. So in moisture, the

smaller quantity occupies a smaller space, and the larger quantity a

larger space; and one part is at the bottom of the cup, and another

part near the mouth. So in air, each part has its own place; and it is

impossible for the air in this house to have along with itself, in the

same house at the same moment, the air that the neighbors have. And

even as regards light itself, one part pours through one window, and

another through another; and a greater through the larger, and a

smaller through the smaller. Nor, in fact, can there be any bodily

substance, whether celestial or terrestrial, whether aerial or moist,

which is not less in part than in whole, or which can possibly have one

part in the place of another at the same time; but, having one thing in

one place and another in another, its extension in space is a substance

which has distinct limits and parts, or, so to speak, sections. The

nature of the soul, on the other hand, though we leave out of account

its power of perceiving truth, and consider only its inferior power of

giving unity to the body, and of sensation in the body, does not appear

to have any material extension in space. For it is all present in each

separate part of its body when it is all present in any sensation.

There is not a smaller part in the finger, and a larger in the arm, as

the bulk of the finger is less than that of the arm; but the quantity

everywhere is the same, for the whole is present everywhere. For when

the finger is touched, the whole mind feels, though the sensation is

not through the whole body. No part of the mind is unconscious of the

touch, which proves the presence of the whole. And yet it is not so

present in the finger or in the sensation as to abandon the rest of the

body, or to gather itself up into the one place where the sensation

occurs. For when it is all present in the sensation in a finger, if

another part, say the foot, be touched, it does not fail to be all

present in this sensation too: so that at the same moment it is all

present in different places, without leaving one in order to be in the

other, and without having one part in one, and another in the other;

but by this power showing itself to be all present at the same moment

in separate places. Since it is all present in the sensations of these

places, it proves that it is not bound by the conditions of space.

[281]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[281] [Modern mental physiologists differ among themselves as regards

the presence of the mind throughout the entire nervous system; some

maintaining the view here presented, and others making the brain to be

the seat of sensation, and the nerves telegraphic lines, so to speak,

for the communication of impressions from the various parts of the body

to the brain. Compare Carpenter: Mental Physiology, and Calderwood:

Mind and Brain.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 17.--The Memory Contains the Ideas of Places of the Greatest

Size.

Again, if we consider the mind's power of remembering not the objects

of the intellect, but material objects, such as we see brutes also

remembering (for cattle find their way without mistake in familiar

places, and animals return to their cribs, and dogs recognize the

persons of their masters, and when asleep they often growl, or break

out into a bark, which could not be unless their mind retained the

images of things before seen or perceived by some bodily sense), who

can conceive rightly where these images are contained, where they are

kept, or where they are formed? If, indeed, these images were no

larger than the size of our body, it might be said that the mind shapes

and retains them in the bodily space which contains itself. But while

the body occupies a small material space, the mind revolves images of

vast extent, of heaven and earth, with no want of room, though they

come and go in crowds; so that clearly, the mind is not diffused

through space: for instead of being contained in images of the largest

spaces, it rather contains them; not, however, in any material

receptacle, but by a mysterious faculty or power, by which it can

increase or diminish them, can contract them within narrow limits, or

expand them indefinitely, can arrange or disarrange them at pleasure,

can multiply them or reduce them to a few or to one.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 18.--The Understanding Judges of the Truth of Things, and of

Its Own Action.

What, then, must be said of the power of perceiving truth, and of

making a vigorous resistance against these very images which take their

shape from impressions on the bodily senses, when they are opposed to

the truth? This power discerns the difference between, to take a

particular example, the true Carthage and its own imaginary one, which

it changes as it pleases with perfect ease. It shows that the

countless worlds of Epicurus, in which his fancy roamed without

restraint, are due to the same power of imagination, and, not to

multiply examples, that we get from the same source that land of light,

with its boundless extent, and the five dens of the race of darkness,

with their inmates, in which the fancies of Manich�us have dared to

usurp for themselves the name of truth. What then is this power which

discerns these things? Clearly, whatever its extent may be, it is

greater than all these things, and is conceived of without any such

material images. Find, if you can, space for this power; give it a

material extension; provide it with a body of huge size. Assuredly if

you think well, you cannot. For of everything of this corporeal nature

your mind forms an opinion as to its divisibility, and you make of such

things one part greater and another less, as much as you like; while

that by which you form a judgment of these things you perceive to be

above them, not in local loftiness of place, but in dignity of power.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 19.--If the Mind Has No Material Extension, Much Less Has God.

21. So then, if the mind, so liable to change, whether from a

multitude of dissimilar desires, or from feelings varying according to

the abundance or the want of desirable things, or from these endless

sports of the fancy, or from forgetfulness and remembrance, or from

learning and ignorance; if the mind, I say, exposed to frequent change

from these and the like causes, is perceived to be without any local or

material extension, and to have a vigor of action which surmounts these

material conditions, what must we think or conclude of God Himself, who

remains superior to all intelligent beings in His freedom from

perturbation and from change, giving to every one what is due? Him the

mind dares to express more easily than to see; and the clearer the

sight, the less is the power of expression. And yet this God, if, as

the Manich�an fables are constantly asserting, He were limited in

extension in one direction and unlimited in others, could be measured

by so many subdivisions or fractions of greater or less size, as every

one might fancy; so that, for example, a division of the extent of two

feet would be less by eight parts than one of ten feet. For this is

the property of all natures which have extension in space, and

therefore cannot be all in one place. But even with the mind this is

not the case; and this degrading and perverted idea of the mind is

found among people who are unfit for such investigations.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 20.--Refutation of the Absurd Idea of Two Territories.

22. But perhaps, instead of thus addressing carnal minds, we should

rather descend to the views of those who either dare not or are as yet

unfit to turn from the consideration of material things to the study of

an immaterial and spiritual nature, and who thus are unable to reflect

upon their own power of reflection, so as to see how it forms a

judgment of material extension without itself possessing it. Let us

descend then to these material ideas, and let us ask in what direction,

and on what border of the shining and sacred territory, to use the

expressions of Manich�us, was the region of darkness? For he speaks of

one direction and border, without saying which, whether the right or

the left. In any case, it is clear that to speak of one side implies

that there is another. But where there are three or more sides, either

the figure is bounded in all directions, or if it extends infinitely in

one direction, still it must be limited in the directions where it has

sides. If,then, on one side of the region of light there was the race

of darkness, what bounded it on the other side or sides? The

Manich�ans say nothing in reply to this; but when pressed, they say

that on the other sides the region of light, as they call it, is

infinite, that is, extends throughout boundless space. They do not

see, what is plain to the dullest understanding, that in that case

there could be no sides? For the sides are where it is bounded. What,

then, he says, though there are no sides? But what you said of one

direction or side, implied of necessity the existence of another

direction and side, or other directions and sides. For if there was

only one side, you should have said, on the side, not on one side; as

in reference to our body we say properly, By one eye, because there is

another; or on one breast, because there is another. But if we spoke

of a thing as being on one nose, or one navel, we should be ridiculed

by learned and unlearned, since there is only one. But I do not insist

on words, for you may have used one in the sense of the only one.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 21.--This Region of Light Must Be Material If It is Joined to

the Region of Darkness. The Shape of the Region of Darkness Joined to

the Region of Light.

What, then, bordered on the side of the region which you call shining

and sacred? The region, you reply, of darkness. Do you then allow

this latter region to have been material? Of course you must, since

you assert that all bodies derive their origin from it. How then is it

that, dull and carnal as you are, you do not see that unless both

regions were material, they could not have their sides joined to one

another? How could you ever be so blinded in mind as to say that only

the region of darkness was material, and that the so-called region of

light was immaterial and spiritual? My good friends, let us open our

eyes for once, and see, now that we are told of it, what is most

obvious, that two regions cannot be joined at their sides unless both

are material.

23. Or if we are too dull and stupid to see this, let us hear whether

the region of darkness too has one side, and is boundless in the other

directions, like the region of light. They do not hold this from fear

of making it seem equal to God. Accordingly they make it boundless in

depth and in length; but upwards, above it, they maintain that there is

an infinity of empty space. And lest this region should appear to be a

fraction equal in amount to half of that representing the region of

light, they narrow it also on two sides. As if, to give the simplest

illustration, a piece of bread were made into four squares, three white

and one black; then suppose the three white pieces joined as one, and

conceive them as infinite upwards and downwards, and backwards in all

directions: this represents the Manich�an region of light. Then

conceive the black square infinite downwards and backwards, but with

infinite emptiness above it: this is their region of darkness. But

these are secrets which they disclose to very eager and anxious

inquirers.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 22.--The Form of the Region of Light the Worse of the Two.

Well, then, if this is so, the region of darkness is clearly touched on

two sides by the region of light. And if it is touched on two sides,

it must touch on two. So much for its being on one side, as we were

told before.

24. And what an unseemly appearance is this of the region of

light!--like a cloven arch, with a black wedge inserted below, bounded

only in the direction of the cleft, and having a void space interposed

where the boundless emptiness stretches above the region of darkness.

Indeed, the form of the region of darkness is better than that of the

region of light: for the former cleaves, the latter is cloven; the

former fills the gap which is made in the latter; the former has no

void in it, while the latter is undefined in all directions, except

that where it is filled up by the wedge of darkness. In an ignorant

and greedy notion of giving more honor to a number of pans than to a

single one, so that the region of light should have six, three upwards

and three downwards, they have made this region be split up, instead of

sundering the other. For, according to this figure, though there may

be no commixture of darkness with light, there is certainly

penetration.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 23.--The Anthropomorphites Not So Bad as the Manich�ans.

25. Compare, now, not spiritual men of the Catholic faith, whose mind,

as far as is possible in this life, perceives that the divine substance

and nature has no material extension, and has no shape bounded by

lines, but the carnal and weak of our faith, who, when they hear the

members of the body used figuratively, as, when God's eyes or ears are

spoken of, are accustomed, in the license of fancy, to picture God to

themselves in a human form; compare these with the Manich�ans, whose

custom it is to make known their silly stories to anxious inquirers as

if they were great mysteries: and consider who have the most allowable

and respectable ideas of God, --those who think of Him as having a

human form which is the most excellent of its kind, or those who think

of Him as having boundless material extension, yet not in all

directions, but with three parts infinite and solid, while in one part

He is cloven, with an empty void, and with undefined space above, while

the region of darkness is inserted wedge-like below. Or perhaps the

proper expression is, that He is unconfined above in His own nature,

but encroached on below by a hostile nature. I join with you in

laughing at the folly of carnal men, unable as yet to form spiritual

conceptions, who think of God as having a human form. Do you too join

me, if you can, in laughing at those whose unhappy conceptions

represent God as having a shape cloven or cut in such an unseemly and

unbecoming way, with such an empty gap above, and such a dishonorable

curtailment below. Besides, there is this difference, that these

carnal people, who think of God as having a human form, if they are

content to be nourished with milk from the breast of the Catholic

Church, and do not rush headlong into rash opinions, but cultivate in

the Church the pious habit of inquiry, and there ask that they may

receive, and knock that it may be opened to them, begin to understand

spiritually the figures and parables of the Scriptures, and gradually

to perceive that the divine energies are suitably set forth under the

name, sometimes of ears, sometimes of eyes, sometimes of hands or feet,

or even of wings and feathers a shield too, and sword, and helmet, and

all the other innumerable things. And the more progress they make in

this understanding, the more are they confirmed as Catholics. The

Manich�ans, on the other hand, when they abandon their material

fancies, cease to be Manich�ans. For this is the chief and special

point in their praises of Manich�us, that the divine mysteries which

were taught figuratively in books from ancient times were kept for

Manich�us, who was to come last, to solve and demonstrate; and so after

him no other teacher will come from God, for he has said nothing in

figures or parables, but has explained ancient sayings of that kind,

and has himself taught in plain, simple terms. Therefore, when the

Manich�ans hear these words of their founder, on one side and border of

the shining and sacred region was the region of darkness, they have no

interpretations to fall back on. Wherever they turn, the wretched

bondage of their own fancies brings them upon clefts or sudden

stoppages and joinings or sunderings of the most unseemly kind, which

it would be shocking to believe as true of any immaterial nature, even

though mutable, like the mind, not to speak of the immutable nature of

God. And yet if I were unable to rise to higher things, and to bring

my thoughts from the entanglement of false imaginations which are

impressed on the memory by the bodily senses, into the freedom and

purity of spiritual existence, how much better would it be to think of

God as in the form of a man, than to fasten that wedge of darkness to

His lower edge, and, for want of a covering for the boundless vacuity

above to leave it void and unoccupied throughout infinite space! What

notion could be worse than this? What darker error can be taught or

imagined?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 24.--Of the Number of Natures in the Manich�an Fiction.

26. Again, I wish to know, when I read of God the Father and His

kingdoms founded on the shining and happy region, whether the Father

and His kingdoms, and the region, are all of the same nature and

substance. If they are, then it is not another nature or sort of body

of God which the wedge of the race of darkness cleaves and penetrates,

which itself is an unspeakably revolting thing, but it is actually the

very nature of God which undergoes this. Think of this, I beseech

you: as you are men, think of it, and flee from it; and if by tearing

open your breasts you can cast out by the roots such profane fancies

from your faith, I pray you to do it. Or will you say that these three

are not of one and the same nature, but that the Father is of one, the

kingdoms of another, and the region of another, so that each has a

peculiar nature and substance, and that they are arranged according to

their degree of excellence? If this is true, Manich�us should have

taught that there are four natures, not two; or if the Father and the

kingdoms have one nature, and the region only one of its own, he should

have made three. Or if he made only two, because the region of

darkness does not belong to God, in what sense does the region of light

belong to God? For if it has a nature of its own, and if God neither

generated nor made it, it does not belong to Him, and the seat of His

kingdom is in what belongs to another. Or if it belongs to Him because

of its vicinity, the region of darkness must do so too; for it not only

borders on the region of light, but penetrates it so as to sever it in

two. Again, if God generated it, it cannot have a separate nature.

For what is generated by God must be what God is, as the Catholic

Church believes of the only begotten Son. So you are brought back of

necessity to that shocking and detestable profanity, that the wedge of

darkness sunders not a region distinct and separate from God, but the

very nature of God. Or if God did not generate, but make it, of what

did He make it? Or if of Himself, what is this but to generate? If of

some other nature, was this nature good or evil? If good, there must

have been some good nature not belonging to God; which you will

scarcely have the boldness to assert. If evil, the race of darkness

cannot have been the only evil nature. Or did God take a part of that

region and turn it into a region of light, in order to found His

kingdom upon it? If He had, He would have taken the whole, and there

would have been no evil nature left. If God, then, did not make the

region of light of a substance distinct from His own, He must have made

it of nothing. [282]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[282] [There is sufficient reason to think that Mani identified God

with the kingdom and the region of light. See Introduction.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 25.--Omnipotence Creates Good Things Differing in Degree. In

Every Description Whatsoever of the Junction of the Two Regions There

is Either Impropriety or Absurdity.

27. If, then, you are now convinced that God is able to create some

good thing out of nothing, come into the Catholic Church, and learn

that all the natures which God has created and founded in their order

of excellence from the highest to the lowest are good, and some better

than others; and that they were made of nothing, though God, their

Maker, made use of His own wisdom as an instrument, so to speak, to

give being to what was not, and that as far as it had being it might be

good, and that the limitation of its being might show that it was not

begotten by God, but made out of nothing. If you examine the matter,

you will find nothing to keep you from agreeing to this. For you

cannot make your region of light to be what God is, without making the

dark section an infringement on the very nature of God. Nor can you

say that it was generated by God, without being reduced to the same

enormity, from the necessity of concluding that as begotten of God, it

must be what God is. Nor can you say that it was distinct from Him,

lest you should be forced to admit that God placed His kingdom in what

did not belong to Him, and that there are three natures. Nor can you

say that God made it of a substance distinct from His own, without

making something good besides God, or something evil besides the race

of darkness. It remains, therefore that you must confess that God made

the region of light out of nothing: and you are unwilling to believe

this; because if God could make out of nothing some great good which

yet was inferior to Himself, He could also, since He is good, and

grudges no good, make another good inferior to the former, and again a

third inferior to the second, and so on, in order down to the lowest

good of created natures, so that the whole aggregate, instead of

extending indefinitely without number or measure should have a fixed

and definite consistency. Again, if you will not allow this either,

that God made the region of light out of nothing, you will have no

escape from the shocking profanities to which your opinions lead.

28. Perhaps, since the carnal imagination can fancy any shapes it

likes, you might be able to devise some other form for the junction of

the two regions, instead of presenting to the mind such a disagreeable

and painful description as this, that the region of God, whether it be

of the same nature as God or not, where at least God's kingdoms are

founded, lies through immensity in such a huge mass that its members

stretch loosely to an infinite extent, and that on their lower part

that wedge of the region of darkness, itself of boundless size

encroaches upon them. But whatever other form you contrive for the

junction of these two regions, you cannot erase what Manich�us has

written. I refer not to other treatises where a more particular

description is given,--for perhaps, because they are in the hands of

only a few, there might not be so much difficulty with them,--but to

this Fundamental Epistle which we are now considering, with which all

of you who are called enlightened are usually quite familiar. Here the

words are: "On one side the border of the shining and sacred region

was the region of darkness, deep and boundless in extent."

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 26.--The Manich�ans are Reduced to the Choice of a Tortuous, or

Curved, or Straight Line of Junction. The Third Kind of Line Would

Give Symmetry and Beauty Suitable to Both Regions.

What more is to be got? we have now heard what is on the border. Make

what shape you please, draw any kind of lines you like, it is certain

that the junction of this boundless mass of the region of darkness to

the region of light must have been either by a straight line, or a

curved, or a tortuous one. If the line of junction is tortuous the

side of the region of light must also be tortuous; otherwise its

straight side joined to a tortuous one would leave gaps of infinite

depth, instead of having vacuity only above the land of darkness, as we

were told before. And if there were such gaps, how much better it

would have been for the region of light to have been still more

distant, and to have had a greater vacuity between, so that the region

of darkness might not touch it at all! Then there might have been such

a gap of bottomless depth, that, on the rise of any mischief in that

race, although the chiefs of darkness might have the foolhardy wish to

cross over, they would fall headlong into the gap (for bodies cannot

fly without air to support them); and as there is infinite space

downwards, they could do no more harm, though they might live for ever,

for they would be for ever falling. Again, if the line of junction was

a curved one, the region of light must also have had the disfigurement

of a curve to answer it. Or if the land of darkness were curved

inwards like a theatre, there would be as much disfigurement in the

corresponding line in the region of light. Or if the region of

darkness had a curved line, and the region of light a straight one,

they cannot have touched at all points. And certainly, as I said

before, it would have been better if they had not touched, and if there

was such a gap between that the regions might be kept distinctly

separate, and that rash evildoers might fall headlong so as to be

harmless. If, then, the line of junction was a straight one, there

remain, of course, no more gaps or grooves, but, on the contrary, so

perfect a junction as to make the greatest possible peace and harmony

between the two regions. What more beautiful or more suitable than

that one side should meet the other in a straight line, without bends

or breaks to disturb the natural and permanent connection throughout

endless space and endless duration? And even though there was a

separation, the straight sides of both regions would be beautiful in

themselves, as being straight; and besides, even in spite of an

interval, their correspondence, as running parallel, though not

meeting, would give a symmetry to both. With the addition of the

junction, both regions become perfectly regular and harmonious; for

nothing can be devised more beautiful in description or in conception

than this junction of two straight lines. [283]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[283] [This discussion of the lines bounding the Kingdom of Light and

the Kingdom of Darkness seems very much like trifling, but Augustin's

aim was to bring the Manich�an representations into ridicule.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 27.--The Beauty of the Straight Line Might Be Taken from the

Region of Darkness Without Taking Anything from Its Substance. So Evil

Neither Takes from Nor Adds to the Substance of the Soul. The

Straightness of Its Side Would Be So Far a Good Bestowed on the Region

of Darkness by God the Creator.

29. What is to be done with unhappy minds, perverse in error, and held

fast by custom? These men do not know what they say when they say

those things; for they do not consider. Listen to me; no one forces

you, no one quarrels with you, no one taunts you with past errors,

unless some one who has not experienced the divine mercy in deliverance

from error: all we desire is that the errors should some time or other

be abandoned. Think a little without animosity or bitterness. We are

all human beings: let us hate, not one another, but errors and lies.

Think a little, I pray you. God of mercy, help them to think, and

kindle in the minds of inquirers the true light. If anything is plain,

is not this, that right is better than wrong? Give me, then, a calm

and quiet answer to this, whether making crooked the right line of the

region of darkness which joins on to the right line of the region of

light, would not detract from its beauty. If you will not be dogged,

you must confess that not only is beauty taken from it by its being

made crooked, but also the beauty which it might have had from

connection with the right line of the region of light. Is it the case,

then, that in this loss of beauty, in which right is made crooked, and

harmony becomes discord, and agreement disagreement, there is any loss

of substance? Learn, then, from this that substance is not evil; but

as in the body, by change of form for the worse, beauty is lost, or

rather lessened, and what was called fair before is said to be ugly,

and what was pleasing becomes displeasing, so in the mind the

seemliness of a right will, which makes a just and pious life, is

injured when the will changes for the worse; and by this sin the mind

becomes miserable, instead of enjoying as before the happiness which

comes from the ornament of a right will, without any gain or loss of

substance.

30. Consider, again, that though we admit that the border of the

region of darkness was evil for other reasons, such as that it was dim

and dark, or any other reason, still it was not evil in being

straight. So, if I admit that there was some evil in its color, you

must admit that there was some good in its straightness. Whatever the

amount of this good, it is not allowable to attribute it to any other

than God the Maker, from whom we must believe that all good in

whatsoever nature comes, if we are to escape deadly error. It is

absurd, then, to say that this region is perfect evil, when in its

straightness of border is found the good of not a little beauty of a

material kind; and also to make this region to be altogether estranged,

from the almighty and good God, when this good which we find in it can

be attributed to no other but the author of all good things. But this

border, too, we are told, was evil. Well, suppose it evil: it would

surely have been worse had it been crooked instead of straight. And

how can that be the perfection of evil than which something worse than

itself can be thought of? And to be worse implies that there is some

good, the want of which makes the thing worse. Here the want of

straightness would make the line worse. Therefore its straightness is

something good. And you will never answer the question whence this

goodness comes, without reference to Him from whom we must acknowledge

that all good things come, whether small or great. But now we shall

pass on from considering this border to something else.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 28.--Manich�us Places Five Natures in the Region of Darkness.

31. "There dwelt," he says, "in that region fiery bodies, destructive

races." By speaking of dwelling, he must mean that those bodies were

animated and in life. But, not to appear to cavil at a word, let us

see how he divides into five classes all these inhabitants of this

region. "Here," he says, "was boundless darkness, flowing from the

same source in immeasurable abundance, with the productions properly

belonging to it. Beyond this were muddy turbid waters, with their

inhabitants; and inside of them winds terrible and violent, with their

prince and their progenitors. Then, again, a fiery region of

destruction, with its chiefs and peoples. And, similarly, inside of

this a race full of smoke and gloom, where abode the dreadful prince

and chief of all, having around him innumerable princes, himself the

mind and source of them all. Such are the five natures of the

pestiferous region." We find here five natures mentioned as part of

one nature, which he calls the pestiferous region. The natures are

darkness, waters, winds, fire, smoke; which he so arranges as to make

darkness first, beginning at the outside. Inside of darkness he puts

the waters; inside of the waters, the winds; inside of the winds, the

fire; inside of the fire, the smoke. And each of these natures had its

peculiar kind of inhabitants, which were likewise five in number. For

to the question, Whether there was only one kind in all, or different

kinds corresponding to the different natures; the reply is, that they

were different: as in other books we find it stated that the darkness

had serpents; the waters swimming creatures, such as fish; the winds

flying creatures, such as birds; the fire quadrupeds, such as horses,

lions, and the like; the smoke bipeds, such as men.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 29.--The Refutation of This Absurdity.

32. Whose arrangement, then, is this? Who made the distinctions and

the classification? Who gave the number, the qualities, the forms, the

life? For all these things are in themselves good, nor could each of

the natures have them except from the bestowal of God, the author of

all good things. For this is not like the descriptions or suppositions

of poets about an imaginary chaos, as being a shapeless mass, without

form, without quality, without measurement, without weight and number,

without order and variety; a confused something, absolutely destitute

of qualities, so that some Greek writers call it apoion. So far from

being like this is the Manich�an description of the region of darkness,

as they call it, that, in a directly contrary style, they add side to

side, and join border to border; they number five natures; they

separate, arrange, and assign to each its own qualities. Nor do they

leave the natures barren or waste, but people them with their proper

inhabitants; and to these, again, they give suitable forms, and adapted

to their place of habitation, besides giving the chief of all

endowments, life. To recount such good things as these, and to speak

of them as having no connection with God, the author of all good

things, is to lose sight of the excellence of the order in the things,

and of the great evil of the error which leads to such a conclusion.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 30.--The Number of Good Things in Those Natures Which Manich�us

Places in the Region of Darkness.

33. "But," is the reply, "the orders of beings inhabiting those five

natures were fierce and destructive." As if I were praising their

fierceness and destructiveness. I, you see, join with you in

condemning the evils you attribute to them; join you with me in

praising the good things which you ascribe to them: so it will appear

that there is a mixture of good and evil in what you call the last

extremity of evil. If I join you in condemning what is mischievous in

this region, you must join with me in praising what is beneficial. For

these beings could not have been produced, or nourished, or have

continued to inhabit that region, without some salutary influence. I

join with you in condemning the darkness; join with me in praising the

productiveness. For while you call the darkness immeasurable, you

speak of "suitable productions." Darkness, indeed, is not a real

substance, and means no more than the absence of light, as nakedness

means the want of clothing, and emptiness the want of material

contents: so that darkness could produce nothing, although a region in

darkness--that is, in the absence of light--might produce something.

But passing over this for the present, it is certain that where

productions arise there must be a beneficent adaptation of substances,

as well as a symmetrical arrangement and construction in unity of the

members of the beings produced,--a wise adjustment making them agree

with one another. And who will deny that all these things are more to

be praised than darkness is to be condemned? If I join with you in

condemning the muddiness of the waters, you must join with me in

praising the waters as far as they possessed the form and quality of

water, and also the agreement of the members of the inhabitants

swimming in the waters, their life sustaining and directing their body,

and every particular adaptation of substances for the benefit of

health. For though you find fault with the waters as turbid and muddy,

still, in allowing them the quality of producing and maintaining their

living inhabitants, you imply that there was some kind of bodily form,

and similarity of parts, giving unity and congruity of character;

otherwise there could be no body at all: and, as a rational being, you

must see that all these things are to be praised. And however great

you make the ferocity of these inhabitants, and their massacrings and

devastations in their assaults, you still leave them the regular limits

of form, by which the members of each body are made to agree together,

and their beneficial adaptations, and the regulating power of the

living principle binding together the parts of the body in a friendly

and harmonious union. And if all these are regarded with common sense

it will be seen that they are more to be commended than the faults are

to be condemned. I join with you in condemning the frightfulness of

the winds; join with me in praising their nature, as giving breath and

nourishment, and their material form in its continuousness and

diffusion by the connection of its parts: for by these things these

winds had the power of producing and nourishing, and sustaining in

vigor these inhabitants you speak of; and also in these

inhabitants--besides the other things which have already been commended

in all animated creatures--this particular power of going quickly and

easily whence and whither they please, and the harmonious stroke of

their wings in flight, and their regular motion. I join with you in

condemning the destructiveness of fire; join with me in commending the

productiveness of this fire, and the growth of these productions, and

the adaptation of the fire to the beings produced, so that they had

coherence, and came to perfection in measure and shape, and could live

and have their abode there: for you see that all these things deserve

admiration and praise, not only in the fire which is thus habitable,

but in the inhabitants too. I join with you in condemning the

denseness of smoke, and the savage character of the prince who, as you

say, abode in it; join with me in praising the similarity of all the

parts in this very smoke, by which it preserves the harmony and

proportion of its parts among themselves, according to its own nature,

and has an unity which makes it what it is: for no one can calmly

reflect on these things without wonder and praise. Besides, even to

the smoke you give the power and energy of production, for you say that

princes inhabited it; so that in that region the smoke is productive,

which never happens here, and, moreover, affords a wholesome dwelling

place to its inhabitants.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 31.--The Same Subject Continued.

34. And even in the prince of smoke himself, instead of mentioning

only his ferocity as a bad quality, ought you not to have taken notice

of the other things in his nature which you must allow to be

commendable? For he had a soul and a body; the soul life-giving, and

the body endowed with life. Since the soul governed and the body

obeyed, the soul took the lead and the body followed; the soul gave

consistency, the body was not dissolved; the soul gave harmonious

motion, and the body was constructed of a well-proportioned framework

of members. In this single prince are you not induced to express

approval of the orderly peace or the peaceful order? And what applies

to one applies to all the rest. You say he was fierce and cruel to

others. This is not what I commend, but the other important things

which you will not take notice of. Those things, when perceived and

considered,--after advice by any one who has without consideration put

faith in Manich�us,--lead him to a clear conviction that, in speaking

of those natures, he speaks of things good in a sense, not perfect and

un-created, like God the one Trinity, nor of the higher rank of created

things, like the holy angels and the ever-blessed powers; but of the

lowest class, and ranked according to the small measure of their

endowments. These things are thought to be blameworthy by the

uninstructed when they compare them with higher things; and in view of

their want of some good, the good they have gets the name of evil,

because it is defective. My reason also for thus discussing the

natures enumerated by Manich�us is that the things named are things

familiar to us in this world. We are familiar with darkness, waters,

winds, fire, smoke; we are familiar, too, with animals, creeping,

swimming, flying; with quadrupeds and biped. With the exception of

darkness (which, as I have said already, is nothing but the absence of

light, and the perception of it is only the absence of sight, as the

perception of silence is the absence of hearing; not that darkness is

anything, but that light is not, as neither that silence is anything,

but that sound is not), all the other things are natural qualities and

are familiar to all; and the form of those natures, which is

commendable and good as far as it exists, no wise man attributes to any

other author than God, the author of all good things. [284]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[284] [This portion of the argument is conducted with great

adroitness. Augustin takes the inhabitants of the region of darkness,

as Mani describes them, and proves that they possess so much of good

that they can have no other author than God.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 32.--Manich�us Got the Arrangement of His Fanciful Notions from

Visible Objects.

35. For in giving to these natures which he has learned from visible

things, an arrangement according to his fanciful ideas, to represent

the race of darkness, Manich�us is clearly in error. First of all, he

makes darkness productive, which is impossible. But, he replies, this

darkness was unlike what you are familiar with. How, then, can you

make me understand about it? After so many promises to give knowledge,

will you force me to take your word for it? Suppose I believe you,

this at least is certain, that if the darkness had no form, as darkness

usually has not, it could produce nothing; if it had form, it was

better than ordinary darkness: whereas, when you call it different

from the ordinary kind, you wish us to believe that it is worse. You

might as well say that silence, which is the same to the ear as

darkness to the eyes, produced some deaf or dumb animals in that

region; and then, in reply to the objection that silence is not a

nature, you might say that it was different silence from ordinary

silence; in a word, you might say what you pleased to those whom you

have once misled into believing you. No doubt, the obvious facts

relating to the origin of animal life led Manich�us to say that

serpents were produced in darkness. However, there are serpents which

have such sharp sight, and such pleasure in light, that they seem to

give evidence of the most weighty kind against this idea. Then the

idea of swimming things in the water might easily be got here, and

applied to the fanciful objects in that region; and so of flying things

in the winds, for the motion of the lower air in this world, where

birds fly, is called wind. Where he got the idea of the quadrupeds in

fire, no one can tell. Still he said this deliberately, though without

sufficient thought, and from great misconception. The reason usually

given is, that quadrupeds are voracious and salacious. But many men

surpass any quadruped in voracity, though they are bipeds, and are

called children of the smoke, and not of fire. Geese, too, are as

voracious as any animal; and though he might place them in fire as

bipeds, or in the water because they love to swim, or in the winds

because they have wings and sometimes fly, they certainly have nothing

to do with fire in this classification. As regards salaciousness, I

suppose he was thinking of neighing horses, which sometimes bite

through the bridle and rush at the mares; and writing hastily, with

this in his mind, he forgot the common sparrow, in comparison of which

the hottest stallion is cold. The reason they give for assigning

bipeds to the smoke is, that bipeds are conceited and proud, for men

are derived from this class; and the idea, which is a plausible one, is

that smoke resembles proud people in rising up into the air, round and

swelling. This idea might warrant a figurative description of proud

men, or an allegorical expression or explanation, but not the belief

that bipeds are born in smoke and of smoke. They might with equal

reason be said to be born in dust, for it often rises up to the heaven

with a similar circling and lofty motion; or in the clouds, for they

are often drawn up from the earth in such a way, that those looking

from a distance are uncertain whether they are clouds or smoke. Once

more, why, in the case of the waters and the winds, does he suit the

inhabitants to the character of the place, as we see swimming things in

water, and flying things in the wind; whereas, in the face of fire and

smoke, this bold liar is not ashamed to assign to these places the most

unlikely inhabitants? For fire burns quadrupeds, and consumes them,

and smoke suffocates and kills bipeds. At least he must acknowledge

that he has made these natures better in the race of darkness than they

are here, though he wishes us to think everything to be worse. For,

according to this, the fire there produced and nourished quadrupeds,

and gave them a lodging not only harmless, but most convenient. The

smoke, too, provided room for the offspring of its own benign bosom,

and cherished them up to the rank of prince. Thus we see that these

lies, which have added to the number of heretics, arose from the

perception by carnal sense, only without care or discernment, of

visible objects in this world, and when thus conceived, were brought

forth by fancy, and then presumptuously written and published.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 33.--Every Nature, as Nature, is Good.

36. But the consideration we wish most to urge is the truth of the

Catholic doctrine, if they can understand it, that God is the author of

all natures. I urged this before when I said, I join with you in your

condemnation of destructiveness, of blindness, of dense muddiness, of

terrific violence, of perishableness, of the ferocity of the princes,

and so on; join with me in commending form, classification,

arrangement, harmony, unity of structure, symmetry and correspondence

of members, provision for vital breath and nourishment, wholesome

adaptation, regulation and control by the mind, and the subjection of

the bodies, and the assimilation and agreement of parts in the natures,

both those inhabiting and those inhabited, and all the other things of

the same kind. From this, if they would only think honestly, they

would understand that it implies a mixture of good and evil, even in

the region where they suppose evil to be alone and in perfection: so

that if the evils mentioned were taken away, the good things will

remain, without anything to detract from the commendation given to

them; whereas, if the good things are taken away, no nature is left.

From this every one sees, who can see, that every nature, as far as it

is nature, is good; since in one and the same thing in which I found

something to praise, and he found something to blame, if the good

things are taken away, no nature will remain; but if the disagreeable

things are taken away, the nature will remain unimpaired. Take from

waters their thickness and muddiness, and pure clear water remains;

take from them the consistence of their parts, and no water will be

left. If then, after the evil is removed, the nature remains in a

purer state, and does not remain at all when the good is taken away, it

must be the good which makes the nature of the thing in which it is,

while the evil is not nature, but contrary to nature. Take from the

winds their terribleness and excessive force, with which you find

fault, you can conceive of winds as gentle and mild; take from them the

similarity of their parts which gives them continuity of substance, and

the unity essential to material existence, and no nature remains to be

conceived of. It would be tedious to go through all the cases; but all

who consider the subject free from party spirit must see that in their

list of natures the disagreeable things mentioned are additions to the

nature; and when they are removed, the natures remain better than

before. This shows that the natures, as far as they are natures, are

good; for when you take from them the good instead of the evil, no

natures remain. And attend, you who wish to arrive at a correct

judgment, to what is said of the fierce prince himself. If you take

away his ferocity, see how many excellent things will remain; his

material frame, the symmetry of the members on one side with those on

the other, the unity of his form, the settled continuity of his parts,

the orderly adjustment of the mind as ruling and animating, and the

body as subject and animated. The removal of these things, and of

others I may have omitted to mention, will leave no nature remaining.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 34.--Nature Cannot Be Without Some Good. The Manich�ans Dwell

Upon the Evils.

37. But perhaps you will say that these evils cannot be removed from

the natures, and must therefore be considered natural. The question at

present is not what can be taken away, and what cannot; but it

certainly helps to a clear perception that these natures, as far as

they are natures, are good, when we see that the good things can be

thought of without these evil things, while without these good things

no nature can be conceived of. I can conceive of waters without muddy

commotion; but without settled continuity of parts no material form is

an object of thought or of sensation in any way. Therefore even these

muddy waters could not exist without the good which was the condition

of their material existence. As to the reply that these evil things

cannot be taken from such natures, I rejoin that neither can the good

things be taken away. Why, then, should you call these things natural

evils, on account of the evil things which you suppose cannot be taken

away, and yet refuse to call them natural good things, on account of

the good things which, as has been proved, cannot be taken away?

38. You may next ask, as you usually do for a last resource, whence

come these evils which I have said that I too disapprove of. I shall

perhaps tell you, if you first tell me whence are those good things

which you too are obliged to commend, if you would not be altogether

unreasonable. But why should I ask this, when we both acknowledge that

all good things whatever, and how great soever, are from the one God,

who is supremely good? You must therefore yourselves oppose Manich�us

who has placed all these important good things which we have mentioned

and justly commended,--the continuity and agreement of parts in each

nature, the health and vigor of the animated creatures, and the other

things which it would be wearisome to repeat,--(in an imaginary region

of darkness, so as to separate them altogether from that God whom he

allows to be the author of all good things.) He lost sight of those

good things, while taking notice only of what was disagreeable; as if

one, frightened by a lion's roaring, and seeing him dragging away and

tearing the bodies of cattle or human beings which he had seized,

should from childish pusillanimity be so overpowered with fear as to

see nothing but the cruelty and ferocity of the lion; and overlooking

or disregarding all the other qualities, should exclaim against the

nature of this animal as not only evil, but a great evil, his fear

adding to his vehemence. But were he to see a tame lion, with its

ferocity subdued, especially if he had never been frightened by a lion,

he would have leisure, in the absence of danger and terror, to observe

and admire the beauty of the animal. My only remark on this is one

closely connected with our subject: that any nature may be in some

case disagreeable, so as to excite hatred towards the whole nature;

though it is clear that the form of a real living beast, even when it

excites terror in the woods, is far better than that of the artificial

imitation which is commended in a painting on the wall. We must not

then be misled into this error by Manich�us, or be hindered from

observing the forms of the natures, by his finding fault with some

things in them in such a way as to make us disapprove of them entirely,

when it is impossible to show that they deserve entire disapproval.

And when our minds are thus composed and prepared to form a just

judgment, we may ask whence come those evils which I have said that I

condemn. It will be easier to see this if we class them all under one

name.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 35.--Evil Alone is Corruption. Corruption is Not Nature, But

Contrary to Nature. Corruption Implies Previous Good.

39. For who can doubt that the whole of that which is called evil is

nothing else than corruption? Different evils may, indeed, be called

by different names; but that which is the evil of all things in which

any evil is perceptible is corruption. So the corruption of an

educated mind is ignorance; the corruption of a prudent mind is

imprudence; the corruption of a just mind, injustice; the corruption of

a brave mind, cowardice; the corruption of a calm, peaceful mind,

cupidity, fear, sorrow, pride. Again, in a living body, the corruption

of health is pain and disease; the corruption of strength is

exhaustion; the corruption of rest is toil. Again, in any corporeal

thing, the corruption of beauty is ugliness; the corruption of

straightness is crookedness; the corruption of order is confusion; the

corruption of entireness is disseverance, or fracture, or diminution.

It would be long and laborious to mention by name all the corruptions

of the things here mentioned, and of countless other things; for in

many cases the words may apply to the mind as well as to the body, and

in innumerable cases the corruption has a distinct name of its own.

But enough has been said to show that corruption does harm only as

displacing the natural condition; and so, that corruption is not

nature, but against nature. And if corruption is the only evil to be

found anywhere, and if corruption is not nature, no nature is evil.

40. But if, perchance, you cannot follow this, consider again, that

whatever is corrupted is deprived of some good: for if it were not

corrupted, it would be incorrupt; or if it could not in any way be

corrupted, it would be incorruptible. Now, if corruption is an evil,

both incorruption and incorruptibility must be good things. We are

not, however, speaking at present of incorruptible nature, but of

things which admit of corruption, and which, while not corrupted, may

be called incorrupt, but not incorruptible. That alone can be called

incorruptible which not only is not corrupted, but also cannot in any

part be corrupted. Whatever things, then, being incorrupt, but liable

to corruption, begin to be corrupted, are deprived of the good which

they had as incorrupt. Nor is this a slight good, for corruption is a

great evil. And the continued increase of corruption implies the

continued presence of good, of which they may be deprived.

Accordingly, the natures supposed to exist in the region of darkness

must have been either corruptible or incorruptible. If they were

incorruptible, they were in possession of a good than which nothing is

higher. If they were corruptible, they were either corrupted or not

corrupted. If they were not corrupted, they were incorrupt, to say

which of anything is to give it great praise. If they were corrupted,

they were deprived of this great good of incorruption; but the

deprivation implies the previous possession of the good they are

deprived of; and if they possessed this good, they were not the

perfection of evil, and consequently all the Manich�an story is a

falsehood.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 36.--The Source of Evil or of Corruption of Good.

41. After thus inquiring what evil is, and learning that it is not

nature, but against nature, we must next inquire whence it is. If

Manich�us had done this, he might have escaped falling into the snare

of these serious errors. Out of time and out of order, he began with

inquiring into the origin of evil, without first asking what evil was;

and so his inquiry led him only to the reception of foolish fancies, of

which the mind, much fed by the bodily senses, with difficulty rids

itself. Perhaps, then, some one, desiring no longer argument, but

delivery from error, will ask, Whence is this corruption which we find

to be the common evil of good things which are not incorruptible? Such

an inquirer will soon find the answer if he seeks for truth with great

earnestness, and knocks reverently with sustained assiduity. For while

man can use words as a kind of sign for the expression of his thoughts,

teaching is the work of the incorruptible Truth itself, who is the one

true, the one internal Teacher. He became external also, that He might

recall us from the external to the internal; and taking on Himself the

form of a servant, that He might bring down His height to the knowledge

of those rising up to Him, He condescended to appear in lowliness to

the low. In His name let us ask, and through Him let us seek mercy of

the Father while making this inquiry. For to answer in a word the

question, Whence is corruption? it is hence, because these natures that

are capable of corruption were not begotten by God, but made by Him out

of nothing; and as we already proved that those natures are good, no

one can say with propriety that they were not good as made by God. If

it is said that God made them perfectly good, it must be remembered

that the only perfect good is God Himself, the maker of those good

things.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 37.--God Alone Perfectly Good.

42. What harm, you ask, would follow if those things too were

perfectly good? Still, should any one, who admits and believes the

perfect goodness of God the Father, inquire what source we should

reverently assign to any other perfectly good thing, supposing it to

exist, our only correct reply would be, that it is of God the Father,

who is perfectly good. And we must bear in mind that what is of Him is

born of Him, and not made by Him out of nothing, and that it is

therefore perfectly, that is, incorruptibly, good like God Himself. So

we see that it is unreasonable to require that things made out of

nothing should be as perfectly good as He who was begotten of God

Himself, and who is one as God is one, otherwise God would have

begotten something unlike Himself. Hence it shows ignorance and

impiety to seek for brethren for this only-begotten Son through whom

all good things were made by the Father out of nothing, except in this,

that He condescended to appear as man. Accordingly in Scripture He is

called both only-begotten and first-begotten; only-begotten of the

Father, and first-begotten from the dead. "And we beheld," says John,

"His glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of

grace and truth." [285] And Paul says, "that He might be the

first-born among many brethren." [286]

43. But should we say, These things made out of nothing are not good

things, but only God's nature is good, we shall be unjust to good

things of great value. And there is impiety in calling it a defect in

anything not to be what God is, and in denying a thing to be good

because it is inferior to God. Pray submit then, thou nature of the

rational soul, to be somewhat less than God, but only so far less, that

after Him nothing else is above thee. Submit, I say, and yield to Him,

lest He drive thee still lower into depths where the punishment

inflicted will continually detract more and more from the good which

thou hast. Thou exaltest thyself against God, if thou art indignant at

His preceding thee; and thou art very contumacious in thy thoughts of

Him, if thou dost not rejoice unspeakably in the possession of this

good, that He alone is above thee. This being settled as certain, thou

art not to say, God should have made me the only nature: there should

be no good thing after me. It could not be that the next good thing to

God should be the last. And in this is seen most clearly how great

dignity God conferred on thee, that He who in the order of nature alone

rules over thee, made other good things for thee to rule over. Nor be

surprised that they are not now in all respects subject to thee, and

that sometimes they pain thee; for thy Lord has greater authority over

the things subject to thee than thou hast, as a master over the

servants of his servants. What wonder, then, if, when thou sinnest,

that is, disobeyest thy Lord, the things thou before ruledst over are

made instrumental in thy punishment? For what is so just, or what is

more just than God? For this befell human nature in Adam, of whom this

is not the place to speak. Suffice it to say, the righteous Ruler acts

in character both in just rewards and in just punishments, in the

happiness of those who live rightly, and in the penalty inflicted on

sinners. Nor yet art thou [287] left without mercy, since by an

appointed distribution of things and times thou art called to return.

Thus the righteous control of the supreme Creator extends even to

earthly good things, which are corrupted and restored, that thou

mightest have consolations mingled with punishments; that thou mightest

both praise God when delighted by the order of good things, and

mightest take refuge in Him when tried by experience of evils. So, as

far as earthly things are subject to thee, they teach thee that thou

art their ruler; as far as they distress thee, they teach thee to be

subject to thy Lord.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[285] John i. 14.

[286] Rom. viii. 29.

[287] [Augustin still addresses himself to the "nature of the rational

soul."--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 38.--Nature Made by God; Corruption Comes from Nothing.

44. In this way, though corruption is an evil, and though it comes not

from the Author of natures, but from their being made out of nothing,

still, in God's government and control over all that He has made, even

corruption is so ordered that it hurts only the lowest natures, for the

punishment of the condemned, and for the trial and instruction of the

returning, that they may keep near to the incorruptible God, and remain

incorrupt, which is our only good; as is said by the prophet, "But it

is good for me that I keep near to God." [288] And you must not say,

God did not make corruptible natures: for, as far as they are natures,

God made them; but as far as they are corruptible, God did not make

them: for corruption cannot come from Him who alone is incorruptible.

If you can receive this, give thanks to God; if you cannot, be quiet

and do not condemn what you do not yet understand, but humbly wait on

Him who is the light of the mind that thou mayest know. For in the

expression "corruptible nature" there are two words, and not one only.

So, in the expression, God made out of nothing, "God" and "nothing" are

two separate words. Render therefore to each of these words that which

belongs to each, so that the word "nature" may go with the word

"God,"and the word "corruptible" with the word "nothing." And yet even

the corruptions, though they have not their origin from God, are to be

overruled by Him in accordance with the order of inanimate things and

the deserts of His intelligent creatures. Thus we say rightly that

reward and punishment are both from God. For God's not making

corruption is consistent with His giving over to corruption the man who

deserves to be corrupted, that is, who has begun to corrupt himself by

sinning, that he who has wilfully yielded to the allurements of

corruption may, against his will, suffer its pains.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[288] Ps. lxxiii. 28.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 39.--In What Sense Evils are from God.

45. Not only is it written in the Old Testament, "I make good, and

create evil;" [289] but more clearly in the New Testament, where the

Lord says, "Fear not them which kill the body, and have no more that

they can do; but fear him who, after he has killed the body, has power

to cast the soul into hell." [290] And that to voluntary corruption

penal corruption is added in the divine judgment, is plainly declared

by the Apostle Paul, when he says, "The temple of God is holy, which

temple ye are; whoever corrupts the temple of God, him will God

corrupt." [291] If this had been said in the Old Law, how vehemently

would the Manich�ans have denounced it as making God a corrupter! And

from fear of the word, many Latin translators make it, "him shall God

destroy," instead of corrupt, avoiding the offensive word without any

change of meaning. Although these would inveigh against any passage in

the Old Law or the prophets if God was called in it a destroyer. But

the Greek original here shows that corrupt is the true word; for it is

written distinctly, "Whoever corrupts the temple of God, him will God

corrupt." If the Manich�ans are asked to explain the words, they will

say, to escape making God a corrupter, that corrupt here means to give

over to corruption, or some such explanation. Did they read the Old

Law in this spirit, they would both find many admirable things in it;

and instead of spitefully attacking passages which they did not

understand, they would reverently postpone the inquiry.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[289] Ps. xlv. 7.

[290] Matt. x. 28, and Luke xii. 4.

[291] 1 Cor. iii. 17.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 40.--Corruption Tends to Non-Existence.

46. But if any one does not believe that corruption comes from

nothing, let him place before himself existence and non-existence--one,

as it were, on one side, and the other on the other (to speak so as not

to outstrip the slow to understand); then let him set something, say

the body of an animal, between them, and let him ask himself whether,

while the body is being formed and produced, while its size is

increasing, while it gains nourishment, health, strength, beauty,

stability, it is tending, as regards its duration and permanence, to

this side or that, to existence or non-existence. He will see without

difficulty, that even in the rudimentary form there is an existence,

and that the more the body is established and built up in form, and

figure and strength, the more does it come to exist, and to tend to the

side of existence. Then, again, let the body begin to be corrupted;

let its whole condition be enfeebled, let its vigor languish, its

strength decay, its beauty be defaced, its framework be sundered, the

consistency of its parts give way and go to pieces; and let him ask now

where the body is tending in this corruption, whether to existence or

non-existence: he will not surely be so blind or stupid as to doubt

how to answer himself, or as not to see that, in proportion as anything

is corrupted, in that proportion it approaches decease. But whatever

tends to decease tends to non-existence. Since, then, we must believe

that God exists immutably and incorruptibly, while what is called

nothing is clearly altogether nonexistent; and since, after setting

before yourself existence and non-existence, you have observed that the

more a visible object increases the more it tends towards existence,

while the more it is corrupted the more it tends towards non-existence,

why are you at a loss to tell regarding any nature what in it is from

God, and what from nothing; seeing that visible form is natural, and

corruption against nature? The increase of form leads to existence,

and we acknowledge God as supreme existence; the increase of corruption

leads to non-existence, and we know that what is non-existent is

nothing. Why then, I say, are you at a loss to tell regarding a

corruptible nature, when you have both the words nature and

corruptible, what is from God, and what from nothing? And why do you

inquire for a nature contrary to God, since, if you confess that He is

the supreme existence, it follows that non-existence is contrary to

Him? [292]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[292] [We have already encountered in the treatise Concerning two

Souls, substantially the same course of argumentation here pursued.

The doctrine of the negativity of evil may be said to have been

fundamental with Augustin, and he uses it very effectually against

Manich�an dualism.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 41.--Corruption is by God's Permission, and Comes from Us.

47. You ask, Why does corruption take from nature what God has given

to it? It takes nothing but where God permits; and He permits in

righteous and well-ordered judgment, according to the degrees of

non-intelligent and the deserts of intelligent creatures. The word

uttered passes away as an object of sense, and perishes in silence; and

yet the coming and going of these passing words make our speech, and

the regular intervals of silence give pleasing and appropriate

distinction; and so it is with temporal natures which have this lowest

form of beauty, that transition gives them being, and the death of what

they give birth to gives them individuality. And if our sense and

memory could rightly take in the order and proportions of this beauty,

it would so please us, that we should not dare to give the name of

corruptions to those imperfections which give rise to the distinction.

And when distress comes to us through their peculiar beauty, by the

loss of beloved temporal things passing away, we both pay the penalty

of our sins, and are exhorted to set our affection on eternal things.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 42.--Exhortation to the Chief Good.

48. Let us, then, not seek in this beauty for what has not been given

to it (and from not having what we seek for, this is the lowest form of

beauty); and in that which has been given to it, let us praise God,

because He has bestowed this great good of visible form even on the

lowest degree of beauty. And let us not cleave as lovers to this

beauty, but as praisers of God let us rise above it; and from this

superior position let us pronounce judgment on it, instead of so being

bound up in it as to be judged along with it. And let us hasten on to

that good which has no motion in space or advancement in time, from

which all natures in space and time receive their sensible being and

their form. To see this good let us purify our heart by faith in our

Lord Jesus Christ, who says, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they

shall see God." [293] For the eyes needed in order to see this good

are not those with which we see the light spread through space, which

has part in one place and part in another, instead of being all in

every place. The sight and the discernment we are to purify is that by

which we see, as far as is allowed in this life, what is just, what is

pious, what is the beauty of wisdom. He who sees these things, values

them far above the fullness of all regions in space, and finds that the

vision of these things requires not the extension of his perception

through distances in space, but its invigoration by an immaterial

influence. [294]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[293] Matt. v. 8.

[294] [The Neo-Platonic quality of this section cannot escape the

attention of the philosophical student.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 43.--Conclusion.

49. And as this vision is greatly hindered by those fancies which are

originated by the carnal sense, and are retained and modified by the

imagination, let us abhor this heresy which has been led by faith in

its fancies to represent the divine substance as extended and diffused

through space, even through infinite space, and to cut short one side

so as to make room for evil,--not being able to perceive that evil is

not nature, but against nature; and to beautify this very evil with

such visible appearance, and forms, and consistency of parts prevailing

in its several natures, not being able to conceive of any nature

without those good things, that the evils found fault with in it are

buried under a countless abundance of good things.

Here let us close this part of the treatise. The other absurdities of

Manich�us will be exposed in what follows, by the permission and help

of God. [295]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[295] Vide Preface.
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Reply to Faustus the Manich�an.

[Contra Faustum Manich�um.] a.d. 400.

------------------------

Written about the year 400. [Faustus was undoubtedly the acutest, most

determined and most unscrupulous opponent of orthodox Christianity in

the age of Augustin. The occasion of Augustin's great writing against

him was the publication of Faustus' attack on the Old Testament

Scriptures, and on the New Testament so far as it was at variance with

Manich�an error. Faustus seems to have followed in the footsteps of

Adimantus, against whom Augustin had written some years before, but to

have gone considerably beyond Adimantus in the recklessness of his

statements. The incarnation of Christ, involving his birth from a

woman, is one of the main points of attack. He makes the variations in

the genealogical records of the Gospels a ground for rejecting the

whole as spurious. He supposed the Gospels, in their present form, to

be not the works of the Apostles, but rather of later Judaizing

falsifiers. The entire Old Testament system he treats with the utmost

contempt, blaspheming the Patriarchs, Moses, the Prophets, etc., on the

ground of their private lives and their teachings. Most of the

objections to the morality of the Old Testament that are now current

were already familiarly used in the time of Augustin. Augustin's

answers are only partially satisfactory, owing to his imperfect view of

the relation of the old dispensation to the new; but in the age in

which they were written they were doubtless very effective. The

writing is interesting from the point of view of Biblical criticism, as

well as from that of polemics against Manich�ism.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Book I.

Who Faustus was. Faustus's object in writing the polemical treatise

that forms the basis of Augustin's reply. Augustin's remarks thereon.

1. Faustus was an African by race, a citizen of Mileum; he was

eloquent and clever, but had adopted the shocking tenets of the

Manich�an heresy. He is mentioned in my Confessions, [296] where there

is an account of my acquaintance with him. This man published a

certain volume against the true Christian faith and the Catholic

truth. A copy reached us, and was read by the brethren, who called for

an answer from me, as part of the service of love which I owe to them.

Now, therefore, in the name and with the help of our Lord and Saviour

Jesus Christ, I undertake the task, that all my readers may know that

acuteness of mind and elegance of style are of no use to a man unless

the Lord directs his steps. [297] In the mysterious equity of divine

mercy, God often bestows His help on the slow and the feeble; while

from the want of this help, the most acute and eloquent run into error

only with greater rapidity and willfulness. I will give the opinions

of Faustus as if stated by himself, and mine as if in reply to him.

2. Faustus said: As the learned Adimantus, the only teacher since the

sainted Manich�us deserving of our attention, has plentifully exposed

and thoroughly refuted the errors of Judaism and of semi-Christianity,

I think it not amiss that you should be supplied in writing with brief

and pointed replies to the captious objections of our adversaries, that

when, like children of the wily serpent, they try to bewilder you with

their quibbles, you may be prepared to give intelligent answers. In

this way they will be kept to the subject, instead of wandering from

one thing to another. And I have placed our opinions and those of our

opponent over against one another, as plainly and briefly as possible,

so as not to perplex the reader with a long and intricate discourse.

3. Augustin replies: You warn against semi-Christians, which you say

we are; but we warn against pseudo-Christians, which we have shown you

to be. Semi-Christianity may be imperfect without being false. So,

then, if the faith of those whom you try to mislead is imperfect, would

it not be better to supply what is lacking than to rob them of what

they have? It was to imperfect Christians that the apostle wrote,

"joying and beholding your conversation," and "the deficiency in your

faith in Christ." [298] The apostle had in view a spiritual

structure, as he says elsewhere, "Ye are God's building;" [299] and in

this structure he found both a reason for joy and a reason for

exertion. He rejoiced to see part already finished; and the necessity

of bringing the edifice to perfection called for exertion. Imperfect

Christians as we are, you pursue us with the desire to pervert what you

call our semi-Christianity by false doctrine; while even those who are

so deficient in faith as to be unable to reply to all your sophisms,

are wise enough at least to know that they must not have anything at

all to do with you. You look for semi-Christians to deceive: we wish

to prove you pseudo-Christians, that Christians may learn something

from your refutation, and that the less advanced may learn to avoid

you. Do you call us children of the serpent? You have surely

forgotten how often you have found fault with the prohibition in

Paradise, and have praised the serpent for opening Adam's eyes. You

have the better claim to the title which you give us. The serpent owns

you as well when you blame him as when you praise him.

------------------------

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[296] Confessions, v. 3, 6.

[297] Ps. xxxvii. 23.

[298] Col. ii. 5; cf. 1 Thess. iii. 10.

[299] 1 Cor. iii. 9.
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Book II.

Faustus claims to believe the Gospel, yet refuses to accept the

genealogical tables on various grounds which Augustin seeks to set

aside.

1. Faustus said: Do I believe the gospel? Certainly. Do I therefore

believe that Christ was born? Certainly not. It does not follow that

because I believe the gospel, as I do, I must therefore believe that

Christ was born. This I do not believe; because Christ does not say

that He was born of men, and the gospel, both in name and in fact,

begins with Christ's preaching. As for the genealogy, the author

himself does not venture to call it the gospel. For what did he

write? "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ the Son of David."

[300] The book of the generation is not the book of the gospel. It

is more like a birth-register, the star confirming the event. Mark, on

the other hand, who recorded the preaching of the Son of God, without

any genealogy, begins most suitably with the words, "The gospel of

Jesus Christ the Son of God." It is plain that the genealogy is not

the gospel. Matthew himself says, that after John was put in prison,

Jesus began to preach the gospel of the kingdom; so that what is

mentioned before this is the genealogy, and not the gospel. Why did

not Matthew begin with, "The gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God,"

but because he thought it sinful to call the genealogy the gospel?

Understand, then, what you have hitherto overlooked --the distinction

between the genealogy and the gospel. Do I then admit the truth of the

gospel? Yes; understanding by the gospel the preaching of Christ. I

have plenty to say about the generations too, if you wish. But you

seem to me now to wish to know not whether I accept the gospel, but

whether I accept the generations.

2. Augustin replied: Well, in answer to your own questions, you tell

us first that you believe the gospel, and next, that you do not believe

in the birth of Christ; and your reason is, that the birth of Christ is

not in the gospel. What, then, will you answer the apostle when he

says, "Remember that Christ Jesus rose from the dead, of the seed of

David, according to my gospel?" [301] You surely are ignorant, or

pretend to be ignorant, what the gospel is. You use the word, not as

the apostle teaches, but as suits your own errors. What the apostles

call the gospel you depart from; for you do not believe that Christ was

of the seed of David. This was Paul's gospel; and it was also the

gospel of the other apostles, and of all faithful stewards of so great

a mystery. For Paul says elsewhere, "Whether, therefore, I or they, so

we preach, and so ye believed." [302] They did not all write the

gospel, but they all preached it. The name evangelist is properly

given to the narrators of the birth, the actions, the words, the

sufferings of our Lord Jesus Christ. The word gospel means good news,

and might be used of any good news, but is properly applied to the

narrative of the Saviour. If, then, you teach something different, you

must have departed from the gospel. Assuredly those babes whom you

despise as semi-Christians will oppose you, when they hear their mother

Charity declaring by the mouth of the apostle, "If any one preach

another gospel than that which we have preached to you, let him be

accursed." [303] Since, then, Paul, according to his gospel, preached

that Christ was of the seed of David, and you deny this and preach

something else, may you be accursed! And what can you mean by saying

that Christ never declares Himself to have been born of men, when on

every occasion He calls Himself the Son of man?

3. You learned men, forsooth, dress up for our benefit some wonderful

First Man, who came down from the race of light to war with the race of

darkness, armed with his waters against the waters of the enemy, and

with his fire against their fire, and with his winds against their

winds. And why not with his smoke against their smoke, and with his

darkness against their darkness? According to you, he was armed

against smoke with air, and against darkness with light. So it appears

that smoke and darkness are bad, since they could not belong to his

goodness. The other three, again--water, wind, and fire--are good.

How, then, could these belong to the evil of the enemy? You reply that

the water of the race of darkness was evil, while that which the First

Man brought was good; and so, too, his good wind and fire fought

against the evil wind and fire of the adversary. But why could he not

bring good smoke against evil smoke? Your falsehoods seem to vanish in

smoke. Well, your First Man warred against an opposite nature. And

yet only one of the five things he brought was the opposite of what the

hostile race had. The light was opposed to the darkness, but the four

others are not opposed to one another. Air is not the opposite of

smoke, and still less is water the opposite of water, or wind of wind,

or fire of fire.

4. One is shocked at your wild fancies about this First Man changing

the elements which he brought, that he might conquer his enemies by

pleasing them. So you make what you call the kingdom of falsehood keep

honestly to its own nature, while truth is changeable in order to

deceive. Jesus Christ, according to you, is the son of this First

Man. Truth springs, forsooth, from your fiction. You praise this

First Man for using changeable and delusive forms in the contest. If

you, then, speak the truth, you do not imitate him. If you imitate

him, you deceive as he did. But our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the

true and truthful Son of God, the true and truthful Son of man, both of

which He testifies of Himself, derived the eternity of His godhead from

true God, and His incarnation from true man. Your First Man is not the

first man of the apostle. "The first man," he says, "was of the earth,

earthy; the second man is from heaven, heavenly. As is the earthy,

such are they also that are earthy; as is the heavenly, such are they

also that are heavenly. As we have borne the image of the earthy, let

us also bear the image of the heavenly." [304] The first man of the

earth, earthy, is Adam, who was made of dust. The second man from

heaven, heavenly, is the Lord Jesus Christ; for, being the Son of God,

He became flesh that He might be a man outwardly, while He remained God

within; that He might be both the true Son of God, by whom we were

made, and the true Son of man, by whom we are made anew. Why do you

conjure up this fabulous First Man of yours, and refuse to acknowledge

the first man of the apostle? Is this not a fulfillment of what the

apostle says: "Turning away their ears from the truth, they will give

heed to fables?" [305] According to Paul, the first man is of the

earth, earthy; according to Manich�us, he is not earthy, and is

equipped with five elements of some unreal, unintelligible kind. Paul

says: "If any one should have announced to you differently from what

we have announced let him be accursed." Therefore lest Paul be a liar,

let Manich�us be accursed.

5. Again, you find fault with the star by which the Magi were led to

worship the infant Christ, which you should be ashamed of doing, when

you represent your fabulous Christ, the son of your fabulous First Man

not as announced by a star, but as bound up in all the stars. [306]

For you say that he mingled with the principles of darkness in his

conflict with the race of darkness, that by capturing these principles

the world might be made out of the mixture. So that, by your profane

fancies, Christ is not only mingled with heaven and all the stars, but

conjoined and compounded with the earth and all its productions, [307]

--a Saviour no more, but needing to be saved by you, by your eating and

disgorging Him.

This foolish custom of making your disciples bring you food, that your

teeth and stomach may be the means of relieving Christ, who is bound up

in it, is a consequence of your profane fancies. You declare that

Christ is liberated in this way--not, however, entirely; for you hold

that some tiny particles of no value still remain in the excrement, to

be mixed up and compounded again and again in various material forms,

and to be released and purified at any rate by the fire in which the

world will be burned up, if not before. Nay, even then, you say,

Christ is not entirely liberated; but some extreme particles of His

good and divine nature, which have been so defiled that they cannot be

cleansed, are condemned to stay for ever in the horrid mass of

darkness. And these people pretend to be offended with our saying that

a star announced the birth of the Son of God, as if this were placing

His birth under the influence of a constellation; while they subject

Him not to stars only, but to such polluting contact with all material

things, with the juices of all vegetables, and with the decay of all

flesh, and with the decomposition of all food, in which He is bound up,

that the only way of releasing Him, at least one great means, is that

men, that is the Elect of the Manich�ans, should succeed in digesting

their dinner.

We, too, deny the influence of the stars upon the birth of any man; for

we maintain that, by the just law of God, the free-will of man, which

chooses good or evil, is under no constraint of necessity. How much

less do we subject to any constellation the incarnation of the eternal

Creator and Lord of all! When Christ was born after the flesh, the

star which the Magi saw had no power as governing, but attended as a

witness. Instead of assuming control over Him, it acknowledged Him by

the homage it did. Besides, this star was not one of those which from

the beginning of the world continue in the course ordained by the

Creator. Along with the new birth from the Virgin appeared a new star,

which served as a guide to the Magi who were themselves seeking for

Christ; for it went before them till they reached the place where they

found the Word of God in the form of a child. But what astrologer ever

thought of making a star leave its course, and come down to the child

that is born, as they imagine, under it? They think that the stars

affect the birth, not that the birth changes the course of the stars;

so, if the star in the Gospel was one of those heavenly bodies, how

could it determine Christ's action, when it was compelled to change its

own action at Christ's birth? But if, as is more likely, a star which

did not exist before appeared to point out Christ, it was the effect of

Christ's birth, and not the cause of it. Christ was not born because

the star was there; but the star was there because Christ was born. If

there was any fate, it was in the birth, and not in the star. The word

fate is derived from a word which means to speak; and since Christ is

the Word of God by which all things were spoken before they were, the

conjunction of stars is not the fate of Christ, but Christ is the fate

of the stars. The same will that made the heavens took our earthly

nature. The same power that ruled the stars laid down His life and

took it again.

6. Why, then, should the narrative of the birth not be the gospel,

since it conveys such good news as heals our malady? Is it because

Matthew begins, not like Mark, with the words, "The beginning of the

gospel of Jesus Christ," but, "The book of the generation of Jesus

Christ?" In this way, John, too, might be said not to have written the

gospel, for he has not the words, Beginning of the gospel, or Book of

the gospel, but, "In the beginning was the Word." Perhaps the clever

word-maker Faustus will call the introduction in John a Verbidium, as

he called that in Matthew a Genesidium. The wonder is, that you are so

impudent as to give the name of gospel to your silly stories. What

good news is there in telling us that, in the conflict against some

strange hostile nation, God could protect His own kingdom only by

sending part of His own nature into the greedy jaws of the former, and

to be so defiled, that after all those toils and tortures it cannot all

be purged? Is this bad news the gospel? Every one who has even a

slender knowledge of Greek knows that gospel means good news. But

where is your good news, when your God himself is said to weep as under

eclipse till the darkness and defilement are removed from his members?

And when he ceases to weep, it seems he becomes cruel. For what has

that part of him which is to be involved in the mass done to deserve

this condemnation? This part must go on weeping for ever. But no;

whoever examines this news will not weep because it is bad, but will

laugh because it is not true.

------------------------

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[300] Matt. i. 1.

[301] 2 Tim. ii. 8.

[302] 1 Cor. xv. 11.

[303] Gal. i. 8, 9.

[304] 1 Cor. xv. 47-49.

[305] 2 Tim. iv. 4.

[306] [This mixture of the substance of Primordial Man, with the

kingdom of darkness, and the formation of stars out of portions

thereof, was probably a part of primitive Manich�an teaching.--A.H.N.]

[307] [Compare Book xx. 2, where Faustus states the Manich�an doctrine

of the Jesus patabilis. Beausobre, Mosheim and Baur agree in thinking

that Augustin has not distinguished accurately in these two passages

between names Christ and Jesus, as used by the Manich�ans. See Baur:

Das Manich�ische Religionssystem, p. 72.--A.H.N.]
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Book III.

Faustus objects to the incarnation of God on the ground that the

evangelists are at variance with each other, and that incarnation is

unsuitable to deity. Augustin attempts to remove the critical and

theological difficulties.

1. Faustus said: Do I believe in the incarnation? For my part, this

is the very thing I long tried to persuade myself of, that God was

born; but the discrepancy in the genealogies of Luke and Matthew

stumbled me, as I knew not which to follow. For I thought it might

happen that, from not being omniscient, I might take the true for

false, and the false for true. So, in despair of settling this

dispute, I betook myself to Mark and John, two authorities still, and

evangelists as much as the others. I approved with good reason of the

beginning of Mark and John, for they have nothing of David, or Mary, or

Joseph. John says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was

with God, and the Word was God," meaning Christ. Mark says, "The

gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God," as if correcting Matthew, who

calls him the Son of David. Perhaps, however, the Jesus of Matthew is

a different person from the Jesus of Mark. This is my reason for not

believing in the birth of Christ.

Remove this difficulty, if you can, by harmonizing the accounts, and I

am ready to yield. In any case, however, it is hardly consistent to

believe that God, the God of Christians, was born from the womb.

2. Augustin replied: Had you read the Gospel with care, and inquired

into those places where you found opposition, instead of rashly

condemning them, you would have seen that the recognition of the

authority of the evangelists by so many learned men all over the world,

in spite of this most obvious discrepancy, proves that there is more in

it than appears at first sight. Any one can see, as well as you, that

the ancestors of Christ in Matthew and Luke are different; while Joseph

appears in both, at the end in Matthew and at the beginning in Luke.

Joseph, it is plain, might be called the father of Christ, on account

of his being in a certain sense the husband of the mother of Christ;

and so his name, as the male representative, appears at the beginning

or end of the genealogies. Any one can see as well as you that Joseph

has one father in Matthew and another in Luke, and so with the

grandfather and with all the rest up to David. Did all the able and

learned men, not many Latin writers certainly, but innumerable Greek,

who have examined most attentively the sacred Scriptures, overlook this

manifest difference? Of course they saw it. No one can help seeing

it. But with a due regard to the high authority of Scripture, they

believed that there was something here which would be given to those

that ask, and denied to those that snarl; would be found by those that

seek, and taken away from those that criticise; would be open to those

that knock, and shut against those that contradict. They asked,

sought, and knocked; they received, found, and entered in.

3. The whole question is how Joseph had two fathers. Supposing this

possible, both genealogies may be correct. With two fathers, why not

two grandfathers, and two great-grandfathers, and so on, up to David,

who was the father both of Solomon, who is mentioned in Matthew's list,

and of Nathan, who occurs in Luke? This is the difficulty with many

people who think it impossible that two men should have one and the

same son, forgetting the very obvious fact that a man may be called the

son of the person who adopted him as well as of the person who begot

him.

Adoption, we know, was familiar to the ancients; for even women adopted

the children of other women, as Sarah adopted Ishmael, and Leah her

handmaid's son, and Pharaoh's daughter Moses. Jacob, too, adopted his

grandsons, the children of Joseph. Moreover, the word adoption is of

great importance in the system of our faith, as is seen from the

apostolic writings. For the Apostle Paul, speaking of the advantages

of the Jews, says: "Whose are the adoption, and the glory, and the

covenants, and the giving of the law; whose are the fathers, and of

whom, according to the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed

for ever." [308] And again: "We ourselves also groan within

ourselves, waiting for the adoption of the sons of God, even the

redemption of the body." [309] Again, elsewhere: "But in the

fullness of time, God sent His Son, made of a woman, made under the

law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." [310] These

passages show clearly that adoption is a significant symbol. God has

an only Son, whom He begot from His own substance, of whom it is said,

"Being in the form of God, He thought it not robbery to be equal to

God." [311] Us He begot not of His own substance, for we belong to

the creation which is not begotten, but made; but that He might make us

the brothers of Christ, He adopted us. That act, then, by which God,

when we were not born of Him, but created and formed, begot us by His

word and grace, is called adoption. So John says, "He gave them power

to become the sons of God." [312]

Since, therefore; the practice of adoption is common among our fathers,

and in Scripture, is there not irrational profanity in the hasty

condemnation of the evangelists as false because the genealogies are

different, as if both could not be true, instead of considering calmly

the simple fact that frequently in human life one man may have two

fathers, one of whose flesh he is born, and another of whose will he is

afterwards made a son by adoption? If the second is not rightly called

father, neither are we right in saying, "Our Father which art in

heaven," to Him of whose substance we were not born, but of whose grace

and most merciful will we were adopted, according to apostolic

doctrine, and truth most sure. For one is to us God, and Lord, and

Father: God, for by Him we are created, though of human parents; Lord,

for we are His subjects; Father, for by His adoption we are born

again. Careful students of sacred Scripture easily saw, from a little

consideration, how, in the different genealogies of the two

evangelists, Joseph had two fathers, and consequently two lists of

ancestors. You might have seen this too, if you had not been blinded

by the love of contradiction. Other things far beyond your

understanding have been discovered in the careful investigation of all

parts of these narratives. The familiar occurrence of one man

begetting a son and another adopting him, so that one man has two

fathers, you might, in spite of Manich�an error, have thought of as an

explanation, if you had not been reading in a hostile spirit.

4. But why Matthew begins with Abraham and descends to Joseph, while

Luke begins with Joseph and ascends, not to Abraham, but to God, who

made man, and, by giving a commandment, gave him power to become, by

believing, a son of God; and why Matthew records the generations at the

commencement of his book, Luke after the baptism of the Saviour by

John; and what is the meaning of the number of the generations in

Matthew, who divides them into three sections of fourteen each, though

in the whole sum there appears to be one wanting; while in Luke the

number of generations recorded after the baptism amount to

seventy-seven, which number the Lord Himself enjoins in connection with

the forgiveness of sins, saying, "Not only seven times, but

seventy-seven times;"--these things you will never understand, unless

either you are taught by some Catholic of superior stamp, who has

studied the sacred Scriptures, and has made all the progress possible,

or you yourselves turn from your error, and in a Christian spirit ask

that you may receive, seek that you may find, and knock that it may be

opened to you.

5. Since, then, this double fatherhood of nature and adoption removes

the difficulty arising from the discrepancy of the genealogies, there

is no occasion for Faustus to leave the two evangelists and betake

himself to the other two, which would be a greater affront to those he

betook himself to than to those he left. For the sacred writers do not

desire to be favored at the expense of their brethren. For their joy

is in union, and they are one in Christ; and if one says one thing, and

another another, or one in one way and another in another, still they

all speak truth, and in no way contradict one another; only let the

reader be reverent and humble, not in an heretical spirit seeking

occasion for strife, but with a believing heart desiring edification.

Now, in this opinion that the evangelists give the ancestors of

different fathers, as it is quite possible for a man to have two

fathers, there is nothing inconsistent with truth. So the evangelists

are harmonized, and you, by Faustus's promise are bound to yield at

once.

6. You may perhaps be troubled by that additional remark which he

makes: "In any case, however, it is hardly consistent to believe that

God, the God of Christians, was born from the womb." As if we believed

that the divine nature came from the womb of a woman. Have I not just

quoted the testimony of the apostle, speaking of the Jews: "Whose are

the fathers, and of whom, according to the flesh, Christ came, who is

God over all, blessed for ever?" Christ, therefore, our Lord and

Saviour, true Son of God in His divinity, and true son of man according

to the flesh, not as He is God over all was born of a woman, but in

that feeble nature which He took of us, that in it He might die for us,

and heal it in us: not as in the form of God, in which He thought it

not robbery to be equal to God, was He born of a woman, but in the form

of a servant, in taking which He emptied Himself. He is therefore said

to have emptied Himself because He took the form of a servant, not

because He lost the form of God. For in the unchangeable possession of

that nature by which in the form of God He is equal to the Father, He

took our changeable nature, by which He might be born of a virgin.

You, while you protest against putting the flesh of Christ in a

virgin's womb, place the very divinity of God in the womb not only of

human beings, but of dogs and swine. You refuse to believe that the

flesh of Christ was conceived in the Virgin's womb, in which God was

not found nor even changed; while you assert that in all men and

beasts, in the seed of male and in the womb of female, in all

conceptions on land or in water, an actual part of God and the divine

nature is continually bound, and shut up, and contaminated, never to be

wholly set free. [313]

------------------------

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[308] Rom. ix. 4, 5.

[309] Rom. viii. 23.

[310] Gal. iv. 4, 5.

[311] Phil. ii. 6.

[312] John i. 12.

[313] [It cannot be said that Augustin adequately meets the difficulty

that Faustus finds in the genealogies of our Lord. Cf. Hervey: The

Genealogies of Our Lord, and the recent commentaries, such as Meyer's,

Lange's, The International Revision, and especially Broadus on

Matthew.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Book IV.

Faustus's reasons for rejecting the Old Testament, and Augustin's

animadversions thereon.

1. Faustus said: Do I believe the Old Testament? If it bequeaths

anything to me, I believe it; if not, I reject it. It would be an

excess of forwardness to take the documents of others which pronounce

me disinherited. Remember that the promise of Canaan in the Old

Testament is made to Jews, that is, to the circumcised, who offer

sacrifice, and abstain from swine's flesh, and from the other animals

which Moses pronounces unclean, and observe Sabbaths, and the feast of

unleavened bread, and other things of the same kind which the author of

the Testament enjoined. Christians have not adopted these observances,

and no one keeps them; so that if we will not take the inheritance, we

should surrender the documents. This is my first reason for rejecting

the Old Testament, unless you teach me better. My second reason is,

that this inheritance is such a poor fleshly thing, without any

spiritual blessings, that after the New Testament, and its glorious

promise of the kingdom of heaven and eternal life, I think it not worth

the taking.

2. Augustin replied: No one doubts that promises of temporal things

are contained in the Old Testament, for which reason it is called the

Old Testament; or that the kingdom of heaven and the promise of eternal

life belong to the New Testament. But that in these temporal things

were figures of future things which should be fulfilled in us upon whom

the ends of the ages are come, is not my fancy, but the judgment of the

apostle, when he says of such things, "These things were our examples;"

and again, "These things happened to them for an example, and they are

written for us on whom the ends of the ages are come." [314] We

receive the Old Testament, therefore, not in order to obtain the

fulfillment of these promises, but to see in them predictions of the

New Testament; for the Old bears witness to the New. Whence the Lord,

after He rose from the dead, and allowed His disciples not only to see

but to handle Him, still, lest they should doubt their mortal and

fleshly senses, gave them further confirmation from the testimony of

the ancient books, saying, "It was necessary that all things should be

fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets

and Psalms, concerning me." [315] Our hope, therefore, rests not on

the promise of temporal things. Nor do we believe that the holy and

spiritual men of these times--the patriarchs and prophets--were taken

up with earthly things. For they understood, by the revelation of the

Spirit of God, what was suitable for that time, and how God appointed

all these sayings and actions as types and predictions of the future.

Their great desire was for the New Testament; but they had a personal

duty to perform in those predictions, by which the new things of the

future were foretold. So the life as well as the tongue of these men

was prophetic. The carnal people, indeed, thought only of present

blessings, though even in connection with the people there were

prophecies of the future.

These things you do not understand, because, as the prophet said,

"Unless you believe, you shall not understand." [316] For you are not

instructed in the kingdom of heaven,--that is, in the true Catholic

Church of Christ. If you were, you would bring forth from the treasure

of the sacred Scriptures things old as well as new. For the Lord

Himself says, "Therefore every scribe instructed in the kingdom of

heaven is like an householder who brings forth from his treasure things

new and old." [317] And so, while you profess to receive only the new

promises of God, you have retained the oldness of the flesh, adding

only the novelty of error; of which novelty the apostle says, "Shun

profane novelties of words, for they increase unto more ungodliness,

and their speech eats like a cancer. Of whom is Hymen�us and Philetus,

who concerning the faith have erred, saying that the resurrection is

past already, and have overthrown the faith of some." [318] Here you

see the source of your false doctrine, in teaching that the

resurrection is only of souls by the preaching of the truth, and that

there will be no resurrection of the body. But how can you understand

spiritual things of the inner man, who is renewed in the knowledge of

God, when in the oldness of the flesh, if you do not possess temporal

things, you concoct fanciful notions about them in those images of

carnal things of which the whole of your false doctrine consists? You

boast of despising as worthless the land of Canaan, which was an actual

thing, and actually given to the Jews; and yet you tell of a land of

light cut asunder on one side, as by a narrow wedge, by the land of the

race of darkness,--a thing which does not exist, and which you believe

from the delusion of your minds; so that your life is not supported by

having it, and your mind is wasted in desiring it. [319]

------------------------

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[314] 1 Cor. x. 6, 11.

[315] Luke xxiv. 44.

[316] Isa. vii. 9.

[317] Matt. xiii. 52.

[318] 2 Tim. ii. 16-18.

[319] [A good argumentum ad hominem, a species of argument which

Augustin is fond of using.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Book V.

Faustus claims that the Manich�ans and not the Catholics are consistent

believers in the Gospel, and seeks to establish this claim by comparing

Manich�an and Catholic obedience to the precepts of the Gospel.

Augustin exposes the hypocrisy of the Manich�ans and praises the

asceticism of Catholics.

1. Faustus said: Do I believe the gospel? You ask me if I believe

it, though my obedience to its commands shows that I do. I should

rather ask you if you believe it, since you give no proof of your

belief. I have left my father, mother, wife, and children, and all

else that the gospel requires; [320] and do you ask if I believe the

gospel? Perhaps you do not know what is called the gospel. The gospel

is nothing else than the preaching and the precept of Christ. I have

parted with all gold and silver, and have left off carrying money in my

purse; content with daily food; without anxiety for tomorrow; and

without solicitude about how I shall be fed, or where-withal I shall be

clothed: and do you ask if I believe the gospel? You see in me the

blessings of the gospel; [321] and do you ask if I believe the gospel?

You see me poor, meek, a peacemaker, pure in heart, mourning,

hungering, thirsting, bearing persecutions and enmity for

righteousness' sake; and do you doubt my belief in the gospel? One can

understand now how John the Baptist, after seeing Jesus, and also

hearing of His works, yet asked whether He was Christ. Jesus properly

and justly did not deign to reply that He was; but reminded him of the

works of which he had already heard: "The blind see, the deaf hear,

the dead are raised." [322] In the same way, I might very well reply to

your question whether I believe the gospel, by saying, I have left all,

father, mother, wife, children, gold, silver, eating, drinking,

luxuries, pleasures; take this as a sufficient answer to your

questions, and believe that you will be blessed if you are not offended

in me. [323]

2. But, according to you, to believe the gospel is not only to obey

its commands, but also to believe in all that is written in it; and,

first of all, that God was born. But neither is believing the gospel

only to believe that Jesus was born, but also to do what He commands.

So, if you say that I do not believe the gospel because I disbelieve

the incarnation, much more do you not believe because you disregard the

commandments. At any rate, we are on a par till these questions are

settled. If your disregard of the precepts does not prevent you from

professing faith in the gospel, why should my rejection of the

genealogy prevent me? And if, as you say, to believe the gospel

includes both faith in the genealogies and obedience to the precepts,

why do you condemn me, since we both are imperfect? What one wants the

other has. But if, as there can be no doubt, belief in the gospel

consists solely in obedience to the commands of God, your sin is

twofold. As the proverb says, the deserter accuses the soldier. But

suppose, since you will have it so, that there are these two parts of

perfect faith, one consisting in word, or the confession that Christ

was born, the other in deed or the observance of the precepts; it is

plain that my part is hard and painful, yours light and easy. It is

natural that the multitude should flock to you and away from me, for

they know not that the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power.

Why, then, do you blame me for taking the harder part, and leaving to

you, as to a weak brother, the easy part? You have the idea that your

part of faith, or confessing that Christ was born, has more power to

save the soul than the other parts.

3. Let us then ask Christ Himself, and learn from His own mouth, what

is the chief means of our salvation. Who shall enter, O Christ, into

Thy kingdom? He that doeth the will of my Father in heaven, [324] is

His reply; not, "He that confesses that I was born." And again, He

says to His disciples, "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the

name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching

them to observe all things which I have commanded you." [325] It is

not, "teaching them that I was born," but, "to observe my

commandments." Again, "Ye are my friends if ye do what I command you;"

[326] not, "if you believe that I was born." Again, "If ye keep my

commandments, ye shall abide in my love," [327] and in many other

places. Also in the sermon on the mount, when He taught, "Blessed are

the poor, blessed are the meek, blessed are the peacemakers, blessed

are the pure in heart, blessed are they that mourn, blessed are they

that hunger, blessed are they that are persecuted for righteousness'

sake," [328] He nowhere says, "Blessed are they that confess that I was

born." And in the separation of the sheep from the goats in the

judgment, He says that He will say to them on the right hand, "I was

hungry, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink,"

[329] and so on; therefore "inherit the kingdom." Not, "Because ye

believe that I was born, inherit the kingdom." Again, to the rich man

seeking for eternal life, He says, "Go, sell all that thou hast, and

follow me;" [330] not, "Believe that I was born, that you may have

eternal life." You see, the kingdom, life, happiness, are everywhere

promised to the part I have chosen of what you call the two parts of

faith, and nowhere to your part. Show, if you can, a place where it is

written that whoso confesses that Christ was born of a woman is

blessed, or shall inherit the kingdom, or have eternal life. Even

supposing, then, that there are two parts of faith, your part has no

blessing. But what if we prove that your part is not a part of faith

at all? It will follow that you are foolish, which indeed will be

proved beyond a doubt. At present, it is enough to have shown that our

part is crowned with the beatitudes. Besides, we have also a beatitude

for a confession in words: for we confess that Jesus Christ is the Son

of the living God; and Jesus declares with His own lips that this

confession has a benediction, when He says to Peter, "Blessed art thou,

Simon Barjona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed this unto thee,

but my Father which is in heaven." [331] So that we have not one, but

both these parts of faith, and in both alike are we pronounced blessed

by Christ; for in one we reduce faith to practice, while in the other

our confession is unmixed with blasphemy.

4. Augustin replied: I have already said that the Lord Jesus Christ

repeatedly calls Himself the Son of man, and that the Manich�ans have

contrived a silly story about some fabulous First Man, who figures in

their impious heresy, not earthly, but combined with spurious elements,

in opposition to the apostle, who says, "The first man is of the earth,

earthy;" [332] and that the apostle carefully warns us, "If any one

preaches to you differently from what we have preached, let him be

accursed." [333] So that we must believe Christ to be the Son of man

according to apostolic truth, not according to Manich�an error. And

since the evangelists assert that Christ was born of a woman, of the

seed of David, and Paul writing to Timothy says, "Remember that Jesus

Christ, of the seed of David, was raised from the dead, according to my

gospel," [334] it is clear what sense we must believe Christ to be the

Son of man; for being the Son of God by whom we were made, He also by

His incarnation became the Son of man, that He might die for our sins,

and rise again for our justification. [335] Accordingly He calls

Himself both Son of God and Son of man. To take only one instance out

of many, in the Gospel of John it is written, "Verily, verily, I say

unto you, The hour cometh, and now is, when the dead shall hear the

voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live. For as the

Father hath life in Himself, so He hath given to the Son to have life

in Himself; and hath given Him power to execute judgment also, because

He is the Son of man." [336] He says, "They shall hear the voice of

the Son of God;" and He says, "because He is the Son of man." As the

Son of man, He has received power to execute judgment, because He will

come to judgment in human form, that He may be seen by the good and the

wicked. In this form He ascended into heaven, and that voice was heard

by His disciples, "He shall so come as ye have seen Him go into

heaven." [337] As the Son of God, as God equal to and one with the

Father, He will not be seen by the wicked; for "blessed are the pure in

heart, for they shall see God." Since, then, He promises eternal life

to those that believe in Him, and since to believe in Him is to believe

in the true Christ, such as He declares Himself and His apostles

declare Him to be, true Son of God and true Son of man; you,

Manich�ans, who believe on a false and spurious son of a false and

spurious man, and teach that God Himself, from fear of the assault of

the hostile race, gave up His own members to be tortured, and after all

not to be wholly liberated, are plainly far from that eternal life

which Christ promises to those who believe in Him. It is true, He said

to Peter when he confessed Him to be the Son of God, "Blessed art thou,

Simon. Barjona." But does He promise nothing to those who believe Him

to be the Son of man, when the Son of God and the Son of man are the

same? Besides, eternal life is expressly promised to those who believe

in the Son of man. "As Moses," He says, "lifted up the serpent in the

wilderness, so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever

believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life." [338]

What more do you wish? Believe then in the Son of man, that you may

have eternal life; for He is also the Son of God, who can give eternal

life: for He is "the true God and eternal life," as the same John says

in his epistle. John also adds, that he is antichrist who denies that

Christ has come in the flesh. [339]

5. There is no need, then that you should extol so much the perfection

of Christ's commands, because you obey the precepts of the gospel. For

the precepts, supposing you really to fulfill them, would not profit

you without true faith. Do you not know that the apostle says, "If I

distribute all my goods to the poor, and give my body to be burned, and

have not charity, it profiteth me nothing?" [340] Why do you boast of

having Christian poverty, when you are destitute of Christian charity?

Robbers have a kind of charity to one another, arising from a mutual

consciousness of guilt and crime; but this is not the charity commended

by the apostle. In another passage he distinguishes true charity from

all base and vicious affections, by saying, "Now the end of the

commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and

faith unfeigned." [341] How then can you have true charity from a

fictitious faith? [342] You persist in a faith corrupted by

falsehood: for your First Man, according to you, used deceit in the

conflict by changing his form, while his enemies remained in their own

nature; and, besides, you maintain that Christ, who says, "I am the

truth," feigned His incarnation, His death on the cross, the wounds of

His passion, the marks shown after His resurrection. If you speak the

truth, and your Christ speaks falsehood, you must be better than he.

But if you really follow your own Christ, your truthfulness may be

doubted, and your obedience to the precepts you speak of may be only a

pretence. Is it true, as Faustus says, that you have no money in your

purses? He means, probably, that your money is in boxes and bags; nor

would we blame you for this, if you did not profess one thing and

practise another. Constantius, who is still alive, and is now our

brother in Catholic Christianity, once gathered many of your sect into

his house at Rome, to keep these precepts of Manich�us, which you think

so much of, though they are very silly and childish. The precepts

proved too much for your weakness, and the gathering was entirely

broken up. Those who persevered separated from your communion, and are

called Mattarians, because they sleep on mats,--a very different bed

from the feathers of Faustus and his goatskin coverlets, and all the

grandeur that made him despise not only the Mattarians, but also the

house of his poor father in Mileum. Away, then, with this accursed

hypocrisy from your writing, if not from your conduct; or else your

language will conflict with your life by your deceitful words, as your

First Man with the race of darkness by his deceitful elements.

6. I am, however, addressing not merely men who fail to do what they

are commanded, but the members of a deluded sect. For the precepts of

Manich�us are such that, if you do not keep them, you are deceivers; if

you do keep them, you are deceived. Christ never taught you that you

should not pluck a vegetable for fear of committing homicide; for when

His disciples were hungry when passing through a field of corn, He did

not forbid them to pluck the ears on the Sabbath-day; which was a

rebuke to the Jews of the time since the action was on Sabbath; and a

rebuke in the action itself to the future Manich�ans. The precept of

Manich�us, however, only requires you to do nothing while others commit

homicide for you; though the real homicide is that of ruining miserable

souls by such doctrines of devils.

7. The language of Faustus has the typhus of heresy in it, and is the

language of overweening arrogance. "You see in me" he says, "the

beatitudes of the gospel; and do you ask if I believe the gospel? You

see me poor, meek, a peacemaker, pure in heart, mourning, hungering,

thirsting, bearing persecution and enmity for righteousness' sake; and

do you doubt my belief in the gospel?" If to justify oneself were to

be just, Faustus would have flown to heaven while uttering these

words. I say nothing of the luxurious habits of Faustus, known to all

the followers of the Manich�ans, and especially to those at Rome. I

shall suppose a Manich�an such as Constantius sought for, when he

enforced the observance of these precepts with the sincere desire to

see them observed. How can I see him to be poor in spirit, when he is

so proud as to believe that his own soul is God, and is not ashamed to

speak of God as in bondage? How can I see him meek, when he affronts

all the authority of the evangelists rather than believe? How a

peacemaker, when he holds that the divine nature itself by which God is

whatever is, and is the only true existence, could not remain in

lasting peace? How pure in heart, when his heart is filled with so

many impious notions? How mourning, unless it is for his God captive

and bound till he be freed and escape, with the loss, however, of a

part which is to be united by the Father to the mass of darkness, and

is not to be mourned for? How hungering and thirsting for

righteousness, which Faustus omits in his writings lest, no doubt, he

should be thought destitute of righteousness? But how can they hunger

and thirst after righteousness, whose perfect righteousness will

consist in exulting over their brethren condemned to darkness, not for

any fault of their own, but for being irremediably contaminated by the

pollution against which they were sent by the Father to contend?

8. How do you suffer persecution and enmity for righteousness' sake,

when, according to you, it is righteous to preach and teach these

impieties? The wonder is, that the gentleness of Christian times

allows such perverse iniquity to pass wholly or almost unpunished. And

yet, as if we were blind or silly, you tell us that your suffering

reproach and persecution is a great proof of your righteousness. If

people are just according to the amount of their suffering, atrocious

criminals of all kinds suffer much more than you. But, at any rate, if

we are to grant that suffering endured on account of any sort of

profession of Christianity proves the sufferer to be in possession of

true faith and righteousness, you must admit that any case of greater

suffering that we can show proves the possession of truer faith and

greater righteousness. Of such cases you know many among our martyrs,

and chiefly Cyprian himself, whose writings also bear witness to his

belief that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary. For this faith, which

you abhor, he suffered and died along with many Christian believers of

that day, who suffered as much, or more. Faustus, when shown to be a

Manich�an by evidence, or by his own confession, on the intercession of

the Christians themselves, who brought him before the proconsul, was,

along with some others, only banished to an island, which can hardly be

called a punishment at all, for it is what God's servants do of their

own accord every day when they wish to retire from the tumult of the

world. Besides, earthly sovereigns often by a public decree give

release from this banishment as an act of mercy. And in this way all

were afterwards released at once. Confess, then, that they were in

possession of a truer faith and a more righteous life, who were

accounted worthy to suffer for it much more than you ever suffered. Or

else, cease boasting of the abhorrence which many feel for you, and

learn to distinguish between suffering for blasphemy and suffering for

righteousness. What it is you suffer for, your own books will show in

a way that deserves your most particular attention.

9. Those evangelical precepts of peculiar sublimity which you make

people who know no better believe that you obey, are really obeyed by

multitudes in our communion. Are there not among us many of both sexes

who have entirely refrained from sexual intercourse, and many formerly

married who practise continence? Are there not many others who give

largely of their property, or give it up altogether, and many who keep

the body in subjection by fasts, either frequent or daily, or

protracted beyond belief? Then there are fraternities whose members

have no property of their own, but all things common, including only

things necessary for food and clothing, living with one soul and one

heart towards God, inflamed with a common feeling of charity. In all

such professions many turn out to be deceivers and reprobates, while

many who are so are never discovered; many, too, who at first walk

well, fall away rapidly from willfulness. Many are found in times of

trial to have adopted this kind of life with another intention than

they professed; and again, many in humility and steadfastness persevere

in their course to the end, and are saved. There are apparent

diversities in these societies; but one charity unites all who, from

some necessity, in obedience to the apostle's injunction, have their

wives as if they had them not, and buy as if they bought not, and use

this world as if they used it not. With these are joined, in the

abundant riches of God's mercy, the inferior class of those to whom it

is said, "Defraud not one another, except it be with consent for a

time, that ye may give yourselves to prayer; and come together again,

that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency. But I speak this by

permission, and not of commandment." [343] To such the same apostle

also says, "Now therefore there is utterly a fault among you, that ye

go to law one with another;" while, in consideration of their

infirmity, he adds, "If ye have judgments of things pertaining to this

life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the Church." [344]

For in the kingdom of heaven there are not only those who, that they

may be perfect, sell or leave all they have and follow the Lord; but

others in the partnership of charity are joined like a mercenary force

to the Christian army, to whom it will be said at last, "I was hungry,

and ye gave me meat," and so on. Otherwise, there would be no

salvation for those to whom the apostle gives so many anxious and

particular directions about their families, telling the wives to be

obedient to their husbands, and husbands to love their wives; children

to obey their parents, and parents to bring up their children in the

instruction and admonition of the Lord; servants to obey with fear

their masters according to the flesh, and masters to render to their

servants what is just and equal. The apostle is far from condemning

such people as regardless of gospel precepts, or unworthy of eternal

life. For where the Lord exhorts the strong to attain perfection,

saying, "If any man take not up his cross and follow me, he cannot be

my disciple," He immediately adds, for the consolation of the weak,

"Whoso receiveth a just man in the name of a just man shall receive a

just man's reward; and whoso receiveth a prophet in the name of a

prophet, shall receive a prophet's reward." So that not only he who

gives Timothy a little wine for his stomach's sake, and his frequent

infirmities, but he who gives to a strong man a cup of cold water only

in the name of a disciple, shall not lose his reward. [345]

10. If it is true that a man cannot receive the gospel without giving

up everything, why do you delude your followers, by allowing them to

keep in your service their wives, and children, and households, and

houses, and fields? Indeed, you may well allow them to disregard the

precepts of the gospel: for all you promise them is not a

resurrection, but a change to another mortal existence, in which they

shall live the silly, childish, impious life of those you call the

Elect, the life you live yourself, and are so much praised for; or if

they possess greater merit, they shall enter into melons or cucumbers,

or some eatables which you will masticate, that they may be quickly

purified by your digestion. Least of all should you who teach such

doctrines profess any regard for the gospel. For if the faith of the

gospel had any connection with such nonsense, the Lord should have

said, not, "I was hungry, and ye gave me meat;" but, "Ye were hungry,

and ye ate me," or, "I was hungry, and I ate you." For, by your

absurdities, a man will not be received into the kingdom of God for the

service of giving food to the saints, but, because he has eaten them

and belched them out, or has himself been eaten and belched into

heaven. Instead of saying, "Lord, when saw we Thee hungry, and fed

Thee?" the righteous must say, "When saw we Thee hungry, and were eaten

by Thee?" And He must answer, not, "When ye gave food to one of the

least of these my brethren, you gave to me;" but, "When you were eaten

by one of the least of these my brethren, you were eaten by me."

11. Believing and teaching such monstrosities, and living accordingly,

you yet have the boldness to say that you obey the precepts of the

gospel, and to decry the Catholic Church, which includes many weak as

well as strong, both of whom the Lord blesses, because both according

to their measure obey the precepts of the gospel and hope in its

promises. The blindness of hostility makes you see only the tares in

our harvest: for you might easily see wheat too, if you were willing

that there should be any. But among you, those who are pretended

Manich�ans are wicked, and those who are really Manich�ans are silly.

For where the faith itself is false, he who hypocritically professes it

acts deceitfully, while he who truly believes is deceived. Such a

faith cannot produce a good life, for every man's life is good or bad

according as his heart is engaged. If your affections were set upon

spiritual and intellectual good, instead of material forms, you would

not pay homage to the material sun as a divine substance, and as the

light of wisdom, which every one knows you do, though I now only

mention it in passing.

------------------------

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[320] Matt. xix. 29.

[321] Matt. v. 3-11.

[322] Matt. xi. 2-6.

[323] [This is a good description of ideal Manich�an religious life.

Whether Faustus lived up to the claims here set forth is another

question.--A.H.N.]

[324] Matt. vii. 21.

[325] Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

[326] John xv. 14.

[327] John xv. 10.

[328] Matt v. 3-10.

[329] Matt. xxv. 35.

[330] Matt. xix. 21.

[331] Matt. xvi. 7.

[332] 1 Cor. xv. 47.

[333] Gal. i. 8, 9.

[334] 2 Tim. ii. 8.

[335] Rom. iv. 25.

[336] John v. 25-27.

[337] Acts. i. 14.

[338] John iii. 14, 15.

[339] 1 John v. 20, iv. 3.

[340] 1 Cor. xiii. 3.

[341] 1 Tim. i. 5.

[342] [Augustin confounds saving faith with orthodox doctrine, as has

been too commonly done since.--A.H.N.]

[343] 1 Cor. vii. 5, 6.

[344] 1 Cor. vi. 7, 4.

[345] Matt. x. 38-42.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Book VI.

Faustus avows his disbelief in the Old Testament and his disregard of

its precepts, and accuses Catholics of inconsistency in neglecting its

ordinances, while claiming to accept it as authoritative. Augustin

explains the Catholic view of the relation of the Old Testament to the

New.

1. Faustus said: You ask if I believe the Old Testament. Of course

not, for I do not keep its precepts. Neither, I imagine, do you. I

reject circumcision as disgusting; and if I mistake not, so do you. I

reject the observance of Sabbaths as superfluous: I suppose you do the

same. I reject sacrifice as idolatry, as doubtless you also do.

Swine's flesh is not the only flesh I abstain from; nor is it the only

flesh you eat. I think all flesh unclean: you think none unclean.

Both alike, in these opinions, throw over the Old Testament. We both

look upon the weeks of unleavened bread and the feast of tabernacles as

unnecessary and useless. Not to patch linen garments with purple; to

count it adultery to make a garment of linen and wool; to call it

sacrilege to yoke together an ox and an ass when necessary; not to

appoint as priest a bald man, or a man with red hair, or any similar

peculiarity, as being unclean in the sight of God, are things which we

both despise and laugh at, and rank as of neither first nor second

importance; and yet they are all precepts and judgments of the Old

Testament. You cannot blame me for rejecting the Old Testament; for

whether it is right or wrong to do so, you do it as much as I. As for

the difference between your faith and mine, it is this, that while you

choose to act deceitfully, and meanly to praise in words what in your

heart you hate, I, not having learned the art of deception, frankly

declare that I hate both these abominable precepts and their authors.

2. Augustin replied: How and for what purpose the Old Testament is

received by the heirs of the New Testament has been already explained.

[346] But as the remarks of Faustus were then about the promises of

the Old Testament, and now he speaks of the precepts, I reply that he

displays ignorance of the difference between moral and symbolical

precepts. For example, "Thou shalt not covet" is a moral precept;

"Thou shalt circumcise every male on the eighth day" is a symbolical

precept. From not making this distinction, the Manich�ans, and all who

find fault with the writings of the Old Testament, not seeing that

whatever observance God appointed for the former dispensation was a

shadow of future things, because these observances are now

discontinued, condemn them, though no doubt what is unsuitable now was

perfectly suitable then as prefiguring the things now revealed. In

this they contradict the apostle who says, "All these things happened

to them for an example, and they were written for our learning, on whom

the end of the world is come." [347] The apostle here explains why

these writings are to be received, and why it is no longer necessary to

continue the symbolical observances. For when he says, "They were

written for our learning," he clearly shows that we should be very

diligent in reading and in discovering the meaning of the Old Testament

Scriptures, and that we should have great veneration for them, since it

was for us that they were written. Again, when he says, "They are our

examples," and "these things happened to them for an example," he shows

that, now that the things themselves are clearly revealed, the

observance of the actions by which these things were prefigured is no

longer binding. So he says elsewhere, "Let no man judge you in meat,

or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon or of the

sabbath-days, which are a shadow of things to come." [348] Here also,

when he says, "Let no one judge you" in these things, he shows that we

are no longer bound to observe them. And when he says, "which are a

shadow of things to come," he explains how these observances were

binding at the time when the things fully disclosed to us were

symbolized by these shadows of future things.

3. Assuredly, if the Manich�ans were justified by the resurrection of

the Lord,--the day of whose resurrection, the third after His passion,

was the eighth day, coming after the Sabbath, that is, after the

seventh day,--their carnal minds would be delivered from the darkness

of earthly passions which rests on them; and rejoicing in the

circumcision of the heart, they would not ridicule it as prefigured in

the Old Testament by circumcision in the flesh, although they should

not enforce this observance under the New Testament. But, as the

apostle says, "To the pure all things are pure. But to the impure and

unbelieving nothing is pure, but both their mind and conscience are

defiled." [349] So these people, who are so pure in their own eyes,

that they regard, or pretend to regard, as impure these members of

their bodies, are so defiled with unbelief and error, that, while they

abhor the circumcision of the flesh,--which the apostle calls a seal of

the righteousness of faith,--they believe that the divine members of

their God are subjected to restraint and contamination in these very

carnal members of theirs. For they say that flesh is unclean; and it

follows that God, in the part which is detained by the flesh, is made

unclean: for they declare that He must be cleansed, and that till this

is done, as far as it can be done, He undergoes all the passions to

which flesh is subject, not only in suffering pain and distress, but

also in sensual gratification. For it is for His sake, they say, that

they abstain from sexual intercourse, that He may not be bound more

closely in the bondage of the flesh, nor suffer more defilement. The

apostle says, "To the pure all things are pure." And if this is true

of men, who may be led into evil by a perverse will, how much more must

all things be pure to God, who remains for ever immutable and

immaculate! In those books which you defile with your violent

reproaches, it is said of the divine wisdom, that "no defiled thing

falleth into it, and it goeth everywhere by reason of its pureness."

[350] It is mere prurient absurdity to find fault with the sign of

human regeneration appointed by that God, to whom all things are pure,

to be put on the organ of human generation, while you hold that your

God, to whom nothing is pure, is in a part of his nature subjected to

taint and corruption by the vicious actions in which impure men employ

the members of their body. For if you think there is pollution in

conjugal intercourse, what must there be in all the practices of the

licentious? If you ask, then, as you often do, whether God could not

find some other way of sealing the righteousness of faith, the answer

is, Why not this way, since all things are pure to the pure, much more

to God? And we have the authority of the apostle for saying that

circumcision was the seal of the righteousness of the faith of

Abraham. As for you, you must try not to blush when you are asked

whether your God had nothing better to do than to entangle part of his

nature with these members that you revile so much. These are delicate

subjects to speak of, on account of the penal corruption attending the

propagation of man. They are things which call into exercise the

modesty of the chaste, the passions of the impure, and the justice of

God.

4. The rest of the Sabbath we consider no longer binding as an

observance, now that the hope of our eternal rest has been revealed.

But it is a very useful thing to read of, and to reflect on. In

prophetic times, when things now manifested were prefigured and

predicted by actions as well as words, this sign of which we read was a

presage of the reality which we possess. But I wish to know why you

observe a sort of partial rest. The Jews, on their Sabbath, which they

still keep in a carnal manner, neither gather any fruit in the field,

nor dress and cook it at home. But you, in your rest, wait till one of

your followers takes his knife or hook to the garden, to get food for

you by murdering the vegetables, and brings back, strange to say,

living corpses. For if cutting plants is not murder, why are you

afraid to do it? And yet, if the plants are murdered, what becomes of

the life which is to obtain release and restoration from your

mastication and digestion? Well, you take the living vegetables, and

certainly you ought, if it could be done to swallow them whole; so that

after the one wound your follower has been guilty of inflicting in

pulling them, of which you will no doubt consent to absolve him, they

may reach without loss or injury your private laboratory, where your

God may be healed of his wound. Instead of this, you not only tear

them with your teeth, but, if it pleases your taste, mince them,

inflicting a multitude of wounds in the most criminal manner. Plainly

it would be a most advantageous thing if you would rest at home too,

and not only once a week, like the Jews, but every day of the week.

The cucumbers suffer while you are cooking them, without any benefit to

the life that is in them: for a boiling pot cannot be compared to a

saintly stomach. And yet you ridicule as superfluous the rest of the

Sabbath. Would it not be better, not only to refrain from finding

fault with the fathers for this observance, in whose case it was not

superfluous, but, even now that it is superfluous, to observe this rest

yourselves instead of your own, which has no symbolical use, and is

condemned as grounded on falsehood? According to your own foolish

opinions, you are guilty of a defective observance of your own rest,

though the observance itself is foolish in the judgment of truth. You

maintain that the fruit suffers when it is pulled from the tree, when

it is cut and scraped, and cooked, and eaten. So you are wrong in

eating anything that can not be swallowed raw and unhurt, so that the

wound inflicted might not be from you, but from your follower in

pulling them. You declare that you could not give release to so great

a quantity of life, if you were to eat only things which could be

swallowed without cooking or mastication. But if this release

compensates for all the pains you inflict, why is it unlawful for you

to pull the fruit? Fruit may be eaten raw, as some of your sect make a

point of eating raw vegetables of all kinds. But before it can be

eaten at all, it must be pulled or fall off, or be taken in some way

from the ground or from the tree. You might well be pardoned for

pulling it, since nothing can be done without that, but not for

torturing the members of your God to the extent you do in dressing your

food. One of your silly notions is that the tree weeps when the fruit

is pulled. Doubtless the life in the tree knows all things, and

perceives who it is that comes to it. If the elect were to come and

pull the fruit, would not the tree rejoice to escape the misery of

having its fruit plucked by others, and to gain felicity by enduring a

little momentary pain? And yet, while you multiply the pains and

troubles of the fruit after it is plucked, you will not pluck it.

Explain that, if you can! Fasting itself is a mistake in your case.

There should be no intermission in the task of purging away the dross

of the excrements from the spiritual gold, and of releasing the divine

members from confinement. The most merciful man among you is he who

keeps himself always in good health, takes raw food, and eats a great

deal. But you are cruel when you eat, in making your food undergo so

much suffering; and you are cruel when you fast, in desisting from the

work of liberating the divine members. [351]

5. With all this, you venture to denounce the sacrifices of the Old

Testament, and to call them idolatry, and to attribute to us the same

impious notion. To answer for ourselves in the first place, while we

consider it no longer a duty to offer sacrifices, we recognize

sacrifices as part of the mysteries of Revelation, by which the things

prophesied were foreshadowed. For they were our examples, and in many

and various ways they all pointed to the one sacrifice which we now

commemorate. Now that this sacrifice has been revealed, and has been

offered in due time, sacrifice is no longer binding as an act of

worship, while it retains its symbolical authority. For these things

"were written for our learning, upon whom the end of the world is

come." [352] What you object to in sacrifice is the slaughter of

animals, though the whole animal creation is intended conditionally in

some way for the use of man. You are merciful to beasts, believing

them to contain the souls of human beings, while you refuse a piece of

bread to a hungry beggar. The Lord Jesus, on the other hand, was cruel

to the swine when He granted the request of the devils to be allowed to

enter into them. [353] The same Lord Jesus, before the sacrifice of

His passion, said to a leper whom He had cured, "Go, show thyself to

the priest, and give the offering, as Moses commanded, for a testimony

unto them." [354] When God, by the prophets, repeatedly declares that

He needs no offering, as indeed reason teaches us that offerings cannot

be needed by Him who stands in need of nothing, the human mind is led

to inquire what God wished to teach us by these sacrifices. For,

assuredly, He would not have required offerings of which He had no

need, except to teach us something that it would profit us to know, and

which was suitably set forth by means of these symbols. How much

better and more honorable it would be for you to be still bound by

these sacrifices, which have an instructive meaning, though they are

not now necessary, than to require your followers to offer to you as

food what you believe to be living victims. The Apostle Paul says most

appropriately of some who preached the gospel to gratify their

appetite, that their "god was their belly." [355] But the arrogance

of your impiety goes much beyond this; for, instead of making your

belly your god, you do what is far worse in making your belly the

purifier of God. Surely it is great madness to make a pretence of

piety in not slaughtering animals, while you hold that the souls of

animals inhabit all the food you eat, and yet make what you call living

creatures suffer such torture from your hands and teeth.

6. If you will not eat flesh why should you not slay animals in

sacrifice to your God, in order that their souls, which you hold to be

not only human, but so divine as to be members of God Himself, may be

released from the confinement of flesh, and be saved from returning by

the efficacy of your prayers? Perhaps, however, your stomach gives

more effectual aid than your intellect, and that part of divinity which

has had the advantage of passing through your bowels is more likely to

be saved than that which has only the benefit of your prayers. Your

objection to eating flesh will be that you cannot eat animals alive,

and so the operation of your stomach will not avail for the liberation

of their souls. Happy vegetables, that, torn up with the hand, cut

with knives, tortured in fire, ground by teeth, yet reach alive the

altars of your intestines! Unhappy sheep and oxen, that are not so

tenacious of life, and therefore are refused entrance into your

bodies! Such is the absurdity of your notions. And you persist in

making out an opposition in us to the Old Testament, because we

consider no flesh unclean: according to the opinion of the apostle,

"To the pure all things are pure;" [356] and according to the saying of

our Lord Himself, "Not that which goeth into your mouth defileth you,

but that which cometh out." [357] This was not said to the crowd

only, as your Adimantus, whom Faustus, in his attack on the Old

Testament, praises as second only to Manich�us, wishes us to

understand; but when retired from the crowd, the Lord repeated this

still more plainly and pointedly to His disciples. Adimantus quotes

this saying of our Lord in opposition to the Old Testament, where the

people are prohibited from eating some animals which are pronounced

unclean; and doubtless he was afraid that he should be asked why, since

he quotes a passage from the Gospel about man not being defiled by what

enters into his mouth and passes into his belly, and out into the

draft, he yet considers not some only, but all flesh unclean, and

abstains from eating it. It is in order to escape from this strait,

when the plain truth is too much for his error, that he makes the Lord

say this to the crowd; as if the Lord were in the habit of speaking the

truth only in small companies, while He blurted out falsehoods in

public. To speak of the Lord in this way is blasphemy. And all who

read the passage can see that the Lord said the same thing more plainly

to His disciples in private. Since Faustus praises Adimantus so much

at the beginning of this book of his, placing him next to Manich�us,

let him say in a word whether it is true or false that a man is not

defiled by what enters into his mouth. If it is false, why does this

great teacher Adimantus quote it against the Old Testament? If it is

true, why, in spite of this, do you believe that eating any flesh will

defile you? It is true, if you choose this explanation, that the

apostle does not say that all things are pure to heretics, but, "to the

pure all things are pure." The apostle also goes on to explain why all

things are not pure to heretics: "To the impure and unbelieving

nothing is pure, but both their mind and conscience are defiled." [358]

So to the Manich�ans there is absolutely nothing pure; for they hold

that the very substance or nature of God not only may be, but has

actually been defiled, and so defiled that it can never be wholly

restored and purified. What do they mean when they call animals

unclean, and refrain from eating them, when it is impossible for them

to think anything, whether food or whatever it may be, clean?

According to them, vegetables too, fruits, all kinds of crops, the

earth and sky, are defiled by mixture with the race of darkness. Why

do they not act up to their opinions about other things as well as

about animals? Why do they not abstain altogether, and starve

themselves to death, instead of persisting in their blasphemies? If

they will not repent and reform, this is evidently the best thing that

they could do.

7. The saying of the apostle, that "to the pure all things are pure,"

and that "every creature of God is good," is not opposed to the

prohibitions of the Old Testament; and the explanation, if they can

understand it, is this. The apostle speaks of the natures of the

things, while the Old Testament calls some animals unclean, not in

their nature, but symbolically, on account of the prefigurative

character of that dispensation. For instance, a pig and a lamb are

both clean in their nature, for every creature of God is good; but

symbolically, a lamb is clean, and a pig unclean. So the words wise

and fool are both clean in their nature, as words composed of letters

but fool may be called symbolically unclean, because it means an

unclean thing. Perhaps a pig is the same among symbols as a fool is

among real things. The animal, and the four letters which compose the

word, may mean the same thing. No doubt the animal is pronounced

unclean by the law, because it does not chew the cud; which is not a

fault but its nature. But the men of whom this animal is a symbol are

unclean, not by nature, but from their own fault; because, though they

gladly hear the words of wisdom, they never reflect on them

afterwards. For to recall, in quiet repose, some useful instruction

from the stomach of memory to the mouth of reflection, is a kind of

spiritual rumination. The animals above mentioned are a symbol of

those people who do not do this. And the prohibition of the flesh of

these animals is a warning against this fault. Another passage of

Scripture speaks of the precious treasure of wisdom, and describes

ruminating as clean, and not ruminating as unclean: "A precious

treasure resteth in the mouth of a wise man; but a foolish man swallows

it up." [359] Symbols of this kind, either in words or in things,

give useful and pleasant exercise to intelligent minds in the way of

inquiry and comparison. But formerly people were required not only to

hear, but to practise many such things. For at that time it was

necessary that, by deeds as well as by words, those things should be

foreshadowed which were in after times to be revealed. After the

revelation by Christ and in Christ, the community of believers is not

burdened with the practice of the observances, but is admonished to

give heed to the prophecy. This is our reason for accounting no

animals unclean, in accordance with the saying of the Lord and of the

apostle, while we are not opposed to the Old Testament, where some

animals are pronounced unclean. Now let us hear why you consider all

animal food unclean.

8. One of your false doctrines is, that flesh is unclean on account of

mixture with the race of darkness. But this would make not only flesh

unclean, but your God himself, in that part which he sent to become

subject to absorption and contamination, in order that the enemy might

be conquered and taken captive. Besides, on account of this mixture,

all that you eat must be unclean. But you say flesh is especially

unclean. It requires patience to listen to all their absurd reasons

for this peculiar impurity of flesh. I will mention only what will

suffice to show the inveterate folly of these critics of the Old

Testament, who, while they denounce flesh, savor only fleshly things,

and have no sort of spiritual perception. And a lengthy discussion of

this question may perhaps enable us to dispense with saying much on

some other points. The following, then, is an account of their vain

delusions in this matter:--In that battle, when the First Man ensnared

the race of darkness by deceitful elements, princes of both sexes

belonging to this race were taken. By means of these princes the world

was constructed; and among those used in the formation of the heavenly

bodies, were some pregnant females. When the sky began to rotate, the

rapid circular motion made these females give birth to abortions,

which, being of both sexes, fell on the earth, and lived, and grew, and

came together, and produced offspring. Hence sprang all animal life in

earth, air, and sea. [360] Now if the origin of flesh is from heaven,

that is no reason for thinking it especially unclean. Indeed, in this

construction of the world, they hold that these principles of darkness

were arranged higher or lower, according to the greater or less amount

of good mixed with them in the construction of the various parts of the

world. So flesh ought to be cleaner than vegetables which come out of

the earth, for it comes from heaven. And how irrational to suppose

that the abortions, before becoming animate, were so lively, though in

an abortive state, that after falling from the sky, they could live and

multiply; whereas, after becoming animate, they die if brought forth

prematurely, and a fall from a very moderate height is enough to kill

them! The kingdom of life in contest with the kingdom of death ought

to have improved them, by giving them life instead of making them more

perishable than before. If the perishableness is a consequence of a

change of nature, it is wrong to say that there is a bad nature. The

change is the only cause of the perishableness. Both natures are good,

though one is better than the other. Whence then comes the peculiar

impurity of flesh as it exists in this world, sprung, as they say, from

heaven? They tell us, indeed, of the first bodies of these principles

of darkness being generated like worms from trees of darkness; and the

trees, they say, are produced from the five elements. But supposing

that the bodies of animals come in the first place from trees, and

afterwards from heaven, why should they be more unclean than the fruit

of trees? Perhaps it will be said that what remains after death is

unclean, because the life is no longer there. For the same reason

fruits and vegetables must be unclean, for they die when they are

pulled or cut. As we saw before, the elect get others to bring their

food to them, that they may not be guilty of murder. Perhaps, since

they say that every living being has two souls, one of the race of

light, and the other of the race of darkness, the good soul leaves at

death, and the bad soul remains. But, in that case, the animal would

be as much alive as it was in the kingdom of darkness, when it had only

the soul of its own race, with which it had rebelled against the

kingdom of God. So, since both souls leave at death, why call the

flesh unclean, as if only the good soul had left? Any life that

remains must be of both kinds; for some remains of the members of God

are found, we are told, even in filth. There is therefore no reason

for making flesh more unclean than fruits. The truth is, they pretend

to great chastity in holding flesh unclean because it is generated.

But if the divine body is more grossly shut in by flesh, there is all

the more reason that they should liberate it by eating. And there are

innumerable kinds of worms not produced from sexual intercourse; some

in the neighborhood of Venice come from trees, which they should eat,

since there is not the same reason for their being unclean. Besides,

there are the frogs produced by the earth after a shower of rain. [361]

Let them liberate the members of their God from these. Let them

rebuke the mistake of mankind in preferring fowls and pigeons produced

from males and females to the pure frogs, daughters of heaven and

earth. By this theory, the first principles of darkness produced from

trees must be purer than Manich�us, who was produced by generation; and

his followers, for the same reason, must be less pure than the lice

which spring from the perspiration of their bodies. But if everything

that comes from flesh is unclean, because the origin of flesh itself is

unclean, fruits and vegetables must also be unclean, because they are

manured with dung. After this, what becomes of the notion that fruits

are cleaner than flesh? Dung is the most unclean product of flesh, and

also the most fertilizing manure. Their doctrine is, that the life

escapes in the mastication and digestion of the food, so that only a

particle remains in the excrement. How is it, then, that this particle

of life has such an effect on the growth and the quality of your

favorite food? Flesh is nourished by the productions of the earth, not

by its excrements; while the earth is nourished by the excrements of

flesh, not by its productions. Let them say which is the cleaner. Or

let them turn from being unbelieving and impure to whom nothing is

clean, and join with us in embracing the doctrine of the apostle, that

to the pure all things are pure; that the earth is the Lord's, and the

fullness thereof; that every creature of God is good. All things in

nature are good in their own order; and no one sins in using them,

unless, by disobedience to God, he transgresses his own order, and

disturbs their order by using them amiss.

9. The elders who pleased God kept their own order by their obedience,

in observing, according to God's arrangement, what was appointed as

suitable to certain times. So, although all animals intended for food

are by nature clean, they abstained from some which had then a

symbolical uncleanness, in preparation for the future revelation of the

things signified. And so with regard to unleavened bread and all such

things, in which the apostle says there was a shadow of future things,

neglect of their observance under the old dispensation, when this

observance was enjoined, and was employed to prefigure what was

afterwards to be revealed, would have been as criminal, as it would now

be foolish in us, after the light of the New Testament has arisen, to

think that these predictive observances could be of any use to us. On

the other hand, since the Old Testament teaches us that the things now

revealed were so long ago prefigured, that we may be firm and faithful

in our adherence to them, it would be blasphemy and impiety to discard

these books, simply because the Lord requires of us now not a literal,

but a spiritual and intelligent regard to their contents. They were

written, as the apostle says, for our admonition, on whom the end of

the world is come. [362] "For whatsoever things were written

aforetime were written for our learning." [363] Not to eat unleavened

bread in the appointed seven days was a sin in the time of the Old

Testament; in the time of the New Testament it is not a sin. But

having the hope of a future world through Christ, who makes us

altogether new by clothing our souls with righteousness and our bodies

with immortality, to believe that the bondage and infirmity of our

original corruption will prevail over us or over our actions, must

continue to be a sin, till the seven days of the course of time are

accomplished. In the time of the Old Testament, this, under the

disguise of a type, was perceived by some saints. In the time of the

New Testament it is fully declared and publicly preached. [364]

What was then a precept of Scripture is now a testimony. Formerly, not

to keep the feast of tabernacles was a sin, which is not the case now.

But not to form part of the building of God's tabernacle, which is the

Church, is always a sin. Formerly this was acted in a figure; now the

record serves as testimony. The ancient tabernacle, indeed, would not

have been called the tabernacle of the testimony, unless as an

appropriate symbol it had borne testimony to some truth which was to be

revealed in its own time. To patch linen garments with purple, or to

wear a garment of woollen and linen together, is not a sin now. But to

live intemperately, and to wish to combine opposite modes of life,--as

when a woman devoted to religion wears the ornaments of married women,

or when one who has not abstained from marriage dresses like a

virgin,--is always sin. So it is sin whenever inconsistent things are

combined in any man's life. This, which is now a moral truth, was then

symbolized in dress. What was then a type is now revealed truth. So

the same Scripture which then required symbolical actions, now

testifies to the things signified. The prefigurative observance is now

a record for the confirmation of our faith. Formerly it was unlawful

to plough with an ox and an ass together; now it is lawful. The

apostle explains this when he quotes the text about not muzzling the ox

that is treading out the corn. He says, "Does God care for oxen?"

What, then, have we to do with an obsolete prohibition? The apostle

teaches us in the following words, "For our sakes it is written." [365]

It must be impiety in us not to read what was written for our sakes;

for it is more for our sakes, to whom the revelation belongs, than for

theirs who had only the figure. There is no harm in joining an ox with

an ass where it is required. But to put a wise man and a fool

together, not that one should teach and the other obey, but that both

with equal authority should declare the word of God, cannot be done

without causing offence. So the same Scripture which was once a

command enjoining the shadow in which future things were veiled, is now

an authoritative witness to the unveiled truth.

In what he says of the uncleanness of a man that is bald or has red

hair, Faustus is inaccurate, or the manuscript he has used is

incorrect. [366] Would that Faustus were not ashamed to bear on his

forehead the cross of Christ, the want of which is baldness, instead of

maintaining that Christ, who says, "I am the truth," showed unreal

marks, after His resurrection, of unreal wounds! Faustus says he has

not learned the art of deceiving, and speaks what he thinks. He cannot

therefore be a disciple of his Christ, whom he madly declares to have

shown false marks of wounds to his disciples when they doubted. Are we

to believe Faustus, not only in his other absurdities, but also when he

tells us that he does not deceive us in calling Christ a deceiver? Is

he better than Christ? Is he not a deceiver, while Christ is? Or does

he prove himself to be a disciple not of the truthful Christ, but of

the deceiver Manich�us, by this very falsehood, when he boasts that he

has not learned the art of deceiving?

------------------------

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[346] Book iv.

[347] 1 Cor. x. 6.

[348] Col. ii. 16, 17.

[349] Tit. i. 15.

[350] Wisd. vii. 24, 25.

[351] [In bringing to notice the absurdities of the Manich�an moral

system, Augustin may seem to be trifling, but he is in reality striking

at the root of the heresy.--A.H.N.]

[352] 1 Cor. x. 11.

[353] Matt. viii. 32.

[354] Luke v. 14.

[355] Phil. iii. 19.

[356] Tit. i. 15.

[357] Matt. xvi. 11.

[358] Tit. i. 15.

[359] Prov. xxi. 20.

[360] [Compare the Introduction, where an abstract is given of the

Fihrist's account of the creation.--A.H.N.]

[361] [These biological blunders belong to the age, and are not

Augustin's peculiar fancies. Of course, the argumentative value of

them depends on their general acceptance.--A.H.N.]

[362] 1 Cor. x. 11.

[363] Rom. xv. 4.

[364] [It will be seen in subsequent portions of this treatise that

Augustin carries the typological idea to an absurd extreme.--A.H.N.]

[365] 1 Cor. ix. 9, 10.

[366] Cf. Lev. xxi. 18.
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Book VII.

The genealogical question is again taken up and argued on both sides.

1. Faustus said: You ask why I do not believe in the genealogy of

Jesus. There are many reasons; but the principal is, that He never

declares with His own lips that He had an earthly father or descent,

but on the contrary, that he is not of this world, that He came forth

from God the Father, that He descended from heaven, that He has no

mother or brethren except those who do the will of His Father in

heaven. Besides, the framers of these genealogies do not seem to have

known Jesus before His birth or soon after it, so as to have the

credibility of eye-witnesses of what they narrate. They became

acquainted with Jesus as a young man of about thirty years of age, if

it is not blasphemy to speak of the age of a divine being. Now the

question regarding a witness is always whether he has seen or heard

what he testifies to. But the writers of these genealogies never

assert that they heard the account from Jesus Himself, nor even the

fact of His birth; nor did they see Him till they came to know Him

after his baptism, many years after the time of His birth. To me,

therefore, and to every sensible man, it appears as foolish to believe

this account, as it would be to call into court a blind and deaf

witness.

2. Augustin replied: As regards what Faustus calls his principal

reason for not receiving the genealogy of Jesus Christ, a complete

refutation is found in the passages formerly quoted, where Christ

declares Himself to be the Son of man, and in what we have said of the

identity of the Son of man with the Son of God: that in His Godhead He

has no earthly descent, while after the flesh He is of the seed of

David, as the apostle teaches. We are to believe, therefore, that He

came forth from the Father, that He descended from heaven, and also

that the Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst men. If the words, "Who

is my mother, and who are my brethren?" [367] are quoted to show that

Christ had no earthly mother or descent, it follows that we must

believe that His disciples, whom He here teaches by His own example to

set no value on earthly relationship, as compared with the kingdom of

heaven, had no fathers, because Christ says to them, "Call no man

father upon earth; for one is your Father, even God." [368] What He

taught them to do with reference to their fathers, He Himself first did

in reference to His own mother and brethren; as in many other things He

condescended to set us an example, and to go before that we might

follow in His footsteps. Faustus' principal objection to the genealogy

fails completely; and after the defeat of this invincible force, the

rest is easily routed. He says that the apostles who declared Christ

to be the Son of man as well as the Son of God are not to be believed,

because they were not present at the birth of Christ, whom they joined

when He had reached manhood, nor heard of it from Christ Himself. Why

then do they believe John 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 by Him, and without Him was

not anything made," [369] and such passages, which they agree to,

without understanding them? Where did John see this, or did he ever

hear it from the Lord Himself? In whatever way John learned this,

those who narrate the nativity may have learned also. Again, how do

they know that the Lord said, "Who is my mother, and who are my

brethren?" If on the authority of the evangelist, why do they not also

believe that the mother and the brethren of Christ were seeking for

Him? They believe that Christ said these words, which they

misunderstand, while they deny a fact resting on the same authority.

Once more, if Matthew could not know that Christ was born, because he

knew Him only in His manhood, how could Manich�us, who lived so long

after, know that He was not born? They will say that Manich�us knew

this from the Holy Spirit which was in him. Certainly the Holy Spirit

would make him speak the truth. But why not rather believe what

Christ's own disciples tell us, who were personally acquainted with

Him, and who not only had the gift of inspiration to supply defects in

their knowledge, but in a purely natural way obtained information of

the birth of Christ, and of His descent, when the event was fresh in

memory? And yet he dares to call the apostles deaf and blind. Why

were you not deaf and blind, to prevent you from learning such profane

nonsense, and dumb too, to prevent you from uttering it?

------------------------
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[367] Matt. xii. 48.

[368] Matt. xxiii. 9.

[369] John i. 1-5.
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Book VIII.

Faustus maintains that to hold to the Old Testament after the giving of

the New is putting new cloth on an old garment. Augustin further

explains the relation of the Old Testament to the New, and reproaches

the Manich�ans with carnality.

1. Faustus said: Another reason for not receiving the Old Testament

is, that I am provided with the New; and Scripture says that old and

new do not agree. For "no one putteth a piece of new cloth unto an old

garment, otherwise the rent is made worse." [370] To avoid making a

worse rent, as you have done, I do not mix Christian newness with

Hebrew oldness. Every one accounts it mean, when a man has got a new

dress, not to give the old one to his inferiors. So, even if I were a

Jew by birth, as the apostles were, it would be proper for me, on

receiving the New Testament, to discard the Old, as the apostles did.

And having the advantage of being born free from the yoke of bondage,

and being early introduced into the full liberty of Christ, what a

foolish and ungrateful wretch I should be to put myself again under the

yoke! This is what Paul blames the Galatians for; because, going back

to circumcision, they turned again to the weak and beggarly elements,

whereunto they desired again to be in bondage. [371] Why should I do

what I see another blamed for doing? My going into bondage would be

worse than their returning to it.

2. Augustin replied: We have already shown sufficiently why and how

we maintain the authority of the Old Testament, not for the imitation

of Jewish bondage, but for the confirmation of Christian liberty. It

is not I, but the apostle, who says, "All these things happened to them

as an example, and they were written for our admonition, on whom the

ends of the world are come." [372] We do not therefore, as bondmen,

observe what was enjoined as predictive of us; but as free, we read

what was written to confirm us. So any one may see that the apostle

remonstrates with the Galatians not for devoutly reading what Scripture

says of circumcision, but for superstitiously desiring to be

circumcised. We do not put a new cloth to an old garment, but we are

instructed in the kingdom of heaven, like the householder, whom the

Lord describes as bringing out of his treasure things new and old.

[373] He who puts a new cloth to an old garment is the man who

attempts spiritual self-denial before he has renounced fleshly hope.

Examine the passage, and you will see that, when the Lord was asked

about fasting, He replied, "No man putteth a new cloth to an old

garment." The disciples had still a carnal affection for the Lord; for

they were afraid that, if He died, they would lose Him. So He calls

Peter Satan for dissuading Him from suffering, because he understood

not the things of God, but the things of men. [374] The fleshly

character of your hope is evident from your fancies about the kingdom

of God, and from your paying homage and devotion to the light of the

sun, which the carnal eye perceives, as if it were an image of heaven.

So your carnal mind is the old garment to which you join your fasts.

Moreover, if a new cloth and an old garment do not agree, how do the

members of your God come to be not only joined or fastened, but to be

united far more intimately by mixture and coherence to the principles

of darkness? Perhaps both are old, because both are false, and both of

the carnal mind. Or perhaps you wish to prove that one was new and the

other old, by the rent being made worse, in tearing away the unhappy

piece of the kingdom of light, to be doomed to eternal imprisonment in

the mass of darkness. So this pretended artist in the fashions of the

sacred Scriptures is found stitching together absurdities, and dressing

himself in the rags of his own invention.

------------------------
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[370] Matt. ix. 16.

[371] Gal. iv. 9.

[372] 1 Cor. x. 11.

[373] Matt. xiii. 52.

[374] Matt. xvi. 23.
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Book IX.

Faustus argues that if the apostles born under the old covenant could

lawfully depart from it, much more can he having been born a Gentile.

Augustin explains the relation of Jews and Gentiles alike to the

Gospel.

1. Faustus said: Another reason for not receiving the Old Testament

is, that if it was allowable for the apostles, who were born under it,

to abandon it, much more may I, who was not born under it, be excused

for not thrusting myself into it. We Gentiles are not born Jews, nor

Christians either. Out of the same Gentile world some are induced by

the Old Testament to become Jews, and some by the New Testament to

become Christians. It is as if two trees, a sweet and a bitter, drew

from one soil the sap which each assimilates to its own nature. The

apostle passed from the bitter to the sweet; it would be madness in me

to change from the sweet to the bitter.

2. Augustin replied: You say that the apostle, in leaving Judaism,

passed from the bitter to the sweet. But the apostle himself says that

the Jews, who would not believe in Christ, were branches broken off,

and that the Gentiles, a wild olive tree, were grafted into the good

olive, that is, the holy stock of the Hebrews, that they might partake

of the fatness of the olive. For, in warning the Gentiles not to be

proud on account of the fall of the Jews, he says: "For I speak to you

Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles. I magnify my

office; if by any means I may provoke to emulation them which are my

flesh, and might save some of them. For if the casting away of them be

the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but

life from the dead? For if the first fruit be holy, the lump is also

holy; and if the root be holy, so are the branches. And if some of the

branches are broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, were

grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness

of the olive tree; boast not against the branches: but if thou boast,

thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, The

branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well; because of

unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not

high-minded, but fear; for if God spared not the natural branches, take

heed lest He also spare not thee. Behold therefore the goodness and

severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee,

goodness, if thou continue in His goodness; otherwise thou also shalt

be cut off. And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall

be grafted in; for God is able to graft them in again. For if thou

wert cut out of the olive tree, which is wild by nature, and wert

grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree; how much more shall

these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive

tree? For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this

mystery (lest ye should be wise in your own conceits), that blindness

in part is happened to Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles be

come in; and so all Israel shall be saved." [375] It appears from

this, that you, who do not wish to be graffed into this root, though

you are not broken off, like the carnal unbelieving Jews, remain still

in the bitterness of the wild olive. Your worship of the sun and moon

has the true Gentile flavor. You are none the less in the wild olive

of the Gentiles, because you have added thorns of a new kind, and

worship along with the sun and moon a false Christ, the fabrication not

of your hands, but of your perverse heart. Come, then, and be grafted

into the root of the olive tree, in his return to which the apostle

rejoices, after by unbelief he had been among the broken branches. He

speaks of himself as set free, when he made the happy transition from

Judaism to Christianity. For Christ was always preached in the olive

tree, and those who did not believe on Him when He came were broken

off, while those who believed were grafted in. These are thus warned

against pride: "Be not high-minded, but fear; for if God spared not

the natural branches, neither will He spare thee." And to prevent

despair of those broken off, he adds: "And they also, if they abide

not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in; for God is able to graft

them in again. For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree, which is

wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive

tree, how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be

grafted into their own olive tree." The apostle rejoices in being

delivered from the condition of a broken branch, and in being restored

to the fatness of the olive tree. So you who have been broken off by

error should return and be grafted in again. Those who are still in

the wild olive should separate themselves from its barrenness, and

become partakers of fertility.

------------------------
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[375] Rom. xi. 16-26.
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Book X.

Faustus insists that the Old Testament promises are radically different

from those of the New. Augustin admits a difference, but maintains

that the moral precepts are the same in both.

1. Faustus said: Another reason for not receiving the Old Testament

is, that both the Old and the New teach us not to covet what belongs to

others. Everything in the Old Testament is of this kind. It promises

riches, and plenty, and children, and children's children, and long

life, and withal the land of Canaan; but only to the circumcised, the

Sabbath observers, those offering sacrifices, and abstaining from

swine's flesh. Now I, like every other Christian, pay no attention to

these things, as being trifling and useless for the salvation of the

soul. I conclude, therefore, that the promises do not belong to me.

And mindful of the commandment, Thou shall not covet, I gladly leave to

the Jews their own property, and content myself with the gospel, and

with the bright inheritance of the kingdom of heaven. If a Jew were to

claim part in the gospel, I should justly reproach him with claiming

what he had no right to, because he does not obey its precepts. And a

Jew might say the same to me if I professed to receive the Old

Testament while I disregard its requirements.

2. Augustin replied: Faustus is not ashamed to repeat the same

nonsense again and again. But it is tiresome to repeat the same

answers, though it is to repeat truth. What Faustus says here has

already been answered. [376] But if a Jew asks me why I profess to

believe the Old Testament while I do not observe its precepts, my reply

is this: The moral precepts of the law are observed by Christians; the

symbolical precepts were properly observed during the time that the

things now revealed were prefigured. Accordingly, those observances,

which I regard as no longer binding, I still look upon as a testimony,

as I do also the carnal promises from which the Old Testament derives

its name. For although the gospel teaches me to hope for eternal

blessings, I also find a confirmation of the gospel in those things

which "happened to them for an example, and were written for our

admonition, on whom the ends of the world are come." So much for our

answer to the Jews. And now we have something to say to the

Manich�ans.

3. By showing the way in which we regard the authority of the Old

Testament we have answered the Jews, by whose question about our not

observing the precepts Faustus thought we would be puzzled. But what

answer can you give to the question, why you deceive simple-minded

people by professing to believe in the New Testament, while you not

only do not believe it, but assail it with all your force? It will be

more difficult for you to answer this than it was for us to answer the

Jews. We hold all that is written in the Old Testament to be true, and

enjoined by God for suitable times. But in your inability to find a

reason for not receiving what is written in the New Testament, you are

obliged, as a last resource, to pretend that the passages are not

genuine. This is the last gasp of a heretic in the clutches of truth;

or rather it is the breath of corruption itself. Faustus, however,

confesses that the Old Testament as well as the New teaches him not to

covet. His own God could never have taught him this. For if this God

did not covet what belonged to another, why did he construct new worlds

in the region of darkness? Perhaps the race of darkness first coveted

his kingdom. But this would be to imitate their bad example. Perhaps

the kingdom of light was previously of small extent, and war was

desirable in order to enlarge it by conquest. In that case, no doubt,

there was covetousness, though the hostile race was allowed to begin

the wars to justify the conquest. If there had been no such desire,

there was no necessity to extend the kingdom beyond its old limits into

the region of the conquered foe. If the Manich�ans would only learn

from these Scriptures the moral precepts, one of which is, Do not

covet, instead of taking offence at the symbolical precept, they would

acknowledge in meekness and candor that they suited the time then

present. We do not covet what belongs to another, when we read in the

Old Testament what "happened to them for examples, and was written for

our admonition, on whom the ends of the world are come." It is surely

not coveting when a man reads what is written for his benefit.

------------------------
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[376] Book vi. 2.
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Book XI.

Faustus quotes passages to show that the Apostle Paul abandoned belief

in the incarnation, to which he earlier held. Augustin shows that the

apostle was consistent with himself in the utterances quoted.

1. Faustus said: Assuredly I believe the apostle. And yet I do not

believe that the Son of God was born of the seed of David according to

the flesh, [377] because I do not believe that God's apostle could

contradict himself, and have one opinion about our Lord at one time,

and another at another. But, granting that he wrote this,--since you

will not hear of anything being spurious in his writings,--it is not

against us. For this seems to be Paul's old belief about Jesus, when

he thought, like everybody else, that Jesus was the son of David.

Afterwards, when he learned that this was false, he corrects himself;

and in his Epistle to the Corinthians he says: "We know no man after

the flesh; yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now

henceforth know we Him no more." [378] Observe the difference between

these two verses. In one he asserts that Jesus was the son of David

after the flesh; in the other he says that now he knows no man after

the flesh. If Paul wrote both, it can only have been in the way I have

stated. In the next verse he adds: "Therefore, if any man be in

Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold, all

things are become new." The belief that Jesus was born of the seed of

David according to the flesh is of this old transitory kind; whereas

the faith which knows no man after the flesh is new and permanent. So,

he says elsewhere: "When I was a child, I spoke as a child, I

understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I

put away childish things." [379] We are thus warranted in preferring

the new and amended confession of Paul to his old and faulty one. And

if you hold by what is said in the Epistle to the Romans, why should

not we hold by what is said to the Corinthians? But it is only by your

insisting on the correctness of the text that we are made to represent

Paul as building again the things which he destroyed, in spite of his

own repudiation of such prevarication. If the verse is Paul's, he has

corrected himself. If Paul should not be supposed to have written

anything requiring correction, the verse is not his.

2. Augustin replied: As I said a little ago, when these men are beset

by clear testimonies of Scripture, and cannot escape from their grasp,

they declare that the passage is spurious. The declaration only shows

their aversion to the truth, and their obstinacy in error. Unable to

answer these statements of Scripture, they deny their genuineness. But

if this answer is admitted, or allowed to have any weight, it will be

useless to quote any book or any passage against your errors. It is

one thing to reject the books themselves, and to profess no regard for

their authority, as the Pagans reject our Scriptures, and the Jews the

New Testament, and as we reject any books peculiar to your sect, or any

other heretical sect, and also the apocryphal books, which are so

called, not because of any mysterious regard paid to them, but because

they are mysterious in their origin, and in the absence of clear

evidence, have only some obscure presumption to rest upon; and it is

another thing to say, This holy man wrote only the truth, and this is

his epistle, but some verses are his, and some are not. And then, when

you are asked for a proof, instead of referring to more correct or more

ancient manuscripts, or to a greater number, or to the original text,

your reply is, This verse is his, because it makes for me; and this is

not his, because it is against me. Are you, then, the rule of truth?

Can nothing be true that is against you? But what answer could you

give to an opponent as insane as yourself, if he confronts you by

saying, The passage in your favor is spurious, and that against you is

genuine? Perhaps you will produce a book, all of which can be

explained so as to support you. Then, instead of rejecting a passage,

he will reply by condemning the whole book as spurious. You have no

resource against such an opponent. For all the testimony you can bring

in favor of your book from antiquity or tradition will avail nothing.

In this respect the testimony of the Catholic Church is conspicuous, as

supported by a succession of bishops from the original seats of the

apostles up to the present time, and by the consent of so many

nations. Accordingly, should there be a question about the text of

some passage, as there are a few passages with various readings well

known to students of the sacred Scriptures, we should first consult the

manuscripts of the country where the religion was first taught; and if

these still varied, we should take the text of the greater number, or

of the more ancient. And if any uncertainty remained, we should

consult the original text. This is the method employed by those who,

in any question about the Scriptures, do not lose sight of the regard

due to their authority, and inquire with the view of gaining

information, not of raising disputes. [380]

3. As regards the passage from Paul's epistle which teaches, in

opposition to your heresy, that the Son of God was born of the seed of

David, it is found in all manuscripts both new and old of all Churches,

and in all languages. So the profession which Faustus makes of

believing the apostle is hypocritical. Instead of saying, "Assuredly I

believe," he should have said, Assuredly I do not believe, as he would

have said if he had not wished to deceive people. What part of his

belief does he get from the apostle? Not the first man, of whom the

apostle says that he is of the earth, earthy; and again, "The first man

Adam was made a living soul." Faustus' First Man is neither of the

earth, earthy, nor made a living soul, but of the substance of God, and

the same in essence as God; and this being is said to have mixed up

with the race of darkness his members, or vesture, or weapons, that is,

the five elements, which also are part of the substance of God, so that

they became subject to confinement and pollution. Nor does Faustus get

from Paul his Second Man, of whom Paul says that He is from heaven, and

that He is the last Adam, and a quickening spirit; and also that He was

born of the seed of David after the flesh, that He was made of a woman,

made under the law, that He might redeem them that were under the law.

[381] Of Him Paul says to Timothy: "Remember that Jesus Christ, of

the seed of David, was raised from the dead, according to my gospel."

[382] And this resurrection he quotes as an example of our

resurrection: "I delivered unto you first of all that which I also

received, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the

Scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third

day, according to the Scriptures." And a little further on he draws an

inference from this doctrine: "Now, if Christ be preached that He rose

from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of

the dead?" [383] Our professed believer in Paul believes nothing of

all this. He denies that Jesus was born of the seed of David, that He

was made of a woman (by the word woman is not meant a wife in the

common sense of the word, but merely one of the female sex, as in the

book of Genesis, where it is said that God made a woman before she was

brought to Adam [384] ); he denies His death, His burial, and His

resurrection. He holds that Christ had not a mortal body, and

therefore could not really die; and that the marks of His wounds which

He showed to His disciples when He appeared to them alive after His

resurrection, which Paul also mentions, [385] were not real. He

denies, too, that our mortal body will be raised again, changed into a

spiritual body; as Paul teaches: "It is sown a natural body, it is

raised a spiritual body." To illustrate this distinction between the

natural and the spiritual body, the apostle adds what I have quoted

already about the first and the last Adam. Then he goes on: "But this

I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of

God." And to explain what he means by flesh and blood, that it is not

the bodily substance, but corruption, which will not enter into the

resurrection of the just, he immediately says, "Neither shall

corruption inherit incorruption." And in case any one should still

suppose that it is not what is buried that is to rise again, but that

it is as if one garment were laid aside and a better taken instead, he

proceeds to show distinctly that the same body will be changed for the

better, as the garments of Christ on the mount were not displaced, but

transfigured: "Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all be

changed, but we shall all rise." [386] Then he shows who are to be

changed: "In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last

trumpet: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall rise

incorruptible, and we shall be changed." And if it should be said that

it is not as regards our mortal and corruptible body, but as regards

our soul, that we are to be changed, it should be observed that the

apostle is not speaking of the soul, but of the body, as is evident

from the question he starts with: "But some one will say, How are the

dead raised, and with what body do they come?" So also, in the

conclusion of his argument, he leaves no doubt of what he is speaking:

"This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on

immortality." [387] Faustus denies this; and the God whom Paul

declares to be "immortal, incorruptible, to whom alone is glory and

honor," [388] he makes corruptible. For in this monstrous and horrible

fiction of theirs, the substance and nature of God was in danger of

being wholly corrupted by the race of darkness, and to save the rest

part actually was corrupted. And to crown all this, he tries to

deceive the ignorant who are not learned in the sacred Scriptures, by

making this profession: I assuredly believe the Apostle Paul; when he

ought to have said, I assuredly do not believe.

4. But Faustus has a proof to show that Paul changed his mind, and, in

writing to the Corinthians, corrected what he had written to the

Romans; or else that he never wrote the passage which appears as his,

about Jesus Christ being born of the seed of David according to the

flesh. And what is this proof? If the passage, he says, in the

Epistle to the Romans is true, "the Son of God, who was made of the

seed of David according to the flesh," what he says to the Corinthians

cannot be true, "Henceforth know we no man after the flesh; yea, though

we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no

more." We must therefore show that both these passages are true, and

not opposed to one another. The agreement of the manuscripts proves

both to be genuine. In some Latin versions the word "born" [389] is

used instead of "made," [390] which is not so literal a rendering, but

gives the same meaning. For both these translations, as well as the

original, teach that Christ was of the seed of David after the flesh.

We must not for a moment suppose that Paul corrected himself on account

of a change of opinion. Faustus himself felt the impropriety and

impiety of such an explanation, and preferred to say that the passage

was spurious, instead of that Paul was mistaken.

5. As regards our writings, which are not a rule of faith or practice,

but only a help to edification, we may suppose that they contain some

things falling short of the truth in obscure and recondite matters, and

that these mistakes may or may not be corrected in subsequent

treatises. For we are of those of whom the apostle says: "And if ye

be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you." [391] Such

writings are read with the right of judgment, and without any

obligation to believe. In order to leave room for such profitable

discussions of difficult questions, there is a distinct boundary line

separating all productions subsequent to apostolic times from the

authoritative canonical books of the Old and New Testaments. The

authority of these books has come down to us from the apostles through

the successions of bishops and the extension of the Church, and, from a

position of lofty supremacy, claims the submission of every faithful

and pious mind. If we are perplexed by an apparent contradiction in

Scripture, it is not allowable to say, The author of this book is

mistaken; but either the manuscript is faulty, or the translation is

wrong, or you have not understood. In the innumerable books that have

been written latterly we may sometimes find the same truth as in

Scripture, but there is not the same authority. Scripture has a

sacredness peculiar to itself. In other books the reader may form his

own opinion, and perhaps, from not understanding the writer, may differ

from him, and may pronounce in favor of what pleases him, or against

what he dislikes. In such cases, a man is at liberty to withhold his

belief, unless there is some clear demonstration or some canonical

authority to show that the doctrine or statement either must or may be

true. But in consequence of the distinctive peculiarity of the sacred

writings, we are bound to receive as true whatever the canon shows to

have been said by even one prophet, or apostle, or evangelist.

Otherwise, not a single page will be left for the guidance of human

fallibility, if contempt for the wholesome authority of the canonical

books either puts an end to that authority altogether, or involves it

in hopeless confusion. [392]

6. With regard, then, to this apparent contradiction between the

passage which speaks of the Son of God being of the seed of David, to

the words, "Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now

henceforth know we Him no more," even though both quotations were not

from the writings of one apostle,--though one were from Paul, and the

other from Peter, or Isaiah, or any other apostle or prophet,--such is

the equality of canonical authority, that it would not be allowable to

doubt of either. For the utterances of Scripture, harmonious as if

from the mouth of one man, commend themselves to the belief of the most

accurate and clear-sighted piety, and demand for their discovery and

confirmation the calmest intelligence and the most ingenious research.

In the case before us both quotations are from the canonical, that is,

the genuine epistles of Paul. We cannot say that the manuscript is

faulty, for the best Latin translations substantially agree; or that

the translations are wrong, for the best texts have the same reading.

So that, if any one is perplexed by the apparent contradiction, the

only conclusion is that he does not understand. Accordingly it remains

for me to explain how both passages, instead of being contradictory,

may be harmonized by one rule of sound faith. The pious inquirer will

find all perplexity removed by a careful examination.

7. That the Son of God was made man of the seed of David, is not only

said in other places by Paul, but is taught elsewhere in sacred

Scripture. As regards the words, "Though we have known Christ after

the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more," the context shows

what is the apostle's meaning. Here, or elsewhere, he views with an

assured hope, as if it were already present and in actual possession,

our future life, which is now fulfilled in our risen Head and Mediator,

the man Christ Jesus. This life will certainly not be after the flesh,

even as Christ's life is now not after the flesh. For by flesh the

apostle here means not the substance of our bodies, in which sense the

Lord used the word when, after His resurrection, He said, "Handle me,

and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have,"

[393] but the corruption and mortality of flesh, which will then not be

in us, as now it is not in Christ. The apostle uses the word flesh in

the sense of corruption in the passage about the resurrection quoted

before: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither

shall corruption inherit incorruption." So, after the event described

in the next verse, "Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall all rise,

but we shall not all be changed. In a moment, in the twinkling of an

eye, at the last trump (for the trumpet shall sound); and the dead

shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this

corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on

immortality," [394] --then flesh, in the sense of the substance of the

body, will, after this change, no longer have flesh, in the sense of

the corruption of mortality; and yet, as regards its own nature, it

will be the same flesh, the same which rises and which is changed.

What the Lord said after His resurrection is true, "Handle me, and see;

for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have;" and what the

apostle says is true, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of

God." The first is said of the bodily substance, which exists as the

subject of the change: the second is said of the corruption of the

flesh, which will cease to exist, for, after its change, flesh will not

be corrupted. So, "we have known Christ after the flesh," that is,

after the mortality of flesh, before His resurrection; "now henceforth

we know Him no more," because, as the same apostle says, "Christ being

risen from the dead, dieth no more, and death hath no more dominion

over Him." [395] The words, "we have known Christ after the flesh,"

strictly speaking, imply that Christ was after the flesh, for what

never was cannot be known. And it is not "we have supposed," but "we

have known." But not to insist on a word, in case some one should say

that known is used in the sense of supposed, it is astonishing, if one

could be surprised at want of sight in a blind man, that these blind

people do not perceive that if what the apostle says about not knowing

Christ after the flesh proves that Christ had not flesh, then what he

says in the same place of not knowing any one henceforth after the

flesh proves that all those here referred to had not flesh. For when

he speaks of not knowing any one, he cannot intend to speak only of

Christ; but in his realization of the future life with those who are to

be changed at the resurrection, he says, "Henceforth we know no man

after the flesh;" that is, we have such an assured hope of our future

incorruption and immortality, that the thought of it makes us rejoice

even now. So he says elsewhere: "If ye then be risen with Christ,

seek those things that are above, where Christ sitteth at the right

hand of God. Set your affections upon things above, and not on things

on the earth." [396] It is true we have not yet risen as Christ has,

but we are said to have risen with Him on account of the hope which we

have in Him. So again he says: "According to His mercy He saved us,

by the washing of regeneration." [397] Evidently what we obtain in

the washing of regeneration is not the salvation itself, but the hope

of it. And yet, because this hope is certain, we are said to be saved,

as if the salvation were already bestowed. Elsewhere it is said

explicitly: "We groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, even

the redemption of our body. For we are saved by hope. But hope which

is seen is not hope; for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?

But if we hope for what we see not, then do we with patience wait for

it." [398] The apostle says not, "we are to be saved," but, "We are

now saved," that is, in hope, though not yet in reality. And in the

same way it is in hope, though not yet in reality, that we now know no

man after the flesh. This hope is in Christ, in whom what we hope for

as promised to us has already been fulfilled. He is risen, and death

has no more dominion over Him. Though we have known Him after the

flesh, before His death, when there was in His body that mortality

which the apostle properly calls flesh, now henceforth know we Him no

more; for that mortal of His has now put on immortality, and His flesh,

in the sense of mortality, no longer exists.

8. The context of the passage containing this clause of which our

adversaries make such a bad use, brings out its real meaning. "The

love of Christ," we read, "constrains us, because we thus judge, that

if one died for all, then all died; and He died for all, that they

which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but to Him who

died for them, and rose again. Therefore henceforth know we no man

after the flesh; and though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet

now henceforth know we Him no more." The words, "that they which live

should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him who died for

them, and rose again," show plainly that the resurrection of Christ is

the ground of the apostle's statement. To live not to themselves, but

to Him, must mean to live not after the flesh, in the hope of earthly

and perishable goods, but after the spirit, in the hope of

resurrection,--a resurrection already accomplished in Christ. Of

those, then, for whom Christ died and rose again, and who live

henceforth not to themselves, but to Him, the Apostle says that he

knows no one after the flesh, on account of the hope of future

immortality to which they were looking forward,--a hope which in Christ

was already a reality. So, though he has known Christ after the flesh,

before His death, now he knows Him no more; for he knows that He has

risen, and that death has no more dominion over Him. And because in

Christ we all are even now in hope, though not in reality, what Christ

is, he adds: "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new

creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become

new. And all things are of God, who has reconciled us to Himself by

Christ." [399] What the new creature--that is, the people renewed by

faith--hopes for regarding itself, it has already in Christ; and the

hope will also hereafter be actually realized. And, as regards this

hope, old things have passed away, because we are no longer in the

times of the Old Testament, expecting a temporal and carnal kingdom of

God; and all things are become new, making the promise of the kingdom

of heaven, where there shall be no death or corruption, the ground of

our confidence. But in the resurrection of the dead it will not be as

a matter of hope, but in reality, that old things shall pass away, when

the last enemy, death, shall be destroyed; and all things shall become

new when this corruptible has put on incorruption, and this mortal has

put on immortality. This has already taken place in Christ, whom Paul

accordingly, in reality, knew no longer after the flesh. But not yet

in reality, but only in hope, did he know no one after the flesh of

those for whom Christ died and rose again. For, as he says to the

Ephesians, we are already saved by grace. The whole passage is to the

purpose: "But God, who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith

He loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together

with Christ, by whose grace we have been saved." The words, "hath

quickened us together with Christ," correspond to what he said to the

Corinthians, "that they which live should no longer live to themselves,

but to Him that died for them and rose again." And in the words, "by

whose grace we have been saved," he speaks of the thing hoped for as

already accomplished. So, in the passage quoted above, he says

explicitly, "We have been saved by hope." And here he proceeds to

specify future events as if already accomplished. "And has raised us

up together," he says, "and has made us sit together in heavenly places

in Christ Jesus." Christ is certainly already seated in heavenly

places, but we not yet. But as in an assured hope we already possess

the future, he says that we sit in heavenly places, not in ourselves,

but in Him. And to show that it is still future, in case it should be

thought that what is spoken of as accomplished in hope has been

accomplished in reality, he adds, "that He might show in the ages to

come the exceeding riches of His grace in His kindness towards us in

Christ Jesus." [400] So also we must understand the following

passage: "For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which

were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto

death." [401] He says, "when we were in the flesh," as if they were

no longer in the flesh. He means to say, when we were in the hope of

fleshly things, referring to the time when the law, which can be

fulfilled only by spiritual love, was in force, in order that by

transgression the offence might abound, that after the revelation of

the New Testament, grace and the gift by grace might much more abound.

And to the same effect he says elsewhere, "They which are in the flesh

cannot please God;" and then, to show that he does not mean those not

yet dead, he adds, "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit."

[402] The meaning is, those who are in the hope of fleshly good

cannot please God; but you are not in the hope of fleshly things, but

in the hope of spiritual things, that is, of the kingdom of heaven,

where the body itself, which now is natural, will, by the change in the

resurrection, be, according to the capacity of its nature, a spiritual

body. For "it is sown a natural body, it will be raised a spiritual

body." If, then, the apostle knew no one after the flesh of those who

were said to be not in the flesh, because they were not in the hope of

fleshly things, although they still were burdened with corruptible and

mortal flesh; how much more significantly could he say of Christ that

he no longer knew Him after the flesh, seeing that in the body of

Christ what they hoped for had already been accomplished! Surely it is

better and more reverential to examine the passages of sacred Scripture

so as to discover their agreement with one another, than to accept some

as true, and condemn others as false, whenever any difficulty occurs

beyond the power of our weak intellect to solve. As to the apostle in

his childhood understanding as a child, this is said merely as an

illustration. [403] And when he was a child he was not a spiritual

man, as he was when he produced for the edification of the churches

those writings which are not, as other books, merely a profitable

study, but which authoritatively claim our belief as part of the

ecclesiastical canon.

------------------------

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[377] Rom. i. 3.

[378] 2 Cor. v. 16.

[379] 1 Cor. xiii. 11.

[380] [The extremely subjective method of dealing with Scripture which

Augustin ascribes to Faustus, was characteristic of Manich�ism in

general.--A.H.N.]

[381] Gal. iv. 4, 5.

[382] 2 Tim. ii. 8.

[383] 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4, 12.

[384] Gen. ii. 22.

[385] 1 Cor. xi. 5.

[386] Vulg.

[387] 1 Cor. xv. 35-53.

[388] 1 Tim. i. 17.

[389] Natus.

[390] Factus.

[391] Phil. iii. 15.

[392] [This is an excellent statement of the doctrine of Scriptural

authority, that has been held to by Protestants with far more

consistency than by Catholics.--A.H.N.]

[393] Luke xxiv. 39.

[394] 1 Cor. xv. 50-53.

[395] Rom. vi. 9.

[396] Col. iii. 1, 2.

[397] Tit. iii. 5.

[398] Rom. viii. 23-25.

[399] 2 Cor. v. 14-18.

[400] Eph. ii. 4-7.

[401] Rom. vii. 5.

[402] Rom. viii. 8, 9.

[403] 1 Cor. xiii. 11.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Book XII.

Faustus denies that the prophets predicted Christ. Augustin proves

such prediction from the New Testament, and expounds at length the

principal types of Christ in the Old Testament.

1. Faustus said: Why do I not believe the prophets? Rather why do

you believe them? On account, you will reply, of their prophecies

about Christ. For my part, I have read the prophets with the most

eager attention, and have found no such prophecies. And surely it

shows a weak faith not to believe in Christ without proofs and

testimonies. Indeed, you yourselves are accustomed to teach that

Christian faith is so simple and absolute as not to admit of laborious

investigations. Why, then, should you destroy the simplicity of faith

by buttressing it with evidences, and Jewish evidences too? Or if you

are changing your opinion about evidences, what more trustworthy

witness could you have than God Himself testifying to His own Son when

He sent Him on earth,--not by a prophet or an interpreter,--by a voice

immediately from heaven: "This is my beloved Son, believe Him?" [404]

And again He testifies of Himself: "I came forth from the Father,

and am come into the world;" [405] and in many similar passages. When

the Jews quarrelled with this testimony, saying "Thou bearest witness

of thyself, thy witness is not true," He replied: "Although I bear

witness of myself, my witness is true. It is written in your law, The

witness of two men is true. I am one that bear witness of myself, and

the Father who sent me beareth witness of me." [406] He does not

mention the prophets. Again He appeals to the testimony of His own

works, saying, "If ye believe not me, believe the works;" [407] not,

"If ye believe not me, believe the prophets." Accordingly we require

no testimonies concerning our Saviour. All we look for in the prophets

is prudence and virtue, and a good example, which, you are well aware,

are not to be found in the Jewish prophets. This, no doubt, explains

your referring me at once to their predictions as a reason for

believing them, without a word about their actions. This may be good

policy, but it is not in harmony with the declaration of Scripture,

that it is impossible to gather grapes from thorns, or figs from

thistles. This may serve meanwhile as a brief and sufficient reply to

the question, why we do not believe the prophets. The fact that they

did not prophesy of Christ is abundantly proved in the writings of our

fathers. I shall only add this, that if the Hebrew prophets knew and

preached Christ, and yet lived such vicious lives, what Paul says of

the wise men among the Gentiles might be applied to them: "Though they

knew God, they glorified Him not as God, nor were thankful; but they

became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was

darkened." [408] You see the knowledge of great things is worth

little, unless the life corresponds.

2. Augustin replied: The meaning of all this is, that the Hebrew

prophets foretold nothing of Christ, and that, if they did, their

predictions are of no use to us, and they themselves did not live

suitably to the dignity of such prophecies. We must therefore prove

the fact of the prophecies; and their use for the truth and

steadfastness of our faith; and that the lives of the prophets were in

harmony with their words. In this threefold discussion, it would take

a long time under the first head to quote from all the books the

passages in which Christ may be shown to have been predicted. Faustus'

frivolity may be met effectually by the weight of one great authority.

Although Faustus does not believe the prophets, he professes to believe

the apostles. Above, as if to satisfy the doubts of some opponent, he

declares that he assuredly believes the Apostle Paul. [409] Let us

then hear what Paul says of the prophets. His words are: "Paul, a

servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the

gospel of God, which He had promised before by His prophets in the holy

Scriptures, concerning His Son, who was made of the seed of David

according to the flesh." [410] What more does Faustus wish? Will he

maintain that the apostle is speaking of some other prophets, and not

of the Hebrew prophets? In any case, the gospel spoken of as promised

was concerning the Son of God, who was made for Him of the seed of

David according to the flesh: and to this gospel the apostle says that

he was separated. So that the Manich�an heresy is opposed to faith in

the gospel, which teaches that the Son of God was made of the seed of

David according to the flesh. Besides, there are many passages where

the apostle plainly testifies in behalf of the Hebrew prophets, with an

authority by which the necks of these proud Manich�ans are broken.

3. "I speak the truth in Christ," says the apostle, "I lie not, my

conscience bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, that I have great

heaviness and continual sorrow of heart. For I could wish that myself

were accursed from Christ, for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the

flesh: who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the

glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service

and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the

flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever." [411]

Here is the most abundant and express testimony and the most solemn

commendation. The adoption here spoken of is evidently through the Son

of God; as the apostle says to the Galatians: "In the fullness of

time, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, that

He might redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the

adoption of sons." [412] And the glory spoken of is chiefly that of

which he says in the same Epistle to the Romans: "What advantage hath

the Jew? or what profit is there in circumcision? Much every way:

chiefly, because unto them were committed the oracles of God." [413]

Can the Manich�ans tell us of any oracles of God committed to the Jews

besides those of the Hebrew prophets? And why are the covenants said

to belong especially to the Israelites, but because not only was the

Old Testament given to them, but also the New was prefigured in the

Old? Our opponents often display much ignorant ferocity in attacking

the dispensation of the law given to the Israelites, not understanding

that God wishes us to be not under the law, but under grace. They are

here answered by the apostle himself, who, in speaking of the

advantages of the Jews, mentions this as one, that they had the giving

of the law. If the law had been bad, the apostle would not have

referred to it in praise of the Jews. And if Christ had not been

preached by the law, the Lord Himself would not have said, "If ye

believe Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me;" [414]

nor would He have borne the testimony He did after His resurrection,

saying, "All things must needs be fulfilled that were written in the

law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me."

[415]

4. But because the Manich�ans preach another Christ, and not Him whom

the apostles preached, but a false Christ of their own false

contrivance, in imitation of whose falsehood they themselves speak

lies, though they may perhaps be believed when they are not ashamed to

profess to be the followers of a deceiver, that has befallen them which

the apostle asserts of the unbelieving Jews: "When Moses is read, a

veil is upon their heart." Neither will this veil which keeps them

from understanding Moses be taken away from them till they turn to

Christ; not a Christ of their own making, but the Christ of the Hebrew

prophets. For, as the apostle says, "When thou shalt turn to the Lord,

the veil shall be taken away." [416] We cannot wonder that they do

not believe in the Christ who rose from the dead, and who said, "All

things must needs be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses,

and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me;" for this Christ

has Himself told us what Abraham said to a hard-hearted rich man when

he was in torment in hell, and asked Abraham to send some one to his

brothers to teach them, that they might not come too into that place of

torment. Abraham's reply was: "They have Moses and the prophets, let

them hear them." And when the rich man said that they would not

believe unless some one rose from the dead, he received this most

truthful answer: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither

will they believe even though one rose from the dead." [417]

Wherefore, the Manich�ans will not hear Moses and the prophets, and so

they do not believe Christ, though He rose from the dead. Indeed, they

do not even believe that Christ rose from the dead. For how can they

believe that He rose, when they do not believe that He died? For,

again, how can they believe that He died, when they deny that He had a

mortal body?

5. But we reject those false teachers whose Christ is false, or

rather, whose Christ never existed. For we have a Christ true and

truthful, foretold by the prophets, preached by the apostles, who in

innumerable places refer to the testimonies of the law and the prophets

in support of their preaching. Paul, in one short sentence, gives the

right view of this subject. "Now," he says, "the righteousness of God

without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the

prophets." [418] What prophets, if not of Israel, to whom, as he

expressly says, pertain the covenants, and the giving of the law, and

the promises? And what promises, but about Christ? Elsewhere,

speaking of Christ, he says concisely: "All the promises of God are in

Him yea." [419] Paul tells me that the giving of the law pertained to

the Israelites. He also tells me that Christ is the end of the law for

righteousness to every one that believeth. He also tells me that all

the promises of God are in Christ yea. And you tell me that the

prophets of Israel foretold nothing of Christ. Shall I believe the

absurdities of Manich�us relating a vain and long fable in opposition

to Paul? or shall I believe Paul when he forewarns us: "If any man

preach to you another gospel than that which we have preached, let him

be accursed?"

6. Our opponents may perhaps ask us to point out passages where Christ

is predicted by the prophets of Israel. One would think they might be

satisfied with the authority of the apostles, who declare that what we

read in the writings of the Hebrew prophets was fulfilled in Christ, or

with that of Christ Himself, who says that these things were written of

Him. Whoever is unable to point out the passages should lay the blame

on his own ignorance; for the apostles and Christ and the sacred

Scriptures are not chargeable with falsehood. However, one instance

out of many may be adduced. The apostle, in the verses following the

passage quoted above, says: "The word of God cannot fail. For they

are not all Israel which are of Israel; neither, because they are the

seed of Abraham, are they all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed

be called: that is, they which are the children of the flesh, these

are not the children of God; but the children of promise are counted

for the seed." [420] What can our opponent say against this, in view

of the declaration made to Abraham: "In thy seed shall all the nations

of the earth be blessed?" At the time when the apostle gave the

following exposition of this promise, "To Abraham and to his seed were

the promises made. He saith not, To seed, as of many, but as of one,

To thy seed, which is Christ," [421] a doubt on this point might then

have been less inexcusable, for at that time all nations had not yet

believed on Christ, who is preached as of the seed of Abraham. But now

that we see the fulfillment of what we read in the ancient

prophecy,--now that all nations are actually blessed in the seed of

Abraham, to whom it was said thousands of years ago, "In thy seed shall

all nations be blessed,"--it is mere obstinate folly to try to bring in

another Christ, not of the seed of Abraham, or to hold that there are

no predictions of Christ in the prophetical books of the children of

Abraham.

7. To enumerate all the passages in the Hebrew prophets referring to

our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, would exceed the limits of a volume,

not to speak of the brief replies of which this treatise consists. The

whole contents of these Scriptures are either directly or indirectly

about Christ. Often the reference is allegorical or enigmatical,

perhaps in a verbal allusion, or in a historical narrative, requiring

diligence in the student, and rewarding him with the pleasure of

discovery. Other passages, again, are plain; for, without the help of

what is clear, we could not understand what is obscure. And even the

figurative passages, when brought together, will be found so harmonious

in their testimony to Christ as to put to shame the obtuseness of the

sceptic.

8. In the creation God finished His works in six days, and rested on

the seventh. The history of the world contains six periods marked by

the dealings of God with men. The first period is from Adam to Noah;

the second, from Noah to Abraham; the third, from Abraham to David; the

fourth, from David to the captivity in Babylon; the fifth, from the

captivity to the advent of lowliness of our Lord Jesus Christ; the

sixth is now in progress, and will end in the coming of the exalted

Saviour to judgment. What answers to the seventh day is the rest of

the saints,--not in this life, but in another, where the rich man saw

Lazarus at rest while he was tormented in hell; where there is no

evening, because there is no decay. On the sixth day, in Genesis, man

is formed after the image of God; in the sixth period of the world

there is the clear discovery of our transformation in the renewing of

our mind, according to the image of Him who created us, as the apostle

says. [422] As a wife was made for Adam from his side while he slept,

the Church becomes the property of her dying Saviour, by the sacrament

of the blood which flowed from His side after His death. The woman

made out of her husband's side is called Eve, or Life, and the mother

of living beings; and the Lord says in the Gospel: "Except a man eat

my flesh and drink my blood, he has no life in him." [423] The whole

narrative of Genesis, in the most minute details, is a prophecy of

Christ and of the Church with reference either to the good Christians

or to the bad. There is a significance in the words of the apostle

when he calls Adam "the figure of Him that was to come;" [424] and when

he says, "A man shall leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to

his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery;

but I speak concerning Christ and the Church." [425] This points most

obviously to the way in which Christ left His Father; for "though He

was in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with

God, He emptied Himself, and took upon Him the form of a servant."

[426] And so, too, He left His mother, the synagogue of the Jews

which cleaved to the carnality of the Old Testament, and was united to

the Church His holy bride, that in the peace of the New Testament they

two might be one flesh. For though with the Father He was God, by whom

we were made, He became in the flesh partaker of our nature, that we

might become the body of which He is the head.

9. As Cain's sacrifice of the fruit of the ground is rejected, while

Abel's sacrifice of his sheep and the fat thereof is accepted, so the

faith of the New Testament praising God in the harmless service of

grace is preferred to the earthly observances of the Old Testament.

For though the Jews were right in practising these things, they were

guilty of unbelief in not distinguishing the time of the New Testament

when Christ came, from the time of the Old Testament. God said to

Cain, "If thou offerest well, yet if thou dividest not well, thou hast

sinned." [427] If Cain had obeyed God when He said, "Be content, for

to thee shall be its reference, and thou shalt rule over it," he would

have referred his sin to himself, by taking the blame of it, and

confessing it to God; and so assisted by supplies of grace, he would

have ruled over his sin, instead of acting as the servant of sin in

killing his innocent brother. So also the Jews, of whom all these

things are a figure, if they had been content, instead of being

turbulent, and had acknowledged the time of salvation through the

pardon of sins by grace, and heard Christ saying, "They that are whole

need not a physician, but they that are sick; I came not to call the

righteous, but sinners to repentance;" [428] and, "Every one that

committeth sin is the servant of sin;" and, "If the Son make you free,

ye shall be free indeed," [429] --they would in confession have

referred their sin to themselves, saying to the Physician, as it is

written in the Psalm, "I said, Lord, be merciful to me; heal my soul,

for I have sinned against Thee." [430] And being made free by the

hope of grace, they would have ruled over sin as long as it continued

in their mortal body. But now, being ignorant of God's righteousness,

and wishing to establish a righteousness of their own, proud of the

works of the law, instead of being humbled on account of their sins,

they have not been content; and in subjection to sin reigning in their

mortal body, so as to make them obey it in the lusts thereof, they have

stumbled on the stone of stumbling, and have been inflamed with hatred

against him whose works they grieved to see accepted by God. The man

who was born blind, and had been made to see, said to them, "We know

that God heareth not sinners; but if any man serve Him, and do His

will, him He heareth;" [431] as if he had said, God regardeth not the

sacrifice of Cain, but he regards the sacrifice of Abel. Abel, the

younger brother, is killed by the elder brother; Christ, the head of

the younger people, is killed by the elder people of the Jews. Abel

dies in the field; Christ dies on Calvary.

10. God asks Cain where his brother is, not as if He did not know, but

as a judge asks a guilty criminal. Cain replies that he knows not, and

that he is not his brother's keeper. And what answer can the Jews give

at this day, when we ask them with the voice of God, that is, of the

sacred Scriptures, about Christ, except that they do not know the

Christ that we speak of? Cain's ignorance was pretended, and the Jews

are deceived in their refusal of Christ. Moreover, they would have

been in a sense keepers of Christ, if they had been willing to receive

and keep the Christian faith. For the man who keeps Christ in his

heart does not ask, like Cain, Am I my brother's keeper? Then God says

to Cain, "What hast thou done? The voice of thy brother's blood crieth

unto me from the ground." So the voice of God in the Holy Scriptures

accuses the Jews. For the blood of Christ has a loud voice on the

earth, when the responsive Amen of those who believe in Him comes from

all nations. This is the voice of Christ's blood, because the clear

voice of the faithful redeemed by His blood is the voice of the blood

itself.

11. Then God says to Cain: "Thou art cursed from the earth, which

hath opened its mouth to receive thy brother's blood at thy hand. For

thou shalt till the earth, and it shall no longer yield unto thee its

strength. A mourner and an abject shalt thou be on the earth." It is

not, Cursed is the earth, but, Cursed art thou from the earth, which

hath opened its mouth to receive thy brother's blood at thy hand. So

the unbelieving people of the Jews is cursed from the earth, that is,

from the Church, which in the confession of sins has opened its mouth

to receive the blood shed for the remission of sins by the hand of the

people that would not be under grace, but under the law. And this

murderer is cursed by the Church; that is, the Church admits and avows

the curse pronounced by the apostle: "Whoever are of the works of the

law are under the curse of the law." [432] Then, after saying, Cursed

art thou from the earth, which has opened its mouth to receive thy

brother's blood at thy hand, what follows is not, For thou shalt till

it, but, Thou shalt till the earth, and it shall not yield to thee its

strength. The earth he is to till is not necessarily the same as that

which opened its mouth to receive his brother's blood at his hand.

From this earth he is cursed, and so he tills an earth which shall no

longer yield to him its strength. That is, the Church admits and avows

the Jewish people to be cursed, because after killing Christ they

continue to till the ground of an earthly circumcision, an earthly

Sabbath, an earthly passover, while the hidden strength or virtue of

making known Christ, which this tilling contains, is not yielded to the

Jews while they continue in impiety and unbelief, for it is revealed in

the New Testament. While they will not turn to God, the veil which is

on their minds in reading the Old Testament is not taken away. This

veil is taken away only by Christ, who does not do away with the

reading of the Old Testament, but with the covering which hides its

virtue. So, at the crucifixion of Christ, the veil was rent in twain,

that by the passion of Christ hidden mysteries might be revealed to

believers who turn to Him with a mouth opened in confession to drink

His blood. In this way the Jewish people, like Cain, continue tilling

the ground, in the carnal observance of the law, which does not yield

to them its strength, because they do not perceive in it the grace of

Christ. So too, the flesh of Christ was the ground from which by

crucifying Him the Jews produced our salvation, for He died for our

offences. But this ground did not yield to them its strength, for they

were not justified by the virtue of His resurrection, for He arose

again for our justification. As the apostle says: "He was crucified

in weakness, but He liveth by the power of God." [433] This is the

power of that ground which is unknown to the ungodly and unbelieving.

When Christ rose, He did not appear to those who had crucified Him. So

Cain was not allowed to see the strength of the ground which he tilled

to sow his seed in it; as God said, "Thou shalt till the ground, and it

shall no longer yield unto thee its strength."

12. "Groaning and trembling shalt thou be on the earth." Here no one

can fail to see that in every land where the Jews are scattered they

mourn for the loss of their kingdom, and are in terrified subjection to

the immensely superior number of Christians. So Cain answered, and

said: "My case is worse, if Thou drivest me out this day from the face

of the earth, and from Thy face shall I be hid, and I shall be a

mourner and an outcast on the earth; and it shall be that every one

that findeth me shall slay me." Here he groans indeed in terror, lest

after losing his earthly possession he should suffer the death of the

body. This he calls a worse case than that of the ground not yielding

to him its strength, or than that of spiritual death. For his mind is

carnal; for he thinks little of being hid from the face of God, that

is, of being under the anger of God, were it not that he may be found

and slain. This is the carnal mind that tills the ground, but does not

obtain its strength. To be carnally minded is death; but he, in

ignorance of this, mourns for the loss of his earthly possession, and

is in terror of bodily death. But what does God reply? "Not so," He

says; "but whosoever shall kill Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him

sevenfold." That is, It is not as thou sayest; not by bodily death

shall the ungodly race of carnal Jews perish. For whoever destroys

them in this way shall suffer sevenfold vengeance, that is, shall bring

upon himself the sevenfold penalty under which the Jews lie for the

crucifixion of Christ. So to the end of the seven days of time, the

continued preservation of the Jews will be a proof to believing

Christians of the subjection merited by those who, in the pride of

their kingdom, put the Lord to death.

13. "And the Lord God set a mark upon Cain, lest any one finding him

should slay him." It is a most notable fact, that all the nations

subjugated by Rome adopted the heathenish ceremonies of the Roman

worship; while the Jewish nation, whether under Pagan or Christian

monarchs, has never lost the sign of their law, by which they are

distinguished from all other nations and peoples. No emperor or

monarch who finds under his government the people with this mark kills

them, that is, makes them cease to be Jews, and as Jews to be separate

in their observances, and unlike the rest of the world. Only when a

Jew comes over to Christ, he is no longer Cain, nor goes out from the

presence of God, nor dwells in the land of Nod, which is said to mean

commotion. Against this evil of commotion the Psalmist prays, "Suffer

not my feet to be moved;" [434] and again, "Let not the hands of the

wicked remove me;" [435] and, "Those that trouble me will rejoice when

I am moved:" [436] and, "The Lord is at my right hand, that I should

not be moved;" [437] and so in innumerable places. This evil comes

upon those who leave the presence of God, that is, His

loving-kindness. Thus the Psalmist says, "I said in my prosperity, I

shall never be moved." But observe what follows, "Lord, by Thy favor

Thou hast given strength to my honor; Thou didst hide Thy face, and I

was troubled;" [438] which teaches us that not in itself, but by

participation in the light of God, can any soul possess beauty, or

honor, or strength. The Manich�ans should think of this, to keep them

from the blasphemy of identifying themselves with the nature and

substance of God. But they cannot think, because they are not

content. The Sabbath of the heart they are strangers to. If they were

content, as Cain was told to be, they would refer their sin to

themselves; that is, they would lay the blame on themselves, and not on

a race of darkness that no one ever heard of, and so by the grace of

God they would prevail over their sin. But now the Manich�ans, and all

who oppose the truth by their various heresies, leave the presence of

God, like Cain and the scattered Jews, and inhabit the land of

commotion, that is, of carnal disquietude, instead of the enjoyment of

God, that is instead of Eden, which is interpreted Feasting, where

Paradise was planted. But not to depart too much from the argument of

this treatise I must limit myself to a few, short remarks under this

head.

14. Omitting therefore many passages in these Books where Christ may

be found, but which require longer explanation and proof, although the

most hidden meanings are the sweetest, convincing testimony may be

obtained from the enumeration of such things as the following:--That

Enoch, the seventh from Adam, pleased God, and was translated, as there

is to be a seventh day of rest into which all will be translated who,

during the sixth day of the world's history, are created anew by the

incarnate Word. That Noah, with his family is saved by water and wood,

as the family of Christ is saved by baptism, as representing the

suffering of the cross. That this ark is made of beams formed in a

square, as the Church is constructed of saints prepared unto every good

work: for a square stands firm on any side. That the length is six

times the breadth, and ten times the height, like a human body, to show

that Christ appeared in a human body. That the breadth reaches to

fifty cubits; as the apostle says, "Our heart is enlarged," [439] that

is, with spiritual love, of which he says again, "The love of God is

shed abroad in our heart by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us."

[440] For in the fiftieth day after His resurrection, Christ sent His

Holy Spirit to enlarge the hearts of His disciples. That it is three

hundred cubits long, to make up six times fifty; as there are six

periods in the history of the world during which Christ has never

ceased to be preached,--in five foretold by the prophets, and in the

sixth proclaimed in the gospel. That it is thirty cubits high, a tenth

part of the length; because Christ is our height, who in his thirtieth

year gave His sanction to the doctrine of the gospel, by declaring that

He came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it. Now the ten

commandments are to be the heart of the law; and so the length of the

ark is ten times thirty. Noah himself, too, was the tenth from Adam.

That the beams of the ark are fastened within and without with pitch,

to signify by compact union the forbearance of love, which keeps the

brotherly connection from being impaired, and the bond of peace from

being broken by the offences which try the Church either from without

or from within. For pitch is a glutinous substance, of great energy

and force, to represent the ardor of love which, with great power of

endurance, beareth all things in the maintenance of spiritual

communion.

15. That all kinds of animals are inclosed in the ark; as the Church

contains all nations, which was also set forth in the vessel shown to

Peter. That clean and unclean animals are in the ark; as good and bad

take part in the sacraments of the Church. That the clean are in

sevens, and the unclean in twos; not because the bad are fewer than the

good, but because the good preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond

of peace; and the Spirit is spoken of in Scripture as having a

sevenfold operation, as being "the Holy Spirit of wisdom and

understanding, of counsel and might, of knowledge and piety, and of the

fear of God." [441] So also the number fifty, which is connected with

the advent of the Holy Spirit, is made up of seven times seven, and one

over; whence it is said, "Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit

in the bond of peace." [442] The bad, again, are in twos, as being

easily divided, from their tendency to schism. That Noah, counting his

family, was the eighth; because the hope of our resurrection has

appeared in Christ, who rose from the dead on the eighth day, that is,

on the day after the seventh, or Sabbath day. This day was the third

from His passion; but in the ordinary reckoning of days, it is both the

eighth and the first.

16. That the whole ark together is finished in a cubit above; as the

Church, the body of Christ gathered into unity, is raised to

perfection. So Christ says in the Gospel: "He that gathereth not with

me, scattereth." [443] That the entrance is on the side; as no man

enters the Church except by the sacrament of the remission of sins

which flowed from Christ's opened side. That the lower spaces of the

ark are divided into two and three chambers: as the multitude of all

nations in the Church is divided into two, as circumcised and

uncircumcised; or into three, as descended from the three sons of

Noah. And these parts of the ark are called lower, because in this

earthly state there is a difference of races, and above we are

completed in one. Above there is no diversity; for Christ is all and

in all, finishing us, as it were, in one cubit above with heavenly

unity.

17. That the flood came seven days after Noah entered the ark; as we

are baptized in the hope of the future rest, which was denoted by the

seventh day. That all flesh on the face of the earth, outside the ark,

was destroyed by the flood; as, beyond the communion of the Church,

though the water of baptism is the same, it is efficacious only for

destruction, and not for salvation. That it rained for forty days and

forty nights; as the sacrament of heavenly baptism washes away all the

guilt of the sins against the ten commandments throughout all the four

quarters of the world (four times ten is forty), whether that guilt has

been contracted in the day of prosperity or in the night of adversity.

18. That Noah was five hundred years old when God told him to make the

ark, and six hundred when he entered the ark; which shows that the ark

was made during one hundred years, which seem to correspond to the

years of an age of the world. So the sixth age is occupied with the

construction of the Church by the preaching of the gospel. The man who

avails himself of the offer of salvation is made like a square beam,

fitted for every good work, and forms part of the sacred fabric.

Again, it was the second month of the six hundredth year when Noah

entered the ark, and in two months there are sixty days; so that here,

as in every multiple of six, we have the number denoting the sixth age.

19. That mention is made of the twenty seventh day of the month; as we

have already seen the significance of the square in the beams. Here

especially it is significant; for as twenty-seven is the cube of three,

there is a trinity in the means by which we are, as it were, squared,

or fitted for every good work. By the memory we remember God; by the

understanding we know Him; by the will we love Him. That in the

seventh month the ark rested; reminding us again of the seventh day of

rest. And here again, to denote the perfection of those at rest, the

twenty-seventh day of the month is mentioned for the second time. So

what is promised in hope is realized in experience. There is here a

combination of seven and eight; for the water rose fifteen cubits above

the mountains, pointing to a profound mystery in baptism,--the

sacrament of our regeneration. For the seventh day of rest is

connected with the eighth of resurrection. For when the saints receive

again their bodies after the rest of the intermediate state, the rest

will not cease; but rather the whole man, body and soul united, renewed

in the immortal health, will attain to the realization of his hope in

the enjoyment of eternal life. Thus the sacrament of baptism, like the

waters of Noah, rises above all the wisdom of the proud. Seven and

eight are also combined in the number of one hundred and fifty, made up

of seventy and eighty, which was the number of days during which the

water prevailed, pointing out the deep import of baptism in

consecrating the new man to hold the faith of rest and resurrection.

20. That the raven sent out after forty days did not return, being

either prevented by the water or attracted by some floating carcase; as

men defiled by impure desire, and therefore eager for things outside in

the world, are either baptized, or are led astray into the company of

those to whom, as they are outside the ark, that is, outside the

Church, baptism is destructive. That the dove when sent forth found no

rest, and returned; as in the New Testament rest is not promised to the

saints in this world. The dove was sent forth after forty days, a

period denoting the length of human life. When again sent forth after

seven days, denoting the sevenfold operation of the Spirit, the dove

brought back a fruitful olive branch; as some even who are baptized

outside of the Church, if not destitute of the fatness of charity, may

come after all, as it were in the evening, and be brought into the one

communion by the mouth of the dove in the kiss of peace. That, when

again sent forth after seven days, the dove did not return; as, at the

end of the world, the rest of the saints shall no longer be in the

sacrament of hope, as now, while in the communion of the Church, they

drink what flowed from the side of Christ, but in the perfection of

eternal safety, when the kingdom shall be delivered up to God and the

Father, and when, in that unclouded contemplation of unchangeable

truth, we shall no longer need natural symbols.

21. There are many other points which we cannot take notice of even in

this cursory manner. Why in the six hundred and first year of Noah's

life--that is, after six hundred years were completed--the covering of

the ark is removed, and the hidden mystery, as it were, disclosed. Why

the earth is said to have dried on the twenty-seventh day of the second

month; as if the number fifty-seven denoted the completion of the rite

of baptism. For the twenty-seventh day of the second month is the

fifty-seventh day of the year; and the number fifty-seven is seven

times eight, which are the numbers of the spirit and the body, with one

over, to denote the bond of unity. Why they leave the ark together,

though they entered separately. For it is said: "Noah went in, and

his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives with him, into the ark;"

the men and the women being spoken of separately; which denotes the

time when the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against

the flesh. But they go forth, Noah and his wife, and his sons and

their wives,--the men and women together. For in the end of the world,

and in the resurrection of the just, the body will be united to the

spirit in perfect harmony, undisturbed by the wants and the passions of

mortality. Why, after leaving the ark, only clean animals are offered

in sacrifice to God, though both clean and unclean were in the ark.

22. Then, again, it is significant that when God speaks to Noah, and

begins anew, as it were, in order, by repetition in various forms, to

draw attention to the figure of the Church, the sons of Noah are

blessed, and told to replenish the earth, and all animals are given to

them for food; as was said to Peter of the vessel, "Kill and eat."

That they are told to pour out the blood when they eat; that the former

life may not be kept shut up in the conscience, but may be, as it were,

poured out in confession. That God makes the bow, which appears in the

clouds only when the sun shines, the sign of His covenant with men, and

with every living thing, that He will not destroy them with a flood; as

those do not perish by the flood, in separation from the Church, who in

the clouds of God--that is, in the prophets and in all the sacred

Scriptures--discern the glory of Christ, instead of seeking their own

glory. The worshippers of the sun, however, need not pride themselves

on this; for they must understand that the sun, as also a lion, a lamb,

and a stone, are used as types of Christ because they have some

resemblance, not because they are of the same substance.

23. Again, the sufferings of Christ from His own nation are evidently

denoted by Noah being drunk with the wine of the vineyard he planted,

and his being uncovered in his tent. For the mortality of Christ's

flesh was uncovered, to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks

foolishness; but to them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, both

Shem and Japhet, the power of God and the wisdom of God. Because the

foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is

stronger than men. [444]

Moreover, the two sons, the eldest and the youngest, carrying the

garment backwards, are a figure of the two peoples, and the sacrament

of the past and completed passions of the Lord. They do not see the

nakedness of their father, because they do not consent to Christ's

death; and yet they honor it with a covering, as knowing whence they

were born. The middle son is the Jewish people, for they neither held

the first place with the apostles, nor believed subsequently with the

Gentiles. They saw the nakedness of their father, because they

consented to Christ's death; and they told it to their brethren

outside, for what was hidden in the prophets was disclosed by the

Jews. And thus they are the servants of their brethren. For what else

is this nation now but a desk for the Christians, bearing the law and

the prophets, and testifying to the doctrine of the Church, so that we

honor in the sacrament what they disclose in the letter?

24. Again, every one must be impressed, and be either enlightened or

confirmed in the faith, by the blessing of the two sons who honored the

nakedness of their father, though they turned away their faces, as

displeased with the evil done by the vine. "Blessed," he says, "be the

Lord God of Shem." For although God is the God of all nations, even

the Gentiles acknowledge Him to be in a peculiar sense the God of

Israel. And how is this to be explained but by the blessing of

Japhet? The occupation of all the world by the Church among the

Gentiles was exactly foretold in the words: "Let God enlarge Japhet,

and let him dwell in the tents of Shem." That is for the Manich�an to

attend to. You see what the state of the world actually is. The very

thing that you are astonished and grieved at in us is this, that God is

enlarging Japhet. Is He not dwelling in the tents of Shem?--that is,

in the churches built by the apostles, the sons of the prophets. Hear

what Paul says to the believing Gentiles: "Ye were at that time

without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and

strangers from the covenants; having no hope of the promise, and

without God in the world." In these words there is a description of

the state of Japhet before he dwelt in the tents of Shem. But observe

what follows: "Now then;" he says, "ye are no more strangers and

foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household

of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets,

Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone." [445] Here we

have Japhet enlarged, and dwelling in the tents of Shem. These

testimonies are taken from the epistles of the apostles, which you

yourselves acknowledge, and read, and profess to follow. You occupy an

unhappy middle position in a building of which Christ is not the chief

corner-stone. For you do not belong to the wall of those who, like the

apostles, being of the circumcision, believed in Christ; nor to the

wall of those who, being of the uncircumcision, like all the Gentiles,

are joined in the unity of faith, as in the fellowship of the

corner-stone. However, all who accept and read any books of our canon

in which Christ is spoken of as having been born and having suffered in

the flesh, and who do not unite with us in a common veiling with the

sacrament of the mortality, uncovered by the passion, but without the

knowledge of piety and charity make known that from which we all are

born,--although they differ among themselves, whether as Jews and

heretics, or as heretics of one kind or other,--are still all useful to

the Church, as being all alike servants, either in bearing witness to

or in proving some truth. For of heretics it is said: "There must be

heresies, that those who are approved among you may be manifested."

[446] Go on, then, with your objections to the Old Testament

Scriptures! Go on, ye servants of Ham! You have despised the flesh

from which you were born when uncovered. For you could not have called

yourselves Christians unless Christ had come into the world, as

foretold by the prophets, and had drunk of His own vine that cup which

could not pass from Him, and had slept in His passion, as in the

drunkenness of the folly which is wiser than men; and so, in the hidden

counsel of God, the disclosure had been made of that infirmity of

mortal flesh which is stronger than men. For unless the Word of God

had taken on Himself this infirmity, the name of Christian, in which

you also glory, would not exist in the earth. Go on, then, as I have

said. Declare in mockery what we may honor with reverence. Let the

Church use you as her servants to make manifest those members who are

approved. So particular are the predictions of the prophets regarding

the state and the sufferings of the Church, that we can find a place

even for you in what is said of the destructive error by which the

reprobate are to perish, while the approved are to be manifested.

25. You say that Christ was not foretold by the prophets of Israel,

when, in fact, their Scriptures teem with such predictions, if you

would only examine them carefully, instead of treating them with

levity. Who in Abraham leaves his country and kindred that he may

become rich and prosperous among strangers, but He who, leaving the

land and country of the Jews, of whom He was born in the flesh, is now

extending His power, as we see, among the Gentiles? Who in Isaac

carried the wood for His own sacrifice, but He who carried His own

cross? Who is the ram for sacrifice, caught by the horns in a. bush,

but He who was fastened to the cross as an offering for us?

26. Who in the angel striving with Jacob, on the one hand is

constrained to give him a blessing, as the weaker to the stronger, the

conquered to the conqueror, and on the other hand puts his thigh-bone

out of joint, but He who, when He suffered the people of Israel to

prevail against Him, blessed those among them who believed, while the

multitude, like Jacob's thigh-bone, halted in their carnality? Who is

the stone placed under Jacob's head, but Christ the head of man? And

in its anointing the very name of Christ is expressed, for, as all

know, Christ means anointed. Christ refers to this in the Gospel, and

declares it to be a type of Himself, when He said of Nathanael that he

was an Israelite indeed, in whom was no guile, and when Nathanael,

resting his head, as it were, on this Stone, or on Christ, confessed

Him as the Son of God and the King of Israel anointing the Stone by his

confession, in which he acknowledged Jesus to be Christ. On this

occasion the Lord made appropriate mention of what Jacob saw in his

dream "Verily I say unto you, Ye shall see heaven opened, and the

angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man." [447]

This Jacob saw, who in the blessing was called Israel, when he had the

stone for a pillow, and had the vision of the ladder reaching from

earth to heaven, on which the angels of God were ascending and

descending. [448] The angels denote the evangelists, or preachers of

Christ. They ascend when they rise above the created universe to

describe the supreme majesty of the divine nature of Christ as being in

the beginning God with God, by whom all things were made. They descend

to tell of His being made of a woman, made under the law, that He might

redeem them that were under the law. Christ is the ladder reaching

from earth to heaven, or from the carnal to the spiritual: for by His

assistance the carnal ascend to spirituality; and the spiritual may be

said to descend to nourish the carnal with milk when they cannot speak

to them as to spiritual, but as to carnal. [449] There is thus both

an ascent and a descent upon the Son of man. For the Son of man is

above as our head, being Himself the Saviour; and He is below in His

body, the Church. He is the ladder, for He says, "I am the way." We

ascend to Him to see Him in heavenly places; we descend to Him for the

nourishment of His weak members. And the ascent and descent are by Him

as well as to Him. Following His example, those who preach Him not

only rise to behold Him exalted, but let themselves down to give a

plain announcement of the truth. So the apostle ascends, "Whether we

be beside ourselves, it is to God;" and descends, "Whether we be sober,

it is for your sake." And by whom did he ascend and descend? "For the

love of Christ constraineth us: for we thus judge, that if one died

for all, then all died; and that He died for all, that they which live

should no longer live unto themselves, but unto Him that died for them,

and rose again." [450]

27. The man who does not find pleasure in these views of sacred

Scripture is turned away to fables, because he cannot bear sound

doctrine. The fables have an attraction for childish minds in people

of all ages; but we who are of the body of Christ should say with the

Psalmist; "O Lord, the wicked have spoken to me pleasing things, but

they are not after Thy law." [451] In every page of these Scriptures,

while I pursue my search as a son of Adam in the sweat of my brow,

Christ either openly or covertly meets and refreshes me. Where the

discovery is laborious my ardor is increased, and the spoil obtained is

eagerly devoured, and is hidden in my heart for my nourishment.

28. Christ appears to me in Joseph, who was persecuted and sold by his

brethren, and after his troubles obtained honor in Egypt. We have seen

the troubles of Christ in the world, of which Egypt was a figure, in

the sufferings of the martyrs. And now we see the honor of Christ in

the same world which He subdues to Himself, in exchange for the food

which He bestows. Christ appears to me in the rod of Moses, which

became a serpent when cast on the earth as a figure of His death, which

came from the serpent. Again, when caught by the tail it became a rod,

as a figure of His return after the accomplishment of His work in His

resurrection to what He was before, destroying death by His new life,

so as to leave no trace of the serpent. We, too, who are His body,

glide along in the same mortality through the folds of time; but when

at last the tail of this course of things is laid hold of by the hand

of judgment that it shall go no further, we shall be renewed, and

rising from the destruction of death, the last enemy, we shall be the

sceptre of government in the right hand of God.

29. Of the departure of Israel from Egypt, let us hear what the

apostle himself says: "I would not, brethren, that ye should be

ignorant that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed

through the sea, and were all baptized into Moses in the cloud and in

the sea, and did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink of

the same spiritual drink. For they drank of the spiritual rock which

followed them, and that rock was Christ." [452] The explanation of one

thing is a key to the rest. For if the rock is Christ from its

stability, is not the manna Christ, the living bread which came down

from heaven, which gives spiritual life to those who truly feed on it?

The Israelites died because they received the figure only in its carnal

sense. The apostle, by calling it spiritual food, shows its reference

to Christ, as the spiritual drink is explained by the words, "That rock

was Christ," which explain the whole. Then is not the cloud and the

pillar Christ, who by His uprightness and strength supports our

feebleness; who shines by night and not by day, that they who see not

may see, and that they who see may be made blind? In the clouds and

the Red Sea there is the baptism consecrated by the blood of Christ.

The enemies following behind perish, as past sins are put away.

30. The Israelites are led through the wilderness, as those who are

baptized are in the wilderness while on the way to the promised land,

hoping and patiently waiting for that which they see not. In the

wilderness are severe trials, lest they should in heart return to

Egypt. Still Christ does not leave them; the pillar does not go away.

The bitter waters are sweetened by wood, as hostile people become

friendly by learning to honor the cross of Christ. The twelve

fountains watering the seventy palm trees are a figure of apostolic

grace watering the nations. As seven is multiplied by ten, so the

decalogue is fulfilled in the sevenfold operation of the Spirit. The

enemy attempting to stop them in their way is overcome by Moses

stretching out his hands in the figure of the cross. The deadly bites

of serpents are healed by the brazen serpent, which was lifted up that

they might look at it. The Lord Himself gives the explanation of

this: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the

Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in Him may not

perish, but have everlasting life." [453] So in many other things we

may find a protest against the obstinacy of unbelieving hearts. In the

passover a lamb is killed, representing Christ, of whom it is said in

the Gospel, "Behold the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the

world!" [454] In the passover the bones of the lamb were not to be

broken; and on the cross the bones of the Lord were not broken. The

evangelist, in reference to this, quotes the words, "A bone of Him

shall not be broken." [455] The posts were marked with blood to keep

away destruction, as people are marked on their foreheads with the sign

of the Lord's passion for their salvation. The law was given on the

fiftieth day after the passover; so the Holy Spirit came on the

fiftieth day after the passion of the Lord. The law is said to have

been written with the finger of God; and the Lord says of the Holy

Spirit, "With the finger of God I cast out devils." [456] Such are

the Scriptures in which Faustus, after shutting his eyes, declares that

he can see no prediction of Christ. But we need not wonder that he

should have eyes to read and yet no heart to understand, since, instead

of knocking in devout faith at the door of the heavenly secret, he

dares to act in profane hostility. So let it be, for so it ought to

be. Let the gate of salvation be shut to the proud. The meek, to whom

God teaches His ways, will find all these things in the Scriptures, and

those things which he does not see he will believe from what he sees.

31. He will see Jesus leading the people into the land of promise; for

this name was given to the leader of Israel, not at first, or by

chance, but on account of the work to which he was called. He will see

the cluster from the land of promise hanging from a wooden pole. He

will see in Jericho, as in this perishing world, an harlot, one of

those of whom the Lord says that they go before the proud into the

kingdom of heaven, putting out of her window a scarlet line symbolical

of blood, as confession is made with the mouth for the remission of

sins. He will see the walls of Jericho, like the frail defences of the

world, fall when compassed seven times by the ark of the covenant; as

now in the course of the seven days of time the covenant of God

compasses the whole globe, that in the end, death, the last enemy, may

be destroyed, and the Church, like one single house, be saved from the

destruction of the ungodly, purified from the defilement of fornication

by the window of confession in the blood of remission.

32. He will see the times of the judges precede those of the kings, as

the judgment will precede the kingdom. And under both the judges and

the kings he will see Christ and the Church repeatedly prefigured in

many and various ways. Who was in Samson, when he killed the lion that

met him as he went to get a wife among strangers, but He who, when

going to call His Church from among the Gentiles, said, "Be of good

cheer, I have overcome the world?" [457] What means the hive in the

mouth of the slain lion, but that, as we see, the very laws of the

earthly kingdom which once raged against Christ have now lost their

fierceness, and have become a protection for the preaching of gospel

sweetness? What is that woman boldly piercing the temples of the enemy

with a wooden nail, but the faith of the Church casting down the

kingdom of the devil by the cross of Christ? What is the fleece wet

while the ground was dry, and again the fleece dry while the ground was

wet, but the Hebrew nation at first possessing alone in its typical

institution Christ the mystery of God, while the whole world was in

ignorance? And now the whole world has this mystery revealed, while

the Jews are destitute of it.

33. To mention only a few things in the times of the kings, at the

very outset does not the change in the priesthood when Eli was rejected

and Samuel chosen, and in the kingdom when Saul was rejected and David

chosen, clearly predict the new priesthood and kingdom to come in our

Lord Jesus Christ, when the old, which was a shadow of the new, was

rejected? Did not David, when he ate the shew-bread, which it was not

lawful for any but the priests to eat, prefigure the union of the

kingdom and priesthood in one person, Jesus Christ? In the separation

of the ten tribes from the temple while two were left, is there not a

figure of what the apostle asserts of the whole nation: "A remnant is

saved by the election of grace."? [458]

34. In the time of famine, Elijah is fed by ravens bringing bread in

the morning and flesh in the evening; but the Manich�ans cannot in this

perceive Christ, who, as it were, hungers for our salvation, and to

whom sinners come in confession, having now the first-fruits of the

Spirit, while in the end, that is to say in the evening of the age,

they will have the resurrection of their bodies also. Elijah is sent

to be fed by a widow woman of another nation, who was going to gather

two sticks before she died, denoting the two wooden beams of the

cross. Her meal and oil are blessed, as the fruit and cheerfulness of

charity do not diminish by expenditure, for God loveth a cheerful

giver. [459]

35. The children that mocked Elisha by calling out Baldhead, are

devoured by wild beasts, as those who in childish folly scoff at Christ

crucified on Calvary are destroyed by devils. Elisha sends his

servants to lay his staff on the dead body, but it does not revive; he

comes himself, and lays himself exactly upon the dead body, and it

revives: as the Word of God sent the law by His servant, without any

profit to mankind dead in sins; and yet it was not sent without purpose

by Him who knew the necessity of its being first sent. Then He Himself

came, conformed Himself to us by participation in our death, and we

were revived. When they were cutting down wood with axes, the iron,

flying off the wood, sank to the bottom of the river, and came up again

when the wood was thrown in by Elisha. So, when Christ's bodily

presence was cutting down the unfruitful trees among the unbelieving

Jews, according to the saying of John, "Behold, the axe is laid to the

roots of the tree," [460] by the death they inflicted, Christ was

separated from His body, and descended to the depths of the infernal

world; and then, when His body was laid in the tomb, like the wood on

the water, His spirit returned, like the iron to the handle, and He

rose. The reader will observe how many things of this kind are omitted

for the sake of brevity.

36. As regards the departure to Babylon, where the Spirit of God by

the prophet Jeremiah enjoins them to go, telling them to pray for the

people in whose land they dwell as strangers, because in their peace

they would find peace, and to build houses, and plant vineyards and

gardens,--the figurative meaning is plain, when we consider that the

true Israelites, in whom is no guile, passed over in the ministry of

the apostles with the ordinances of the gospel into the kingdom of the

Gentiles. So the apostle, like an echo of Jeremiah, says to us, "I

will first of all that prayer, supplications, intercessions and giving

of thanks be made for all men, and for those in authority, that we may

live a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and charity; for this

is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have

all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth." [461]

Accordingly the basilicas of Christian congregations have been built

by believers as abodes of peace, and vineyards of the faithful have

been renewed, and gardens planted, where chief among the plants is the

mustard tree, in whose wide-spreading branches the pride of the

Gentiles, like the birds of heaven, in its soaring ambition, takes

shelter. Again, in the return from captivity after seventy years,

according to Jeremiah's prophecy, and in the restoration of the temple,

every believer in Christ must see a figure of our return as the Church

of God from the exile of this world to the heavenly Jerusalem, after

the seven days of time have fulfilled their course. Joshua the high

priest, after the captivity, who rebuilt the temple, was a figure of

Jesus Christ, the true High Priest of our restoration. The prophet

Zechariah saw this Joshua in a filthy garment; and after the devil who

stood by to accuse him was defeated, the filthy garment was taken from

him, and a dress of honor and glory given him. So the body of Jesus

Christ, which is the Church, when the adversary is conquered in the

judgment at the end of the world, will pass from the pains of exile to

the glory of everlasting safety. This is the song of the Psalmist at

the dedication of his house: "Thou hast turned for me my mourning into

gladness; Thou hast removed my sackcloth, and girded me with gladness,

that my glory may sing praise unto Thee, and not be silent." [462]

37. It is impossible, in a digression like this, to refer, however

briefly, to all the figurative predictions of Christ which are to be

found in the law and the prophets. Will it be said that these things

happened in the regular course of things, and that it is a mere

ingenious fancy to make them typical of Christ? Such an objection

might come from Jews and Pagans; but those who wish to be considered

Christians must yield to the authority of the apostle when he says,

"All these things happened to them for an example;" and again, "These

things are our examples." [463] For if two men, Ishmael and Isaac,

are types of the two covenants, can it be supposed that there is no

significance in the vast number of particulars which have no historical

or natural value? Suppose we were to see some Hebrew characters

written on the wall of a noble building, should we be so foolish as to

conclude that, because we cannot understand the characters, they are

not intended to be read, and are mere painting, without any meaning?

So, whoever with a candid mind reads all these things that are

contained in the Old Testament Scriptures, must feel constrained to

acknowledge that they have a meaning.

38. As an example of those particulars which have no meaning at all if

not a symbolical one: Granting that it was necessary that woman should

be made as an help meet for man, what natural reason can be assigned

for her being taken from his side while he slept? Granting that an ark

was required in order to escape from the flood, why should it have

precisely these dimensions, and why should they be recorded for the

devout study of future generations? Granting that the animals were

brought into the ark to preserve the various races, why should there be

seven clean and two unclean? Granting that the ark must have a door,

why should it be in the side, and why should this fact be committed to

writing? Abraham is commanded to sacrifice his son: we may allow that

this proof of his obedience was required in order to make it

conspicuous in all ages; we may allow, too, that it was a proper thing

for the son to carry the wood instead of the aged father, and that in

the end the fatal stroke was forbidden, lest the father should be left

childless. But what had the shedding of the ram's blood to do with

Abraham's trial? or if it was necessary to complete the sacrifice, was

the ram any the better of being caught by the horns in a bush? The

human mind, that is to say, a rational mind, is led by the

consideration of the way in which these apparently superfluous things

are blended with what is necessary, first to acknowledge their

significance, and then to try to discover it.

39. The Jews themselves, who scoff at the crucified Saviour in whom we

believe, and who consequently will not allow that Christ is predicted

in the sayings and actions recorded in the Old Testament, are compelled

to come to us for an explanation of those things which, if not

explained, must appear trifling and ridiculous. This led Philo, a Jew

of great learning, whom the Greeks speak of as rivalling Plato in

eloquence, to attempt to explain some things without any reference to

Christ, in whom he did not believe. His attempt only shows the

inferiority of all ingenious speculations, when made without keeping

Christ in view, to whom all the predictions really point. So true is

that saying of the apostle: "When they shall turn to the Lord, the

veil shall be taken away." [464] For instance, Noah's ark is,

according to Philo, a type of the human body, member by member: with

this view, he shows that the numerical proportions agree perfectly.

For there is no reason why a type of Christ should not be a type of the

human body, too, since the Saviour of mankind appeared in a human body,

though what is typical of a human body is not necessarily typical of

Christ. Philo's explanation fails, however, as regards the door in the

side of the ark. He actually, for the sake of saying something, makes

this door represent the lower apertures of the body. He has the

hardihood to put this in words, and on paper. Indeed, he knew not the

door and could not understand the symbol. Had he turned to Christ the

veil would have been taken away, and he would have found the sacraments

of the Church flowing from the side of Christ's human body. For,

according to the announcement, "They two shall be one flesh," some

things in the ark which is a type of Christ, refer to Christ, and some

to the Church. This contrast between the explanations which keep

Christ in view, and all other ingenious perversions, is the same in

every particular of all the figures in Scripture.

40. The Pagans, too, cannot deny our right to give a figurative

meaning to both words and things, especially as we can point to the

fulfillment of the types and figures. For the Pagans themselves try to

find in their own fables figures of natural and religious truth.

Sometimes they give clear explanations, while at other times they

disguise their meaning, and what is sacred in the temples becomes a

jest in the theatres. They unite a disgraceful licentiousness to a

degrading superstition.

41. Besides this wonderful agreement between the types and the things

typified, the adversary may be convinced by plain prophetic

intimations, such as this: "In thy seed shall all nations be

blessed." This was said to Abraham, [465] and again to Isaac, [466]

and again to Jacob. [467] Hence the significance of the words "I am

the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob." [468] God fulfills His

promise to their seed in blessing all nations. With a like

significance, Abraham himself, when he made his servant swear, told him

to put his hand under his thigh; [469] for he knew that thence would

come the flesh of Christ, in whom we have now, not the promise of

blessing to all nations, but the promise fulfilled.

42. I should like to know, or rather, it would be well not to know,

with what blindness of mind Faustus reads the passage where Jacob calls

his sons, and says, "Assemble, that I may tell you the things that are

to happen in the last day. Assemble and hear, ye sons of Jacob; give

ear to Israel, your father." Surely these are the words of a prophet.

What, then, does he say of his son Judah, of whose tribe Christ came of

the seed of David according to the flesh, as the apostle teaches?

"Judah," he says, "thy brethren shall praise thee: thy hand shall be

upon the backs of thine enemies; the sons of thy father shall bow down

to thee. Judah is a lion's whelp; my son and offspring: bowing down,

thou hast gone up: thou sleepest as a lion, and as a young lion, who

will rouse him up? A prince shall not depart from Judah, nor a leader

from his loins, till those things come which have been laid up for

him. He also is the desire of nations: binding his foal unto the

vine, and his ass's colt with sackcloth, he shall wash his garment in

wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes: his eyes are bright with

wine, and his teeth whiter than milk." [470] There is no falsehood or

obscurity in these words when we read them in the clear light of

Christ. We see His brethren the apostles and all His joint-heirs

praising Him, seeking, not their own glory, but His. We see His hands

on the backs of His enemies, who are bent and bowed to the earth by the

growth of the Christian communities in spite of their opposition. We

see Him worshipped by the sons of Jacob, the remnant saved according to

the election of grace. Christ, who was born as an infant, is the

lion's whelp, as it is added, My son and offspring, to show why this

whelp, in whose praise it is said, "The lion's whelp is stronger than

the herd," [471] is even in infancy stronger than its elders. We see

Christ ascending the cross, and bowing down when He gave up His

spirit. We see Him sleeping as a lion, because in death itself He was

not the conquered, but the conqueror, and as a lion's whelp; for the

reason of His birth and of His death was the same. And He is raised

from the dead by Him whom no man hath seen or can see; for the words,

"Who will raise Him up?" point to an unknown power. A prince did not

depart from Judah, nor a leader from his loins, till in due time those

things came which had been laid up in the promise. For we learn from

the authentic history of the Jews themselves, that Herod, under whom

Christ was born, was their first foreign king. So the sceptre did not

depart from the seed of Judah till the things laid up for him came.

Then, as the promise is not only to the believing Jews, it is added:

"He is the desire of the nations." Christ bound His foal--that is, His

people--to the vine, when He preached in sackcloth, crying, "Repent,

for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The Gentiles made subject to

Him are represented by the ass's colt, on which He also sat, leading it

into Jerusalem, that is, the vision of peace teaching the meek His

ways. We see Him washing His garments in wine; for He is one with the

glorious Church, which He presents to Himself, not having spot or

wrinkle; to whom also it is said by Isaiah: "Though your sins be as

scarlet, I will make them white as snow." [472] How is this done but

by the remission of sins? And the wine is none other than that of

which it is said that it is "shed for many, for the remission of

sins." Christ is the cluster that hung on the pole. So it is added,

"and His clothes in the blood of the grape." Again, what is said of

His eyes being bright with wine, is understood by those members of His

body who are enabled, in holy aberration of mind from the current of

earthly things, to gaze on the eternal light of wisdom. So Paul says

in a passage quoted before: "If we be beside ourselves, it is to

God." Those are the eyes bright with wine. But he adds: "If we be

sober, it is for your sakes." The babes needing to be fed with milk

are not forgotten, as is denoted by the words, "His teeth are whiter

than milk."

43. What can our deluded adversaries say to such plain examples, which

leave no room for perverse denial, or even for sceptical uncertainty?

I call on the Manich�ans to begin to inquire into these subjects, and

to admit the force of these evidences, on which I have no time to

dwell; nor do I wish to make a selection, in case the ignorant reader

should think there are no others, while the Christian student might

blame me for the omission of many points more striking than those which

occur to me at the moment. You will find many passages which require

no such explanation as has been given here of Jacob's prophecy. For

instance, every reader can understand the words, "He was led as a lamb

to the slaughter," and the whole of that plain prophecy, "With His

stripes we are healed"--"He bore our sins." [473] We have a poetical

gospel in the words: "They pierced my hands and feet. They have told

all my bones. They look and stare upon me. They divided my garments

among them, and cast lots on my vesture." [474] The blind even may

now see the fulfillment of the words: "All the ends of the earth shall

remember and turn unto the Lord, and all kingdoms of the nations shall

worship before Him." The words in the Gospel, "My soul is sorrowful,

even unto death," "My soul is troubled," are a repetition of the words

in the Psalm, "I slept in trouble." [475] And who made Him sleep?

Whose voices cried, Crucify him, crucify him? The Psalm tells us:

"The sons of men, their teeth are spears and arrows, and their tongue a

sharp sword." [476] But they could not prevent His resurrection, or

His ascension above the heavens, or His filling the earth with the

glory of His name; for the Psalm says: "Be Thou exalted, O God, above

the heavens, and let Thy glory be above all the earth." Every one must

apply these words to Christ: "The Lord said unto me, Thou art my Son,

this day have I begotten Thee. Ask of me, and I will give Thee the

heathen for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for

Thy possession." [477] And what Jeremiah says of wisdom plainly

applies to Christ: "Jacob delivered it to his son, and Israel to his

chosen one. Afterwards He appeared on earth, and conversed with men."

[478]

44. The same Saviour is spoken of in Daniel, where the Son of man

appears before the Ancient of days, and receives a kingdom without end,

that all nations may serve Him. [479] In the passage quoted from

Daniel by the Lord Himself, "When ye shall see the abomination of

desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy

place, let him that readeth understand," [480] the number of weeks

points not only to Christ, but to the very time of His advent. With

the Jews, who look to Christ for salvation as we do, but deny that He

has come and suffered, we can argue from actual events. Besides the

conversion of the heathen, now so universal, as prophesied of Christ in

their own Scriptures, there are the events in the history of the Jews

themselves. Their holy place is thrown down, the sacrifice has ceased,

and the priest, and the ancient anointing; which was all clearly

foretold by Daniel when he prophesied of the anointing of the Most

Holy. [481] Now, that all these things have taken place, we ask the

Jews for the anointed Most Holy, and they have no answer to give. But

it is from the Old Testament that the Jews derive all the knowledge

they have of Christ and His advent. Why do they ask John whether he is

Christ? Why do they say to the Lord, "How long dost thou make us to

doubt? If thou art the Christ, tell us plainly." Why do Peter and

Andrew and Philip say to Nathanael, "We have found Messias, which is

interpreted Christ," but because this name was known to them from the

prophecies of their Scriptures? In no other nation were the kings and

priests anointed, and called Anointed or Christs. Nor could this

symbolical anointing be discontinued till the coming of Him who was

thus prefigured. For among all their anointed ones the Jews looked for

one who was to save them. But in the mysterious justice of God they

were blinded; and thinking only of the power of the Messiah, they did

not understand His weakness, in which He died for us. In the book of

Wisdom it is prophesied of the Jews: "Let us condemn him to an

ignominious death; for he will be proved in his words. If he is truly

the Son of God, He will aid him; and deliver him from the hand of his

enemies. Thus they thought, and erred; for their wickedness blinded

them." [482] These words apply also to those who, in spite of all

these evidences, in spite of such a series of prophecies, and of their

fulfillment, still deny that Christ is foretold in the Scriptures. As

often as they repeat this denial, we can produce fresh proofs, with the

help of Him who has made such provision against human perversity, that

proofs already given need not be repeated.

45. Faustus has an evasive objection, which he no doubt thinks a most

ingenious way of eluding the force of the clearest evidence of

prophecy, but of which one is unwilling to take any notice, because

answering it may give it an appearance of importance which it does not

really possess. What could be more irrational than to say that it is

weak faith which will not believe in Christ without evidence? Do our

adversaries, then, believe in testimony about Christ? Faustus wishes

us to believe the voice from heaven as distinguished from human

testimony. But did they hear this voice? Has not the knowledge of it

come to us through human testimony? The apostle describes the

transmission of this knowledge, when he says: "How shall they call on

Him on whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe on Him

of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a

preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent? As it is

written, "How beautiful are the feet of them who publish peace, who

bring good tidings!" [483] Clearly, in the preaching of the apostles

there was a reference to prophetic testimony. The apostles quoted the

predictions of the prophets, to prove the truth and importance of their

doctrines. For although their preaching was accompanied with the power

of working miracles, the miracles would have been ascribed to magic, as

some even now venture to insinuate, unless the apostles had shown that

the authority of the prophets was in their favor. The testimony of

prophets who lived so long before could not be ascribed to magical

arts. Perhaps the reason why Faustus will not have us believe the

Hebrew prophets as witnesses of the true Christ, is because he believes

Persian heresies about a false Christ.

46. According to the teaching of the Catholic Church, the Christian

mind must first be nourished in simple faith, in order that it may

become capable of understanding things heavenly and eternal. Thus it

is said by the prophet: "Unless ye believe, ye shall not understand."

[484] Simple faith is that by which, before we attain to the height

of the knowledge of the love of Christ, that we may be filled with all

the fullness of God, we believe that not without reason was the

dispensation of Christ's humiliation, in which He was born and suffered

as man, foretold so long before by the prophets through a prophetic

race, a prophetic people, a prophetic kingdom. This faith teaches us,

that in the foolishness which is wiser than men, and in the weakness

which is stronger than men, is contained the hidden means of our

justification and glorification. There are hid all the treasures of

wisdom and knowledge, which are opened to no one who despises the

nourishment transmitted through the breast of his mother that is, the

milk of apostolic and prophetic instruction; or who, thinking himself

too old for infantile nourishment, devours heretical poison instead of

the food of wisdom, for which he rashly thought himself prepared. To

require simple faith is quite consistent with requiring faith in the

prophets. The very use of simple faith is to believe the prophets at

the outset, while the understanding of the person who speaks in the

prophets is attained after the mind has been purified and strengthened.

47. But, it is said, if the prophets foretold Christ, they did not

live in a way becoming their office. How can you tell whether they did

or not? You are bad judges of what it is to live well or ill, whose

justice consists in giving relief to an inanimate melon by eating it,

instead of giving food to the starving beggar. It is enough for the

babes in the Catholic Church, who do not yet know the perfect justice

of the human soul, and the difference between the justice aimed at and

that actually attained, to think of those men according to the

wholesome doctrine of the apostles, that the just lives by faith.

"Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness.

For the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by

faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thy seed

shall all nations be blessed." [485] These are the words of the

apostle. If you would, at his clear well-known voice, wake up from

your unprofitable dreams, you would follow in the footsteps of our

father Abraham, and would be blessed, along with all nations, in his

seed. For, as the apostle says, "He received the sign of circumcision,

a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being

uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all that believe in

uncircumcision; that he might be the father of circumcision not only to

those who are of the circumcision, but also to those who follow the

footsteps of the faith of our father Abraham in uncircumcision." [486]

Since the righteousness of Abraham's faith is thus set forth as an

example to us, that we too, being justified by faith, may have peace

with God, we ought to understand his manner of life, without finding

fault with it; lest, by a premature separation from mother-Church, we

prove abortions, instead of being brought forth in due time, when the

conception has arrived at completeness.

48. This is a brief reply to Faustus in behalf of the character of the

patriarchs and prophets. It is the reply of the babes of our faith,

among whom I would reckon myself, inasmuch as I would not find fault

with the life of the ancient saints, even if I did not understand its

mystical character. Their life is proclaimed to us with approval by

the apostles in their Gospel, as they themselves in their prophecy

foretold the future apostles, that the two Testaments, like the

seraphim, might cry to one another, "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God

of hosts." [487] When Faustus, instead of the vague general

accusation which he makes here, condemns particular actions in the

lives of the patriarchs and the prophets, the Lord their God, and ours

also, will assist me to reply suitably and appropriately to the

separate charges. For the present, the reader must choose whether to

believe the commendation of the Apostle Paul or the accusations of

Faustus the Manich�an. [488]
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Book XIII.

Faustus asserts that even if the Old Testament could be shown to

contain predictions, it would be of interest only to the Jews, pagan

literature subserving the same purpose for Gentiles. Augustin shows

the value of prophesy for Gentiles and Jews alike.

1. Faustus said: We are asked how we worship Christ when we reject

the prophets, who declared the promise of His advent. It is doubtful

whether, on examination, it can be shown that the Hebrew prophets

foretold our Christ, that is, the Son of God. But were it so, what

does it matter to us? If these testimonies of the prophets that you

speak of were the means of converting any one from Judaism to

Christianity, and if he should afterwards neglect these prophets, he

would certainly be in the wrong, and would be chargeable with

ingratitude. But we are by nature Gentiles, of the uncircumcision; as

Paul says, born under another law. Those whom the Gentiles call poets

were our first religious teachers, and from them we were afterwards

converted to Christianity. We did not first become Jews, so as to

reach Christianity through faith in their prophets; but were attracted

solely by the fame, and the virtues, and the wisdom of our liberator

Jesus Christ. If I were still in the religion of my fathers, and a

preacher were to come using the prophets as evidence in favor of

Christianity, I should think him mad for attempting to support what is

doubtful by what is still more doubtful to a Gentile of another

religion altogether. He would require first to persuade me to believe

the prophets, and then through the prophets to believe Christ. And to

prove the truth of the prophets, other prophets would be necessary.

For if the prophets bear witness to Christ, who bears witness to the

prophets? You will perhaps say that Christ and the prophets mutually

support each other. But a Pagan, who has nothing to do with either,

would believe neither the evidence of Christ to the prophets, nor that

of the prophets to Christ. If the Pagan becomes a Christian, he has to

thank his own faith, and nothing else. Let us, for the sake of

illustration, suppose ourselves conversing with a Gentile inquirer. We

tell him to believe in Christ, because He is God. He asks for proof.

We refer him to the prophets. He asks, What prophets? We reply, The

Hebrew. He smiles, and says that he does not believe them. We remind

him that Christ testifies to them. He replies, laughing, that we must

first make him believe in Christ. The result of such a conversation is

that we are silenced, and the inquirer departs, thinking us more

zealous than wise. Again, I say, the Christian Church, which consists

more of Gentiles than of Jews, can owe nothing to Hebrew witnesses.

If, as is said, any prophecies of Christ are to be found in the Sibyl,

[489] or in Hermes, [490] called Trismegistus, or Orpheus, or any

heathen poet, they might aid the faith of those who, like us, are

converts from heathenism to Christianity. But the testimony of the

Hebrews is useless to us before conversion, for then we cannot believe

them; and superfluous after, for we believe without them.

2. Augustin replied: After the long reply of last book, a short

answer may suffice here. To one who has read that reply, it must seem

insanity in Faustus to persist in denying that Christ was foretold by

the Hebrew prophets, when the Hebrew nation was the only one in which

the name Christ had a peculiar sacredness as applied to kings and

priests; in which sense it continued to be applied till the coming of

Him whom those kings and priests typified. Where did the Manich�an

learn the name of Christ? If from Manich�us, it is very strange that

Africans, not to speak of others, should believe the Persian Manich�us,

since Faustus finds fault with the Romans and Greeks, and other

Gentiles, for believing the Hebrew prophets as belonging to another

race. According to Faustus, the predictions of the Sibyl, or Orpheus,

or any heathen poet, are more suitable for leading Gentiles to believe

in Christ. He forgets that none of these are read in the churches,

whereas the voice of the Hebrew prophets, sounding everywhere, draws

swarms of people to Christianity. When it is so evident that men are

everywhere led to Christ by the Hebrew prophets, it is great absurdity

to say that those prophets are not suitable for the Gentiles.

3. Christ as foretold by the Hebrew prophets does not please you; but

this is the Christ in whom the Gentile nations believe, with whom,

according to you, Hebrew prophecy should have no weight. They receive

the gospel which, as Paul says, "God had promised before by His

prophets in the Holy Scriptures of His Son, who was made of the seed of

David according to the flesh." [491] So we read in Isaiah: "There

shall be a Root of Jesse, which shall rise to reign in the nations; in

Him shall the Gentiles trust." [492] And again: "Behold, a virgin

shall conceive and bear a son, and they shall call His name Emmanuel,"

[493] which is, being interpreted, God with us. Nor let the Manich�an

think that Christ is foretold only as a man by the Hebrew prophets; for

this is what Faustus seems to insinuate when he says, "Our Christ is

the Son of God," as if the Christ of the Hebrews was not the Son of

God. We can prove Christ the virgin's son of Hebrew prophecy to be

God. For the Lord Himself teaches the carnal Jews not to think that,

because He is foretold as the son of David, He is therefore no more

than that. He asks: "What think ye of Christ? Whose son is He?"

They reply: "Of David." Then, to remind them of the name Emmanuel,

God with us, He says: "How does David in the Spirit call Him Lord,

saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit Thou at my right hand, till I

make Thine enemies Thy footstool?" [494] Here, then, Christ appears

as God in Hebrew prophecy. What prophecy can the Manich�ans show with

the name of Christ in it?

4. Manich�us indeed was not a prophet of Christ, but calls himself an

apostle, which is a shameless falsehood; for it is well known that this

heresy began not only after Tertullian, but after Cyprian. In all his

letters Manich�us begins thus: "Manich�us, an apostle of Jesus

Christ." Why do you believe what Manich�us says of Christ? What

evidence does he give of his apostleship? This very name of Christ is

known to us only from the Jews, who, in their application of it to

their kings and priests, were not individually, but nationally,

prophets of Christ and Christ's kingdom. What right has he to use this

name, who forbids you to believe the Hebrew prophets, that he may make

you the heretical disciples of a false Christ, as he himself is a false

and heretical apostle? And if Faustus quotes as evidence in his own

support some prophets who, according to him, foretell Christ, how will

he satisfy his supposed inquirer, who will not believe either the

prophets or Faustus? Will he take our apostles as witnesses? Unless

he can find some apostles in life, he must read their writings; and

these are all against him. They teach our doctrine that Christ was

born of the Virgin Mary, that He was the Son of God, of the seed of

David according to the flesh. He cannot pretend that the writings have

been tampered with, for that would be to attack the credit of his own

witnesses. Or if he produces his own manuscripts of the apostolic

writings, he must also obtain for them the authority of the churches

founded by the apostles themselves, by showing that they have been

preserved and transmitted with their sanction. It will be difficult

for a man to make me believe him on the evidence of writings which

derive all their authority from his own word, which I do not believe.

5. But perhaps you believe the common report about Christ. Faustus

makes a feeble suggestion of this kind as a last resource, to escape

being obliged either to produce his worthless authorities, or to come

under the power of those opposed to him. Well, if report is your

authority, you should consider the consequences of trusting to such

evidence. There are many bad things reported of you which you do not

wish people to believe. Is it reasonable to make the same evidence

true about Christ and false about yourselves? In fact, you deny the

common report about Christ. For the report most widely spread, and

which every one has heard repeated, is that which distinctly asserts

that Christ was born of the seed of David, according to the promise

made in the Hebrew Scriptures to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob: "In thy

seed shall all nations be blessed." You will not admit this Hebrew

testimony, but you do not seem to have any other. The authority of our

books, which is confirmed by the agreement of so many nations,

supported by a succession of apostles, bishops, and councils, is

against you. Your books have no authority, for it is an authority

maintained by only a few, and these the worshippers of an untruthful

God and Christ. If they are not following the example of the beings

they worship, their testimony must be against their own false

doctrine. And, once more, common report gives a very bad account of

you, and invariably asserts, in opposition to you, that Christ was of

the seed of David. You did not hear the voice of the Father from

heaven. You did not see the works by which Christ bore witness to

Himself. The books which tell of these things you profess to receive,

that you may maintain a delusive appearance of Christianity; but when

anything is quoted against you, you say that the books have been

tampered with. You quote the passage where Christ says, "If ye believe

not me, believe the works;" and again, "I am one that bear witness of

myself, and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me;" but you

will not let us quote in reply such passages as these: "Search the

Scriptures; for in them ye think that ye have eternal life, and they

are they that testify of me;" "If ye believed Moses, ye would believe

me, for he wrote of me;" "They have Moses and the prophets, let them

hear them;" "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they

believe though one rose from the dead." What have you to say for

yourselves? Where is your authority? If you reject these passages of

Scripture, in spite of the weighty authority in their favor, what

miracles can you show? However, if you did work miracles, we should be

on our guard against receiving their evidence in your case; for the

Lord has forewarned us: "Many false Christs and false prophets shall

arise, and shall do many signs and wonders, that they may deceive, if

it were possible, the very elect: behold, I have told you before."

[495] This shows that the established authority of Scripture must

outweigh every other; for it derives new confirmation from the progress

of events which happen, as Scripture proves, in fulfillment of the

predictions made so long before their occurrence.

6. Are, then, your doctrines so manifestly true, that they require no

support from miracles or from any testimony? Show us these

self-evident truths, if you have anything of the kind to show. Your

legends, as we have already seen, are long and silly, old wives fables

for the amusement of women and children. The beginning is detached

from the rest, the middle is unsound, and the end is a miserable

failure. If you begin with the immortal, invisible, incorruptible God,

what need was there of His fighting with the race of darkness? And as

for the middle of your theory, what becomes of the incorruptibility and

unchangeableness of God, when His members in fruits and vegetables are

purified by your mastication and digestion? And for the end, is it

just that the wretched soul should be punished with lasting confinement

in the mass of darkness, because its God is unable to cleanse it of the

defilement contracted from evil external to itself in the fulfillment

of His own commission? You are at a loss for a reply. See the

worthlessness of your boasted manuscripts, numerous and valuable as you

say they are! Alas for the toils of the antiquaries! Alas for the

property of the unhappy owners! Alas for the food of the deluded

followers! Destitute as you are of Scripture authority, of the power

of miracles, of moral excellence, and of sound doctrine, depart

ashamed, and return penitent, confessing that true Christ, who is the

Saviour of all who believe in Him, whose name and whose Church are now

displayed as they were of old foretold, not by some being issuing from

subterranean darkness, but by a nation in a distinct kingdom

established for this purpose, that there those things might be

figuratively predicted of Christ which are now in reality fulfilled,

and the prophets might foretell in writing what the apostles now

exhibit in their preaching.

7. Let us suppose, then, a conversation with a heathen inquirer, in

which Faustus described us as making a poor appearance, though his own

appearance was much more deplorable. If we say to the heathen, Believe

in Christ, for He is God, and, on his asking for evidence, produce the

authority of the prophets, if he says that he does not believe the

prophets, because they are Hebrew and he is a Gentile, we can prove the

truth of the prophets from the actual fulfillment of their prophecies.

He could scarcely be ignorant of the persecutions suffered by the early

Christians from the kings of this world; or if he was ignorant, he

could be informed from history and the records of imperial laws. But

this is what we find foretold long ago by the prophet, saying, "Why do

the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of

the earth set themselves, and the princes take counsel together against

the Lord, and against His Christ." The rest of the Psalm shows that

this is not said of David. For what follows might convince the most

stubborn unbeliever: "The Lord said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day

have I begotten Thee. Ask of me, and I will give Thee the heathen for

Thine inheritance, and the ends of the earth for Thy possession." [496]

This never happened to the Jews, whose king, David was, but is now

plainly fulfilled in the subjection of all nations to the name of

Christ. This and many similar prophecies, which it would take too long

to quote, would surely impress the mind of the inquirer. He would see

these very kings of the earth now happily subdued by Christ, and all

nations serving Him; and he would hear the words of the Psalm in which

this was so long before predicted: "All the kings of the earth shall

bow down to Him; all nations shall serve Him." [497] And if he were

to read the whole of that Psalm, which is figuratively applied to

Solomon, he would find that Christ is the true King of peace, for

Solomon means peaceful; and he would find many things in the Psalm

applicable to Christ, which have no reference at all to the literal

King Solomon. Then there is that other Psalm where God is spoken of as

anointed by God, the very word anointed pointing to Christ, showing

that Christ is God, for God is represented as being anointed. [498]

In reading what is said in this Psalm of Christ and of the Church, he

would find that what is there foretold is fulfilled in the present

state of the world. He would see the idols of the nations perishing

from off the earth, and he would find that this is predicted by the

prophets, as in Jeremiah, "Then shall ye say unto them, The gods that

have not made the heavens and the earth shall perish from the earth,

and from under heaven;" [499] and again, "O Lord, my strength, and my

fortress, and my refuge in the day of affliction, the Gentiles shall

come unto Thee from the ends of the earth, and shall say, Surely our

fathers have inherited lies, vanity, and things wherein there is no

profit. Shall a man make gods unto himself, and they are no gods?

Therefore, behold, I will at that time cause them to know, I will cause

them to know mine hand and my might; and they shall know that I am the

Lord." [500] Hearing these prophecies, and seeing their actual

fulfillment, I need not say that he would be affected; for we know by

experience how the hearts of believers are confirmed by seeing ancient

predictions now receiving their accomplishment.

8. In the same prophet the inquirer would find clear proof that Christ

is not merely one of the great men that have appeared in the world.

For Jeremiah goes on to say: "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man,

and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord: for

he shall be like the heath in the desert, and shall not see when good

cometh; but shall inhabit the parched places of the wilderness, in a

salt land not inhabited. Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord,

and whose hope the Lord is: for he shall be as a tree beside the

water, that spreadeth out its roots by the river: he shall not fear

when heat cometh, but his leaf shall be green; he shall not be careful

in the year of drought, neither shall cease from yielding fruit." [501]

On hearing this curse pronounced in the figurative language of

prophecy on him that trusts in man, and the blessing in similar style

on him that trusts in God, the inquirer might have doubts about our

doctrine, in which we teach not only that Christ is God, so that our

trust is not in man, but also that He is man because He took our

nature. So some err by denying Christ's humanity, while they allow His

divinity. Others, again, assert His humanity, but deny His divinity,

and so either become infidels or incur the guilt of trusting in man.

The inquirer, then, might say that the prophet says only that Christ is

God, without any reference to His human nature; whereas, in our

apostolic doctrine, Christ is not only God in whom we may safely trust,

but the Mediator between God and man--the man Jesus. The prophet

explains this in the words in which he seems to check himself, and to

supply the omission: "His heart," he says "is sorrowful throughout;

and He is man, and who shall know Him?" [502] He is man, in order

that in the form of a servant He might heal the hard in heart, and that

they might acknowledge as God Him who became man for their sakes, that

their trust might be not in man, but in God-man. He is man taking the

form of a servant. And who shall know Him? For "He was in the form of

God, and thought it not robbery to be equal to God." [503] He is man,

for "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." And who shall know

Him? For "in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,

and the Word was God." [504] And truly His heart was sorrowful

throughout. For even as regards His own disciples His heart was

sorrowful, when He said, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet

have ye not known me?" "Have I been so long time with you" answers to

the words "He is man," and "Have ye not known me?" to "Who shall know

Him?" And the person is none other but He who says, "He that hath seen

me hath seen the Father." [505] So that our trust is not in man, to

be under the curse of the prophet, but in God-man, that is, in the Son

of God, the Saviour Jesus Christ, the Mediator between God and man. In

the form of a servant the Father is greater than He; in the form of God

He is equal with the Father.

9. In Isaiah we read: "The pride of man shall be brought low; and the

Lord alone shall be exalted in that day. And they shall hide the

workmanship of their hands in the clefts of the rocks, and in dens and

caves of the earth, from fear of the Lord, and from the glory of His

power, when He shall arise to shake terribly the earth. For in that

day a man shall cast away his idols of gold and silver, which they have

made to worship, as useless and hurtful." [506] Perhaps the inquirer

himself, who, as Faustus supposes, would laugh and say that he does not

believe the Hebrew prophets, has hid idols made with hands in some

cleft, or cave, or den. Or he may know a friend, or neighbor, or

fellow-citizen who has done this from the fear of the Lord, who by the

severe prohibition of the kings of the earth, now serving and bowing

down to him, as the prophet predicted, shakes the earth, that is,

breaks the stubborn heart of worldly men. The inquirer is not likely

to disbelieve the Hebrew prophets, when he finds their predictions

fulfilled, perhaps in his own person.

10. One might rather fear that the inquirer, in the midst of such

copious evidence, would say that the Christians composed those writings

when the events described had already begun to take place, in order

that those occurrences might appear to be not due to a merely human

purpose, but as if divinely foretold. One might fear this, were it not

for the widely spread and widely known people of the Jews; that Cain,

with the mark that he should not be killed by any one; that Ham, the

servant of his brethren, carrying as a load the books for their

instruction. From the Jewish manuscripts we prove that these things

were not written by us to suit the event, but were long ago published

and preserved as prophecies in the Jewish nation. These prophecies are

now explained in their accomplishment: for even what is obscure in

them--because these things happened to them as an example, and were

written for our benefit, on whom the ends of the world are come--is now

made plain; and what was hidden in the shadows of the future is now

visible in the light of actual experience.

11. The inquirer might bring forward as a difficulty the fact that

those in whose books these prophecies are found are not united with us

in the gospel. But when convinced that this also is foretold, he would

feel how strong the evidence is. The prophecies of the unbelief of the

Jews no one can avoid seeing, no one can pretend to be blind to them.

No one can doubt that Isaiah spoke of the Jews when he said, "The ox

knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib; but Israel hath not

known, and my people hath not considered;" [507] or again, in the words

quoted by the apostle, "I have stretched out my hands all the day to a

wicked and gainsaying people;" [508] and especially where he says, "God

has given them the spirit of remorse, eyes that they should not see,

and ears that they should not hear, and should not understand," [509]

and many similar passages. If the inquirer objected that it was not

the fault of the Jews if God blinded them so that they did not know

Christ, we should try in the simplest manner possible to make him

understand that this blindness is the just punishment of other secret

sins known to God. We should prove that the apostle recognizes this

principle when he says of some persons, "God gave them up to the lusts

of their own hearts, and to a reprobate mind, to do things not

convenient;" [510] and that the prophets themselves speak of this.

For, to revert to the words of Jeremiah, "He is man, and who shall know

Him?" lest it should be an excuse for the Jews that they did not

know,--for if they had known, as the apostle says, "they would not have

crucified the Lord of glory," [511] --the prophet goes on to show that

their ignorance was the result of secret criminality; for he says: "I

the Lord search the heart and try the reins, to give to every one

according to his ways, and according to the fruits of his doings."

12. If the next difficulty in the mind of the inquirer arose from the

divisions and heresies among those called Christians, he would learn

that this too is taken notice of by the prophets. For, as if it was

natural that, after being satisfied about the blindness of the Jews,

this objection from the divisions among Christians should occur,

Jeremiah, observing this order in his prophecy, immediately adds in the

passage already quoted: "The partridge is clamorous, gathering what it

has not brought forth, making riches without judgment." For the

partridge is notoriously quarrelsome, and is often caught from its

eagerness in quarreling. So the heretics discuss not to find the

truth, but with a dogged determination to gain the victory one way or

another, that they may gather, as the prophet says, what they have not

brought forth. For those whom they lead astray are Christians already

born of the gospel, whom the Christian profession of the heretics

misleads. Thus they make riches not with judgment, but with

inconsiderate haste. For they do not consider that the followers whom

they gather as their riches are taken from the genuine original

Christian society, and deprived of its benefits; and as the apostle

describes these heretics in the words: "As Jannes and Jambres

withstood Moses, so they also resist the truth: men of corrupt minds,

reprobate concerning the faith. But they shall proceed no further:

for their folly shall be manifest to all men, as theirs also was."

[512] So the prophet goes on to say of the partridge, which gathers

what it has not brought forth: "In the midst of his days they shall

leave him, and in the end he shall be a fool;" that is, he who at first

misled people by a promising display of superior wisdom, shall be a

fool, that is, shall be seen to be a fool. He will be seen when his

folly is manifest to all men, and to those to whom he was at first a

wise man he will then be a fool.

13. As if anticipating that the inquirer would ask next by what plain

mark a young disciple, not yet able to distinguish the truth among so

many errors, might find the true Church of Christ, since the clear

fulfillment of so many predictions compelled him to believe in Christ,

the prophet answers this question in what follows, and teaches that the

Church of Christ, which he describes prophetically, is conspicuously

visible. His words are: "A glorious high throne is our sanctuary."

[513] This glorious throne is the Church of which the apostle says:

"The temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." [514] The Lord

also, foreseeing the conspicuousness of the Church as a help to young

disciples who might be misled, says, "A city that is set on an hill

cannot be hid." [515] Since, then, a glorious high throne is our

sanctuary, no attention is to be paid to those who would lead us into

sectarianism, saying, "Lo, here is Christ," or "Lo there." Lo here, lo

there, speaks of division; but the true city is on a mountain, and the

mountain is that which, as we read in the prophet Daniel, grew from a

little stone till it filled the whole earth. [516] And no attention

should be paid to those who, professing some hidden mystery confined to

a small number, say, Behold, He is in the chamber; behold, in the

desert: for a city set on an hill cannot be hid, and a glorious high

throne is our sanctuary.

14. After considering these instances of the fulfillment of prophecy

about kings and people acting as persecutors, and then becoming

believers, about the destruction of idols, about the blindness of the

Jews, about their testimony to the writings which they have preserved,

about the folly of heretics, about the dignity of the Church of true

and genuine Christians, the inquirer would most reasonably receive the

testimony of these prophets about the divinity of Christ. No doubt, if

we were to begin by urging him to believe prophecies yet unfulfilled,

he might justly answer, What have I to do with these prophets, of whose

truth I have no evidence? But, in view of the manifest accomplishment

of so many remarkable predictions, no candid person would despise

either the things which were thought worthy of being predicted in those

early times with so much solemnity, or those who made the predictions.

To none can we trust more safely, as regards either events long past or

those still future, than to men whose words are supported by the

evidence of so many notable predictions having been fulfilled.

15. If any truth about God or the Son of God is taught or predicted in

the Sibyl or Sibyls, or in Orpheus, or in Hermes, if there ever was

such a person, or in any other heathen poets, or theologians, or sages,

or philosophers, it may be useful for the refutation of Pagan error,

but cannot lead us to believe in these writers. For while they spoke,

because they could not help it, of the God whom we worship, they either

taught their fellow-countrymen to worship idols and demons, or allowed

them to do so without daring to protest against it. But our sacred

writers, with the authority and assistance of God, were the means of

establishing and preserving among their people a government under which

heathen customs were condemned as sacrilege. If any among this people

fell into idolatry or demon-worship, they were either punished by the

laws, or met by the awful denunciations of the prophets. They

worshipped one God, the maker of heaven and earth. They had rites; but

these rites were prophetic, or symbolical of things to come, and were

to cease on the appearance of the things signified. The whole state

was one great prophet, with its king and priest symbolically anointed

which was discontinued, not by the wish of the Jews themselves, who

were in ignorance through unbelief, but only on the coming of Him who

was God, anointed with spiritual grace above His fellows, the holy of

holies, the true King who should govern us, the true Priest who should

offer Himself for us. In a word, the predictions of heathen ingenuity

regarding Christ's coming are as different from sacred prophecy as the

confession of devils from the proclamation of angels.

16. By such arguments, which might be expanded if we were discussing

with one brought up in heathenism, and might be supported by proofs in

still greater number, the inquirer whom Faustus has brought before us

would certainly be led to believe, unless he preferred his sins to his

salvation. As a believer, he would be taken to be cherished in the

bosom of the Catholic Church, and would be taught in due course the

conduct required of him. He would see many who do not practise the

required duties; but this would not shake his faith, even though these

people should belong to the same Church and partake of the same

sacraments as himself. He would understand that few share in the

inheritance of God, while many partake in its outward signs; that few

are united in holiness of life, and in the gift of love shed abroad in

our hearts by the Holy Spirit who is given to us, which is a hidden

spring that no stranger can approach; and that many join in the

solemnity of the sacrament, which he that eats and drinks unworthily

eats and drinks judgment to himself, while he who neglects to eat it

shall not have life in him, [517] and so shall never reach eternal

life. He will understand, too, that the good are called few as

compared with the multitude of the evil, but that as scattered over the

world there are very many growing among the tares, and mixed with the

chaff, till the day of harvest and of purging. As this is taught in

the Gospel, so is it foretold by the prophets. We read, "As a lily

among thorns, so is my beloved among the daughters;" [518] and again,

"I have dwelt in the tabernacles of Kedar; peaceful among them that

hated peace;" [519] and again, "Mark in the forehead those who sigh and

cry for the iniquities of my people, which are done in the midst of

them." [520] The inquirer would be confirmed by such passages; and

being now a fellow-citizen with the saints and of the household of God,

no longer an alien from Israel, but an Israelite indeed, in whom is no

guile, would learn to utter from a guileless heart the words which

follow in the passage of Jeremiah already quoted, "O Lord, the patience

of Israel: let all that forsake Thee be dismayed." After speaking of

the partridge that is clamorous, and gathers what it has not brought

forth; and after extolling the city set on an hill which cannot be hid,

to prevent heretics from drawing men away from the Catholic Church;

after the words, "A glorious high throne is our sanctuary," he seems to

ask himself, What do we make of all those evil men who are found mixed

with the Church, and who become more numerous as the Church extends,

and as all nations are united in Christ? And then follow the words, "O

Lord, the patience of Israel." Patience is necessary to obey the

command, "Suffer both to grow together till the harvest." [521]

Impatience towards the evil might lead to forsaking the good, who in

the strict sense are the body of Christ, and to forsake them would be

to forsake Him. So the prophet goes on to say, "Let all that forsake

Thee be dismayed; let those who have departed to the earth be

confounded." The earth is man trusting in himself, and inducing others

to trust in him. So the prophet adds: "Let them be overthrown, for

they have forsaken the Lord, the fountain of life." This is the cry of

the partridge, that it has got the fountain of life, and will give it;

and so men are gathered to it, and depart from Christ, as if Christ,

whose name they had professed, had not fulfilled His promise. The

partridge gathers those whom it has not brought forth. And in order to

do this, it declares, The salvation which Christ promises is with me; I

will give it. In opposition to this the prophet says: "Heal me, O

Lord, and I shall be healed; save me, and I shall be saved." So we

read in the apostle, "Let no man glory in men;" [522] or in the words

of the prophet, "Thou art my praise." [523] Such is a specimen of

instruction in apostolic and prophetic doctrine, by which a man may be

built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets.

17. Faustus has not told us how he would prove the divinity of Christ

to the heathen, whom he makes to say: I believe neither the prophets

in support of Christ, nor Christ in support of the prophets. It would

be absurd to suppose that such a man would believe what Christ says of

Himself, when he disbelieves what He says of others. For if he thinks

Him unworthy of credit in one case, he must think Him so in all, or at

least more so when speaking of Himself than when speaking of others.

Perhaps, failing this, Faustus would read to him the Sibyls and

Orpheus, and any heathen prophecies about Christ that he could find.

But how could he do this, when he confesses that he knows none? His

words are: "If, as is said, any prophecies of Christ are to be found

in the Sibyl, or in Hermes, called Trismegistus, or Orpheus, or any

heathen poet." How could he read writings of which he knows nothing,

and which he supposes to exist only from report, to one who will not

believe either the prophets or Christ? What, then, would he do? Would

he bring forward Manich�us as a witness to Christ? The opposite of

this is what the Manich�ans do. They take advantage of the widespread

fragrance of the name of Christ to gain acceptance for Manich�us, that

the edge of their poisoned cup may be sweetened with this honey.

Taking hold of the promises of Christ to His disciples that He would

send the Paraclete, that is, the Comforter or Advocate, they say that

this Paraclete is Manich�us, or in Manich�us, and so steal an entrance

into the minds of men who do not know when He who was promised by

Christ really came. Those who have read the canonical book called the

Acts of the Apostles find a reference to Christ's promise, and an

account of its fulfillment. Faustus, then, has no proof to give to the

inquirer. It is not likely that any one will be so infatuated as to

take the authority of Manich�us when he rejects that of Christ. Would

he not reply in derision, if not in anger, Why do you ask me to believe

Persian books, when you forbid me to believe Hebrew books? The

Manich�an has no hold on the inquirer, unless he is already in some way

convinced of the truth of Christianity. When he finds him willing to

believe Christ, then he deludes him with the representation of Christ

given by Manich�us. So the partridge gathers what it has not brought

forth. When will you whom he gathers leave him? When will you see him

to be a fool, who tells you that Hebrew testimony is worthless in the

case of unbelievers, and superfluous to believers?

18. If believers are to throw away all the books which have led them

to believe, I see no reason why they should continue reading the Gospel

itself. The Gospel, too, must be worthless to this inquirer, who,

according to Faustus' pitiful supposition, rejects with ridicule the

authority of Christ. And to the believer it must be superfluous, if

true notices of Christ are superfluous to believers. And if the Gospel

should be read by the believer, that he may not forget what he has

believed, so should the prophets, that he may not forget why he

believed. For if he forgets this his faith cannot be firm. By this

principle, you should throw away the books of Manich�us, on the

authority of which you already believe that light--that is, God--fought

with darkness, and that, in order to bind darkness, the light was first

swallowed up and bound, and polluted and mangled by darkness, to be

restored, and liberated, and purified, and healed by your eating, for

which you are rewarded by not being condemned to the mass of darkness

for ever, along with that part of the light which cannot be

extricated. This fiction is sufficiently published by your practice

and your words. Why do you seek for the testimony of books, and add to

the embarrassment of your God by the consumption of strength in the

needless task of writing manuscripts? Burn all your parchments, with

their finely-ornamented binding; so you will be rid of a useless

burden, and your God who suffers confinement in the volume will be set

free. What a mercy it would be to the members of your God, if you

could boil your books and eat them! There might be a difficulty,

however, from the prohibition of animal food. Then the writing must

share in the impurity of the sheepskin. Indeed, you are to blame for

this, for, like what you say was done in the first war between light

and darkness, you brought what was clean in the pen in contact with the

uncleanness of the parchment. Or perhaps, for the sake of the colors,

we may put it the other way; and so the darkness would be yours, in the

ink which you brought against the light of the white pages. If these

remarks irritate you, you should rather be angry with yourselves for

believing doctrines of which these are the necessary consequences. As

for the books of the apostles and prophets, we read them as a record of

our faith, to encourage our hope and animate our love. These books are

in perfect harmony with one another; and their harmony, like the music

of a heavenly trumpet, wakens us from the torpor of worldliness, and

urges us on to the prize of our high calling. The apostle, after

quoting from the prophets the words, "The reproaches of them that

reproached Thee fell on me," goes on to speak of the benefit of reading

the prophets: "For whatsoever things were written beforetime were

written for our learning; that we, through patience and comfort of the

Scriptures, might have hope." [524] If Faustus denies this, we can

only say with Paul, "If any one shall preach to you another doctrine

than that ye have received, let him be accursed." [525]

------------------------

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[489] [On the Sibylline books, see article by G. H. Schodde in the

Schaff-Hertzog Encyclop�dia of Religious Knowledge, and the works there

referred to. The Christian writers of the first three centuries seem

not to have suspected the real character of these pseudo-prophetical

writings, and to have regarded them as remarkable testimonies from the

heathen world to the Truth of the Christian religion.--A.H.N.]

[490] ["The Mercurius or Hermes Trismegistus of legend was a personage,

an Egyptian sage or succession of sages, who, since the time of Plato,

has been identified with the Thoth (the name of the month September),

of that people.... He was considered to be the impersonation of the

religion, art, learning and sacerdotal discipline of the Egyptian

priesthood. He was by several of the Fathers, and, in modern times, by

three of his earliest editors, supposed to have existed before the time

of Moses, and to have obtained the appellation of Thrice greatest',

from his threefold learning and rank of Philosopher, Priest and King,

and that of Hermes,' or Mercurius, as messenger and authoritative

interpreter of divine things." The author of the books that go under

the name of Hermes Trismegistus is thought to have lived about the

beginning of the second century, and was a Christian Neo-Platonist.

See J. C. Chambers: The Theological and Philosophical Works of Hermes

Trismegistus, translated from the original Greek, with Preface, Notes

and Index, Edinburh, 1882.--A.H.N.]
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Book XIV.

Faustus abhors Moses for the awful curse he has pronounced upon

Christ. Augustin expounds the Christian doctrine of the suffering

Saviour by comparing Old and New Testament passages.

1. Faustus said: If you ask why we do not believe Moses, it is on

account of our love and reverence for Christ. The most reckless man

cannot regard with pleasure a person who has cursed his father. So we

abhor Moses, not so much for his blasphemy of everything human and

divine, as for the awful curse he has pronounced upon Christ the Son of

God, who for our salvation hung on the tree. Whether Moses did this

intentionally or not is your concern. Either way, he cannot be

excused, or considered worthy of belief. His words are, "Cursed is

every one that hangeth on a tree." [526] You tell me to believe this

man, though, if he was inspired, he must have cursed Christ knowingly

and intentionally; and if he did it in ignorance, he cannot have been

divine. Take either alternative. Moses was no prophet, and while

cursing in his usual manner, he fell ignorantly into the sin of

blasphemy against God. Or he was indeed divine, and foresaw the

future; and from ill-will to our salvation, he directs the venom of his

malediction against Him who was to accomplish that salvation on a

tree. He who thus injures the Son cannot surely have seen or known the

Father. He who knew nothing of the final ascension of the Son, cannot

surely have foretold His advent. Moreover, the extent of the injury

inflicted by this curse is to be considered. For it denounces all the

righteous men and martyrs, and sufferers of every kind, who have died

in this way, as Peter and Andrew, and the rest. Such a cruel

denunciation could never have come from Moses if he had been a prophet,

unless he was a bitter enemy of these sufferers. For he pronounces

them cursed not only of men but of God. What hope, then, of blessing

remains to Christ, or his apostles, or to us if we happen to be

crucified for Christ's sake? It indicates great thoughtlessness in

Moses, and the want of all divine inspiration, that he overlooked the

fact that men are hung on a tree for very different reasons, some for

their crimes, and others who suffer in the cause of God and of

righteousness. In this thoughtless way lie heaps all together without

distinction under the same curse; whereas if he had had any sense, not

to say inspiration, if he wished to single out the punishment of the

cross from all others as specially detestable, he would have said,

Cursed is every guilty and impious person that hangeth on a tree. This

would have made a distinction between the guilty and the innocent. And

yet even this would have been incorrect, for Christ took the malefactor

from the cross along with himself into the Paradise of his Father.

What becomes of the curse on every one that hangeth on a tree? Was

Barabbas, the notorious robber, who certainly was not hung on a tree,

but was set free from prison at the request of the Jews, more blessed

than the thief who accompanied Christ from the cross to heaven? Again,

there is a curse on the man that worships the sun or the moon. Now if

under a heathen monarch I am forced to worship the sun, and if from

fear of this curse I refuse, shall I incur this other curse by

suffering the punishment of crucifixion? Perhaps Moses was in the

habit of cursing everything good. We think no more of his denunciation

than of an old wife's scolding. So we find him pronouncing a curse on

all youths of both sexes, when he says: "Cursed is every one that

raiseth not up a seed in Israel." [527] This is aimed directly at

Jesus, who, according to you, was born among the Jews, and raised up no

seed to continue his family. It points too at his disciples, some of

whom he took from the wives they had married, and some who were

unmarried he forbade to take wives. We have good reason, you see, for

expressing our abhorrence of the daring style in which Moses hurls his

maledictions against Christ, against light, against chastity, against

everything divine. You cannot make much of the distinction between

hanging on a tree and being crucified, as you often try to do by way of

apology; for Paul repudiates such a distinction when he says, "Christ

hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us;

as it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." [528]

2. Augustin replied: The pious Faustus is pained because Christ is

cursed by Moses. His love for Christ makes him hate Moses. Before

explaining the sacred import and the piety of the words, "Cursed is

every one that hangeth on a tree," I would ask these pious people why

they are angry with Moses, since his curse does not affect their

Christ. If Christ hung on the tree, He must have been fastened to it

with nails, the marks of which He showed to His doubting disciple after

His resurrection. Accordingly He must have had a vulnerable and mortal

body, which the Manich�ans deny. Call the wounds and the marks false,

and it follows that His hanging on the tree was false. This Christ is

not affected by the curse, and there is no occasion for this

indignation against the person uttering the curse. If they pretend to

be angry with Moses for cursing what they call the false death of

Christ, what are we to think of themselves, who do not curse Christ,

but, what is much worse, make Him a liar? If it is wrong to curse

mortality, it is a much more heinous offense to sully the purity of

truth. But let us make these heretical cavils an occasion for

explaining this mystery to believers.

3. Death comes upon man as the punishment of sin, and so is itself

called sin; not that a man sins in dying, but because sin is the cause

of his death. So the word tongue, which properly means the fleshy

substance between the teeth and the palate, is applied in a secondary

sense to the result of the tongue's action. In this sense we speak of

a Latin tongue and a Greek tongue. The word hand, too, means both the

members of the body we use in working, and the writing which is done

with the hand. In this sense we speak of writing as being proved to be

the hand of a certain person, or of recognizing the hand of a friend.

The writing is certainly not a member of the body, but the name hand is

given to it because it is the hand that does it. So sin means both a

bad action deserving punishment, and death the consequence of sin.

Christ has no sin in the sense of deserving death, but He bore for our

sakes sin in the sense of death as brought on human nature by sin.

This is what hung on the tree; this is what was cursed by Moses. Thus

was death condemned that its reign might cease, and cursed that it

might be destroyed. By Christ's taking our sin in this sense, its

condemnation is our deliverance, while to remain in subjection to sin

is to be condemned.

4. What does Faustus find strange in the curse pronounced on sin, on

death, and on human mortality, which Christ had on account of man's

sin, though He Himself was sinless? Christ's body was derived from

Adam, for His mother the Virgin Mary was a child of Adam. But God said

in Paradise, "On the day that ye eat, ye shall surely die." This is

the curse which hung on the tree. A man may deny that Christ was

cursed who denies that He died. But the man who believes that Christ

died, and acknowledges that death is the fruit of sin, and is itself

called sin, will understand who it is that is cursed by Moses, when he

hears the apostle saying "For our old man is crucified with Him." [529]

The apostle boldly says of Christ, "He was made a curse for us;" for

he could also venture to say, "He died for all." "He died," and "He

was cursed," are the same. Death is the effect of the curse; and all

sin is cursed, whether it means the action which merits punishment, or

the punishment which follows. Christ, though guiltless, took our

punishment, that He might cancel our guilt, and do away with our

punishment.

5. These things are not my conjectures, but are affirmed constantly by

the apostle, with an emphasis sufficient to rouse the careless and to

silence the gainsayers. "God," he says, "sent His Son in the likeness

of sinful flesh, that by sin He might condemn sin in the flesh." [530]

Christ's flesh was not sinful, because it was not born of Mary by

ordinary generation; but because death is the effect of sin, this

flesh, in being mortal, had the likeness of sinful flesh. This is

called sin in the following words, "that by sin He might condemn sin in

the flesh." Again he says: "He hath made Him to be sin for us who

knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him."

[531] Why should not Moses call accursed what Paul calls sin? In

this prediction the prophet claims a share with the apostle in the

reproach of the heretics. For whoever finds fault with the word cursed

in the prophet, must find fault with the word sin in the apostle; for

curse and sin go together.

6. If we read, "Cursed of God is every one that hangeth on a tree,"

the addition of the words "of God" creates no difficulty. For had not

God hated sin and our death, He would not have sent His Son to bear and

to abolish it. And there is nothing strange in God's cursing what He

hates. For His readiness to give us the immortality which will be had

at the coming of Christ, is in proportion to the compassion with which

He hated our death when it hung on the cross at the death of Christ.

And if Moses curses every one that hangeth on a tree, it is certainly

not because he did not foresee that righteous men would be crucified,

but rather because He foresaw that heretics would deny the death of the

Lord to be real, and would try to disprove the application of this

curse to Christ, in order that they might disprove the reality of His

death. For if Christ's death was not real, nothing cursed hung on the

cross when He was crucified, for the crucifixion cannot have been

real. Moses cries from the distant past to these heretics: Your

evasion in denying the reality of the death of Christ is useless.

Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree; not this one or that, but

absolutely every one. What! the Son of God? Yes, assuredly. This is

the very thing you object to, and that you are so anxious to evade.

You will not allow that He was cursed for us, because you will not

allow that He died for us. Exemption from Adam's curse implies

exemption from his death. But as Christ endured death as man, and for

man; so also, Son of God as He was, ever living in His own

righteousness, but dying for our offences, He submitted as man, and for

man, to bear the curse which accompanies death. And as He died in the

flesh which He took in bearing our punishment, so also, while ever

blessed in His own righteousness, He was cursed for our offences, in

the death which He suffered in bearing our punishment. And these words

"every one" are intended to check the ignorant officiousness which

would deny the reference of the curse to Christ, and so, because the

curse goes along with death, would lead to the denial of the true death

of Christ.

7. The believer in the true doctrine of the gospel will understand

that Christ is not reproached by Moses when he speaks of Him as cursed,

not in His divine majesty, but as hanging on the tree as our

substitute, bearing our punishment, any more than He is praised by the

Manich�ans when they deny that He had a mortal body, so as to suffer

real death. In the curse of the prophet there is praise of Christ's

humility, while in the pretended regard of the heretics there is a

charge of falsehood. If, then, you deny that Christ was cursed, you

must deny that He died; and then you have to meet, not Moses, but the

apostles. Confess that He died, and you may also confess that He,

without taking our sin, took its punishment. Now the punishment of sin

cannot be blessed, or else it would be a thing to be desired. The

curse is pronounced by divine justice, and it will be well for us if we

are redeemed from it. Confess then that Christ died, and you may

confess that He bore the curse for us; and that when Moses said,

"Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree," he said in fact, To hang

on a tree is to be mortal, or actually to die. He might have said,

"Cursed is every one that is mortal," or "Cursed is every one dying;"

but the prophet knew that Christ would suffer on the cross, and that

heretics would say that He hung on the tree only in appearance, without

really dying. So he exclaims, Cursed; meaning that He really died. He

knew that the death of sinful man, which Christ though sinless bore,

came from that curse, "If ye touch it, ye shall surely die." Thus

also, the serpent hung on the pole was intended to show that Christ did

not feign death, but that the real death into which the serpent by his

fatal counsel cast mankind was hung on the cross of Christ's passion.

The Manich�ans turn away from the view of this real death, and so they

are not healed of the poison of the serpent, as we read that in the

wilderness as many as looked were healed.

8. It is true, some ignorantly distinguish between hanging on a tree

and being crucified. So some explain this passage as referring to

Judas. But how do they know whether he hung himself from wood or from

stone? Faustus is right in saying that the apostle obliges us to refer

the words to Christ. Such ignorant Catholics are the prey of the

Manich�ans. Such they get hold of and entangle in their sophistry.

Such were we when we fell into this heresy, and adhered to it. Such

were we, when, not by our own strength, but by the mercy of God, we

were rescued.

9. What attacks on divine things does Faustus speak of when he charges

Moses with sparing nothing human or divine? He makes the charge

without stopping to prove it. We know, on the contrary, that Moses

gave due praise to everything really divine, and in human affairs was a

just ruler, considering his times and the grace of his dispensation.

It will be time to prove this when we see any proof of Faustus'

charges. It may be clever to make such charges cautiously, but there

is great incaution in the cleverness which ruins its possessor. It is

good to be clever on the side of truth, but it is a poor thing to be

clever in opposition to the truth. Faustus says that Moses spared

nothing human or divine; not that he spared no god or man. If he said

that Moses did not spare God, it could easily be shown in reply that

Moses everywhere does honor to the true God, whom he declares to be the

Maker of heaven and earth. Again, if he said that Moses spared none of

the gods, he would betray himself to Christians as a worshipper of the

false gods that Moses denounces; and so he would be prevented from

gathering what he has not brought forth, by the brood taking refuge

under the wings of the Mother Church. Faustus tries to ensnare the

babes, by saying that Moses spared nothing divine, wishing not to

frighten Christians with a profession of belief in the gods, which

would be plainly opposed to Christianity, and at the same time

appearing to take the side of the Pagans against us; for they know that

Moses has said many plain and pointed things against the idols and gods

of the heathen, which are devils.

10. If the Manich�ans disapprove of Moses on this account, let them

confess that they are worshippers of idols and devils. This, indeed,

may be the case without their being aware of it. The apostle tells us

that "in the last days some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to

seducing spirits, and to doctrines of devils, speaking lies in

hypocrisy." [532] Whence but from devils, who are fond of falsehood,

could the idea have come that Christ's sufferings and death were

unreal, and that the marks which He showed of His wounds were unreal?

Are these not the doctrines of lying devils, which teach that Christ,

the Truth itself, was a deceiver? Besides, the Manich�ans openly teach

the worship, if not of devils, still of created things, which the

apostle condemns in the words, "They worshipped and served the creature

rather than the Creator." [533]

11. As there is an unconscious worship of idols and devils in the

fanciful legends of the Manich�ans, so they knowingly serve the

creature in their worship of the sun and moon. And in what they call

their service of the Creator they really serve their own fancy, and not

the Creator at all. For they deny that God created those things which

the apostle plainly declares to be the creatures of God, when he says

of food, "Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if

it is received with thanksgiving." [534] This is sound doctrine,

which you cannot bear, and so turn to fables. The apostle praises the

creature of God, but forbids the worship of it; and in the same way

Moses gives due praise to the sun and moon, while at the same time he

states the fact of their having been made by God, and placed by Him in

their courses,--the sun to rule the day, and the moon to rule the

night. Probably you think Moses spared nothing divine, simply because

he forbade the worship of the sun and moon, whereas you turn towards

them in all directions in your worship. But the sun and moon take no

pleasure in your false praises. It is the devil, the transgressor,

that delights in false praises. The powers of heaven, who have not

fallen by sin, wish their Creator to be praised in them; and their true

praise is that which does no wrong to their Creator. He is wronged

when they are said to be His members, or parts of His substance. For

He is perfect and independent, underived, not divided or scattered in

space, but unchangeably self-existent, self-sufficient, and blessed in

Himself. In the abundance of His goodness, He by His word spoke, and

they were made: He commanded, and they were created. And if earthly

bodies are good, of which the apostle spoke when he said that no food

is unclean, because every creature of God is good, much more the

heavenly bodies, of which the sun and moon are the chief; for the

apostle says again, "The glory of the terrestrial is one, and the glory

of the celestial is another." [535]

12. Moses, then, casts no reproach on the sun and moon when he

prohibits their worship. He praises them as heavenly bodies; while he

also praises God as the Creator of both heavenly and earthly, and will

not allow of His being insulted by giving the worship due to Him to

those who are praised only as dependent upon Him. Faustus prides

himself on the ingenuity of his objection to the curse pronounced by

Moses on the worship of the sun and moon. He says, "If under a heathen

monarch I am forced to worship the sun, and if from fear of this curse

I refuse, shall I incur this other curse by suffering the punishment of

crucifixion?" No heathen monarch is forcing you to worship the sun:

nor would the sun itself force you, if it were reigning on the earth,

as neither does it now wish to be worshipped. As the Creator bears

with blasphemers till the judgment, so these celestial bodies bear with

their deluded worshippers till the judgment of the Creator. It should

be observed that no Christian monarch could enforce the worship of the

sun. Faustus instances a heathen monarch, for he knows that their

worship of the sun is a heathen custom. Yet, in spite of this

opposition to Christianity, the partridge takes the name of Christ,

that it may gather what it has not brought forth. The answer to this

objection is easy, and the force of truth will soon break the horns of

this dilemma. Suppose, then, a Christian threatened by royal authority

with being hung on a tree if he will not worship the sun. If I avoid,

you say, the curse pronounced by the law on the worshipper of the sun,

I incur the curse pronounced by the same law on him that hangs on a

tree. So you will be in a difficulty; only that you worship the sun

without being forced by anybody. But a true Christian, built on the

foundation of the apostles and prophets, distinguishes the curses, and

the reasons of them. He sees that one refers to the mortal body which

is hung on the tree, and the other to the mind which worships the sun.

For though the body bows in worship,--which also is a heinous

offence,--the belief or imagination of the object worshipped is an act

of the mind. The death implied in both curses is in one case the death

of the body, and in the other the death of the soul. It is better to

have the curse in bodily death,--which will be removed in the

resurrection,--than the curse in the death of the soul, condemning it

along with the body to eternal fire. The Lord solves this difficulty

in the words: "Fear not them that kill the body, but cannot kill the

soul; but fear him who has power to cast both soul and body into

hell-fire." [536] In other words, fear not the curse of bodily death,

which in time is removed; but fear the curse of spiritual death, which

leads to the eternal torment of both soul and body. Be assured, Cursed

is every one that hangeth on a tree is no old wife's railing, but a

prophetical utterance. Christ, by the curse, takes the curse away, as

He takes away death by death, and sin by sin. In the words, "Cursed is

every one that hangeth on a tree," there is no more blasphemy than in

the words of the apostle, "He died," or, "Our old man was crucified

along with Him," [537] or, "By sin He condemned sin," [538] or, "He

made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin," [539] and in many similar

passages. Confess, then, that when you exclaim against the curse of

Christ, you exclaim against His death. If this is not an old wife's

railing on your part, it is devilish delusion, which makes you deny the

death of Christ because your own souls are dead. You teach people that

Christ's death was feigned, making Christ your leader in the falsehood

with which you use the name of Christian to mislead men.

13. If Faustus thinks Moses an enemy of continence or virginity

because he says, "Cursed is everyone that raiseth not up seed in

Israel," let them hear the words of Isaiah: "Thus saith the Lord to

all eunuchs; To them who keep my precepts, and choose the things that

please me, and regard my covenant, will I give in my house and within

my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters; I

will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off." [540]

Though our adversaries disagree with Moses, if they agree with Isaiah

it is something gained. It is enough for us to know that the same God

spoke by both Moses and Isaiah, and that every one is cursed who

raiseth not up seed in Israel, both then when begetting children in

marriage (for the continuation of the people was a civil duty), and now

because no one spiritually born should rest content without seeking

spiritual increase in the production of Christians by preaching Christ,

each one according to his ability. So that the times of both

Testaments are briefly described in the words, "Cursed is every one

that raiseth not up seed in Israel." [541]

------------------------
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[526] Deut. xxi. 23.

[527] Deut. xxv. 5-10.

[528] Gal. iii. 10.

[529] Rom. vi. 6.

[530] Rom. viii. 3.

[531] 2 Cor. v. 21.

[532] 1 Tim. iv. 1, 2.

[533] Rom. i. 25.

[534] 1 Tim. iv. 4.

[535] 1 Cor. xv. 40.

[536] Matt. x. 28.
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[540] Isa. lvi. 4, 5.

[541] [In scarcely any other Manich�an record do we find the Manich�an

hostility to Judaism expressed with so much ardor and with so much

precision as in the blasphemous statements of Faustus in this

treatise.--A.H.N.]
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Book XV.

Faustus rejects the Old Testament because it leaves no room for

Christ. Christ the one Bridegroom suffices for His Bride the Church.

Augustin answers as well as he can, and reproves the Manich�ans with

presumption in claiming to be the Bride of Christ.

1. Faustus said: Why do we not receive the Old Testament? Because

when a vessel is full, what is poured on it is not received, but

allowed to run over; and a full stomach rejects what it cannot hold.

So the Jews, satisfied with the Old Testament, reject the New; and we

who have received the New Testament from Christ, reject the Old. You

receive both because you are only half filled with each, and the one is

not completed, but corrupted by the other. For vessels half filled

should not be filled up with anything of a different nature from what

they already contain. If it contains wine, it should be filled up with

wine, honey with honey, vinegar with vinegar. For to pour gall on

honey, or water on wine, or alkalies on vinegar, is not addition, but

adulteration. This is why we do not receive the Old Testament. Our

Church, the bride of Christ, the poor bride of a rich bridegroom, is

content with the possession of her husband, and scorns the wealth of

inferior lovers, and despises the gifts of the Old Testament and of its

author, and from regard to her own character, receives only the letters

of her husband. We leave the Old Testament to your Church, that, like

a bride faithless to her spouse, delights in the letters and gifts of

another. This lover who corrupts your chastity, the God of the Hebrews

in his stone tablets promises you gold and silver, and abundance of

food, and the land of Canaan. Such low rewards have tempted you to be

unfaithful to Christ, after all the rich dowry bestowed by him. By

such attractions the God of the Hebrews gains over the bride of

Christ. You must know that you are cheated, and that these promises

are false. This God is in poverty and beggary, and cannot do what he

promises. For if he cannot give these things to the synagogue, his

proper wife, who obeys him in all things like a servant, how can he

bestow them on you who are strangers, and who proudly throw off his

yoke from your necks? Go on, then, as you have begun, join the new

cloth to the old garment, put the new wine in old bottles, serve two

masters without pleasing either, make Christianity a monster, half

horse and half man; but allow us to serve only Christ, content with his

immortal dower, and imitating the apostle who says, "Our sufficiency is

of God, who has made us able ministers of the New Testament." [542]

In the God of the Hebrews we have no interest whatever; for neither can

he perform his promises, nor do we desire that he should. The

liberality of Christ has made us indifferent to the flatteries of this

stranger. This figure of the relation of the wife to her husband is

sanctioned by Paul, who says: "The woman that has a husband is bound

to her husband as long as he liveth; but if her husband die, she is

freed from the law of her husband. So, then, if while her husband

liveth she be joined to another man, she shall be called an adulteress;

but if her husband be dead, she is not an adulteress, though she be

married to another man." [543] Here he shows that there is a

spiritual adultery in being united to Christ before repudiating the

author of the law, and counting him, as it were, as dead. This applies

chiefly to the Jews who believe in Christ, and who ought to forget

their former superstition. We who have been converted to Christ from

heathenism, look upon the God of the Hebrews not merely as dead, but as

never having existed, and do not need to be told to forget him. A Jew,

when he believes, should regard Adonai as dead; a Gentile should regard

his idol as dead; and so with everything that has been held sacred

before conversion. One who, after giving up idolatry, worships both

the God of the Hebrews and Christ, is like an abandoned woman, who

after the death of one husband marries two others.

2. Augustin replied: Let all who have given their hearts to Christ

say whether they can listen patiently to these things, unless Christ

Himself enable them. Faustus, full of the new honey, rejects the old

vinegar; and Paul, full of the old vinegar, has poured out half that

the new honey may be poured in, not to be kept, but to be corrupted.

When the apostle calls himself a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be

an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God, this is the new honey.

But when he adds, "which He promised before by His prophets in the Holy

Scriptures of His Son, who was made of the seed of David according to

the flesh," [544] this is the old vinegar. Who could bear to hear

this, unless the apostle himself consoled us by saying: "There must be

heresies, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you?"

[545] Why should we repeat what we said already? [546] --that the new

cloth and the old garment, the new wine and the old bottles, mean not

two Testaments, but two lives and two hopes,--that the relation of the

two Testaments is figuratively described by the Lord when He says:

"Therefore every scribe instructed in the kingdom of God is like an

householder bringing out of his treasure things new and old." [547]

The reader may remember this as said before, or he may find it on

looking back. For if any one tries to serve God with two hopes, one of

earthly felicity, and the other of the kingdom of heaven, the two hopes

cannot agree; and when the latter is shaken by some affliction, the

former will be lost too. Thus it is said, No man can serve two

masters; which Christ explains thus: "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon."

[548] But to those who rightly understand it, the Old Testament is a

prophecy of the New. Even in that ancient people, the holy patriarchs

and prophets, who understood the part they performed, or which they

were instrumental in performing, had this hope of eternal life in the

New Testament. They belonged to the New Testament, because they

understood and loved it, though revealed only in figure. Those

belonging to the Old Testament were the people who cared for nothing

else but the temporal promises, without understanding them as

significant of eternal things. But all this has already been more than

enough insisted on.

3. It is amazingly bold in the impious and impure sect of the

Manich�ans to boast of being the chaste bride of Christ. All the

effect of such a boast on the really chaste members of the holy Church

is to remind them of the apostle's warning against deceivers: "I have

joined you to one husband, to present you as a chaste virgin to

Christ. But I fear lest, as the serpent deceived Eve by his guile, so

your minds also should be corrupted from the purity which is in

Christ." [549] What else do those preachers of another gospel than

that which we have received try to do, but to corrupt us from the

purity which we preserve for Christ, when they stigmatize the law of

God as old, and praise their own falsehoods as new, as if all that is

new must be good, and all that is old bad? The Apostle John, however,

praises the old commandment, and the Apostle Paul bids us avoid

novelties in doctrine. As an unworthy son and servant of the Catholic

Church, the true bride of the true Christ, I too, as appointed to give

out food to my fellow-servants, would speak to her a word of counsel.

Continue ever to shun the profane errors of the Manich�ans, which have

been tried by the experience of thine own children, and condemned by

their recovery. By that heresy I was once separated from thy

fellowship, and after running into danger which ought to have been

avoided, I escaped. Restored to thy service, my experience may perhaps

be profitable to thee. Unless thy true and truthful Bridegroom, from

whose side thou wert made, had obtained the remission of sins through

His own real blood, the gulf of error would have swallowed me up; I

should have become dust, and been devoured by the serpent. Be not

misled by the name of truth. The truth is in thine own milk, and in

thine own bread. They have the name only, and not the thing. Thy

full-grown children, indeed, are secure; but I speak to thy babes, my

brothers, and sons, and masters, whom thou, the virgin mother, fertile

as pure, dost cherish into life under thine anxious wings, or dost

nourish with the milk of infancy. I call upon these, thy tender

offspring, not to be seduced by noisy vanities, but rather to pronounce

accursed any one that preaches to them another gospel than that which

they have received in thee. I call upon these not to leave the true

and truthful Christ, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and

knowledge; not to forsake the abundance of His goodness which He has

laid up for them that fear Him, and has wrought for them that trust in

Him. [550] How can they expect to find truthful words in one who

preaches an untruthful Christ? Scorn the reproaches cast on thee, for

thou knowest well that the gift which thou desirest from thy Bridegroom

is eternal life, for He Himself is eternal life.

4. It is a silly falsehood that thou hast been seduced to another God,

who promises abundance of food and the land of Canaan. For thou canst

perceive how the saints of old, who were also thy children, were

enlightened by these figures which were prophecies of thee. Thou

needest not regard the poor jest against the stone tablets, for the

stony heart of which they were in old times a figure is not in thee.

For thou art an epistle of the apostles, "written not with ink, but

with the Spirit of the living God; not on tables of stone, but on the

fleshy tables of the heart." [551] Our opponents ignorantly think

that these words are in their favor, and that the apostle finds fault

with the dispensation of the Old Testament, whereas they are the words

of the prophet. This utterance of the apostles was a fulfillment of

the long anterior utterances of the prophet whom the Manich�ans reject,

for they believe the apostles without understanding them. The prophet

says: "I will take away from them the stony heart, and I will give

them a heart of flesh." [552] What is this but "Not on tables of

stones but on the fleshy tables of the heart"? For by the heart of

flesh and the fleshy tables is not meant a carnal understanding: but

as flesh feels, whereas a stone cannot, the insensibility of stone

signifies an unintelligent heart, and the sensibility of flesh

signifies an intelligent heart. Instead, then, of scoffing at thee,

they deserve to be ridiculed who say that earth, and wood, and stones

have sense, and that their life is more intelligent than animal life.

So, not to speak of the truth, even their own fiction obliges them to

confess that the law written on tables of stone was purer than their

sacred parchments. Or perhaps they prefer sheepskin to stone, because

their legends make stones the bones of princes. In any case, the ark

of the Old Testament was a cleaner covering for the tables of stone

than the goatskin of their manuscripts. Laugh at these things, while

pitying them, to show their falsehood and absurdity. With a heart no

longer stony, thou canst see in these stone tablets a suitableness to

that hard-hearted people; and at the same time thou canst find even

there the stone, thy Bridegroom, described by Peter as "a living stone,

rejected by men, but chosen of God, and precious." To them He was "a

stone of stumbling and a rock of offence;" but to thee, "the stone

which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner." [553]

This is all explained by Peter, and is quoted from the prophets, with

whom these heretics have nothing to do. Fear not, then, to read these

tablets--they are from thy Husband; to others the stone was a sign of

insensibility, but to thee of strength and stability. With the finger

of God these tablets were written; with the finger of God thy Lord cast

out devils; with the finger of God drive thou away the doctrines of

lying devils which sear the conscience. With these tablets thou canst

confound the seducer who calls himself the Paraclete, that he may

impose upon thee by a sacred name. For on the fiftieth day after the

passover the tables were given; and on the fiftieth day after the

passion of thy Bride-groom--of whom the passover was a type--the finger

of God, the Holy Spirit, the promised Paraclete, was given. Fear not

the tablets which convey to thee ancient writings now made plain. Only

be not under the law, lest fear prevent thy fulfilling it; but be under

grace, that love, which is the fulfilling of the law, may be in thee.

For it was in a review of these very tablets that the friend of thy

Bridegroom said: "For thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not

murder, Thou shalt not covet, and if there be any other commandment, it

is contained in this word, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling

of the law." [554] One table contains the precept of love to God, and

the other of love to man. And He who first sent these tablets Himself

came to enjoin those precepts on which hang the law and the prophets.

[555] In the first precept is the chastity of thy espousals; in the

second is the unity of thy members. In the one thou art united to

divinity; in the other thou dost gather a society. And these two

precepts are identical with the ten, of which three relate to God, and

seven to our neighbor. Such is the chaste tablet in which thy Lover

and thy Beloved of old prefigured to thee the new song on a psaltery of

ten strings; Himself to be extended on the cross for thee, that by sin

He might condemn sin in the flesh, and that the righteouness of the law

might be fulfilled in thee. Such is the conjugal tablet, which may

well be hated by the unfaithful wife.

5. I turn now to thee, thou deluded and deluding congregation of

Manich�us,--wedded to so many elements, or rather prostituted to so

many devils, and impregnated with blasphemous falsehoods,--dost thou

dare to slander as unchaste the marriage of the Catholic Church with

thy Lord? Behold thy lovers, one balancing creation, and the other

bearing it up like Atlas. For one, by thy account, holds the sources

of the elements, and hangs the world in space; while the other keeps

him up by kneeling down and carrying the weight on his shoulders.

Where are those beings? And if they are so occupied, how can they come

to visit thee, to spend an idle hour in getting their shoulders or

their fingers relieved by thy soft, soothing touch? But thou art

deceived by evil spirits which commit adultery with thee, that thou

mayest conceive falsehoods and bring forth vanities. Well mayest thou

reject the message of the true God, as opposed to thy parchments, where

in the vain imaginations of a wanton mind thou hast gone after so many

false gods. The fictions of the poets are more respectable than thine,

in this at least, that they deceive no one; while the fables in thy

books, by assuming an appearance of truth, mislead the childish, both

young and old, and pervert their minds. As the apostle says, they have

itching ears, and turn away from hearing the truth to listen to fables.

[556] How shouldest thou bear the sound doctrine of these tables,

where the first commandment is, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is

one Lord," [557] when thy corrupt affections find shameful delight in

so many false deities? Dost thou not remember thy love-song, where

thou describest the chief ruler in perennial majesty, crowned with

flowers, and of fiery countenance? To have even one such lover is

shameful; for a chaste wife seeks not a husband crowned with flowers.

And thou canst not say that this description or representation has a

typical meaning, for thou art wont to praise Manich�us for nothing more

than for speaking to thee the simple naked truth without the disguise

of figures. So the God of thy song is a real king, bearing a sceptre

and crowned with flowers. When he wears a crown of flowers, he ought

to put aside his sceptre; for effeminacy and majesty are incongruous.

And then he is not thy only lover; for the song goes on to tell of

twelve seasons clothed in flowers, and filled with song, throwing their

flowers at their father's face. These are twelve great gods of thine,

three in each of the four regions surrounding the first deity. How

this deity can be infinite, when he is thus circumscribed, no one can

say. Besides, there are countless principalities, and hosts of gods,

and troops of angels, which thou sayest were not created by God, but

produced from His substance.

6. Thou art thus convicted of worshipping gods without number; for

thou canst not bear the sound doctrine which teaches that there is one

Son of one God, and one Spirit of both. And these, instead of being

without number, are not three Gods; for not only is their substance one

and the same, but their operation by means of this substance is also

one and the same, while they have a separate manifestation in the

material creation. These things thou dost not understand, and canst

not receive. Thou art full, as thou sayest, for thou art steeped in

blasphemous absurdities. Will thou continue burying thyself under such

crudities? Sing on, then, and open thine eyes, if thou canst, to thine

own shame. In this doctrine of lying devils thou art invited to

fabulous dwellings of angels in a happy clime, and to fragrant fields

where nectar flows for ever from trees and hills, in seas and rivers.

These are the fictions of thy foolish heart, which revels in such idle

fancies. Such expressions are sometimes used as figurative

descriptions of the abundance of spiritual enjoyments; and they lead

the mind of the student to inquire into their hidden meaning.

Sometimes there is a material representation to the bodily senses, as

the fire in the bush, the rod becoming a serpent, and the serpent a

rod, the garment of the Lord not divided by His persecutors, the

anointing of His feet or of His head by a devout woman, the branches of

the multitude preceding and following Him when riding on the ass.

Sometimes, either in sleep or in a trance, the spirit is informed by

means of figures taken from material things, as Jacob's ladder, and the

stone in Daniel cut out without hands and growing into a mountain, and

Peter's vessel, and all that John saw. Sometimes the figures are only

in the language; as in the Song of Songs, and in the parable of a

householder making a marriage for his son, or that of the prodigal son,

or that of the man who planted a vineyard and let it out to

husbandmen. Thou boastest of Manich�us as having come last, not to use

figures, but to explain them. His expositions throw light on ancient

types, and leave no problem unsolved. This idea is supported by the

assertion that the ancient types, in vision or in action or in words,

had in view the coming of Manich�us, by whom they were all to be

explained; while he, knowing that no one is to follow him, makes use of

a style free from all figurative expressions. What, then, are those

fields, and shady hills, and crowns of flowers, and fragrant odors, in

which the desires of thy fleshly mind take pleasure? If they are not

significant figures, they are either idle fancies or delirious dreams.

If they are figures, away with the impostor who seduces thee with the

promise of naked truth, and then mocks thee with idle tales. His

ministers and his wretched deluded followers are wont to bait their

hook with that saying of the apostle, "Now we see through a glass in a

figure, but then face to face." [558] As if, forsooth, the Apostle

Paul knew in part, and prophesied in part, and saw through a glass in a

figure; whereas all this is removed at the coming of Manich�us, who

brings that which is perfect, and reveals the truth face to face. O

fallen and shameless! still to continue uttering such folly, still

feeding on the wind, still embracing the idols of thine own heart.

Hast thou, then, seen face to face the king with the sceptre, and the

crown of flowers, and the hosts of gods, and the great worldholder with

six faces and radiant with light, and that other exalted ruler

surrounded with troops of angels, and the invincible warrior with a

spear in his right hand and a shield in his left, and the famous

sovereign who moves the three wheels of fire, water, and wind, and

Atlas, chief of all, bearing the world on his shoulders, and supporting

himself on his arms? These, and a thousand other marvels, hast thou

seen face to face, or are thy songs doctrines learned from lying

devils, though thou knowest it not? Alas! miserable prostitute to

these dreams, such are the vanities which thou drinkest up instead of

the truth; and, drunk with this deadly poison, thou darest with this

jest of the tablets to affront the matronly purity of the spouse of the

only Son of God; because no longer under the tutorship of the law, but

under the control of grace, neither proud in activity nor crouching in

fear, she lives by faith, and hope, and love, the Israel in whom there

is no guile, who hears what is written: "The Lord thy God is one

God." This thou hearest not, and art gone a whoring after a multitude

of false gods.

7. Of necessity these tables are against thee, for the second

commandment is, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in

vain;" whereas thou dost attribute the vanity of falsehood to Christ

Himself, who, to remove the vanity of the fleshly mind, rose in a true

body, visible to the bodily eye. So also the third commandment about

the rest of the Sabbath is against thee, for thou art tossed about by a

multitude of restless fancies. How these three commandments relate to

the love of God, thou hast neither the power nor the will to

understand. Shamefully headstrong and turbulent, thou hast reached the

height of folly, vanity, and worthlessness; thy beauty is spoiled, and

thine order perished. I know thee, for I was once the same. How shall

I now teach thee that these three precepts relate to the love of God,

of whom, and by whom, and in whom are all things? How canst thou

understand this, when thy pernicious doctrines prevent thee from

understanding and from obeying the seven precepts relating to the love

of our neighbor, which is the bond of human society? The first of

these precepts is, "Honor thy father and mother;" which Paul quotes as

the first commandment with promise, and himself repeats the

injunction. But thou art taught by thy doctrine of devils to regard

thy parents as thine enemies, because their union brought thee into the

bonds of flesh, and laid impure fetters even on thy god. The doctrine

that the production of children is an evil, directly opposes the next

precept, "Thou shall not commit adultery;" for those who believe this

doctrine, in order that their wives may not conceive, are led to commit

adultery even in marriage. They take wives, as the law declares, for

the procreation of children; but from this erroneous fear of polluting

the substance of the deity, their intercourse with their wives is not

of a lawful character; and the production of children, which is the

proper end of marriage, they seek to avoid. As the apostle long ago

predicted of thee, thou dost indeed forbid to marry, for thou seekest

to destroy the purpose of marriage. Thy doctrine turns marriage into

an adulterous connection, and the bed-chamber into a brothel. This

false doctrine leads in a similar way to the transgression of the

commandment, "Thou shall not kill." For thou dost not give bread to

the hungry, from fear of imprisoning in flesh the member of thy God.

From fear of fancied murder, thou dost actually commit murder. For if

thou wast to meet a beggar starving for want of food, by the law of God

to refuse him food would be murder; while to give food would be murder

by the law of Manich�us. Not one commandment in the decalogue dost

thou observe. If thou wert to abstain from theft, thou wouldst be

guilty of allowing bread or food, whatever it might be, to undergo the

misery of being devoured by a man of no merit, instead of running off

with it to the laboratory of the stomach of thine elect; and so by

theft saving thy god from the imprisonment with which he is threatened,

and also from that from which he already suffers. Then, if thou art

caught in the theft, wilt thou not swear by this god that thou art not

guilty? For what will he do to thee when thou sayest to him, I swore

by thee falsely, but it was for thy benefit; a regard for thine honor

would have been fatal to thee? So the precept, Thou shall not bear

false witness, will be broken, not only in thy testimony, but in thine

oath, for the sake of the liberation of the members of thy god. The

commandment, "Thou shall not covet thy neighbor's wife," is the only

one which thy false doctrine does not oblige thee to break. But if it

is unlawful to covet our neighbor's wife, what must it be to excite

covetousness in others? Remember thy beautiful gods and goddesses

presenting themselves with the purpose of exciting desire in the male

and female leaders of darkness, in order that the gratification of this

passion might effect the liberation of this god, who is in confinement

everywhere, and who requires the assistance of such self-degradation.

The last commandment, "Thou shall not covet the possessions of thy

neighbor," it is wholly impossible for thee to obey. Does not this god

of thine delude thee with the promise of making new worlds in a region

belonging to another, to be the scene of thine imaginary triumph after

thine imaginary conquest? In the desire for the accomplishment of

these wild fancies, while at the same time thou believest that this

land of darkness is in the closest neighborhood with thine own

substance, thou certainly covetest the possessions of thy neighbor.

Well indeed mayest thou dislike the tables which contain such good

precepts in opposition to thy false doctrine. The three relating to

the love of God thou dost entirely set aside. The seven by which human

society is preserved thou keepest only from a regard to the opinion of

men, or from fear of human laws; or good customs make thee averse to

some crimes; or thou art restrained by the natural principle of not

doing to another what thou wouldst not have done to thyself. But

whether thou doest what thou wouldst not have done to thyself, or

refrainest from doing what thou wouldst not have done to thyself, thou

seest the opposition of the heresy to the law, whether thou actest

according to it or not.

8. The true bride of Christ, whom thou hast the audacity to taunt with

the stone tablets, knows the difference between the letter and the

spirit, or in other words, between law and grace; and serving God no

longer in the oldness of the letter, but in newness of spirit, she is

not under the law, but under grace. She is not blinded by a spirit of

controversy, but learns meekly from the apostle what is this law which

we are not to be under; for "it was given," he says, "on account of

transgression, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made."

[559] And again: "It entered, that the offence might abound; but

where sin abounded, grace has much more abounded." [560] Not that the

law is sin, though it cannot give life without grace, but rather

increases the guilt; for "where there is no law, there is no

transgression." [561] The letter without the spirit, the law without

grace, can only condemn. So the apostle explains his meaning, in case

any should not understand: "What shall we say then? Is the law sin?

God forbid. For I had not known sin but by the law. For I had not

known lust unless the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin,

taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me.

Therefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and

good. Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid.

But sin, that it might appear sin, wrought death in me by that which is

good." [562] She at whom thou scoffest knows what this means; for she

asks earnestly, and seeks humbly, and knocks meekly. She sees that no

fault is found with the law, when it is said, "The letter killeth, but

the spirit giveth life," any more than with knowledge, when it is said,

"Knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth." [563] The passage runs

thus: "We know that we all have knowledge. Knowledge puffeth up, but

love edifieth." The apostle certainly had no desire to be puffed up;

but he had knowledge, because knowledge joined with love not only does

not puff up, but strengthens. So the letter when joined with the

spirit, and the law when joined with grace, is no longer the letter and

the law in the same sense as when by itself it kills by abounding sin.

In this sense the law is even called the strength of sin, because its

strict prohibitions increase the fatal pleasure of sin. Even thus,

however, the law is not evil; but "sin, that it may appear sin, works

death by that which is good." So things that are not evil may often be

hurtful to certain people. The Manich�ans, when they have sore eyes,

will shut out their god the sun. The bride of Christ, then, is dead to

the law, that is, to sin, which abounds more from the prohibition of

the law; for the law apart from grace commands, but does not enable.

Being dead to the law in this sense, that she may be married to another

who rose from the dead, she makes this distinction without any reproach

to the law, which would be blasphemy against its author. This is thy

crime; for though the apostle tells thee that the law is holy, and the

commandment holy, and just, and good, thou dost not acknowledge it as

the production of a good being. Its author thou makest to be one of

the princes of darkness. Here the truth confronts thee. They are the

words of the Apostle Paul: "The law is holy, and the commandment holy,

and just, and good." Such is the law given by Him who appointed for a

great symbolical use the tablets which thou foolishly deridest. The

same law which was given by Moses becomes through Jesus Christ grace

and truth; for the spirit is joined to the letter, that the

righteousness of the law might begin to be fulfilled, which when

unfulfilled only added the guilt of transgression. The law which is

holy, and just, and good, is the same law by which sin works death, and

to which we must die, that we may be married to another who rose from

the dead. Hear what the apostle adds: "But sin, that it might appear

sin, wrought death in me by that which is good, that sin by the

commandment might become exceeding sinful." Deaf and blind, dost thou

not now hear and see? "Sin wrought death in me," he says, "by that

which is good." The law is always good: whether it hurts those who

are destitute of grace, or benefits those who are filled with grace,

itself is always good; as the sun is always good, for every creature of

God is good, whether it hurts weak eyes or gladdens the sight of the

healthy. Grace fits the mind for keeping the law, as health fits the

eyes for seeing the sun. And as healthy eyes die not to the pleasure

of seeing the sun, but to that painful effect of the rays which beat

upon the eye so as to increase the darkness; so the mind, healed by the

love of the spirit, dies not to the justice of the law, but to the

guilt and transgression which followed on the law in the absence of

grace. So it is said "The law is good, if used lawfully;" and

immediately after of the same law, "Knowing this, that the law is not

made for a righteous man." The man who delights in righteousness

itself, does not require the restraint of the letter.

9. The bride of Christ rejoices in the hope of full salvation, and

desires for thee a happy conversion from fables to truth. She desires

that the fear of Adoneus, as if he were a strange lover, may not

prevent thy escape from the seductions of the wily serpent. Adonai is

a Hebrew word, meaning Lord, as applied only to God. In the same way

the Greek word latria means service, in the sense of the service of

God; and Amen means true, in a special sacred sense. This is to be

learned only from the Hebrew Scriptures, or from a translation. The

Church of Christ understands and loves these names, without regarding

the evils of those who scoff because they are ignorant. What she does

not yet understand, she believes may be explained, as similar things

have already been explained to her. If she is charged with loving

Emmanuel, she laughs at the ignorance of the accuser, and holds fast by

the truth of this name. If she is charged with loving Messiah, she

scorns her powerless adversary, and clings to her anointed Master. Her

prayer for thee is, that thou also mayest be cured of thy errors, and

be built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets. The

monstrosity with which thou ignorantly chargest the true doctrine, is

really to be found in the world which, according to thy fanciful

stories, is made partly of thy god and partly of the world of

darkness. This world, half savage and half divine, is worse than

monstrous. The view of such follies should make thee humble and

penitent, and should lead thee to shun the serpent, who seduces thee

into such errors. If thou dost not believe what Moses says of the

guile of the serpent, thou mayest be warned by Paul, who, when speaking

of presenting the Church as a chaste virgin to Christ, says, "I fear

lest, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his craftiness, your minds

also should be corrupted from the simplicity and purity which is in

Christ." [564] In spite of this warning, thou hast been so misled, so

infatuated by the serpent's fatal enchantments, that while he has

persuaded other heretics to believe various falsehoods, he has

persuaded thee to believe that he is Christ. Others, though fallen

into the maze of manifold error, still admit the truth of the apostle's

warning. But thou art so far gone in corruption, and so lost to shame,

that thou holdest as Christ the very being by whom the apostle declares

that Eve was beguiled, and against whom he thus seeks to put the virgin

bride of Christ on her guard. Thy heart is darkened by the deceiver,

who intoxicates thee with dreams of glittering groves. What are these

promises but dreams? What reason is there to believe them true? O

drunken, but not with wine!

10. Thou hast the impious audacity to accuse the God of the prophets

of not fulfilling His promises even to His servants the Jews. Thou

dost not mention, however, any promise that is unfulfilled; otherwise

it might be shown, either that the promise has been fulfilled, and so

that thou dost not understand it, or that it is yet to be fulfilled,

and so that thou dost not believe it. What promise has been fulfilled

to thee, to make it probable that thou wilt obtain new worlds gained

from the region of darkness? If there are prophets who predict the

Manich�ans with praise, and if it is said that the existence of the

sect is a fulfillment of this prediction, it must first be proved that

these predictions were not forged by Manich�us in order to gain

followers. He does not consider falsehood sinful. If he declares in

praise of Christ that He showed false marks of wounds in His body, he

can have no scruple about showing false predictions in his sheepskin

volumes. Assuredly there are predictions of the Manich�ans, less clear

in the prophets, and most explicit in the apostle. For example: "The

Spirit," he says, "speaketh expressly, that in the last times some

shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and to

doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their

conscience seared, forbidding to marry, abstaining from meats, which

God has created to be received with thanksgiving by believers, and

those who know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and

nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving." [565]

The fulfillment of this in the Manich�ans is as clear as day to all

that know them, and has already been proved as fully as time permits.

11. She whom the apostle warns against the guile of the serpent by

which thou hast been corrupted, that he may present her as a chaste

virgin to Christ, her only husband, acknowledges the God of the

prophets as the true God, and her own God. So many of His promises

have already been fulfilled to her, that she looks confidently for the

fulfillment of the rest. Nor can any one say that these prophecies

have been forged to suit the present time, for they are found in the

books of the Jews. What could be more unlikely than that all nations

should be blessed in Abraham's seed, as it was promised? And yet how

plainly is this promise now fulfilled! The last promise is made in the

following short prophecy: "Blessed are they that dwell in Thy house:

they shall ever praise Thee." [566] When trial is past, and death,

the last enemy, is destroyed, there will be rest in the constant

occupation of praising God, where there shall be no arrivals and no

departures. So the prophet says elsewhere: "Praise the Lord, O

Jerusalem; celebrate thy God, O Zion: for He hath strengthened the

bars of thy gates; He hath blessed thy children within thee." [567]

The gates are shut, so that none can go in or out. The Bridegroom

Himself says in the Gospel, that He will not open to the foolish

virgins though they knock. This Jerusalem, the holy Church, the bride

of Christ, is described fully in the Revelation of John. And that

which commends the promises of future bliss to the belief of this

chaste virgin is, that now she is in possession of what was foretold of

her by the same prophets. For she is thus described: "Hearken, O

daughter, and regard, and incline thine ear; forget also thine own

people, and thy father's house. For the King hath greatly desired thy

beauty; and He is thy God. The daughters of Tyre shall worship Him

with gifts; the rich among the people shall entreat thy favor. The

daughter of the King is all glorious within; her clothing is of wrought

gold. The virgins following her shall be brought unto the King: her

companions shall be brought unto thee; with gladness and rejoicing

shall they be brought into the temple of the King. Instead of thy

fathers, children shall be born to thee, whom thou shall make princes

over all the earth. Thy name shall be remembered to all generations:

therefore shall the people praise thee for ever and ever." [568]

Unhappy victim of the serpent's guile, the inward beauty of the

daughter of the King is not for thee even to think of. For this purity

of mind is that which thou hast lost in opening thine eyes to love and

worship the sun and moon. And so by the just judgment of God thou art

estranged from the tree of life, which is eternal and internal wisdom;

and with thee nothing is called or accounted truth or wisdom but that

light which enters the eyes opened to evil, and which in thy impure

mind expands and shapes itself into fanciful images. These are thy

abominable whoredoms. Still the truth calls on thee to reflect and

return. Return to me, and thou shall be cleansed and restored, if thy

shame leads thee to repentance. Hear these words of the true Truth,

who neither with feigned shapes fought against the race of darkness,

nor with feigned blood redeemed thee.

------------------------
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Book XVI.

Faustus willing to believe not only that the Jewish but that all

Gentile prophets wrote of Christ, if it should be proved; but he would

none the less insist upon rejecting their superstitions. Augustin

maintains that all Moses wrote is of Christ, and that his writings must

be either accepted or rejected as a whole.

1. Faustus said: You ask why we do not believe Moses, when Christ

says, "Moses wrote of me; and if ye believed Moses, ye would also

believe me." I should be glad if not only Moses, but all prophets, Jew

and Gentile, had written of Christ. It would be no hindrance, but a

help to our faith, if we could cull testimonies from all hands agreeing

in favor of our God. You could extract the prophecies of Christ out of

the superstition which we should hate as much as ever. I am quite

willing to believe that Moses, though so much the opposite of Christ,

may seem to have written of Him. No one but would gladly find a flower

in every thorn, and food in every plant, and honey in every insect,

although we would not feed on insects or on grass, nor wear thorns as a

crown. No one but would wish pearls to be found in every deep, and

gems in every land, and fruit on every tree. We may eat fish from the

sea without drinking the water. We may take the useful, and reject

what is hurtful. And why may we not take the prophecies of Christ from

a religion the rites of which we condemn as useless? This need not

make us liable to be led into the bondage of the errors; for we do not

hate the unclean spirits less because they confessed plainly and openly

that Jesus was the Son of God. If any similar testimony is found in

Moses, I will accept it. But I will not on this account be brought

into subjection to his law, which to my mind is pure Paganism. There

is no reason whatever for thinking that I can have any objections to

receiving prophecies of Christ from every spirit.

2. Since you have proved that Christ declared that Moses wrote of him,

I should be very grateful if you would show me what he has written. I

have searched the Scriptures, as we are told to do, and have found no

prophecies of Christ, either because there are none, or because I could

not understand them. The only escape from this perplexity was in one

or other of two conclusions. Either this verse must be spurious, or

Jesus a liar. As it is not consistent with piety to suppose God a

liar, I preferred to attribute falsehood to the writers, rather than to

the Author, of truth. Moreover, He Himself tells that those who came

before him were thieves and robbers, which applies first of all to

Moses. And when, on the occasion of His speaking of His own majesty,

and calling Himself the light of the world, the Jews angrily rejoined,

"Thou bearest witness of thyself, thy witness is not true," I do not

find that He appealed to the prophecies of Moses, as might have been

expected. Instead of this, as having no connection with the Jews, and

receiving no testimony from their fathers, He replied: "It is written

in your law, that the testimony of two men is true. I am one who bear

witness of myself, and the Father who sent me beareth witness of me."

[569] He referred to the voice from heaven which all had heard:

"This is my beloved Son, believe Him." I think it likely that if

Christ had said that Moses wrote of Him, the ingenious hostility of the

Jews would have led them at once to ask what He supposed Moses to have

written. The silence of the Jews is a proof that Jesus never made such

a statement.

3. My chief reason, however, for suspecting the genuineness of this

verse is what I said before, that in all my search of the writings of

Moses I have found no prophecy of Christ. But now that I have found in

you a reader of superior intelligence, I hope to learn something; and I

promise to be grateful if no feeling of ill-will prevents you from

giving me the benefit of your higher attainments, as your lofty style

of reproof entitles me to expect from you. I ask for instruction in

whatever the writings of Moses contain about our God and Lord which has

escaped me in reading. I beseech you not to use the ignorant argument

that Christ affirms Moses to have written of Him. For suppose you had

not to deal with me, as in my case there is an obligation to believe

Him whom I profess to follow, but with a Jew or a Gentile, in reply to

the statement that Moses wrote of Christ, they will ask for proofs.

What shall we say to them? We cannot quote Christ's authority, for

they do not believe in Him. We must point out what Moses wrote.

4. What, then, shall we point to? Shall it be that passage which you

often quote where the God of Moses says to him: "I will raise up unto

them from among their brethren a prophet like unto thee?" [570] But

the Jew can see that this does not refer to Christ, and there is every

reason against our thinking that it does. Christ was not a prophet,

nor was He like Moses: for Moses was a man, and Christ was God; Moses

was a sinner, and Christ sinless; Moses was born by ordinary

generation, and Christ of a virgin according to you, or, as I hold, not

born at all: Moses, for offending his God, was put to death on the

mountain; and Christ suffered voluntarily, and the Father was well

pleased in Him. If we were to assert that Christ was a prophet like

Moses, the Jew would either deride us as ignorant or pronounce us

untruthful.

5. Or shall we take another favorite passage of yours: "They shall

see their life hanging, and shall not believe their life?" [571] You

insert the words "on a tree," which are not in the original. Nothing

can be easier than to show that this has no reference to Christ. Moses

is uttering dire threatenings in case the people should depart from his

law, and says among other things that they would be taken captive by

their enemies, and would be expecting death day and night, having no

confidence in the life allowed them by their conquerors, so that their

life would hang in uncertainty from fear of impending danger. This

passage will not do, we must try others. I cannot admit that the

words, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree," refer to Christ,

or when it is said that the prince or prophet must be killed who should

try to turn away the people from their God, or should break any of the

commandments. [572] That Christ did this I am obliged to grant. But

if you assert that these things were written of Christ, it may be asked

in reply, What spirit dictated these prophecies in which Moses curses

Christ and orders him to be killed? If he had the Spirit of God, these

things are not written of Christ; if they are written of Christ, he had

not the Spirit of God. The Spirit of God would not curse Christ, or

order Him to be killed. To vindicate Moses, you must confess that

these passages too have no reference to Christ. So, if you have no

others to show, there are none. If there are none, Christ could not

have said that there were; and if Christ did not say so, that verse is

spurious.

6. The next verse too is suspicious, "If ye believed Moses, ye would

also believe me;" for the religion of Moses is so entirely different

from that of Christ, that if the Jews believed one, they could not

believe the other. Moses strictly forbids any work to be done on

Sabbath, and gives as a reason for this prohibition that God made the

world and all that is therein in six days, and rested on the seventh

day, which is Sabbath; and therefore blessed or sanctified it as His

haven of repose after toil, and commanded that breaking the Sabbath

should be punished with death. The Jews, in obedience to Moses,

insisted strongly on this, and so would not even listen to Christ when

He told them that God always works, and that no day is appointed for

the intermission of His pure and unwearied energy, and that accordingly

He Himself had to work incessantly even on Sabbath. "My Father," he

says, "worketh always, and I too must work." [573] Again, Moses

places circumcision among the rites pleasing to God, and commands every

male to be circumcised in the foreskin of his flesh, and declares that

this is a necessary sign of the covenant which God made with Abraham,

and that every male not circumcised would be cut off from his tribe,

and from his part in the inheritance promised to Abraham and to his

seed. [574] In this observance, too, the Jews were very zealous, and

consequently could not believe in Christ, who made light of these

things, and declared that a man when circumcised became twofold a child

of hell. [575] Again, Moses is very particular about the distinction

in animal foods, and discourses like an epicure on the merits of fish,

and birds, and quadrupeds, and orders some to be eaten as clean, and

others which are unclean not to be touched. Among the unclean he

reckons the swine and the hare, and fish without scales, and quadrupeds

that neither divide the hoof nor chew the cud. In this also the Jews

carefully obeyed Moses, and so could not believe in Christ, who taught

that all food is alike, and though he allowed no animal food to his own

disciples, gave full liberty to the laity to eat whatever they pleased,

and taught that men are polluted not by what goes into the mouth, but

by the evil things which come out of it. In these and many other

things the doctrine of Jesus, as everybody knows, contradicts that of

Moses.

7. Not to enumerate all the points of difference, it is enough to

mention this one fact, that most Christian sects, and, as is well

known, the Catholics, pay no regard to what is prescribed in the

writings of Moses. If this does not originate in some error, but in

the doctrine correctly transmitted from Christ and His disciples, you

surely must acknowledge that the teaching of Jesus is opposed to that

of Moses, and that the Jews did not believe in Christ on account of

their attachment to Moses. How can it be otherwise than false that

Jesus said to the Jews, "If ye believed Moses, ye would believe me

also," when it is perfectly clear that their belief in Moses prevented

them from believing in Jesus, which they might have done if they had

left off believing in Moses? Again I ask you to show me anything that

Moses wrote of Christ.

8. Elsewhere Faustus says: When you find no passage to point to, you

use this weak and inappropriate argument, that a Christian is bound to

believe Christ when he says that Moses wrote of Him, and that whoever

does not believe this is not a Christian. It would be far better to

confess at once that you cannot find any passage. This argument might

be used with me, because my reverence for Christ compels me to believe

what He says. Still it may be a question whether this is Christ's own

declaration, requiring absolute belief, or only the writer's, to be

carefully examined. And disbelief in falsehood is no offence to

Christ, but to impostors. But of whatever use this argument may be

with Christians, it is wholly inapplicable in the case of the Jew or

Gentile, with whom we are supposed to be discussing. And even with

Christians the argument is objectionable. When the Apostle Thomas was

in doubt, Christ did not spurn him from Him. Instead of saying,

"Believe, if thou art a disciple; whoever does not believe is not a

disciple," Christ sought to heal the wounds of his mind by showing him

the marks of the wounds in His own body. Does it become you then to

tell me that I am not a Christian because I am in doubt, not about

Christ, but about the genuineness of a remark attributed to Christ?

But, you say, He calls those especially blessed, who have not seen, and

yet have believed. If you think that this refers to believing without

the use of judgment and reason, you are welcome to this blind

blessedness. I shall be content with rational blessedness.

9. Augustin replied: Your idea of taking any prophecies of Christ to

be found in Moses, as a fish out of the sea, while you throw away the

water from which the fish is taken, is a clever one. But since all

that Moses wrote is of Christ, or relates to Christ, either as

predicting Him by words and actions, or as illustrating His grace and

glory, you, with your faith in the untrue and untruthful Christ from

the writings of Manich�us, and your unbelief in Moses, will not even

eat the fish. Moreover, though you are sincere in your hostility to

Moses, you are hypocritical in your praise of fish. For how can you

say that there is no harm in eating a fish taken out of the sea, when

your doctrine is that such food is so hurtful, that you would rather

starve than make use of it? If all flesh is unclean, as you say it is,

and if the wretched life of your god is confined in all water or

plants, from which it is liberated by your using them for food,

according to your own vile superstition, you must throw away the fish

you have praised, and drink the water and eat the thistles you speak of

as useless. As for your comparison of the servant of God to devils, as

if his prophecies of Christ resembled their confession, the servant

does not refuse to bear the reproach of his master. If the Master of

the house was called Beelzebub, how much more they of His household!

[576] You have learned this reproach from Christ's enemies; and you

are worse than they were. They did not believe that Jesus was Christ,

and therefore thought Him an impostor. But the only doctrine you

believe in is that which dares to make Christ a liar.

10. What reason have you for saying that the law of Moses is pure

Paganism? Is it because it speaks of a temple, and an altar of

sacrifices, and priests? But all these names are found also in the New

Testament. "Destroy," Christ says, "this temple, and in three days I

will raise it up;" [577] and again, "When thou offerest thy gift at the

altar;" [578] and again, "Go, show thyself to the priest, and offer for

thyself a sacrifice as Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them."

[579] What these things prefigured the Lord Himself partly tells us,

when He calls His own body the temple; and we learn also from the

apostle, who says, "The temple of God is holy, which temple ye are;"

[580] and again, "I beseech you therefore by the mercies of God, that

ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God;"

[581] and in similar passages. As the same apostle says, in words

which cannot be too often quoted, these things were our examples, for

they were not the work of devils, but of the one true God who made

heaven and earth, and who, though not needing such things, yet, suiting

His requirements to the time, made ancient observances significant of

future realities. Since you pretend to abhor Paganism, though it is

only that you may lead astray by your deception unlearned Christians or

those not established in the faith, show us any authority in Christian

books for your worship and service of the sun and moon. Your heresy is

liker Paganism than the law of Moses is. For you do not worship

Christ, but only something that you call Christ, a fiction of your own

fancy; and the gods you serve are either the bodies visible in the

heavens, or hosts of your own contrivance. If you do not build shrines

for these worthless idols, the creatures of the imagination, you make

your hearts their temple.

11. You ask me to show what Moses wrote of Christ. Many passages have

already been pointed out. But who could point out all? Besides, when

any quotation is made, you are ready perversely to try to give the

words another meaning; or if the evidence is too strong to be resisted,

you will say that you take the passage as a sweet fish out of the salt

water, and that you will not therefore consent to drink all the brine

of the books of Moses. It will be enough, then, to take those passages

in the Hebrew law which Faustus has chosen for criticism, and to show

that, when rightly understood, they apply to Christ. For if the things

which our adversary ridicules and condemns are made to prove that he

himself is condemned by Christian truth, it will be evident that either

the mere quotation or the careful examination of the other passages

will be enough to show their agreement with Christian faith. Well,

then, O thou full of all subtilty, when the Lord in the Gospel says,

"If ye believed Moses, ye would believe me also, for he wrote of me,"

[582] there is no occasion for the great perplexity you pretend to be

in, or for the alternative of either pronouncing this verse spurious or

calling Jesus a liar. The verse is as genuine as its words are true.

I preferred, says Faustus, to attribute falsehood to the writers,

rather than to the Author of truth. What sort of faith can you have in

Christ as the author of truth, when your doctrine is that His flesh and

His death, His wounds and their marks, were feigned? And where is your

authority for saying that Christ is the author of truth, if you dare to

attribute falsehood to those who wrote of Him, whose testimony has come

down to us with the confirmation of those immediately succeeding them?

You have not seen Christ, nor has He conversed with you as with the

apostles, nor called you from heaven as He did Saul. What knowledge or

belief can we have of Christ, but on the authority of Scripture? Or if

there is falsehood in the Gospel which has been widely published among

all nations, and has been held in such high sacredness in all churches

since the name of Christ was first preached, where shall we find a

trustworthy record of Christ? If the Gospel is called in question in

spite of the general consent regarding it, there can be no writing

which a man may not call spurious if he does not wish to believe it.

12. You go on to quote Christ's words, that all who came before Him

were thieves and robbers. How do you know that these were Christ's

words, but from the Gospel? You profess faith in these words, as if

you had heard them from the mouth of the Lord Himself. But if any one

declares the verse to be spurious, and denies that Christ said this,

you will have, in reply, to exert yourself in vindication of the

authority of the Gospel. Unhappy being! what you refuse to believe is

written in the same place as that which you quote as spoken by the Lord

Himself. We believe both, for we believe the sacred narrative in which

both are contained. We believe both that Moses wrote of Christ, and

that all that came before Christ were thieves and robbers. By their

coming He means their not being sent. Those who were sent, as Moses

and the holy prophets, came not before Him, but with Him. They did not

proudly wish to precede Him, but were the humble bearers of the message

which He uttered by them. According to the meaning which you give to

the Lord's words, it is plain that with you there can be no prophets.

And so you have made a Christ for yourselves who should prophesy a

Christ to come. If you have any prophets of your own, they will have,

of course, no authority, as not being recognized by any others; but if

there are any that you dare to quote as prophesying that Christ would

come in an unreal body, and would suffer an unreal death, and would

show to His doubting disciples unreal marks of wounds, not to speak of

the abominable nature of such prophecies, and of the evident

untruthfulness of those who commend falsehood in Christ, by your own

interpretation those prophets must have been thieves and robbers, for

they could not have spoken of Christ as coming in any manner unless

they had come before Him. If by those who came before Christ we

understand those who would not come with Him,--that is, with the Word

of God,--but without being sent by God brought their own falsehoods to

men, you yourselves, although you are born in this world after the

death and the resurrection of Christ, are thieves and robbers. For,

without waiting for His illumination that you might preach His truth,

you have come before Him to preach up your own deceits.

13. In the passage where we read of the Jews saying to Christ, Thou

bearest witness of thyself, thy witness is not true, you do not see

that Christ replies by saying that Moses wrote of Him, simply because

you have not got the eye of piety to see with. The answer of Christ is

this: "It is written in your law, that the testimony of two men is

true; I am one who bear witness of myself, and the Father that sent me

beareth witness of me." [583] What does this mean, if rightly

understood, but that this number of witnesses required by the law was

fixed upon and consecrated in the spirit of prophecy, that even thus

might be prefigured the future revelation of the Father and Son, whose

spirit is the Holy Spirit of the inseparable Trinity? So it is

written: "In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be

established." [584] As a matter of fact, one witness generally speaks

the truth, while a number tell lies. And the world, in its conversion

to Christianity, believed one apostle preaching the gospel rather than

the mistaken multitude who persecuted him. There was a special reason

for requiring this number of witnesses, and in His answer the Lord

implied that Moses prophesied of Him. Do you carp at His saying your

law instead of the law of God? But, as every one knows, this is the

common expression in Scripture. Your law means the law given to you.

So the apostle speaks of his gospel, while at the same time he declares

that he received it not from man, but by the revelation of Jesus

Christ. You might as well say that Christ denies God to be His Father,

when He uses the words your Father instead of our Father. Again, you

should refuse to believe the voice which you allude to as having come

from heaven, This is my beloved Son, believe Him, because you did not

hear it. But if you believe this because you find it in the sacred

Scriptures, you will also find there what you deny, that Moses wrote of

Christ, besides many other things that you do not acknowledge as true.

Do you not see that your own mischievous argument may be used to prove

that this voice never came from heaven? To your own destruction, and

to the detriment of the welfare of mankind, you try to weaken the

authority of the gospel, by arguing that it cannot be true that Christ

said that Moses wrote of Him; because if He had said this, the

ingenious hostility of the Jews would have led them at once to ask what

He supposed Moses to have written of Him. In the same way, it might be

impiously argued that if that voice had really come from heaven, all

the Jews who heard it would have believed. Why are you so unreasonable

as not to consider that, as it was possible for the Jews to remain

hardened in unbelief after hearing the voice from heaven, so it was

possible for them, when Christ said that Moses wrote of Him, to refrain

from asking what Moses wrote, because in their ingenious hostility they

were afraid of being proved to be in the wrong?

14. Besides that this argument is an impious assault on the gospel,

Faustus himself is aware of its feebleness, and therefore insists more

on what he calls his chief difficulty,--that in all his search of the

writings of Moses he has found no prophecies of Christ. The obvious

reply is, that he does not understand. And if any one asks why he does

not understand, the answer is that he reads with a hostile, unbelieving

mind; he does not search in order to know, but thinks he knows when he

is ignorant. This vainglorious presumption either blinds the eye of

his understanding so as to prevent his seeing anything, or distorts his

vision, so that his remarks of approval or disapproval are

misdirected. I ask, he says, for instruction in whatever the writings

of Moses contain about our God and Lord, which has escaped me in

reading. I reply at once that it has all escaped him, for all is

written of Christ. As we cannot go through the whole, I will, with the

help of God, comply with your request, to the extent I have already

promised, by showing that the passages which you specially criticise

refer to Christ. You tell me not to use the ignorant argument that

Christ affirms Moses to have written of Him. But if I use this

argument, it is not because I am ignorant, but because I am a

believer. I acknowledge that this argument will not convince a Gentile

or a Jew. But, in spite of all your evasions, you are obliged to

confess that it tells against you, who boast of possessing a kind of

Christianity. You say, Suppose you had not to deal with me, as in my

case there is an obligation to believe Him whom I profess to follow,

but with a Jew or a Gentile. This is as much as to say that you, at

any rate, with whom I have at present to do, are satisfied that Moses

wrote of Christ; for you are not bold enough to discard altogether the

well-grounded authority of the Gospel where Christ's own declaration is

recorded. Even when you attack this authority indirectly, you feel

that you are attacking your own position. You are aware that if you

refuse to believe the Gospel, which is so generally known and received,

you must fail utterly in the attempt to substitute for it any

trustworthy record of the sayings and doings of Christ. You are afraid

that the loss of the Christian name might lead to the exposure of your

absurdities to universal scorn and condemnation. Accordingly you try

to recover yourself, by saying that your profession of Christianity

obliges you to believe these words of the Gospel. So you, at any rate,

which is all that we need care for just now, are caught and slain in

this death blow to your errors. You are forced to confess that Moses

wrote of Christ, because the Gospel, which your profession obliges you

to believe, states that Christ said so. As regards a discussion with a

Jew or a Gentile, I have already shown as well as I could how I think

it should be conducted.

15. I still hold that there is a reference to Christ in the passage

which you select for refutation, where God says to Moses, "I will raise

up unto them from among their brethren a prophet like unto thee." [585]

The string of showy antitheses with which you try to ornament your

dull discourse does not at all affect my belief of this truth. You

attempt to prove, by a comparison of Christ and Moses, that they are

unlike, and that therefore the words, "I will raise up a prophet like

unto thee," cannot be understood of Christ. You specify a number of

particulars in which you find a diversity: that the one is man, and

the other God; that one is a sinner, the other sinless; that one is

born of ordinary generation, the other, as we hold, of a virgin, and,

as you hold, not even of a virgin; the one incurs God's anger, and is

put to death on a mountain, the other suffers voluntarily, having

throughout the approval of His Father. But surely things may be said

to be like, although they are not like in every respect. Besides the

resemblance between things of the same nature, as between two men, or

between parents and children, or between men in general, or any species

of animals, or in trees, between one olive and another, or one laurel

and another, there is often a resemblance in things of a different

nature, as between a wild and a tame olive, or between wheat and

barley. These things are to some extent allied. But there is the

greatest possible distance between the Son of God, by whom all things

were made, and a beast or a stone. And yet in the Gospel we read,

"Behold the Lamb of God," [586] and in the apostle, "That rock was

Christ." [587] This could not be said except on the supposition of

some resemblance. What wonder, then, if Christ condescended to become

like Moses, when He was made like the lamb which God by Moses commanded

His people to eat as a type of Christ, enjoining that its blood should

be used as a means of protection, and that it should be called the

Passover, which every one must admit to be fulfilled in Christ? The

Scripture, I acknowledge, shows points of difference; and the Scripture

also, as I call on you to acknowledge, shows points of resemblance.

There are points of both kinds, and one can be proved as well as the

other. Christ is unlike man, for He is God; and it is written of Him

that He is "over all, God blessed for ever." [588] Christ is also

like man, for He is man; and it is likewise written of Him, that He is

the "Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." [589]

Christ is unlike a sinner, for He is ever holy; and He is like a

sinner, for "God sent His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, that by

sin He might condemn sin in the flesh." [590] Christ is unlike a man

born in ordinary generation, for He was born of a virgin; and yet He is

like, for He too was born of a woman, to whom it was said, "That holy

thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."

[591] Christ is unlike a man, who dies on account of his own sin, for

He died without sin, and of His own free-will; and again, He is like,

for He too died a real death of the body.

16. You ought not to say, in disparagement of Moses, that he was a

sinner, and that he was put to death on a mountain because his God was

angry with him. For Moses could glory in the Lord as his Saviour, who

is also the Saviour of him who says, "Christ Jesus came into the world

to save sinners, of whom I am chief." [592] Moses, indeed, is accused

by the voice of God, because his faith showed signs of weakness when he

was commanded to draw water out of the rock. [593] In this he may

have sinned as Peter did, when from the weakness of his faith he became

afraid in the midst of the waves. [594] But we cannot think from

this, that he who, as the Gospel tells us, was counted worthy to be

present with the Lord along with holy Elias on the mount of

transfiguration, was separated from the eternal fellowship of the

saints. The sacred history shows in what favor he was with God even

after his sin. But since you may ask why God speaks of this sin as

deserving the punishment of death, and as I have promised to point out

prophecies of Christ in those passages which you select for criticism,

I will try, with the Lord's help, to show that what you object to in

the death of Moses is, when rightly understood, prophetical of Christ.

17. We often find in the symbolical passages of Scripture, that the

same person appears in different characters on different occasions.

So, on this occasion, Moses represents and prefigures the Jewish people

as placed under the law. As, then, Moses, when he struck the rock with

his rod, doubted the power of God, so the people who were under the law

given by Moses, when they nailed Christ to the cross, did not believe

Him to be the power of God. And as water flowed from the smitten rock

for those that were athirst, so life comes to believers from the stroke

of the Lord's passion. The testimony of the apostle is clear and

decisive on this point, when he says, "This rock was Christ." [595]

In the command of God, that the death of the flesh of Moses should take

place on the mountain, we see the divine appointment that the carnal

doubt of the divinity of Christ should die on Christ's exaltation. As

the rock is Christ, so is the mountain. The rock is the fortitude of

His humiliation; the mountain the height of His exaltation. For as the

apostle says, "This rock was Christ," so Christ Himself says, "A city

set upon an hill cannot be hid," [596] showing that He is the hill, and

believers the city built upon the glory of His name. The carnal mind

lives when, like the smitten rock, the humiliation of Christ on the

cross is despised. For Christ crucified is to the Jews a

stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness. And the carnal mind

dies when, like the mountain-top, Christ is seen in His exaltation.

"For to them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ is the power

of God, and the wisdom of God." [597] Moses therefore ascended the

mount, that in the death of the flesh he might be received by the

living spirit. If Faustus had ascended, he would not have uttered

carnal objections from a dead mind. It was the carnal mind that made

Peter dread the smiting of the rock, when, on the occasion of the

Lord's foretelling His passion, he said, "Be it far from Thee, Lord;

spare Thyself." And this sin too was severely rebuked, when the Lord

replied, "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offense unto me: for

thou savorest not the things which be of God, but those which be of

men." [598] And where did this carnal distrust die but in the

glorification of Christ, as on a mountain height? If it was alive when

Peter timidly denied Christ, it was dead when he fearlessly preached

Him. It was alive in Saul, when, in his aversion to the offense of the

cross, he made havoc of the Christian faith, and where but on this

mountain had it died, when Paul was able to say, "I live no longer, but

Christ liveth in me?" [599]

18. What other reason has your heretical folly to give for thinking

that there is no prophecy of Christ in the words, "I will raise up unto

them a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee?" Your

showing Christ to be unlike Moses is no reason; for we can show that in

other respects He is like. How can you object to Christ's being called

a prophet, since He condescended to be a man, and actually foretold

many future events? What is a prophet, but one who predicts events

beyond human foresight? So Christ says of Himself: "A prophet is not

without honor, save in his own country." [600] But, turning from you,

since you have already acknowledged that your profession of

Christianity obliges you to believe the Gospel, I address myself to the

Jew, who enjoys the poor privilege of liberty from the yoke of Christ,

and who therefore thinks it allowable to say: Your Christ spoke

falsely; Moses wrote nothing of him.

19. Let the Jews say what prophet is meant in this promise of God to

Moses: "I will raise up unto them a Prophet from among their brethren,

like unto thee." Many prophets appeared after Moses; but one in

particular is here pointed out. The Jews will perhaps naturally think

of the successor of Moses, who led into the promised land the people

that Moses had brought out of Egypt. Having this successor of Moses in

his mind, he may perhaps laugh at me for asking to what prophet the

words of the promise refer, since it is recorded who followed Moses in

ruling and leading the people. When he has laughed at my ignorance, as

Faustus supposes him to do, I will still continue my inquiries, and

will desire my laughing opponent to give me a serious answer to the

question why Moses changed the name of this successor, who was

preferred to himself as the leader of the people into the promised

land, to show that the law given by Moses not to save, but to convince

the sinner, cannot lead us into heaven, but only the grace and truth

which are by Jesus Christ. This successor was called Osea, and Moses

gave him the name of Jesus. Why then did he give him this name when he

sent him from the valley of Pharan into the land into which he was to

lead the people? [601] The true Jesus says, "If I go and prepare a

place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself." [602]

I will ask the Jew if the prophet does not show the prophetical meaning

of these things when he says, "God shall come from Africa, and the Holy

One from Pharan." Does this not mean that the holy God would come with

the name of him who came from Africa by Pharan, that is, with the name

of Jesus? Then, again, it is the Word of God Himself who speaks when

He promises to provide this successor to Moses, speaking of him as an

angel,--a name commonly given in Scripture to those carrying any

message. The words are: "Behold I send my angel before thy face, to

preserve thee in the way, and to bring thee into the land which I have

sworn to give thee. Take heed unto him, and obey, and beware of

unbelief in him; for he will not take anything from thee wrongfully,

for my name is in him." [603] Consider these words. Let the Jew, not

to speak of the Manich�an, say what other angel he can find in

Scripture to whom these words apply, but this leader who was to bring

the people into the land of promise. Then let him inquire who it was

that succeeded Moses, and brought in the people. He will find that it

was Jesus, and that this was not his name at first, but after his name

was changed. It follows that He who said, "My name is in him," is the

true Jesus, the leader who brings His people into the inheritance of

eternal life, according to the New Testament, of which the Old was a

figure. No event or action could have a more distinctly prophetical

character than this, where the very name is a prediction.

20. It follows that this Jew, if he wishes to be a Jew inwardly, in

the spirit, and not in the letter, if he wishes to be thought a true

Israelite, in whom is no guile, will recognize in this dead Jesus, who

led the people into the land of mortality, a figure of the true living

Jesus, whom he may follow into the land of life. In this way, he will

no longer in a hostile spirit resist so plain a prophecy, but,

influenced by the allusion to the Jesus of the Old Testament, he will

be prepared to listen meekly to Him whose name he bore, and who leads

to the true land of promise; for He says, "Blessed are the meek, for

they shall inherit the land." [604] The Gentile also, if his heart is

not too stony, if he is one of those stones from which God raises up

children unto Abraham, must allow it to be wonderful that in the

ancient books of the people of whom Jesus was born, so plain a

prophecy, including His very name, is found recorded; and must remark

at the same time, that it is not any man of the name of Jesus who is

prophesied of, but a divine person, because God said that His name was

in that man who was appointed to rule the people, and to lead them into

the kingdom, and who by a change of name was called Jesus. In His

being sent with this new name, He brings a great and divine message,

and is therefore called an Angel, which, as every tyro in Greek knows,

means messenger. No Gentile, therefore, if he were not perverse and

obstinate, would despise these books merely because he is not subject

to the law of the Hebrews, to whom the books belong; but would think

highly of the books, no matter whose they were, on finding in them

prophecies of such ancient date, and of what he sees now taking place.

Instead of despising Christ Jesus because He is foretold in the Hebrew

Scriptures, he would conclude that one thought worthy of being the

subject of prophetic description, whoever the writers might be, for so

many ages before His coming into the world,--sometimes in plain

announcements, sometimes in figure by symbolic actions and

utterances,--must claim to be regarded with profound admiration and

reverence, and to be followed with implicit reliance. Thus the facts

of Christian history would prove the truth of the prophecy, and the

prophecy would prove the claims of Christ. Call this fancy, if it is

not actually the case that men all over the world have been led, and

are now led, to believe in Christ by reading these books.

21. In view of the multitudes from all nations who have become zealous

believers in these books, it is laughably absurd to tell us that it is

impossible to persuade a Gentile to learn the Christian faith from

Jewish books. Indeed, it is a great confirmation of our faith that

such important testimony is borne by enemies. The believing Gentiles

cannot suppose these testimonies to Christ to be recent forgeries; for

they find them in books held sacred for so many ages by those who

crucified Christ, and still regarded with the highest veneration by

those who every day blaspheme Christ. If the prophecies of Christ were

the production of the preachers of Christ, we might suspect their

genuineness. But now the preacher expounds the text of the

blasphemer. In this way the Most High God orders the blindness of the

ungodly for the profit of the saint, in His righteous government

bringing good out of evil, that those who by their own choice live

wickedly may be, in His just judgment, made the instruments of His

will. So, lest those that were to preach Christ to the world should be

thought to have forged the prophecies which speak of Christ as to be

born, to work miracles, to suffer unjustly, to die, to rise again, to

ascend to heaven, to publish the gospel of eternal life among all

nations, the unbelief of the Jews has been made of signal benefit to

us; so that those who do not receive in their heart for their own good

these truths, carry, in their hands for our benefit the writings in

which these truths are contained. And the unbelief of the Jews

increases rather than lessens the authority of the books, for this

blindness is itself foretold. They testify to the truth by their not

understanding it. By not understanding the books which predict that

they would not understand, they prove these books to be true.

22. In the passage, "Thou shalt see thy life hanging, and shalt not

believe thy life," [605] Faustus is deceived by the ambiguity of the

words. The words may be differently interpreted; but that they cannot

be understood of Christ is not said by Faustus, nor can be said by

anyone who does not deny that Christ is life, or that He was seen by

the Jews hanging on the cross, or that they did not believe Him. Since

Christ Himself says, "I am the life," [606] and since there is no doubt

that He was seen hanging by the unbelieving Jews, I see no reason for

doubting that this was written of Christ; for, as Christ says, Moses

wrote of Him. Since we have already refuted Faustus' arguments by

which he tries to show that the words, "I will raise up from among

their brethren a prophet like unto thee," do not apply to Christ,

because Christ is not like Moses, we need not insist on this other

prophecy. Since, in the one case, his argument is that Christ is

unlike Moses, so here he ought to argue that Christ is not the life, or

that He was not seen hanging by the unbelieving Jews. But as he has

not said this, and as no one will now venture to say so, there should

be no difficulty in accepting this too as a prophecy of our Lord and

Saviour Jesus Christ, uttered by His servant. These words, says

Faustus, occur in a chapter of curses. But why should it be the less a

prophecy because it occurs in the midst of prophecies? Or why should

it not be a prophecy of Christ, although the context does not seem to

refer to Christ? Indeed, among all the curses which the Jews brought

on themselves by their sinful pride, nothing could be worse than this,

that they should see their Life--that is, the Son of God --hanging, and

should not believe their Life. For the curses of prophecy are not

hostile imprecations, but announcements of coming judgment. Hostile

imprecations are forbidden, for it is said, "Bless, and curse not."

[607] But prophetic announcements are often found in the writings of

the saints, as when the Apostle Paul says: "Alexander the coppersmith

has done me much evil; the Lord shall reward him according to his

works." [608] So it might be thought that the apostle was prompted by

angry feeling to utter this imprecation: "I would that they were even

made eunuchs that trouble you." [609] But if we remember who the

writer is, we may see in this ambiguous expression an ingenious style

of benediction. For there are eunuchs which have made themselves

eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. [610] If Faustus had a

pious appetite for Christian food, he would have found a similar

ambiguity in the words of Moses. By the Jews the declaration, "Thou

shalt see thy life hanging, and shalt not believe thy life," may have

been understood to mean that they would see their life to be in danger

from the threats and plots of their enemies, and would not expect to

live. But the child of the Gospel, who has heard Christ say, "He wrote

of me," distinguishes in the ambiguity of the prophecy between what is

thrown to swine and what is addressed to man. To his mind the thought

immediately suggests itself of Christ hanging as the life of man, and

of the Jews not believing in Him for this very reason, that they saw

Him hanging. As to the objection that these words, "Thou shalt see thy

life hanging, and shalt not believe thy life," are the only words

referring to Christ in a passage containing maledictions not applicable

to Christ, some might grant that this is true. For this prophecy might

very well occur among the curses pronounced by the prophet upon the

ungodly people, for these curses are of different kinds. But I, and

those who with me consider more closely the saying of the Lord in His

Gospel, which is not, He wrote also of me, as admitting that Moses

wrote other things not referring to Christ, but, "He wrote of me," as

teaching that in searching the Scriptures we should view them as

intended solely to illustrate the grace of Christ, see a reference to

Christ in the rest of the passage also. But it would take too much

time to explain this here.

23. So far from these words of Faustus' quotation being proved not to

refer to Christ by their occurring among the other curses, these curses

cannot be rightly understood except as prophecies of the glory of

Christ, in which lies the happiness of man. And what is true of these

curses is still more true of this quotation. If it could be said of

Moses that his words have a different meaning from what was in his

mind, I would rather suppose him to have prophesied without knowing it,

than allow that the words, "Thou shalt see thy life hanging, and shalt

not believe thy life," are not applicable to Christ. So the words of

Caiaphas had a different meaning from what he intended, when, in his

hostility to Christ, he said that it was expedient that one man should

die for the people, and that the whole nation should not perish, where

the Evangelist added that he said this not of himself, but, since he

was high priest, he prophesied. [611] But Moses was not Caiaphas; and

therefore when Moses said to the Hebrew people, "Thou shalt see thy

life hanging, and shalt not believe thy life," he not only spoke of

Christ, as he certainly did, even though he spoke without knowing the

meaning of what he said, but he knew that he spoke of Christ. For he

was a most faithful steward of the prophetic mystery, that is, of the

priestly unction which gives the knowledge of the name of Christ; and

in this mystery even Caiaphas, wicked as he was, was able to prophesy

without knowing it. The prophetic unction enabled him to prophesy,

though his wicked life prevented him from knowing it. Who then can say

that there are no prophecies of Christ in Moses, with whom began that

unction to which we owe the knowledge of Christ's name, and by which

even Caiaphas, the persecutor of Christ, prophesied of Christ without

knowing it?

24. We have already said as much as appeared desirable of the curse

pronounced on every one that hangs on a tree. Enough has been said to

show that the command to kill any prophet or prince who tried to turn

away the children of Israel from their God, or to break any

commandment, is not directed against Christ. The more we consider the

words and actions of our Lord Jesus Christ, the more clearly will this

appear; for Christ never tried to turn away any of the Israelites from

their God. The God whom Moses taught the people to love and serve, is

the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, whom the Lord Jesus Christ

speaks of by this name, using the name in refutation of the Sadducees,

who denied the resurrection of the dead. He says, "Of the resurrection

of the dead, have ye not read what God said from the bush to Moses, I

am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is

not the God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto Him."

[612] In the same words with which Christ answered the Sadducees we

may answer the Manich�ans, for they too deny the resurrection, though

in a different way. Again, when Christ said, in praise of the

centurion's faith, "Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great

faith, no, not in Israel," He added, "And I say unto you, that many

shall come from the east and from the west, and shall sit down with

Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven; but the

children of the kingdom shall go into outer darkness." [613] If,

then, as Faustus must admit, the God of whom Moses spoke was the God of

Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, of whom Christ also spoke, as these

passages prove, it follows that Christ did not try to turn away the

people from their God. On the contrary, He warned them that they would

go into outer darkness, because He saw that they were turned away from

their God, in whose kingdom He says the Gentiles called from the whole

world will sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob; implying that

they would believe in the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob.

So the apostle also says: "The Scripture, foreseeing that God would

justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the gospel beforehand to

Abraham, saying, In thy seed shall all nations be blessed." [614] It

is implied that those who are blessed in the seed of Abraham shall

imitate the faith of Abraham. Christ, then, did not try to turn away

the Israelites from their God, but rather charged them with being

turned away. The idea that Christ broke one of the commandments given

by Moses is not a new one, for the Jews thought so; but it is a

mistake, for the Jews were in the wrong. Let Faustus mention the

commandment which he supposes the Lord to have broken, and we will

point out his mistake, as we have done already, when it was required.

Meanwhile it is enough to say, that if the Lord had broken any

commandment, He could not have found fault with the Jews for doing so.

For when the Jews blamed His disciples for eating with unwashen hands,

in which they transgressed not a commandment of God, but the traditions

of the elders, Christ said, "Why do ye also transgress the commandment

of God, that ye may observe your traditions?" He then quotes a

commandment of God, which we know to have been given by Moses. "For

God said," He adds, "Honor thy father and mother, and he that curseth

father or mother shall die the death. But ye say, Whoever shall say to

his father or mother, It is a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be

profited by me, is not obliged to honor his father. So ye make the

word of God of none effect by your traditions." [615] From this

several things maybe learned: that Christ did not turn away the Jews

from their God; that He not only did not Himself break God's

commandments, but found fault with those who did so; and that it was

God Himself who gave these commandments by Moses.

25. In fulfillment of our promise that we would prove the reference to

Christ in those passages selected by Faustus from the writings of Moses

for adverse criticism, since we cannot here point out the reference to

Christ which we believe to exist in all the writings of Moses, it

becomes our duty to show that this commandment of Moses, that every

prophet or prince should be killed who tried to turn away the people

from their God, or to break any commandment, refers to the preservation

of the faith which is taught in the Church of Christ. Moses no doubt

knew in the spirit of prophecy, and from what he himself heard from

God, that many heretics would arise to teach errors of all kinds

against the doctrine of Christ, and to preach another Christ than the

true Christ. For the true Christ is He that was foretold in the

prophecies uttered by Moses himself, and by the other holy men of that

nation. Moses accordingly commanded that whoever tried to teach

another Christ should be put to death. In obedience to this command,

the voice of the Catholic Church, as with the spiritual two-edged sword

of both Testaments, puts to death all who try to turn us away from our

God, or to break any of the commandments. And chief among these is

Manich�us himself; for the truth of the law and the prophets convinces

him of error as trying to turn us away from our God, the God of

Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, whom Christ acknowledges, and as trying

to break the commandments of the law, which, even when they are only

figurative, we regard as prophetic of Christ.

26. Faustus uses an argument which is either very deceitful or very

stupid. And as Faustus is not stupid, it is probable that he used the

argument intentionally, with the design of misleading the careless

reader. He says: If these things are not written of Christ, and if

you cannot show any others, it follows that there are none at all. The

proposition is true; but it remains to be proved, both that these

things are not written of Christ, and that no other can be shown.

Faustus has not proved this; for we have shown both how these things

are to be understood of Christ, and that there are many other things

which have no meaning but as applied to Christ. So it does not follow,

as Faustus says, that nothing was written by Moses of Christ. Let us

repeat Faustus' argument: If these things are not written of Christ,

and if you cannot show any others, it follows that there are none at

all. Perfectly so. But as both these things and many others have been

shown to be written of Christ, or with reference to Christ, the true

conclusion is that Faustus' argument is worthless. In the passages

quoted by Faustus, he has tried, though without success, to show that

they were not written of Christ. But in order to draw the conclusion

that there are none at all, he should first have proved that no others

can be shown. Instead of this, he takes for granted that the readers

of his book will be blind, or the hearers deaf, so that the omission

will be overlooked, and runs on thus: If there are none, Christ could

not have asserted that there were any. And if Christ did not make this

assertion, it follows that this verse is spurious. Here is a man who

thinks so much of what he says himself, that he does not consider the

possibility of another person saying the opposite. Where is your wit?

Is this all you could say for a bad cause? But if the badness of the

cause made you utter folly, the bad cause was your own choice. To

prove your antecedent false, we have only to show some other things

written of Christ. If there are some, it will not be true that there

are none. And if there are some, Christ may have asserted that there

were. And if Christ may have asserted this, it follows that this verse

of the Gospel is not spurious. Coming back, then, to Faustus'

proposition, If you cannot show any other, it follows that there are

none at all, it requires to be proved that we cannot show any other.

We need only refer to what we showed before, as sufficient to prove the

truth of the text in the Gospel, in which Christ says, "If ye believed

Moses, ye would also believe me; for he wrote of me." And even though

from dullness of mind we could find nothing written of Christ by Moses,

still, so strong is the evidence in support of the authority of the

Gospel, that it would be incumbent on us to believe that not only some

things, but everything written by Moses, refers to Christ; for He says

not, He wrote also of me, but, He wrote of me. The truth then is this,

that even though there were doubts, which God forbid, of the

genuineness of this verse, the doubt would be removed by the number of

testimonies to Christ which we find in Moses; while, on the other hand,

even if we could find none, we should still be bound to believe that

these are to be found, because no doubts can be admitted regarding any

verse in the Gospel.

27. As to your argument that the doctrine of Moses was unlike that of

Christ, and that therefore it was improbable that if they believed

Moses, they would believe Christ too; and that it would rather follow

that their belief in one would imply of necessity opposition to the

other,--you could not have said this if you had turned your mind's eye

for a moment to see men all the world over, when they are not blinded

by a contentious spirit, learned and unlearned, Greek and barbarian,

wise and unwise, to whom the apostle called himself a debtor, [616]

believing in both Christ and Moses. If it was improbable that the Jews

would believe both Christ and Moses, it is still more improbable that

all the world would do so. But as we see all nations believing both,

and in a common and well-grounded faith holding the agreement of the

prophecy of the one with the gospel of the other, it was no impossible

thing to which this one nation was called, when Christ said to them,

"If ye believed Moses, ye would also believe me." Rather we should be

amazed at the guilty obstinacy of the Jews, who refused to do what we

see the whole world has done.

28. Regarding the Sabbath and circumcision, and the distinction in

foods, in which you say the teaching of Moses differs from what

Christians are taught by Christ, we have already shown that, as the

apostle says, "all those things were our examples." [617] The

difference is not in the doctrine, but in the time. There was a time

when it was proper that these things should be figuratively predicted;

and there is now a different time when it is proper that they should be

openly declared and fully accomplished. It is not surprising that the

Jews, who understood the Sabbath in a carnal sense, should oppose

Christ, who began to open up its spiritual meaning. Reply, if you can,

to the apostle, who declares that the rest of the Sabbath was a shadow

of something future. [618] If the Jews opposed Christ because they

did not understand what the true Sabbath is, there is no reason why you

should oppose Him, or refuse to learn what true innocence is. For on

that occasion when Jesus appears especially to set aside the Sabbath,

when His disciples were hungry, and pulled the ears of corn through

which they were passing, and ate them, Jesus, in replying to the Jews,

declared His disciples to be innocent. "If you knew," He said "what

this meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, you would not have

condemned the innocent." [619] They should rather have pitied the

wants of the disciples, for hunger forced them to do what they did.

But pulling ears of corn, which is innocence in the teaching of Christ,

is murder in the teaching of Manich�us. Or was it an act of charity in

the apostles to pull the ears of corn, that they might in eating set

free the members of God, as in your foolish notions? Then it must be

cruelty in you not to do the same. Faustus' reason for setting aside

the Sabbath is because he knows that God's power is exercised without

cessation, and without weariness. It is for those to say this, who

believe that all times are the production of an eternal act of God's

will. But you will find it difficult to reconcile this with your

doctrine, that the rebellion of the race of darkness broke your god's

rest, which was also disturbed by a sudden attack of the enemy; or

perhaps God never had rest, as he foresaw this from eternity, and could

not feel at ease in the prospect of so dire a conflict, with such loss

and disaster to his members.

29. Unless Christ had considered this Sabbath--which in your want of

knowledge and of piety you laugh at--one of the prophecies written of

Himself, He would not have borne such a testimony to it as He did. For

when, as you say in praise of Christ, He suffered voluntarily, and so

could choose His own time for suffering and for resurrection, He

brought it about that His body rested from all its works on Sabbath in

the tomb, and that His resurrection on the third day, which we call the

Lord's day, the day after the Sabbath, and therefore the eighth, proved

the circumcision of the eighth day to be also prophetical of Him. For

what does circumcision mean, but the eradication of the mortality which

comes from our carnal generation? So the apostle says: "Putting off

from Himself His flesh, He made a show of principalities and powers,

triumphing over them in Himself." [620] The flesh here said to be put

off is that mortality of flesh on account of which the body is properly

called flesh. The flesh is the mortality, for in the immortality of

the resurrection there will be no flesh; as it is written, "Flesh and

blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God." You are accustomed to

argue from these words against our faith in the doctrine of the

resurrection of the body, which has already taken place in the Lord

Himself. You keep out of view the following words, in which the

apostle explains his meaning. To show what he here means by flesh, he

adds, "Neither shall corruption inherit incorruption." For this body,

which from its mortality is properly called flesh, is changed in the

resurrection, so as to be no longer corruptible and mortal. This is

the apostle's statement, and not a supposition of ours, as his next

words prove. "Lo" he says, "I show you a mystery: we shall all rise

again, but we shall not all be changed. In a moment, in the twinkling

of an eye, at the last trump; for the last trumpet shall sound, and the

dead shall rise incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this

corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on

immortality." [621] To put on immortality, the body puts off

mortality. This is the mystery of circumcision, which by the law took

place on the eighth day; and on the eighth day, the Lord's day, the day

after the Sabbath, was fulfilled in its true meaning by the Lord.

Hence it is said, "Putting off His flesh, He made a show of

principalities and powers." For by means of this mortality the hostile

powers of hell ruled over us. Christ is said to have made a show or

example of these, because in Himself, our Head, He gave an example

which will be fully realized in the liberation of His whole body, the

Church, from the power of the devil at the last resurrection. This is

our faith. And according to the prophetic declaration quoted by Paul,

"The just shall live by faith." This is our justification. [622]

Even Pagans believe that Christ died. But only Christians believe that

Christ rose again. "If thou confess with thy mouth," says the apostle,

"that Jesus is the Lord, and believest in thy heart that God raised Him

from the dead, thou shalt be saved." [623] Again, because we are

justified by faith in Christ's resurrection, the apostle says, "He died

for our offenses, and rose again for our justification." [624] And

because this resurrection by faith in which we are justified was

prefigured by the circumcision of the eighth day, the apostle says of

Abraham, with whom the observance began, "He received the sign of

circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of faith." [625]

Circumcision, then, is one of the prophecies of Christ, written by

Moses, of whom Christ said, "He wrote of me." In the words of the

Lord, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass

sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, ye make him

twofold more the child of hell than yourselves," [626] it is not the

circumcision of the proselyte which is meant, but his imitation of the

conduct of the scribes and Pharisees, which the Lord forbids His

disciples to imitate, when He says: "The scribes and Pharisees sit on

Moses' seat: what they say unto you, do; but do not after their works;

for they say, and do not." [627] These words of the Lord teach us

both the honor due to the teaching of Moses, in whose seat even bad men

were obliged to teach good things, and the reason of the proselyte

becoming a child of hell, which was not that he heard from the

Pharisees the words of the law, but that he copied their example. Such

a circumcised proselyte might have been addressed in the words of

Paul: "Circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law." [628]

His imitation of the Pharisees in not keeping the law made him a child

of hell. And he was twofold more than they, probably because of his

neglecting to fulfill what he voluntarily undertook, when, not being

born a Jew, he chose to become a Jew.

30. Your scoff is very inappropriate, when you say that Moses

discusses like a glutton what should be eaten, and commands some things

to be freely used as clean, and other things as unclean to be not even

touched. A glutton makes no distinction, except in choosing the

sweetest food. Perhaps you wish to commend to the admiration of the

uninitiated the innocence of your abstemious habits, by appearing not

to know, or to have forgotten, that swine's flesh tastes better than

mutton. But as this too was written by Moses of Christ in figurative

prophecy, in which the flesh of animals signifies those who are to be

united to the body of Christ, which is the Church, or who are to be

cast out, you are typified by the unclean animals; for your

disagreement with the Catholic faith shows that you do not ruminate on

the word of wisdom, and that you do not divide the hoof, in the sense

of making a correct distinction between the Old Testament and the New.

But you show still more audacity in adopting the erroneous opinions of

your Adimantus.

31. You follow Adimantus in saying that Christ made no distinction in

food, except in entirely prohibiting the use of animal food to His

disciples, while He allowed the laity to eat anything that is eatable;

and declared that they were not polluted by what enters into the mouth,

but that the unseemly things which come out of the mouth are the things

which defile a man. These words of yours are unseemly indeed, for they

express notorious falsehood. If Christ taught that the evil things

which come out of the mouth are the only things that defile a man, why

should they not be the only things to defile His disciples, so as to

make it unnecessary that any food should be forbidden or unclean? Is

it only the laity that are not polluted by what goes into the mouth,

but by what comes out of it? In that case, they are better protected

from impurity than the saints, who are polluted both by what goes in

and by what comes out. But as Christ, comparing Himself with John, who

came neither eating nor drinking, says that He came eating and

drinking, I should like to know what He ate and drank. When exposing

the perversity which found fault with both, He says: "John came

neither eating nor drinking; and ye say, He hath a devil. The Son of

man cometh eating and drinking; and ye say, Behold a glutton and a

wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners." [629] We know what

John ate and drank. For it is not said that he drank nothing, but that

he drank no wine or strong drink; so he must have drunk water. He did

not live without food, but his food was locusts and wild honey. [630]

When Christ says that John did not eat or drink, He means that he did

not use the food which the Jews used. And because the Lord used this

food, He is spoken of, in contrast with John, as eating and drinking.

Will it be said that it was bread and vegetables which the Lord ate,

and which John did not eat? It would be strange if one was said not to

eat, because he used locusts and honey, while the other is said to eat

simply because he used bread and vegetables. But whatever may be

thought of the eating, certainly no one could be called a wine-bibber

unless he used wine. Why then do you call wine unclean? It is not in

order to subdue the body by abstinence that you prohibit these things,

but because they are unclean, for you say that they are the poisonous

filth of the race of darkness; whereas the apostle says, "To the pure

all things are pure." [631] Christ, according to this doctrine,

taught that all food was alike, but forbade His disciples to use what

the Manich�ans call unclean. Where do you find this prohibition? You

are not afraid to deceive men by falsehood; but in God's righteous

providence, you are so blinded that you provide us with the means of

refuting you. For I cannot resist quoting for examination the whole of

that passage of the Gospel which Faustus uses against Moses; that we

may see from it the falsehood of what was said first by Adimantus, and

here by Faustus, that the Lord Jesus forbade the use of animal food to

His disciples, and allowed it to the laity. After Christ's reply to

the accusation that His disciples ate with unwashen hands, we read in

the Gospel as follows: "And He called the multitude, and said unto

them, Hear and understand. Not that which goeth into the mouth

defileth a man: but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth

a man. Then came His disciples, and said unto Him, Knowest Thou that

the Pharisees were offended after they heard this saying?" Here, when

addressed by His disciples, He ought certainly, according to the

Manich�ans, to have given them special instructions to abstain from

animal food, and to show that His words, "Not that which goeth into the

mouth defileth a man, but that which goeth out of the mouth," applied

to the multitude only. Let us hear, then, what, according to the

evangelist, the Lord replied, not to the multitude, but to His

disciples: "But He answered and said, Every plant which my heavenly

Father hath not planted shall be rooted up. Let them alone: they be

blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both

shall fall into the ditch." The reason of this was, that in their

desire to observe their own traditions, they did not understand the

commandments of God. As yet the disciples had not asked the Master how

they were to understand what He had said to the multitude. But now

they do so; for the evangelist adds: "Then answered Peter and said

unto Him, Declare unto us this parable." This shows that Peter thought

that when the Lord said, "Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth

a man, but that which goeth out of the mouth," He did not speak plainly

and literally, but, as usual, wished to convey some instruction under

the guise of a parable. When His disciples, then, put this question in

private, does He tell them, as the Manich�ans say, that all animal food

is unclean, and that they must never touch it? Instead of this, He

rebukes them for not understanding His plain language, and for thinking

it a parable when it was not. We read: "And Jesus said, Are ye also

yet without understanding? Do not ye yet understand, that whatsoever

entereth in at the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the

drought? But those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth

from the heart, and they defile the man. For out of the heart proceed

evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false

witness, blasphemies. These are the things which defile a man: but to

eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man." [632]

32. Here we have a complete exposure of the falsehood of the

Manich�ans: for it is plain that the Lord did not in this matter teach

one thing to the multitude, and another in private to His disciples.

Here is abundant evidence that the error and deceit are in the

Manich�ans, and not in Moses, nor in Christ, nor in the doctrine taught

figuratively in one Testament and plainly in the other,--prophesied in

one, and fulfilled in the other. How can the Manich�ans say that the

Catholics regard none of the things that Moses wrote, when in fact they

observe them all, not now in the figures, but in what the figures were

intended to foretell? No one would say that one who reads the

Scripture subsequently to its being written does not observe it because

he does not form the letters which he reads. The letters are the

figures of the sounds which he utters; and though he does not form the

letters, he cannot read without examining them. The reason why the

Jews did not believe in Christ, was because they did not observe even

the plain literal precepts of Moses. So Christ says to them: "Ye pay

tithe of mint and cummin, and omit the weightier matters of the law,

mercy and judgment. Ye strain out a gnat and swallow a camel. These

ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone." [633] So

also He told them that by their traditions they made of none effect the

commandment of God to give honor to parents. On account of this pride

and perversity in neglecting what they understood, they were justly

blinded, so that they could not understand the other things.

33. You see, my argument is not that if you are a Christian you must

believe Christ when He says that Moses wrote of Him, and that if you do

not believe this you are no Christian. The account you give of

yourself in asking to be dealt with as a Jew or a Gentile is your own

affair. My endeavor is to leave no avenue of error open to you. I

have shut you out, too, from that precipice to which you rush as a last

resort, when you say that these are spurious passages in the Gospel; so

that, freed from the pernicious influence of this opinion, you may be

reduced to the necessity of believing in Christ. You say you wish to

be taught like the Christian Thomas, whom Christ did not spurn from Him

because he doubted of Him, but, in order to heal the wounds of his

mind, showed him the marks of the wounds in His own body. These are

your own words. It is well that you desire to be taught as Thomas

was. I feared you would make out this passage too to be spurious.

Believe, then, the marks of Christ's wounds. For if the marks were

real, the wounds must have been real. And the wounds could not have

been real, unless His body had been capable of real wounds; which

upsets at once the whole error of the Manich�ans. If you say that the

marks were unreal which Christ showed to His doubting disciple, it

follows that He must be a deceitful teacher, and that you wish to be

deceived in being taught by Him. But as no one wishes to be deceived,

while many wish to deceive, it is probable that you would rather

imitate the teaching which you ascribe to Christ than the learning you

ascribe to Thomas. If, then, you believe that Christ deceived a

doubting inquirer by false marks of wounds, you must yourself be

regarded, not as a safe teacher, but as a dangerous impostor. On the

other hand, if Thomas touched the real marks of Christ's wounds, you

must confess that Christ had a real body. So, if you believe as Thomas

did, you are no more a Manich�an. If you do not believe even with

Thomas, you must be left to your infidelity.
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Book XVII.

Faustus rejects Christ's declaration that He came not to destroy the

law and the prophets but to fulfill them, on the ground that it is

found only in Matthew, who was not present when the words purport to

have been spoken. Augustin rebukes the folly of refusing to believe

Matthew and yet believing Manich�us, and shows what the passage of

scripture really means.

1. Faustus said: You ask why we do not receive the law and the

prophets, when Christ said that he came not to destroy them, but to

fulfill them. Where do we learn that Jesus said this? From Matthew,

who declares that he said it on the mount. In whose presence was it

said? In the presence of Peter, Andrew, James, and John--only these

four; for the rest, including Matthew himself, were not yet chosen. Is

it not the case that one of these four--John, namely--wrote a Gospel?

It is. Does he mention this saying of Jesus? No. How, then, does it

happen that what is not recorded by John, who was on the mount, is

recorded by Matthew, who became a follower of Christ long after He came

down from the mount? In the first place, then, we must doubt whether

Jesus ever said these words, since the proper witness is silent on the

matter, and we have only the authority of a less trustworthy witness.

But, besides this, we shall find that it is not Matthew that has

imposed upon us, but some one else under his name, as is evident from

the indirect style of the narrative. Thus we read: "As Jesus passed

by, He saw a man, named Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom, and

called him; and he immediately rose up, and followed Him." [634] No

one writing of himself would say, He saw a man, and called him; and he

followed Him; but, He saw me, and called me, and I followed Him.

Evidently this was written not by Matthew himself, but by some one else

under his name. Since, then, the passage already quoted would not be

true even if it had been written by Matthew, since he was not present

when Jesus spoke on the mount; much more is its falsehood evident from

the fact that the writer was not Matthew himself, but some one

borrowing the names both of Jesus and of Matthew.

2. The passage itself, in which Christ tells the Jews not to think

that He came to destroy the law, is rather designed to show that He did

destroy it. For, had He not done something of the kind, the Jews would

not have suspected Him. His words are: "Think not that I am come to

destroy the law." Suppose the Jews had replied, What actions of thine

might lead us to suspect this? Is it because thou exposest

circumcision, breakest the Sabbath, discardest sacrifices, makest no

distinction in foods? this would be the natural answer to the words,

Think not. The Jews had the best possible reason for thinking that

Jesus destroyed the law. If this was not to destroy the law, what is?

But, indeed, the law and the prophets consider themselves already so

faultlessly perfect, that they have no desire to be fulfilled. Their

author and father condemns adding to them as much as taking away

anything from them; as we read in Deuteronomy: "These precepts which I

deliver unto thee this day, O Israel, thou shalt observe to do; thou

shalt not turn aside from them to the right hand or to the left; thou

shalt not add thereto nor diminish from it, that thy God may bless

thee." [635] Whether, therefore, Jesus turned aside to the right by

adding to the law and the prophets in order to fulfill them, or to the

left in taking away from them to destroy them, either way he offended

the author of the law. So this verse must either have some other

meaning, or be spurious.

3. Augustin replied: What amazing folly, to disbelieve what Matthew

records of Christ, while you believe Manich�us! If Matthew is not to

be believed because he was not present when Christ said, "I came not to

destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfill," was Manich�us

present, was he even born, when Christ appeared among men? According,

then, to your rule, you should not believe anything that Manich�us says

of Christ. On the other hand, we refuse to believe what Manich�us says

of Christ; not because he was not present as a witness of Christ's

words and actions, but because he contradicts Christ's disciples, and

the Gospel which rests on their authority. The apostle, speaking in

the Holy Spirit, tells us that such teachers would arise. With

reference to such, he says to believers: "If any man preaches to you

another gospel than that ye have received, let him be accursed." [636]

If no one can say what is true of Christ unless he has himself seen

and heard Him, no one now can be trusted. But if believers can now say

what is true of Christ because the truth has been handed down in word

or writing by those who saw and heard, why might not Matthew have heard

the truth from his fellow-disciple John, if John was present and he

himself was not, as from the writings of John both we who are born so

long after and those who shall be born after us can learn the truth

about Christ? In this way, the Gospels of Luke and Mark, who were

companions of the disciples, as well as the Gospel of Matthew, have the

same authority as that of John. Besides, the Lord Himself might have

told Matthew what those called before him had already been witnesses

of. Your idea is, that John should have recorded this saying of the

Lord, as he was present on the occasion. As if it might not happen

that, since it was impossible to write all that be heard from the Lord,

he set himself to write some, omitting this among others. Does he not

say at the close of his Gospel: "And there are also many other things

which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I

suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that

should be written"? [637] This proves that he omitted many things

intentionally. But if you choose John as an authority regarding the

law and the prophets, I ask you only to believe his testimony to them.

It is John who writes that Isaiah saw the glory of Christ. [638] It

is in his Gospel we find the text already treated of: "If ye believed

Moses, ye would also believe me; for he wrote of me." [639] Your

evasions are met on every side. You ought to say plainly that you do

not believe the gospel of Christ. For to believe what you please, and

not to believe what you please, is to believe yourselves, and not the

gospel.

4. Faustus thinks himself wonderfully clever in proving that Matthew

was not the writer of this Gospel, because, when speaking of his own

election, he says not, He saw me, and said to me, Follow me; but, He

saw him, and said to him, Follow me. This must have been said either

in ignorance or from a design to mislead. Faustus can hardly be so

ignorant as not to have read or heard that narrators, when speaking of

themselves, often use a construction as if speaking of another. It is

more probable that Faustus wished to bewilder those more ignorant than

himself, in the hope of getting hold on not a few unacquainted with

these things. It is needless to resort to other writings to quote

examples of this construction from profane authors for the information

of our friends, and for the refutation of Faustus. We find examples in

passages quoted above from Moses by Faustus himself, without any

denial, or rather with the assertion, that they were written by Moses,

only not written of Christ. When Moses, then, writes of himself, does

he say, I said this, or I did that, and not rather, Moses said, and

Moses did? Or does he say, The Lord called me, The Lord said to me,

and not rather, The Lord called Moses, The Lord said to Moses, and so

on? So Matthew, too, speaks of himself in the third person. And John

does the same; for towards the end of his book he says: "Peter,

turning, saw the disciple whom Jesus loved, who also lay on His breast

at supper, and who said to the Lord, Who is it that shall betray

Thee?" Does he say, Peter, turning, saw me? Or will you argue from

this that John did not write this Gospel? But he adds a little after:

"This is the disciple that testifies of Jesus, and has written these

things; and we know that his testimony is true." [640] Does he say, I

am the disciple who testify of Jesus, and who have written these

things, and we know that my testimony is true? Evidently this style is

common in writers of narratives. There are innumerable instances in

which the Lord Himself uses it. "When the Son of man," He says,

"cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?" [641] Not, When I come,

shall I find? Again, "The Son of man came eating and drinking;" [642]

not, I came. Again, "The hour shall come, and now is, when the dead

shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live;"

[643] not, My voice. And so in many other places. This may suffice to

satisfy inquirers and to refute scoffers.

5. Every one can see the weakness of the argument that Christ could

not have said, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the

prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfill," unless He had done

something to create a suspicion of this kind. Of course, we grant that

the unenlightened Jews may have looked upon Christ as the destroyer of

the law and the prophets; but their very suspicion makes it certain

that the true and truthful One, in saying that He came not to destroy

the law and the prophets, referred to no other law than that of the

Jews. This is proved by the words that follow: "Verily, verily, I say

unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no

wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore

shall break one of the least of these commandments, and shall teach men

so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven. But whosoever

shall do and teach them, shall be called great in the kingdom of

heaven." This applied to the Pharisees, who taught the law in word,

while they broke it in deed. Christ says of the Pharisees in another

place, "What they say, that do; but do not after their works: for they

say, and do not." [644] So here also He adds, "For I say unto you,

Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and

Pharisees, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven;" [645] that

is, Unless ye shall both do and teach what they teach without doing, ye

shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. This law, therefore, which

the Pharisees taught without keeping it, Christ says He came not to

destroy, but to fulfill; for this was the law connected with the seat

of Moses in which the Pharisees sat, who because they said without

doing, are to be heard, but not to be imitated.

6. Faustus does not understand, or pretends not to understand, what it

is to fulfill the law. He supposes the expression to mean the addition

of words to the law, regarding which it is written that nothing is to

be added to or taken away from the Scriptures of God. From this

Faustus argues that there can be no fulfillment of what is spoken of as

so perfect that nothing can be added to it or taken from it. Faustus

requires to be told that the law is fulfilled by living as it enjoins.

"Love is the fulfilling of the law," [646] as the apostle says. The

Lord has vouchsafed both to manifest and to impart this love, by

sending the Holy Spirit to His believing people. So it is said by the

same apostle: "The love of God is shed abroad in our heart by the Holy

Ghost, which is given unto us." [647] And the Lord Himself says: "By

this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one

to another." [648] The law, then, is fulfilled both by the observance

of its precepts and by the accomplishment of its prophecies. For "the

law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."

[649] The law itself, by being fulfilled, becomes grace and truth.

Grace is the fulfillment of love, and truth is the accomplishment of

the prophecies. And as both grace and truth are by Christ, it follows

that He came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it; not by

supplying any defects in the law, but by obedience to what is written

in the law. Christ's own words declare this. For He does not say, One

jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till its defects

are supplied, but "till all be fulfilled."

------------------------
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Book XVIII.

The relation of Christ to prophecy, continued.

1. Faustus said: "I came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it."

If these are Christ's words, unless they have some other meaning, they

are as much against you as against me. Your Christianity as well as

mine is based on the belief that Christ came to destroy the law and the

prophets. Your actions prove this, even though in words you deny it.

It is on this ground that you disregard the precepts of the law and the

prophets. It is on this ground that we both acknowledge Jesus as the

founder of the New Testament, in which is implied the acknowledgment

that the Old Testament is destroyed. How, then, can we believe that

Christ said these words without first confessing that hitherto we have

been wholly in error, and without showing our repentance by entering on

a course of obedience to the law and the prophets, and of careful

observance of their requirements, whatever they may be? This done, we

may honestly believe that Jesus said that he came not to destroy the

law, but to fulfill it. As it is, you accuse me of not believing what

you do not believe yourself, and what therefore is false.

2. But grant that we have been in the wrong hitherto. What is to be

done now? Shall we come under the law, since Christ has not destroyed,

but fulfilled it? Shall we by circumcision add shame to shame, and

believe that God is pleased with such sacraments? Shall we observe the

rest of the Sabbath, and bind ourselves in the fetters of Saturn?

Shall we glut the demon of the Jews, for he is not God, with the

slaughter of bulls, rams, and goats, not to say of men; and adopt, only

with greater cruelty, in obedience to the law and the prophets, the

practices on account of which we abandoned idolatry? Shall we, in

fine, call the flesh of some animals clean, and that of others unclean,

among which, according to the law and the prophets, swine's flesh has a

particular defilement? Of course you will allow that as Christians we

must not do any of these things, for you remember that Christ says that

a man when circumcised becomes twofold a child of hell. [650] It is

plain also that Christ neither observed the Sabbath himself, nor

commanded it to be observed. And regarding foods, he says expressly

that man is not defiled by anything that goes into his mouth, but

rather by the things which come out of it. [651] Regarding

sacrifices, too, he often says that God desires mercy, and not

sacrifice. [652] What becomes, then, of the statement that he came

not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it? If Christ said this, he

must have meant something else, or, what is not to be thought of, he

told a lie, or he never said it. No Christian will allow that Jesus

spoke falsely; therefore he must either not have said this, or said it

with another meaning.

3. For my part, as a Manich�an, this verse has little difficulty for

me, for at the outset I am taught to believe that many things which

pass in Scripture under the name of the Saviour are spurious, and that

they must therefore be tested to find whether they are true, and sound,

and genuine; for the enemy who comes by night has corrupted almost

every passage by sowing tares among the wheat. So I am not alarmed by

these words, notwithstanding the sacred name affixed to them; for I

still claim the liberty to examine whether this comes from the hand of

the good sower, who sows in the day-time, or of the evil one, who sows

in the night. But what escape from this difficulty can there be for

you, who receive everything without examination, condemning the use of

reason, which is the prerogative of human nature, and thinking it

impiety to distinguish between truth and falsehood, and as much afraid

of separating between what is good and what is not as children are of

ghosts? For suppose a Jew or any one acquainted with these words

should ask you why you do not keep the precepts of the law and the

prophets, since Christ says that he came not to destroy but to fulfill

them: you will be obliged either to join in the superstitious follies

of the Jews, or to declare this verse false, or to deny that you are a

follower of Christ.

4. Augustin replied: Since you continue repeating what has been so

often exposed and refuted, we must be content to repeat the

refutation. The things in the law and the prophets which Christians do

not observe, are only the types of what they do observe. These types

were figures of things to come, and are necessarily removed when the

things themselves are fully revealed by Christ, that in this very

removal the law and the prophets may be fulfilled. So it is written in

the prophets that God would give a new covenant, "not as I gave to

their fathers." [653] Such was the hardness of heart of the people

under the Old Testament, that many precepts were given to them, not so

much because they were good, as because they suited the people. Still,

in all these things the future was foretold and prefigured, although

the people did not understand the meaning of their own observances.

After the manifest appearance of the things thus signified, we are not

required to observe the types; but we read them to see their meaning.

So, again, it is foretold in the prophets, "I will take away their

stony heart, and will give them a heart of flesh," [654] --that is, a

sensible heart, instead of an insensible one. To this the apostle

alludes in the words: "Not in tables of stone, but in the fleshy

tables of the heart." [655] The fleshy tables of the heart are the

same as the heart of flesh. Since, then, the removal of these

observances is foretold, the law and the prophets could not have been

fulfilled but by this removal. Now, however, the prediction is

accomplished, and the fulfillment of the law and the prophets is found

in what at first sight seems the very opposite.

5. We are not afraid to meet your scoff at the Sabbath, when you call

it the fetters of Saturn. It is a silly and unmeaning expression,

which occurred to you only because you are in the habit of worshipping

the sun on what you call Sunday. What you call Sunday we call the

Lord's day, and on it we do not worship the sun, but the Lord's

resurrection. And in the same way, the fathers observed the rest of

the Sabbath, not because they worshipped Saturn, but because it was

incumbent at that time, for it was a shadow of things to come, as the

apostle testifies. [656] The Gentiles, of whom the apostle says that

they "worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator,"

[657] gave the names of their gods to the days of the week. And so far

you do the same, except that you worship only the two brightest

luminaries, and not the rest of the stars, as the Gentiles did.

Besides, the Gentiles gave the names of their gods to the months. In

honor of Romulus, whom they believed to be the son of Mars, they

dedicated the first month to Mars, and called it March. The next

month, April, is named not from any god, but from the word for opening,

because the buds generally open in this month. The third month is

called May, in honor of Maia the mother of Mercury. The fourth is

called June, from Juno. The rest to December used to be named

according to their number. The fifth and sixth, however, got the names

of July and August from men to whom divine honors were decreed; while

the others, from September to December, continued to be named from

their number. January, again, is named from Janus, and February from

the rites of the Luperci called Febru�. Must we say that you worship

the god Mars in the month of March? But that is the month in which you

hold the feast you call Bema with great pomp. But if you think it

allowable to observe the month of March without thinking of Mars, why

do you try to bring in the name of Saturn in connection with the rest

of the seventh day enjoined in Scripture, merely because the Gentiles

call the day Saturday? The Scripture name for the day is Sabbath,

which means rest. Your scoff is as unreasonable as it is profane.

6. As regards animal sacrifices, every Christian knows that they were

enjoined as suitable to a perverse people, and not because God had any

pleasure in them. Still, even in these sacrifices there were types of

what we enjoy; for we cannot obtain purification or the propitiation of

God without blood. The fulfillment of these types is in Christ, by

whose blood we are purified and redeemed. In these figures of the

divine oracles, the bull represents Christ, because with the horns of

His cross He scatters the wicked; the lamb, from His matchless

innocence; the goat, from His being made in the likeness of sinful

flesh, that by sin He might condemn sin. [658] Whatever kind of

sacrifice you choose to specify, I will show you a prophecy of Christ

in it. Thus we have shown regarding circumcision, and the Sabbath, and

the distinction of food, and the sacrifice of animals, that all these

things were our examples, and our prophecies, which Christ came not to

destroy, but to fulfill, by fulfilling what was thus foretold. Your

opponent is the apostle, whose opinion I give in his own words: "All

these things were our examples." [659]

7. If you have learned from Manich�us the willful impiety of admitting

only those parts of the Gospel which do not contradict your errors,

while you reject the rest, we have learned from the apostle the pious

caution of looking on every one as accursed that preaches to us another

gospel than that which we have received. Hence Catholic Christians

look upon you as among the tares; for, in the Lord's exposition of the

meaning of the tares, they are not falsehood mixed with truth in the

Scriptures, but children of the wicked one--that is, people who imitate

the deceitfulness of the devil. It is not true that Catholic

Christians believe everything; for they do not believe Manich�us or any

of the heretics. Nor do they condemn the use of human reason; but what

you call reasoning they prove to be fallacious. Nor do they think it

profane to distinguish truth from falsehood; for they distinguish

between the truth of the Catholic faith and the falsehood of your

doctrines. Nor do they fear to separate good from evil; but they

contend that evil, instead of being natural, is unnatural. They know

nothing of your race of darkness, which, you say, is produced from a

principle of its own, and fights against the kingdom of God, and of

which your god seems really to be more frightened than children are of

ghosts; for, according to you, he covered himself with a veil, that he

might not see his own members taken and plundered by the assault of the

enemy. To conclude, Catholic Christians are in no difficulty regarding

the words of Christ, though in one sense they may be said not to

observe the law and the prophets; for by the grace of Christ they keep

the law by their love to God and man; and on these two commandments

hang all the law and the prophets. [660] Besides, they see in Christ

and the Church the fulfillment of all the prophecies of the Old

Testament, whether in the form of actions, or of symbolic rites, or of

figurative language. So we neither join in superstitious follies, nor

declare this verse false; nor deny that we are followers of Christ; for

on those principles which I have set forth to the best of my power, the

law and the prophets which Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfill,

are no other than those recognized by the Church.

------------------------
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Book XIX.

Faustus is willing to admit that Christ may have said that He came not

to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfill them; but if He

did, it was to pacify the Jews and in a modified sense. Augustin

replies, and still further elaborates the Catholic view of prophecy and

its fulfillment.

1. Faustus said: I will grant that Christ said that he came not to

destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfill them. But why did

Jesus say this? Was it to pacify the Jews, who were enraged at seeing

their sacred institutions trampled upon by Christ, and regarded him as

a wild blasphemer, not to be listened to, much less to be followed? Or

was it for our instruction as Gentile believers, that we might learn

meekly and patiently to bear the yoke of commandment laid on our necks

by the law and the prophets of the Jews? You yourself can hardly

suppose that Christ's words were intended to bring us under the

authority of the law and the prophets of the Hebrews. So that the

other explanation which I have given of the words must be the true

one. Every one knows that the Jews were always ready to attack Christ,

both with words and with actual violence. Naturally, then, they would

be enraged at the idea that Christ was destroying their law and their

prophets; and, to appease them, Christ might very well tell them not to

think that he came to destroy the law, but that he came to fulfill it.

There was no falsehood or deceit in this, for he used the word law in a

general sense, not of any particular law.

2. There are three laws. One is that of the Hebrews, which the

apostle calls the law of sin and death. [661] The second is that of

the Gentiles, which he calls the law of nature. "For the Gentiles," he

says, "do by nature the things contained in the law; and, not having

the law, they are a law into themselves; who show the work of the law

written on their hearts." [662] The third law is the truth of which

the apostle speaks when he says, "The law of the spirit of life in

Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." [663]

Since, then, there are three laws, we must carefully inquire which of

the three Christ spoke of when He said that He came not to destroy the

law, but to fulfill it. In the same way, there are prophets of the

Jews, and prophets of the Gentiles, and prophets of truth. With the

prophets of the Jews, of course, every one is acquainted. If any one

is in doubt about the prophets of the Gentiles, let him hear what Paul

says when writing of the Cretans to Titus: "A prophet of their own has

said, The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies." [664]

This proves that the Gentiles also had their prophets. The truth also

has its prophets, as we learn from Jesus as well as from Paul. Jesus

says: "Behold, I send unto you wise men and prophets, and some of them

ye shall kill in divers places." [665] And Paul says: "The Lord

Himself appointed first apostles, and then prophets." [666]

3. As "the law and the prophets" may have three different meanings, it

is uncertain in what sense the words are used by Jesus, though we may

form a conjecture from what follows. For if Jesus had gone on to speak

of circumcision, and Sabbaths, and sacrifices, and the observances of

the Hebrews, and had added something as a fulfillment, there could have

been no doubt that it was the law and the prophets of the Jews of which

He said that He came not to destroy, but to fulfill them. But Christ,

without any allusion to these, speaks only of commandments which date

from the earliest times: "Thou shall not kill; Thou shalt not commit

adultery; Thou shalt not bear false witness." These, it can be proved,

were of old promulgated in the world by Enoch and Seth, and the other

righteous men, to whom the precepts were delivered by angels of lofty

rank, in order to tame the savage nature of men. From this it appears

that Jesus spoke of the law and the prophets of truth. And so we find

him giving a fulfillment of those precepts already quoted. "Ye have

heard," He says, "that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not

kill; but I say unto you, Be not even angry." This is the

fulfillment. Again: "Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt not

commit adultery; but I say unto you, Do not lust even." This is the

fulfillment. Again: "It has been said, Thou shalt not bear false

witness; but I say unto you, Swear not." This too is the fulfillment.

He thus both confirms the old precepts and supplies their defects.

Where He seems to speak of some Jewish precepts, instead of fulfilling

them, He substitutes for them precepts of an opposite tendency. He

proceeds thus: "Ye have heard that it has been said, An eye for an

eye, and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you, Whosoever shall smite

thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." This is not

fulfillment, but destruction. Again: "It has been said, Thou shall

love thy friend, and hate thine enemy; but I say unto you, Love your

enemies, and pray for your persecutors." This too is destruction.

Again: "It has been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him

give her a writing of divorcement; but I say unto you, That whosoever

shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth

her to commit adultery, and is himself an adulterer if he afterwards

marries another woman." [667] These precepts are evidently destroyed

because they are the precepts of Moses; while the others are fulfilled

because they are the precepts of the righteous men of antiquity. If

you agree to this explanation, we may allow that Jesus said that he

came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it. If you disapprove of

this explanation, give one of your own. Only beware of making Jesus a

liar, and of making yourself a Jew, by binding yourself to fulfill the

law because Christ did not destroy it.

4. If one of the Nazareans, or Symmachians, as they are sometimes

called, were arguing with me from these words of Jesus that he came not

to destroy the law, I should find some difficulty in answering him.

For it is undeniable that, at his coming, Jesus was both in body and

mind subject to the influence of the law and the prophets. Those

people, moreover, whom I allude to, practise circumcision, and keep the

Sabbath, and abstain from swine's flesh and such like things, according

to the law, although they profess to be Christians. They are evidently

misled as well as you, by this verse in which Christ says that he came

not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it. It would not be easy to

reply to such opponents without first getting rid of this troublesome

verse. But with you I have no difficulty, for you have nothing to go

upon; and instead of using arguments, you seem disposed, in mere

mischief, to induce me to believe that Christ said what you evidently

do not yourself believe him to have said. On the strength of this

verse you accuse me of dullness and evasiveness, without yourself

giving any indication of keeping the law instead of destroying it. Do

you too, like a Jew or a Nazarean, glory in the obscene distinction of

being circumcised? Do you pride yourself in the observance of the

Sabbath? Can you congratulate yourself on being innocent of swine's

flesh? Or can you boast of having gratified the appetite of the Deity

by the blood of sacrifices and the incense of Jewish offerings? If

not, why do you contend that Christ came not to destroy the law, but to

fulfill it?

5. I give unceasing thanks to my teacher, who prevented me from

falling into this error, so that I am still a Christian. For I, like

you, from reading this verse without sufficient consideration, had

almost resolved to become a Jew. And with reason; for if Christ came

not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it, and as a vessel in order to

be filled full must not be empty, but partly filled already, I

concluded that no one could become a Christian but an Israelite, nearly

filled already with the law and the prophets, and coming to Christ to

be filled to the full extent of his capacity. I concluded, too, that

in thus coming he must not destroy what he already possesses; otherwise

it would be a case, not of fulfilling, but of emptying. Then it

appeared that I, as a Gentile, could get nothing by coming to Christ,

for I brought nothing that he could fill up by his additions. This

preparatory supply is found, on inquiry, to consist of Sabbaths,

circumcision, sacrifices, new moons, baptisms, feasts of unleavened

bread, distinctions of foods, drink, and clothes, and other things, too

many to specify. This, then, it appeared, was what Christ came not to

destroy, but to fulfill. Naturally it must appear so: for what is a

law without precepts, or prophets without predictions? Besides, there

is that terrible curse pronounced upon those who abide not in all

things that are written in the book of the law to do them. [668] With

the fear of this curse appearing to come from God on the one side, and

with Christ on the other side, seeming, as the Son of God, to say that

he came not to destroy these things, but to fulfill them, what was to

prevent me from becoming a Jew? The wise instruction of Manich�us

saved me from this danger.

6. But how can you venture to quote this verse against me? Or why

should it be against me only, when it is as much against yourself? If

Christ does not destroy the law and the prophets, neither must

Christians do so. Why then do you destroy them? Do you begin to

perceive that you are no Christian? How can you profane with all kinds

of work the day pronounced sacred in the law and in all the prophets,

on which they say that God, the maker of the world, himself rested,

without dreading the penalty of death pronounced against

Sabbath-breakers, or the curse on the transgressor? How can you refuse

to receive in your person the unseemly mark of circumcision, which the

law and all the prophets declare to be honorable, especially in the

case of Abraham, after what was thought to be his faith; for does not

the God of the Jews proclaim that whosoever is without this mark of

infamy shall perish from his people? How can you neglect the appointed

sacrifices, which were made so much of both by Moses and the prophets

under the law, and by Abraham in his faith? And how can you defile

your souls by making no distinction in foods, if you believe that

Christ came not to destroy these things, but to fulfill them? Why do

you discard the annual feast of unleavened bread, and the appointed

sacrifice of the lamb, which, according to the law and the prophets, is

to be observed for ever? Why, in a word, do you treat so lightly the

new moons, the baptisms, and the feast of tabernacles, and all the

other carnal ordinances of the law and the prophets, if Christ did not

destroy them? I have therefore good reason for saying that, in order

to justify your neglect of these things, you must either abandon your

profession of being Christ's disciple, or acknowledge that Christ

himself has already destroyed them; and from this acknowledgment it

must follow, either that this text is spurious in which Christ is made

to say that he came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it, or that

the words have an entirely different meaning from what you suppose.

7. Augustin replied: If you allow, in consideration of the authority

of the Gospel, that Christ said that He came not to destroy the law and

the prophets, but to fulfill them, you should show the same

consideration to the authority of the apostle, when he says, "All these

things were our examples;" and again of Christ, "He was not yea and

nay, but in Him was yea; for all the promises of God are in Him yea;"

[669] that is, they are set forth and fulfilled in Him. In this way

you will see in the clearest light both what law Christ fulfilled, and

how He fulfilled it. It is a vain attempt that you make to escape by

your three kinds of law and your three kinds of prophets. It is quite

plain, and the New Testament leaves no doubt on the matter, what law

and what prophets Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfill. The law

given by Moses is that which by Jesus Christ became grace and truth.

[670] The law given by Moses is that of which Christ says, "He wrote

of me." [671] For undoubtedly this is the law which entered that the

offence might abound; [672] words which you often ignorantly quote as a

reproach to the law. Read what is there said of this law: "The law is

holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Was then that

which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might

appear sin, wrought death in me by that which is good." [673] The

entrance of the law made the offense abound, not because the law

required what was wrong, but because the proud and self-confident

incurred additional guilt as transgressors after their acquaintance

with the holy, and just, and good commandments of the law; so that,

being thus humbled, they might learn that only by grace through faith

could they be freed from subjection to the law as transgressors, and be

reconciled to the law as righteous. So the same apostle says: "For

before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith

which was afterwards revealed. Therefore the law was our schoolmaster

in Christ Jesus; but after faith came, we are no longer under a

schoolmaster." [674] That is, we are no longer subject to the penalty

of the law, because we are set free by grace. Before we received in

humility the grace of the Spirit, the letter was only death to us, for

it required obedience which we could not render. Thus Paul also says:

"The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." [675] Again, he

says: "For if a law had been given which could have given life, verily

righteousness should have been by the law; but the Scripture hath

concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ

might be given to them that believe." [676] And once more: "What the

law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sent His

Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, that by sin He might condemn sin

in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in

us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." [677] Here

we see Christ coming not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it. As the

law brought the proud under the guilt of transgression, increasing

their sin by commandments which they could not obey, so the

righteousness of the same law is fulfilled by the grace of the Spirit

in those who learn from Christ to be meek and lowly in heart; for

Christ came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it. Moreover,

because even for those who are under grace it is difficult in this

mortal life perfectly to keep what is written in the law, Thou shall

not covet, Christ, by the sacrifice of His flesh, as our Priest obtains

pardon for us. And in this also He fulfills the law; for what we fail

in through weakness is supplied by His perfection, who is the Head,

while we are His members. Thus John says: "My little children, these

things write I unto you, that ye sin not; and if any man sin, we have

an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: He is the

propitiation for our sins." [678]

8. Christ also fulfilled the prophecies, because the promises of God

were made good in Him. As the apostle says in the verse quoted above,

"The promises of God are in Him yea." Again, he says: "Now I say that

Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God,

to confirm the promises made unto the fathers." [679] Whatever, then,

was promised in the prophets, whether expressly or in figure, whether

by words or by actions, was fulfilled in Him who came not to destroy

the law and the prophets, but to fulfill them. You do not perceive

that if Christians were to continue in the use of acts and observances

by which things to come were prefigured, the only meaning would be that

the things prefigured had not yet come. Either the thing prefigured

has not come, or if it has, the figure becomes superfluous or

misleading. Therefore, if Christians do not practise some things

enjoined in the Hebrews by the prophets, this, so far from showing, as

you think, that Christ did not fulfill the prophets, rather shows that

He did. So completely did Christ fulfill what these types prefigured,

that it is no longer prefigured. So the Lord Himself says: "The law

and the prophets were until John." [680] For the law which shut up

transgressors in increased guilt, and to the faith which was afterwards

revealed, became grace through Jesus Christ, by whom grace

superabounded. Thus the law, which was not fulfilled in the

requirement of the letter, was fulfilled in the liberty of grace. In

the same way, everything in the law that was prophetic of the Saviour's

advent, whether in words or in typical actions, became truth in Jesus

Christ. For "the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by

Jesus Christ." [681] At Christ's advent the kingdom of God began to

be preached; for the law and the prophets were until John: the law,

that its transgressors might desire salvation; the prophets, that they

might foretell the Saviour. No doubt there have been prophets in the

Church since the ascension of Christ. Of these prophets Paul says:

"God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets,

thirdly teachers," and so on. [682] It is not of these prophets that

it was said, "The law and the prophets were until John," but of those

who prophesied the first coming of Christ, which evidently cannot be

prophesied now that it has taken place.

9. Accordingly, when you ask why a Christian is not circumcised if

Christ came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it, my reply is,

that a Christian is not circumcised precisely for this reason, that

what was prefigured by circumcision is fulfilled in Christ.

Circumcision was the type of the removal of our fleshly nature, which

was fulfilled in the resurrection of Christ, and which the sacrament of

baptism teaches us to look forward to in our own resurrection. The

sacrament of the new life is not wholly discontinued, for our

resurrection from the dead is still to come; but this sacrament has

been improved by the substitution of baptism for circumcision, because

now a pattern of the eternal life which is to come is afforded us in

the resurrection of Christ, whereas formerly there was nothing of the

kind. So, when you ask why a Christian does not keep the Sabbath, if

Christ came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it, my reply is,

that a Christian does not keep the Sabbath precisely because what was

prefigured in the Sabbath is fulfilled in Christ. For we have our

Sabbath in Him who said, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy

laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of

me; for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your

souls." [683]

10. When you ask why a Christian does not observe the distinction in

food as enjoined in the law, if Christ came not to destroy the law, but

to fulfill it, I reply, that a Christian does not observe this

distinction precisely because what was thus prefigured is now fulfilled

in Christ, who admits into His body, which in His saints He has

predestined to eternal life, nothing which in human conduct corresponds

to the characteristics of the forbidden animals. When you ask, again,

why a Christian does not offer sacrifices to God of the flesh and blood

of slain animals, if Christ came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill

it, I reply, that it would be improper for a Christian to offer such

sacrifices, now that what was thus prefigured has been fulfilled in

Christ's offering of His own body and blood. When you ask why a

Christian does not keep the feast of unleavened bread as the Jews did,

if Christ came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it, I reply, that

a Christian does not keep this feast precisely because what was thus

prefigured is fulfilled in Christ, who leads us to a new life by

purging out the leaven of the old life. [684] When you ask why a

Christian does not keep the feast of the paschal lamb, if Christ came

not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it, my reply is, that he does

not keep it precisely because what was thus prefigured has been

fulfilled in the sufferings of Christ, the Lamb without spot. When you

ask why a Christian does not keep the feasts of the new moon appointed

in the law, if Christ came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it, I

reply, that he does not keep them precisely because what was thus

prefigured is fulfilled in Christ. For the feast of the new moon

prefigured the new creature, of which the apostle says: "If therefore

there is any new creature in Christ Jesus, the old things have passed

away; behold, all things are become new." [685] When you ask why a

Christian does not observe the baptisms for various kinds of

uncleanness according to the law, if Christ came not to destroy the

law, but to fulfill it, I reply, that he does not observe them

precisely because they were figures of things to come, which Christ has

fulfilled. For He came to bury us with Himself by baptism into death,

that as Christ rose again from the dead, so we also should walk in

newness of life. [686] When you ask why Christians do not keep the

feast of tabernacles, if the law is not destroyed, but fulfilled by

Christ, I reply that believers are God's tabernacle, in whom, as they

are united and built together in love, God condescends to dwell, so

that Christians do not keep this feast precisely because what was thus

prefigured is now fulfilled by Christ in His Church.

11. I touch upon these things merely in passing with the utmost

brevity, rather than omit them altogether. The subjects, taken

separately, have filled many large volumes, written to prove that these

observances were typical of Christ. So it appears that all the things

in the Old Testament which you think are not observed by Christians

because Christ destroyed the law, are in fact not observed because

Christ fulfilled the law. The very intention of the observances was to

prefigure Christ. Now that Christ has come, instead of its being

strange or absurd that what was done to prefigure His advent should not

be done any more, it is perfectly right and reasonable. The typical

observances intended to prefigure the coming of Christ would be

observed still, had they not been fulfilled by the coming of Christ; so

far is it from being the case that our not observing them now is any

proof of their not being fulfilled by Christ's coming. There can be no

religious society, whether the religion be true or false, without some

sacrament or visible symbol to serve as a bond of union. The

importance of these sacraments cannot be overstated, and only scoffers

will treat them lightly. For if piety requires them, it must be

impiety to neglect them.

12. It is true, the ungodly may partake in the visible sacraments of

godliness, as we read that Simon Magus received holy baptism. Such are

they of whom the apostle says that "they have the form of godliness,

but deny the power of it." [687] The power of godliness is the end of

the commandment, that is, love out of a pure heart, and of a good

conscience, and of faith unfeigned. [688] So the Apostle Peter,

speaking of the sacrament of the ark, in which the family of Noah was

saved from the deluge, says, "So by a similar figure baptism also saves

you." And lest they should rest content with the visible sacrament, by

which they had the form of godliness, and should deny its power in

their lives by profligate conduct, he immediately adds, "Not the

putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good

conscience." [689]

13. Thus the sacraments of the Old Testament, which were celebrated in

obedience to the law, were types of Christ who was to come; and when

Christ fulfilled them by His advent they were done away, and were done

away because they were fulfilled. For Christ came not to destroy, but

to fulfill. And now that the righteousness of faith is revealed, and

the children of God are called into liberty, and the yoke of bondage

which was required for a carnal and stiffnecked people is taken away,

other sacraments are instituted, greater in efficacy, more beneficial

in their use, easier in performance, and fewer in number.

14. And if the righteous men of old, who saw in the sacraments of

their time the promise of a future revelation of faith, which even then

their piety enabled them to discern in the dim light of prophecy, and

by which they lived, for the just can live only by faith; [690] if,

then, these righteous men of old were ready to suffer, as many actually

did suffer, all trials and tortures for the sake of those typical

sacraments which prefigured things in the future; if we praise the

three children and Daniel, because they refused to be defiled by meat

from the king's table, from their regard for the sacrament of their

day; if we feel the strongest admiration for the Maccabees, who refused

to touch food which Christians lawfully use; [691] how much more should

a Christian in our day be ready to suffer all things for Christ's

baptism, for Christ's Eucharist, for Christ's sacred sign, since these

are proofs of the accomplishment of what the former sacraments only

pointed forward to in the future! For what is still promised to the

Church, the body of Christ, is both clearly made known, and in the

Saviour Himself, the Head of the body, the Mediator between God and

men, the man Christ Jesus, has already been accomplished. Is not the

promise of eternal life by resurrection from the dead? This we see

fulfilled in the flesh of Him of whom it is said, that the Word became

flesh and dwelt among us. [692] In former days faith was dim, for the

saints and righteous men of those times all believed and hoped for the

same things, and all these sacraments and ceremonies pointed to the

future; but now we have the revelation of the faith to which the people

were shut up under the law; [693] and what is now promised to believers

in the judgment is already accomplished in the example of Him who came

not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfill them.

15. It is a question among the students of the sacred Scriptures,

whether the faith in Christ before His passion and resurrection, which

the righteous men of old learned by revelation or gathered from

prophecy, had the same efficacy as faith has now that Christ has

suffered and risen; or whether the actual shedding of the blood of the

Lamb of God, which was, as He Himself says, for many for the remission

of sins, [694] conferred any benefit in the way of purifying or adding

to the purity of those who looked forward in faith to the death of

Christ, but left the world before it took place; whether, in fact,

Christ's death reached to the dead, so as to effect their liberation.

To discuss this question here, or to prove what has been ascertained on

the subject, would take too long, besides being foreign from our

present purpose.

16. Meanwhile it is sufficient to prove, in opposition to Faustus'

ignorant cavils, how greatly they mistake who conclude, from the change

in signs and sacraments, that there must be a difference in the things

which were prefigured in the rites of a prophetic dispensation, and

which are declared to be accomplished in the rites of the gospel; or

those, on the other hand, who think that as the things are the same,

the sacraments which announce their accomplishment should not differ

from the sacraments which foretold that accomplishment. For if in

language the form of the verb changes in the number of letters and

syllables according to the tense, as done signifies the past, and to be

done the future, why should not the symbols which declare Christ's

death and resurrection to be accomplished, differ from those which

predicted their accomplishment, as we see a difference in the form and

sound of the words, past and future, suffered and to suffer, risen and

to rise? For material symbols are nothing else than visible speech,

which, though sacred, is changeable and transitory. For while God is

eternal, the water of baptism, and all that is material in the

sacrament, is transitory: the very word "God," which must be

pronounced in the consecration, is a sound which passes in a moment.

The actions and sounds pass away, but their efficacy remains the same,

and the spiritual gift thus communicated is eternal. To say,

therefore, that if Christ had not destroyed the law and the prophets,

the sacraments of the law and the prophets would continue to be

observed in the congregations of the Christian Church, is the same as

to say that if Christ had not destroyed the law and the prophets, He

would still be predicted as about to be born, to suffer, and to rise

again; whereas, in fact, it is proved that He did not destroy, but

fulfill those things, because the prophecies of His birth, and passion,

and resurrection, which were represented in these ancient sacraments,

have ceased, and the sacraments now observed by Christians contain the

announcement that He has been born, has suffered, has risen. He who

came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfill them, by

this fulfillment did away with those things which foretold the

accomplishment of what is thus shown to be now accomplished. Precisely

in the same way, he might substitute for the expressions, "He is to be

born, is to suffer, is to rise," which were in these times appropriate,

the expressions, "He has been born, has suffered, has risen," which are

appropriate now that the others are accomplished, and so done away.

17. Corresponding to this change in words is the change which

naturally took place in the substitution of new sacraments instead of

those of the Old Testament. In the case of the first Christians, who

came to the faith as Jews, it was by degrees that they were brought to

change their customs, and to have a clear perception of the truth; and

permission was given them by the apostle to preserve their hereditary

worship and belief, in which they had been born and brought up; and

those who had to do with them were required to make allowance for this

reluctance to accept new customs. So the apostle circumcised Timothy,

the son of a Jewish mother and a Greek father, when they went among

people of this kind; and he himself accommodated his practice to

theirs, not hypocritically, but for a wise purpose. For these

practices were harmless in the case of those born and brought up in

them, though they were no longer required to prefigure things to come.

It would have done more harm to condemn them as hurtful in the case of

those to whose time it was intended that they should continue. Christ,

who came to fulfill all these prophecies, found those people trained in

their own religion. But in the case of those who had no such training,

but were brought to Christ, the corner-stone, from the opposite wall of

circumcision, there was no obligation to adopt Jewish customs. If,

indeed, like Timothy, they chose to accommodate themselves to the views

of those of the circumcision who were still wedded to their old

sacraments, they were free to do so. But if they supposed that their

hope and salvation depended on these works of the law, they were warned

against them as a fatal danger. So the apostle says: "Behold, I Paul

say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you

nothing;" [695] that is, if they were circumcised, as they were

intending to be, in compliance with some corrupt teachers, who told

them that without these works of the law they could not be saved. For

when, chiefly through the preaching of the Apostle Paul, the Gentiles

were coming to the faith of Christ, as it was proper that they should

come, without being burdened with Jewish observances--for those who

were grown up were deterred from the faith by fear of ceremonies to

which they were not accustomed, especially of circumcision; and if they

who had not been trained from their birth to such observances had been

made proselytes in the usual way, it would have implied that the coming

of Christ still required to be predicted as a future event;--when,

then, the Gentiles were admitted without these ceremonies, those of the

circumcision who believed, not understanding why the Gentiles were not

required to adopt their customs, nor why they themselves were still

allowed to retain them, began to disturb the Church with carnal

contentions, because the Gentiles were admitted into the people of God

without being made proselytes in the usual way by circumcision and the

other legal observances. Some also of the converted Gentiles were bent

on these ceremonies, from fear of the Jews among whom they lived.

Against these Gentiles the Apostle Paul often wrote, and when Peter was

carried away by their hypocrisy, he corrected him with a brotherly

rebuke. [696] Afterwards, when the apostles met in council, decreed

that these works of the law were not obligatory in the case of the

Gentiles, [697] some Christians of the circumcision were displeased,

because they failed to understand that these observances were

permissible only in those who had been trained in them before the

revelation of faith, to bring to a close the prophetic life in those

who were engaged in it before the prophecy was fulfilled, lest by a

compulsory abandonment it should seem to be condemned rather than

closed; while to lay these things on the Gentiles would imply either

that they were not instituted to prefigure Christ, or that Christ was

still to be prefigured. The ancient people of God, before Christ came

to fulfill the law and the prophets, were required to observe all these

things by which Christ was prefigured. It was freedom to those who

understood the meaning of the observance, but it was bondage to those

who did not. But the people in those latter times who come to believe

in Christ as having already come, and suffered, and risen, in the case

of those whom this faith found trained to those sacraments, are neither

required to observe them, nor prohibited from doing so; while there is

a prohibition in the case of those who were not bound by the ties of

custom, or by any necessity, to accommodate themselves to the practice

of others, so that it might become manifest that these things were

instituted to prefigure Christ, and that after His coming they were to

cease, because the promises had been fulfilled. Some believers of the

circumcision who did not understand this were displeased with this

tolerant arrangement which the Holy Spirit effected through the

apostles, and stubbornly insisted on the Gentiles becoming Jews. These

are the people of whom Faustus speaks under the name of Symmachians or

Nazareans. Their number is now very small, but the sect still

continues.

18. The Manich�ans, therefore have no ground for saying, in

disparagement of the law and the prophets, that Christ came to destroy

rather than to fulfill them, because Christians do not observe what is

there enjoined: for the only things which they do not observe are

those that prefigured Christ, and these are not observed because their

fulfillment is in Christ, and what is fulfilled is no longer

prefigured; the typical observances having properly come to a close in

the time of those who, after being trained in such things, had come to

believe in Christ as their fulfillment. Do not Christians observe the

precept of Scripture "Hear, O Israel; the Lord thy God is one God;"

"Thou shalt not make unto thee an image," and so on? Do make

Christians not observe the precept, "Thou shalt not take the name of

the Lord thy God in vain?" Do Christians not observe the Sabbath, even

in the sense of a true rest? Do Christians not honor their parents,

according to the commandment? Do Christians not abstain from

fornication, and murder, and theft, and false witness, from coveting

their neighbor's wife, and from coveting his property,--all of which

things are written in the law? These moral precepts are distinct from

typical sacraments: the former are fulfilled by the aid of divine

grace, the latter by the accomplishment of what they promise. Both are

fulfilled in Christ, who has ever been the bestower of this grace,

which is also now revealed in Him, and who now makes manifest the

accomplishment of what He in former times promised; for "the law was

given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." [698]

Again, these things which concern the keeping of a good conscience are

fulfilled in the faith which worketh by love; [699] while types of the

future pass away when they are accomplished. But even the types are

not destroyed, but fulfilled; for Christ, in bringing to light what the

types signified, does not prove them vain or illusory.

19. Faustus, therefore, is wrong in supposing that the Lord Jesus

fulfilled some precepts of righteous men who lived before the law of

Moses, such as, "Thou shall not kill," which Christ did not oppose, but

rather confirmed by His prohibition of anger and abuse; and that He

destroyed some things apparently peculiar to the Hebrew law, such as,

"An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," which Christ seems rather

to abolish than to confirm, when He says, "But I say unto you, that ye

resist not evil; but if any one smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to

him the other also," [700] and so on. But we say that even these

things which Faustus thinks Christ destroyed by enjoining the opposite,

were suitable to the times of the Old Testament, and were not

destroyed, but fulfilled by Christ.

20. In the first place let me ask our opponents if these ancient

righteous men, Enoch and Seth, whom Faustus mentions particularly, and

any others who lived before Moses, or even, if you choose, before

Abraham, were angry with their brother without a cause, or said to

their brother, Thou fool. If not, why may they not have taught these

things as well as preached them? And if they taught these things, how

can Christ be said to have fulfilled their righteousness or their

teaching, any more than that of Moses, by adding, "But I say unto you,

if any man is angry with his brother, or if he says Racha, or if he

says, Thou fool, he shall be in danger of the judgment, or of the

council, or of hell-fire," since these men did these very things

themselves, and enjoined them upon others? Will it be said that they

were ignorant of its being the duty of a righteous man to restrain his

passion, and not to provoke his brother with angry abuse; or that,

knowing this, they were unable to act accordingly? In that case, they

deserved the punishment of hell, and could not have been righteous.

But no one will venture to say that in their righteousness there was

such ignorance of duty, and such a want of self-control, as to make

them liable to the punishment of hell. How, then, can Christ be said

to have fulfilled the law, by which these men lived by means of adding

things without which they could have had no righteousness at all? Will

it be said that a hasty temper and bad language are sinful only since

the time of Christ, while formerly such qualities of the heart and

speech were allowable; as we find some institutions vary according to

the times, so that what is proper at one time is improper at another,

and vice versa? You will not be so foolish as to make this assertion.

But even were you to do so, the reply will be that, according to this

idea, Christ came not to fulfill what was defective in the old law, but

to institute a law which did not previously exist; if it is true that

with the righteous men of old it was not a sin to say to their brother,

Thou fool, which Christ pronounces so sinful, that whoever does so is

in danger of hell. So, then, you have not succeeded in finding any law

of which it can be said that Christ supplied its defect by these

additions.

21. Will it be said that the law in these early times was incomplete

as regards not committing adultery, till it was completed by the Lord,

who added that no one should look on a woman to lust after her? This

is what you imply in the way you quote the words, "Ye have heard that

it has been said, Thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you,

Do not lust even." "Here," you say, "is the fulfillment." But let us

take the words as they stand in the Gospel, without any of your

modifications, and see what character you give to those righteous men

of antiquity. The words are: "Ye have heard that it has been said,

thou shall not commit adultery; but I say unto you, that whosoever

looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her

already in his heart." [701] In your opinion, then, Enoch and Seth,

and the rest, committed adultery in their hearts; and either their

heart was not the temple of God, or they committed adultery in the

temple of God. But if you dare not say this, how can you say that

Christ, when He came, fulfilled the law, which was already in the time

of those men complete?

22. As regards not swearing, in which also you say that Christ

completed the law given to these righteous men of antiquity, I cannot

be certain that they did not swear, for we find that Paul the apostle

swore. With you, swearing is still a common practice, for you swear by

the light, which you love as flies do; for the light of the mind which

lighteth every man that cometh into the world, as distinct from mere

natural light, you know nothing of. You swear, too, by your master

Manich�us, whose name in his own tongue was Manes. As the name Manes

seemed to be connected with the Greek word for madness, you have

changed it by adding a suffix, which only makes matters worse, by

giving the new meaning of pouring forth madness. One of your own sect

told me that the name Manich�us was intended to be derived from the

Greek words for pouring forth manna; for cheein means to pour. But, as

it is, you only express the idea of madness with greater emphasis. For

by adding the two syllables, while you have forgotten to insert another

letter in the beginning of the word, you make it not Mannich�us, but

Manich�us; which must mean that he pours forth madness in his long

unprofitable discourses. Again, you often swear by the Paraclete,--not

the Paraclete promised and sent by Christ to His disciples, but this

same madness-pourer himself. Since, then, you are constantly swearing,

I should like to know in what sense you make Christ to have fulfilled

this part of the law, which is one you mention as belonging to the

earliest times. And what do you make of the oaths of the apostle? For

as to your authority, it cannot weigh much with yourselves, not to

speak of me or any other person. It is therefore evident that Christ's

words, "I am come not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it," have not

the meaning which you give them. Christ makes no reference in these

words to His comments on the ancient sayings which He quotes, and of

which His discourse was an explanation, but not a fulfillment.

23. Thus, as regards murder, which was understood to mean merely the

destruction of the body, by which a man is deprived of life, the Lord

explained that every unjust disposition to injure our brother is a kind

of murder. So John also says, "He that hateth his brother is a

murderer." [702] And as it was thought that adultery meant only the

act of unlawful intercourse with a woman, the Master showed that the

lust He describes is also adultery. Again, because perjury is a

heinous sin, while there is no sin either in not swearing at all or in

swearing truly, the Lord wished to secure us from departing from the

truth by not swearing at all, rather than that we should be in danger

of perjury by being in the habit of swearing truly. For one who never

swears is less in danger of swearing falsely than one who is in the

habit of swearing truly. So, in the discourses of the apostle which

are recorded, he never used an oath, lest he should ever fall unawares

into perjury from being in the habit of swearing. In his writings, on

the other hand, where he had more leisure and opportunity for caution,

we find him using oaths in several places, [703] to teach us that there

is no sin in swearing truly, but that, on account of the infirmity of

human nature, we are best preserved from perjury by not swearing at

all. These considerations will also make it evident that the things

which Faustus supposes to be peculiar to Moses were not destroyed by

Christ, as he says they were.

24. To take, for instance, this saying of the ancients, "Thou shalt

love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy," how does Faustus make out

that this is peculiar to Moses? Does not the Apostle Paul speak of

some men as hateful to God? [704] And, indeed, in connection with

this saying, the Lord enjoins on us that we should imitate God. His

words are: "That ye may be the children of your Father in heaven, who

maketh the sun to rise upon the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on

the just and the unjust." [705] In one sense we must hate our

enemies, after the example of God, to whom Paul says some men are

hateful; while, at the same time, we must also love our enemies after

the example of God, who makes the sun to rise on the evil and the good,

and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust. If we understand this, we

shall find that the Lord, in explaining to those who did not rightly

understand the saying, Thou shalt hate thine enemy, made use of it to

show that they should love their enemy, which was a new idea to them.

It would take too long to show the consistency of the two things here.

But when the Manich�ans condemn without exception the precept, Thou

shall hate thine enemy, they may easily be met with the question

whether their god loves the race of darkness. Or, if we should love

our enemies now, because they have a part of good, should we not also

hate them as having a part of evil? So even in this way it would

appear that there is no opposition between the saying of ancient times,

Thou shall hate thine enemy, and that of the Gospel, Love your

enemies. For every wicked man should be hated as far as he is wicked;

while he should be loved as a man. The vice which we rightly hate in

him is to be condemned, that by its removal the human nature which we

rightly love in him may be amended. This is precisely the principle we

maintain, that we should hate our enemy for what is evil in him, that

is, for his wickedness; while we also love our enemy for that which is

good in him, that is, for his nature as a social and rational being.

The difference between us and the Manich�ans is, that we prove the man

to be wicked, not by nature, either his own or any other, but by his

own will; whereas they think that a man is evil on account of the

nature of the race of darkness, which, according to them, was an object

of dread to God when he existed entire, and by which also he was partly

conquered, so that he cannot be entirely set free. The intention of

the Lord, then, is to correct those who, from knowing without

understanding what was said by them of old time, Thou shalt hate thine

enemy, hated their fellow-men instead of only hating their wickedness;

and for this purpose He says, Love your enemies. Instead of destroying

what is written about hatred of enemies in the law, of which He said,

"I am come not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it," He would have us

learn, from the duty of loving our enemies, how it is possible in the

case of one and the same person, both to hate him for his sin, and to

love him for his nature. It is too much to expect our perverse

opponents to understand this. But we can silence them, by showing that

by their irrational objection they condemn their own god, of whom they

cannot say that he loves the race of darkness; so that in enjoining on

every one to love his enemy, they cannot quote his example. There

would appear to be more love of their enemy in the race of darkness

than in the god of the Manich�ans. The story is, that the race of

darkness coveted the domain of light bordering on their territory, and,

from a desire to possess it, formed the plan of invading it. Nor is

there any sin in desiring true goodness and blessedness. For the Lord

says, "The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take

it by force." [706] This fabulous race of darkness, then, wished to

take by force the good they desired, for its beautiful and attractive

appearance. But God, instead of returning the love of those who wished

to possess Him, hated it so as to endeavor to annihilate them. If,

therefore, the evil love the good in the desire to possess it, while

the good hate the evil in fear of being defiled, I ask the Manich�ans,

which of these obeys the precept of the Lord, "Love your enemies"? If

you insist on making these precepts opposed to one another, it will

follow that your god obeyed what is written in the law of Moses, "Thou

shall hate thine enemy"; while the race of darkness obeyed what is

written in the Gospel, "Love your enemies." However, you have never

succeeded in explaining the difference between the flies that fly in

the day-time and the moths that fly at night; for both, according to

you, belong to the race of darkness. How is it that one kind love the

light, contrary to their nature; while the other kind avoid it, and

prefer the darkness from which they sprung? Strange, that filthy

sewers should breed a cleaner sort than dark closets!

25. Nor, again, is there any opposition between that which was said by

them of old time, "An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth," and what

the Lord says, "But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil; but if any

one smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also," and

so on. [707] The old precept as well as the new is intended to check

the vehemence of hatred, and to curb the impetuosity of angry passion.

For who will of his own accord be satisfied with a revenge equal to the

injury? Do we not see men, only slightly hurt, eager for slaughter,

thirsting for blood, as if they could never make their enemy suffer

enough? If a man receives a blow, does he not summon his assailant,

that he may be condemned in the court of law? Or if he prefers to

return the blow, does he not fall upon the man with hand and heel, or

perhaps with a weapon, if he can get hold of one? To put a restraint

upon a revenge so unjust from its excess, the law established the

principle of compensation, that the penalty should correspond to the

injury inflicted. So the precept, "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a

tooth," instead of being a brand to kindle a fire that was quenched,

was rather a covering to prevent the fire already kindled from

spreading. For there is a just revenge due to the injured person from

his assailant; so that when we pardon, we give up what we might justly

claim. Thus, in the Lord's prayer, we are taught to forgive others

their debts that God may forgive us our debts. There is no injustice

in asking back a debt, though there is kindness in forgiving it. But

as, in swearing, one who swears, even though truly, is in danger of

perjury, of which one is in no danger who never swears; and while

swearing truly is not a sin, we are further from sin by not swearing;

so that the command not to swear is a guard against perjury: in the

same way since it is sinful to wish to be revenged with an unjust

excess, though there is no sin in wishing for revenge within the limits

of justice, the man who wishes for no revenge at all is further from

the sin of an unjust revenge. It is sin to demand more than is due,

though it is no sin to demand a debt. And the best security against

the sin of making an unjust demand is to demand nothing, especially

considering the danger of being compelled to pay the debt to Him who is

indebted to none. Thus, I would explain the passage as follows: It

has been said by them of old time, Thou shall not take unjust revenge;

but I say, Take no revenge at all: here is the fulfillment. It is

thus that Faustus, after quoting, "It has been said, Thou shall not

swear falsely; but I say unto you, swear not at all," adds: here is

the fulfillment. I might use the same expression if I thought that by

the addition of these words Christ supplied a defect in the law, and

not rather that the intention of the law to prevent unjust revenge is

best secured by not taking revenge at all, in the same way as the

intention to prevent perjury is best secured by not swearing at all.

For if "an eye for an eye" is opposed to "If any one smite thee on the

cheek, turn to him the other also," is there not as much opposition

between "Thou shalt perform unto the Lord thine oath," and "Swear not

at all?" [708] If Faustus thinks that there is not destruction, but

fulfillment, in the one case, he ought to think the same of the other.

For if "Swear not" is the fulfillment of "Swear truly," why should not

"Take no revenge" be the fulfillment of "Take revenge justly"?

So, according to my interpretation, there is in both cases a guard

against sin, either of false swearing or of unjust revenge; though, as

regards giving up the right to revenge, there is the additional

consideration that, by forgiving such debts, we shall obtain the

forgiveness of our debts. The old precept was required in the case of

a self-willed people, to teach them not to be extravagant in their

demands. Thus, when the rage eager for unrestrained vengeance, was

subdued, there would be leisure for any one so disposed to consider the

desirableness of having his own debt cancelled by the Lord, and so to

be led by this consideration to forgive the debt of his fellow-servant.

26. Again, we shall find on examination, that there is no opposition

between the precept of the Lord about not putting away a wife, and what

was said by them of old time: "Whosoever putteth away his wife, let

him give her a writing of divorcement." [709] The Lord explains the

intention of the law, which required a bill of divorce in every case

where a wife was put away. The precept not to put away a wife is the

opposite of saying that a man may put away his wife if he pleases;

which is not what the law says. On the contrary, to prevent the wife

from being put away, the law required this intermediate step, that the

eagerness for separation might be checked by the writing of the bill,

and the man might have time to think of the evil of putting away his

wife; especially since, as it is said, among the Hebrews it was

unlawful for any but the scribes to write Hebrew: for the scribes

claimed the possession of superior wisdom; and if they were men of

upright and pious character, their pursuits might justly entitle them

to make this claim. In requiring, therefore, that in putting away his

wife, a man should give her a writing of divorcement, the design was

that he should be obliged to have recourse to those from whom he might

expect to receive a cautious interpretation of the law, and suitable

advice against separation. Having no other way of getting the bill

written, the man should be obliged to submit to their direction, and to

allow of their endeavors to restore peace and harmony between him and

his wife. In a case where the hatred could not be overcome or checked,

the bill would of course be written. A wife might with reason be put

away when wise counsel failed to restore the proper feeling and

affection in the mind of her husband. If the wife is not loved, she is

to be put away. And that she may not be put away, it is the husband's

duty to love her. Now, while a man cannot be forced to love against

his will, he may be influenced by advice and persuasion. This was the

duty of the scribe, as a wise and upright man; and the law gave him the

opportunity, by requiring the husband in all cases of quarrel to go to

him, to get the bill of divorcement written. No good or prudent man

would write the bill unless it were a case of such obstinate aversion

as to make reconciliation impossible. But according to your impious

notions, there can be nothing in putting away a wife; for matrimony,

according to you, is a criminal indulgence. The word "matrimony" shows

that a man takes a wife in order that she may become a mother, which

would be an evil in your estimation. According to you, this would

imply that part of your god is overcome and captured by the race of

darkness, and bound in the fetters of flesh.

27. But, to explain the point in hand: If Christ, in adding the

words, "But I say unto you," to the quotations He makes of ancient

sayings, neither fulfilled the law of primitive times by His additions,

nor destroyed the law given to Moses by opposite precepts, but rather

paid such deference to the Hebrew law in all the quotations He made

from it, as to make His own remarks chiefly explanatory of what the law

stated less distinctly, or a means of securing the design intended by

the law, it follows that from the words, "I came not to destroy the

law, but to fulfill it" we are not to understand that Christ by His

precepts filled up what was wanting in the law; but that what the

literal command failed in doing from the pride and disobedience of men,

is accomplished by grace in those who are brought to repentance and

humility. The fulfillment is not in additional words, but in acts of

obedience. So the apostle says "Faith worketh by love;" [710] and

again, He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." [711] This

love, by which also the righteousness of the law can be fulfilled was

bestowed in its significance by Christ in His coming, through the

spirit which He sent according to His promise; and therefore He said,

"I came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it." This is the New

Testament in which the promise of the kingdom of heaven is made to this

love; which was typified in the Old Testament, suitably to the times of

that dispensation. So Christ says again; "A new commandment I give

unto you, that ye love one another." [712]

28. So we find in the Old Testament all or nearly all the counsels and

precepts which Christ introduces with the words "But I say unto you."

Against anger it is written, "Mine eyes troubled because of anger;"

[713] and again, "Better is he that conquers his anger, than he that

taketh a city." [714] Against hard words, "The stroke of a whip

maketh a wound; but the stroke of the tongue breaketh the bones." [715]

Against adultery in the heart, "Thou shall not covet thy neighbor's

wife." [716] It is not, "Thou shall not commit adultery;" but, "Thou

shall not covet." The apostle, in quoting this, says: "I had not

known lust, unless the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." [717]

Regarding patience in not offering resistance, a man is praised who

"giveth his cheek to him that smiteth him, and who is filled full with

reproach." [718] Of love to enemies it is said: "If thine enemy

hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink." [719] This also is

quoted by the apostle. [720] In the Psalm, too, it is said, "I was a

peace maker among them that hated peace;" [721] and in many similar

passages. In connection also with our imitating God in refraining from

taking revenge, and in loving even the wicked, there is a passage

containing a full description of God in this character; for it is

written: "To Thee alone ever belongeth great strength, and who can

withstand the power of Thine arm? For the whole world before Thee is

as a little grain of the balance; yea, as a drop of the morning dew

that falleth down upon the earth. But Thou hast mercy upon all, for

Thou canst do all things, and winkest at the sins of men, because of

repentance. For Thou lovest all things that are, and abhorrest nothing

which Thou hast made; for never wouldest Thou have made anything if

Thou hadst hated it. And how could anything have endured, if it had

not been Thy will? or been preserved, if not called by Thee? But Thou

sparest all; for they are Thine, O Lord, Thou lover of souls. For Thy

good Spirit is in all things; therefore chastenest Thou them by little

and little that offend, and warnest them by putting them in remembrance

wherein they have offended, that learning their wickedness, they may

believe in Thee, O Lord." [722] Christ exhorts us to imitate this

long-suffering goodness of God, who maketh the sun to rise upon the

evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust; that

we may not be careful to revenge, but may do good to them that hate us,

and so may be perfect, even as our Father in heaven is perfect. [723]

From another passage in these ancient books we learn that, by not

exacting the vengeance due to us, we obtain the remission of our own

sins; and that by not forgiving the debts of others, we incur the

danger of being refused forgiveness when we pray for the remission of

our own debts: "He that revengeth shall find vengeance from the Lord,

and He will surely keep his sin in remembrance. Forgive thy neighbor

the hurt that he hath done to thee; so shall thy sins also be forgiven

when thou prayest. One man beareth hatred against another, and doth he

seek pardon of the Lord? He showeth no mercy to a man who is like

himself; and doth he ask forgiveness of his own sins? If he that is

but flesh nourishes hatred, and asks for favor from the Lord, who will

entreat for the pardon of his sins?" [724]

29. As regards not putting away a wife, there is no need to quote any

other passage of the Old Testament than that referred to most

appropriately in the Lord's reply to the Jews when they questioned Him

on this subject. For when they asked whether it is lawful for a man to

put away his wife for any reason, the Lord answered: "Have ye not

read, that He that made them at the beginning made them male and

female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave his father and

mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they two shall be one flesh?

Therefore they are no longer twain, but one flesh. What therefore God

hath joined, let no man put asunder." [725] Here the Jews, who

thought that they acted according to the intention of the law of Moses

in putting away their wives, are made to see from the book of Moses

that a wife should not be put away. And, by the way, we learn here,

from Christ's own declaration, that God made and joined male and

female; so that by denying this, the Manich�ans are guilty of opposing

the gospel of Christ as well as the writings of Moses. And supposing

their doctrine to be true, that the devil made and joined male and

female, we see the diabolical cunning of Faustus in finding fault with

Moses for dissolving marriages by granting a bill of divorce, and

praising Christ for strengthening the union by the precept in the

Gospel. Instead of this, Faustus, consistently with his own foolish

and impious notions, should have praised Moses for separating what was

made and joined by the devil, and should have blamed Christ for

ratifying a bond of the devil's workmanship. To return, let us hear

the good Master explain how Moses, who wrote of the conjugal chastity

in the first union of male and female as so holy and inviolable,

afterwards allowed the people to put away their wives. For when the

Jews replied, "Why did Moses then command to give a writing of

divorcement, and to put her away?" Christ said unto them, "Moses,

because of the hardness of your heart, suffered you to put away your

wives." [726] This passage we have already explained. [727] The

hardness must have been great indeed which could not be induced to

admit the restoration of wedded love, even though by means of the

writing an opportunity was afforded for advice to be given to this

effect by wise and upright men. Then the Lord quoted the same law, to

show both what was enjoined on the good and what was permitted to the

hard; for, from what is written of the union of male and female, He

proved that a wife must not be put away, and pointed out the divine

authority for the union; and shows from the same Scriptures that a bill

of divorcement was to be given because of the hardness of the heart,

which might be subdued or might not.

30. Since, then, all these excellent precepts of the Lord, which

Faustus tries to prove to be contrary to the old books of the Hebrews,

are found in these very books, the only sense in which the Lord came

not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it, is this, that besides the

fulfillment of the prophetic types, which are set aside by their actual

accomplishment, the precepts also, in which the law is holy, and just,

and good, are fulfilled in us, not by the oldness of the letter which

commands, and increases the offence of the proud by the additional

guilt of transgression, but by the newness of the Spirit, who aids us,

and by the obedience of the humble, through the saving grace which sets

us free. For, while all these sublime precepts are found in the

ancient books, still the end to which they point is not there revealed;

although the holy men who foresaw the revelation lived in accordance

with it, either veiling it in prophecy as suited the time, or

themselves discovering the truth thus veiled.

31. I am disposed, after careful examination, to doubt whether the

expression so often used by the Lord, "the kingdom of heaven," can be

found in these books. It is said, indeed, "Love wisdom, that ye may

reign for ever." [728] And if eternal life had not been clearly made

known in the Old Testament, the Lord would not have said, as He did

even to the unbelieving Jews: "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye

think that ye have eternal life, and they are they that testify of me."

[729] And to the same effect are the words of the Psalmist: "I shall

not die, but live, and declare the works of the Lord." [730] And

again: "Enlighten mine eyes, lest I sleep the sleep of death." [731]

Again, we read, "The souls of the righteous are in the hand of the

Lord, and pain shall not touch them;" and immediately following: "They

are in peace; and if they have suffered torture from men, their hope is

full of immortality; and after a few trouble, they shall enjoy many

rewards." [732] Again, in another place: "The righteous shall live

for ever, and their reward is with the Lord, and their concern with the

Highest; therefore shall they receive from the hand of the Lord a

kingdom of glory and a crown of beauty." [733] These and many similar

declarations of eternal life, in more or less explicit terms, are found

in these writings. Even the resurrection of the body is spoken of by

the prophets. The Pharisees, accordingly, were fierce opponents of the

Sadducees, who disbelieved the resurrection. This we learn not only

from the canonical Acts of the Apostles, which the Manich�ans reject,

because it tells of the advent of the Paraclete promised by the Lord,

but also from the Gospel, when the Sadducees question the Lord about

the woman who married seven brothers, one dying after the other, whose

wife she would be in the resurrection. [734] As regards, then,

eternal life and the resurrection of the dead, numerous testimonies are

to be found in these Scriptures. But I do not find there the

expression, "the kingdom of heaven." This expression belongs properly

to the revelation of the New Testament, because in the resurrection our

earthly bodies shall, by that change which Paul fully describes, become

spiritual bodies, and so heavenly, that thus we may possess the kingdom

of heaven. And this expression was reserved for Him whose advent as

King to govern and Priest to sanctify His believing people, was ushered

in by all the symbolism of the old covenant, in its genealogies, its

typical acts and words, its sacrifices and ceremonies and feasts, and

in all its prophetic utterances and events and figures. He came full

of grace and truth, in His grace helping us to obey the precepts, and

in His truth securing the accomplishment of the promises. He came not

to destroy the law, but to fulfill it.
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Book XX.

Faustus repels the charge of sun-worship, and maintains that while the

Manich�ans believe that God's power dwells in the sun and his wisdom in

the moon, they yet worship one deity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

They are not a schism of the Gentiles, nor a sect. Augustin emphasizes

the charge of polytheism, and goes into an elaborate comparison of

Manich�an and pagan mythology.

1. Faustus said: You ask why we worship the sun, if we are a sect or

separate religion, and not Pagans, or merely a schism of the Gentiles.

It may therefore be as well to inquire into the matter, that we may see

whether the name of Gentiles is more applicable to you or to us.

Perhaps, in giving you in a friendly way this simple account of my

faith, I shall appear to be making an apology for it, as if I were

ashamed, which God forbid, of doing homage to the divine luminaries.

You may take it as you please; but I shall not regret what I have done

if I succeed in conveying to some at least this much knowledge, that

our religion has nothing in common with that of the Gentiles.

2. We worship, then, one deity under the threefold appellation of the

Almighty God the Father, and his son Christ, and the Holy Spirit.

While these are one and the same, we believe also that the Father

properly dwells in the highest or principal light, which Paul calls

"light inaccessible," [735] and the Son in his second or visible

light. And as the Son is himself twofold, according to the apostle,

who speaks of Christ as the power of God and the wisdom of God, [736]

we believe that His power dwells in the sun, and His wisdom in the

moon. We also believe that the Holy Spirit, the third majesty, has His

seat and His home in the whole circle of the atmosphere. By His

influence and spiritual infusion, the earth conceives and brings forth

the mortal Jesus, who, as hanging from every tree, is the life and

salvation of men. [737] Though you oppose these doctrines so

violently, your religion resembles ours in attaching the same

sacredness to the bread and wine that we do to everything. This is our

belief, which you will have an opportunity of hearing more of, if you

wish to do so. Meanwhile there is some force in the consideration that

you or any one that is asked where his God dwells, will say that he

dwells in light; so that the testimony in favor of my worship is almost

universal.

3. As to your calling us a schism of the Gentiles, and not a sect, I

suppose the word schism applies to those who have the same doctrines

and worship as other people, and only choose to meet separately. The

word sect, again, applies to those whose doctrine is quite unlike that

of others, and who have made a form of divine worship peculiar to

themselves. If this is what the words mean, in the first place, in our

doctrine and worship we have no resemblance to the Pagans. We shall

see presently whether you have. The Pagan doctrine is, that all things

good and evil, mean and glorious, fading and unfading, changeable and

unchangeable, material and divine, have only one principle. In

opposition to this, my belief is that God is the principle of all good

things, and Hyle [matters] of the opposite. Hyle is the name given by

our master in divinity to the principle or nature of evil. The Pagans

accordingly think it right to worship God with altars, and shrines, and

images, and sacrifices, and incense. Here also my practice differs

entirely from theirs: for I look upon myself as a reasonable temple of

God, if I am worthy to be so; and I consider Christ his Son as the

living image of his living majesty; and I hold a mind well cultivated

to be the true altar, and pure and simple prayers to be the true way of

paying divine honors and of offering sacrifices. Is this being a

schism of the Pagans?

4. As regards the worship of the Almighty God, you might call us a

schism of the Jews, for all Jews are bold enough to profess this

worship, were it not for the difference in the form of our worship,

though it may be questioned whether the Jews really worship the

Almighty. But the doctrine I have mentioned is common to the Pagans in

their worship of the sun, and to the Jews in their worship of the

Almighty. Even in relation to you, we are not properly a schism,

though we acknowledge Christ and worship Him; for our worship and

doctrine are different from yours. In a schism, little or no change is

made from the original; as, for instance, you, in your schism from the

Gentiles, have brought with you the doctrine of a single principle, for

you believe that all things are of God. The sacrifices you change into

love-feasts, the idols into martyrs, to whom you pray as they do to

their idols. You appease the shades of the departed with wine and

food. You keep the same holidays as the Gentiles; for example, the

calends and the solstices. In your way of living you have made no

change. Plainly you are a mere schism; for the only difference from

the original is that you meet separately. In this you have followed

the Jews, who separated from the Gentiles, but differed only in not

having images. For they used temples, and sacrifices, and altars, and

a priesthood, and the whole round of ceremonies the same as those of

the Gentiles, only more superstitious. Like the Pagans, they believe

in a single principle; so that both you and the Jews are schisms of the

Gentiles, for you have the same faith, and nearly the same worship, and

you call yourselves sects only because you meet separately. The fact

is, there are only two sects, the Gentiles and ourselves. We and the

Gentiles are as contrary in our belief as truth and falsehood, day and

night, poverty and wealth, health and sickness. You, again, are not a

sect in relation either to truth or to error. You are merely a schism

and a schism not of truth, but of error.

5. Augustin replied: O hateful mixture of ignorance and cunning! Why

do you put arguments in the mouth of your opponent, which no one that

knows you would use? We do not call you Pagans, or a schism of Pagans;

but we say that you resemble them in worshipping many gods. But you

are far worse than Pagans, for they worship things which exist, though

they should not be worshipped: for idols have an existence, though for

salvation they are nought. So, to worship a tree with prayers, instead

of improving it by cultivation, is not to worship nothing, but to

worship in a wrong way. When the apostle says that "the things which

the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons, and not to God,"

[738] he means that these demons exist to whom the sacrifices are made,

and with whom he wishes us not to be partakers. So, too, heaven and

earth, the sea and air, the sun and moon, and the other heavenly

bodies, are all objects which have a sensible existence. When the

Pagans worship these as gods, or as parts of one great God (for some of

them identify the universe with the Supreme Deity), they worship things

which have an existence. In arguing with Pagans, we do not deny the

existence of these things, but we say that they should not be

worshipped; and we recommend the worship of the invisible Creator of

all these things, in whom alone man can find the happiness which all

allow that he desires. To those, again, who worship what is invisible

and immaterial, but still is created, as the soul or mind of man, we

say that happiness is not to be found in the creature even under this

form, and that we must worship the true God, who is not only invisible,

but unchangeable; for He alone is to be worshipped, in the enjoyment of

whom the worshipper finds happiness, and without whom the soul must be

wretched, whatever else it possesses. You, on the other hand, who

worship things which have no existence at all except in your fictitious

legends, would be nearer true piety and religion if you were Pagans, or

if you were worshippers of what has an existence, though not a proper

object of worship. In fact, you do not properly worship the sun,

though he carries your prayers with him in his course round the

heavens.

6. Your statements about the sun himself are so false and absurd, that

if he were to repay you for the injury done to him, he would scorch you

to death. First of all, you call the sun a ship, so that you are not

only astray worlds off, as the saying is, but adrift. Next, while

every one sees that the sun is round, which is the form corresponding

from its perfection to his position among the heavenly bodies, you

maintain that he is triangular, that is, that his light shines on the

earth through a triangular window in heaven. Hence it is that you bend

and bow your heads to the sun, while you worship not this visible sun,

but some imaginary ship which you suppose to be shining through a

triangular opening. Assuredly this ship would never have been heard

of, if the words required for the composition of heretical fictions had

to be paid for, like the wood required for the beams of a ship. All

this is comparatively harmless, however ridiculous or pitiable. Very

different is your wicked fancy about youths of both sexes proceeding

from this ship, whose beauty excites eager desire in the princes and

princesses of darkness; and so the members of your god are released

from this humiliating confinement in the members of the race of

darkness, by means of sinful passion and sensual appetite. And to

these filthy rags of yours you would unite the mystery of the Trinity;

for you say that the Father dwells in a secret light, the power of the

Son in the sun, and His wisdom in the moon, and the Holy Spirit in the

air.

7. As for this threefold or rather fourfold fiction, what shall I say

of the secret light of the Father, but that you can think of no light

except what you have seen? From your knowledge of visible light, with

which beasts and insects as well as men are familiar, you form some

vague idea in your mind, and call it the light in which God the Father

dwells with His subjects. How can you distinguish between the light by

which we see, and that by which we understand, when, according to your

ideas, to understand truth is nothing else than to form the conception

of material forms, either finite or in some cases infinite; and you

actually believe in these wild fancies? It is manifest that the act of

my mind in thinking of your region of light which has no existence, is

entirely different from my conception of Alexandria, which exists,

though I have not seen it. And, again, the act of forming a conception

of Alexandria, which I have never seen, is very different from thinking

of Carthage, which I know. But this difference is insignificant as

compared with that between my thinking of material things which I know

from seeing them, and my understanding justice, chastity, faith, truth,

love, goodness, and things of this nature. Can you describe this

intellectual light, which gives us a clear perception of the

distinction between itself and other things, as well as of the

distinction between those things themselves? And yet even this is not

the sense in which it can be said that God is light, for this light is

created, whereas God is the Creator; the light is made, and He is the

Maker; the light is changeable. For the intellect changes from dislike

to desire, from ignorance to knowledge, from forgetfulness to

recollection; whereas God remains the same in will, in truth, and in

eternity. From God we derive the beginning of existence, the principle

of knowledge, the law of affection. From God all animals, rational and

irrational, derive the nature of their life, the capacity of sensation,

the faculty of emotion. From God all bodies derive their subsistence

in extension, their beauty in number, and their order in weight. This

light is one divine being, in an inseparable triune existence; and yet,

without supposing the assumption of any bodily form, you assign to

separate places parts of the immaterial, spiritual, and unchangeable

substance. And instead of three places for the Trinity, you have

four: one, the light inaccessible, which you know nothing about, for

the Father; two, the sun and moon, for the Son; and again one, the

circle of the atmosphere, for the Holy Spirit. Of the inaccessible

light of the Father I shall say nothing further at present, for

orthodox believers do not separate the Son and the Spirit from the

Father in relation to this light.

8. It is difficult to understand how you have been taken with the

absurd idea of placing the power of the Son in the sun, and His wisdom

in the moon. For, as the Son remains inseparably in the Father, His

wisdom and power cannot be separated from one another, so that one

should be in the sun and the other in the moon. Only material things

can be thus assigned to separate places. If you only understood this,

it would have prevented you from taking the productions of a diseased

fancy as the material for so many fictions. But there is inconsistency

and improbability as well as falsehood in your ideas. For, according

to you, the seat of wisdom is inferior in brightness to the seat of

power. Now energy and productiveness are the qualities of power,

whereas light teaches and manifests; so that if the sun had the greater

heat, and the moon the greater light, these absurdities might appear to

have some likelihood to men of carnal minds, who know nothing except

through material conceptions. From the connection between great heat

and motion, they might identify power with heat; while light from its

brightness, and as making things discernible, they might represent

wisdom. But what folly as well as profanity, in placing power in the

sun, which excels so much in light, and wisdom in the moon, which is so

inferior in brightness! And while you separate Christ from Himself,

you do not distinguish between Christ and the Holy Spirit; whereas

Christ is one, the power of God, and the wisdom of God, and the Spirit

is a distinct person. But according to you, the air, which you make

the seat of the Spirit, fills and pervades the universe. So the sun

and moon in their course are always united to the air. But the moon

approaches the sun at one time, and recedes from it at another. So

that, if we may believe you, or rather, if we may allow ourselves to be

imposed on by you, wisdom recedes from power by half the circumference

of a circle, and again approaches it by the other half. And when

wisdom is full, it is at a distance from power. For when the moon is

full, the distance between the two bodies is so great, that the moon

rises in the east while the sun is setting in the west. But as the

loss of power produces weakness, the fuller the moon is, the weaker

must wisdom be. If, as is certainly true, the wisdom of God is

unchangeable in power, and the power of God unchangeable in wisdom, how

can you separate them so as to assign them to different places? And

how can the place be different when the substance is the same? Is this

not the infatuation of subjection to material fancies; showing such a

want of power and wisdom that your wisdom is as weak as your power is

foolish? This execrable absurdity would divide Christ between the sun

and the moon,--His power in one, and His wisdom in the other; so that

He would be incomplete in both, lacking wisdom in the sun, and power in

the moon, while in both He supplies youths, male and female, to excite

the affection of the princes and princesses of darkness. Such are the

tenets which you learn and profess. Such is the faith which directs

your conduct. And can you wonder that you are regarded with

abhorrence?

9. But besides your errors regarding these conspicuous and familiar

luminaries, which you worship not for what they are, but for what your

wild fancy makes them to be, your other absurdities are still worse

than this. Your illustrious World-bearer, and Atlas who helps to hold

him up, are unreal beings. Like innumerable other creatures of your

fancy, they have no existence, and yet you worship them. For this

reason we say that you are worse than Pagans, while you resemble them

in worshipping many gods. You are worse, because, while they worship

things which exist though they are not gods, you worship things which

are neither gods nor anything else, for they have no existence. The

Pagans, too, have fables, but they know them to be fables; and either

look upon them as amusing poetical fancies, or try to explain them as

representing the nature of things, or the life of man. Thus they say

that Vulcan is lame, because flame in common fire has an irregular

motion: that Fortune is blind, because of the uncertainty of what are

called fortuitous occurrences: that there are three Fates, with

distaff, and spindle, and fingers spinning wool into thread, because

there are three times,--the past, already spun and wound on the

spindle; the present, which is passing through the fingers of the

spinner; and the future, still in wool bound to the distaff, and soon

to pass through the fingers to the spindle, that is, through the

present into the future: and that Venus is the wife of Vulcan, because

pleasure has a natural connection with heat; and that she is the

mistress of Mars, because pleasure is not properly the companion of

warriors: and that Cupid is a boy with wings and a bow, from the

wounds inflicted by thoughtless, inconstant passion in the hearts of

unhappy beings: and so with many other fables. The great absurdity is

in their continuing to worship these beings, after giving such

explanations; for the worship without the explanations, though

criminal, would be a less heinous crime. The very explanations prove

that they do not worship that God, the enjoyment of whom can alone give

happiness, but things which He has created. And even in the creature

they worship not only the virtues, as in Minerva, who sprang from the

head of Jupiter, and who represents prudence,--a quality of reason

which, according to Plato, has its seat in the head,--but their vices,

too, as in Cupid. Thus one of their dramatic poets says, "Sinful

passion, in favor of vice, made Love a god." [739] Even bodily evils

had temples in Rome, as in the case of pallor and fever. Not to dwell

on the sin of the worshippers of these idols, who are in a way affected

by the bodily forms, so that they pay homage to them as deities, when

they see them set up in some lofty place, and treated with great honor

and reverence, there is greater sin in the very explanations which are

intended as apologies for these dumb, and deaf, and blind, and lifeless

objects. Still, though, as I have said, these things are nothing in

the way of salvation or of usefulness, both they and the things they

are said to represent are real existences. But your First Man, warring

with the five elements; and your Mighty Spirit, who constructs the

world from the captive bodies of the race of darkness, or rather from

the members of your god in subjection and bondage; and your

World-holder, who has in his hand the remains of these members, and who

bewails the capture and bondage and pollution of the rest; and your

giant Atlas, who keeps up the World-holder on his shoulders, lest he

should from weariness throw away his burden, and so prevent the

completion of the final imitation of the mass of darkness, which is to

be the last scene in your drama;--these and countless other absurdities

are not represented in painting or sculpture, or in any explanation;

and yet you believe and worship things which have no existence, while

you taunt the Christians with being credulous for believing in

realities with a faith which pacifies the mind under its influence.

The objects of your worship can be shown to have no existence by many

proofs, which I do not bring forward here, because, though I could

without difficulty discourse philosophically on the construction of the

world, it would take too long to do so here. One proof suffices. If

these things are real, God must be subject to change, and corruption,

and contamination; a supposition as blasphemous as it is irrational.

All these things, therefore, are vain, and false, and unreal. Thus you

are much worse than those Pagans, with whom all are familiar, and who

still preserve traces of their old customs, of which they themselves

are ashamed; for while they worship things which are not gods, you

worship things which do not exist.

10. If you think that your doctrines are true because they are unlike

the errors of the Pagans, and that we are in error because we perhaps

differ more from you than from them, you might as well say that a dead

man is in good health because he is not sick; or that good health is

undesirable, because it differs less from sickness than from death. Or

if the Pagans should be viewed in many cases as rather dead than sick,

you might as well praise the ashes in the tomb because they have no

longer the human shape, as compared with the living body, which does

not differ so much from a corpse as from ashes. It is thus we are

reproached for having more resemblance to the dead body of Paganism

than to the ashes of Manich�ism. But in division, it often happens

that a thing is placed in different classes, according to the point of

resemblance on which the division proceeds. For instance, if animals

are divided into those that fly and those that cannot fly, in this

division men and beasts are classed together as distinct from birds,

because they are both unable to fly. But if they are divided into

rational and irrational, beasts and birds are classed together as

distinct from men, for they are both destitute of reason. Faustus did

not think of this when he said: There are in fact only two sects, the

Gentiles and ourselves, for we are directly opposed to them in our

belief. The opposition he means is this, that the Gentiles believe in

a single principle, whereas the Manich�ans believe also in the

principle of the race of darkness. Certainly, according to this

division we agree in general with the Pagans. But if we divide all who

have a religion into those who worship one God and those who worship

many gods, the Manich�ans must be classed along with the Pagans, and we

along with the Jews. This is another distinction, which may be said to

make only two sects. Perhaps you will say that you hold all your gods

to be of one substance, which the Pagans do not. But you at least

resemble them in assigning to your gods different powers, and

functions, and employments. One does battle with the race of darkness;

another constructs the world from the part which is captured; another,

standing above, has the world in his hand; another holds him up from

below; another turns the wheels of the fires and winds and waters

beneath; another, in his circuit of the heavens, gathers with his beams

the members of your god from cesspools. Indeed, your gods have

innumerable occupations, according to your fabulous descriptions, which

you neither explain nor represent in a visible form. But again, if men

were divided into those who believe that God takes an interest in human

affairs and those who do not, the Pagans and Jews, and you and all

heretics that have anything of Christianity, will be classed together,

as opposed to the Epicureans, and any others holding similar views. As

this is a principle of importance, here again we may say that there are

only two sects, and you belong to the same sect as we do. You will

hardly venture to dissent from us in the opinion that God is concerned

in human affairs, so that in this matter your opposition to the

Epicureans makes you side with us. Thus, according to the nature of

the division, what is in one class at one time, is in another at

another time: things joined here are separated there: in some things

we are classed with others, and they with us; in other things we are

classed separately, and stand alone. If Faustus thought of this, he

would not talk such eloquent nonsense.

11. But what are we to make of these words of Faustus: The Holy

Spirit, by his influence and spiritual infusion, makes the earth

conceive and bring forth the mortal Jesus, who, as hanging from every

tree, is the life and salvation of men? Letting pass for a moment the

absurdity of this statement, we observe the folly of believing that the

mortal Jesus can be conceived through the power of the Holy Spirit by

the earth, but not by the Virgin Mary. Dare you compare the holiness

of that chaste virgin's womb with any piece of ground where trees and

plants grow? Do you pretend to look with abhorrence upon a pure

virgin, while you do not shrink from believing that Jesus is produced

in gardens watered by the filthy drains of a city? For plants of all

kinds spring up and are nourished in such moisture. You will have

Jesus to be born in this way, while you cry out against the idea of His

being born of a virgin. Do you think flesh more unclean than the

excrements which its nature rejects? Is the filth cleaner than the

flesh which expels it? Are you not aware how fields are manured in

order to make them productive? Your folly comes to this, that the Holy

Spirit, who, according to you, despised the womb of Mary, makes the

earth conceive more fruitfully in proportion as it is carefully

enriched with animal off-scourings. Do you reply that the Holy Spirit

preserves His incorruptible purity everywhere? I ask again, Why not

also in the virgin's womb? Passing from the conception, you maintain

in regard to the mortal Jesus--who, as you say, is born from the earth,

which has conceived by the power of the Holy Spirit--that He hangs in

the shape of fruit from every tree: so that, besides this pollution,

He suffers additional defilement from the flesh of the countless

animals that eat the fruit; except, indeed, the small amount that is

purified by your eating it. While we believe and confess Christ the

Son of God, and the Word of God, to have become flesh without suffering

defilement, because the divine substance is not defiled by flesh, as it

is not defiled by anything, your fanciful notions would make Jesus to

be defiled even as hanging on the tree, before entering the flesh of

any animal; for if He were not defiled, there would be no need of His

being purified by your eating Him. And if all trees are the cross of

Christ, as Faustus seems to imply when he says that Jesus hangs from

every tree, why do you not pluck the fruit, and so take Jesus down from

hanging on the tree to bury Him in your stomach, which would correspond

to the good deed of Joseph of Arimathea, when he took down the true

Jesus from the cross to bury Him? [740] Why should it be impious to

take Christ from the tree, while it is pious to lay Him in the tomb?

Perhaps you wish to apply to yourselves the words quoted from the

prophet by Paul, "Their throat is an open sepulchre:" [741] and so

you wait with open mouth till some one comes to use your throat as the

best sepulchre for Christ. Once more, how many Christs do you make?

Is there one whom you call the mortal Christ, whom the earth conceives

and brings forth by the power of the Holy Spirit; and another crucified

by the Jews under Pontius Pilate; and a third whom you divide between

the sun and the moon? Or is it one and the same person, part of whom

is confined in the trees, to be released by the help of the other part

which is not confined? If this is the case, and you allow that Christ

suffered under Pontius Pilate, though it is difficult to see how he

could have suffered without flesh, as you say he did, the great

question is, with whom he left those ships you speak of, that he might

come down and suffer these things, which he certainly could not have

suffered without having a body of some kind. A mere spiritual presence

could not have made him liable to these sufferings, and in his bodily

presence he could not be at the same time in the sun, in the moon, and

on the cross. So, then, if he had not a body, he was not crucified;

and if he had a body, the question is, where he got it: for, according

to you, all bodies belong to the race of darkness, though you cannot

think of the divine substance except as being material. Thus you must

say either that Christ was crucified without a body; which is utterly

absurd; or that he was crucified in appearance and not in reality,

which is blasphemy; or that all bodies do not belong to the race of

darkness, but that the divine substance has also a body, and that not

an immortal body, but liable to crucifixion and death, which, again, is

altogether erroneous; or that Christ had a mortal body from the race of

darkness, so that, while you will not allow that Christ's body came

from the Virgin Mary, you derive it from the race of demons. Finally,

as in Faustus' statement, in which he alludes in the briefest manner

possible to the lengthy stories of Manich�an invention, the earth by

the power of the Holy Spirit conceives and brings forth the mortal

Jesus, who, hanging from every tree, is the life and salvation of men,

why should this Saviour be represented by whatever is hanging, because

he hung on the tree, and not by whatever is born, because he was born?

But if you mean that the Jesus on the trees, and the Jesus crucified

under Pontius Pilate, and the Jesus divided between the sun and the

moon, are all one and the same substance, why do you not give the name

of Jesus to your whole host of deities? Why should not your

World-holder be Jesus too, and Atlas, and the King of Honour, and the

Mighty Spirit, and the First Man, and all the rest, with their various

names and occupations?

12. So, with regard to the Holy Spirit, how can you say that he is the

third person, when the persons you mention are innumerable? Or why is

he not Jesus himself? And why does Faustus mislead people, in trying

to make out an agreement between himself and true Christians, from whom

he differs only too widely, by saying, We worship one God under the

threefold appellation of the Almighty God the Father, Christ his Son,

and the Holy Spirit? Why is the appellation only threefold, instead of

being manifold? And why is the distinction in appellation only, and

not in reality, if there are as many persons as there are names? For

it is not as if you gave three names to the same thing, as the same

weapon may be called a short sword, a dagger, or a dirk; or as you give

the name of moon, and the lesser ship, and the luminary of night, and

so on, to the same thing. For you cannot say that the First Man is the

same as the Mighty Spirit, or as the World-Holder, or as the giant

Atlas. They are all distinct persons, and you do not call any of them

Christ. How can there be one Deity with opposite functions? Or why

should not Christ himself be the single person, if in one substance

Christ hangs on the trees, and was persecuted by the Jews, and exists

in the sun and moon? The fact is, your fancies are all astray, and are

no better than the dreams of insanity.

13. How can Faustus think that we resemble the Manich�ans in attaching

sacredness to bread and wine, when they consider it sacrilege to taste

wine? They acknowledge their god in the grape, but not in the cup;

perhaps they are shocked at his being trampled on and bottled. It is

not any bread and wine that we hold sacred as a natural production, as

if Christ were confined in corn or in vines, as the Manich�ans fancy,

but what is truly consecrated as a symbol. What is not consecrated,

though it is bread and wine, is only nourishment or refreshment, with

no sacredness about it; although we bless and thank God for every gift,

bodily as well as spiritual. According to your notion, Christ is

confined in everything you eat, and is released by digestion from the

additional confinement of your intestines. So, when you eat, your god

suffers; and when you digest, you suffer from his recovery. When he

fills you, your gain is his loss. This might be considered kindness on

his part, because he suffers in you for your benefit, were it not that

he gains freedom by escaping and leaving you empty. There is not the

least resemblance between our reverence for the bread and wine, and

your doctrines, which have no truth in them. To compare the two is

even more foolish than to say, as some do, that in the bread and wine

we worship Ceres and Bacchus. I refer to this now, to show where you

got your silly idea that our fathers kept the Sabbath in honor of

Saturn. For as there is no connection with the worship of the Pagan

deities Ceres and Bacchus in our observance of the sacrament of the

bread and wine, which you approve so highly that you wish to resemble

us in it, so there was no subjection to Saturn in the case of our

fathers, who observed the rest of the Sabbath in a manner suitable to

prophetic times.

14. You might have found a resemblance in your religion to that of the

Pagans as regards Hyle [matter], which the Pagans often speak of. You,

on the contrary, maintain that you are directly opposed to them in your

belief in the evil principle which your teacher in theology calls

Hyle. But here you only show your ignorance, and, with an affectation

of learning, use this word without knowing what it means. The Greeks,

when speaking of nature, give the name Hyle to the subject-matter of

things, which has no form of its own, but admits of all bodily forms,

and is known only through these changeable phenomena, not being itself

an object of sensation or perception. Some Gentiles, indeed,

erroneously make this matter co-eternal with God, as not being derived

from Him, though the bodily forms are. In this manifest error you

resemble the Pagans, for you hold that Hyle has a principle of its own,

and does not come from God. It is only ignorance that leads you to

deny this resemblance. In saying that Hyle has no form of its own, and

can take its forms only from God, the Pagans come near to the truth

which we believe in contradistinction from your errors. Not knowing

what Hyle or the subject-matter of things is, you make it the race of

darkness, in which you place not only innumerable bodily forms of five

different kinds, but also a formative mind. Such, indeed, is your

ignorance or insanity, that you call this mind Hyle, and make it give

forms instead of taking them. If there were such a formative mind as

you speak of, and bodily elements capable of form, the word Hyle would

properly be applicable to the bodily elements, which would be the

matter to be formed by the mind, which you make the principle of evil.

Even this would not be a quite accurate use of the word Hyle, which has

no form of any kind; whereas these elements, although capable of new

forms, have already the form of elements, and belong to different

kinds. Still this use of the word would not be so much amiss,

notwithstanding your ignorance; for it would thus be applied, as it

properly is, to that which takes form, and not to that which gives it.

Even here, however, your folly and impiety would appear in tracing so

much that is good to the evil principle, from your not knowing that all

natures of every kind, all forms in their proportion, and all weights

in their order, can come only from the Father, the Son, and the Holy

Spirit. As it is, you know neither what Hyle is, nor what evil is.

Would that I could persuade you to refrain from misleading people still

more ignorant than yourselves!

15. Every one must see the folly of your boasting of superiority to

the Pagans because they use altars and temples, images and sacrifices

and incense, in the worship of God, which you do not. As if it were

not better to build an altar and offer sacrifice to a stone, which has

some kind of existence, than to employ a heated imagination in

worshipping things which have no existence at all. And what do you

mean by saying that you are a rational temple of God? Can that be

God's temple which is partly the construction of the devil? And is

this not true of you, as you say that all your members and your whole

body were formed by the evil principle which you call Hyle, and that

part of this formative mind dwells in the body along with part of your

god? And as this part of your god is bound and confined, you should be

called the prison of God rather than his temple. Perhaps it is your

soul that is the temple of God, as you have it from the region of

light. But you generally call your soul not a temple, but a part or

member of God. So, when you say you are the temple of God, it must be

in your body, which, you say, was formed by the devil. Thus you

blaspheme the temple of God, calling it not only the workmanship of

Satan, but the prison-house of God. The apostle, on the other hand,

says: "The temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." And to show

that this refers not merely to the soul, he says expressly: "Know ye

not that your bodies are the temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you,

which ye have of God?" [742] You call the workmanship of devils the

temple of God, and there, to use Faustus' words, you place Christ, the

Son of God, the living image of living majesty. Your impiety may well

contrive a fabulous temple for a fabulous Christ. The image you speak

of must be so called, because it is the creature of your imagination.

16. If your mind is an altar, you see whose altar it is. You may see

from the very doctrines and duties in which you say you are trained.

You are taught not to give food to a beggar; and so your altar smokes

with the sacrifice of cruelty. Such altars the Lord destroys; for in

words quoted from the law He tells us what offering pleases God: "I

desire mercy, and not sacrifice." Observe on what occasion the Lord

uses these words. It was when, in passing through a field, the

disciples plucked the ears of corn because they were hungry. Your

doctrine would lead you to call this murder. Your mind is an altar,

not of God, but of lying devils, by whose doctrines the evil conscience

is seared as with a hot iron, [743] calling murder what the truth calls

innocence. For in His words to the Jews, Christ by anticipation deals

a fatal blow to you: "If ye had known what this meaneth, I desire

mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless."

[744]

17. Nor can you say that you honor God with sacrifices in the shape of

pure and simple prayers: for, in your low, dishonoring notions about

the divine nature and substance, you make your god to be the victim in

the sacrifices of Pagans; so far are you from pleasing the true God

with your sacrifices. For you hold that God is confined not only in

trees and plants, or in the human body, but also in the flesh of

animals, which contaminates Him with its impurity. And how can your

soul give praise to God, when you actually reproach Him by calling your

soul a particle of His substance taken captive by the race of darkness;

as if God could not maintain the conflict except by this corruption of

His members, and this dishonorable captivity? Instead of honoring God

in your prayers, you insult Him. For what sin did you commit, when you

belonged to Him, that you should be thus punished by the god you cry

to, not because you left Him sinfully of your own choice; for he

himself gave you to His enemies, to obtain peace for His kingdom? You

are not even given as hostages to be honorably guarded. Nor is it as

when a shepherd lays a snare to catch a wild beast: for he does not

put one of his own members in the snare, but some animal from his

flock; and generally, so that the wild beast is caught before the

animal is hurt. You, though you are the members of your god, are given

to the enemy, whose ferocity you keep off from your god only by being

contaminated with their impurity, infected with their corruptions,

without any fault of your own. You cannot in your prayers use the

words: "Free us, O Lord, for the glory of Thy name; and for Thy name's

sake pardon our sins." [745] Your prayer is: "Free us by Thy skill,

for we suffer here oppression, and torture, and pollution, only that

Thou mayest mourn unmolested in Thy kingdom." These are words of

reproach, not of entreaty. Nor can you use the words taught us by the

Master of truth: "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors."

[746] For who are the debtors who have sinned against you? If it is

the race of darkness, you do not forgive their debts, but make them be

utterly cast out and shut up in eternal imprisonment. And how can God

forgive your debts, when He rather sinned against you by sending you

into such a state, than you against Him, whom you obeyed by going? If

this was not a sin in Him, because He was compelled to do it, this

excuse must apply you, now that you have been overthrown in the

conflict, more than to Him before the conflict began. You suffer now

from the mixture of evil, which was not the case with Him when

nevertheless He was compelled to send you. So either He requires that

you should forgive Him his debt; or, if He is not in debt to you, still

less are you to Him. It appears that your sacrifices and your pure and

simple prayers are false and vile blasphemies.

18. How is it, by the way, that you use the words temple, altar,

sacrifice, for the purpose of commending your own practices? If such

things can be spoken of as properly belonging to true religion, they

must constitute the true worship of the true God. And if there is such

a thing as true sacrifice to the true God, which is implied in the

expression divine honors, there must be some one true sacrifice of

which the rest are imitations. On the one hand, we have the spurious

imitations in the case of false and lying gods, that is, of devils, who

proudly demand divine honors from their deluded votaries, as is or was

the case in the temples and idols of the Gentiles. On the other hand,

we have the prophetic intimations of one most true sacrifice to be

offered for the sins of all believers, as in the sacrifices enjoined by

God on our fathers; along with which there was also the symbolical

anointing typical of Christ, as the name Christ itself means anointed.

The animal sacrifices, therefore, presumptuously claimed by devils,

were an imitation of the true sacrifice which is due only to the one

true God, and which Christ alone offered on His altar. Thus the

apostle says: "The sacrifices which the Gentiles offer, they offer to

devils, and not to God." [747] He does not find fault with

sacrifices, but with offering to devils. The Hebrews, again, in their

animal sacrifices, which they offered to God in many varied forms,

suitably to the significance of the institution, typified the sacrifice

offered by Christ. This sacrifice is also commemorated by Christians,

in the sacred offering and participation of the body and blood of

Christ. The Manich�ans understand neither the sinfulness of the

Gentile sacrifices, nor the importance of the Hebrew sacrifices, nor

the use of the ordinance of the Christian sacrifice. Their own errors

are the offering they present to the devil who has deceived them. And

thus they depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and

to doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy.

19. It may be well that Faustus, or at least that those who are

charmed with Faustus' writings, should know that the doctrine of a

single principle did not come to us from the Gentiles; for the belief

in one true God, from whom every kind of nature is derived, is a part

of the original truth retained among the Gentiles, notwithstanding

their having fallen away to many false gods. For the Gentile

philosophers had the knowledge of God, because, as the apostle says,

"the invisible things of God, from the creation of the world, are

clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His

eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse." But, as

the apostle adds, "when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God,

neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their

foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they

became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an

image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed

beasts, and creeping things." [748] These are the idols of the

Gentiles, which they cannot explain except by referring to the

creatures made by God; so that this very explanation of their idolatry,

on which the more enlightened Gentiles were wont to pride themselves as

a proof of their superiority, shows the truth of the following words of

the apostle: "They worshipped and served the creature rather than the

Creator, who is blessed forever." [749] Where you differ from the

Gentiles, you are in error; where you resemble them, you are worse than

they. You do not believe, as they do, in a single principle; and so

you fall into the impiety of believing the substance of the one true

God to be liable to subjugation and corruption. As regards the worship

of a plurality of gods, the doctrine of lying devils has led the

Gentiles to worship many idols, and you to worship many phantasms.

20. We do not turn the sacrifices of the Gentiles into love-feasts, as

Faustus says we do. Our love-feasts are rather a substitute for the

sacrifice spoken of by the Lord, in the words already quoted: "I will

have mercy, and not sacrifice." At our love-feasts the poor obtain

vegetable or animal food; and so the creature of God is used, as far as

it is suitable, for the nourishment of man, who is also God's

creature. You have been led by lying devils, not in self-denial, but

in blasphemous error, "to abstain from meats which God hath created to

be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the

truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused,

if it be received with thanksgiving." [750] In return for the

bounties of the Creator, you ungratefully insult Him with your impiety;

and because in our love-feasts flesh is often given to the poor, you

compare Christian charity to Pagan sacrifices. This indeed, is another

point in which you resemble some Pagans. You consider it a crime to

kill animals, because you think that the souls of men pass into them;

which is an idea found in the writings of some Gentile philosophers,

although their successors appear to have thought differently. But here

again you are most in error: for they dreaded slaughtering a relative

in the animal; but you dread the slaughter of your god, for you hold

even the souls of animals to be his members.

21. As to our paying honor to the memory of the martyrs, and the

accusation of Faustus, that we worship them instead of idols, I should

not care to answer such a charge, were it not for the sake of showing

how Faustus, in his desire to cast reproach on us, has overstepped the

Manich�an inventions, and has fallen heedlessly into a popular notion

found in Pagan poetry, although he is so anxious to be distinguished

from the Pagans. For in saying that we have turned the idols into

martyrs, he speaks of our worshipping them with similar rites, and

appeasing the shades of the departed with wine and food. Do you, then,

believe in shades? We never heard you speak of such things, nor have

we read of them in your books. In fact, you generally oppose such

ideas: for you tell us that the souls of the dead, if they are wicked,

or not purified, are made to pass through various changes, or suffer

punishment still more severe; while the good souls are placed in ships,

and sail through heaven to that imaginary region of light which they

died fighting for. According to you, then, no souls remain near the

burying-place of the body; and how can there be any shades of the

departed? What and where are they? Faustus' love of evil-speaking has

made him forget his own creed; or perhaps he spoke in his sleep about

ghosts, and did not wake up even when he saw his words in writing. It

is true that Christians pay religious honor to the memory of the

martyrs, both to excite us to imitate them and to obtain a share in

their merits, and the assistance of their prayers. But we build altars

not to any martyr, but to the God of martyrs, although it is to the

memory of the martyrs. No one officiating at the altar in the saints'

burying-place ever says, We bring an offering to thee, O Peter! or O

Paul! or O Cyprian! The offering is made to God, who gave the crown of

martyrdom, while it is in memory of those thus crowned. The emotion is

increased by the associations of the place, and love is excited both

towards those who are our examples, and towards Him by whose help we

may follow such examples. We regard the martyrs with the same

affectionate intimacy that we feel towards holy men of God in this

life, when we know that their hearts are prepared to endure the same

suffering for the truth of the gospel. There is more devotion in our

feeling towards the martyrs, because we know that their conflict is

over; and we can speak with greater confidence in praise of those

already victors in heaven, than of those still combating here. What is

properly divine worship, which the Greeks call latria, and for which

there is no word in Latin, both in doctrine and in practice, we give

only to God. To this worship belongs the offering of sacrifices; as we

see in the word idolatry, which means the giving of this worship to

idols. Accordingly we never offer, or require any one to offer,

sacrifice to a martyr, or to a holy soul, or to any angel. Any one

falling into this error is instructed by doctrine, either in the way of

correction or of caution. For holy beings themselves, whether saints

or angels, refuse to accept what they know to be due to God alone. We

see this in Paul and Barnabas, when the men of Lycaonia wished to

sacrifice to them as gods, on account of the miracles they performed.

They rent their clothes, and restrained the people, crying out to them,

and persuading them that they were not gods. We see it also in the

angels, as we read in the Apocalypse that an angel would not allow

himself to be worshipped, and said to his worshipper, "I am thy

fellow-servant, and of thy brethen." [751] Those who claim this

worship are proud spirits, the devil and his angels, as we see in all

the temples and rites of the Gentiles. Some proud men, too, have

copied their example; as is related of some kings of Babylon. Thus the

holy Daniel was accused and persecuted, because when the king made a

decree that no petition should be made to any god, but only to the

king, he was found worshipping and praying to his own God, that is, the

one true God. [752] As for those who drink to excess at the feasts of

the martyrs, we of course condemn their conduct; for to do so even in

their own houses would be contrary to sound doctrine. But we must try

to amend what is bad as well as prescribe what is good, and must of

necessity bear for a time with some things that are not according to

our teaching. The rules of Christian conduct are not to be taken from

the indulgences of the intemperate or the infirmities of the weak.

Still, even in this, the guilt of intemperance is much less than that

of impiety. To sacrifice to the martyrs, even fasting, is worse than

to go home intoxicated from their feast: to sacrifice to the martyrs,

I say, which is a different thing from sacrificing to God in memory of

the martyrs, as we do constantly, in the manner required since the

revelation of the New Testament, for this belongs to the worship or

latria which is due to God alone. But it is vain to try to make these

heretics understand the full meaning of these words of the Psalmist:

"He that offereth the sacrifice of praise glorifieth me, and in this

way will I show him my salvation." [753] Before the coming of Christ,

the flesh and blood of this sacrifice were foreshadowed in the animals

slain; in the passion of Christ the types were fulfilled by the true

sacrifice; after the ascension of Christ, this sacrifice is

commemorated in the sacrament. Between the sacrifices of the Pagans

and of the Hebrews there is all the difference that there is between a

false imitation and a typical anticipation. We do not despise or

denounce the virginity of holy women because there were vestal

virgins. And, in the same way, it is no reproach to the sacrifices of

our fathers that the Gentiles also had sacrifices. The difference

between the Christian and vestal virginity is great, yet it consists

wholly in the being to whom the vow is made and paid; and so the

difference in the being to whom the sacrifices of the Pagans and

Hebrews are made and offered makes a wide difference between them. In

the one case they are offered to devils, who presumptuously make this

claim in order to be held as gods, because sacrifice is a divine

honor. In the other case they are offered to the one true God, as a

type of the true sacrifice, which also was to be offered to Him in the

passion of the body and blood of Christ.

22. Faustus is wrong in saying that our Jewish forefathers, in their

separation from the Gentiles, retained the temple, and sacrifices, and

altars, and priesthood, and abandoned only graven images or idols, for

they might have sacrificed, as some do, without any graven image, to

trees and mountains, or even to the sun and moon and the stars. If

they had thus rendered to these objects the worship called latria, they

would have served the creature instead of the Creator, and so would

have fallen into the serious error of heathenish superstition; and even

without idols, they would have found devils ready to take advantage of

their error, and to accept their offerings. For these proud and wicked

spirits feed not, as some foolishly suppose, on the smell of the

sacrifice, and the smoke, but on the errors of men. They enjoy not

bodily refreshment, but a malevolent gratification, when they in any

way deceive people, or when, with a bold assumption of borrowed

majesty, they boast of receiving divine honors. It was not, therefore,

only the idols of the Gentiles that our Jewish forefathers abandoned.

They sacrificed neither to the earth nor to any earthly thing, nor to

the sea, nor to heaven, nor to the hosts of heaven, but laid the

victims on the altar of the one God, Creator of all, who required these

offerings as a means of foreshadowing the true victim, by whom He has

reconciled us to Himself in the remission of sins through our Lord

Jesus Christ. So Paul, addressing believers, who are made the body of

which Christ is the Head, says: "I beseech you, therefore, brethren,

by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice,

holy, acceptable to God." [754] The Manich�ans, on the other hand,

say that human bodies are the workmanship of the race of darkness, and

the prison in which the captive deity is confined. Thus Faustus'

doctrine is very different from Paul's. But since whosover preaches to

you another gospel than that ye have received must be accursed, what

Christ says in Paul is the truth, while Manich�us in Faustus is

accursed.

23. Faustus says also, without knowing what he says, that we have

retained the manners of the Gentiles. But seeing that the just lives

by faith, and that the end of the commandment is love out of a pure

heart, and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned, and that these

three, faith, hope, and love, abide to form the life of believers, it

is impossible that there should be similarity in the manners of those

who differ in these three things. Those who believe differently, and

hope differently, and love differently, must also live differently.

And if we resemble the Gentiles in our use of such things as food and

drink, and houses and clothes and baths, and those of us who marry, in

taking and keeping wives, and in begetting and bringing up children as

our heirs, there is still a great difference between the man who uses

these things for some end of his own, and the man who, in using them,

gives thanks to God, having no unworthy or erroneous ideas about God.

For as you, according to your own heresy, though you eat the same bread

as other men, and live upon the produce of the same plants and the

water of the same fountain, and are clothed like others in wool and

linen, yet lead a different life, not because you eat or drink, or

dress differently, but because you differ from others in your ideas and

in your faith, and in all these things have in view an end of your

own--the end, namely, set forth in your false doctrines; in the same

way we, though we resemble the Gentiles in the use of this and other

things, do not resemble them in our life; for while the things are the

same, the end is different: for the end we have in view is, according

to the just commandment of God, love out of a pure heart, and a good

conscience, and faith unfeigned; from which some having erred, are

turned to vain jangling. In this vain jangling you bear the palm, for

you do not attend to the fact that so great is the difference of life

produced by a different faith, even when the things in possession and

use are the same, that though your followers have wives, and in spite

of themselves get children, for whom they gather and store up wealth;

though they eat flesh, drink wine, bathe, reap harvests, gather

vintages, engage in trade, and occupy high official positions, you

nevertheless reckon them as belonging to you, and not to the Gentiles,

though in their actions they approach nearer to the Gentiles than to

you. And though some of the Gentiles in some things resemble you more

than your own followers,--those, for instance, who in superstitious

devotion abstain from flesh, and wine, and marriage,--you still count

your own followers, even though they use all these things, and so are

unlike you, as belonging to the flock of Manich�us rather than those

who resemble you in their practices. You consider as belonging to you

a woman that believes in Manich�us, though she is a mother, rather than

a Sibyl, though she never marries. But you will say that many who are

called Catholic Christians are adulterers, robbers, misers, drunkards,

and whatever else is contrary to sound doctrine. I ask if none such

are to be found in your company, which is almost too small to be called

a company. And because there are some among the Pagans who are not of

this character, do you consider them as better than yourselves? And

yet, in fact, your heresy is so blasphemous, that even your followers

who are not of such a character are worse than the Pagans who are. It

is therefore no impeachment to sound doctrine, which alone is Catholic,

that many wish to take its name, who will not yield to its beneficial

influence. We must bear in mind the true meaning of the contrast which

the Lord makes between the little company and the mass of mankind, as

spread over all the world; for the company of saints and believers is

small, as the amount of grain is small when compared with the heap of

chaff; and yet the good grain is quite sufficient far to outnumber you,

good and bad together, for good and bad are both strangers to the

truth. In a word, we are not a schism of the Gentiles, for we differ

from them greatly for the better; nor are you, for you differ from them

greatly for the worse. [755]

------------------------

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[735] 1 Tim. vi. 16.

[736] 1 Cor. i. 24.

[737] [The Manich�an doctrine of the Jesus patabilis is more fully

expounded in this book than elsewhere. Of course, this is only a way

of expressing the familiar Manich�an notion that the divine life which

is imprisoned in the world and which is trying to escape through the

growth of plants, etc., suffers from any sort of injury done to

plants. Compare Baur: Das Manich�ische Religionssystem, pp.

72-77.--A.H.N.]

[738] 1 Cor. x. 20.

[739] Sen. Hipp. vv. 194, 195.

[740] John xix. 38.

[741] Rom. iii. 13.

[742] 1 Cor. iii. 17, and vi. 19.

[743] 1 Tim. iv. 2.

[744] Matt. xii. 7.

[745] Ps. lxxix. 9.

[746] Matt. vi. 12.

[747] 1 Cor. x. 30.

[748] Rom. i. 20-23.

[749] Rom. i. 25.

[750] 1 Tim. iv. 3, 4.

[751] Rev. xix. 10.

[752] Dan. vi.

[753] Ps. l. 23.

[754] Rom. xii. 1.

[755] [Augustin's exposure of the paganism of Manich�ism is an

admirable and effective piece of argumentum ad hominem. That the

Christianity of Augustin's time was becoming paganized is undoubted,

but Manich�ism was pure paganism.--A.H.N.]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Book XXI.

Faustus denies that Manich�ans believe in two gods. Hyle no god.

Augustin discusses at large the doctrine of God and Hyle, and fixes the

charge of dualism upon the Manich�ans.

1. Faustus said: Do we believe in one God or in two? In one, of

course. If we are accused of making two gods, I reply that it cannot

be shown that we ever said anything of the kind. Why do you suspect us

of this? Because, you say, you believe in two principles, good and

evil. It is true, we believe in two principles; but one we call God,

and the other Hyle, or, to use common popular language, the devil. If

you think this means two gods, you may as well think that the health

and sickness of which doctors speak are two kinds of health, or that

good and evil are two kinds of good, or that wealth and poverty are two

kinds of wealth. If I were describing two things, one white and the

other black, or one hot and the other cold, or one sweet and the other

bitter, it would appear like idiocy or insanity in you to say that I

was describing two white things, or two hot things, or two sweet

things. So, when I assert that there are two principles, God and Hyle,

you have no reason for saying that I believe in two gods. Do you think

that we must call them both gods because we attribute, as is proper,

all the power of evil to Hyle, and all the power of good to God? If

so, you may as well say that a poison and the antidote must both be

called antidotes, because each has a power of its own, and certain

effects follow from the action of both. So also, you may say that a

physician and a poisoner are both physicians; or that a just and an

unjust man are both just, because both do something. If this is

absurd, it is still more absurd to say that God and Hyle must both be

gods, because they both produce certain effects. It is a very childish

and impotent way of arguing, when you cannot refute my statements, to

make a quarrel about names. I grant that we, too, sometimes call the

hostile nature God; not that we believe it to be God, but that this

name is already adopted by the worshippers of this nature, who in their

error suppose it to be God. Thus the apostle says: "The god of this

world has blinded the minds of them that believe not." [756] He calls

him God, because he would be so called by his worshippers; adding that

he blinds their minds, to show that he is not the true God.

2. Augustin replied: You often speak in your discourses of two gods,

as indeed you acknowledge, though at first you denied it. And you give

as a reason for thus speaking the words of the apostle: "The god of

this world has blinded the minds of them that believe not." Most of us

punctuate this sentence differently, and explain it as meaning that the

true God has blinded the minds of unbelievers. They put a stop after

the word God, and read the following words together. Or without this

punctuation you may, for the sake of exposition, change the order of

the words, and read, "In whom God has blinded the minds of unbelievers

of this world," which gives the same sense. The act of blinding the

minds of unbelievers may in one sense be ascribed to God, as the effect

not of malice, but of justice. Thus Paul himself says elsewhere, "Is

God unjust, who taketh vengeance?" [757] and again, "What shall we say

then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid. For Moses

saith, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and will have

compassion on whom I will have compassion." Observe what he adds,

after asserting the undeniable truth that there is no unrighteousness

with God: "But what if God, willing to show His wrath, and to make His

power known, endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath

fitted for destruction, and that He might manifest the riches of His

grace towards the vessels of mercy, which He hath before prepared unto

glory?" [758] etc. Here it evidently cannot be said that it is one God

who shows his wrath, and makes known his power in the vessels of wrath

fitted for destruction, and another God who shows his riches in the

vessels of mercy. According to the apostle's doctrine, it is one and

the same God who does both. Hence he says again, "For this cause God

gave them up to the lusts of their own heart, to uncleanness, to

dishonor their own bodies between themselves;" and immediately after,

"For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections;" and again, "And

even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave

them over to a reprobate mind." [759] Here we see how the true and

just God blinds the minds of unbelievers. For in all these words

quoted from the apostle no other God is understood than He whose Son,

sent by Him, came saying, "For judgment am I come into this world, that

they which see not might see, and that they which see might be made

blind." [760] Here, again, it is plain to the minds of believers how

God blinds the minds of unbelievers. For among the secret things,

which contain the righteous principles of God's judgment, there is a

secret which determines that the minds of some shall be blinded, and

the minds of some enlightened. Regarding this, it is well said of God,

"Thy judgments are a great deep." [761] The apostle, in admiration of

the unfathomable depth of this abyss, exclaims: "O the depth of the

riches both of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God! How

unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!" [762]

3. You cannot distinguish between what God does in mercy and what He

does in judgment, because you can neither understand nor use the words

of our Psalter: "I will sing of mercy and judgment unto Thee, O Lord."

[763] Accordingly, whatever in the feebleness of your frail humanity

seems amiss to you, you separate entirely from the will and judgment of

God: for you are provided with another evil god, not by a discovery of

truth, but by an invention of folly; and to this god you attribute not

only what you do unjustly, but also what you suffer justly. Thus you

assign to God the bestowal of blessings, and take from Him the

infliction of judgments, as if He of whom Christ says that He has

prepared everlasting fire for the wicked were a different being from

Him who makes His sun to rise upon the evil and the good, and sends

rain on the just and on the unjust. Why do you not understand that

this great goodness and great severity belong to one God, but because

you have not learned to sing of mercy and judgment? Is not He who

causes the sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the

just and on the unjust, the same who also breaks off the natural

branches, and engrafts contrary to nature the wild olive tree? Does

not the apostle, in reference to this, say of this one God: "Thou

seest, then, the goodness and severity of God: to them which were

broken off, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in

His goodness?" [764] Here it is to be observed how the apostle takes

away neither judicial severity from God, nor free-will from man. It is

a profound mystery, impenetrable by human thought, how God both

condemns the ungodly and justifies the ungodly; for both these things

are said of Him in the truth of the Holy Scriptures. But is the

mysteriousness of the divine judgments any reason for taking pleasure

in cavilling against them? How much more becoming, and more suitable

to the limitation of our powers, to feel the same awe which the apostle

felt, and to exclaim, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and

of the knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments, and His

ways past finding out!" How much better thus to admire what you cannot

explain, than to try to make an evil god in addition to the true God,

simply because you cannot understand the one good God! For it is not a

question of names, but of actions.

4. Faustus glibly defends himself by saying, "We speak not of two

gods, but of God and Hyle." But when you ask for the meaning of Hyle,

you find that it is in fact another god. If the Manich�ans gave the

name of Hyle, as the ancients did, to the unformed matter which is

susceptible of bodily forms, we should not accuse them of making two

gods. But it is pure folly and madness to give to matter the power of

forming bodies, or to deny that what has this power is God. When you

give to some other being the power which belongs to the true God of

making the qualities and forms, by which bodies, elements, and animals

exist, according to their respective modes, whatever name you choose to

give to this being, you are chargeable with making another god. There

are indeed two errors in this blasphemous doctrine. In the first

place, you ascribe the act of God to a being whom you are ashamed to

call god; though you must call him god as long as you make him do

things which only God can do. In the second place, the good things

done by a good God you call bad, and ascribe to an evil god, because

you feel a childish horror of whatever shocks the frailty of fallen

humanity, and a childish pleasure in the opposite. So you think snakes

are made by an evil being; while you consider the sun so great a good,

that you believe it to be not the creature of God, but an emission from

His substance. You must know that the true God, in whom, alas, you

have not yet come to believe, made both the snake along with the lower

creatures, and the sun along with other exalted creatures. Moreover,

among still more exalted creatures, not heavenly bodies, but spiritual

beings, He has made what far surpasses the light of the sun, and what

no carnal man can perceive, much less you, who, in your condemnation of

flesh, condemn the very principle by which you determine good and

evil. For your only idea of evil is from the disagreeableness of some

things to the fleshly sense; and your only idea of good is from sensual

gratification.

5. When I consider the things lowest in the scale of nature, which are

within our view, and which, though earthly, and feeble, and mortal, are

still the works of God, I am lost in admiration of the Creator, who is

so great, in the great works and no less great in the small. For the

divine skill seen in the formation of all creatures in heaven and earth

is always like itself, even in those things that differ from one

another; for it is everywhere perfect, in the perfection which it gives

to everything in its own kind. We see each creature made not as a

whole by itself, but in relation to the rest of the creation; so that

the whole divine skill is displayed in the formation of each, arranging

each in its proper place and order, and providing what is suitable for

all, both separately and unitedly. See here, lowest in the scale, the

animals which fly, and swim, and walk, and creep. These are mortal

creatures, whose life, as it is written, "is as a vapor which appeareth

for a little time." [765] Each of these, according to the capacity of

its kind, contributes the measure appointed in the goodness of the

Creator to the completeness of the whole, so that the lowest partake in

the good which the highest possess in a greater degree. Show me, if

you can, any animal, however despicable, whose soul hates its own

flesh, and does not rather nourish and cherish it, by its vital motion

minister to its growth and direct its activity, and exercise a sort of

management over a little universe of its own, which it makes

subservient to its own preservation. Even in the discipline of his own

body by a rational being, who brings his body under, that earthly

passion may not hinder his perception of wisdom, there is love for his

own flesh, which he then reduces to obedience, which is its proper

condition. Indeed, you yourselves, although your heresy teaches you a

fleshly abhorrence of the flesh, cannot help loving your own flesh, and

caring for its safety and comfort, both by avoiding all injury from

blows, and falls, and inclement weather, and by seeking for the means

of keeping it in health. Thus the law of nature is too strong for your

false doctrine.

6. Looking at the flesh itself, do we not see in the construction of

its vital parts, in the symmetry of form, in the position and

arrangement of the limbs of action and the organs of sensation, all

acting in harmony; do we not see in the adjustment of measures, in the

proportion of numbers, in the order of weights, the handiwork of the

true God, of whom it is truly said, "Thou hast ordered all things in

measure, and number, and weight"? [766] If your heart was not

hardened and corrupted by falsehood, you would understand the invisible

things of God from the things which He has made, even in these feeble

creatures of flesh. For who is the author of the things I have

mentioned, but He whose unity is the standard of all measure, whose

wisdom is the model of all beauty, and whose law is the rule of all

order? If you are blind to these things, hear at least the words of

the apostle.

7. For the apostle, in speaking of the love which husbands ought to

have for their wives gives, as an example, the love of the soul for the

body. The words are: "He that loveth his wife, loveth himself: for

no man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it,

even as Christ the Church." [767] Look at the whole animal creation,

and you find in the instinctive self-preservation of every animal this

natural principle of love to its own flesh. It is so not only with

men, who, when they live aright, both provide for the safety of their

flesh, and keep their carnal appetites in subjection to the use of

reason; the brutes also avoid pain, and shrink from death, and escape

as rapidly as they can from whatever might break up the construction of

their bodies, or dissolve the connection of spirit and flesh; for the

brutes, too, nourish and cherish their own flesh. "For no one ever

yet," says the apostle, "hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and

cherisheth it, even as Christ the Church." See where the apostle

begins, and to what he ascends. Consider, if you can, the greatness

which creation derives from its Creator, embracing as it does the whole

extent from the host of heaven down to flesh and blood, with the beauty

of manifold form, and the order of successive gradations.

8. The same apostle again, when speaking of spiritual gifts as

diverse, and yet tending to harmonious action, to illustrate a matter

so great, and divine, and mysterious, makes a comparison with the human

body,--thus plainly intimating that this flesh is the handiwork of

God. The whole passage, as found in the Epistle to the Corinthians, is

so much to the point, that though it is long, I think it not amiss to

insert it all: "Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not

have you ignorant. Ye know that ye were Gentiles, carried away unto

these dumb idols, even as ye were led. Wherefore I give you to

understand, that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus

accursed; and that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the

Holy Ghost. Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit.

And there are diversities of administrations, but the same Lord. And

there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which

worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to

every man to profit withal. For to one is given by the Spirit the word

of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to

another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by

the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another

prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of

tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues: but all these

worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man

severally as He will. For as the body is one, and hath many members,

and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so

also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body,

whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have

been all made to drink into one Spirit. For the body is not one

member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I

am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear

shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it

therefore not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were

the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? But

now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath

pleased Him. And if they were all one member, where were the body?

But now are they many members, yet but one body. And the eye cannot

say unto the hand, I have no need of thee; nor again the head to the

feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much more those members of the body,

which seem to be more feeble, are necessary; and those members of the

body which we think to be less honorable, upon these we bestow more

abundant honor; and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness.

For our comely parts have no need; but God hath tempered the body

together, having given more abundant honor to that part which lacked:

that there should be no schism in the body, but that the members should

have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all

the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members

rejoice with it." [768] Apart altogether from Christian faith, which

would lead you to believe the apostle, if you have common sense to

perceive what is self-evident, let each examine and see for himself the

plain truth regarding those things of which the apostle speaks,--what

greatness belongs to the least, and what goodness to the lowest; for

these are the things which the apostle extols, in order to illustrate

by means of these common and visible bodily objects, unseen spiritual

realities of the most exalted nature.

9. Whoever, then, denies that our body and its members, which the

apostle so approves and extols, are the handiwork of God, you see whom

he contradicts, preaching contrary to what you have received. So,

instead of refuting his opinions, I may leave him to be accursed of all

Christians. The apostle says, God tempered the body. Faustus says,

Not God, but Hyle. Anathemas are more suitable than arguments to such

contradictions. You cannot say that God is here called the God of this

world. And if any one understands the passage where this expression

does occur to mean that the devil blinds the minds of unbelievers, we

grant that he does so by his evil suggestions, from yielding to which,

men lose the light of righteousness in God's righteous retribution.

This is all in accordance with sacred Scripture. The apostle himself

speaks of temptation from without: "I fear lest, as the serpent

beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted

from the simplicity and purity that is in Christ." [769] To the same

purpose are the words, "Evil communications corrupt good manners;"

[770] and when he speaks of a man deceiving himself, "Whoever thinketh

himself to be anything, when he is nothing, deceiveth himself;" [771]

or again, in the passage already quoted of the judgment of God, "God

gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not

convenient." [772] Similarly, in the Old Testament, after the words,

"God did not create death, nor hath He pleasure in the destruction of

the living," we read, "By the envy of the devil death entered into the

world." [773] And again of death, that men may not put the blame from

themselves, "The wicked invite her with hands and voice; and thinking

her a friend, they are drawn down." [774] Elsewhere, however, it is

said, "Good and evil, life and death, riches and poverty, are from the

Lord God." [775] This seems perplexing to people who do not

understand that, apart from the manifest judgment to follow hereafter

upon every evil work, there is an actual judgment at the time; so that

in one action, besides the craft of the deceiver and the wickedness of

the voluntary agent, there is also the just penalty of the judge: for

while the devil suggests, and man consents, God abandons. So, if you

join the words, God of this world, and understand that the devil blinds

unbelievers by his mischievous delusions, the meaning is not a bad

one. For the word God is not used by itself, but with the

qualification of this world, that is, of wicked men, who seek to

prosper only in this age. In this sense the world is also called evil,

where it is written, "that He might deliver us from this present evil

age." [776] In the same way, in the expression, "whose god is their

belly," it is only in connection with the word whose that the belly is

called god. So also, in the Psalms, the devils would not be called

gods without adding "of the nations." [777] But in the passage we are

now considering it is not said, The god of this world, or, Whose god is

their belly, or, The gods of the nations are devils; but simply, God

has tempered the body, which can be understood only of the true God,

the Creator of all. There is no disparaging addition here, as in the

other cases. But perhaps Faustus will say that God tempered the body,

not as the maker of it, in the arrangement of its members, but by

mixing His light with it. Thus Faustus would attribute to some other

being than God the construction of the body, and the arrangement of its

members, while God tempered the evil of the construction by the mixture

of His goodness. Such are the inventions with which the Manich�ans

cram feeble minds. But God, in aid of the feeble, by the mouth of the

sacred writers rebukes this opinion. For we read a few verses before:

"God has placed the members every one of them in the body, as it has

pleased Him." Evidently, God is said to have tempered the body,

because He has constructed it of many members, which in their union

preserve the variety of their respective functions.

10. Do the Manich�ans suppose that the animals which, according to

their wild notions, were constructed by Hyle in the race of darkness,

had not this harmonious action of their members, commended by the

apostle, before God mixed His light with them; so that then the head

did say to the feet, or the eye to the hand, I have no need of thee?

This is not and cannot be the Manich�an doctrine, for they describe the

animals as using all these members, and speak of them as creeping,

walking, swimming, flying, each in its own kind. They could all see,

too, and hear, and use the other senses, and nourish and cherish their

own bodies with appropriate means and appliances. Hence, moreover,

they had the power of reproduction, for they are spoken of as having

offspring. All these things, of which Faust speaks disparagingly as

the works of Hyle, could not be done without that harmonious

arrangement which the apostle praises and ascribes to God. Is it not

now plain who is to be followed, and who is to be pronounced accursed?

Indeed, the Manich�ans tell us of animals that could speak; and their

speeches were heard and understood and approved of by all creatures,

whether creeping things, or quadrupeds, or birds, or fish. Amazing and

supernatural eloquence! Especially as they had no grammarian or

elocutionist to teach them, and had not passed through the painful

experience of the cane and the birch. Why, Faustus himself began late

in life to learn oratory, that he might discourse eloquently on these

absurdities; and with all his cleverness, after ruining his health by

study, his preaching has gained a mere handful of followers. What a

pity that he was born in the light, and not in that region of

darkness! If he had discoursed there against the light, the whole

animal creation, from the biped to the centipede, from the dragon to

the shell-fish, would have listened eagerly, and obeyed at once;

whereas, when he discourses here against the race of darkness, he is

oftener called eloquent than learned, and oftener still a false teacher

of the worst kind. And among the few Manich�ans who extol him as a

great teacher, he has none of the lower animals as his disciples; and

not even his horse is any the wiser for his master's instructions, so

that the mixture of a part of deity seems only to make the animals more

stupid. What absurdity is this! When will these deluded beings have

the sense to compare the description in the Manich�an fiction of what

the animals were formerly in their own region, with what they are now

in this world? Then their bodies were strong, now they are feeble;

then their power of vision was such that they were induced to invade

the region of God on account of the beauty which they saw, now it is

too weak to face the rays of the sun; then they had intelligence

sufficient to understand a discourse addressed to them, now they have

no ability of the kind; then this astonishing and effective eloquence

was natural, now eloquence of the most meagre kind requires diligent

study and preparation. How many good things did the race of darkness

lose by the mixture of good!

11. Faustus has displayed his ingenuity, in the remarks to which I am

now replying, by making for himself a long list of opposites--health

and sickness, riches and poverty, white and black, cold and hot, sweet

and bitter. We need not say much about black and white. Or, if there

is a character for good or evil in colors, so that white must be

ascribed to God and black to Hyle; if God threw a white color on the

wings of birds, when Hyle, as the Manich�ans say, created them, where

had the crows gone to when the swans got whitened? Nor need we discuss

heat and cold, for both are good in moderation, and dangerous in

excess. With regard to the rest, Faustus probably intended that good

and evil, which he might as well have put first, should be understood

as including the rest, so that health, riches, white, hot, sweet,

should belong to good; and sickness, poverty, black, cold, bitter, to

evil. The ignorance and folly of this is obvious. It might look like

reviling if I were to take up separately white and black, hot and cold,

sweet and bitter, health and sickness. For if white and sweet are both

good, and black and bitter evil, how is it that most grapes and all

olives become black as they become sweet, and so get good by getting

evil? And if heat and health are both good, and cold and sickness

evil, why do bodies become sick when heated? Is it healthy to have

fever? But I let these things pass, for they may have been put down

hastily, or they may have been given as merely instances of opposition,

and not as being good and bad, especially as it is nowhere stated that

the fire among the race of darkness is cold, so that heat in this case

must unquestionably be evil.

12. We pass on, then, to health, riches, sweetness, which Faustus

evidently accounts good in his contrasts. Was there no health of body

in the race of darkness where animals were born and grew up and brought

forth, and had such vitality, that when some that were with child were

taken, as the story is, and were put in bonds in heaven, even the

abortive offspring of a premature birth, falling from heaven to earth,

nevertheless lived, and grew, and produced the innumerable kinds of

animals which now exist? Or were there no riches where trees could

grow not only in water and wind, but in smoke and fire, and could bear

such a rich produce, that animals, according to their several kinds,

sprang from the fruit, and were provided with the means of subsistence

from those fertile trees, and showed how well fed they were by a

numerous progeny? And all this where there was no toil in cultivation,

and no inclement change from summer to winter, for there was no sun to

give variety to the seasons by his annual course. There must have been

perennial productiveness where the trees were not only born in their

own element, but had a supply of appropriate nourishment to make them

constantly fertile; as we see orange-trees bearing fruit all the year

round if they are well watered. The riches must have been abundant,

and they must have been secure from harm; for there could be no fear of

hailstorms when there were no light-gatherers who, in your fable, set

the thunder in motion.

13. Nor would the beings in this race of darkness have sought for food

if it had not been sweet and pleasant, so that they would have died

from want. For we find that all bodies have their peculiar wants,

according to which food is either agreeable or offensive. If it is

agreeable, it is said to be sweet or pleasant; if it is offensive, it

is said to be bitter or sour, or in some way disagreeable. In human

beings we find that one desires food which another dislikes, from a

difference in constitution or habit or state of health. Still more,

animals of quite different make can find pleasure in food which is

disagreeable to us. Why else should the goats feed so eagerly on the

wild olives? This food is sweet to them, as in some sicknesses honey

tastes bitter to us. To a thoughtful inquirer these things suggest the

beauty of the arrangement in which each finds what suits it, and the

greatness of the good which extends from the lowest to the highest, and

from the material to the spiritual. As for the race of darkness, if an

animal sprung from any element fed on what was produced by that

element, doubtless the food must have been sweet from its

appropriateness. Again, if this animal had found food of another

element, the want of appropriateness would have appeared in its

offensiveness to the taste. Such offensiveness is called sourness, or

bitterness, or disagreeableness, or something of the kind; or if its

adverse nature is such as to destroy the harmony of the bodily

constitution, and so take away life or reduce the strength, it is

called poison, simply on account of this want of appropriateness, while

it may nourish the kind of life to which it is appropriate. So, if a

hawk eat the bread which is our daily food, it dies; and we die if we

eat hellebore, which cattle often feed on, and which may itself in a

certain form be used as a medicine. If Faustus had known or thought of

this, he would not have given poison and antidote as an example of the

two natures of good and evil, as if God were the antidote and Hyle the

poison. For the same thing, of one and the same nature, kills or

cures, as it is used appropriately or inappropriately. In the

Manich�an legends, their god might be said to have been poison to the

race of darkness; for he so injured their bodies, that from being

strong, they became utterly feeble. But then again, as the light was

itself taken, and subjected to loss and injury, it may be said to have

been poison to itself.

14. Instead of one good and one evil principle, you seem to make both

good or both evil, or rather two good and two evil; for they are good

in themselves, and evil to one another. We may see afterwards which is

the better or the worse; but meanwhile we may think of them as both

good in themselves. Thus God reigned in one region, while Hyle reigned

in the other. There was health in both kingdoms, and rich produce in

both; both had a numerous progeny, and both tasted the sweetness of

pleasures suitable to their respective natures. But the race of

darkness, say the Manich�ans, excepting the part which was evil to the

light which it bordered on, was also evil to itself. As, however, I

have already pointed out many good things in it, if you can point out

its evils, there will still be two good kingdoms, though the one where

there are no evils will be the better of the two. What, then, do you

call its evils? They plundered, and killed, and devoured one another,

according to Faustus. But if they did nothing else than this, how

could such numerous hosts be born and grow up to maturity? They must

have enjoyed peace and tranquillity too. But, allowing the kingdom

where there is no discord to be the better of the two, still they

should both be called good, rather than one good and the other bad.

Thus the better kingdom will be that where they killed neither

themselves nor one another; and the worse, or less good, where, though

they fought with one another, each separate animal preserved its own

nature in health and safety. But we cannot make much difference

between your god and the prince of darkness, whom no one opposed, whose

reign was acknowledged by all, and whose proposals were unanimously

agreed to. All this implies great peace and harmony. Those kingdoms

are happy where all agree heartily in obedience to the king. Moreover,

the rule of this prince extended not only to his own species, or to

bipeds whom you make the parents of mankind, but to all kinds of

animals, who waited in his presence, obeying his commands, and

believing his declarations. Do you think people are so stupid as not

to recognize the attributes of deity in your description of this

prince, or to think it possible that you can have another? If the

authority of this prince rested on his resources, he must have been

very powerful; if on his fame, he must have been renowned; if on love,

the regard must have been universal; if on fear, he must have kept the

strictest order. If some evils, then, were mixed with so many good

things, who that knows the meaning of words would call this the nature

of evil? Besides, if you call this the nature of evil, because it was

not only evil to the other nature, but was also evil in itself, was

there no evil, think you, in the dire necessity to which your god was

subjected before the mixture with the opposite nature, so that he was

compelled to fight with it, and to send his own members to be swallowed

up so mercilessly as to be beyond the hope of complete recovery? This

was a great evil in that nature before its mixture with the only thing

you allow to be evil. Your god must either have had it in his power

not to be injured and sullied by the race of darkness, in which case

his own folly must have brought him into trouble; or if his substance

was liable to corruption, the object of your worship is not the

incorruptible God of whom the apostle speaks. [778] Does not, then

this liability to corruption, even apart from the actual experience,

seem to you to be an evil in your god?

15. It is plain, moreover, that either he must have been destitute of

prescience,--a great defect, surely, in the Deity, not to know what is

coming; or if he had prescience, he can never have felt secure, but

must have been in constant terror, which you must allow to be a serious

evil. There must have been the fear at every moment, that the time

might be come for that conflict in which his members suffered such loss

and contamination, that to liberate and purify them costs infinite

labor, and, after all, can be done only partially. If it is going too

far to attribute this state of alarm to the Deity himself, his members

at least must have dreaded the prospect of suffering all these evils.

Then, again, if they were ignorant of what was to happen, the substance

of your god must have been so far wanting in prescience. How many

evils do you reckon in your chief good? Perhaps you will say that they

had no fear, because they foresaw, along with the suffering, their

liberation and triumph. But still they must have feared for their

companions, if they knew that they were to be cut off from their

kingdom, and bound for ever in the mass of darkness.

16. Had they not the charity to feel a kindly sympathy for those who

were doomed to suffer eternal punishment, without having committed any

sin? These souls that were to be bound up with the mass, were not they

too part of your god? Were they not of the same origin, the same

substance? They at least must have felt grief or fear in the prospect

of their own eternal bondage. To say that they did not know what was

to happen, while the others did, is to make one and the same substance

partly acquainted with the future, and partly ignorant. How can you

call this substance the pure, and perfect, and supreme good, if there

were such evils in it, even before its mixture with the evil

principle? You will have to confess your two principles either both

good or both evil. If you make two evils, you may make either of them

the worse, as you please. But if you make two goods, we shall have to

inquire which you make the better. Meanwhile there is an end to your

doctrine of two principles, one good and the other evil, which are in

fact two gods, one good and the other evil. But if hurting another is

evil, they both hurt one another. Perhaps the greater evil was in the

principle that first began the attack. But if one began the injury,

the other returned it; and not by the law of compensation, an eye for

an eye, which you are foolish enough to find fault with, but with far

greater severity. You must choose which you will call the worse,--the

one that began the injury, or the one that had the will and the power

to do still greater injury. The one tried to get a share in the

enjoyment of light; the other effected the entire overthrow of its

opponent. If the one had got what it desired, it would certainly have

done no harm to itself. But the other, in the discomfiture of its

adversary, did great mischief to part of itself; reminding us of the

well-known passionate exclamation, which is on record as having been

actually used, "Perish our friends, if that will rid us of our

enemies." [779] For part of your god was sent to suffer hopeless

contamination, that there might be a covering for the mass in which the

enemy is to be buried for ever alive. So much will he continue to be

dreaded even when conquered and bound, that the security, such as it

is, of one part of the deity must be purchased by the eternal misery of

the other parts. Such is the harmlessness of the good principle! Your

god, it appears, is guilty of the crime with which you charge the race

of darkness--of injuring both friends and enemies. The charge is

proved in the case of your god, by that final mass in which his enemies

are confined, while his own subjects are involved in it. In fact, the

principle that you call god is the more injurious of the two, both to

friends and to enemies. In the case of Hyle, there was no desire to

destroy the opposite kingdom, but only to possess it; and though some

of its subjects were put to death by the violence of others, they

appeared again in other forms, so that in the alternation of life and

death they had intervals of enjoyment in their history. But your god,

with all the omnipotence and perfect excellence that you ascribe to

him, dooms his enemies to eternal destruction, and his friends to

eternal punishment. And the height of insanity is in believing that

while internal contest occasions the injury of the members of Hyle,

victory brings punishment to the members of God. What means this

folly? To use Faustus' comparison of God and Hyle to the antidote and

poison, the antidote seems to be more mischievous than the poison. We

do not hear of Hyle shutting up God for ever in a mass of darkness, or

driving its own members into it; or, which is worst of all, slandering

this unfortunate remnant, as an excuse for not effecting its

purification. For Manich�us, in his Fundamental Epistle, says that

these souls deserved to be thus punished, because they allowed

themselves to be led away from their original brightness, and became

enemies of holy light; whereas it was God himself that sent them to

lose themselves in the region of darkness, that light might be opposed

to light: which was unjust, if he forced them against their will;

while, if they went willingly, he is ungrateful in punishing them.

These souls can never have been happy, if they were tormented with fear

before the conflict, from knowing that they were to become enemies to

their original principle, and then in the conflict were hopelessly

contaminated, and afterwards eternally condemned. On the other hand,

they can never have been divine, if before the conflict they were

unaware of what was coming, from want of prescience, and then showed

feebleness in the conflict, and suffered misery afterwards. And what

is true of them must be true of God, since they are of the same

substance. Is there any hope of your seeing the folly of these

blasphemies? You attempt, indeed, to vindicate the goodness of God, by

asserting that Hyle when shut up is prevented from doing any more

injury to itself. Hyle, it seems, is to get some good, when it has no

longer any good mixed with it. Perhaps, as God before the conflict had

the evil of necessity, when the good was unmixed with evil, so Hyle

after the conflict is to have the good of rest, when the evil is

unmixed with good. Your principles are thus either two evils, one

worse than the other; or two goods, both imperfect, but one better than

the other. The better, however, is the more miserable; for if the

issue of this great conflict is that the enemy gets some good by the

cessation of mutual injuries in Hyle, while God's own subjects suffer

the serious evil of being driven into the mass of darkness, we may ask

who has got the victory. The poison, we are to understand, is Hyle,

where, nevertheless, animal life found a plentiful supply of the means

of growth and productiveness; while the antidote is God, who could

condemn his own members, but could not restore them. In reality, it is

as absurd to call the one Hyle, as it is to call the other God. These

are the follies of men who turn to fables because they cannot bear

sound doctrine. [780]
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Book XXII.

Faustus states his objections to the morality of the law and the

prophets, and Augustin seeks by the application of the type and the

allegory to explain away the moral difficulties of the Old Testament.

1. Faustus said: You ask why we blaspheme the law and the prophets.

We are so far from professing or feeling any hostility to the law and

the prophets, that we are ready, if you will allow us, to declare the

falsehood of all the writings which make the law and the prophets

appear objectionable. But this you refuse to admit, and by maintaining

the authority of your writers, you bring a perhaps unmerited reproach

upon the prophets; you slander the patriarchs, and dishonor the law.

You are so unreasonable as to deny that your writers are false, while

you uphold the piety and sanctity of those who are described in these

writings as guilty of the worst crimes, and as leading wicked lives.

These opinions are inconsistent; for either these were bad characters,

or the writers were untruthful.

2. Supposing, then, that we agree in condemning the writers, we may

succeed in vindicating the law and the prophets. By the law must be

understood not circumcision, or Sabbaths, or sacrifices, or the other

Jewish observances, but the true law, viz., Thou shall not kill, Thou

shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not bear false witness, and so

on. To this law, promulgated throughout the world, that is, at the

commencement of the present constitution of the world, the Hebrew

writers did violence, by infecting it with the pollution of their

disgusting precepts about circumcision and sacrifice. As a friend of

the law, you should join with me in condemning the Jews for injuring

the law by this mixture of unsuitable precepts. Plainly, you must be

aware that these precepts are not the law, or any part of the law,

since you claim to be righteous, though you make no attempt to keep the

precepts. In seeking to lead a righteous life, you pay great regard to

the commandments which forbid sinful actions, while you take no notice

of the Jewish observances; which would be unjustifiable if they were

one and the same law. You resent as a foul reproach being called

negligent of the precept, "Thou shalt not kill," or "Thou shall not

commit adultery." And if you showed the same resentment at being

called uncircumcised, or negligent of the Sabbath, it would be evident

that you considered both to be the law and the commandment of God. In

fact, however, you consider the honor and glory of keeping the one no

way endangered by disregard of the other. It is plain, as I have said,

that these observances are not the law, but a disfigurement of the

law. If we condemn them, it is not as being genuine, but as spurious.

In this condemnation there is no reproach of the law, or of God its

author, but only of those who published their shocking superstitions

under these names. If we sometimes abuse the venerable name of law in

attacking the Jewish precepts, the fault is yours, for refusing to

distinguish between Hebrew observances and the law. Only restore to

the law its proper dignity, by removing these foul Israelitish blots;

grant that these writers are guilty of disfiguring the law, and you

will see at once that we are the enemies not of the law, but of

Judaism. You are misled by the word law; for you do not know to what

that name properly belongs.

3. For my part, I see no reason for your thinking that we blaspheme

your prophets and patriarchs. There would indeed be some ground for

the charge, if we had been directly or remotely the authors of the

account given of their actions. But as this account is written either

by themselves, in a criminal desire to be famous for their misdeeds, or

by their companions and coevals, why should you blame us? You condemn

them in abhorrence of the wicked actions of which they have voluntarily

declared themselves guilty, though there was no occasion for such a

confession. Or if the narrative is only a malicious fiction, let its

authors be punished, let the books be condemned, let the prophetic name

be cleared from this foul reproach, let the patriarchs recover the

respect due to their simplicity and purity of managers.

4. These books, moreover, contain shocking calumnies against God

himself. We are told that he existed from eternity in darkness, and

admired the light when he saw it; that he was so ignorant of the

future, that he gave Adam a command, not foreseeing that it would be

broken; that his perception was so limited that he could not see Adam

when, from the knowledge of his nakedness, he hid himself in a corner

of Paradise; that envy made him afraid lest his creature man should

taste of the tree of life, and live for ever; that afterwards he was

greedy for blood, and fat from all kinds of sacrifices, and jealous if

they were offered to any one but himself; that he was enraged sometimes

against his enemies, sometimes against his friends; that he destroyed

thousands of men for a slight offense, or for nothing; that he

threatened to come with a sword and spare nobody, righteous or wicked.

The authors of such bold libels against God might very well slander the

men of God. You must join with us in laying the blame on the writers

if you wish to vindicate the prophets.

5. Again, we are not responsible for what is said of Abraham, that in

his irrational craving to have children, and not believing God, who

promised that his wife Sara should have a son, he defiled himself with

a mistress, with the knowledge of his wife, which only made it worse;

[781] or that, in sacrilegious profanation of his marriage, he on

different occasions, from avarice and greed, sold his wife Sara for the

gratification of the kings Abimelech and Pharas, telling them that she

was his sister, because she was very fair. [782] The narrative is not

ours, which tells how Lot, Abraham's brother, after his escape from

Sodom, lay with his two daughters on the mountain [783] (better for him

to have perished in the conflagration of Sodom, than to have burned

with incestuous passion); or how Isaac imitated his father's conduct,

and called his wife Rebecca his sister, that he might gain a shameful

livelihood by her; [784] or how his son Jacob, husband of four

wives--two full sisters, Rachel and Leah, and their handmaids--led the

life of a goat among them, so that there was a daily strife among his

women who should be the first to lay hold of him when he came from the

field, ending sometimes in their hiring him from one another for the

night; [785] or, again, how his son Judah slept with his

daughter-in-law Tamar, after she had been married to two of his sons,

deceived, we are told, by the harlot's dress which Tamar put on,

knowing that her father-in-law was in the habit of associating with

such characters; [786] or how David, after having a number of wives,

seduced the wife of his soldier Uriah, and caused Uriah himself to be

killed in the battle; [787] or how his son Solomon had three hundred

wives, and seven hundred concubines, and princesses without number;

[788] or how the first prophet Hosea got children from a prostitute,

and, what is worse, it is said that this disgraceful conduct was

enjoined by God; [789] or how Moses committed murder, [790] and

plundered Egypt, [791] and waged wars, and commanded, or himself

perpetrated, many cruelties. [792] And he too was not content with

one wife. We are neither directly nor remotely the authors of these

and similar narratives, which are found in the books of the patriarchs

and the prophets. Either your writers forged these things, or the

fathers are really guilty. Choose which you please; the crime in

either case is detestable, for vicious conduct and falsehood are

equally hateful.

6. Augustin replied: You understand neither the symbols of the law

nor the acts of the prophets, because you do not know what holiness or

righteousness means. We have repeatedly shown at great length, that

the precepts and symbols of the Old Testament contained both what was

to be fulfilled in obedience through the grace bestowed in the New

Testament, and what was to be set aside as a proof of its having been

fulfilled in the truth now made manifest. For in the love of God and

of our neighbor is secured the accomplishment of the precepts of the

law, while the accomplishment of its promises is shown in the abolition

of circumcision, and of other typical observances formerly practised.

By the precept men were led, through a sense of guilt to desire

salvation; by the promise they were led to find in the typical

observances the assurance that the Saviour would come. The salvation

desired was to be obtained through the grace bestowed on the appearance

of the New Testament; and the fulfillment of the expectation rendered

the types no longer necessary. The same law that was given by Moses

became grace and truth in Jesus Christ. By the grace in the pardon of

sin, the precept is kept in force in the case of those supported by

divine help. By the truth the symbolic rites are set aside, that the

promise might, in those who trust in the divine faithfulness, be

brought to pass.

7. Those, accordingly, who, finding fault with what they do not

understand, call the typical institutions of the law disfigurements and

excrescences, are like men displeased with things of which they do not

know the use. As if a deaf man, seeing others move their lips in

speaking, were to find fault with the motion of the mouth as needless

and unsightly; or as if a blind man, on hearing a house commended, were

to test the truth of what he heard by passing his hand over the surface

of the wall, and on coming to the windows were to cry out against them

as flaws in the level, or were to suppose that the wall had fallen in.

8. How shall I make those whose minds are full of vanity understand

that the actions of the prophets were also mystical and prophetic? The

vanity of their minds is shown in their thinking that we believe God to

have once existed in darkness, because it is written, "Darkness was

over the deep." [793] As if we called the deep God, where there was

darkness, because the light did not exist there before God made it by

His word. From their not distinguishing between the light which is

God, and the light which God made, they imagine that God must have been

in darkness before He made light, because darkness was over the deep

before God said, "Let there be light, and there was light." In the New

Testament both these things are ascribed to God. For we read, "God is

light, and in Him is no darkness at all;" [794] and again, "God, who

commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our

hearts." [795] So also, in the Old Testament, the name "Brightness of

eternal light" [796] is given to the wisdom of God, which certainly was

not created, for by it all things were made; and of the light which

exists only as the production of this wisdom it is said, "Thou wilt

light my candle, O Lord; my God, Thou wilt enlighten my darkness."

[797] In the same way, in the beginning, when darkness was over the

deep, God said, "Let there be light, and there was light," which only

the light-giving light, which is God Himself, could have made.

9. For as God is His own eternal happiness, and is besides the

bestower of happiness, so He is His own eternal light, and is also the

bestower of light. He envies the good of none, for He is Himself the

source of happiness to all good beings; He fears the evil of none, for

the loss of all evil beings is in their being abandoned by Him. He can

neither be benefited by those on whom He Himself bestows happiness, nor

is He afraid of those whose misery is the doom awarded by His own

judgment. Very different, O Manich�us, is the object of your worship.

You have departed from God in the pursuit of your own fancies, which of

all kinds have increased and multiplied in your foolish roving hearts,

drinking in through the sense of sight the light of the heavenly

bodies. This light, though it too is made by God, is not to be

compared to the light created in the minds of the pious, whom God

brings out of darkness into light, as He brings them out of sinfulness

into righteousness. Still less can it be compared to that inaccessible

light from which all kinds of light are derived. Nor is this light

inaccessible to all; for "blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall

see God." [798] "God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all;" but

the wicked shall not see light, as is said in Isaiah. [799] To them

the light-giving light is inaccessible. From the light comes not only

the spiritual light in the minds of the pious, but also the material

light, which is not denied to the wicked, but is made to rise on the

evil and on the good.

10. So, when darkness was over the deep, He who was light said, "Let

there be light." From what light this light came is clear; for the

words are, "God said." What light is that which was made, is not so

clear. For there has been a friendly discussion among students of the

sacred Scriptures, whether God then made the light in the minds of the

angels, or, in other words, these rational spirits themselves, or some

material light which exists in the higher regions of the universe

beyond our ken. For on the fourth day He made the visible luminaries

of heaven. And it is also a question whether these bodies were made at

the same time as their light, or were somehow kindled from the light

made already. But whoever reads the sacred writings in the pious

spirit which is required to understand them, must be convinced that

whatever the light was which was made when, at the time that darkness

was over the deep, God said, "Let there be light," it was created

light, and the creating Light was the maker of it.

11. Nor does it follow that God, before He made light, abode in

darkness, because it is said that darkness was over the deep, and then

that the Spirit of God moved on the waters. The deep is the

unfathomable abyss of the waters. And the carnal mind might suppose

that the Spirit abode in the darkness which was over the deep, because

it is said that He moved on the waters. This is from not understanding

how the light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehendeth it

not, till by the word of God those who were darkness are made light,

and it is said to them, "Ye were once darkness, but now are ye light in

the Lord." [800] But if rational minds which are in darkness through

a sinful will cannot comprehend the light of the wisdom of God, though

it is present everywhere, because they are separated from it not in

place, but in disposition: why may not the Spirit of God have moved on

the darkness of the waters, when He moved on the waters, though at an

immeasurable distance from it, not in place, but in nature?

12. In all this I know I am singing to deaf ears; but the Lord, from

whom is the truth which we speak, can open some ears to catch the

strain. But what shall we say of those critics of the Holy Scriptures

who object to God's being pleased with His own works, and find fault

with the words, "God saw the light that it was good," as if this meant

that God admired the light as something new? God's seeing His works

that they were good, means that the Creator approved of His own works

as pleasing to Himself. For God cannot be forced to do anything

against His will, so that He should not be pleased with His own work;

nor can He do anything by mistake, so that He should regret having done

it. Why should the Manich�ans object to our God seeing His work that

it was good, when their god placed a covering before himself when he

mingled his own members with the darkness? For instead of seeing his

work that it is good, he refuses to look at it because it is evil.

13. Faustus speaks of our God as astonished, which is not said in

Scripture; nor does it follow that one must be astonished when he sees

anything to be good. There are many good things which we see without

being astonished, as if they were better than we expected; we merely

approve of them as being what they ought to be. We can, however, give

an instance of God being astonished, not from the Old Testament, which

the Manich�ans assail with undeserved reproach, but from the New

Testament, which they profess to believe in order to entrap the

unwary. For they acknowledge Christ as God, and use this as a bait to

entice Christ's followers into their snares. God, then, was astonished

when Christ was astonished. For we read in the Gospel, that when

Christ heard the faith of a certain centurion, He was astonished, and

said to His disciples, "Verily I have not found so great faith, no, not

in Israel." [801] We have already given our explanation of the words,

"God saw that it was good." Better men may give a better explanation.

Meanwhile let the Manich�ans explain Christ's being astonished at what

He foresaw before it happened, and knew before He heard it. For though

seeing a thing to be good is quite different from being astonished at

it, in this case there is some resemblance, for Jesus was astonished at

the light of faith which He Himself had created in the heart of the

centurion; for Jesus is the true light, which enlighteneth every man

that cometh into the world.

14. Thus an irreligious Pagan might bring the same reproaches against

Christ in the Gospel, as Faustus brings against God in the Old

Testament. He might say that Christ lacked foresight, not only because

He was astonished at the faith of the centurion, but because He chose

Judas as a disciple who proved disobedient to His commands; as Faustus

objects to the precept given in Paradise, which, as it turned out, was

not obeyed. He might also cavil at Christ's not knowing who touched

Him, when the woman suffering from an issue of blood touched the hem of

His garment; as Faustus blames God for not knowing where Adam had hid

himself. If this ignorance is implied in God's saying, "Where art

thou, Adam?" [802] the same may be said of Christ's asking, "Who

touched me?" [803] The Pagans also might call Christ timid and

envious, in not wishing five of the ten virgins to gain eternal life by

entering into His kingdom, and in shutting them out, so that they

knocked in vain in their entreaty to have the door opened, as if

forgetful of His own promise, "Knock, and it shall be opened unto you;"

[804] as Faustus charges God with fear and envy in not admitting man

after his sin to eternal life. Again, he might call Christ greedy of

the blood, not of beasts, but of men, because he said, "He that loseth

his life for my sake, shall keep it unto life eternal;" [805] as

Faustus reproaches God in reference to those animal sacrifices which

prefigured the sacrifice of blood-shedding by which we are redeemed.

He might also accuse Christ of jealousy, because in narrating His

driving the buyers and sellers out of the temple, the evangelist quotes

as applicable to Him the words, "The jealousy of Thine house hath eaten

me up;" [806] as Faustus accuses God of jealousy in forbidding

sacrifices to be offered to other gods. He might say that Christ was

angry with both His friends and His enemies: with His friends, because

He said, "The servant that knows his lord's will, and doeth it not,

shall be beaten with many stripes;" and with His enemies, because He

said, "If any one shall not receive you, shake off against him the dust

of your shoes; verily I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable

for Sodom in the day of judgment than for that city;" [807] as Faustus

accuses God of being angry at one time with His friends, and at another

with His enemies; both of whom are spoken of thus by the apostle:

"They that have sinned without law shall perish without law, and they

that have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law." [808] Or he

might say that Christ shed the blood of many without mercy, for a

slight offense or for nothing. For to a Pagan there would appear to be

little or no harm in not having a wedding garment at the marriage

feast, for which our King in the Gospel commanded a man to be bound

hand and foot, and cast into outer darkness; [809] or in not wishing to

have Christ for a king, which is the sin of which Christ says, "Those

that would not have me to reign over them, bring hither and slay before

me;" [810] as Faustus blames God in the Old Testament for slaughtering

thousands of human beings for slight offenses, as Faustus calls them,

or for nothing. Again, if Faustus finds fault with God's threatening

to come with the sword, and to spare neither the righteous nor the

wicked, might not the Pagan find as much fault with the words of the

Apostle Paul, when he says of our God," He spared not His own Son, but

gave Him up for us all;" [811] or of Peter, when, in exhorting the

saints to be patient in the midst of persecution and slaughter, he

says, "It is time that judgment begin from the house of God; and if it

first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that believe not the

gospel of the Lord? And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where

shall the ungodly and sinner appear?" [812] What can be more

righteous than the Only-Begotten, whom nevertheless the Father did not

spare? And what can be plainer than that the righteous also are not

spared, but chastised with manifold afflictions, as is clearly implied

in the words, "If the righteous scarcely are saved"? As it is said in

the Old Testament, "Whom the Lord loveth He correcteth, and chastiseth

every son whom He receiveth;" [813] and, "If we receive good at the

hand of the Lord, shall we not also receive evil?" [814] So we read

also in the New Testament, "Whom I love I rebuke and chasten;" [815]

and, "If we judge ourselves, we shall not be judged of the Lord; but

when we are judged, we are corrected of the Lord, that we may not be

condemned with the world." [816] If a Pagan were to make such

objections to the New Testament, would not the Manich�ans try to answer

them, though they themselves make similar objections to the Old

Testament? But supposing them able to answer the Pagan, how absurd it

would be to defend in the one Testament what they find fault with in

the other! But if they could not answer the objections of the Pagan,

why should they not allow in both Testaments, instead of in one only,

that what appears wrong to unbelievers, from their ignorance, should be

believed to be right by pious readers even when they also are ignorant?

15. Perhaps our opponents will maintain that these parallel passages

quoted from the New Testament are themselves neither authoritative nor

true: for they claim the impious liberty of holding and teaching, that

whatever they deem favorable to their heresy was said by Christ and the

apostles; while they have the profane boldness to say, that whatever in

the same writings is unfavorable to them is a spurious interpolation.

I have already at some length, as far as the intention of the present

work required, exposed the unreasonableness of this assault upon the

authority of the whole of Scripture.

16. At present I would call attention to the fact, that when the

Manich�ans, although they disguise their blasphemous absurdities under

the name of Christianity, bring such objections against the Christian

Scriptures, we have to defend the authority of the divine record in

both Testaments against the Manich�ans as much as against the Pagans.

A Pagan might find fault with passages in the New Testament in the same

way as Faustus does with what he calls unworthy representations of God

in the Old Testament; and the Pagan might be answered by the quotation

of similar passages from his own authors, as in Paul's speech at

Athens. [817] Even in Pagan writings we might find the doctrine that

God created and constructed the world, and that He is the giver of

light, which does not imply that before light was made He abode in

darkness; and that when His work was finished He was elated with joy,

which is more than saying that He saw that it was good; and that He

made a law with rewards for obedience, and punishments for

disobedience, by which they do not mean to say that God was ignorant of

the future, because He gave a law to those by whom it was to be

broken. Nor could they make asking questions a proof of a want of

foresight even in a human being; for in their books many questions are

asked only for the purpose of using the answers for the conviction of

the persons addressed: for the questioner knows not only what answer

he desires, but what will actually be given. Again, if the Pagan tried

to make out God to be envious of any one, because He will not give

happiness to the wicked, he would find many passages in the writings of

his own authors in support of this principle of the divine government.

17. The only objection that a Pagan would make on the subject of

sacrifice would refer to our reason for finding fault with Pagan

sacrifices, when in the Old Testament God is described as requiring men

to offer sacrifice to Him. If I were to reply at length on this

subject, I might prove to him that sacrifice is due only to the one

true God, and that this sacrifice was offered by the one true Priest,

the Mediator of God and man; and that it was proper that this sacrifice

should be pre-figured by animal sacrifices, in order to foreshadow the

flesh and blood of the one sacrifice for the remission of sins

contracted by flesh and blood, which shall not inherit the kingdom of

God: for the natural body will be endowed with heavenly attributes, as

the fire in the sacrifice typified the swallowing up of death in

victory. Those observances properly belonged to the people whose

kingdom and priesthood were prophetic of the King and Priest who should

come to govern and to consecrate believers in all nations, and to lead

them into the kingdom of heaven, and the holy society of angels and

eternal life. And as this true sacrifice was piously set forth in the

Hebrew observances, so it was impiously caricatured by the Pagans,

because, as the apostle says, what they offer they offer to devils, and

not to God. [818] The typical rite of blood-shedding in sacrifice

dates from the earliest ages, pointing forward from the outset of human

history to the passion of the Mediator. For Abel is mentioned in the

sacred Scripture as the first who offered such sacrifices. [819] We

need not therefore wonder that fallen angels who occupy the air, and

whose chief sins are pride and falsehood, should demand from their

worshippers by whom they wished to be considered as gods what they knew

to be due to God only. This deception was favored by the folly of the

human heart, especially when regret for the dead led to the making of

likenesses, and so to the use of images. [820] By the increase of

this homage, divine honors came to be paid to the dead as dwelling in

heaven, while devils took their place on earth as the objects of

worship, and required that their deluded and degraded votaries should

present sacrifices to them. Thus the nature of sacrifice as due only

to God appears not only when God righteously claims it, but also when a

false god proudly arrogates it. If the Pagan was slow to believe these

things, I should argue from the prophecies, and point out that, though

uttered long ago, they are now fulfilled. If he still remained in

unbelief, this is rather to be expected than to be wondered at; for the

prophecy itself intimates that all would not believe.

18. If the Pagan, in the next place, were to find fault with both

Testaments as attributing jealousy to God and Christ, he would only

show his own ignorance of literature, or his forgetfulness. For though

their philosophers distinguish between desire and passion, joy and

gratification, caution and fear, gentleness and tender-heartedness,

prudence and cunning, boldness and daring, and so on, giving the first

name in each pair to what is good, and the second to what is bad, their

books are notwithstanding full of instances in which, by the abuse of

these words, virtues are called by the names which properly belong to

vices; as passion is used for desire, gratification for joy, fear for

caution, tender-heartedness for gentleness, cunning for prudence,

daring for boldness. The cases are innumerable in which speech

exhibits similar inaccuracies. Moreover, each language has its own

idioms. For in religious writings I remember no instance of the word

tender-heartedness being used in a bad sense. And common usage affords

examples of similar peculiarities in the use of words. In Greek, one

word stands for two distinct things, labor and pain; while we have a

separate name for each. Again, we use the word in two senses, as when

we say of what is not dead, that it has life; and again, of any one

that he is a man of good life, whereas in Greek each of these meanings

has a word of its own. So that, apart from the abuse of words which

prevails in all languages, it may be an Hebrew idiom to use jealousy in

two senses, as a man is called jealous when he suffers from a diseased

state of mind caused by distress on account of the faithlessness of his

wife, in which sense the word cannot be applied to God; or as when

diligence is manifested in guarding conjugal chastity, in which sense

it is profitable for us not only unhesitatingly to admit, but

thankfully to assert, that God is jealous of His people when He calls

them His wife, and warns them against committing adultery with a

multitude of false gods. The same may be said of the anger of God.

For God does not suffer perturbation when He visits men in anger; but

either by an abuse of the word, or by a peculiarity of idiom, anger is

used in the sense of punishment.

19. The slaughter of multitudes would not seem strange to the Pagan,

unless he denied the judgment of God, which Pagans do not; for they

allow that all things in the universe, from the highest to the lowest,

are governed by God's providence. But if he would not allow this, he

would be convinced either by the authority of Pagan writers, or by the

more tedious method of demonstration; and if still obstinate and

perverse, he would be left to the judgment which he denies. Then, if

he were to give instances of the destruction of men for no offense, or

for a very slight one, we should show that these were offenses, and

that they were not slight. For instance, to take the case already

referred to of the wedding garment, we should prove that it was a great

crime in a man to attend the sacred feast, seeking not the bridegroom's

glory, but his own, or whatever the garment may be found on better

interpretation to signify. And in the case of the slaughter before the

king of those who would not have him to reign over them, we might

perhaps easily prove that, though it may be no sin in a man to refuse

to obey his fellow-man, it is both a fault and a great one to reject

the reign of Him in whose reign alone is there righteousness, and

happiness, and continuance.

20. Lastly, as regards Faustus' crafty insinuation, that the Old

Testament misrepresents God as threatening to come with a sword which

will spare neither the righteous nor the wicked, if the words were

explained to the Pagan, he would perhaps disagree neither with the Old

Testament nor with the New; and he might see the beauty of the parable

in the Gospel, which people who pretend to be Christians either

misunderstand from their blindness, or reject from their perversity.

The great husbandman of the vine uses his pruning-hook differently in

the fruitful and in the unfruitful branches; yet he spares neither good

nor bad, pruning one and cutting off the other. [821] There is no man

so just as not to require to be tried by affliction to advance, or to

establish, or to prove his virtue. Do the Manich�ans not reckon Paul

as righteous, who, while confessing humbly and honestly his past sins,

still gives thanks for being justified by faith in Jesus Christ? Was

Paul then spared by Him whom fools misunderstand, when He says, "I will

spare neither the righteous nor the sinner"? Hear the apostle

himself: "Lest I should be exalted above measure by the abundance of

the revelation, there was given me a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of

Satan to buffet me. For this I besought the Lord thrice, that He would

remove it from me; and He said unto me, My grace is sufficient for

thee: for strength is perfected in weakness." [822] Here a just man

is not spared that his strength might be perfected in weakness by Him

who had given him an angel of Satan to buffet him. If you say that the

devil gave this angel, it follows that the devil sought to prevent

Paul's being exalted above measure by the abundance of the revelation,

and to perfect his strength. This is impossible. Therefore He who

gave up this righteous man to be buffeted by the messenger of Satan, is

the same as He who, through Paul, gave up to Satan himself the wicked

persons of whom Paul says: "I have delivered them to Satan, that they

may learn not to blaspheme." [823] Do you see now how the Most High

spares neither the righteous nor the wicked? Or is it the sword that

frightens you? For to be buffeted is not so bad as to be put to

death. But did not the thousands of martyrs suffer death in various

forms? And could their persecutors have had this power against them

except it had been given them by God, who thus spared neither the

righteous nor the wicked? For the Lord Himself, the chief martyr, says

expressly to Pilate: "Thou couldst have no power at all against me,

except it were given thee from above." [824] Paul also, besides

recording his own experience, says that the afflictions and

persecutions of the righteous exhibit the judgment of God. [825] This

truth is set forth at length by the Apostle Peter in the passage

already quoted, where he says: "It is time that judgment should begin

at the house of the Lord. And if it first begin at us, what shall the

end be of those that believe not the gospel of God? And if the

righteous scarcely are saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner

appear?" [826] Peter also explains how the wicked are not spared, for

they are branches broken off to be burnt; while the righteous are not

spared, because their purification is to be brought to perfection. He

ascribes these things to the will of Him who says in the Old Testament,

I will spare neither the righteous nor the wicked; for he says: "It is

better, if the will of the Spirit of God be so, that we suffer for

well-doing than for evil-doing." [827] So, when by the will of the

Spirit of God men suffer for well-doing, the righteous are not spared;

when they suffer for evil-doing, the wicked are not spared. In both

cases it is according to the will of Him who says: I will spare

neither the righteous nor the wicked; correcting the one as a son, and

punishing the other as a transgressor.

21. I have thus shown, to the best of my power, that the God we

worship did not abide from eternity in darkness, but is Himself light,

and in Him is no darkness at all; and in Himself dwells in light

inaccessible; and the brightness of this light is His coeternal

wisdom. From what we have said, it appears that God was not taken by

surprise by the unexpected appearance of light, but that light owes its

existence to Him as its Creator, as its owes its continued existence to

His approval. Neither was God ignorant of the future, but the author

of the precept as well as the punisher of disobedience; that by showing

His righteous anger against transgression, He might provide a restraint

for the time, and a warning for the future. Nor does He ask questions

from ignorance, but by His very inquiry declares His judgment. Nor is

He curious or timid, but excludes the transgressor from eternal life,

which is the just reward of obedience. Nor is He greedy for blood and

fat; but by requiring from a carnal people sacrifices, suited to their

character, He by certain types prefigures the true sacrifice. Nor is

His jealousy an emotion of pale anxiety, but of quiet benevolence, in

desire to keep the soul, which owes chastity to the one true God, from

being defiled and prostituted by serving many false gods. Nor is He

enraged with a passion similar to human anger, but is angry, not in the

sense of desiring vengeance, but in the peculiar sense of giving full

effect to the sentence of a righteous retribution. Nor does He destroy

thousands of men for trifling offenses, or for nothing, but manifests

to the world the benefit to be obtained from fearing Him, by the

temporal death of those already mortal. Nor does He punish the

righteous and sinners indiscriminately, but chastises the righteous for

their good, in order to perfect them, and gives to sinners the

punishment justly due to them. Thus, ye Manich�ans, do your suspicions

lead you astray, when, by misunderstanding our Scriptures, or by

hearing bad interpreters, you form a mistaken judgment of Catholics.

Hence you leave sound doctrine, and turn to impious fables; and in your

perversity and estrangement from the society of saints, you reject the

instruction of the New Testament, which, as we have shown, contains

statements similar to those which you condemn in the Old Testament. So

we are obliged to defend both Testaments against you as well as against

the Pagans.

22. But supposing that there is some one so deluded by carnality as to

worship not the God whom we worship, who is one and true, but the

fiction of your suspicions or your slanders, whom you say we worship,

is not even this god better than yours? Observe, I beseech you, what

must be plain to the feeblest understanding; for here there is no need

of great perspicacity. I address all, wise and unwise. I appeal to

the common sense and judgment of all alike. Hear, consider, judge.

Would it not have been better for your god to have remained in darkness

from eternity, than to have plunged the light coeternal with him and

cognate to him into darkness? Would it not have been better to have

expressed admiration in surprise at the appearance of a new light

coming to scatter the darkness, than to have been unable to baffle the

assault of darkness except by the concession of his own light? Unhappy

if he did this in alarm, and cruel if there was no need of it. Surely

it would have been better to see light, made by himself, and to admire

it as good, than to make the light begotten by himself evil; better

than that his own light should become hostile to himself in repelling

the forces of darkness. For this will be the accusation against those

who will be condemned for ever to the mass of darkness, that they

suffered themselves to lose their original brightness, and became the

enemies of sacred light. If they did not know from eternity that they

would be thus condemned, they must have suffered the darkness of

eternal ignorance; or if they did know, the darkness of eternal fear.

Thus part of the substance of your god really did remain from eternity

in its own darkness; and instead of admiring new light on its

appearance, it only met with another and a hostile darkness, of which

it had always been in fear. Indeed, God himself must have been in the

darkness of fear for this part of himself, if he was dreading the evil

coming upon it. If he did not foresee the evil, he must have been in

the darkness of ignorance. If he foresaw it, and was not in fear, the

darkness of such cruelty is worse than the darkness either of ignorance

or of fear. Your god appears to be destitute of the quality which the

apostle commends in the body, which you insanely believe to be made not

by God, but by Hyle: "If one member suffers, all the members suffer

with it." [828] But suppose he did suffer; he foresaw, he feared, he

suffered, but he could not help himself. Thus he remained from

eternity in the darkness of his own misery; and then, instead of

admiring a new light which was to drive away the darkness, he came in

contact, to the injury of his own light, with another darkness which he

had always dreaded. Again, would it not have been much better, I say,

not to have given a commandment like God, but even to have received a

commandment like Adam, which he would be rewarded for keeping and

punished for breaking, acting either way by his own free-will, than to

be forced by inevitable necessity to admit darkness into his light in

spite of himself? Surely it would have been better to have given a

precept to human nature, not knowing that it would become sinful, than

to have been driven by necessity to sin contrary to his own divine

nature. Think for a moment, and say how darkness could be conquered by

one who was himself conquered by necessity. Conquered already by this

greater enemy, he fought under his conqueror's orders against a less

formidable opponent. Would it not have been better not to know where

Adam had hid himself, than to have been himself destitute of any means

of escape, first from a hard and hateful necessity, and then from a

dissimilar and hostile race? Would it not have been better to grudge

eternal life to human nature, than to consign to misery the divine

nature; to desire the blood and fat of sacrifices, than to be himself

slaughtered in so many forms, on account of his mixture with the blood

and fat of every victim; to be disturbed by jealousy at these

sacrifices being offered to other gods as well as to himself, than to

be himself offered on all altars to all devils, as mixed up not only

with all fruits, but also with all animals? Would it not have been

much better to be affected even with human anger, so as to be enraged

against both his friends and his enemies for their sins, than to be

himself influenced by fear as well as by anger wherever these passions

exist, or than to share in all the sin that is committed, and in all

punishment that is suffered? For this is the doom of that part of your

god which is in confinement everywhere, condemned to this by himself,

not as guilty, but in order to conquer his dreaded enemy. Doomed

himself to such a fatal necessity, the part of himself which he has

given over to condemnation might pardon him, if he were as humble as he

is miserable. But how can you pretend to find fault with God for His

anger against both friends and enemies when they sin, when the god of

your fancies first under compulsion compels his own members to go to be

devoured by sin, and then condemns them to remain in darkness? Though

he does this, you say that it will not be in anger. But will he not be

ashamed to punish, or to appear to punish, those from whom he should

ask pardon in words such as these: "Forgive me, I beseech you. You

are my members; could I treat you thus, except from necessity? You

know yourselves, that you were sent here because a formidable enemy had

arisen; and now you must remain here to prevent his rising again"?

Again, is it not better to slay thousands of men for trifling faults,

or for nothing, than to cast into the abyss of sin, and to condemn to

the punishment of eternal imprisonment, God's own members, his

substance--in fact, God himself? It cannot properly be said of the

real substance of God that it has the choice of sinning or not sinning,

for God's substance is absolutely unchangeable. God cannot sin, as He

cannot deny Himself. Man, on the contrary, can sin and deny God, or he

can choose not to do so. But suppose the members of your god had, like

a rational human soul, the choice of sinning or not sinning; they might

perhaps be justly punished for heinous offenses by confinement in the

mass of darkness. But you cannot attribute to these parts a liberty

which you deny to God himself. For if God had not given them up to

sin, he would have been forced to sin himself, by the prevalence of the

race of darkness. But if there was no danger of being thus forced, it

was a sin to send these parts to a place where they incurred this

danger. To do so, indeed, from free choice is a crime deserving the

torment which your god unnaturally inflicts upon his own parts, more

than the conduct of these parts in going by his command to a place

where they lost the power of living in righteousness. But if God

himself was in danger of being forced to sin by invasion and capture,

unless he had secured himself first by the misconduct and then by the

punishment of his own parts, there can have been no free-will either in

your god or in his parts. Let him not set himself up as judge, but

confess himself a criminal. For though he was forced against his own

will, he professes to pass a righteous sentence in condemning those

whom he knows to have suffered evil rather than done it; making this

profession that he may not be thought of as having been conquered; as

if it could do a beggar any good to be called prosperous and happy.

Surely it would have been better for your god to have spared neither

righteous nor wicked in indiscriminate punishment (which is Faustus'

last charge against our God), than to have been so cruel to his own

members,--first giving them up to incurable contamination, and then, as

if that was not enough, accusing them falsely of misconduct. Faustus

declares that they justly suffer this severe and eternal punishment,

because they allowed themselves to be led astray from their original

brightness, and became hostile to sacred light. But the reason of

this, as Faustus says, was that they were so greedily devoured in the

first assault of the princes of darkness, that they were unable to

recover themselves, or to separate themselves from the hostile

principle. These souls, therefore, did no evil themselves, but in all

this were innocent sufferers. The real agent was he who sent them away

from himself into this wretchedness. They suffered more from their

father than from their enemy. Their father sent them into all this

misery; while their enemy desired them as something good, wishing not

to hurt them, but to enjoy them. The one injured them knowingly, the

other in ignorance. This god was so weak and helpless that he could

not otherwise secure himself first against an enemy threatening attack,

and then against the same enemy in confinement. Let him, then, not

condemn those parts whose obedience defended him, and whose death

secures his safety. If he could not avoid the conflict, why slander

his defenders? When these parts allowed themselves to be led astray

from their original brightness, and became hostile to sacred light,

this must have been from the force of the enemy; and if they were

forced against their will, they are innocent; while, if they could have

resisted had they chosen, there is no need of the origin of evil in an

imaginary evil nature, since it is to be found in free-will. Their not

resisting, when they could have done so, is plainly their own fault,

and not owing to any force from without. For, supposing them able to

do a thing, to do which is right, while not to do it is great and

heinous sin, their not doing it is their own choice. So, then, if they

choose not to do it, the fault is in their will not in necessity. The

origin of sin is in the will; therefore in the will is also the origin

of evil, both in the sense of acting against a just precept, and in the

sense of suffering under a just sentence. There is thus no reason why,

in your search for the origin of evil, you should fall into so great an

evil as that of calling a nature so rich in good things the nature of

evil, and of attributing the terrible evil of necessity to the nature

of perfect good, before any commixture with evil. The cause of this

erroneous belief is your pride, which you need not have unless you

choose; but in your wish to defend at all hazards the error into which

you have fallen, you take away the origin of evil from free-will, and

place it in a fabulous nature of evil. And thus you come at last to

say, that the souls which are to be doomed to eternal confinement in

the mass of darkness became enemies to sacred light not from choice,

but by necessity; and to make your god a judge with whom it is of no

use to prove, in behalf of your clients. that they were under

compulsion, and a king who will make no allowance for your brethren,

his own sons and members, whose hostility against you and against

himself you ascribe not to choice, but to necessity. What shocking

cruelty! unless you proceed in the next place to defend your god, as

also acting not from choice, but by necessity. So, if there could be

found another judge free from necessity, who could decide the question

on the principles of equity, he would sentence your god to be bound to

this mass, not by being fastened on the outside, but by being shut up

inside along with the formidable enemy. The first in the guilt of

necessity ought to be first in the sentence of condemnation. Would it

not be much better, then, in comparison with such a god as this, to

choose the god whom we indeed do not worship, but whom you think or

pretend to think we worship? Though he spares not his servants,

whether righteous or sinful, making no proper separation, and not

distinguishing between punishment and discipline, is he not better than

the god who spares not his own members though innocent, if necessity is

no crime, or guilty from their obedience to him, if necessity itself is

criminal; so that they are condemned eternally by him, along with whom

they should have been released, if any liberty was recovered by the

victory, while he should have been condemned along with them if the

victory reduced the force of necessity even so far as to give this

small amount of force to justice? Thus the god whom you represent us

as worshipping, though he is not the one true God whom we really

worship, is far better than your god. Neither, indeed, has any

existence; but both are the creatures of your imaginations. But,

according to your own representations, the one whom you call ours, and

find fault with, is better than the one whom you call your own, and

whom you worship. [829]

23. So also the patriarchs and prophets whom you cry out against are

not the men whom we honor, but men whose characters are drawn from your

fancy, prompted by ill-will. And yet even thus as you paint them, I

will not be content with showing them to be superior to your elect, who

keep all the precepts of Manich�us, but will prove their superiority to

your god himself. Before proving this, however, I must, with the help

of God, defend our holy fathers the patriarchs and prophets against

your accusations, by a clear exposition of the truth as opposed to the

carnality of your hearts. As for you Manich�ans, it would be enough to

say that the faults you impute to our fathers are preferable to what

you praise in your own, and to complete your shame by adding that your

god can be proved far inferior to our fathers as you describe them.

This would be a sufficient reply for you. But as, even apart from your

perversities, some minds are of themselves disturbed when comparing the

life of the prophets in the Old Testament with that of the apostles in

the New,--not discerning between the manner of the time when the

promise was under a veil, and that of the time when the promise is

revealed,--I must first of all reply to those who either have the

boldness to pride themselves as superior in temperance to the prophets,

or quote the prophets in defence of their own bad conduct.

24. First of all, then, not only the speech of these men, but their

life also, was prophetic; and the whole kingdom of the Hebrews was like

a great prophet, corresponding to the greatness of the Person

prophesied. So, as regards those Hebrews who were made wise in heart

by divine instruction, we may discover a prophecy of the coming of

Christ and of the Church, both in what they said and in what they did;

and the same is true as regards the divine procedure towards the whole

nation as a body. For, as the apostle says, "all these things were our

examples."

25. Those who find fault with the prophets, accusing them of adultery

for instance, in actions which are above their comprehension, are like

those Pagans who profanely charge Christ with folly or madness because

He looked for fruit from a tree out of the season; [830] or with

childishness, because He stooped down and wrote on the ground, and,

after answering the people who were questioning Him, began writing

again. [831] Such critics are incapable of understanding that certain

virtues in great minds resemble closely the vices of little minds, not

in reality, but in appearance. Such criticism of the great is like

that of boys at school, whose learning consists in the important rule,

that if the nominative is in the singular, the verb must also be in the

singular; and so they find fault with the best Latin author, because he

says, Pars in frusta secant. [832] He should have written, say they,

secat. And again, knowing that religio is spelt with one l, they blame

him for writing relligio, when he says, Relligione patrum. [833]

Hence it may with reason be said, that as the poetical usage of words

differs from the solecisms and barbarisms of the unlearned, so, in

their own way, the figurative actions of the prophets differ from the

impure actions of the vicious. Accordingly, as a boy guilty of a

barbarism would be whipped if he pled the usage of Virgil; so any one

quoting the example of Abraham begetting a son from Hagar, in defence

of his own sinful passion for his wife's handmaid, ought to be

corrected not by caning only, but by severe scourging, that he may not

suffer the doom of adulterers in eternal punishment. This indeed is a

comparison of great and important subjects with trifles; and it is not

intended that a peculiar usage in speech should be put on a level with

a sacrament, or a solecism with adultery. Still, allowing for the

difference in the character of the subjects, what is called learning or

ignorance in the proprieties and improprieties of speech, resembles

wisdom or the want of it in reference to the grand moral distinction

between virtue and vice. [834]

26. Instead of entering on the distinctions between the praiseworthy

and the blameworthy, the criminal and the innocent, the dangerous and

the harmless, the guilty and the guiltless, the desirable and the

undesirable, which are all illustrations of the distinction between sin

and righteousness, we must first consider what sin is, and then examine

the actions of the saints as recorded in the holy books, that, if we

find these saints described as sinning, we may if possible discover the

true reason for keeping these sins in memory by putting them on

record. Again, if we find things recorded which, though they are not

sins, appear so to the foolish and the malevolent, and in fact do not

exhibit any virtues, here also we have to see why these things are put

into the Scriptures which we believe to contain wholesome doctrine as a

guide in the present life, and a title to the inheritance of the

future. As regards the examples of righteousness found among the acts

of the saints, the propriety of recording these must be plain even to

the ignorant. The question is about those actions the mention of which

may seem useless if they are neither righteous nor sinful, or even

dangerous if the actions are really sinful, as leading people to

imitate them, because they are not condemned in these books, and so may

be supposed not to be sinful, or because, though they are condemned,

men may copy them from the idea that they must be venial if saints did

them.

27. Sin, then, is any transgression in deed, or word, or desire, of

the eternal law. And the eternal law is the divine order or will of

God, which requires the preservation of natural order, and forbids the

breach of it. But what is this natural order in man? Man, we know,

consists of soul and body; but so does a beast. Again, it is plain

that in the order of nature the soul is superior to the body.

Moreover, in the soul of man there is reason, which is not in a beast.

Therefore, as the soul is superior to the body, so in the soul itself

the reason is superior by the law of nature to the other parts which

are found also in beasts; and in reason itself, which is partly

contemplation and partly action, contemplation is unquestionably the

superior part. The object of contemplation is the image of God, by

which we are renewed through faith to sight. Rational action ought

therefore to be subject to the control of contemplation, which is

exercised through faith while we are absent from the Lord, as it will

be hereafter through sight, when we shall be like Him, for we shall see

Him as He is. [835] Then in a spiritual body we shall by His grace be

made equal to angels, when we put on the garment of immortality and

incorruption, with which this mortal and corruptible shall be clothed,

that death may be swallowed up of victory, when righteousness is

perfected through grace. For the holy and lofty angels have also their

contemplation and action. They require of themselves the performance

of the commands of Him whom they contemplate, whose eternal government

they freely because sweetly obey. We, on the other hand, whose body is

dead because of sin, till God quicken also our mortal bodies by His

Spirit dwelling in us, live righteously in our feeble measure,

according to the eternal law in which the law of nature is preserved,

when we live by that faith unfeigned which works by love, having in a

good conscience a hope of immortality and incorruption laid up in

heaven, and of the perfecting of righteousness to the measure of an

inexpressible satisfaction, for which in our pilgrimage we must hunger

and thirst, while we walk by faith and not by sight.

28. A man, therefore, who acts in obedience to the faith which obeys

God, restrains all mortal affections, and keeps them within the natural

limit, regulating his desires so as to put the higher before the

lower. If there was no pleasure in what is unlawful, no one would

sin. To sin is to indulge this pleasure instead of restraining it.

And by unlawful is meant what is forbidden by the law in which the

order of nature is preserved. It is a great question whether there is

any rational creature for which there is no pleasure in what is

unlawful. If there is such a class of creatures, it does not include

man, nor that angelic nature which abode not in the truth. These

rational creatures were so made, that they had the potentiality of

restraining their desires from the unlawful; and in not doing this they

sinned. Great, then, is the creature man, for he is restored by this

potentiality, by which, if he had so chosen, he would not have fallen.

And great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised, who created man. For

He created also inferior natures which cannot sin, and superior natures

which will not sin. Beasts do not sin, for their nature agrees with

the eternal law from being subject to it, without being in possession

of it. And again, angels do not sin, because their heavenly nature is

so in possession of the eternal law that God is the only object of its

desire, and they obey His will without any experience of temptation.

But man, whose life on this earth is a trial on account of sin, subdues

to himself what he has in common with beasts, and subdues to God what

he has in common with angels; till, when righteousness is perfected and

immortality attained, he shall be raised from among beasts and ranked

with angels.

29. The exercise or indulgence of the bodily appetites is intended to

secure the continued existence and the invigoration of the individual

or of the species. If the appetites go beyond this, and carry the man,

no longer master of himself, beyond the limits of temperance, they

become unlawful and shameful lusts, which severe discipline must

subdue. But if this unbridled course ends in plunging the man into

such a depth of evil habits that he supposes that there will be no

punishment of his sinful passions, and so refuses the wholesome

discipline of confession and repentance by which he might be rescued;

or, from a still worse insensibility, justifies his own indulgences in

profane opposition to the eternal law of Providence; and if he dies in

this state, that unerring law sentences him now not to correction, but

to damnation.

30. Referring, then, to the eternal law which enjoins the preservation

of natural order and forbids the breach of it, let us see how our

father Abraham sinned, that is, how he broke this law, in the things

which Faustus has charged him with as highly criminal. In his

irrational craving to have children, says Faustus, and not believing

God, who promised that his wife Sara should have a son, he defiled

himself with a mistress. But here Faustus, in his irrational desire to

find fault, both discloses the impiety of his heresy, and in his error

and ignorance praises Abraham's intercourse with the handmaid. For as

the eternal law--that is, the will of God the Creator of all--for the

preservation of the natural order, permits the indulgence of the bodily

appetite under the guidance of reason in sexual intercourse, not for

the gratification of passion, but for the continuance of the race

through the procreation of children; so, on the contrary, the

unrighteous law of the Manich�ans, in order to prevent their god, whom

they bewail as confined in all seeds, from suffering still closer

confinement in the womb, requires married people not on any account to

have children, their great desire being to liberate their god.

Instead, therefore, of an irrational craving in Abraham to have

children, we find in Manich�us an irrational fancy against having

children. So the one preserved the natural order by seeking in

marriage only the production of a child; while the other, influenced by

his heretical notions, thought no evil could be greater than the

confinement of his god.

31. So, again, when Faustus says that the wife's being privy to her

husband's conduct made the matter worse, while he is prompted only by

the uncharitable wish to reproach Abraham and his wife, he really,

without intending it, speaks in praise of both. For Sara did not

connive at any criminal action in her husband for the gratification of

his unlawful passions; but from the same natural desire for children

that he had, and knowing her own barrenness, she warrantably claimed as

her own the fertility of her handmaid; not consenting with sinful

desires in her husband, but requesting of him what it was proper in him

to grant. Nor was it the request of proud assumption; for every one

knows that the duty of a wife is to obey her husband. But in reference

to the body, we are told by the apostle that the wife has power over

her husband's body, as he has over hers; [836] so that, while in all

other social matters the wife ought to obey her husband, in this one

matter of their bodily connection as man and wife their power over one

another is mutual,--the man over the woman, and the woman over the

man. So, when Sara could not have children of her own, she wished to

have them by her handmaid, and of the same seed from which she herself

would have had them, if that had been possible. No woman would do this

if her love for her husband were merely an animal passion; she would

rather be jealous of a mistress than make her a mother. So here the

pious desire for the procreation of children was an indication of the

absence of criminal indulgence.

32. Abraham, indeed, cannot be defended, if, as Faustus says, he

wished to get children by Hagar, because he had no faith in God, who

promised that he should have children by Sara. But this is an entire

mistake: this promise had not yet been made. Any one who reads the

preceding chapters will find that Abraham had already got the promise

of the land with a countless number of inhabitants, [837] but that it

had not yet been made known to him how the seed spoken of was to be

produced, whether by generation from his own body, or from his choice

in the adoption of a son, or, in the case of its being from his own

body, whether it would be by Sara or another. Whoever examines into

this will find that Faustus has made either an imprudent mistake or an

impudent misrepresentation. Abraham, then, when he saw that he had no

children, though the promise was to his seed, thought first of

adoption. This appears from his saying of his slave, when speaking to

God, "This is mine heir;" as much as to say, As Thou hast not given me

a seed of my own, fulfill Thy promise in this man. For the word seed

may be applied to what has not come out of a man's own body, else the

apostle could not call us the seed of Abraham: for we certainly are

not his descendants in the flesh; but we are his seed in following his

faith, by believing in Christ, whose flesh did spring from the flesh of

Abraham. Then Abraham was told by the Lord "This shall not be thine

heir; but he that cometh out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir."

[838] The thought of adoption was thus removed; but it still remained

uncertain whether the seed which was to come from himself would be by

Sara or another. And this God was pleased to keep concealed, till a

figure of the Old Testament had been supplied in the handmaid. We may

thus easily understand how Abraham, seeing that his wife was barren,

and that she desired to obtain from her husband and her handmaid the

offspring which she herself could not produce, acted not in compliance

with carnal appetite, but in obedience to conjugal authority, believing

that Sara had the sanction of God for her wish; because God had already

promised him an heir from his own body, but had not foretold who was to

be the mother. Thus, when Faustus shows his own infidelity in accusing

Abraham of unbelief, his groundless accusation only proves the madness

of the assailant. In other cases, Faustus' infidelity has prevented

him from understanding; but here, in his love of slander, he has not

even taken time to read.

33. Again, when Faustus accuses a righteous and faithful man of a

shameless profanation of his marriage from avarice and greed, by

selling his wife Sara at different times to the two kings Abimelech and

Pharaoh, telling them that she was his sister, because she was very

fair, he does not distinguish justly between right and wrong, but

unjustly condemns the whole transaction. Those who think that Abraham

sold his wife cannot discern in the light of the eternal law the

difference between sin and righteousness; and so they call perseverance

obstinacy, and confidence presumption, as in these and similar cases

men of wrong judgment are wont to blame what they suppose to be wrong

actions. Abraham did not become partner in crime with his wife by

selling her to others: but as she gave her handmaid to her husband,

not to gratify his passion, but for the sake of offspring, in the

authority she had consistently with the order of nature, requiring the

performance of a duty, not complying with a sinful desire; so in this

case, the husband, in perfect assurance of the chaste attachment of his

wife to himself, and knowing her mind to be the abode of modest and

virtuous affection, called her his sister, without saying that she was

his wife, lest he himself should be killed, and his wife fall into the

hands of strangers and evil-doers: for he was assured by his God that

He would not allow her to suffer violence or disgrace. Nor was he

disappointed in his faith and hope; for Pharaoh, terrified by strange

occurrences, and after enduring many evils on account of her, when he

was informed by God that Sara was Abraham's wife, restored her with

honor uninjured. Abimelech also did the same, after learning the truth

in a dream.

34. Some people, not scoffers and evil-speakers like Faustus, but men

who pay due honor to the Scriptures, which Faustus finds fault with

because he does not understand them, or which he fails to understand

because of his fault-finding, in commenting on this act of Abraham, are

of opinion that he stumbled from weakness of faith, and denied his wife

from fear of death, as Peter denied the Lord. If this is the correct

view, we must allow that Abraham sinned; but the sin should not cancel

or obliterate all his merits, any more than in the case of the

apostle. Besides, to deny his wife is not the same as to deny the

Saviour. But when there is another explanation, why not abide by it,

instead of giving blame without cause, since there is no proof that

Abraham told a lie from fear? He did not deny that Sara was his wife

in answer to any question on the subject; but when asked who she was,

he said she was his sister, without denying her to be his wife: he

concealed part of the truth, but said nothing false.

35. It is waste of time to observe Faustus' remark, that Abraham

falsely called Sara his sister; as if Faustus had discovered the family

of Sara, though it is not mentioned in Scripture. In a matter which

Abraham knew, and we do not, it is surely better to believe the

patriarch when he says what he knows, than to believe Manich�us when he

finds fault with what he knows nothing about. Since, then, Abraham

lived at that period in human history, when, though marriage had become

unlawful between children of the same parents, or of the same father or

mother, no law or authority interfered with the custom of marriage

between the children of brothers, or any less degree of consanguinity,

why should he not have had as wife his sister, that is, a woman

descended from his father? For he himself told the king, when he

restored Sara, that she was his sister by his father, and not by his

mother. And on this occasion he could not have been led to tell a

falsehood from fear, for the king knew that she was his wife, and was

restoring her with honor, because he had been warned by God. We learn

from Scripture that, among the ancients, it was customary to call

cousins brothers and sisters. Thus Tobias says in his prayer to God,

before having intercourse with his wife, "And now, O Lord, Thou knowest

that not in wantonness I take to wife my sister;" [839] though she was

not sprung immediately from the same father or the same mother, but

only belonged to the same family. And Lot is called the brother of

Abraham, though Abraham was his uncle. [840] And, by the same use of

the word, those called in the Gospel the Lord's brothers are certainly

not children of the Virgin Mary, but all the blood relations of the

Lord. [841]

36. Some may say, Why did not Abraham's confidence in God prevent his

being afraid to confess his wife? God could have warded off from him

the death which he feared, and could have protected both him and his

wife while among strangers, so that Sara, although very fair, should

not have been desired by any one, nor Abraham killed on account of

her. Of course, God could have done this; it would be absurd to deny

it. But if, in reply to the people, Abraham had told them that Sara

was his wife, his trust in God would have included both his own life

and the chastity of Sara. Now it is part of sound doctrine, that when

a man has any means in his power, he should not tempt the Lord his

God. So it was not because the Saviour was unable to protect His

disciples that He told them, "When ye are persecuted in one city, flee

to another." [842] And He Himself set the example. For though He had

the power of laying down His own life, and did not lay it down till He

chose to do so, still when an infant He fled to Egypt, carried by His

parents; [843] and when He went up to the feast, He went not openly,

but secretly, though at other times He spoke openly to the Jews, who in

spite of their rage and hostility could not lay hands on Him, because

His hour was not come, [844] --not the hour when He would be obliged to

die, but the hour when He would consider it seasonable to be put to

death. Thus He who displayed divine power by teaching and reproving

openly, without allowing the rage of his enemies to hurt Him, did also,

by escaping and concealing Himself, exhibit the conduct becoming the

feebleness of men, that they should not tempt God when they have any

means in their power of escaping threatened danger. So also in the

apostle, it was not from despair of divine assistance and protection,

or from loss of faith, that he was let down over the wall in a basket,

in order to escape being taken by his enemies: [845] not from want of

faith in God did he thus escape, but because not to escape, when this

escape was possible, would have been tempting God. Accordingly, when

Abraham was among strangers, and when, on account of the remarkable

beauty of Sara, both his life and her chastity were in danger, since it

was in his power to protect not both of these, but one only,--his life,

namely,--to avoid tempting God he did what he could; and in what he

could not do, he trusted to God. Unable to conceal his being a man, he

concealed his being a husband, lest he should be put to death; trusting

to God to preserve his wife's purity.

37. There might also be a difference of opinion on the nice point

whether Sara's chastity would have been violated even if some one had

intercourse with her, since she submitted to this to save her husband's

life, both with his knowledge and by his authority. In this there

would be no desertion of conjugal fidelity or rebellion against her

husband's authority; in the same way as Abraham was not an adulterer,

when, in submission to the lawful authority of his wife, he consented

to be made a father by his wife's handmaid. But, from the nature of

the relationship, for a wife to have two husbands, both in life, is not

the same thing as for a man to have two wives: so that we regard the

explanation already given of Abraham's conduct as the most correct and

unobjectionable; that our father Abraham avoided tempting God by taking

what measures he could for the preservation of his own life, and that

he showed his hope in God by entrusting to Him the chastity of his

wife.

38. But a pleasure which all must feel is obtained from this narrative

so faithfully recorded in the Holy Scriptures, when we examine into the

prophetic character of the action, and knock with pious faith and

diligence at the door of the mystery, that the Lord may open, and show

us who was prefigured in the ancient personage, and whose wife this is,

who, while in a foreign land and among strangers, is not allowed to be

stained or defiled, that she may be brought to her own husband without

spot or wrinkle. Thus we find that the righteous life of the Church is

for the glory of Christ, that her beauty may bring honor to her

husband, as Abraham was honored on account of the beauty of Sara among

the inhabitants of that foreign land. To the Church, to whom it is

said in the Song of Songs, "O thou fairest among women," [846] kings

offer gifts in acknowledgment of her beauty; as king Abimelech offered

gifts to Sara, admiring the grace of her appearance; all the more that,

while he loved, he was not allowed to profane it. The holy Church, too

is in secret the spouse of the Lord Jesus Christ. For it is secretly,

and in the hidden depths of the Spirit, that the soul of man is joined

to the word of God, so that they two are one flesh; of which the

apostle speaks as a great mystery in marriage, as referring to Christ

and the Church. [847] Again, the earthly kingdom of this world,

typified by the kings which were not allowed to defile Sara, had no

knowledge or experience of the Church as the spouse of Christ, that is,

of how faithfully she maintained her relation to her Husband, till it

tried to violate her, and was compelled to yield to the divine

testimony borne by the faith of the martyrs, and in the person of later

monarchs was brought humbly to honor with gifts the Bride whom their

predecessors had not been able to humble by subduing her to

themselves. What, in the type, happened in the reign of one and the

same king, is fulfilled in the earlier monarchs of this era and their

successors.

39. Again, when it is said that the Church is the sister of Christ,

not by the mother but by the father, we learn the excellence of the

relation, which is not of the temporary nature of earthly descent, but

of divine grace, which is everlasting. By this grace we shall no

longer be a race of mortals when we receive power to be called and to

become sons of God. This grace we obtain not from the synagogue, which

is the mother of Christ after the flesh, but from God the Father. And

when Christ calls us into another life where there is no death, He

teaches us, instead of acknowledging, to deny the earthly relationship,

where death soon follows upon birth; for He says to His disciples,

"Call no man your father upon earth; for you have one Father, who is in

heaven." [848] And He set us an example of this when He said, "Who is

my mother, and who are my brethren? And stretching forth His hand to

His disciples, He said, These are my brethren." And lest any one

should think that He referred to an earthly relationship, He added,

"Whosoever shall do the will of my Father, the same is my brother, and

sister, and mother;" [849] as much as to say, I derive this

relationship from God my Father, not from the Synagogue my mother; I

call you to eternal life, where I have an immortal birth, not to

earthly life, for to call you away from this life I have taken

mortality.

40. As for the reason why, though it is concealed among strangers

whose wife the Church is, it is not hidden whose sister she is, it is

plainly because it is obscure and hard to understand how the human soul

and the Word of God are united or mingled, or whatever word may be used

to express this connection between God and the creature. It is from

this connection that Christ and the Church are called bridegroom and

bride, or husband and wife. The other relationship, in which Christ

and all the saints are brethren by divine grace and not by earthly

consanguinity, or by the father and not by the mother, is more easily

expressed in words, and more easily understood. For the same grace

makes all the saints to be also brethren of one another; while in their

society no one is the bridegroom of all the rest. So also,

notwithstanding the surpassing justice and wisdom of Christ, His

manhood was much more plainly and readily recognized by strangers, who,

indeed, were not wrong in believing Him to be man, but they did not

understand His being God as well as man. Hence Jeremiah says: "He is

both a man, and who shall know Him?" [850] He is a man, for it is

made manifest that He is a brother. And who shall know Him? for it is

concealed that He is a husband. This must suffice as a defense of our

father Abraham against Faustus' impudence and ignorance and malice.

41. Lot also, the brother of Abraham, was just and hospitable in

Sodom, and was found worthy to escape the conflagration which

prefigured the future judgment; for he was free from all participation

in the corruption of the people of Sodom. He was a type of the body of

Christ, which in the person of all the saints both groans now among the

ungodly and wicked, to whose evil deeds it does not consent, and will

at the end of the world be rescued from their society, when they are

doomed to the punishment of eternal fire. Lot's wife was the type of a

different class of men,--of those, namely, who, when called by the

grace of God, look back, instead of, like Paul, forgetting the things

that are behind, and looking forward to the things that are before.

[851] The Lord Himself says: "No man that putteth his hand to the

plough, and looketh back, is fit for the kingdom of Heaven." [852]

Nor did He omit to mention the case of Lot's wife; for she, for our

warning, was turned into a pillar of salt, that being thus seasoned we

might not trifle thoughtlessly with this danger, but be on our guard

against it. So, when the Lord was admonishing every one to get rid of

the things that are behind by the most strenuous endeavor to reach the

things that are before, He said, "Remember Lot's wife." [853] And, in

addition to these, there is still a third type in Lot, when his

daughters lay with him. For here Lot seems to prefigure the future

law; for those who spring from the law, and are placed under the law,

by misunderstanding it, stupefy it, as it were, and bring forth the

works of unbelief by an unlawful use of the law. "The law is good"

says the apostle, "if a man use it lawfully." [854]

42. It is no excuse for this action of Lot or of his daughters that it

represented the perversity which was afterwards in certain cases to be

displayed. The purpose of Lot's daughters is one thing, and the

purpose of God is another, in allowing this to happen that He might

make some truth manifest; for God both pronounces judgment on the

actions of the people of those times, and arranges in His providence

for the prefigurement of the future. As a part of Scripture, this

action is a prophecy; as part of the history of those concerned, it is

a crime.

43. At the same time there is in this transaction no reason for the

torrent of abuse which Faustus' blind hostility discharges on it. By

the eternal law which requires the preservation of the order of nature

and condemns its violation, the judgment in this case is not what it

would have been if Lot had been prompted by a criminal passion to

commit incest with his daughters, or if they had been inflamed with

unnatural desires. In justice, we must ask not only what was done, but

with what motive, in order to obtain a fair view of the action as the

effect of that motive. The resolution of Lot's daughters to lie with

their father was the effect of the natural desire for offspring in

order to preserve the race; for they supposed that there were no other

men to be found, thinking that the whole world had been consumed in

that conflagration, which, for all they knew, had left no one alive but

themselves. It would have been better for them never to have been

mothers, than to have become mothers by their own father. But still,

the fulfillment of a desire like this is very different from the

accursed gratification of lust.

44. Knowing that their father would condemn their design, Lot's

daughters thought it necessary to fulfill it without his knowledge. We

are told that they made him drunk, so that he was unaware of what

happened. His guilt therefore is not that of incest, but of

drunkenness. This, too, is condemned by the eternal law, which allows

meat and drink only as required by nature for the preservation of

health. There is, indeed, a great difference between a drunk man and

an habitual drunkard; for the drunkard is not always drunk, and a man

may be drunk on one occasion without being a drunkard. However, in the

case of a righteous man, we require to account for even one instance of

drunkenness. What can have made Lot consent to receive from his

daughters all the cups of wine which they went on mixing for him, or

perhaps giving him unmixed? Did they feign excessive grief, and did he

resort to this consolation in their loneliness, and in the loss of

their mother, thinking that they were drinking too, while they only

pretended to drink? But this does not seem a proper method for a

righteous man to take in consoling his friends when in trouble. Had

the daughters learned in Sodom some vile art which enabled them to

intoxicate their father with a few cups, so that in his ignorance he

might sin, or rather be sinned against? But it is not likely that the

Scripture would have omitted all notice of this, or that God would have

allowed His servant to be thus abused without any fault of his own.

45. But we are defending the sacred Scriptures, not man's sins. Nor

are we concerned to justify this action, as if our God had either

commanded it or approved of it; or as if, when men are called just in

Scripture, it meant that they could not sin if they chose. And as, in

the books which those critics find fault with, God nowhere expresses

approval of this action, what thoughtless folly it is to bring a charge

from this narrative against these writings, when in other places such

actions are condemned by express prohibitions! In the story of Lot's

daughters the action is related, not commended. And it is proper that

the judgment of God should be declared in some cases, and concealed in

others, that by its manifestation our ignorance may be enlightened, and

that by its concealment our minds may be improved by the exercise of

recalling what we already know, or our indolence stimulated to seek for

an explanation. Here, then, God, who can bring good out of evil, made

nations arise from this origin, as He saw good, but did not bring upon

His own Scriptures the guilt of man's sin. It is God's writing, but

not His doing; He does not propose these things for our imitation, but

holds them up for our warning.

46. Faustus' effrontery appears notably in his accusing Isaac also,

the son of Abraham of pretending that his wife Rebecca was his sister.

[855] For as regards the family of Rebecca Scripture is not silent,

and it appears that she was his sister in the well-known sense of the

word. His concealing that she was his wife is not surprising, nor is

it insignificant, if he did it in imitation of his father, so that he

can be justified on the same grounds. We need only refer to the answer

already given to Faustus' charge against Abraham, as being equally

applicable to Isaac. Perhaps, however some inquirer will ask what

typical significance there is in the foreign king discovering Rebecca

to be the wife of Isaac by seeing him playing with her; for he would

not have known, had he not seen Isaac playing with Rebecca as it would

have been improper to do with a woman not his wife. When holy men act

thus as husbands, they do it not foolishly, but designedly: for they

accommodate themselves to the nature of the weaker sex in words and

actions of gentle playfulness; not in effeminacy, but in subdued

manliness. But such behavior towards any woman except a wife would be

disgraceful. This is a question in good manners, which is referred to

only in case some stern advocate of insensibility should find fault

with the holy man even for playing with his wife. For if these men

without humanity see a sedate man chatting playfully with children that

he may adapt himself to the childish understanding with kindly

sympathy, they think that he is insane; forgetting that they themselves

were once children, or unthankful for their maturity. The typical

meaning, as regards Christ and His Church, which is to be found in this

great patriarch playing with his wife, and in the conjugal relation

being thus discovered, will be seen by every one who, to avoid

offending the Church by erroneous doctrine, carefully studies in

Scripture the secret of the Church's Bridegroom. He will find that the

Husband of the Church concealed for a time in the form of a servant the

majesty in which He was equal to the Father, as being in the form of

God, that feeble humanity might be capable of union with Him, and that

so He might accommodate Himself to His spouse. So far from being

absurd, it has a symbolic suitableness that the prophet of God should

use a playfulness which is of the flesh to meet the affection of his

wife, as the Word of God Himself became flesh that He might dwell among

us.

47. Again, Jacob the son of Isaac is charged with having committed a

great crime because he had four wives. But here there is no ground for

a criminal accusation: for a plurality of wives was no crime when it

was the custom; and it is a crime now, because it is no longer the

custom. There are sins against nature, and sins against custom, and

sins against the laws. In which, then, of these senses did Jacob sin

in having a plurality of wives? As regards nature, he used the women

not for sensual gratification, but for the procreation of children.

For custom, this was the common practice at that time in those

countries. And for the laws, no prohibition existed. The only reason

of its being a crime now to do this, is because custom and the laws

forbid it. Whoever despises these restraints, even though he uses his

wives only to get children, still commits sin, and does an injury to

human society itself, for the sake of which it is that the procreation

of children is required. In the present altered state of customs and

laws, men can have no pleasure in a plurality of wives, except from an

excess of lust; and so the mistake arises of supposing that no one

could ever have had many wives but from sensuality and the vehemence of

sinful desires. Unable to form an idea of men whose force of mind is

beyond their conception, they compare themselves with themselves, as

the apostle says, [856] and so make mistakes. Conscious that, in their

intercourse though with one wife only, they are often influenced by

mere animal passion instead of an intelligent motive, they think it an

obvious inference that, if the limits of moderation are not observed

where there is only one wife, the infirmity must be aggravated where

there are more than one.

48. But those who have not the virtues of temperance must not be

allowed to judge of the conduct of holy men, any more than those in

fever of the sweetness and wholesomeness of food. Nourishment must be

provided not by the dictates of the sickly taste, but rather by the

judgment and direction of health, so as to cure the sickness. If our

critics, then, wish to attain not a spurious and affected, but a

genuine and sound moral health, let them find a cure in believing the

Scripture record, that the honorable name of saint is given not without

reason to men who had several wives; and that the reason is this, that

the mind can exercise such control over the flesh as not to allow the

appetite implanted in our nature by Providence to go beyond the limits

of deliberate intention. By a similar misunderstanding, this

criticism, which consists rather in dishonest slander than in honest

judgment, might accuse the holy apostles too of preaching the gospel to

so many people, not from the desire of begetting children to eternal

life, but from the love of human praise. There was no lack of renown

to these our fathers in the gospel, for their praise was spread in

numerous tongues through the churches of Christ. In fact, no greater

honor and glory could have been paid by men to their fellow-creatures.

It was the sinful desire for this glory in the Church which led the

reprobate Simon in his blindness to wish to purchase for money what was

freely bestowed on the apostles by divine grace. [857] There must

have been this desire of glory in the man whom the Lord in the Gospel

checks in his desire to follow Him, saying, "The foxes have holes, and

the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of man hath not where to

lay His Head." [858] The Lord saw that his mind was darkened by false

appearances and elated by sudden emotion, and that there was no ground

of faith to afford a lodging to the Teacher of humility; for in

Christ's discipleship the man sought not Christ's grace, but his own

glory. By this love of glory those were led away whom the Apostle Paul

characterizes as preaching Christ not sincerely, but of contention and

envy; and yet the apostle rejoices in their preaching, knowing that it

might happen that, while the preachers gratified their desire for human

praise, believers might be born among their hearers,--not as the result

of the envious feeling which made them wish to rival or surpass the

fame of the apostles, but by means of the gospel which they preached,

though not sincerely; so that God might bring good out of their evil.

So a man may be induced to marry by sensual desire, and not to beget

children; and yet a child may be born, a good work of God, due to the

natural power, not to the misconduct of the parent. As, therefore, the

holy apostles were gratified when their doctrine met with acceptance

from their hearers, not because they were greedy for praise, but

because they desired to spread the truth; so the holy patriarchs in

their conjugal intercourse were actuated not by the love of pleasure,

but by the intelligent desire for the continuance of their family.

Thus the number of their hearers did not make the apostles ambitious;

nor did the number of their wives make the patriarchs licentious. But

why defend the husbands, to whose character the divine word bears the

highest testimony, when it appears that the wives themselves looked

upon their connection with their husbands only as a means of getting

sons? So, when they found themselves barren, they gave their handmaids

to their husbands; so that while the handmaids had the fleshly

motherhood, the wives were mothers in intention.

49. Faustus makes a most groundless statement when he accuses the four

women of quarreling like abandoned characters for the possession of

their husband. Where Faustus read this I know not, unless it was in

his own heart, as in a book of impious delusions, in which Faustus

himself is seduced by that serpent with regard to whom the apostle

feared for the Church, which he desired to present as a chaste virgin

to Christ; lest, as the serpent had deceived Eve by his subtlety, so he

should also corrupt their minds by turning them away from the

simplicity of Christ. [859] The Manich�ans are so fond of this

serpent, that they assert that he did more good than harm. From him

Faustus must have got his mind corrupted with the lies instilled into

it, which he now reproduces in these infamous calumnies, and is even

bold enough to put down in writing. It is not true that one of the

handmaids carried off Jacob from the other, or that they quarreled

about possessing him. There was arrangement, because there was no

licentious passion; and the law of conjugal authority was all the

stronger that there was none of the lawlessness of fleshly desire. His

being hired by one of his wives proves what is here said, in plain

opposition to the libels of the Manich�ans. Why should one have hired

him, unless by the arrangement he was to have gone in to the other? It

does not follow that he would never have gone in to Leah unless she had

hired him. He must have gone to her always in her turn, for he had

many children by her; and in obedience to her he had children by her

hand-maid, and afterwards, without any hiring, by herself. On this

occasion it was Rachel's turn, so that she had the power so expressly

mentioned in the New Testament by the apostle, "The husband hath not

power over his own body, but the wife." [860] Rachel had a bargain

with her sister, and, being in her sister's debt, she referred her to

Jacob, her own debtor. For the apostle uses this figure when he says,

"Let the husband render unto the wife what is due." [861] Rachel gave

what was in her power as due from her husband, in return for what she

had chosen to take from her sister.

50. If Jacob had been of such a character as Faustus in his incurable

blindness supposes, and not a servant of righteousness rather than of

concupiscence, would he not have been looking forward eagerly all day

to the pleasure of passing the night with the more beautiful of his

wives, whom he certainly loved more than the other, and for whom he

paid the price of twice seven years of gratuitous service? How, then,

at the close of the day, on his way to his beloved, could he have

consented to be turned aside, if he had been such as the ignorant

Manich�ans represent him? Would he not have disregarded the wish of

the women, and insisted upon going to the fair Rachel, who belonged to

him that night not only as his lawful wife, but also as coming in

regular order? He would thus have used his power as a husband, for the

wife also has not power over her own body, but the husband; and having

on this occasion the arrangement in their obedience in favor of the

gratification of his love of beauty, he might have enforced his

authority the more successfully. In that case it would be to the

credit of the women, that while he thought of his own pleasure they

contended about having a son. As it was, this virtuous man, in manly

control of sensual appetite, thought more of what was due from him than

to him, and instead of using his power for his own pleasure, consented

to be only the debtor in this mutual obligation. So he consented to

pay the debt to the person to whom she to whom it was due wished him to

pay it. When, by this private bargain of his wives, Jacob was suddenly

and unexpectedly forced to turn from the beautiful wife to the plain

one, he did not give way either to anger or to disappointment, nor did

he try to persuade his wives to let him have his own way; but, like a

just husband and an intelligent parent, seeing his wives concerned

about the production of children, which was all he himself desired in

marriage, he thought it best to yield to their authority, in desiring

that each should have a child: for, since all the children were his,

his own authority was not impaired. As if he had said to them:

Arrange as you please among yourselves which is to be the mother; it

matters not to me, since in any case I am the father. This control

over the appetites, and simple desire to beget children, Faustus would

have been clever enough to see and approve, unless his mind had been

corrupted by the shocking tenets of his sect, which lead him to find

fault with everything in the Scripture, and, moreover, teach him to

condemn as the greatest crime the procreation of children, which is the

proper design of marriage.

51. Now, having defended the character of the patriarch, and refuted

an accusation arising from these detestable errors, let us avail

ourselves of the opportunity of searching out the symbolical meaning,

and let us knock with the reverence of faith, that the Lord may open to

us the typical significance of the four wives of Jacob, of whom two

were free, and two slaves. We see that, in the wife and bond-slaves of

Abraham, the apostle understands the two Testaments. [862] But there,

one represents each; here, the application does not suit so well, as

there are two and two. There, also, the son of the bond-slave is

disinherited; but here the sons of the slaves receive the land of

promise along with the sons of the free women: so that this type must

have a different meaning.

52. Supposing that the two free wives point to the New Testament, by

which we are called to liberty, what is the meaning of there being

two? Perhaps because in Scripture, as the attentive reader will find,

we are said to have two lives in the body of Christ,--one temporal, in

which we suffer pain, and one eternal, in which we shall behold the

blessedness of God. We see the one in the Lord's passion, and the

other in His resurrection. The names of the women point to this

meaning: It is said that Leah means Suffering, and Rachel the First

Principle made visible, or the Word which makes the First Principle

visible. The action, then, of our mortal human life, in which we live

by faith, doing many painful tasks without knowing what benefit may

result from them to those in whom we are interested, is Leah, Jacob's

first wife. And thus she is said to have had weak eyes. For the

purposes of mortals are timid, and our plans uncertain. Again, the

hope of the eternal contemplation of God, accompanied with a sure and

delightful perception of truth, is Rachel. And on this account she is

described as fair and well-formed. This is the beloved of every pious

student, and for this he serves the grace of God, by which our sins,

though like scarlet, are made white as snow. [863] For Laban means

making white; and we read that Jacob served Laban for Rachel. [864]

No man turns to serve righteousness, in subjection to the grace of

forgiveness, but that he may live in peace in the Word which makes

visible the First Principle, or God; that is, he serves for Rachel, not

for Leah. For what a man loves in the works of righteousness is not

the toil of doing and suffering. No one desires this life for its own

sake; as Jacob desired not Leah, who yet was brought to him, and became

his wife, and the mother of children. Though she could not be loved of

herself, the Lord made her be borne with as a step to Rachel; and then

she came to be approved of on account of her children. Thus every

useful servant of God, brought into His grace by which his sins are

made white, has in his mind, and heart, and affection, when he thus

turns to God, nothing but the knowledge of wisdom. This we often

expect to attain as a reward for practising the seven precepts of the

law which concern the love of our neighbor, that we injure no one:

namely, Honor thy father and mother; Thou shall not commit adultery;

Thou shall not kill; Thou shalt not steal; Thou shall not bear false

witness; Thou shalt not desire thy neighbor's wife; Thou shall not

covet thy neighbor's property. When a man has obeyed these to the best

of his ability, and, instead of the bright joys of truth which he

desired and hoped for, finds in the darkness of the manifold trials of

this world that he is bound to painful endurance, or has embraced Leah

instead of Rachel, if there is perseverance in his love, he bears with

the one in order to attain the other; and as if it were said to him,

Serve seven other years for Rachel, he hears seven new commands,--to be

poor in spirit, to be meek, to be a mourner, to hunger and thirst after

righteousness, to be merciful, pure, and a peacemaker. [865] A man

would desire, if it were possible, to obtain at once the joys of lovely

and perfect wisdom, without the endurance of toil in action and

suffering; but this is impossible in mortal life. This seems to be

meant, when it is said to Jacob: "It is not the custom in our country

to marry the younger before the elder." [866] The elder may very well

mean the first in order of time. So, in the discipline of man, the

toil of doing the work of righteousness precedes the delight of

understanding the truth.

53. To this purpose it is written: "Thou hast desired wisdom; keep

the commandments, and the Lord shall give it thee." [867] The

commandments are those concerning righteousness, and the righteousness

is that which is by faith, surrounded with the uncertainty of

temptations; so that understanding is the reward of a pious belief of

what is not yet understood. The meaning I have given to these words,

"Thou hast desired wisdom; keep the commandments, and the Lord shall

give it thee," I find also in the passage, "Unless ye believe, ye shall

not understand;" [868] showing that as righteousness is by faith,

understanding comes by wisdom. Accordingly, in the case of those who

eagerly demand evident truth, we must not condemn the desire, but

regulate it, so that beginning with faith it may proceed to the desired

end through good works. The life of virtue is one of toil; the end

desired is unclouded wisdom. Why should I believe, says one, what is

not clearly proved? Let me hear some word which will disclose the

first principle of all things. This is the one great craving of the

rational soul in the pursuit of truth. And the answer is, What you

desire is excellent, and well worthy of your love; but Leah is to be

married first, and then Rachel. The proper effect of your eagerness is

to lead you to submit to the right method, instead of rebelling against

it; for without this method you cannot attain what you so eagerly long

for. And when it is attained, the possession of the lovely form of

knowledge will be in this world accompanied with the toils of

righteousness. For however clear and true our perception in this life

may be of the unchangeable good, the mortal body is still a weight on

the mind and the earthly tabernacle is a clog on the intellect in its

manifold activity. The end then, is one, but many things must be gone

through for the sake of it.

54. Thus Jacob has two free wives; for both are daughters of the

remission of sins, or of whitening, that is, of Laban. One is loved,

the other is borne. But she that is borne is the most and the soonest

fruitful, that she may be loved, if not for herself, at least for her

children. For the toil of the righteous is specially fruitful in those

whom they beget for the kingdom of God, by preaching the gospel amid

many trials and temptations; and they call those their joy and crown

[869] for whom they are in labors more abundantly, in stripes above

measure, in deaths often, [870] --for whom they have fightings without

and fears within. [871] Such births result most easily and

plentifully from the word of faith, the preaching of Christ crucified,

which speaks also of His human nature as far as it can be easily

understood, so as not to hurt the weak eyes of Leah. Rachel, again,

with clear eye, is beside herself to God, [872] and sees in the

beginning the Word of God with God, and wishes to bring forth, but

cannot; for who shall declare His generation? So the life devoted to

contemplation, in order to see with no feeble mental eye things

invisible to flesh, but understood by the things that are made, and to

discern the ineffable manifestation of the eternal power and divinity

of God, seeks leisure from all occupation, and is therefore barren. In

this habit of retirement, where the fire of meditation burns bright,

there is a want of sympathy with human weakness, and with the need men

have of our help in their calamities. This life also burns with the

desire for children (for it wishes to teach what it knows, and not to

go with the corruption of envy [873] ), and sees its sister-life fully

occupied with work and with bringing forth; and it grieves that men run

after that virtue which cares for their wants and weaknesses, instead

of that which has a divine imperishable lesson to impart. This is what

is meant when it is said, "Rachel envied her sister." [874] Moreover,

as the pure intellectual perception of that which is not matter, and so

is not the object of the bodliy sense, cannot be expressed in words

which spring from the flesh, the doctrine of wisdom prefers to get some

lodging for divine truth in the mind by whatever material figures and

illustrations occur, rather than to give up teaching these things; and

thus Rachel preferred that her husband should have children by her

handmaid, rather than that she should be without any children. Bilhah,

the name of her handmaid, is said to mean old; and so, even when we

speak of the spiritual and unchangeable nature of God, ideas are

suggested relating to the old life of the bodily senses.

55. Leah, too, got children by her handmaid, from the desire of having

a numerous family. Zilpah, her handmaid, is, interpreted, an open

mouth. So Leah's handmaid represents those who are spoken of in

Scripture as engaging in the preaching of the gospel with open mouth,

but not with open heart. Thus it is written of some: "This people

honor me with their lips, but their heart is far from me." [875] To

such the apostle says: "Thou that preachest that a man should not

steal, dost thou steal? Thou that sayest a man should not commit

adultery, dost thou commit adultery?" [876] But that even by this

arrangement the free wife of Jacob, the type of labor or endurance,

might obtain children to be heirs of the kingdom, the Lord says: "What

they say, do; but do not after their works." [877] And again, the

apostolic life, when enduring imprisonment, says: "Whether Christ is

preached in pretence or in truth, I therein do rejoice, yea, and will

rejoice." [878] It is the joy of the mother over her numerous family,

though born of her handmaid.

56. In one instance Leah owed her becoming a mother to Rachel, who, in

return for some mandrakes, allowed her husband to give her night to her

sister. Some, I know, think that eating this fruit has the effect of

making barren women productive, and that Rachel, from her desire for

children, was thus bent on getting the fruit from her sister. But I

should not agree to this, even had Rachel conceived at the time. As

Leah then conceived, and, besides, had two other children before God

opened Rachel's womb, there is no reason for supposing any such quality

in the mandrake, without any experience to prove it. I will give my

explanation; those better able than I may give a better. Though this

fruit is not often met with, I had once, to my great satisfaction, on

account of its connection with this passage of Scripture, an

opportunity of seeing it. I examined the fruit as carefully as I

could, not with the help of any recondite knowledge of the nature of

roots or the virtues of plants, but only as to what I or any one might

learn from the sight, and smell, and taste. I thought it a

nice-looking fruit, and sweet-smelling, but insipid; and I confess it

is hard to say why Rachel desired it so much, unless it was for its

rarity and its sweet smell. Why the incident should be narrated in

Scripture, in which the fancies of women would not be mentioned as

important unless it was intended that we should learn some important

lesson from them, the only thing I can think of is the very simple idea

that the fruit represents a good character; not the praise given a man

by a few just and wise people, but popular report, which bestows

greatness and renown on a man, and which is not desirable for its own

sake, but is essential to the success of good men in their endeavors to

benefit their fellow-men. So the apostle says, that it is proper to

have a good report of those that are without; [879] for though they are

not infallible, the lustre of their praise and the odor of their good

opinion are a great help to the efforts of those who seek to benefit

them. And this popular renown is not obtained by those that are

highest in the Church, unless they expose themselves to the toils and

hazards of an active life. Thus the son of Leah found the mandrakes

when he went out into the field, that is, when walking honestly towards

those that are without. The pursuit of wisdom, on the other hand,

retired from the busy crowd, and lost in calm meditation, could never

obtain a particle of this public approval, except through those who

take the management of public business, not for the sake of being

leaders, but in order to be useful. These men of action and business

exert themselves for the public benefit, and by a popular use of their

influence gain the approval of the people even for the quiet life of

the student and inquirer after truth; and thus through Leah the

mandrakes come into the hands of Rachel. Leah herself got them from

her first-born son, that is, in honor of her fertility, which

represents all the useful result of a laborious life exposed to the

common vicissitudes; a life which many avoid on account of its

troublesome engagements, because, although they might be able to take

the lead, they are bent on study, and devote all their powers to the

quiet pursuit of knowledge, in love with the beauty of Rachel.

57. But as it is right that this studious life should gain public

approval by letting itself be known, while it cannot rightly gain this

approval if it keeps its follower in retirement, instead of using his

powers for the management of ecclesiastical affairs, and so prevents

his being generally useful; to this purpose Leah says to her sister,

"Is it a small matter that thou hast taken my husband? and wouldest

thou take away my son's mandrakes also?" [880] The husband represents

all those who, though fit for active life, and able to govern the

Church, in administering to believers the mystery of the faith, from

their love of learning and of the pursuit of wisdom, desire to

relinquish all troublesome occupations, and to bury themselves in the

classroom. Thus the words, "Is it a small matter that thou hast taken

my husband? and wouldest thou take away my son's mandrakes also?" mean,

"Is it a small matter that the life of study keeps in retirement men

required for the toils of public life? and does it ask for popular

renown as well?"

58. To get this renown justly, Rachel gives her husband to her sister

for the night; that is, those who, by a talent for business, are fitted

for government, must for the public benefit consent to bear the burden

and suffer the hardships of public life; lest the pursuit of wisdom, to

which their leisure is devoted, should be evil spoken of, and should

not gain from the multitude the good opinion, represented by the fruit,

which is necessary for the encouragement of their pupils. But the life

of business must be forced upon them. This is clearly shown by Leah's

meeting Jacob when coming from the field, and laying hold of him,

saying, "Thou shalt come in to me; for I have hired thee with my son's

mandrakes." [881] As if she said, Dost thou wish the knowledge which

thou lovest to be well thought of? Do not shirk the toil of business.

The same thing happens constantly in the Church. What we read is

explained by what we meet with in our own experience. Do we not

everywhere see men coming from secular employments, to seek leisure for

the study and contemplation of truth, their beloved Rachel, and

intercepted mid-way by ecclesiastical affairs, which require them to be

set to work, as if Leah said to them, You must come in to me? When

such men minister in sincerity the mystery of God, so as in the night

of this world to beget sons in the faith, popular approval is gained

also for that life, in love for which they were led to abandon worldly

pursuits, and from the adoption of which they were called away to

undertake the benevolent task of government. In all their labors they

aim chiefly at this, that their chosen way of life may have greater and

wider renown, as having supplied the people with such leaders; as Jacob

consents to go with Leah, that Rachel may obtain the sweet-smelling and

good-looking fruit. Rachel, too, in course of time, by the mercy of

God, brings forth a child herself, but not till after some time; for it

seldom happens that there is a sound, though only partial,

apprehension, without fleshly ideas, of such sacred lessons of wisdom

as this: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,

and the Word was God." [882]

59. This must suffice as a reply to the false accusations brought by

Faustus against the three fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, from whom

the God whom the Catholic Church worship was pleased to take His name.

This is not the place to discourse on the merits and piety of these

three men, or on the dignity of their prophetic character, which is

beyond the comprehension of carnal minds. It is enough in this

treatise to defend them against the calumnious attacks of malevolence

and falsehood, in case those who read the Scriptures in a carping and

hostile spirit should fancy that they have proved anything against the

sacredness and the profitableness of these books, by their attempts to

blacken the character of men who are there mentioned so honorably.

60. It should be added that Lot, the brother, that is the blood

relation, of Abraham, is not to be ranked as equal to those of whom God

says, "I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob;" nor does he

belong to those testified to in Scripture as having continued righteous

to the end, although in Sodom he lived a pious and virtuous life, and

showed a praiseworthy hospitality, so that he was rescued from the

fire, and a land was given by God to his seed to dwell in, for the sake

of his uncle Abraham. On these accounts he is commended in

Scripture--not for intemperance or incest. But when we find bad and

good actions recorded of the same person, we must take warning from the

one, and example from the other. As, then, the sin of Lot, of whom we

are told that he was righteous previous to this sin, instead of

bringing a stain on the character of God, or the truth of Scripture,

rather calls on us to approve and admire the record in its resemblance

to a faithful mirror, which reflects not only the beauties and

perfections, but also the faults and deformities, of those who approach

it; still more, in the case of Judah, who lay with his daughter-in-law,

we may see how groundless are the reproaches cast on the narrative.

The sacred record has an authority which raises it far above not merely

the cavils of a handful of Manich�ans, but the determined enmity of the

whole Gentile world; for, in confirmation of its claims, we see that

already it has brought nearly all people from their idolatrous

superstitions to the worship of one God, according to the rule of

Christianity. It has conquered the world, not by violence and warfare,

but by the resistless force of truth. Where, then, is Judah praised in

Scripture? Where is anything good said of him, except that in the

blessing pronounced by his father he is distinguished above the rest,

because of the prophecy that Christ would come in the flesh from his

tribe? [883]

61. Judah, as Faustus says, committed fornication; and besides that,

we can accuse him of selling his brother into Egypt. Is it any

disparagement to light, that in revealing all things it discloses what

is unsightly? So neither is the character of Scripture affected by the

evil deeds of which we are informed by the record itself. Undoubtedly,

by the eternal law, which requires the preservation of natural order,

and forbids the transgression of it, conjugal intercourse should take

place only for the procreation of children, and after the celebration

of marriage, so as to maintain the bond of peace. Therefore, the

prostitution of women, merely for the gratification of sinful passion,

is condemned by the divine and eternal law. To purchase the

degradation of another, disgraces the purchaser; so that, though the

sin would have been greater if Judah had knowingly lain with his

daughter-in-law (for if, as the Lord says, man and wife are no more

two, but one flesh, [884] a daughter-in-law is the same as a daughter);

still, it is plain that, as regards his own intention, he was disgraced

by his intercourse with an harlot. The woman, on the other hand, who

deceived her father-in-law, sinned not from wantonness, or because she

loved the gains of iniquity, but from her desire to have children of

this particular family. So, being disappointed in two of the brothers,

and not obtaining the third, she succeeded by craft in getting a child

by their father; and the reward which she got was kept, not as an

ornament, but as a pledge. It would certainly have been better to have

remained childless than to become a mother without marriage. Still,

her desire to have her father-in-law as the father of her children was

very different from having a criminal affection for him. And when, by

his order, she was brought out to be killed, on her producing the staff

and necklace and ring, saying that the father of the child was the man

who had given her those pledges, Judah acknowledged them, and said,

"She hath been more righteous than I"--not praising her, but condemning

himself. He blamed her desire to have children less than his own

unlawful passion, which had led him to one whom he thought to be an

harlot. In a similar sense, it is said of some that they justified

Sodom; [885] that is, their sin was so great, that Sodom seemed

righteous in comparison. And even allowing that this woman is not

spoken of as comparatively less guilty, but is actually praised by her

father-in-law, while, on account of her not observing the established

rites of marriage, she is a criminal in the eye of the eternal law of

right, which forbids the transgression of natural order, both as

regards the body, and first and chiefly as regards the mind, what

wonder though one sinner should praise another?

62. The mistake of Faustus and of Manich�ism generally, is in

supposing that these objections prove anything against us, as if our

reverence for Scripture, and our profession of regard for its

authority, bound us to approve of all the evil actions mentioned in it;

whereas the greater our homage for the Scripture, the more decided must

be our condemnation of what the truth of Scripture itself teaches us to

condemn. In Scripture, all fornication and adultery are condemned by

the divine law; accordingly, when actions of this kind are narrated,

without being expressly condemned, it is intended not that we should

praise them, but that we should pass judgment on them ourselves. Every

one execrates the cruelty of Herod in the Gospel, when, in his

uneasiness on hearing of the birth of Christ, he commanded the

slaughter of so many infants. [886] But this is merely narrated

without being condemned. Or if Manich�an absurdity is bold enough to

deny the truth of this narrative, since they do not admit the birth of

Christ, which was what troubled Herod, let them read the account of the

blind fury of the Jews, which is related without any expression of

reproach, although the feeling of abhorrence is the same in all.

63. But, it is said, Judah, who lay with his daughter-in-law, is

reckoned as one of the twelve patriarchs. And was not Judas, who

betrayed the Lord, reckoned among the twelve apostles? And was not

this one of them, who was a devil, sent along with them to preach the

gospel? [887] In reply to this, it will be said that after his crime

Judas hanged himself, and was removed from the number of the apostles;

while Judah, after his evil conduct, was not only blessed along with

his brethren, but got special honor and approval from his father, who

is so highly spoken of in Scripture. But the main lesson to be learned

from this is, that this prophecy refers not to Judah, but to Christ,

who was foretold as to come in the flesh from his tribe; and the very

reason for the mention of this crime of Judah is to be found in the

desirableness of teaching us to look for another meaning in the words

of his father, which are seen not to be applicable to him in his

misconduct, from the praise which they express.

64. Doubtless, the intention of Faustus' calumnies is to damage this

very assertion, that Christ was born of the tribe of Judah.

Especially, as in the genealogy given by Matthew we find the name of

Zara, whom this woman Tamar bore to Judah. Had Faustus wished to

reproach Jacob's family merely, and not Christ's birth, he might have

taken the case of Reuben the first-born, who committed the unnatural

crime of defiling his father's bed, of which fornication the apostle

says, that it was not so much as named among the Gentiles. [888]

Jacob also mentions this in his blessing, charging his son with the

infamous deed. Faustus might have brought up this, as Reuben seems to

have been guilty of deliberate incest, and there was no harlot's

disguise in this case, were it not that Tamar's conduct in desiring

nothing but to have children is more odious to Faustus than if she had

acted from criminal passion, and did he not wish to discredit the

incarnation, by bringing reproach on Christ's progenitors. Faustus

unhappily is not aware that the most true and truthful Saviour is a

teacher, not only in His words, but also in His birth. In His fleshly

origin there is this lesson for those who should believe on Him from

all nations, that the sins of their fathers need be no hindrance to

them. Besides, the Bridegroom, who was to call good and bad to His

marriage, [889] was pleased to assimilate Himself to His guests, in

being born of good and bad. He thus confirms as typical of Himself the

symbol of the Passover, in which it was commanded that the lamb to be

eaten should be taken from the sheep or from the goats--that is, from

the righteous or the wicked. [890] Preserving throughout the

indication of divinity and humanity, as man He consented to have both

bad and good as His parents, while as God He chose the miraculous birth

from a virgin.

65. The impiety, therefore, of Faustus' attacks on Scripture can

injure no one but himself; for what he thus assails is now deservedly

the object of universal reverence. As has been said already, the

sacred record, like a faithful mirror, has no flattery in its

portraits, and either itself passes sentence upon human actions as

worthy of approval or disapproval, or leaves the reader to do so. And

not only does it distinguish men as blameworthy or praiseworthy, but it

also takes notice of cases where the blameworthy deserve praise, and

the praiseworthy blame. Thus, although Saul was blameworthy, it was

not the less praiseworthy in him to examine so carefully who had eaten

food during the curse, and to pronounce the stern sentence in obedience

to the commandment of God. [891] So, too, he was right in banishing

those that had familiar spirits and wizards out of the land. [892]

And although David was praiseworthy, we are not called on to approve or

imitate his sins, which God rebukes by the prophet. And so Pontius

Pilate was not wrong in pronouncing the Lord innocent, in spite of the

accusations of the Jews; [893] nor was it praiseworthy in Peter to deny

the Lord thrice; nor, again, was he praiseworthy on that occasion when

Christ called him Satan because, not understanding the things of God,

he wished to withhold Christ from his passion, that is, from our

salvation. Here Peter, immediately after being called blessed, is

called Satan. [894] Which character most truly belonged to him, we

may see from his apostleship, and from his crown of martyrdom.

66. In the case of David also, we read of both good and bad actions.

But where David's strength lay, and what was the secret of his success,

is sufficiently plain, not to the blind malevolence with which Faustus

assails holy writings and holy men, but to pious discernment, which

bows to the divine authority, and at the same time judges correctly of

human conduct. The Manich�ans will find, if they read the Scriptures,

that God rebukes David more than Faustus does. [895] But they will

read also of the sacrifice of his penitence, of his surpassing

gentleness to his merciless and bloodthirsty enemy, whom David, pious

as he was brave, dismissed unhurt when now and again he fell into his

hands. [896] They will read of his memorable humility under divine

chastisement, when the kingly neck was so bowed under the Master's

yoke, that he bore with perfect patience bitter taunts from his enemy,

though he was armed, and had armed men with him. And when his

companion was enraged at such things being said to the king, and was on

the point of requiting the insult on the head of the scoffer, he mildly

restrained him, appealing to the fear of God in support of his own

royal order, and saying that this bad happened to him as a punishment

from God, who had sent the man to curse him. [897] They will read

how, with the love of a shepherd for the flock entrusted to him, he was

willing to die for them, when, after he had numbered the people, God

saw good to punish his sinful pride by lessening the number he boasted

of. In this destruction, God, with whom there is no iniquity, in His

secret judgment, both took away the lives of those whom He knew to be

unworthy of life, and by this diminution cured the vainglory which had

prided itself on the number of the people. They will read of that

scrupulous fear of God in his regard for the emblem of Christ in the

sacred anointing, which made David's heart smite him with regret for

having secretly cut off a small piece of Saul's garment, that he might

prove to him that he had no wish to kill him, when he might have done

it. They will read of his judicious behavior as regards his children,

and also of his tenderness toward them--how, when one was sick, he

entreated the Lord for him with many tears and with much

self-abasement, but when he died, an innocent child, he did not mourn

for him; and again, how, when his youthful son was carried away with

unnatural hostility to an infamous violation of his father's bed, and

in a parricidal war, he wished him to live, and wept for him when he

was killed; for he thought of the eternal doom of a soul guilty of such

crimes, and desired that he should live to escape this doom by being

brought to submission and repentance. These, and many other

praiseworthy and exemplary things, may be seen in this holy man by a

candid examination of the Scripture narrative, especially if in humble

piety and unfeigned faith we regard the judgment of God, who knew the

secrets of David's heart, and who, in His infallible inspection, so

approves of David as to commend him as a pattern to his sons.

67. It must have been on account of this inspection of the depths of

David's heart by the Spirit of God that, when on being reproved by the

prophet, he said, I have sinned, he was considered worthy to be told,

immediately after this brief confession, that he was pardoned--that is,

that he was admitted to eternal salvation. For he did not escape the

correction of the fatherly rod, of which God spoke in His threatening,

that, while by his confession he obtained eternal exemption, he might

be tried by temporal chastisement. And it is a remarkable evidence of

the strength of David's faith, and of his meek and submissive spirit,

that, when he had been told by the prophet that God had forgiven him,

although the threatened consequences were still permitted to follow, he

did not accuse the prophet of having deluded him, or murmur against God

as having mocked him with a declaration of forgiveness. This deeply

holy man, whose soul was lifted up unto God, and not against God, knew

that had not the Lord mercifully accepted his confession and

repentance, his sins would have deserved eternal punishment. So when,

instead of this, he was made to smart under temporal correction, he saw

that, while the pardon remained good, wholesome discipline was also

provided. Saul, too, when he was reproved by Samuel, said, I have

sinned. [898] Why, then, was he not considered fit to be told, as

David was, that the Lord had pardoned his sin? Is there acceptance of

persons with God? Far from it. While to the human ear the words were

the same, the divine eye saw a difference in the heart. The lesson for

us to learn from these things is, that the kingdom of heaven is within

us, [899] and that we must worship God from our inmost feelings, that

out of the abundance of the heart the mouth may speak, instead of

honoring Him with our lips, like the people of old, while our hearts

are far from Him. We may learn also to judge of men, whose hearts we

cannot see, only as God judges, who sees what we cannot, and who cannot

be biased or misled. Having, on the high authority of sacred

Scripture, the plainest announcement of God's opinion of David, we may

regard as absurd or deplorable the rashness of men who hold a different

opinion. The authority of Scripture, as regards the character of these

men of ancient times, is supported by the evidence from the prophecies

which they contain, and which are now receiving their fulfillment.

68. We see the same thing in the Gospel, where the devils confess that

Christ is the Son of God in the words used by Peter, but with a very

different heart. So, though the words were the same, Peter is praised

for his faith, while the impiety of the devils is checked. For Christ,

not by human sense, but by divine knowledge, could inspect and

infallibly discriminate the sources from which the words came.

Besides, there are multitudes who confess that Christ is the Son of the

living God, without meriting the same approval as Peter--not only of

those who shall say in that day, "Lord, Lord," and shall receive the

sentence, "Depart from me," but also of those who shall be placed on

the right hand. They may probably never have denied Christ even once;

they may never have opposed His suffering for our salvation; they may

never have forced the Gentiles to do as the Jews; [900] and yet they

shall not be honored equally with Peter, who, though he did all these

things, will sit on one of the twelve thrones, and judge not only the

twelve tribes, but the angels. So, again, many who have never desired

another man's wife, or procured the death of the husband, as David did,

will never reach the place which David nevertheless held in the divine

favor. There is a vast difference between what is in itself so

undesirable that it must be utterly rejected, and the rich and

plenteous harvest which may afterwards appear. For farmers are best

pleased with the fields from which, after weeding them, it may be, of

great thistles, they receive an hundred-fold; not with fields which

have never had any thistles, and hardly bear thirty-fold.

69. So Moses, too, who was so faithful a servant of God in all his

house; the minister of the holy, just, and good law; of whose character

the apostle speaks in the words here quoted; [901] the minister also of

the symbols which, though not conferring salvation, promised the

Saviour, as the Saviour Himself shows, when He says, "If ye believed

Moses, ye would also believe me, for he wrote of me,"--from which

passage we have already sufficiently answered the presumptuous cavils

of the Manich�ans;--this Moses, the servant of the living, the true,

the most high God, that made heaven and earth, not of a foreign

substance, but of nothing--not from the pressure of necessity, but from

plenitude of goodness--not by the suffering of His members, but by the

power of His word;--this Moses, who humbly put from him this high

ministry, but obediently accepted it, and faithfully kept it, and

diligently fulfilled it; who ruled the people with vigilance, reproved

them with vehemence, loved them with fervor, and bore with them in

patience, standing for his subjects before God to receive His counsel,

and to appease His wrath;--this great and good man is not to be judged

of from Faustus' malicious representations, but from what is said by

God, whose word is a true expression of His true opinion of this man,

whom He knew because He made him. For the sins of men are also known

to God, though He is not their author; but He takes notice of them as a

judge in those who refuse to own them, and pardons them as a father in

those who make confession. His servant Moses, as thus described, we

love and admire and to the best of our power imitate, coming indeed far

short of his merits, though we have killed no Egyptian, nor plundered

any one, nor carried on any war; which actions of Moses were in one

case prompted by the zeal of the future champion of his people, and in

the other cases commanded by God.

70. It might be shown that, though Moses slew the Egyptian, without

being commanded by God, the action was divinely permitted, as, from the

prophetic character of Moses, it prefigured something in the future.

Now however, I do not use this argument, but view the action as having

no symbolical meaning. In the light, then, of the eternal law, it was

wrong for one who had no legal authority to kill the man, even though

he was a bad character, besides being the aggressor. But in minds

where great virtue is to come, there is often an early crop of vices,

in which we may still discern a disposition for some particular virtue,

which will come when the mind is duly cultivated. For as farmers, when

they see land bringing forth huge crops, though of weeds, pronounce it

good for corn; or when they see wild creepers, which have to be rooted

out, still consider the land good for useful vines; and when they see a

hill covered with wild olives, conclude that with culture it will

produce good fruit: so the disposition of mind which led Moses to take

the law into his own hands, to prevent the wrong done to his brother,

living among strangers, by a wicked citizen of the country from being

unrequited, was not unfit for the production of virtue, but from want

of culture gave signs of its productiveness in an unjustifiable

manner. He who afterwards, by His angel, called Moses on Mount Sinai,

with the divine commission to liberate the people of Israel from Egypt,

and who trained him to obedience by the miraculous appearance in the

bush burning but not consumed, and by instructing him in his ministry,

was the same who, by the call addressed from heaven to Saul when

persecuting the Church, humbled him, raised him up, and animated him;

or in figurative words, by this stroke He cut off the branch, grafted

it, and made it fruitful. For the fierce energy of Paul, when in his

zeal for hereditary traditions he persecuted the Church, thinking that

he was doing God service, was like a crop of weeds showing great signs

of productiveness. It was the same in Peter, when he took his sword

out of its sheath to defend the Lord, and cut off the right ear of an

assailant, when the Lord rebuked him with something like a threat,

saying, "Put up thy sword into its sheath; for he that taketh the sword

shall perish by the sword." [902] To take the sword is to use weapons

against a man's life, without the sanction of the constituted

authority. The Lord, indeed, had told His disciples to carry a sword;

but He did not tell them to use it. But that after this sin Peter

should become a pastor of the Church was no more improper than that

Moses, after smiting the Egyptian, should become the leader of the

congregation. In both cases the trespass originated not in inveterate

cruelty, but in a hasty zeal which admitted of correction. In both

cases there was resentment against injury, accompanied in one case by

love for a brother, and in the other by love, though still carnal, of

the Lord. Here was evil to be subdued or rooted out; but the heart

with such capacities needed only, like good soil, to be cultivated to

make it fruitful in virtue.

71. Then, as for Faustus' objection to the spoiling of the Egyptians,

he knows not what he says. In this Moses not only did not sin, but it

would have been sin not to do it. It was by the command of God, [903]

who, from His knowledge both of the actions and of the hearts of men,

can decide on what every one should be made to suffer, and through

whose agency. The people at that time were still carnal, and engrossed

with earthly affections; while the Egyptians were in open rebellion

against God, for they used the gold, God's creature, in the service of

idols, to the dishonor of the Creator, and they had grievously

oppressed strangers by making them work without pay. Thus the

Egyptians deserved the punishment, and the Israelites were suitably

employed in inflicting it. Perhaps, indeed, it was not so much a

command as a permission to the Hebrews to act in the matter according

to their own inclinations; and God, in sending the message by Moses,

only wished that they should thus be informed of His permission. There

may also have been mysterious reasons for what God said to the people

on this matter. At any rate, God's commands are to be submissively

received, not to be argued against. The apostle says, "Who hath known

the mind of the Lord? or who hath been His counsellor?" [904]

Whether, then, the reason was what I have said, or whether in the

secret appointment of God, there was some unknown reason for His

telling the people by Moses to borrow things from the Egyptians, and to

take them away with them, this remains certain, that this was said for

some good reason, and that Moses could not lawfully have done otherwise

than God told him, leaving to God the reason of the command, while the

servant's duty is to obey.

72. But, says Faustus, it cannot be admitted that the true God, who is

also good, ever gave such a command. I answer, such a command can be

rightly given by no other than the true and good God, who alone knows

the suitable command in every case, and who alone is incapable of

inflicting unmerited suffering on any one. This ignorant and spurious

goodness of the human heart may as well deny what Christ says, and

object to the wicked being made to suffer by the good God, when He

shall say to the angels, "Gather first the tares into bundles to burn

them." The servants, however, were stopped when they wished to do this

prematurely: "Lest by chance, when ye would gather the tares, ye root

up the wheat also with them." [905] Thus the true and good God alone

knows when, to whom, and by whom to order anything, or to permit

anything. In the same way, this human goodness, or folly rather, might

object to the Lord's permitting the devils to enter the swine, which

they asked to be allowed to do with a mischievous intent, [906]

especially as the Manich�ans believe that not only pigs, but the vilest

insects, have human souls. But setting aside these absurd notions,

this is undeniable, that our Lord Jesus Christ, the only son of God,

and therefore the true and good God, permitted the destruction of swine

belonging to strangers, implying loss of life and of a great amount of

property, at the request of devils. No one can be so insane as to

suppose that Christ could not have driven the devils out of the men

without gratifying their malice by the destruction of the swine. If,

then, the Creator and Governor of all natures, in His superintendence,

which, though mysterious, is ever just, indulged the violent and unjust

inclination of those lost spirits already doomed to eternal fire, why

should not the Egyptians, who were unrighteous oppressors, be spoiled

by the Hebrews, a free people, who would claim payment for their

enforced and painful toil, especially as the earthly possessions which

they thus lost were used by the Egyptians in their impious rites, to

the dishonor of the Creator? Still, if Moses had originated this

order, or if the people had done it spontaneously, undoubtedly it would

have been sinful; and perhaps the people did sin, not in doing what God

commanded or permitted, but in some desire of their own for what they

took. The permission given to this action by divine authority was in

accordance with the just and good counsel of Him who uses punishments

both to restrain the wicked and to educate His own people; who knows

also how to give more advanced precepts to those able to bear them,

while He begins on a lower scale in the treatment of the feeble. As

for Moses, he can be blamed neither for coveting the property, nor for

disputing, in any instance, the divine authority.

73. According to the eternal law, which requires the preservation of

natural order, and forbids the transgression of it, some actions have

an indifferent character, so that men are blamed for presumption if

they do them without being called upon, while they are deservedly

praised for doing them when required. The act, the agent, and the

authority for the action are all of great importance in the order of

nature. For Abraham to sacrifice his son of his own accord is shocking

madness. His doing so at the command of God proves him faithful and

submissive. This is so loudly proclaimed by the very voice of truth,

that Faustus, eagerly rummaging for some fault, and reduced at last to

slanderous charges, has not the boldness to attack this action. It is

scarcely possible that he can have forgotten a deed so famous, that it

recurs to the mind of itself without any study or reflection, and is in

fact repeated by so many tongues, and portrayed in so many places, that

no one can pretend to shut his eyes or his ears to it. If, therefore,

while Abraham's killing his son of his own accord would have been

unnatural, his doing it at the command of God shows not only guiltless

but praiseworthy compliance, why does Faustus blame Moses for spoiling

the Egyptians? Your feeling of disapproval for the mere human action

should be restrained by a regard for the divine sanction. Will you

venture to blame God Himself for desiring such actions? Then "Get thee

behind me, Satan, for thou understandest not the things which be of

God, but those which be of men." Would that this rebuke might

accomplish in you what it did in Peter, and that you might hereafter

preach the truth concerning God, which you now, judging by feeble

sense, find fault with! as Peter became a zealous messenger to announce

to the Gentiles what he objected to at first, when the Lord spoke of it

as His intention.

74. Now, if this explanation suffices to satisfy human obstinacy and

perverse misinterpretation of right actions of the vast difference

between the indulgence of passion and presumption on the part of men,

and obedience to the command of God, who knows what to permit or to

order, and also the time and the persons, and the due action or

suffering in each case, the account of the wars of Moses will not

excite surprise or abhorrence, for in wars carried on by divine

command, he showed not ferocity but obedience; and God in giving the

command, acted not in cruelty, but in righteous retribution, giving to

all what they deserved, and warning those who needed warning. What is

the evil in war? Is it the death of some who will soon die in any

case, that others may live in peaceful subjection? This is mere

cowardly dislike, not any religious feeling. The real evils in war are

love of violence, revengeful cruelty, fierce and implacable enmity,

wild resistance, and the lust of power, and such like; and it is

generally to punish these things, when force is required to inflict the

punishment, that, in obedience to God or some lawful authority, good

men undertake wars, when they find themselves in such a position as

regards the conduct of human affairs, that right conduct requires them

to act, or to make others act in this way. Otherwise John, when the

soldiers who came to be baptized asked, What shall we do? would have

replied, Throw away your arms; give up the service; never strike, or

wound, or disable any one. But knowing that such actions in battle

were not murderous but authorized by law, and that the soldiers did not

thus avenge themselves, but defend the public safety, he replied, "Do

violence to no man, accuse no man falsely, and be content with your

wages." [907] But as the Manich�ans are in the habit of speaking evil

of John, let them hear the Lord Jesus Christ Himself ordering this

money to be given to C�sar, which John tells the soldiers to be content

with. "Give," He says, "to C�sar the things that are C�sar's." [908]

For tribute-money is given on purpose to pay the soldiers for war.

Again, in the case of the centurion who said, "I am a man under

authority, and have soldiers under me: and I say to one, Go, and he

goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this,

and he doeth it," Christ gave due praise to his faith; [909] He did not

tell him to leave the service. But there is no need here to enter on

the long discussion of just and unjust ways.

75. A great deal depends on the causes for which men undertake wars,

and on the authority they have for doing so; for the natural order

which seeks the peace of mankind, ordains that the monarch should have

the power of undertaking war if he thinks it advisable, and that the

soldiers should perform their military duties in behalf of the peace

and safety of the community. When war is undertaken in obedience to

God, who would rebuke, or humble, or crush the pride of man, it must be

allowed to be a righteous war; for even the wars which arise from human

passion cannot harm the eternal well-being of God, nor even hurt His

saints; for in the trial of their patience, and the chastening of their

spirit, and in bearing fatherly correction, they are rather benefited

than injured. No one can have any power against them but what is given

him from above. For there is no power but of God, [910] who either

orders or permits. Since, therefore, a righteous man, serving it may

be under an ungodly king, may do the duty belonging to his position in

the State in fighting by the order of his sovereign,--for in some cases

it is plainly the will of God that he should fight, and in others,

where this is not so plain, it may be an unrighteous command on the

part of the king, while the soldier is innocent, because his position

makes obedience a duty,--how much more must the man be blameless who

carries on war on the authority of God, of whom every one who serves

Him knows that He can never require what is wrong?

76. If it is supposed that God could not enjoin warfare, because in

after times it was said by the Lord Jesus Christ, "I say unto you, That

ye resist not evil: but if any one strike thee on the right cheek,

turn to him the left also," [911] the answer is, that what is here

required is not a bodily action, but an inward disposition. The sacred

seat of virtue is the heart, and such were the hearts of our fathers,

the righteous men of old. But order required such a regulation of

events, and such a distinction of times, as to show first of all that

even earthly blessings (for so temporal kingdoms and victory over

enemies are considered to be, and these are the things which the

community of the ungodly all over the world are continually begging

from idols and devils) are entirely under the control and at the

disposal of the one true God. Thus, under the Old Testament, the

secret of the kingdom of heaven, which was to be disclosed in due time,

was veiled, and so far obscured, in the disguise of earthly promises.

But when the fullness of time came for the revelation of the New

Testament, which was hidden under the types of the Old, clear testimony

was to be borne to the truth, that there is another life for which this

life ought to be disregarded, and another kingdom for which the

opposition of all earthly kingdoms should be patiently borne. Thus the

name martyrs, which means witnesses, was given to those who, by the

will of God, bore this testimony, by their confessions, their

sufferings, and their death. The number of such witnesses is so great,

that if it pleased Christ--who called Saul by a voice from heaven, and

having changed him from a wolf to a sheep, sent him into the midst of

wolves--to unite them all in one army, and to give them success in

battle, as He gave to the Hebrews, what nation could withstand them?

what kingdom would remain unsubdued? But as the doctrine of the New

Testament is, that we must serve God not for temporal happiness in this

life, but for eternal felicity hereafter, this truth was most

strikingly confirmed by the patient endurance of what is commonly

called adversity for the sake of that felicity. So in fullness of time

the Son of God, made of a woman, made under the law, that He might

redeem them that were under the law, made of the seed of David

according to the flesh sends His disciples as sheep into the midst of

wolves, and bids them not fear those that can kill the body, but cannot

kill the soul, and promises that even the body will be entirely

restored, so that not a hair shall be lost. [912] Peter's sword He

orders back into its sheath, restoring as it was before the ear of His

enemy that had been cut off. He says that He could obtain legions of

angels to destroy His enemies, but that He must drink the cup which His

Father's will had given Him. [913] He sets the example of drinking

this cup, then hands it to His followers, manifesting thus, both in

word and deed, the grace of patience. Therefore God raised Him from

the dead, and has given Him a name which is above every name; that in

the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and of

things in earth, and of things under the earth; and that every tongue

should confess that Jesus is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

[914] The patriarchs and prophets, then, have a kingdom in this

world, to show that these kingdoms, too, are given and taken away by

God: the apostles and martyrs had no kingdom here, to show the

superior desirableness of the kingdom of heaven. The prophets,

however, could even in those times die for the truth, as the Lord

Himself says, "From the blood of Abel to the blood of Zacharia; [915]

and in these days, since the commencement of the fulfillment of what is

prophesied in the psalm of Christ, under the figure of Solomon, which

means the peacemaker, as Christ is our peace, [916] "All kings of the

earth shall bow to Him, all nations shall serve Him," [917] we have

seen Christian emperors, who have put all their confidence in Christ,

gaining splendid victories over ungodly enemies, whose hope was in the

rites of idolatry and devil-worship. There are public and undeniable

proofs of the fact, that on one side the prognostications of devils

were found to be fallacious, and on the other, the predictions of

saints were a means of support; and we have now writings in which those

facts are recorded.

77. If our foolish opponents are surprised at the difference between

the precepts given by God to the ministers of the Old Testament, at a

time when the grace of the New was still undisclosed, and those given

to the preachers of the New Testament, now that the obscurity of the

Old is removed, they will find Christ Himself saying one thing at one

time, and another at another. "When I sent you," He says, "without

scrip, or purse, or shoes, did ye lack anything? And they said,

Nothing. Then saith He to them, But now, he that hath a scrip, let him

take it, and also a purse; and he that hath not a sword, let him sell

his garment, and buy one." If the Manich�ans found passages in the Old

and New Testaments differing in this way, they would proclaim it as a

proof that the Testaments are opposed to each other. But here the

difference is in the utterances of one and the same person. At one

time He says, "I sent you without scrip, or purse, or shoes, and ye

lacked nothing;" at another, "Now let him that hath a scrip take it,

and also a purse; and he that hath a tunic, let him sell it and buy a

sword." Does not this show how, without any inconsistency, precepts

and counsels and permissions may be changed, as different times require

different arrangements? If it is said that there was a symbolical

meaning in the command to take a scrip and purse, and to buy a sword,

why may there not be a symbolical meaning in the fact, that one and the

same God commanded the prophets in old times to make war, and forbade

the apostles? And we find in the passage that we have quoted from the

Gospel, that the words spoken by the Lord were carried into effect by

His disciples. For, besides going at first without scrip or purse, and

yet lacking nothing, as from the Lord's question and their answer it is

plain they did, now that He speaks of buying a sword, they say, "Lo,

here are two swords;" and He replied, "It is enough." Hence we find

Peter with a weapon when he cut off the assailant's ear, on which

occasion his spontaneous boldness was checked, because, although he had

been told to take a sword, he had not been told to use it. [918]

Doubtless, it was mysterious that the Lord should require them to carry

weapons, and forbid the use of them. But it was His part to give the

suitable precepts, and it was their part to obey without reserve.

78. It is therefore mere groundless calumny to charge Moses with

making war, for there would have been less harm in making war of his

own accord, than in not doing it when God commanded him. And to dare

to find fault with God Himself for giving such a command, or not to

believe it possible that a just and good God did so, shows, to say the

least, an inability to consider that in the view of divine providence,

which pervades all things from the highest to the lowest, time can

neither add anything nor take away; but all things go, or come, or

remain according to the order of nature or desert in each separate

case, while in men a right will is in union with the divine law, and

ungoverned passion is restrained by the order of divine law; so that a

good man wills only what is commanded, and a bad man can do only what

he is permitted, at the same time that he is punished for what he wills

to do unjustly. Thus, in all the things which appear shocking and

terrible to human feebleness, the real evil is the injustice; the rest

is only the result of natural properties or of moral demerit. This

injustice is seen in every case where a man loves for their own sake

things which are desirable only as means to an end, and seeks for the

sake of something else things which ought to be loved for themselves.

For thus, as far as he can, he disturbs in himself the natural order

which the eternal law requires us to observe. Again, a man is just

when he seeks to use things only for the end for which God appointed

them, and to enjoy God as the end of all, while he enjoys himself and

his friend in God and for God. For to love in a friend the love of God

is to love the friend for God. Now both justice and injustice, to be

acts at all, must be voluntary; otherwise, there can be no just rewards

or punishments; which no man in his senses will assert. The ignorance

and infirmity which prevent a man from knowing his duty, or from doing

all he wishes to do, belong to God's secret penal arrangement, and to

His unfathomable judgments, for with Him there is no iniquity. Thus we

are informed by the sure word of God of Adam's sin; and Scripture truly

declares that in him all die, and that by him sin entered into the

world, and death by sin. [919] And our experience gives abundant

evidence, that in punishment for this sin our body is corrupted, and

weighs down the soul, and the clay tabernacle clogs the mind in its

manifold activity; [920] and we know that we can be freed from this

punishment only by gracious interposition. So the apostle cries out in

distress, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body

of this death? The grace of God through Jesus Christ our Lord." [921]

So much we know; but the reasons for the distribution of divine

judgment and mercy, why one is in this condition, and another in that,

though just, are unknown. Still, we are sure that all these things are

due either to the mercy or the judgment of God, while the measures and

numbers and weights by which the Creator of all natural productions

arranges all things are concealed from our view. For God is not the

author, but He is the controller of sin; so that sinful actions, which

are sinful because they are against nature, are judged and controlled,

and assigned to their proper place and condition, in order that they

may not bring discord and disgrace on universal nature. This being the

case, and as the judgments of God and the movements of man's will

contain the hidden reason why the same prosperous circumstances which

some make a right use of are the ruin of others, and the same

afflictions under which some give way are profitable to others, and

since the whole mortal life of man upon earth is a trial, [922] who can

tell whether it may be good or bad in any particular case--in time of

peace, to reign or to serve, or to be at ease or to die--or in time of

war, to command or to fight, or to conquer or to be killed? At the

same time, it remains true, that whatever is good is so by the divine

blessing, and whatever is bad is so by the divine judgment.

79. Let no one, then, be so daring as to make rash charges against

men, not to say against God. If the service of the ministers of the

Old Testament, who were also heralds of the New, consisted in putting

sinners to death, and that of the ministers of the New Testament, who

are also interpreters of the Old, in being put to death by sinners, the

service in both cases is rendered to one God, who, varying the lesson

to suit the times, teaches both that temporal blessings are to be

sought from Him, and that they are to be forsaken for Him, and that

temporal distress is both sent by Him and should be endured for Him.

There was, therefore, no cruelty in the command, or in the action of

Moses, when, in his holy jealousy for his people, whom he wished to be

subject to the one true God, on learning that they had fallen away to

the worship of an idol made by their own hands, he impressed their

minds at the time with a wholesome fear, and gave them a warning for

the future, by using the sword in the punishment of a few, whose just

punishment God, against whom they had sinned, appointed in the depth of

His secret judgment to be immediately inflicted. That Moses acted as

he did, not in cruelty, but in great love, may be seen from the words

in which he prayed for the sins of the people: "If Thou wilt forgive

their sin, forgive it; and if not, blot me out of Thy book." [923]

The pious inquirer who compares the slaughter with the prayer will find

in this the clearest evidence of the awful nature of the injury done to

the soul by prostitution to the images of devils, since such love is

roused to such anger. We see the same in the apostle, who, not in

cruelty, but in love, delivered a man up to Satan for the destruction

of the flesh, that the spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord

Jesus. [924] Others, too, he delivered up, that they might learn not

to blaspheme. [925] In the apocryphal books of the Manich�ans there

is a collection of fables, published by some unknown authors under the

name of the apostles. The books would no doubt have been sanctioned by

the Church at the time of their publication, if holy and learned men

then in life, and competent to determine the matter, had thought the

contents to be true. One of the stories is, that the Apostle Thomas

was once at a marriage feast in a country where he was unknown, when

one of the servants struck him, and that he forthwith by his curse

brought a terrible punishment on this man. For when he went out to the

fountain to provide water for the guests, a lion fell on him and killed

him, and the hand with which he had given a slight blow to the apostle

was torn off, in fulfillment of the imprecation, and brought by a dog

to the table at which the apostle was reclining. What could be more

cruel than this? And yet, if I mistake not, the story goes on to say,

that the apostle made up for the cruelty by obtaining for the man the

blessing of pardon in the next world; so that, while the people of this

strange country learned to fear the apostle as being so dear to God,

the man's eternal welfare was secured in exchange for the loss of this

mortal life. It matters not whether the story is true or false. At

any rate, the Manich�ans, who regard as genuine and authentic books

which the canon of the Church rejects, must allow, as shown in the

story, that the virtue of patience, which the Lord enjoins when He

says, "If any one smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him thy left

also," may be in the inward disposition, though it is not exhibited in

bodily action or in words. For when the apostle was struck, instead of

turning his other side to the man, or telling him to repeat the blow,

he prayed to God to pardon his assailant in the next world, but not to

leave the injury unpunished at the time. Inwardly he preserved a

kindly feeling, while outwardly he wished the man to be punished as an

example. As the Manich�ans believe this, rightly or wrongly, they may

also believe that such was the intention of Moses, the servant of God,

when he cut down with the sword the makers and worshippers of the idol;

for his own words show that he so entreated for pardon for their sin of

idolatry as to ask to be blotted out of God's book if his prayer was

not heard. There is no comparison between a stranger being struck with

the hand, and the dishonor done to God by forsaking Him for an idol,

when He had brought the people out of the bondage of Egypt, had led

them through the sea, and had covered with the waters the enemy

pursuing them. Nor, as regards the punishment, is there any comparison

between being killed with the sword and being torn in pieces by wild

beasts. For judges in administering the law condemn to exposure to

wild beasts worse criminals than are condemned to be put to death by

the sword.

80. Another of Faustus' malicious and impious charges which has to be

answered, is about the Lord's saying to the prophet Hosea, "Take unto

thee a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms." [926] As regards

this passage, the impure mind of our adversaries is so blinded that

they do not understand the plain words of the Lord in His gospel, when

He says to the Jews, "The publicans and harlots shall go into the

kingdom of heaven before you." [927] There is nothing contrary to the

mercifulness of truth, or inconsistent with Christian faith, in a

harlot leaving fornication, and becoming a chaste wife. Indeed,

nothing could be more unbecoming in one professing to be a prophet than

not to believe that all the sins of the fallen woman were pardoned when

she changed for the better. So when the prophet took the harlot as his

wife, it was both good for the woman to have her life amended, and the

action symbolized a truth of which we shall speak presently. But it is

plain what offends the Manich�ans in this case; for their great anxiety

is to prevent harlots from being with child. It would have pleased

them better that the woman should continue a prostitute, so as not to

bring their god into confinement, than that she should become the wife

of one man, and have children.

81. As regards Solomon, it need only be said that the condemnation of

his conduct in the faithful narrative of holy Scripture is much more

serious than the childish vehemence of Faustus' attacks. The Scripture

tells us with faithful accuracy both the good that Solomon had at

first, and the evil actions by which he lost the good he began with;

while Faustus, in his attacks, like a man closing his eyes, or with no

eyes at all, seeks no guidance from the light, but is prompted only by

violent animosity. To pious and discerning readers of the sacred

Scriptures evidence of the chastity of the holy men who are said to

have had several wives is found in this, that Solomon, who by his

polygamy gratified his passions, instead of seeking for offspring, is

expressly noted as chargeable with being a lover of women. This, as we

are informed by the truth which accepts no man's person, led him down

into the abyss of idolatry.

82. Having now gone over all the cases in which Faustus finds fault

with the Old Testament, and having attended to the merit of each,

either defending men of God against the calumnies of carnal heretics,

or, where the men were at fault, showing the excellence and the majesty

of Scripture, let us again take the cases in the order of Faustus'

accusations, and see the meaning of the actions recorded, what they

typify, and what they foretell. This we have already done in the case

of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, of whom God said that He was their God,

as if the God of universal nature were the God of none besides them;

not honoring them with an unmeaning title, but because He, who could

alone have a full and perfect knowledge, knew the sincere and

remarkable charity of these men; and because these three patriarchs

united formed a notable type of the future people of God, in not only

having free children by free women, as by Sarah, and Rebecca, and Leah,

and Rachel, but also bond children, as of this same Rebecca was born

Esau, to whom it was said, "Thou shalt serve thy brother;" [928] and in

having by bond women not only bond children, as by Hagar, but also free

children, as by Bilhah and Zilphah. Thus also in the people of God,

those spiritually free not only have children born into the enjoyment

of liberty, like those to whom it is said, "Be ye followers of me, as I

also am of Christ," [929] but they have also children born into guilty

bondage, as Simon was born of Philip. [930] Again, from carnal

bondmen are born not only children of guilty bondage, who imitate them,

but also children of happy liberty, to whom it is said, "What they say,

do; but do not after their works." [931] Whoever rightly observes the

fulfillment of this type in the people of God, keeps the unity of the

Spirit in the bond of peace, by continuing to the end in union with

some, and in patient endurance of others. Of Lot, also, we have

already spoken, and have shown what the Scripture mentions as

praiseworthy in him, and what as blameworthy and the meaning of the

whole narrative.

83. We have next to consider the prophetic significance of the action

of Judah in lying with his daughter-in-law. But, for the sake of those

whose understanding is feeble, we shall begin with observing, that in

sacred Scripture evil actions are sometimes prophetic not of evil, but

of good. Divine providence preserves throughout its essential

goodness, so that, as in the example given above, from adulterous

intercourse a man-child is born, a good work of God from the evil of

man, by the power of nature, and not due to the misconduct of the

parents; so in the prophetic Scriptures, where both good and evil

actions are recorded, the narrative being itself prophetic, foretells

something good even by the record of what is evil, the credit being due

not to the evil-doer, but to the writer. Judah, when, to gratify his

sinful passion, he went in to Tamar, had no intention by his licentious

conduct to typify anything connected with the salvation of men, any

more than Judas, who betrayed the Lord, intended to produce any result

connected with the salvation of men. So then if from the evil deed of

Judas the Lord brought the good work of our redemption by His own

passion, why should not His prophet, of whom He Himself says "He wrote

of me," for the sake of instructing us make the evil action of Judah

significant of something good? Under the guidance and inspiration of

the Holy Spirit, the prophet has compiled a narrative of actions so as

to make a continuous prophecy of the things he designed to foretell.

In foretelling good, it is of no consequence whether the typical

actions are good or bad. If it is written in red ink that the

Ethiopians are black, or in black ink that the Gauls are white, this

circumstance does not affect the information which the writing

conveys. No doubt, if it was a painting instead of a writing, the

wrong color would be a fault; so when human actions are represented for

example or for warning much depends on whether they are good or bad.

But when actions are related or recorded as types, the merit or demerit

of the agents is a matter of no importance, as long as there is a true

typical relation between the action and the thing signified. So in the

case of Caiaphas in the Gospel as regards his iniquitous and

mischievous intention, and even as regards his words in the sense in

which he used them, that a just man should be put to death unjustly,

assuredly they were bad; and yet there was a good meaning in his words

which he did not know of when he said, "It is expedient that one man

should die for the people and that the whole nation perish not." So it

is written of Him, "This he spake not of himself; but being the high

priest, he prophesied that Jesus should die for the people." [932] In

the same way the action of Judah was bad as regards his sinful passion,

but it typified a great good he knew nothing of. Of himself he did

evil while it was not of himself that he typified good. These

introductory remarks apply not only to Judah, but also to all the other

cases where in the narrative of bad actions is contained a prophecy of

good.

84. In Tamar, then, the daughter-in-law of Judah, we see the people of

the kingdom of Judah, whose kings, answering to Tamar's husbands, were

taken from this tribe. Tamar means bitterness; and the meaning is

suitable, for this people gave the cup of gall to the Lord. [933] The

two sons of Judah represent two classes of kings who governed

ill--those who did harm and those who did no good. One of these sons

was evil or cruel before the Lord; the other spilled the seed on the

ground that Tamar might not become a mother. There are only those two

kinds of useless people in the world--the injurious and those who will

not give the good they have but lose it or spill it on the ground. And

as injury is worse than not doing good, the evil-doer is called the

elder and the other the younger. Er, the name of the elder, means a

preparer of skins, which were the coats given to our first parents when

they were punished with expulsion from paradise. [934] Onan, the name

of the younger, means, their grief; that is, the grief of those to whom

he does no good, wasting the good he has on the earth. The loss of

life implied in the name of the elder is a greater evil than the want

of help implied in the name of the younger. Both being killed by God

typifies the removal of the kingdom from men of this character. The

meaning of the third son of Judah not being joined to the woman, is

that for a time the kings of Judah were not of that tribe. So this

third son did not become the husband of Tamar; as Tamar represents the

tribe of Judah, which continued to exist, although the people received

no king from it. Hence the name of this son, Selom, means, his

dismission. None of those types apply to the holy and righteous men

who, like David, though they lived in those times, belong properly to

the New Testament, which they served by their enlightened predictions.

Again, in the time when Judah ceased to have a king of its own tribe,

the elder Herod does not count as one of the kings typified by the

husbands of Tamar; for he was a foreigner, and his union with the

people was never consecrated with the holy oil. His was the power of a

stranger, given him by the Romans and by C�sar. And it was the same

with his sons, the tetrarchs, one of whom, called Herod, like his

father, agreed with Pilate at the time of the Lord's passion. [935]

So plainly were these foreigners considered as distinct from the sacred

monarchy of Judah, that the Jews themselves, when raging against

Christ, exclaimed openly, "We have no king but C�sar." [936] Nor was

C�sar properly their king, except in the sense that all the world was

subject to Rome. The Jews thus condemned themselves, only to express

their rejection of Christ, and to flatter C�sar.

85. The time when the kingdom was removed from the tribe of Judah was

the time appointed for the coming of Christ our Lord, the true Saviour,

who should come not for harm, but for great good. Thus was it

prophesied, "A prince shall not fail from Judah, nor a leader from his

loins, till He come for whom it is reserved: He is the desire of

nations." [937] Not only the kingdom, but all government, of the Jews

had ceased, and also, as prophesied by Daniel, the sacred anointing

from which the name Christ or Anointed is derived. Then came He for

whom it was reserved, the desire of nations; and the holy of holies was

anointed with the oil of gladness above His fellows. [938] Christ was

born in the time of the elder Herod, and suffered in the time of Herod

the tetrarch. He who thus came to the lost sheep of the house of

Israel was typified by Judah when he went to shear his sheep in Thamna,

which means, failing. For then the prince had failed from Judah, with

all the government and anointing of the Jews, that He might come for

whom it was reserved. Judah, we are told, came with his Adullamite

shepherd, whose name was Iras; and Adullamite means, a testimony in

water. So it was with this testimony that the Lord came, having indeed

greater testimony than that of John; [939] but for the sake of his

feeble sheep he made use of the testimony in water. The name Iras,

too, means, vision of my brother. So John saw his brother, a brother

in the family of Abraham, and from the relationship of Mary and

Elisabeth; and the same person he recognised as his Lord and his God,

for, as he himself says, he received of His fullness. [940] On

account of this vision, among those born of woman, there has arisen no

greater than he; [941] because, of all who foretold Christ, he alone

saw what many righteous men and prophets desired to see and saw not.

He saluted Christ from the womb; [942] he knew Him more certainly from

seeing the dove; and therefore, as the Adullamite, he gave testimony by

water. The Lord came to shear His sheep, in releasing them from

painful burdens, as it is said in praise of the Church in the Song of

Songs, that her teeth are like a flock of sheep after shearing. [943]

86. Next, we have Tamar changing her dress; for Tamar also means

changing. Still, the name of bitterness must be retained--not that

bitterness in which gall was given to the Lord, but that in which Peter

wept bitterly. [944] For Judah means confession; and bitterness is

mingled with confession as a type of true repentance. It is this

repentance which gives fruitfulness to the Church established among all

nations. For "it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead,

and that repentance and the remission of sins be preached among all

nations in His name, beginning at Jerusalem." [945] In the dress

Tamar put on there is a confession of sins; and Tamar sitting in this

dress at the gate of �nan or �naim, which means fountain, is a type of

the Church called from among the nations. She ran as a hart to the

springs of water, to meet with the seed of Abraham; and there she is

made fruitful by one who knows her not, as it is foretold, "A people

whom I have not known shall serve me." [946] Tamar received under her

disguise a ring, a bracelet, a staff; she is sealed in her calling,

adorned in her justification, raised in her glorification. For "whom

He predestinated, them He also called: and whom He called, them He also

justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified." [947]

This was while she was still disguised, as I have said; and in the same

state she conceives, and becomes fruitful in holiness. Also the kid

promised is sent to her as to a harlot. The kid represents rebuke for

sin, and it is sent by the Adullamite already mentioned, who, as it

were, uses the reproachful words, "O generation of vipers!" [948] But

this rebuke for sin does not reach her, for she has been changed by the

bitterness of confession. Afterwards, by exhibiting the pledges of the

ring and bracelet and staff, she prevails over the Jews, in their hasty

judgment of her, who are now represented by Judah himself; as at this

day we hear the Jews saying that we are not the people of Christ, and

have not the seed of Abraham. But when we exhibit the sure tokens of

our calling and justification and glorification, they will immediately

be confounded, and will acknowledge that we are justified rather than

they. I should enter into this more particularly, taking, as it were,

each limb and joint separately, as the Lord might enable me, were it

not that such minute inquiry is prevented by the necessity of bringing

this work to a close, for it is already longer than is desirable.

87. As regards the prophetic significance of David's sin, a single

word must suffice. The names occurring in the narrative show what it

typifies. David means, strong of hand, or desirable; and what can be

stronger than the Lion of the tribe of Judah, who has conquered the

world, or more desirable than He of whom the prophet says, "The desire

of all nations shall come?" [949] Bersabee means, well of

satisfaction, or seventh well: either of these interpretations will

suit our purpose. So, in the Song of Songs, the spouse, who is the

Church, is called a well of living water; [950] or again, the number

seven represents the Holy Spirit, as in the number of days in

Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit came from heaven. We learn also from

the book of Tobit, that Pentecost was the feast of seven weeks. [951]

To forty-nine, which is seven times seven, one is added to denote

unity. To this effect is the saying of the apostle: "Bearing with one

another in love, endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the

bond of peace." [952] The Church becomes a well of satisfaction by

this gift of the Spirit, the number seven denoting its spirituality;

for it is in her a fountain of living water springing up unto

everlasting life, and he who has it shall never thirst. [953] Uriah,

Bersabee's husband, must, from the meaning of his name, be understood

as representing the devil. It is in union to the devil that all are

bound whom the grace of God sets free, that the Church without spot or

wrinkle may be married to her true Saviour. Uriah means, my light of

God; and Hittite means, cut off, referring either to his not abiding in

the truth, when he was cut off on account of his pride from the

celestial light which he had of God, or to his transforming himself

into an angel of light, because after losing his real strength by his

fall, he still dares to say, My light is of God. The literal David,

then, was guilty of a heinous crime, which God by the prophet condemned

in the rebuke addressed to David, and which David atoned for by his

repentance. On the other hand, He who is the desire of all nations

loved the Church when washing herself on the roof, that is, when

cleansing herself from the pollution of the world, and in spiritual

contemplation mounting above her house of clay, and trampling upon it;

and after commencing an acquaintance, He puts to death the devil, whom

He first entirely removes from her, and joins her to Himself in

perpetual union. While we hate the sin, we must not overlook the

prophetical significance; and while we love, as is His due, that David

who in His mercy has freed us from the devil, we may also love the

David who by the humility of his repentance healed the wound made by

his transgression.

88. Little need be said of Solomon, who is spoken of in Holy Scripture

in terms of the strongest disapproval and condemnation, while nothing

is said of his repentance and restoration to the divine favor. Nor can

I find in his lamentable fall even a symbolical connection with

anything good. Perhaps the strange women he lusted after may be

thought to represent the Churches chosen from among the Gentiles. This

idea might have been admissible, if the women had left their gods for

Solomon's sake to worship his God. But as he for their sakes offended

his God and worshipped their gods, it seems impossible to think of any

good meaning. Doubtless, something is typified, but it is something

bad, as in the case already explained of Lot's wife and daughters. We

see in Solomon a notable pre-eminence and a notable fall. Now, this

good and evil which we see in him at different periods, first good and

then evil, are in our day found together in the Church. What is good

in Solomon represents, I think, the good members of the Church; and

what was bad in him represents the bad members. Both are in one man,

as the bad and the good are in the chaff and grain of one floor, or in

the tares and wheat of one field. A closer inquiry into what is said

of Solomon in Scripture might disclose, either to me or to others of

greater learning and greater worth, some more probable interpretation.

But as we are now engaged on a different subject, we must not allow

this matter to break the connection of our discourse.

89. As regards the prophet Hosea, it is unnecessary for me to explain

the meaning of the command, or of the prophet's conduct, when God said

to him, "Go and take unto thee a wife of whoredoms and produce children

of whoredoms," for the Scripture itself informs us of the origin and

purpose of this direction. It proceeds thus: "For the land hath

committed great whoredom, departing from the Lord. So he went and took

Gomer the daughter of Diblaim; which conceived, and bare him a son.

And the Lord said unto him, Call his name Jezreel; for yet a little

while, and I will avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Judah,

and will cause to cease the kingdom of the house of Israel. And it

shall come to pass at that day, that I will break the bow of Israel in

the valley of Jezreel. And she conceived again, and bare a daughter.

And God said unto him, Call her name No-mercy: for I will no more have

mercy upon the house of Israel; but I will utterly take them away. But

I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by the

Lord their God, and will not save them by bow, nor by sword, nor by

battle, by horses, nor by horsemen. Now when she had weaned No-mercy,

she conceived, and bare a son. Then said God, Call his name

Not-my-people: for ye are not my people, and I will not be your God.

Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the

sea, which cannot be measured for multitude; and it shall come to pass

that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people,

there it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God.

Then shall the children of Israel and the children of Judah be gathered

together, and appoint themselves one head, and they shall come up out

of the land: for great shall be the day of Jezreel. Say ye unto your

brethren, My people; and to your sister, She hath found mercy." [954]

Since the typical meaning of the command and of the prophet's conduct

is thus explained in the same book by the Lord Himself, and since the

writings of the apostles declare the fulfillment of this prophecy in

the preaching of the New Testament, every one must accept the

explanation thus given of the command and of the action of the prophet

as the true explanation. Thus it is said by the Apostle Paul, "That He

might make known the riches of His glory on the vessels of mercy, which

He had afore prepared unto glory, even us, whom He hath called, not of

the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles. As He saith also in Hosea, I

will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved,

which was not beloved. And it shall come to pass, that in the place

where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there shall they be

called the children of the living God." [955] Here Paul applies the

prophecy to the Gentiles. So also Peter, writing to the Gentiles,

without naming the prophet, borrows his expressions when he says, "But

ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a

peculiar people; that ye might show forth the praises of Him who has

called you out of darkness into His marvellous light; which in time

past were not a people, but are now the people of God: which had not

obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy." [956] From this it is

plain that the words of the prophet, "And the number of the children of

Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured for

multitude," and the words immediately following, "And it shall be that

in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there

they shall be called the children of the living God," do not apply to

that Israel which is after the flesh, but to that of which the apostle

says to the Gentiles, "Ye therefore are the seed of Abraham, and heirs

according to the promise." [957] But, as many Jews who were of the

Israel after the flesh have believed, and will yet believe; for of

these were the apostles, and all the thousands in Jerusalem of the

company of the apostles, as also the churches of which Paul speaks,

when he says to the Galatians, "I was unknown by face to the churches

of Jud�a which were in Christ;" [958] and again, he explains the

passage in the Psalms, where the Lord is called the cornerstone, [959]

as referring to His uniting in Himself the two walls of circumcision

and uncircumcision, "that He might make in Himself of twain one new

man, so making peace; and that He might reconcile both unto God in one

body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby: and that He might

come and preach peace to them that are far off, and to them that are

nigh," that is, to the Gentiles and to the Jews; "for He is our peace,

who hath made of both one;" [960] to the same purpose we find the

prophet speaking of the Jews as the children of Judah, and of the

Gentiles as children of Israel, where he says, "The children of Judah

and the children of Israel shall be gathered together, and shall make

to themselves one head, and shall go up from the land." Therefore, to

speak against a prophecy thus confirmed by actual events, is to speak

against the writings of the apostles as well as those of the prophets;

and not only to speak against writings, but to impugn in the most

reckless manner the evidence clear as noonday of established facts. In

the case of the narrative of Judah, it is perhaps not so easy to

recognize, under the disguise of the woman called Tamar, the harlot

representing the Church gathered from among the corruption of Gentile

superstition; but here, where Scripture explains itself, and where the

explanation is confirmed by the writings of the apostles, instead of

dwelling longer on this, we may proceed at once to inquire into the

meaning of the very things to which Faustus objects in Moses the

servant of God.

90. Moses killing the Egyptian in defending one of his brethren

reminds us naturally of the destruction of the devil, our assailant in

this land of strangers, by our defender the Lord Christ. And as Moses

hid the dead body in the sand, even so the devil, though slain, remains

concealed in those who are not firmly settled. The Lord, we know,

builds the Church on a rock; and those who hear His word and do it, He

compares to a wise man who builds his house upon a rock, and who does

not yield or give way before temptation; and those who hear and do not,

He compares to a foolish man who builds on the sand, and when his house

is tried its ruin is great. [961]

91. Of the prophetic significance of the spoiling of the Egyptians,

which was done by Moses at the command of the Lord his God, who

commands nothing but what is most just, I remember to have set down

what occurred to me at the time in my book entitled On Christian

Doctrine; [962] to the effect that the gold and silver and garments of

the Egyptians typified certain branches of learning which may be

profitably learned or taught among the Gentiles. This may be the true

explanation; or we may suppose that the vessels of gold and silver

represent the precious souls, and the garments the bodies, of those

from among the Gentiles who join themselves to the people of God, that

along with them they may be freed from the Egypt of this world.

Whatever the true interpretation may be, the pious student of the

Scriptures will feel certain that in the command, in the action, and in

the narrative there is a purpose and a symbolic meaning.

92. It would take too long to go through all the wars of Moses. It is

enough to refer to what has already been said, as sufficient for the

purpose in this reply to Faustus of the prophetic and symbolic

character of the war with Amalek. [963] There is also the charge of

cruelty made against Moses by the enemies of Scriptures, or by those

who have never read anything. Faustus does not make any specific

charge, but speaks of Moses as commanding and doing many cruel things.

But, knowing the things they are in the habit of bringing forward and

of misrepresenting, I have already taken a particular case and have

defended it, so that any Manich�ans who are willing to be corrected,

and all other ignorant and irreligious people, may see that there is no

ground for their accusations. We must now inquire into the prophetic

significance of the command, that many of those who, while Moses was

absent, made an idol for themselves should be slain without regard to

relationship. It is easy to see that the slaughter of these men

represents the warfare against the evil principles which led the people

into the same idolatry. Against such evil we are commanded to wage war

in the words of the psalm, "Be ye angry and sin not." [964] And a

similar command is given by the apostle, when he says, "Mortify your

members which are on earth fornication, uncleanness, luxury, evil

concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry." [965]

93. It requires closer examination to see the meaning of the first

action of Moses in burning the calf in fire, and grinding it to powder,

and sprinkling it in the water for the people to drink. The tables

given to him, written with the finger of God, that is, by the agency of

the Holy Spirit, he may have broken, because he judged the people

unworthy of having them read to them; and he may have burned the calf,

and ground it, and scattered it so as to be carried away by the water,

in order to let nothing of it remain among the people. But why should

he have made them drink it? Every one must feel anxious to discover

the typical significance of this action. Pursuing the inquiry, we may

find that in the calf there was an embodiment of the devil, as there is

in men of all nations who have the devil as their head or leader in

their impious rites. The calf is gold, because there is a semblance of

wisdom in the institution of idolatrous worship. Of this the apostle

says, "Knowing God, they glorified Him not as God, nor were thankful;

but they became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was

darkened. Professing themselves to be wise they became foolish, and

changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of

corruptible man, and of birds, and of four-footed beasts, and of

creeping things." [966] From this so-called wisdom came the golden

calf, which was one of the forms of idolatry among the chief men and

professed sages of Egypt. The calf, then, represents every body or

society of Gentile idolaters. This impious society the Lord Christ

burns with that fire of which He says in the Gospel, "I am come to send

fire on the earth;" [967] for, as there is nothing hid from His heat,

[968] when the Gentiles believe in Him they lose the form of the devil

in the fire of divine influence. Then all the body is ground, that is,

after the dissolution of the combination in the membership of iniquity

comes humiliation under the word of truth. Then the dust is sprinkled

in the water, that the Israelites, that is, the preachers of the

gospel, may in baptism admit those formerly idolaters into their own

body, that is, the body of Christ. To Peter, who was one of those

Israelites, it was said of the Gentiles, "Kill, and eat." [969] To

kill and eat is much the same as to grind and drink. So this calf, by

the fire of zeal, and the keen penetration of the word, and the water

of baptism, was swallowed up by the people, instead of their being

swallowed up by it.

94. Thus, when the very passages on which the heretics found their

objections to the Scriptures are studied and examined, the more obscure

they are the more wonderful are the secrets which we discover in reply

to our questions; so that the mouths of blasphemers are completely

stopped, and the evidence of the truth so stifles them that they cannot

even utter a sound. The unhappy men who will not receive into their

hearts the sweetness of the truth must feel its force as a gag in their

mouths. All those passages speak of Christ. The head now ascended

into heaven along with the body still suffering on earth is the full

development of the whole purpose of the authors of Scripture, which is

well called Sacred Scripture. Every part of the narrative in the

prophetical books should be viewed as having a figurative meaning,

except what serves merely as a framework for the literal or figurative

predictions of this king and of his people. For as in harps and other

musical instruments the musical sound does not come from all parts of

the instrument, but from the strings, and the rest is only for

fastening and stretching the strings so as to tune them, that when they

are struck by the musician they may give a pleasant sound; so in these

prophetical narratives the circumstances selected by the prophetic

spirit either predict some future event, or if they have no voice of

their own, they serve to connect together other significant utterances.

95. Should the heretics reject our exposition of those allegorical

narratives, or even insist on understanding them only in a literal

sense, to dispute about such a difference of understanding would be as

useless as to dispute about a difference of taste. Only, the fact that

the divine precepts have either a moral and religious character or a

prophetic meaning must be believed, whether intelligently or not.

Moreover, the figurative interpretations must all be in the interest of

morality and religion. So, if the Manich�ans or any others disagree

with our interpretation, or differ from us in method or in any

particular opinion, suffice it that the character of the fathers whom

God commends for their conduct and obedience to His precepts is

vindicated on a principle which all but those inveterate in their

hostility will acknowledge to be true; and that the purity and dignity

of the Scriptures are maintained in reference to those passages which

the enemies of the truth find fault with, where certain actions are

either praised or blamed, or merely narrated for us to form a judgment

of them.

96. In fact, nothing could have been devised more likely to instruct

and benefit the pious reader of sacred Scripture than that, besides

describing praiseworthy characters as examples, and blameworthy

characters as warnings, it should also narrate cases where good men

have gone back and fallen into evil, whether they are restored to the

right path or continue irreclaimable; and also where bad men have

changed, and have attained to goodness, whether they persevere in it or

relapse into evil; in order that the righteous may be not lifted up in

the pride of security, nor the wicked hardened in despair of cure. And

even those passages in Scripture which contain no examples or warnings

are either required for connection, so as to pass on to essential

matters, or, from their very appearance of superfluity, indicate the

presence of some secret symbolical meaning. For in the books we speak

of, so far from there being a want or a scarcity of prophetical

announcements, such announcements are numerous and distinct; and now

that the fulfillment has actually taken place, the testimony thus borne

to the divine authority of the books is irresistibly strong, so that it

is mere madness to suppose that there can be any useless or unmeaning

passages in books to which all classes of men and of minds do homage,

and which themselves predict what we see thus actually coming to pass.

97. If, then, any one reading of the action of David, of which he

repented when the Lord rebuked and threatened him, find in the

narrative an encouragement to sin, is Scripture to be blamed for this?

Is not the man's own guilt in proportion to the abuse which he makes

for his own injury or destruction of what was written for his recovery

and release? David is set forth as a great example of repentance,

because men who fall into sin either proudly disregard the cure of

repentance, or lose themselves in despair of obtaining salvation or of

meriting pardon. The example is for the benefit of the sick, not for

the injury of those in health. If madmen destroy themselves, or if

evil-doers destroy others, with surgical instruments, it is not the

fault of surgery.

98. Even supposing that our fathers the patriarchs and prophets, of

whose devout and religious habits so good a report is given in that

Scripture which every one who knows it, and has not lost entirely the

use of his reason, must admit to have been provided by God for the

salvation of men, were as lustful and cruel as the Manich�ans falsely

and fanatically allege, they might still be shown to be superior not

only to those whom the Manich�ans call the Elect, but also to their god

himself. Is there in the licentious intercourse of man with woman

anything so bad as the self-abasement of unclouded light by mixture

with darkness? Here, is a man prompted by avarice and greed to pass

off his wife as his sister and sell her to her lover; but worse still

and more shocking, that one should disguise his own nature to gratify

criminal passion, and submit gratuitously to pollution and

degradation. Why, even one who knowingly lies with his own daughters

is not equally criminal with one who lets his members share in the

defilement of all sensuality as gross as this, or grosser. And is not

the Manich�an god a partaker in the contamination of the most atrocious

acts of uncleanness? Again, if it were true, as Faustus says, that

Jacob went from one to another of his four wives, not desiring

offspring, but resembling a he-goat in licentiousness, he would still

not be sunk so low as your god, who must not only have shared in this

degradation, from his being confined in the bodies of Jacob and his

wives so as to be mixed up with all their movements, but also, in union

with this very he-goat of Faustus' coarse comparison, must have endured

all the pains of animal appetite, incurring fresh defilement at every

step, as partaking in the passion of the male, the conception of the

female, and the birth of the kid. And, in the same way, supposing

Judah to have been guilty not only of fornication, but of incest, a

share in the heats and impurities of this incestuous passion would also

belong to your god. David repented of his sin in loving the wife of

another, and in ordering the death of her husband; but when will your

god repent of giving up his members to the wanton passion of the male

and female chiefs of the race of darkness, and of putting to death not

the husband of his mistress, but his own children, whom he confines in

the members of the very demons who were his own lovers? Even if David

had not repented, nor been thus restored to righteousness, he would

still have been better than your god. David may have been defiled by

this one act, or to the extent to which one man is capable of such

defilement; but your god suffers the pollution of his members in all

such actions by whomsoever committed. The prophet Hosea, too, is

accused by Faustus: and, supposing him to have taken the harlot to

wife because he had a criminal affection for her, if he is licentious

and she a prostitute, their souls, according to your own assertion, are

parts and members of your god and of his nature. In plain language,

the harlot herself must be your god. You cannot pretend that your god

is not confined in the contaminated body, or that he is only present,

while preserving entire the purity of his own nature; and you

acknowledge that the members of your god are so defiled as to require a

special purification. This harlot, then, for whom you venture to find

fault with the man of God, even if she had not been changed for the

better by becoming a chaste wife, would still have been your god; at

least you must admit her soul to have been a part, however small, of

your god. But one single harlot is not so bad as your god, for he on

account of his mixture with the race of darkness shares in every act of

prostitution; and wherever such impurities are perpetrated, he goes

through the corresponding experiences of abandonment, of release, and

of confinement, and this from generation to generation, till this most

corrupt part reaches its final state in the mass of darkness, like an

irreclaimable harlot. Such are the evils and such the shameful

abominations which your god could not ward off from his members, and to

which he was brought irresistibly by his merciless enemy; for only by

the sacrifice of his own subjects, or rather his own parts, could he

effect the destruction of his formidable assailant. Surely, there was

nothing so bad as this in killing an Egyptian so as to preserve

uninjured a fellow-countryman. Yet Faustus finds fault with this most

absurdly, while with amazing infatuation he overlooks the case of his

own god. Would it not have been better for him to have carried off the

gold and silver vessels of the Egyptians, than to let his members be

carried off by the race of darkness? And yet the worshippers of this

unfortunate god find fault with the servant of our God for carrying on

wars, in which he with his followers were always victorious, so that,

under the leadership of Moses, the children of Israel carried captive

their enemies, men and women, as your god would have done too, if he

had been able. You profess to accuse Moses of doing wrong, while in

fact you envy his success. There was no cruelty in punishing with the

sword those who had sinned grievously against God. Indeed, Moses

entreated pardon for this sin, even offering to bear himself in their

stead the divine anger. But even had he been cruel instead of

compassionate, he would still have been better than your god. For if

any of his followers had been sent to break the force of the enemy and

had been taken captive, he would never, if victorious, have condemned

him when he had done no wrong, but acted in obedience to orders. And

yet this is what your god is to do with the part of himself which is to

be fastened in the mass of darkness, because it obeyed orders, and

advanced at the risk of its own life in defence of his kingdom against

the body of the enemy. But, says the Manich�an, this part, after

mixture and combination with evil during the course of ages, has not

been obedient. But why? If the obedience was voluntary, the guilt is

real, and the punishment just. But from this it would follow that

there is no nature opposed to sin; otherwise it would not sin

voluntarily; and so the whole system of Manich�ism falls at once. If,

again, this part suffers from the power of this enemy against whom it

was sent, and is subdued by a force it was unable to resist, the

punishment is unjust, and flagrantly cruel. The god who is defended on

the plea of necessity is a fit object of worship to those who refuse to

worship the one true God. Still, it must be allowed that, however

debasing the worship of this god may be, the worshippers are so far

better than their deity, that they have an existence, while he is

nothing more than a fabulous invention. Proceed we now to the rest of

Faustus' vagaries. [970]

------------------------
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[936] John xix. 15.
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[948] Matt. iii. 7.
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[954] Hos. i. 2-ii. 1.
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[970] [This book is one of the most unsatisfactory parts of the entire
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Book XXIII.

Faustus recurs to the genealogical difficulty and insists that even

according to Matthew Jesus was not Son of God until His baptism.

Augustin sets forth the Catholic view of the relation of the divine and

the human in the person of Christ.

1. Faustus said: On one occasion, when addressing a large audience, I

was asked by one of the crowd, Do you believe that Jesus was born of

Mary? I replied, Which Jesus do you mean? for in the Hebrew it is the

name of several people. One was the son of Nun, the follower of Moses;

[971] another was the son of Josedech the high priest; [972] again,

another is spoken of as the son of David; [973] and another is the Son

of God. [974] Of which of these do you ask whether I believe him to

have been born of Mary? His answer was, The Son of God, of course. On

what evidence, said I, oral or written, am I to believe this? He

replied, On the authority of Matthew. What, said I, did Matthew

write? He replied, "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the

son of David, the son of Abraham" (Matt. i. 1). Then said I, I was

afraid you were going to say, The book of the generation of Jesus

Christ, the Son of God; and I was prepared to correct you. Now that

you have quoted the verse accurately, you must nevertheless be advised

to pay attention to the words. Matthew does not profess to give an

account of the generation of the Son of God, but of the son of David.

2. I will, for the present, suppose that this person was right in

saying that the son of David was born of Mary. It still remains true,

that in this whole passage of the generation no mention is made of the

Son of God till we come to the baptism; so that it is an injurious

misrepresentation on your part to speak of this writer as making the

Son of God the inmate of a womb. The writer, indeed, seems to cry out

against such an idea, and in the very title of his book to clear

himself of such blasphemy, asserting that the person whose birth he

describes is the son of David, not the Son of God. And if you attend

to the writer's meaning and purpose, you will see that what he wishes

us to believe of Jesus the Son of God is not so much that He was born

of Mary, as that He became the Son of God by baptism at the river

Jordan. He tells us that the person of whom he spoke at the outset as

the son of David was baptized by John, and became the Son of God on

this particular occasion, when about thirty years old, according to

Luke, when also the voice was heard saying to Him, "Thou art my Son;

this day have I begotten Thee." [975] It appears from this, that what

was born, as is supposed, of Mary thirty years before, was not the Son

of God, but what was afterwards made so by baptism at Jordan, that is,

the new man, the same as in us when we were converted from Gentile

error, and believe in God. This doctrine may or may not agree with

what you call the Catholic faith; at all events, it is what Matthew

says, if Matthew is the real author. The words, Thou art my Son, this

day I have begotten Thee, or, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well

pleased, do not occur in connection with the story of Mary's

motherhood, but with the putting away of sin at Jordan. This is what

is written; and if you believe this doctrine, you must be called a

Matth�an, for you will no longer be a Catholic. The Catholic doctrine

is well known; and it is as unlike Matthew's representations as it is

unlike the truth. In the words of your creed, you declare that you

believe in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who was born of the Virgin

Mary. According to you, therefore, the Son of God comes from Mary;

according to Matthew, from the Jordan; while we believe Him to come

from God. Thus the doctrine of Matthew, if we are right in assigning

the authorship to him, is as different from yours as from ours; only we

acknowledge that he is more cautious than you in ascribing the being

born of a woman to the son of David, and not to the Son of God. As for

you, your only alternative is to deny that those statements were made,

as they appear to be, by Matthew, or to allow that you have abandoned

the faith of the apostles.

3. For our part, while no one can alter our conviction that the Son of

God comes from God, we might indulge a credulous disposition, to the

extent of admitting the fiction, that Jesus became the Son of God at

Jordan, but not that the Son of God was born of a woman. Then, again,

the son said to have been born of Mary cannot properly be called the

son of David, unless it is ascertained that he was begotten by Joseph.

You say he was not, and therefore you must allow him not to have been

the son of David, even though he were the son of Mary. The genealogy

proceeds in the line of Hebrew fathers from Abraham to David, and from

David to Joseph; and as we are told that Joseph was not the real father

of Jesus, Jesus cannot be said to be the son of David. To begin with

calling Jesus the son of David, and then to go on to tell of his being

born of Mary before the consummation of her marriage with Joseph, is

pure madness. And if the son of Mary cannot be called the son of

David, on account of his not being the son of Joseph, still less can

the name be given to the Son of God.

4. Moreover, the Virgin herself appears to have belonged not to the

tribe of Judah, to which the Jewish kings belonged, and which all agree

was David's tribe, but to the priestly tribe of Levi. This appears

from the fact that the Virgin's father Joachim was a priest; and his

name does not occur in the genealogy. How, then, can Mary be brought

within the pale of relationship to David, when she has neither father

nor husband belonging to it? Consequently, Mary's son cannot possibly

be the son of David, unless you can bring the mother into some

connection with Joseph, so as to be either his wife or his daughter.

5. Augustin replied: The Catholic, which is also the apostolic,

doctrine, is, that our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is both the Son of

God in His divine nature, and the Son of David after the flesh. This

we prove from the writings of the evangelists and apostles, so that no

one can reject our proofs without also rejecting these writings.

Faustus' plan is to represent some one as saying a few words, without

bringing forward any evidence in answer to Faustus' fertile sophistry.

But with all his ingenuity, the proofs I have to give will leave

Faustus no reply, but that these passages are spurious interpolations

in the sacred record,--a reply which serves as a means of escaping, or

of trying to escape, the force of the plainest statements in Holy

Scripture. We have already in this treatise sufficiently exposed the

irrational absurdity, as well as the daring profanity, of such

criticism; and not to exceed all limits, we must avoid repetition. It

cannot be necessary that we should bring together all the passages

scattered throughout Scripture, which show, in answer to Faustus, that

in the books of the highest and most sacred authority He who is called

the only-begotten Son of God, even God with God, is also called the Son

of David, on account of His taking the form of a servant from the

Virgin Mary, the wife of Joseph. To instance only Matthew, since

Faustus' argument refers to this Gospel, as the whole book cannot be

quoted here, let whoever choose read it, and see how Matthew carries on

to the passion and the resurrection the narrative of Him whom He calls

the Son of David in the introduction to the genealogy. Of this same

Son of David he speaks as being conceived and born of the Virgin Mary

by the Holy Ghost. He also applies to this the declaration of the

prophet, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and shall bear a son, and

they shall call His name Emmanuel, which is being interpreted, God with

us." [976] Again, He who was called, even from the Virgin's womb,

God-with-us, is said to have heard, when He was baptized by John, a

voice from heaven, saying, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well

pleased." [977] Will Faustus say that to be called God is less than

to be called the Son of God? He seems to think so, for he tries to

prove that because this voice came from heaven at the time of the

baptism, therefore, according to Matthew, He must then have become the

Son of God; whereas the same evangelist, in a previous passage, quotes

the sacred announcement made by the prophet, in which the child born of

the Virgin is called God-with-us.

6. It is remarkable how, amid his wild irrelevancies, this wretched

trifler loses no available opportunity of darkening the declarations of

Scripture by the fabulous creations of his own fancy. Thus he says of

Abraham, that when he took his handmaid to wife he disbelieved God's

promise that he should have a child by Sarah; whereas, in fact, this

promise had not at that time been given. Then he accuses Abraham of

falsehood in calling Sarah his sister, not having read what may be

learned on the authority of Scripture about the family of Sarah.

Abraham's son Isaac also he accuses of falsely calling his wife his

sister, though a distinct account is given of her family. Then he

accuses Jacob of there being a daily quarrel among his four wives,

which should be the first to appropriate him on his return from the

field, while nothing of this is said in Scripture. And this is the man

who pretends to hate the writers of the sacred books for their

falsehood, and who has the effrontery so to misrepresent even the

gospel record, though its authority is admitted by all as possessing

the most abundant confirmation, as to try to make it appear, not indeed

that Matthew himself,--for in that case he would have been forced to

yield to apostolic authority,--but that some one under the name of

Matthew, has written about Christ what he refuses to believe, and

attempts to refute with a contumelious ingenuity!

7. The voice from heaven at the Jordan should be compared with the

voice heard on the Mount. [978] In neither case do the words, "This

is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," imply that He was not

the Son of God before; for He who from the Virgin's womb took the form

of a servant "was in the form of God, and thought it no robbery to be

equal with God." [979] And the same Apostle Paul himself says

distinctly elsewhere, "But in the fullness of time, God sent His Son,

made of a woman, made under the law;" [980] that is, a woman in the

Hebrew sense, not a wife, but one of the female sex. The Son of God is

both Lord of David in His divine nature, and Son of David as being of

the seed of David after the flesh. And if it were not profitable for

us to believe this, the same apostle would not have made it so

prominent as he does, when he says to Timothy, "Remember that Christ

Jesus, of the seed of David, rose from the dead, according to my

gospel." [981] And he carefully enjoins believers to regard as

accursed whoever preaches another gospel contrary to this.

8. This assailant of the holy Gospel need find no difficulty in the

fact that Christ is called the Son of David, though He was born of a

virgin, and though Joseph was not His real father; while the genealogy

is brought down by the evangelist Matthew, not to Mary, but to Joseph.

First of all, the husband, as the man, is the more honorable; and

Joseph was Mary's husband, though she did not live with him, for

Matthew himself mentions that she was called Joseph's wife by the

angel; as it is also from Matthew that we learn that Mary conceived not

by Joseph, but by the Holy Spirit. But if this, instead of being a

true narrative written by Matthew the apostle, was a false narrative

written by some one else under his name, is it likely that he would

have contradicted himself in such an apparent manner, and in passages

so immediately connected, as to speak of the Son of David as born of

Mary without conjugal intercourse, and then, in giving His genealogy,

to bring it down to the very man with whom the Virgin is expressly said

not to have had intercourse, unless he had some reason for doing so?

Even supposing there were two writers, one calling Christ the Son of

David, and giving an account of Christ's progenitors from David down to

Joseph; while the other does not call Christ the Son of David, and says

that He was born of the Virgin Mary without intercourse with any man;

those statements are not irreconcilable, so as to prove that one or

both writers must be false. It will appear on reflection that both

accounts might be true; for Joseph might be called the husband of Mary,

though she was his wife only in affection, and in the intercourse of

the mind, which is more intimate than that of the body. In this way it

might be proper that the husband of the virgin-mother of Christ should

have a place in the list of Christ's ancestors. It might also be the

case that some of David's blood flowed in Mary herself, so that the

flesh of Christ, although produced from a virgin, still owed its origin

to David's seed. But as, in fact, both statements are made by one and

the same writer, who informs us both that Joseph was the husband of

Mary and that the mother of Christ was a virgin, and that Christ was of

the seed of David, and that Joseph is in the list of Christ's

progenitors in the line of David, those who prefer the authority of the

sacred Gospel to that of heretical fiction must conclude that Mary was

not unconnected with the family of David, and that she was properly

called the wife of Joseph, because being a woman she was in spiritual

alliance with him, though there was no bodily connection. Joseph, too,

it is plain, could not be omitted in the genealogy; for, from the

superiority of his sex, such an omission would be equivalent to a

denial of his relation to the woman with whom he was inwardly united;

and believers in Christ are taught not to think carnal connection the

chief thing in marriage, as if without this they could not be man and

wife, but to imitate in Christian wedlock as closely as possible the

parents of Christ, that so they may have the more intimate union with

the members of Christ.

9. We believe that Mary, as well as Joseph, was of the family of

David, because we believe the Scriptures, which assert both that Christ

was of the seed of David after the flesh, and that His mother was the

Virgin Mary, He having no human father. Therefore, whoever denies the

relationship of Mary to David, evidently opposes the pre-eminent

authority of these passages of Scripture; and to maintain this

opposition he must bring evidence in support of his statement from

writings acknowledged by the Church as canonical and catholic, not from

any writings he pleases. In the matters of which we are now treating,

only the canonical writings have any weight with us; for they only are

received and acknowledged by the Church spread over all the world,

which is itself a fulfillment of the prophecies regarding it contained

in these writings. Accordingly, I am not bound to admit the

uncanonical account of Mary's birth which Faustus adopts, that her

father was a priest of the tribe of Levi, of the name of Joachim. But

even were I to admit this account, I should still contend that Joachim

must have in some way belonged to the family of David, and had somehow

been adopted from the tribe of Judah into that of Levi; or if not he,

one of his ancestors; or, at least, that while born in the tribe of

Levi, he had still some relation to the line of David; as Faustus

himself acknowledges that Mary, though belonging to the tribe of Levi,

could be given to a husband of the tribe of Judah; and he expressly

says that if Mary were Joseph's daughter, the name Son of David would

be applicable to Christ. In this way, by the marriage of Joseph's

daughter in the tribe of Levi, her son, though born in the tribe of

Levi, might not improperly be called the Son of David. And so, if the

mother of that Joachim, who in the passage quoted by Faustus is called

the father of Mary, married in the tribe of Levi while she belonged to

the tribe of Judah and to the family of David, there would thus be a

sufficient reason for speaking of Joachim and Mary and Mary's son as

belonging to the seed of David. If I felt obliged to pay any regard to

the apocryphal scripture in which Joachim is called the father of Mary,

I should adopt some such explanation as the above, rather than admit

any falsehood in the Gospel, where it is written both that Jesus

Christ, the Son of God, and our Saviour, was of the seed of David after

the flesh, and that He was born of the Virgin Mary. It is enough for

us that the enemies of these Scriptures, which record these truths and

which we believe, cannot prove against them any charge of falsehood.

10. Faustus cannot pretend then I am unable to prove that Mary was of

the family of David, as I have shown him unable to prove that she was

not. I produce the strongest evidence from Scriptures of established

authority, which declare that Christ was of the seed of David, and that

He was born without a father of the Virgin Mary. Faustus expresses

what he considers a most becoming indignation against impropriety when

he says, It is an injurious misrepresentation of the writer to make him

speak of the Son of God as the inmate of a womb. Of course, the

Catholic doctrine which teaches that Christ the Son of God was born in

the flesh of a virgin, does not make the Son of God the inmate of her

womb in the sense of having no existence beyond it, as if He had

abandoned the government of heaven and earth, or as if He had left the

presence of the Father. The mistake is with the Manich�ans, whose

understanding is so incapable of forming a conception of anything

except what is material, that they cannot comprehend how the Word of

God, who is the virtue and wisdom of God, while remaining in Himself

and with the Father, and while governing the universe, reaches from end

to end in strength, and sweetly orders all things. [982] In the

faultless procedure of this adorable providence, He appointed for

Himself an earthly mother; and to free His servants from the bondage of

corruption He took in this mother the form of a servant, that is, a

mortal body; and this body which He took He showed openly, and when it

had been exposed, even to suffering and death, He raised it again from

the dead, and built again the temple which had been destroyed. You who

shrink from this doctrine as blasphemous, make the members of your god

to be confined not in a virgin's womb, but in the wombs of all female

animals, from elephants down to flies. Perhaps you think the less of

the true Christ, because the Word is said so to have become incarnate

in the Virgin's womb as to provide a temple for Himself in human

nature, while His own nature continued unaltered in its integrity; and,

on the other hand, you think the more of your god, because in the bonds

and pollution of his confinement in flesh, in the part which is to be

made fast to the mass of darkness, he seeks for help to no purpose, or

is even rendered powerless to ask for help.
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Book XXIV.

Faustus explains the Manich�an denial that man was made by God as

applying to the fleshly man not to the spiritual. Augustin elucidates

the Apostle Paul's contrasts between flesh and spirit so as to exclude

the Manich�an view.

1. Faustus said: We are asked the reason for our denial that man is

made by God. But we do not assert that man is in no sense made by God;

we only ask in what sense, and when, and how. For, according to the

apostle, there are two men, one of whom he calls sometimes the outer

man, generally the earthy, sometimes, too, the old man: the other he

calls the inner or heavenly or new man. [983] The question is, Which

of these is made by God? For there are likewise two times of our

nativity; one when nature brought us forth into this light, binding us

in the bonds of flesh; and the other, when the truth regenerated us on

our conversion from error and our entrance into the faith. It is this

second birth of which Jesus speaks in the Gospel, when He says, "Except

a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." [984]

Nicodemus, not knowing what Christ meant, was at a loss, and inquired

how this could be, for an old man could not enter into his mother's

womb and be born a second time. Jesus said in reply, "Except a man be

born of water and of the Holy Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of

God." Then He adds, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and

that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Hence, as the birth in

which our bodies originate is not the only birth, but there is another

in which we are born again in spirit, an important question arises from

this distinction as to which of those births it is in which God makes

us. The manner of birth also is twofold. In the humiliating process

of ordinary generation, we spring from the heat of animal passion; but

when we are brought into the faith, we are formed under good

instruction in honor and purity in Jesus Christ, by the Holy Spirit.

For this reason, in all religion, and especially in the Christian

religion, young children are invited to membership. This is hinted at

in the words of His apostle: "My little children, of whom I travail in

birth again until Christ be formed in you." [985] The question, then,

is not whether God makes man, but what man He makes, and when, and

how. For if it is when we are fashioned in the womb that God forms us

after His own image, which is the common belief of Gentiles and Jews,

and which is also your belief, then God makes the old man, and produces

us by means of sensual passion, which does not seem suitable to His

divine nature. But if it is when we are converted and brought to a

better life that we are formed by God, which is the general doctrine of

Christ and His apostles, and which is also our doctrine, in this case

God makes us new men, and produces us in honor and purity, which would

agree perfectly with His sacred and adorable majesty. If you do not

reject Paul's authority, we will prove to you from him what man God

makes, and when, and how. He says to the Ephesians, "That ye put off

according to your former conversation the old man, which is corrupt

through deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and

put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and

holiness of truth." [986] This shows that in the creation of man

after the image of God, it is another man that is spoken of, and

another birth, and another manner of birth. The putting off and

putting on of which he speaks, point to the time of the reception of

the truth; and the assertion that the new man is created by God implies

that the old man is created neither by God nor after God. And when he

adds, that this new man is made in holiness and righteousness and

truth, he thus points to another manner of birth of which this is the

character, and which, as I have said, differs widely from the manner in

which bodily generation is effected. And as he declares that only the

former is of God, it follows that the latter is not. Again, writing to

the Colossians, he uses words to the same effect: "Put off the old man

with his deeds, and put on the new man, which is renewed in the

knowledge of God according to the image of Him who created Him in

you." Here he not only shows that it is the new man that God makes,

but he declares the time and manner of the formation, for the words in

the knowledge of God point to the time of believing. Then he adds,

according to the image of Him who created him, to make it clear that

the old man is not the image of God, nor formed by God. Moreover, the

following words, "Where there is neither male nor female, Jew nor

Greek, Barbarian nor Scythian," [987] show more plainly still that the

birth by which we are made male and female, Greeks and Jews, Scythians

and Barbarians, is not the birth in which God effects the formation of

man; but that the birth with which God has to do is that in which we

lose the difference of nation and sex and condition, and become one

like Him who is one, that is, Christ. So the same apostle says again,

"As many as have been baptized in Christ have put on Christ: there is

neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither male nor female, there is

neither bond nor free; but all are one in Christ." [988] Man, then,

is made by God, not when from one he is divided into many, but when

from many he becomes one. The division is in the first birth, or that

of the body; union comes by the second, which is immaterial and

divine. This affords sufficient ground for our opinion, that the birth

of the body should be ascribed to nature, and the second birth to the

Supernal Majesty. So the same apostle says again to the Corinthians,

"I have begotten you in Christ Jesus by the gospel;" [989] and,

speaking of himself, to the Galatians, "When it pleased Him, who

separated me from my mother's womb, to reveal His Son in me, that I

might preach Him among the Gentiles, immediately I conferred not with

flesh and blood." [990] It is plain that everywhere he speaks of the

second or spiritual birth as that in which we are made by God, as

distinct from the indecency of the first birth, in which we are on a

level with other animals as regards dignity and purity, as we are

conceived in the maternal womb, and are formed, and brought forth. You

may observe that in this matter the dispute between us is not so much

about a question of doctrine as of interpretation. For you think that

it is the old or outer or earthy man that is said to have been made by

God; while we apply this to the heavenly man, giving the superiority to

the inner or new man. And our opinion is not rash or groundless, for

we have learned it from Christ and His apostles, who are proved to have

been the first in the world who thus taught.

2. Augustin replied: The Apostle Paul certainly uses the expression

the inner man for the spirit of the mind, and the outer man for the

body and for this mortal life; but we nowhere find him making these two

different men, but one, which is all made by God, both the inner and

the outer. However, it is made in the image of God only as regards the

inner, which, besides being immaterial, is rational, and is not

possessed by the lower animals. God, then, did not make one man after

His own image, and another man not after that image; but the one man,

which includes both the inner and the outer, He made after His own

image, not as regards the possession of a body and of mortal life, but

as regards the rational mind with the power of knowing God, and with

the superiority as compared with all irrational creatures which the

possession of reason implies. Faustus allows that the inner man is

made by God, when, as he says, it is renewed in the knowledge of God

after the image of Him that created him. I readily admit this on the

apostle's authority. Why does not Faustus admit on the same authority

that "God has placed the members every one in the body, as it has

pleased Him"? [991] Here we learn from the same apostle that God is

the framer of the outer man too. Why does Faustus take only what he

thinks to be in his own favor, while he leaves out or rejects what

upsets the follies of the Manich�ans? Moreover, in treating of the

earthy and the heavenly man, and making the distinction between the

mortal and the immortal, between that which we are in Adam and that

which we shall be in Christ, the apostle quotes the declaration of the

law regarding the earthy or natural body, referring to the very book

and the very passage where it is written that God made the earthy man

too. Speaking of the manner in which the dead shall rise again, and of

the body with which they shall come, after using the similitude of the

seeds of corn, that they are sown bare grain, and that God gives them a

body as it pleases Him, and to every seed his own body,--thus, by the

way, overthrowing the error of the Manich�ans, who say that grains and

plants, and all roots and shoots, are created by the race of darkness,

and not by God, who, according to them, instead of exerting power in

the production of these objects, is Himself subject to confinement in

them,--he goes on, after this refutation of Manich�an impieties, to

describe the different kinds of flesh. "All flesh," he says, "is not

the same flesh." Then he speaks of celestial and terrestrial bodies,

and then of the change of our body by which it will become spiritual

and heavenly. "It is sown," he says, "in dishonor, it shall rise in

glory; it is sown in weakness, it shall rise in power; it is sown a

natural body, it shall rise a spiritual body." Then, in order to show

the origin of the animal body, he says, "There is a natural body, and

there is a spiritual body; as it is written, The first man, Adam, was

made a living soul." [992] Now this is written in Genesis, [993]

where it is related how God made man, and animated the body which He

had formed of the earth. By the old man the apostle simply means the

old life, which is a life in sin, and is after the manner of Adam, of

whom it is said, "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by

sin; and so death passed upon all men, in that all have sinned." [994]

Thus the whole of this man, both the inner and the outer part, has

become old because of sin, and liable to the punishment of mortality.

There is, however, a restoration of the inner man, when it is renewed

after the image of its Creator, in the putting off of

unrighteousness--that is, the old man, and putting on

righteousness--that is, the new man. But when that which is sown a

natural body shall rise a spiritual body, the outer man too shall

attain the dignity of a celestial character; so that all that has been

created may be created anew, and all that has been made be remade by

the Creator and Maker Himself. This is briefly explained in the

words: "The body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life

because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of Him who raised up Jesus

from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead will

also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit dwelling in you." [995]

No one instructed in the Catholic doctrine but knows that it is in the

body that some are male and some female, not in the spirit of the mind,

in which we are renewed after the image of God. But elsewhere the

apostle teaches that God is the Maker of both; for he says, "Neither is

the woman without the man, nor the man without the woman, in the Lord;

for as the woman is of the man, so is the man by the woman; but all

things are of God." [996] The only reply given to this, by the

perverse stupidity of those who are alienated from the life of God by

the ignorance which is in them, on account of the blindness of their

heart, is, that whatever pleases them in the apostolic writings is

true, and whatever displeases them is false. This is the insanity of

the Manich�ans, who will be wise if they cease to be Manich�ans. As it

is, if they are asked whether it is He that remakes and renews the

inner man (which they acknowledge to be renewed after the image of God,

and they themselves quote the passage in support of this; and,

according to Faustus, God makes man when the inner man is renewed in

the image of God), they will answer, yes. And if we then go on to ask

when God made what He now renews, they must devise some subterfuge to

prevent the exposure of their absurdities. For, according to them, the

inner man is not formed or created or originated by God, but is part of

His own substance sent against His enemies; and instead of becoming old

by sin, it is through necessity captured and damaged by the enemy. Not

to repeat all the nonsense they talk, the first man they speak of is

not the man of the earth earthy that the apostle speaks of, [997] but

an invention proceeding from their own magazine of untruths. Faustus,

though he chooses man as a subject for discussion, says not a word of

this first man; for he is afraid that his opponents in the discussion

might come to know something about him.
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Book XXV.

Faustus seeks to bring into ridicule the orthodox claim to believe in

the infinity of God by caricaturing the anthropomorphic representations

of the Old Testament. Augustin expresses his despair of being able to

induce the Manich�ans to adopt right views of the infinitude of God so

long as they continue to regard the soul and God as extended in space.

1. Faustus said: Is God finite or infinite? He must be finite unless

you are mistaken in addressing Him as the God of Abraham and Isaac and

Jacob; unless, indeed, the being thus addressed is different from the

God you call infinite. In the case of the God of Abraham and Isaac and

Jacob, the mark of circumcision, which separated these men from

fellowship with other people, marked also the limit of God's power as

extending only to them. And a being whose power is finite cannot

himself be infinite. Moreover, in this address, you do not mention

even the ancients before Abraham, such as Enoch, Noah, and Shem, and

others like them, whom you allow to have been righteous though in

uncircumcision; but because they lacked this distinguishing mark, you

will not call God their God, but only of Abraham and his seed. Now, if

God is one and infinite, what need of such careful particularity in

addressing Him, as if it was not enough to name God, without adding

whose God He is--Abraham's, namely, and Isaac's and Jacob's; as if

Abraham were a landmark to steer by in your invocation, to escape

shipwreck among a shoal of deities? The Jews, who are circumcised, may

very properly address this deity, as having a reason for it, because

they call God the God of circumcision, in contrast to the gods of

uncircumcision. But why you should do the same, it is difficult to

understand; for you do not pretend to have Abraham's sign, though you

invoke his God. If we understand the matter rightly, the Jews and

their God seem to have set marks upon one another for the purpose of

recognition, that they might not lose each other. So God gave them the

disgusting mark of circumcision, that, in whatever land or among

whatever people they might be, they might by being circumcised be known

to be His. They again marked God by calling Him the God of their

fathers, that, wherever He might be, though among a crowd of gods, He

might, on hearing the name God of Abraham, God of Isaac, God of Jacob,

know at once that He was addressed. So we often see, in a number of

people of the same name, that no one answers till called by his

surname. In the same way the shepherd or herdsman makes use of a brand

to prevent his property being taken by others. In thus marking God by

calling Him the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, you show not only

that He is finite, but also that you have no connection with Him,

because you have not the mark of circumcision by which He recognizes

His own. Therefore, if this is the God you worship, there can be no

doubt of His being finite. But if you say that God is infinite, you

must first of all give up this finite deity, and by altering your

invocation, show your penitence for your past errors. We have thus

proved God to be finite, taking you on your own ground. But to

determine whether the supreme and true God is infinite or not, we need

only refer to the opposition between good and evil. If evil does not

exist, then certainly God is infinite; otherwise He must be finite.

Evil, however, undoubtedly exists; therefore God is not infinite. It

is where good stops that evil begins.

2. Augustin replied: No one that knows you would dream of asking you

about the infinitude of God, or of discussing the matter with you.

For, before there can be any degree of spirituality in any of your

conceptions, you must first have your minds cleared by simple faith,

and by some elementary knowledge, from the illusions of carnal and

material ideas. This your heresy prevents you from doing, for it

invariably represents the body and the soul and God as extended in

space, either finite or infinite, while the idea of space is applicable

only to the body. As long as this is the case, it will be better for

you to leave this matter alone; for you can teach no truth regarding

it, any more than in other matters; and in this you are unfit for

learning, as you might do in other things, if you were not proud and

quarrelsome. For in such questions as how God can be finite, when no

space can contain Him; how He can be infinite, when the Son knows Him

perfectly; how He can be finite, and yet unbounded; how He can be

infinite, and yet perfect; how He can be finite, who is without

measure; how He can be infinite, who is the measure of all things--all

carnal ideas go for nothing; and if the carnality is to be removed, it

must first become ashamed of itself. Accordingly, your best way of

ending the matter you have brought forward of God as finite or

infinite, is to say no more about it till you cease going so far astray

from Christ, who is the end of the law. Of the God of Abraham and

Isaac and Jacob we have already said enough to show why He who is the

true God of all creatures wished to be familiarly known by His people

under this name. On circumcision, too, we have already spoken in

several places in answer to ignorant reproaches. The Manich�ans would

find nothing to ridicule in this sign if they would view it as

appointed by God, to be an appropriate symbol of the putting off of the

flesh. They ought thus to consider the rite with a Christian instead

of a heretical mind; as it is written, "To the pure all things are

pure." But, considering the truth of the following words, "To the

unclean and unbelieving nothing is pure, but even their mind and

conscience are defiled," [998] we must remind our witty opponents, that

if circumcision is indecent, as they say it is, they should rather weep

than laugh at it; for their god is exposed to restraint and

contamination in conjunction both with the skin which is cut and with

the blood which is shed.

------------------------
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Book XXVI.

Faustus insists that Jesus might have died though not born, by the

exercise of divine power, yet he rejects birth and death alike.

Augustin maintains that there are some things that even God cannot do,

one of which is to die. He refutes the docetism of the Manich�ans.

1. Faustus said: You ask, If Jesus was not born, how did He die?

Well this is a probability, such as one makes use of in want of

proofs. We will, however, answer the question by examples taken from

what you generally believe. If they are true, they will prove our

case; if they are false, they will help you no more than they will us.

You say then, How could Jesus die, if He were not man? In return, I

ask you, How did Elias not die, though he was a man? Could a mortal

encroach upon the limits of immortality, and could not Christ add to

His immortality whatever experience of death was required? If Elias,

contrary to nature, lives for ever, why not allow that Jesus, with no

greater contrariety to nature, could remain in death for three days?

Besides that, it is not only Elias, but Moses and Enoch you believe to

be immortal, and to have been taken up with their bodies to heaven.

Accordingly, if it is a good argument that Jesus was a man because He

died, it is an equally good argument that Elias was not a man because

he did not die. But as it is false that Elias was not a man,

notwithstanding his supposed immortality, so it is false that Jesus was

a man, though He is considered to have died. The truth is, if you will

believe it, that the Hebrews were in a mistake regarding both the death

of Jesus and the immortality of Elias. For it is equally untrue that

Jesus died and that Elias did not die. But you believe whatever you

please; and for the rest, you appeal to nature. And, allowing this

appeal, nature is against both the death of the immortal and the

immortality of the mortal. And if we refer to the power of effecting

their purpose as possessed by God and by man, it seems more possible

for Jesus to die than for Elias not to die; for the power of Jesus is

greater than that of Elias. But if you exalt the weaker to heaven,

though nature is against it, and, forgetting his condition as a mortal,

endow him with eternal felicity, why should I not admit that Jesus

could die if He pleased, even though I were to grant His death to have

been real, and not a mere semblance? For, as from the outset of His

taking the likeness of man He underwent in appearance all the

experiences of humanity, it was quite consistent that He should

complete the system by appearing to die.

2. Moreover, it is to be remembered that this reference to what nature

grants as possible, should be made in connection with all the history

of Jesus, and not only with His death. According to nature, it is

impossible that a man blind from his birth should see the light; and

yet Jesus appears to have performed a miracle of this kind, so that the

Jews themselves exclaimed that from the beginning of the world it was

not seen that one opened the eyes of a man born blind. [999] So also

healing a withered hand, giving the power of utterance and expression

to those born dumb, restoring animation to the dead, with the recovery

of their bodily frame after dissolution had begun, produce a feeling of

amazement, and must seem utterly incredible in view of what is

naturally possible and impossible. And yet, as Christians, we believe

all the things to have been done by the same person; for we regard not

the law of nature, but the powerful operation of God. There is a

story, too, of Jesus having been cast from the brow of a hill, and

having escaped unhurt. If, then, when thrown down from a height He did

not die, simply because He chose not to die, why should He not have had

the power to die when He pleased? We take this way of answering you

because you have a fancy for discussion, and affect to use logical

weapons not properly belonging to you. As regards our own belief, it

is no more true that Jesus died than that Elias is immortal.

3. Augustin replied: As to Enoch and Elias and Moses, our belief is

determined not by Faustus' suppositions, but by the declarations of

Scripture, resting as they do on foundations of the strongest and

surest evidence. People in error, as you are, are unfit to decide what

is natural, and what contrary to nature. We admit that what is

contrary to the ordinary course of human experience is commonly spoken

of as contrary to nature. Thus the apostle uses the words, "If thou

art cut out of the wild olive, and engrafted contrary to nature in the

good olive." [1000] Contrary to nature is here used in the sense of

contrary to human experience of the course of nature; as that a wild

olive engrafted in a good olive should bring forth the fatness of the

olive instead of wild berries. But God, the Author and Creator of all

natures, does nothing contrary to nature; for whatever is done by Him

who appoints all natural order and measure and proportion must be

natural in every case. And man himself acts contrary to nature only

when he sins; and then by punishment he is brought back to nature

again. The natural order of justice requires either that sin should

not be committed or that it should not go unpunished. In either case,

the natural order is preserved, if not by the soul, at least by God.

For sin pains the conscience, and brings grief on the mind of the

sinner, by the loss of the light of justice, even should no physical

sufferings follow, which are inflicted for correction, or are reserved

for the incorrigible. There is, however, no impropriety in saying that

God does a thing contrary to nature, when it is contrary to what we

know of nature. For we give the name nature to the usual common course

of nature; and whatever God does contrary to this, we call a prodigy,

or a miracle. But against the supreme law of nature, which is beyond

the knowledge both of the ungodly and of weak believers, God never

acts, any more than He acts against Himself. As regards spiritual and

rational beings, to which class the human soul belongs, the more they

partake of this unchangeable law and light, the more clearly they see

what is possible, and what impossible; and again, the greater their

distance from it, the less their perception of the future, and the more

frequent their surprise at strange occurrences.

4. Thus of what happened to Elias we are ignorant; but still we

believe the truthful declarations of Scripture regarding him. Of one

thing we are certain, that what God willed happened, and that except by

God's will nothing can happen to any one. So, if I am told that it is

possible that the flesh of a certain man shall be changed into a

celestial body, I allow the possibility, but I cannot tell whether it

will be done; and the reason of my ignorance is, that I am not

acquainted with the will of God in the matter. That it will be done if

it is God's will, is perfectly clear and indubitable. Again, if I am

told that something would happen if God did not prevent it from

happening, I reply confidently that what is to happen is the action of

God, not the event which might otherwise have happened. For God knows

His own future action, and therefore He knows also the effect of that

action in preventing the happening of what would otherwise have

happened; and, beyond all question, what God knows is more certain than

what man thinks. Hence it is as impossible for what is future not to

happen, as for what is past not to have happened; for it can never be

God's will that anything should, in the same sense, be both true and

false. Therefore all that is properly future cannot but happen; what

does not happen never was future; even as all things which are properly

in the past did indubitably take place.

5. Accordingly, to say, if God is almighty, let Him make what has been

done to be undone, is in fact to say, if God is almighty, let Him make

a thing to be in the same sense both true and false. God can put an

end to the existence of anything, when the thing to be put an end to

has a present existence; as when He puts an end by death to the

existence of any one who has been brought into existence in birth; for

in this case there is an actual existence which may be put a stop to.

But when a thing does not exist, the existence cannot be put a stop

to. Now, what is past no longer exists and whatever has an existence

which can be put an end to cannot be past. What is truly past is no

longer present; and the truth of its past existence is in our judgment,

not in the thing itself which no longer exists. The proposition

asserting anything to be past is true when the thing no longer exists.

God cannot make such a proposition false, because He cannot contradict

the truth. The truth in this case, or the true judgment, is first of

all in our own mind, when we know and give expression to it. But

should it disappear from our minds by our forgetting it, it would still

remain as truth. It will always be true that the past thing which is

no longer present had an existence; and the truth of its past existence

after it has stopped is the same as the truth of its future existence

before it began to be. This truth cannot be contradicted by God, in

whom abides the supreme and unchangeable truth, and whose illumination

is the source of all the truth to be found in any mind or

understanding. Now God is not omnipotent in the sense of being able to

die; nor does this inability prevent His being omnipotent. True

omnipotence belongs to Him who truly exists, and who alone is the

source of all existence, both spiritual and corporeal. The Creator

makes what use He pleases of all His creatures; and His pleasure is in

harmony with true and unchangeable justice, by which, as by His own

nature, He, Himself unchangeable, brings to pass the changes of all

changeable things according to the desert of their natures or of their

actions. No one, therefore, would be so foolish as to deny that Elias

being a creature of God could be changed either for the worse or for

the better; or that by the will of the omnipotent God he could be

changed in a manner unusual among men. So we can have no reason for

doubting what on the high authority of Scripture is related of him,

unless we limit the power of God to things which we are familiar with.

6. Faustus' argument is, If Elias who was a man could escape death,

why might not Christ have the power of dying, since He was more than

man? This is the same as to say, If human nature can be changed for

the better, why should not the divine nature be changed for the

worse?--a weak argument, seeing that human nature is changeable, while

the divine nature is not. Such a method of inference would lead to the

glaring absurdity, that if God can bestow eternal glory on man, He must

also have the power of consigning Himself to eternal misery. Faustus

will reply that his argument refers only to three days of death for

God, as compared with eternal life for man. Well, if you understood

the three days of death in the sense of the death of the flesh which

God took as a part of our mortal nature, you would be quite correct;

for the truth of the gospel makes known that the death of Christ for

three days was for the eternal life of men. But in arguing that there

is no impropriety in asserting a death of three days of the divine

nature itself, without any assumption of mortality, because human

nature can be endowed with immortality, you display the folly of one

who knows neither God nor the gifts of God. And indeed, since you make

part of your god to be fastened to the mass of darkness for ever, how

can you escape the absurd conclusion already mentioned, that God

consigns Himself to eternal misery? You will then require to prove

that part of light is light, while part of God is not God. To give you

in a word, without argument, the true reason of our faith, as regards

Elias having been caught up to heaven from the earth, though only a

man, and as regards Christ being truly born of a virgin, and truly

dying on the cross, our belief in both cases is grounded on the

declaration of Holy Scripture, [1001] which it is piety to believe, and

impiety to disbelieve. What is said of Elias you pretend to deny, for

you will pretend anything. Regarding Christ, although even you do not

go the length of saying that He could not die, though He could be born,

still you deny His birth from a virgin, and assert His death on the

cross to have been feigned, which is equivalent to denying it too,

except as a mockery for the delusion of men; and you allow so much

merely to obtain indulgence for your own falsehoods from the believers

in these fictions.

7. The question which Faustus makes it appear that he is asked by a

Catholic, If Jesus was not born, how could He die? could be asked only

by one who overlooked the fact that Adam died, though he was not born.

Who will venture to say that the Son of God could not, if He had

pleased, have made for Himself a true human body in the same way as He

did for Adam; for all things were made by Him? [1002] or who will deny

that He who is the Almighty Son of the Almighty could, if He had

chosen, have taken a body from a heavenly substance, or from air or

vapor, and have so changed it into the precise character of a human

body, as that He might have lived as a man, and have died in it? Or,

once more, if He had chosen to take a body of none of the material

substances which He had made, but to create for Himself from nothing

real flesh, as all things were created by Him from nothing, none of us

will oppose this by saying that He could not have done it. The reason

of our believing Him to have been born of the Virgin Mary, is not that

He could not otherwise have appeared among men in a true body, but

because it is so written in the Scripture, which we must believe in

order to be Christians, or to be saved. We believe, then, that Christ

was born of the Virgin Mary, because it is so written in the Gospel; we

believe that He died on the cross, because it is so written in the

Gospel; we believe that both His birth and death were real, because the

Gospel is no fiction. Why He chose to suffer all these things in a

body taken from a woman is a matter known only to Himself. Perhaps He

took this way of giving importance and honor to both the sexes which He

had created, taking the form of a man, and being born of a woman; or

there may have been some other reason, we cannot tell. But this may be

confidently affirmed, that what took place was exactly as we are told

in the Gospel narrative, and that what the wisdom of God determined

upon was exactly what ought to have happened. We place the authority

of the Gospel above all heretical discussions; and we admire the

counsel of divine wisdom more than any counsel of any creature.

8. Faustus calls upon us to believe him, and says, The truth is, if

you will believe it, that the Hebrews were in a mistake regarding both

the death of Jesus and the immortality of Elias. And a little after he

adds, As from the outset of His taking the likeness of man He underwent

in appearance all the experiences of humanity, it was quite consistent

that He should seal the dispensation by appearing to die. How can this

infamous liar, who declares that Christ feigned death, expect to be

believed? Did Christ utter falsehood when He said, "It behoves the Son

of man to be killed, and to rise the third day?" [1003] And do you

tell us to believe what you say, as if you utter no falsehoods? In

that case, Peter was more truthful than Christ when he said to Him, "Be

it far from Thee, Lord; this shall not be unto Thee;" for which it was

said to him, "Get thee behind me, Satan." [1004] This rebuke was not

lost upon Peter, for, after his correction and full preparation, he

preached even to his own death the truth of the death of Christ. But

if Peter deserved to be called Satan for thinking that Christ would not

die, what should you be called, when you not only deny that Christ

died, but assert that He feigned death? You give, as a reason for

Christ's appearing to die, that He underwent in appearance all the

experiences of humanity. But that He feigned all the experiences of

humanity is only your opinion in opposition to the Gospel. In reality,

when the evangelist says that Jesus slept, [1005] that He was hungry,

[1006] that He was thirsty, [1007] that He was sorrowful, [1008] or

glad, and so on,--these things are all true in the senseof not being

feigned, but actual experiences; only that they were undergone, not

from a mere natural necessity, but in the exercise of a controlling

will, and of divine power. In the case of a man, anger, sorrow,

sleeping, being hungry and thirsty, are often involuntary; in Christ

they were acts of His own will. So also men are born without any act

of their own will, and suffer against their will; while Christ was born

and suffered by His own will. Still, the things are true; and the

accurate narrative of them is intended to instruct whoever believes in

Christ's gospel in the truth, not to delude him with falsehoods.

------------------------

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[999] John ix.

[1000] Rom. xi. 24.

[1001] 2 Kings ii. 11; Matt. i. 25, xvii. 50.

[1002] John i. 3.

[1003] Luke xxiv. 7.

[1004] Matt. xvi. 22, 23.

[1005] Matt. viii. 24.

[1006] Matt. iv. 2.

[1007] John xix. 28.

[1008] Matt. xxvi. 37.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Book XXVII.

Faustus warns against pressing too far the argument, that if Jesus was

not born He cannot have suffered. Augustin accepts the birth and death

alike on the testimony of the Gospel narrative, which is higher

authority than the falsehood of Manich�us.

1. Faustus said: If Jesus was not born, He cannot have suffered; but

since He did suffer, He must have been born. I advise you not to have

recourse to logical inference in these matters, or else your whole

faith will be shaken. For, even according to you, Jesus was born

miraculously of a virgin; which the argument from consequents to

antecedents shows to be false. For your argument might thus be turned

against you: If Jesus was born of a woman, He must have been begotten

by a man; but He was not begotten by a man, therefore He was not born

of a woman. If, as you believe, He could be born without being

begotten, why could He not also suffer without being brought forth?

2. Augustin replied: The argument which you here reply to is one

which could be used only by such ignorant people as you succeed in

misleading, not by those who know enough to refute you. Jesus could

both be born without being begotten and suffer without being brought

forth. His being one and not the other was the effect of His own

will. He chose to be born without being begotten, and not to suffer

without being brought forth. And if you ask how I know that He was

brought forth, and that He suffered, I read this in the faithful Gospel

narrative. If I ask how you know what you state, you bring forward the

authority of Manich�us, and charge the Gospel with falsehood. Even if

Manich�us did not set forth falsehood as an excellence in Christ, I

should not believe his statements. His praise of falsehood comes from

nothing that he found in Christ, but from his own moral character.

------------------------

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Book XXVIII.

Faustus recurs to the genealogy and insists upon examining it as

regards its consistency with itself. Augustin takes his stand on

Scripture authority and maintains that Matthew's statements as to the

birth of Christ must be accepted as final.

1. Faustus said: Christ, you say, could not have died, had He not

been born. I reply, If He was born, He cannot have been God; or if He

could both be God and be born, why could He not both be born and die?

Plainly, arguments and necessary consequences are not applicable to

those matters, where the question is of the account to be given of

Jesus. The answer must be obtained from His own statements, or from

the statements of His apostles regarding Him. The genealogy must be

examined as regards its consistency with itself, instead of arguing

from the supposition of Christ's death to the fact of His birth; for He

might have suffered without having been born, or He might have been

born, and yet never have suffered; for you yourselves acknowledge that

with God nothing is impossible, which is inconsistent with the denial

that Christ could have suffered without having been born.

2. Augustin replied: You are always answering arguments which no one

uses, instead of our real arguments, which you cannot answer. No one

says that Christ could not die if He had not been born; for Adam died

though he had not been born. What we say is, Christ was born, because

this is said not by this or that heretic, but in the holy Gospel; and

He died, for this too is written, not in some heretical production, but

in the holy Gospel. You set aside argument on the question of the true

account to be given of Jesus, and refer to what He says of Himself, and

what His apostles say of Him; and yet, when I begin to quote the Gospel

of His apostle Matthew, where we have the whole narrative of Christ's

birth, you forthwith deny that Matthew wrote the narrative, though this

is affirmed by the continuous testimony of the whole Church, from the

days of apostolic presidency to the bishops of our own time. What

authority will you quote against this? Perhaps some book of Manich�us,

where it is denied that Jesus was born of a virgin. As, then, I

believe your book to be the production of Manich�us, since it has been

kept and handed down among the disciples of Manich�us, from the time

when he lived to the present time, by a regular succession of your

presidents, so I ask you to believe the book which I quote to have been

written by Matthew, since it has been handed down from the days of

Matthew in the Church, without any break in the connection between that

time and the present. The question then is, whether we are to believe

the statements of an apostle who was in the company of Christ while He

was on earth, or of a man away in Persia, born long after Christ. But

perhaps you will quote some other book bearing the name of an apostle

known to have been chosen by Christ; and you will find there that

Christ was not born of Mary. Since, then, one of the books must be

false, the question in this case is, whether we are to yield our belief

to a book acknowledged and approved as handed down from the beginning

in the Church founded by Christ Himself, and maintained through the

apostles and their successors in an unbroken connection all over the

world to the present day; or to a book which this Church condemns as

unknown, and which, moreover, is brought forward by men who prove their

veracity by praising Christ for falsehood.

3. Here you will say, Examine the genealogy as given in the two

Gospels, and see if it is consistent with itself. The answer to this

has been given already. [1009] Your difficulty is how Joseph could

have two fathers. But even if you could not have thought of the

explanation, that one was his own father, and the other adopted, you

should not have been so ready to put yourself in opposition to such

high authority. Now that this explanation has been given you, I call

upon you to acknowledge the truth of the Gospel, and above all to cease

your mischievous and unreasonable attacks upon the truth.

4. Faustus most plausibly refers to what Jesus said of Himself. But

how is this to be known except from the narratives of His disciples?

And if we do not believe them when they tell us that Christ was born of

a virgin, how shall we believe what they record as said by Christ of

Himself? For, as regards any writing professing to come immediately

from Christ Himself, if it were really His, how is it not read and

acknowledged and regarded as of supreme authority in the Church, which,

beginning with Christ Himself, and continued by His apostles, who were

succeeded by the bishops, has been maintained and extended to our own

day, and in which is found the fulfillment of many former predictions,

while those concerning the last days are sure to be accomplished in the

future? In regard to the appearance of such a writing, it would

require to be considered from what quarter it issued. Supposing it to

have issued from Christ Himself, those in immediate connection with Him

might very well have received it, and have transmitted it to others.

In this case, the authority of the writing would be fully established

by the traditions of various communities, and of their presidents, as I

have already said. Who, then, is so infatuated as in our day to

believe that the Epistle of Christ issued by Manich�us is genuine, or

to disbelieve Matthew's narrative of Christ's words and actions? Or,

if the question is of Matthew being the real author, who would not, in

this also, believe what he finds in the Church, which has a distinct

history in unbroken connection from the days of Matthew to the present

time, rather than a Persian interloper, who comes more than two hundred

years after, and wishes us to believe his account of Christ's words and

actions rather than that of Matthew; whereas, even in the case of the

Apostle Paul, who was called from heaven after the Lord's ascension,

the Church would not have believed him, had there not been apostles in

life with whom he might communicate, and compare his gospel with

theirs, so as to be recognized as belonging to the same society? When

it was ascertained that Paul preached what the apostles preached, and

that he lived in fellowship and harmony with them, and when God's

testimony was added by Paul's working miracles like those done by the

apostles, his authority became so great, that his words are now

received in the Church, as if, to use his own appropriate words, Christ

were speaking in him. [1010] Manich�us, on the other hand, thinks

that the Church of Christ should believe what he says in opposition to

the Scriptures, which are supported by such strong and continuous

evidence, and in which the Church finds an emphatic injunction, that

whoever preaches to her differently from what she has received must be

anathema. [1011]

5. Faustus tells us that he has good grounds for concluding that these

Scriptures are unworthy of credit. And yet he speaks of not using

arguments. But the argument too shall be refuted. The end of the

whole argument is to bring the soul to believe that the reason of its

misery in this world is, that it is the means of preventing God from

being deprived of His kingdom, and that God's substance and nature is

so exposed to change, corruption, injury, and contamination, that part

of it is incurably defiled, and is consigned by Himself to eternal

punishment in the mass of darkness, though, when it was in harmless

union with Himself, and guilty of no crime, He knowingly sent it where

it was to suffer defilement. This is the end of all your arguments and

fictions; and would that there were an end of them as regards your

heart and your lips, that you might sometime desist from believing and

uttering those execrable blasphemies! But, says Faustus, I prove from

the writings themselves that they cannot be in all points trustworthy,

for they contradict one another. Why not say, then, that they are

wholly untrustworthy, if their testimony is inconsistent and

self-contradictory? But, says Faustus, I say what I think to be in

accordance with truth. With what truth? The truth is only your own

fiction, which begins with God's battle, goes on to His contamination,

and ends with His damnation. No one, says Faustus, believes writings

which contradict themselves. But if you think they do this, it is

because you do not understand them; for your ignorance has been

manifested in regard to the passages you have quoted in support of your

opinion, and the same will appear in regard to any quotations you may

still make. So there is no reason for our not believing these

writings, supported as they are by such weighty testimony; and this is

itself the best reason for pronouncing accursed those whose preaching

differs from what is there written.

------------------------

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1009] III. 3.

[1010] 2 Cor. xiii. 3.

[1011] Gal. i. 8, 9.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Book XXIX.

Faustus seeks to justify the docetism of the Manich�ans. Augustin

insists that there is nothing disgraceful in being born.

1. Faustus said: If Christ was visible, and suffered without having

been born, this was sorcery. This argument of yours may be turned

against you, by replying that it was sorcery if He was conceived or

brought forth without being begotten. It is not in accordance with the

law of nature that a virgin should bring forth, and still less that she

should still be a virgin after bringing forth. Why, then, do you

refuse to admit that Christ, in a preternatural manner, suffered

without submitting to the condition of birth? Believe me: in

substance, both our beliefs are contrary to nature; but our belief is

decent, and yours is not. We give an explanation of Christ's passion

which is at least probable, while the only explanation you give of His

birth is false. In fine, we hold that He suffered in appearance, and

did not really die; you believe in an actual birth, and conception in

the womb. If it is not so, you have only to acknowledge that the birth

too was a delusion, and our whole dispute will be at an end. As to

what you frequently allege, that Christ could not have appeared or

spoken to men without having been born, it is absurd; for, as our

teachers have shown, angels have often appeared and spoken to men.

2. Augustin replied: We do not say that to die without having been

born is sorcery; for, as we have said already, this happened in the

case of Adam. But, though it had never happened, who will venture to

say that Christ could not, if He had so pleased, have come without

taking His body from a virgin, and yet appearing in a true body to

redeem us by a true death? However, it was better that He should be,

as He actually was, born of a virgin, and, by His condescension, do

honor to both sexes, for whose deliverance He was to die, by taking a

man's body born of a woman. In this He testifies emphatically against

you, and refutes your doctrine, which makes the sexes the work of the

devil. What we call sorcery in your doctrine is your making Christ's

passion and death to have been only in appearance, so that, by a

spectral illusion, He seemed to die when He did not. Hence you must

also make His resurrection spectral and illusory and false; for if

there was no true death, there could not be a real resurrection. Hence

also the marks which He showed to His doubting disciples must have been

false; and Thomas was not assured by truth, but cheated by a lie, when

he exclaimed, "My Lord, and my God." [1012] And yet you would have us

believe that your tongue utters truth, though Christ's whole body was a

falsehood. Our argument against you is, that the Christ you make is

such that you cannot be His true disciples unless you too practise

deceit. The fact that Christ's body was the only one born of a virgin

does not prove that there was sorcery in His birth, any more than there

is sorcery in its being the only body to rise again on the third day,

never to die any more. Will you say that there was sorcery in all the

Lord's miracles because they were unusual? They really happened, and

their appearance, as seen by men, was true, and not an illusion; and

when they are said to be contrary to nature, it is not that they oppose

nature, but that they transcend the method of nature to which we are

accustomed. May God keep the minds of His people who are still babes

in Christ from being influenced by Faustus, when he recommends as a

duty that we should acknowledge Christ's birth to have been illusory

and not real, that so we may end our dispute! Nay, verily, rather let

us continue to contend for the truth against them, than agree with them

in falsehood.

3. But if we are to end the controversy by saying this, why do not our

opponents themselves say it? While they assert the death of Christ to

have been not real but feigned, why do they make out that He had no

birth at all, not even of the same kind as His death? If they had so

much regard for the authority of the evangelist as to oblige them to

admit that Christ suffered, at least in appearance, it is the same

authority which testifies to His birth. Two evangelists, indeed, give

the story of the birth; [1013] but in all we read of Jesus having a

mother. [1014] Perhaps Faustus was unwilling to make the birth an

illusion, because the difference of the genealogies given in Matthew

and Luke causes an apparent discrepancy. But, supposing a man

ignorant, there are many things also relating to the passion of Christ

in which he will think the evangelists disagree; suppose him

instructed, he finds entire agreement. Can it be right to feign death,

and wrong to feign birth? And yet Faustus will have us acknowledge the

birth to be feigned, in order to put an end to the dispute. It will

appear presently in our reply to another objection what we think to be

the reason why Faustus will not admit of any birth, even a feigned one.

4. We deny that there is anything disgraceful in the bodies of

saints. Some members, indeed, are called uncomely, because they have

not so pleasing an appearance as those constantly in view. [1015] But

attend to what the apostle says, when from the unity and harmony of the

body he enjoins charity on the Church: "Much more those members of the

body, which seem to be feeble, are necessary: and those members of the

body, which we think to be less honorable, upon these we bestow more

abundant honor; and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness.

For our comely parts have no need: but God hath tempered the body

together, having given more abundant honor to that part which lacked:

that there should be no schism in the body." [1016] The licentious

and intemperate use of those members is disgraceful, but not the

members themselves; for they are preserved in purity not only by the

unmarried, but also by wedded fathers and mothers of holy life, in

whose case the natural appetite, as serving not lust, but an

intelligent purpose in the production of children, is in no way

disgraceful. Still more, in the holy Virgin Mary, who by faith

conceived the body of Christ, there was nothing disgraceful in the

members which served not for a common natural conception, but for a

miraculous birth. In order that we might conceive Christ in sincere

hearts, and, as it were, produce Him in confession, it was meet that

His body should come from the substance of His mother without injury to

her bodily purity. We cannot suppose that the mother of Christ

suffered loss by His birth, or that the gift of productiveness

displaced the grace of virginity. If these occurrences, which were

real and no illusion, are new and strange, and contrary to the common

course of nature, the reason is, that they are great, and amazing, and

divine; and all the more on this account are they true, and firm, and

sure. Angels, says Faustus, appeared and spoke without having been

born. As if we held that Christ could not have appeared or spoken

without having been born of a woman! He could, but He chose not; and

what He chose was best. And that He chose to do what He did is plain,

because He acted, not like your god, from necessity, but voluntarily.

That He was born we know, because we put faith not in a heretic, but in

Christ's gospel.

------------------------

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1012] John xx. 28.

[1013] Matt. i. 25; Luke ii. 7.

[1014] Matt. ii. 11; Mark iii. 32; Luke ii. 33; John ii. 1.

[1015] In the Retractations, ii. sec 7, Augustin refers in correction

of this remark to his Reply to the Second Answer of Julian, iv. sec.

36, where he makes uncomeliness the effect of sin.

[1016] 1 Cor. xii. 22-25.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Book XXX.

Faustus repels the insinuation that the prophecy of Paul with reference

to those that should forbid to marry, abstain from meats, etc., applies

to the Manich�ans more than to the Catholic ascetics, who are held in

the highest esteem in the Church. Augustin justifies this application

of the prophecy, and shows the difference between Manich�an and

Christian asceticism.

1. Faustus said: You apply to us the words of Paul: "Some shall

depart from the faith, giving heed to lying spirits, and doctrines of

devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their consciences seared as

with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, abstaining from meats, which God

has created to be received with thanksgiving by believers." [1017] I

refuse to admit that the apostle said this, unless you first

acknowledge that Moses and the prophets taught doctrines of devils, and

were the interpreters of a lying and malignant spirit; since they

enjoin with great emphasis abstinence from swine's flesh and other

meats, which they call unclean. This case must first be settled; and

you must consider long and carefully how their teaching is to be

viewed: whether they said these things from God, or from the devil.

As regards these matters, either Moses and the prophets must be

condemned along with us; or we must be acquitted along with them. You

are unjust in condemning us, as you do now, as followers of the

doctrine of devils, because we require the priestly class to abstain

from animal food; for we limit the prohibition to the priesthood, while

you hold that your prophets, and Moses himself, who forbade all classes

of men to eat the flesh of swine, and hares, and conies, besides all

varieties of cuttle-fish, and all fish wanting scales, said this not in

a lying spirit, nor in the doctrine of devils, but from God, and in the

Holy Spirit. Even supposing, then, that Paul said these words, you can

convince me only by condemning Moses and the prophets; and so, though

you will not do it for reason or truth, you will contradict Moses for

the sake of your belly.

2. Besides, you have in your Book of Daniel the account of the three

youths, which you will find it difficult to reconcile with the opinion

that to abstain from meats is the doctrine of devils. For we are told

that they abstained not only from what the law forbade, but even from

what it allowed; [1018] and you are wont to praise them, and count them

as martyrs; though they too followed the doctrine of devils, if this is

to be taken as the apostle's opinion. And Daniel himself declares that

he fasted for three weeks, not eating flesh or drinking wine, while he

prayed for his people. [1019] How is it that he boasts of this

doctrine of devils, and glories in the falsehood of a lying spirit?

3. Again, what are we to think of you, or of the better class of

Christians among you, some of whom abstain from swine's flesh, some

from the flesh of quadrupeds, and some from all animal food, while all

the Church admires them for it, and regards them with profound

veneration, as only not gods? You obstinately refuse to consider that

if the words quoted from the apostle are true and genuine, these people

too are misled by doctrines of devils. And there is another observance

which no one will venture to explain away or to deny, for it is known

to all, and is practised yearly with particular attention in the

congregation of Catholics all over the world--I mean the fast of forty

days, in the due observance of which a man must abstain from all the

things which, according to this verse, were created by God that we

might receive them, while at the same time he calls this abstinence a

doctrine of devils. So, my dear friends, shall we say that you too,

during this fast, while celebrating the mysteries of Christ's passion,

live after the manner of devils, and are deluded by a seducing spirit,

and speak lies in hypocrisy, and have your conscience seared with a hot

iron? If this does not apply to you, neither does it apply to us.

What is to be thought of this verse, or its author; or to whom does it

apply, since it agrees neither with the traditions of the Old

Testament, nor with the institutions of the New? As regards the New

Testament, the proof is from your own practice; and though the Old

requires abstinence only from certain things, still it requires

abstinence. On the other hand, this opinion of yours makes all

abstinence from animal food a doctrine of devils. If this is your

belief, once more I say it, you must condemn Moses, and reject the

prophets, and pass the same sentence on yourselves; for, as they always

abstained from certain kinds of food, so you sometimes abstain from all

food.

4. But if you think that in making a distinction in food, Moses and

the prophets established a divine ordinance, and not a doctrine of

devils; if Daniel in the Holy Spirit observed a fast of three weeks; if

the youths Ananias, Azarias, and Mishael, under divine guidance, chose

to live on cabbage or pulse; if, again, those among you who abstain, do

it not at the instigation of devils; if your abstinence from wine and

flesh for forty days is not superstitious, but by divine

command,--consider, I beseech you, if it is not perfect madness to

suppose these words to be Paul's that abstinence from food and

forbidding to marry are doctrines of devils. Paul cannot have said

that to dedicate virgins to Christ is a doctrine of devils. But you

read the words, and inconsiderately, as usual, apply them to us,

without seeing that this stamps your virgins too as led away by the

doctrine of devils, and that you are the functionaries of the devils in

your constant endeavors to induce virgins to make this profession, so

that in all your churches the virgins nearly outnumber the married

women. Why do you still adhere to such practises? Why do you ensnare

wretched young women, if it is the will of devils, and not of Christ,

that they fulfill? But, first of all, I wish to know if making virgins

is, in all cases, the doctrine of devils, or only the prohibition of

marriage. If it is the prohibition, it does not apply to us, for we

too hold it equally foolish to prevent one who wishes, as it is

criminal and impious to force one who has some reluctance. But if you

say that to encourage the proposal, and not to resist such a desire, is

all the doctrine of devils, to say nothing of the consequence as

regards you, the apostle himself will be thus brought into danger, if

he must be considered as having introduced the doctrines of devils into

Iconium, when Thecla, after having been betrothed, was by his discourse

inflamed with the desire of perpetual virginity. [1020] And what

shall we say of Jesus, the Master Himself, and the source of all

sanctity, who is the unwedded spouse of the virgins who make this

profession, and who, when specifying in the Gospel three kinds of

eunuchs, natural, artificial, and voluntary, gives the palm to those

who have "made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven," [1021]

meaning the youths of both sexes who have extirpated from their hearts

the desire of marriage, and who in the Church act as eunuchs of the

King's palace? Is this also the doctrine of devils? Are those words,

too, spoken in a seducing spirit? And if Paul and Christ are proved to

be priests of devils, is not their spirit the same that speaks in God?

I do not mention the other apostles of our Lord, Peter, Andrew, Thomas,

and the example of celibacy, the blessed John, who in various ways

commended to young men and maidens the excellence of this profession,

leaving to us, and to you too, the form for making virgins. I do not

mention them, because you do not admit them into the canon, and so you

will not scruple impiously to impute to them doctrines of devils. But

will you say the same of Christ, or of the Apostle Paul, who, we know,

everywhere expressed the same preference for unmarried women to the

married, and gave an example of it in the case of the saintly Thecla?

But if the doctrine preached by Paul to Thecla, and which the other

apostles also preached, was not the doctrine of devils, how can we

believe that Paul left on record his opinion, that the very exhortation

to sanctity is the injunction and the doctrine of devils? To make

virgins simply by exhortation, without forbidding to marry, is not

peculiar to you. That is our principle too; and he must be not only a

fool, but a madman, who thinks that a private law can forbid what the

public law allows. As regards marriage, therefore, we too encourage

virgins to remain as they are when they are willing to do so; we do not

make them virgins against their will. For we know the force of will

and of natural appetite when opposed by public law; much more when the

law is only private, and every one is at liberty to disobey it. If,

then, it is no crime to make virgins in this manner, we are guiltless

as well as you. If it is wrong to make virgins in any way, you are

guilty as well as we. So that what you mean, or intend, by quoting

this verse against us, it is impossible to say.

5. Augustin replied: Listen, and you shall hear what we mean and

intend by quoting this verse against you, since you say that you do not

know. It is not that you abstain from animal food; for, as you

observe, our ancient fathers abstained from some kinds of food, not,

however, as condemning them, but with a typical meaning, which you do

not understand, and of which I have said already in this work all that

appeared necessary. Besides, Christians, not heretics, but Catholics,

in order to subdue the body, that the soul may be more humbled in

prayer, abstain not only from animal food, but also from some vegetable

productions, without, however, believing them to be unclean. A few do

this always; and at certain seasons or days, as in Lent, almost all,

more or less, according to the choice or ability of individuals. You,

on the other hand, deny that the creature is good, and call it unclean,

saying that animals are made by the devil of the worst impurities in

the substance of evil and so you reject them with horror, as being the

most cruel and loathsome places of confinement of your god. You, as a

concession, allow your followers, as distinct from the priests, to eat

animal food; as the apostle allows, in certain cases, not marriage in

the general sense, but the indulgence of passion in marriage. [1022]

It is only sin which is thus made allowance for. This is the feeling

you have toward all animal food; you have learned it from your heresy,

and you teach it to your followers. You make allowance for your

followers, because, as I said before, they supply you with necessaries;

but you grant them indulgence without saying that it is not sinful.

For yourselves, you shun contact with this evil and impurity; and hence

our reason for quoting this verse against you is found in the words of

the apostle which follow those with which you end the quotation.

Perhaps it was for this reason that you left out the words, and then

say that you do not know what we mean or intend by the quotation; for

it suited you better to omit the account of our intention than to

express it. For, after speaking of abstaining from meats, which God

has created to be received with thanksgiving by believers, the apostle

goes on, "And by them who know the truth; for every creature of God is

good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving:

for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer." [1023] This you

deny; for your idea, and motive, and belief in abstaining from such

food is, that they are not typically, but naturally, evil and impure.

In this assuredly you blaspheme the Creator; and in this is the

doctrine of devils. You need not be surprised that, so long before the

event, this prediction regarding you was made by the Holy Spirit.

6. So, again, if your exhortations to virginity resembled the teaching

of the apostle, "He who giveth in marriage doeth well, and he who

giveth not in marriage doeth better;" [1024] if you taught that

marriage is good, and virginity better, as the Church teaches which is

truly Christ's Church, you would not have been described in the

Spirit's prediction as forbidding to marry. What a man forbids he

makes evil; but a good thing may be placed second to a better thing

without being forbidden. Moreover, the only honorable kind of

marriage, or marriage entered into for its proper and legitimate

purpose, is precisely that you hate most. So, though you may not

forbid sexual intercourse, you forbid marriage; for the peculiarity of

marriage is, that it is not merely for the gratification of passion,

but, as is written in the contract, for the procreation of children.

And, though you allow many of your followers to retain their connection

with you in spite of their refusal, or their inability, to obey you,

you cannot deny that you make the prohibition. The prohibition is part

of your false doctrine, while the toleration is only for the interests

of the society. And here we see the reason, which I have delayed till

now to mention, for your making not the birth but only the death of

Christ feigned and illusory. Death being the separation of the soul,

that is, of the nature of your god, from the body which belongs to his

enemies, for it is the work of the devil, you uphold and approve of it;

and thus, according to your creed, it was meet that Christ, though He

did not die, should commend death by appearing to die. In birth,

again, you believe your god to be bound instead of released; and so you

will not allow that Christ was born even in this illusory fashion. You

would have thought better of Mary had she ceased to be a virgin without

being a mother, than as being a mother without ceasing to be a virgin.

You see, then, that there is a great difference between exhorting to

virginity as the better of two good things, and forbidding to marry by

denouncing the true purpose of marriage; between abstaining from food

as a symbolic observance, or for the mortification of the body, and

abstaining from food which God has created for the reason that God did

not create it. In one case, we have the doctrine of the prophets and

apostles; in the other, the doctrine of lying devils.

------------------------

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1017] 1 Tim. iv. 1-3.

[1018] Dan. i. 12.

[1019] Dan. x. 2, 3.

[1020] See the apocryphal book, Paul and Thecla.
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Book XXXI.

The scripture passage: "To the pure all things are pure, but to the

impure and defiled is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience

are defiled," is discussed from both the Manich�an and the Catholic

points of view, Faustus objecting to its application to his party and

Augustin insisting on its application.

1. Faustus said: "To the pure all things are pure. But to the impure

and defiled is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience are

defiled." As regards this verse, too, it is very doubtful whether, for

your own sake, you should believe it to have been written by Paul. For

it would follow that Moses and the prophets were not only influenced by

devils in making so much in their laws of the distinctions in food, but

also that they themselves were impure and defiled in their mind and

conscience, so that the following words also might properly be applied

to them: "They profess to know God, but in works deny Him." [1025]

This is applicable to no one more than to Moses and the prophets, who

are known to have lived very differently from what was becoming in men

knowing God. Up to this time I have thought only of adulteries and

frauds and murders as defiling the conscience of Moses and the

prophets; but now, from what this verse says, it is plain that they

were also defiled, because they looked upon something as defiled. How,

then, can you persist in thinking that the vision of the divine majesty

can have been bestowed on such men, when it is written that only the

pure in heart can see God? Even supposing that they had been pure from

unlawful crimes, this superstitious abstinence from certain kinds of

food, if it defiles the mind, is enough to debar them from the sight of

deity. Gone for ever, too, is the boast of Daniel, and of the three

youths, who, till now that we are told that nothing is unclean, have

been regarded among the Jews as persons of great purity and excellence

of character, because, in observance of hereditary customs, they

carefully avoided defiling themselves with Gentile food, especially

that of sacrifices. [1026] Now it appears that they were defiled in

mind and conscience most of all when they were closing their mouth

against blood and idol-feasts.

2. But perhaps their ignorance may excuse them; for, as this Christian

doctrine of all things being pure to the pure had not then appeared,

they may have thought some things impure. But there can be no excuse

for you in the face of Paul's announcement, that there is nothing which

is not pure, and that abstinence from certain food is the doctrine of

devils, and that those who think anything defiled are polluted in their

mind, if you not only abstain, as we have said, but make a merit of it,

and believe that you become more acceptable to Christ in proportion as

you are more abstemious, or, according to this new doctrine, as your

minds are defiled and your conscience polluted. It should also be

observed that, while there are three religions in the world which,

though in a very different manner, appoint chastity and abstinence as

the means of purification of the mind, the religions, namely, of the

Jews, the Gentiles, and the Christians, the opinion that everything is

pure cannot have come from any one of the three. It is certainly not

from Judaism, nor from Paganism, which also makes a distinction of

food; the only difference being, that the Hebrew classification of

animals does not harmonize with the Pagan. Then as to the Christian

faith, if you think it peculiar to Christianity to consider nothing

defiled, you must first of all confess that there are no Christians

among you. For things offered to idols, and what dies of itself, to

mention nothing else, are regarded by you all as great defilement. If,

again, this is a Christian practice, on your part, the doctrine which

is opposed to all abstinence from impurities cannot be traced to

Christianity either. How, then, could Paul have said what is not in

keeping with any religion? In fact, when the apostle from a Jew became

a Christian, it was a change of customs more than of religion. As for

the writer of this verse, there seems to be no religion which favors

his opinion.

3. Be sure, then, whenever you discover anything else in Scripture to

assail our faith with, to see, in the first place, that it is not

against you, before you commence your attack on us. For instance,

there is the passage you continually quote about Peter, that he once

saw a vessel let down from heaven in which were all kinds of animals

and serpents, and that, when he was surprised and astonished, a voice

was heard, saying to him, Peter, kill and eat whatsoever thou seest in

the vessel, and that he replied, Lord I will not touch what is common

or unclean. On this the voice spoke again, What I have cleansed, call

not unclean. [1027] This, indeed, seems to have an allegorical

meaning, and not to refer to the absence of distinction in food. But

as you choose to give it this meaning, you are bound to feed upon all

wild animals, and scorpions, and snakes, and reptiles in general, in

compliance with this vision of Peter's. In this way, you will show

that you are really obedient to the voice which Peter is said to have

heard. But you must never forget that you at the same time condemn

Moses and the prophets, who considered many things polluted which,

according to this utterance, God has sanctified.

4. Augustin replied: When the apostle says, "To the pure all things

are pure," he refers to the natures which God had created,--as it is

written by Moses in Genesis, "And God made all things; and behold they

were very good," [1028] --not to the typical meanings, according to

which God, by the same Moses, distinguished the clean from the

unclean. Of this we have already spoken at length more than once, and

need not dwell on it here. It is clear that the apostle called those

impure who, after the revelation of the New Testament, still advocated

the observance of the shadows of things to come, as if without them the

Gentiles could not obtain the salvation which is in Christ, because in

this they were carnally minded; and he called them unbelieving, because

they did not distinguish between the time of the law and the time of

grace. To them, he says, nothing is pure, because they made an

erroneous and sinful use both of what they received and of what they

rejected; which is true of all unbelievers, but especially of you

Manich�ans, for to you nothing whatever is pure. For, although you

take great care to keep the food which you use separate from the

contamination of flesh, still it is not pure to you, for the only

creator of it you allow is the devil. And you hold, that, by eating

it, you release your god, who suffers confinement and pollution in it.

One would think you might consider yourselves pure, since your stomach

is the proper place for purifying your god. But even your own bodies,

in your opinion, are of the nature and handiwork of the race of

darkness; while your souls are still affected by the pollution of your

bodies. What, then, is pure to you? Not the things you eat; not the

receptacle of your food; not yourselves, by whom it is purified. Thus

you see against whom the words of the apostle are directed; he

expresses himself so as to include all who are impure and unbelieving,

but first and chiefly to condemn you. To the pure, therefore, all

things are pure, in the nature in which they were created; but to the

ancient Jewish people all things were not pure in their typical

significance; and, as regards bodily health, or the customs of society,

all things are not suitable to us. But when things are in their proper

places, and the order of nature is preserved, to the pure all things

are pure; but to the impure and unbelieving, among whom you stand

first, nothing is pure. You might make a wholesome application to

yourselves of the following words of the apostle, if you desired a cure

for your seared consciences. The words are: "Their very mind and

conscience are defiled."

------------------------
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Book XXXII.

Faustus fails to understand why he should be required either to accept

or reject the New Testament as a whole, while the Catholics accept or

reject the various parts of the Old Testament at pleasure. Augustin

denies that the Catholics treat the Old Testament arbitrarily, and

explains their attitude towards it.

1. Faustus said: You say, that if we believe the Gospel, we must

believe everything that is written in it. Why, then, since you believe

the Old Testament, do you not believe all that is found in any part of

it? Instead of that, you cull out only the prophecies telling of a

future King of the Jews, for you suppose this to be Jesus, along with a

few precepts of common morality, such as, Thou shalt not kill, Thou

shalt not commit adultery; and all the rest you pass over, thinking of

the other things as Paul thought of the things which he held to be

dung. [1029] Why, then, should it seem strange or singular in me that

I select from the New Testament whatever is purest, and helpful for my

salvation, while I set aside the interpolations of your predecessors,

which impair its dignity and grace?

2. If there are parts of the Testament of the Father which we are not

bound to observe (for you attribute the Jewish law to the Father, and

it is well known that many things in it shock you, and make you

ashamed, so that in heart you no longer regard it as free from

corruption, though, as you believe, the Father Himself partly wrote it

for you with His own finger while part was written by Moses, who was

faithful and trustworthy), the Testament of the Son must be equally

liable to corruption, and may equally well contain objectionable

things; especially as it is allowed not to have been written by the Son

Himself, nor by His apostles, but long after, by some unknown men, who,

lest they should be suspected of writing of things they knew nothing

of, gave to their books the names of the apostles, or of those who were

thought to have followed the apostles, declaring the contents to be

according to these originals. In this, I think, they do grievous wrong

to the disciples of Christ, by quoting their authority for the

discordant and contradictory statements in these writings, saying that

it was according to them that they wrote the Gospels, which are so full

of errors and discrepancies, both in facts and in opinions, that they

can be harmonized neither with themselves nor with one another. This

is nothing else than to slander good men, and to bring the charge of

dissension on the brotherhood of the disciples. In reading the

Gospels, the clear intention of our heart perceives the errors, and, to

avoid all injustice, we accept whatever is useful, in the way of

building up our faith, and promoting the glory of the Lord Christ, and

of the Almighty God, His Father, while we reject the rest as unbecoming

the majesty of God and Christ, and inconsistent with our belief.

3. To return to what I said of your not accepting everything in the

Old Testament. You do not admit carnal circumcision, though that is

what is written; [1030] nor resting from all occupation on the Sabbath,

though that is enjoined; [1031] and instead of propitiating God, as

Moses recommends, by offerings and sacrifices, you cast these things

aside as utterly out of keeping with Christian worship, and as having

nothing at all to recommend them. In some cases, however, you make a

division, and while you accept one part, you reject the other. Thus,

in the Passover, which is also the annual feast of the Old Testament,

while it is written that in this observance you must slay a lamb to be

eaten in the evening, and that you must abstain from leaven for seven

days, and be content with unleavened bread and bitter herbs, [1032] you

accept the feast, but pay no attention to the rules for its

observance. It is the same with the feast of Pentecost, or seven

weeks, and the accompaniment of a certain kind and number of sacrifices

which Moses enjoins: [1033] you observe the feast, but you condemn

the propitiatory rites, which are part of it, because they are not in

harmony with Christianity. As regards the command to abstain from

Gentile food, you are zealous believers in the uncleanness of things

offered to idols, and of what has died of itself; but you are not so

ready to believe the prohibition of swine's flesh, and hares, and

conies, and mullets, and cuttle-fish, and all the fish that you have a

relish for, although Moses pronounces them all unclean.

4. I do not suppose that you will consent, or even listen, to such

things as that a father-in-law should lie with his daughter-in-law, as

Judah did; or a father with his daughters, like Lot; or prophets with

harlots, like Hosea; or that a husband should sell his wife for a night

to her lover, like Abraham; or that a man should marry two sisters,

like Jacob; or that the rulers of the people and the men you consider

as most inspired should keep their mistresses by hundreds and

thousands; or, according to the provision made in Deuteronomy about

wives, that the wife of one brother, if he dies without children,

should marry the surviving brother, and that he should raise up seed

from her instead of his brother; and that if the man refuses to do

this, the fair plaintiff should bring her case before the elders, that

the brother may be called and admonished to perform this religious

duty; and that, if he persists in his refusal, he must not go

unpunished, but the woman must loose his shoe from his right foot, and

strike him in the face, and send him away, spat upon and accursed, to

perpetuate the reproach in his family. [1034] These, and such as

these, are the examples and precepts of the Old Testament. If they are

good, why do you not practise them? If they are bad, why do you not

condemn the Old Testament, in which they are found? But if you think

that these are spurious interpolations, that is precisely what we think

of the New Testament. You have no right to claim from us an

acknowledgment for the New Testament which you yourselves do not make

for the Old.

5. Since you hold to the divine authorship of the Old as well as of

the New Testament, it would surely be more consistent and more

becoming, as you do not obey its precepts, to confess that it has been

corrupted by improper additions, than to treat it so contemptuously, if

it is genuine and uncorrupted. Accordingly, my explanation of your

neglect of the requirements of the Old Testament has always been, and

still is, that you are either wise enough to reject them as spurious,

or that you have the boldness and irreverence to disregard them if they

are true. At any rate, when you would oblige me to believe everything

contained in the documents of the New Testament because I receive the

Testament itself, you should consider that, though you profess to

receive the Old Testament, you in your heart disbelieve many things in

it. Thus, you do not admit as true or authoritative the declaration of

the Old Testament, that every one that hangeth on a tree is accursed,

[1035] for this would apply to Jesus; or that every man is accursed who

does not raise up seed in Israel, [1036] for that would include all of

both sexes devoted to God; or that whoever is not circumcised in the

flesh of his foreskin will be cut off from among his people, [1037] for

that would apply to all Christians; or that whoever breaks the Sabbath

must be stoned to death; [1038] or that no mercy should be shown to the

man who breaks a single precept of the Old Testament. If you really

believe these things as certainly enjoined by God, you would, in the

time of Christ, have been the first to assail Him, and you would now

have no quarrel with the Jews, who, in persecuting Christ with heart

and soul, acted in obedience to their own God.

6. I am aware that instead of boldly pronouncing these passages

spurious, you make out that these things were required of the Jews till

the coming of Jesus; and that now that He is come, according, as you

say, to the predictions of this Old Testament, He Himself teaches what

we should receive, and what we should set aside as obsolete. Whether

the prophets predicted the coming of Jesus we shall see presently.

Meanwhile, I need say no more than that if Jesus, after being predicted

in the Old Testament, now subjects it to this sweeping criticism, and

teaches us to receive a few things and to throw over many things, in

the same way the Paraclete who is promised in the New Testament teaches

us what part of it to receive, and what to reject; as Jesus Himself

says in the Gospel, when promising the Paraclete, "He shall guide you

into all truth, and shall teach you all things, and bring all things to

your remembrance." [1039] So then, with the help of the Paraclete, we

may take the same liberties with the New Testament as Jesus enables you

to take with the Old, unless you suppose that the Testament of the Son

is of greater value than that of the Father, if it is really the

Father's; so that while many parts of the one are to be condemned, the

other must be exempted from all disapproval; and that, too, when we

know, as I said before, that it was not written by Christ or by His

apostles.

7. Hence, as you receive nothing in the Old Testament except the

prophecies and the common precepts of practical morality, which we

quoted above, while you set aside circumcision, and sacrifices, and the

Sabbath and its observance, and the feast of unleavened bread, why

should not we receive nothing in the New Testament but what we find

said in honor and praise of the majesty of the Son, either by Himself

or by His apostles, with the proviso, in the case of the apostles, that

it was said by them after reaching perfection, and when no longer in

unbelief; while we take no notice of the rest, which, if said at the

time, was the utterance of ignorance or inexperience, or, if not, was

added by crafty opponents with a malicious intention, or was stated by

the writers without due consideration, and so handed down as

authentic? Take as examples, the shameful birth of Jesus from a woman,

His being circumcised like the Jews, His offering sacrifice like the

Gentiles, His being baptized in a humiliating manner, His being led

about by the devil in the wilderness, and His being tempted by him in

the most distressing way. With these exceptions, besides whatever has

been inserted under the pretence of being a quotation from the Old

Testament, we believe the whole, especially the mystic nailing to the

cross, emblematic of the wounds of the soul in its passion; as also the

sound moral precepts of Jesus, and His parables, and the whole of His

immortal discourse, which sets forth especially the distinction of the

two natures, and therefore must undoubtedly be His. There is, then, no

reason for your thinking it obligatory in me to believe all the

contents of the Gospels; for you, as has been proved, take so dainty a

sip from the Old Testament, that you hardly, so to speak, wet your lips

with it.

8. Augustin replied: We give to the whole Old Testament Scriptures

their due praise as true and divine; you impugn the Scriptures of the

New Testament as having been tampered with and corrupted. Those things

in the Old Testament which we do not observe we hold to have been

suitable appointments for the time and the people of that dispensation,

besides being symbolical to us of truths in which they have still a

spiritual use, though the outward observance is abolished; and this

opinion is proved to be the doctrine of the apostolic writings. You,

on the other hand, find fault with everything in the New Testament

which you do not receive, and assert that these passages were not

spoken or written by Christ or His apostles. In these respects there

is a manifest difference between us. When, therefore, you are asked

why you do not receive all the contents of the New Testament, but,

while you approve of some things, reject a great many in the very same

books as false and spurious interpolations, you must not pretend to

imitate us in the distinction which we make, reverently and in faith,

but must give account of your own presumption.

9. If we are asked why we do not worship God as the Hebrew fathers of

the Old Testament worshipped Him, we reply that God has taught us

differently by the New Testament fathers, and yet in no opposition to

the Old Testament, but as that Testament itself predicted. For it is

thus foretold by the prophet: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord,

when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the

house of Judah; not according to the covenant which I made with their

fathers when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of

Egypt." [1040] Thus it was foretold that that covenant would not

continue, but that there would be a new one. And to the objection that

we do not belong to the house of Israel or to the house of Judah, we

answer according to the teaching of the apostle, who calls Christ the

seed of Abraham, and says to us, as belonging to Christ's body,

"Therefore ye are Abraham's seed." [1041] Again, if we are asked why

we regard that Testament as authoritative when we do not observe its

ordinances, we find the answer to this also in the apostolic writings;

for the apostle says, "Let no man judge you in meat or drink, or in

respect of a holiday, or a new moon, or of Sabbaths, which are a shadow

of things to come." [1042] Here we learn both that we ought to read

of these observances, and acknowledge them to be of divine institution,

in order to preserve the memory of the prophecy, for they were shadows

of things to come; and also that we need pay no regard to those who

would judge us for not continuing the outward observance; as the

apostle says elsewhere to the same purpose, "These things happened to

them for an example; and they are written for our admonition, on whom

the end of the ages are come." [1043] So, when we read anything in

the books of the Old Testament which we are not required to observe in

the New Testament, or which is even forbidden, instead of finding fault

with it, we should ask what it means; for the very discontinuance of

the observance proves it to be, not condemned, but fulfilled. On this

head we have already spoken repeatedly.

10. To take, for example, this requirement on which Faustus ignorantly

grounds his charge against the Old Testament, that a man should take

his brother's wife to raise up seed for his brother, to be called by

his name; what does this prefigure, but that every preacher of the

gospel should so labor in the Church as to raise up seed to his

deceased brother, that is, Christ, who died for us, and that this seed

should bear His name? Moreover, the apostle fulfills this requirement

not now in the typical observance, but in the spiritual reality, when

he reproves those of whom he says that he had begotten them in Christ

Jesus by the gospel, [1044] and points out to them their error in

wishing to be of Paul. "Was Paul," he says, "crucified for you? Or

were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" [1045] As if he should say, I

have begotten you for my deceased brother; your name is Christian, not

Paulian. Then, too, whoever refuses the ministry of the gospel when

chosen by the Church, justly deserves the contempt of the Church. So

we see that the spitting in the face is accompanied with a sign of

reproach in loosing a shoe from one foot, to exclude the man from the

company of those to whom the apostle says, "Let your feet be shod with

the preparation of the gospel of peace;" [1046] and of whom the prophet

thus speaks, "How beautiful are the feet of them who publish peace, who

bring good tidings of good!" [1047] The man who holds the faith of

the gospel so as both to profit himself and to be ready when called to

serve the Church, is properly represented as shod on both feet. But

the man who thinks it enough to secure his own safety by believing, and

shirks the duty of benefiting others, has the reproach of being unshod,

not in type, but in reality.

11. Faustus needlessly objects to our observance of the passover,

taunting us with differing from the Jewish observance: for in the

gospel we have the true Lamb, not in shadow, but in substance; and

instead of prefiguring the death, we commemorate it daily, and

especially in the yearly festival. Thus also the day of our paschal

feast does not correspond with the Jewish observance, for we take in

the Lord's day, on which Christ rose. And as to the feast of

unleavened bread, all Christians sound in the faith keep it, not in the

leaven of the old life, that is, of wickedness, but in the truth and

sincerity of the faith; [1048] not for seven days, but always, as was

typified by the number seven, for days are always counted by sevens.

And if this observance is somewhat difficult in this world since the

way which leads to life is strait and narrow, [1049] the future reward

is sure; and this difficulty is typified in the bitter herbs, which are

a little distasteful.

12. The Pentecost, too, we observe, that is, the fiftieth day from the

passion and resurrection of the Lord, for on that day He sent to us the

Holy Paraclete whom He had promised; as was prefigured in the Jewish

passover, for on the fiftieth day after the slaying of the lamb, Moses

on the mount received the law written with the finger of God. [1050]

If you read the Gospel, you will see that the Spirit is there called

the finger of God. [1051] Remarkable events which happened on certain

days are annually commemorated in the Church, that the recurrence of

this festival may preserve the recollection of things so important and

salutary. If you ask, then, why we keep the passover, it is because

Christ was then sacrificed for us. If you ask why we do not retain the

Jewish ceremonies, it is because they prefigured future realities which

we commemorate as past; and the difference between the future and the

past is seen in the different words we use for them. Of this we have

already said enough.

13. Again, if you ask why, of all the kinds of food prohibited in the

former typical dispensation, we abstain only from food offered to idols

and from what dies of itself, you shall hear, if for once you will

prefer the truth to idle calumnies. The reason why it is not expedient

for a Christian to eat food offered to idols is given by the apostle:

"I would not," he says, "that ye should have fellowship with demons."

Not that he finds fault with sacrifice itself, as offered by the

fathers to typify the blood of the sacrifice with which Christ has

redeemed us. For he first says, "The things which the Gentiles offer,

they offer to demons, and not to God;" and then adds these words: "I

would not that ye should have fellowship with demons." [1052] If the

uncleanness were in the nature of sacrificial flesh, it would

necessarily pollute even when eaten in ignorance. But the reason for

not partaking knowingly is not in the nature of the food, but, for

conscience sake, not to seem to have fellowship with demons. As

regards what dies of itself, I suppose the reason why such food was

prohibited was that the flesh of animals which have died of themselves

is diseased, and is not likely to be wholesome, which is the chief

thing in food. The observance of pouring out the blood which was

enjoined in ancient times upon Noah himself after the deluge, [1053]

the meaning of which we have already explained, is thought by many to

be what is meant in the Acts of the Apostles, where we read that the

Gentiles were required to abstain from fornication, and from things

sacrificed, and from blood, [1054] that is, from flesh of which the

blood has not been poured out. Others give a different meaning to the

words, and think that to abstain from blood means not to be polluted

with the crime of murder. It would take too long to settle this

question, and it is not necessary. For, allowing that the apostles did

on that occasion require Christians to abstain from the blood of

animals, and not to eat of things strangled, they seem to me to have

consulted the time in choosing an easy observance that could not be

burdensome to any one, and which the Gentiles might have in common with

the Israelities, for the sake of the Corner-stone, who makes both one

in Himself; [1055] while at the same time they would be reminded how

the Church of all nations was prefigured by the ark of Noah, when God

gave this command,--a type which began to be fulfilled in the time of

the apostles by the accession of the Gentiles to the faith. But since

the close of that period during which the two walls of the circumcision

and the uncircumcision, although united in the Corner-stone, still

retained some distinctive peculiarities, and now that the Church has

become so entirely Gentile that none who are outwardly Israelites are

to be found in it, no Christian feels bound to abstain from thrushes or

small birds because their blood has not been poured out, or from hares

because they are killed by a stroke on the neck without shedding their

blood. Any who still are afraid to touch these things are laughed at

by the rest: so general is the conviction of the truth, that "not what

entereth into the mouth defileth you, but what cometh out of it;"

[1056] that evil lies in the commission of sin, and not in the nature

of any food in ordinary use.

14. As regards the deeds of the ancients, both those which seem sinful

to foolish and ignorant people, when they are not so, and those which

really are sinful, we have already explained why they have been

written, and how this rather adds to than impairs the dignity of

Scripture. So, too, about the curse on him who hangeth on a tree, and

on him who raises not up seed in Israel, our reply has already been

given in the proper place, when meeting Faustus' objections. [1057]

And in reply to all objections whatsoever, whether we have already

answered them separately, or whether they are contained in the remarks

of Faustus which we are now considering, we appeal to our established

principles, on which we maintain the authority of sacred Scripture.

The principle is this, that all things written in the books of the Old

Testament are to be received with approval and admiration, as most true

and most profitable to eternal life; and that those precepts which are

no longer observed outwardly are to be understood as having been most

suitable in those times, and are to be viewed as having been shadows of

things to come, of which we may now perceive the fulfillments.

Accordingly, whoever in those times neglected the observance of these

symbolical precepts was righteously condemned to suffer the punishment

required by the divine statute, as any one would be now if he were

impiously to profane the sacraments of the New Testament, which differ

from the old observances only as this time differs from that. For as

praise is due to the righteous men of old who refused not to die for

the Old Testament sacraments, so it is due to the martyrs of the New

Testament. And as a sick man should not find fault with the medical

treatment, because one thing is prescribed to-day and another

to-morrow, and what was at first required is afterwards forbidden,

since the method of cure depends on this; so the human race, sick and

sore as it is from Adam to the end of the world, as long as the

corrupted body weighs down the mind, [1058] should not find fault with

the divine prescriptions, if sometimes the same observances are

enjoined, and sometimes an old observance is exchanged for one of a

different kind; especially as there was a promise of a change in the

appointments.

15. Hence there is no force in the analogy which Faustus institutes

between Christ's pointing out to us what to believe and what to reject

in the Old Testament, in which He Himself is predicted, and the

Paraclete's doing the same to you as regards the New Testament, where

there is a similar prediction of Him. There might have been some

plausibility in this, had there been anything in the Old Testament

which we denounced as a mistake, or as not of divine authority, or as

untrue. We do nothing of the kind; we receive everything, both what we

observe as rules of conduct, and what we no longer observe, but still

recognize as having been prophetical observances, once enjoined and now

fulfilled. And besides, the promise of the Paraclete is found in those

books, all the contents of which you do not accept; and His mission is

recorded in the book which you shrink from even naming. For, as is

stated above, and has been said repeatedly, there is a distinct

narrative in the Acts of the Apostles of the mission of the Spirit on

the day of Pentecost, and the effect produced showed who it was. For

all who first received Him spoke with tongues; [1059] and in this sign

there was a promise that in all tongues, or in all nations, the Church

of after times would faithfully proclaim the doctrine of the Spirit as

well as of the Father and of the Son.

16. Why, then, do you not accept everything in the New Testament? Is

it because the books have not the authority of Christ's apostles, or

because the apostles taught what was wrong? You reply that the books

have not the authority of the apostles. That the apostles were wrong

in their teaching is what Pagans say. But what can you say to prove

that the publication of these books cannot be traced to the apostles?

You reply that in many things they contradict themselves and one

another. Nothing could be more untrue; the fact is, you do not

understand. In every case where Faustus has brought forward what you

think a discrepancy, we have shown that there was none; and we will do

the same in every other case. It is intolerable that the reader or

learner should dare to lay the blame on Scriptures of such high

authority, instead of confessing his own stupidity. Did the Paraclete

teach you that these writings are not of the apostles' authorship, but

written by others under their names? But where is the proof that it

was the Paraclete from whom you learned this? If you say that the

Paraclete was promised and sent by Christ, we reply that your Paraclete

was neither promised nor sent by Christ; and we also show you when He

sent the Paraclete whom He promised. What proof have you that Christ

sent your Paraclete? Where do you get the evidence in support of your

informant, or rather misinformant? You reply that you find the proof

in the Gospel. In what Gospel? You do not accept all the Gospel, and

you say that it has been tampered with. Will you first accuse your

witness of corruption, and then call for his evidence? To believe him

when you wish it, and then disbelieve him when you wish it, is to

believe nobody but yourself. If we were prepared to believe you, there

would be no need of a witness at all. Moreover, in the promise of the

Holy Spirit as the Paraclete, it is said, "He shall lead you into all

truth;" [1060] but how can you be led into all truth by one who teaches

you that Christ was a deceiver? And again, if you were to prove that

all that is said in the Gospel of the promise of the Paraclete could

apply to no one but Manich�us, as the predictions of the prophets are

applicable to Christ; and if you quoted passages from those manuscripts

which you say are genuine, we might say that on this very point, as

proving Manich�us to be the only person intended, the passages have

been altered in the interest of your sect. Your only answer to this

would be, that you could not possibly alter documents already in the

possession of all Christians; for at the very outset of such an

attempt, it would be met by an appeal to older copies. But if this

proves that the books could not be corrupted by you, it also proves

that they could not be corrupted by any one. The first person who

ventured to do such a thing would be convicted by a comparison of older

manuscripts; especially as the Scripture is to be found not in one

language only, but in many. As it is, false readings are sometimes

corrected by comparing older copies or the original language. Hence

you must either acknowledge these documents as genuine, and then your

heresy cannot stand a moment; or if they are spurious, you cannot use

their authority in support of your doctrine of the Paraclete, and so

you refute yourselves.

17. Further, what is said in the promise of the Paraclete shows that

it cannot possibly refer to Manich�us, who came so many years after.

For it is distinctly said by John, that the Holy Spirit was to come

immediately after the resurrection and ascension of the Lord: "For the

Spirit was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified."

[1061] Now, if the reason why the Spirit was not given was, that

Jesus was not glorified, He would necessarily be given immediately on

the glorification of Jesus. In the same way, the Cataphrygians [1062]

said that they had received the promised Paraclete; and so they fell

away from the Catholic faith, forbidding what Paul allowed, and

condemning second marriages, which he made lawful. They turned to

their own use the words spoken of the Spirit, "He shall lead you into

all truth," as if, forsooth, Paul and the other apostles had not taught

all the truth, but had left room for the Paraclete of the

Cataphrygians. The same meaning they forced from the words of Paul:

"We know in part, and we prophesy in part; but when that which is

perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away;" [1063]

making out that the apostle knew and prophesied in part, when he said,

"Let him do what he will; if he marries, he sinneth not," [1064] and

that this is done away by the perfection of the Phrygian Paraclete.

[1065] And if they are told that they are condemned by the authority

of the Church, which is the subject of such ancient promises, and is

spread all over the world, they reply that this is in exact fulfillment

of what is said of the Paraclete, that the world cannot receive Him.

[1066] And are not those passages, "He shall lead you into all

truth," and, "When that which is perfect is come, that which is in part

shall be done away," and, "The world cannot receive Him," precisely

those in which you find a prediction of Manich�us? And so every heresy

arising under the name of the Paraclete will have the boldness to make

an equally plausible application to itself of such texts. For there is

no heresy but will call itself the truth; and the prouder it is, the

more likely it will be to call itself perfect truth: and so it will

profess to lead into all truth; and since that which is perfect has

come by it, it will try to do away with the doctrine of the apostles,

to which its own errors are opposed. And as the Church holds by the

earnest admonition of the apostle, that "whoever preaches another

gospel to you than that which ye have received, let him be accursed;"

[1067] when the heretical preacher begins to be pronounced accursed by

all the world, will he not forthwith exclaim, This is what is written,

"The world cannot receive Him"?

18. Where, then, will you find the proof required to show that it is

from the Paraclete that you have learned that the Gospels were not

written by the apostles? On the other hand, we have proof that the

Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, came immediately after the glorification of

Jesus. For "He was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet

glorified." We have proof also that He leads into all truth, for the

only way to truth is by love, and "the love of God," says the apostle,

"is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost who is given unto us."

[1068] We show, too, that in the words, "when that which is perfect

is come," Paul spoke of the perfection in the enjoyment of eternal

life. For in the same place he says: "Now we see through a glass

darkly, but then face to face." [1069] You cannot reasonably maintain

that we see God face to face here. Therefore that which is perfect has

not come to you. It is thus clear what the apostle thought on this

subject. This perfection will not come to the saints till the

accomplishment of what John speaks of: "Now we are the sons of God,

and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when it

shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is."

[1070] Then we shall be led into all truth by the Holy Spirit, of

which we have now received the pledge. Again, the words, "The world

cannot receive Him," plainly point to those who are usually called the

world in Scripture--the lovers of the world, the wicked, or carnal; of

whom the apostle says: "The natural man perceiveth not the things

which are of the Spirit of God." [1071] Those are said to be of this

world who can understand nothing beyond material things, which are the

objects of sense in this world; as is the case with you, when, in your

admiration of the sun and moon, you suppose all divine things to

resemble them. Deceivers, and being deceived, you call the author of

this silly theory the Paraclete. But as you have no proof of his being

the Paraclete, you have no reliable ground for the statement that the

Gospel writings, which you receive only in part, are not of apostolic

authorship. Thus your only remaining argument is, that these writings

contain things disparaging to the glory of Christ; such as, that He was

born of a virgin, that He was circumcised, that the customary sacrifice

was offered for Him, that He was baptized, that He was tempted of the

devil.

19. With those exceptions, including also the testimonies quoted from

the Old Testament, you profess, to use the words of Faustus, to receive

all the rest, especially the mystic nailing to the cross, emblematic of

the wounds of the soul in its passion; as also the sound moral precepts

of Jesus, and the whole of His immortal discourse, which sets forth

especially the distinction of the two natures, and therefore must

undoubtedly be His. Your design clearly is to deprive Scripture of all

authority, and to make every man's mind the judge what passage of

Scripture he is to approve of, and what to disapprove of. This is not

to be subject to Scripture in matters of faith, but to make Scripture

subject to you. Instead of making the high authority of Scripture the

reason of approval, every man makes his approval the reason for

thinking a passage correct. If, then, you discard authority, to what,

poor feeble soul, darkened by the mists of carnality, to what, I

beseech you, will you betake yourself? Set aside authority, and let us

hear the reason of your beliefs. Is it by a logical process that your

long story about the nature of God concludes necessarily with this

startling announcement, that this nature is subject to injury and

corruption? And how do you know that there are eight continents and

ten heavens, and that Atlas bears up the world, and that it hangs from

the great world-holder, and innumerable things of the same kind? Who

is your authority? Manich�us, of course, you will say. But, unhappy

being, this is not sight, but faith. If, then, you submit to receive a

load of endless fictions at the bidding of an obscure and irrational

authority, so that you believe all those things because they are

written in the books which your misguided judgment pronounces

trustworthy, though there is no evidence of their truth, why not rather

submit to the authority of the Gospel, which is so well founded, so

confirmed, so generally acknowledged and admired, and which has an

unbroken series of testimonies from the apostles down to our own day,

that so you may have an intelligent belief, and may come to know that

all your objections are the fruit of folly and perversity; and that

there is more truth in the opinion that the unchangeable nature of God

should take part of mortality, so as, without injury to itself from

this union, to do and to suffer not feignedly, but really, whatever it

behoved the mortal nature to do and to suffer for the salvation of the

human race from which it was taken, than in the belief that the nature

of God is subject to injury and corruption, and that, after suffering

pollution and captivity, it cannot be wholly freed and purified, but is

condemned by a supreme divine necessity to eternal punishment in the

mass of darkness?

20. You say, in reply, that you believe in what Manich�us has not

proved, because he has so clearly proved the existence of two natures,

good and evil, in this world. But here is the very source of your

unhappy delusion; for as in the Gospels, so in the world, your idea of

what is evil is derived entirely from the effect on your senses of such

disagreeable things as serpents, fire, poison, and so on; and the only

good you know of is what has an agreeable effect on your senses, as

pleasant flavors, and sweet smells, and sunlight, and whatever else

recommends itself strongly to your eyes, or your nostrils, or your

palate, or any other organ of sensation. But had you begun with

looking on the book of nature as the production of the Creator of all,

and had you believed that your own finite understanding might be at

fault wherever anything seemed to be amiss, instead of venturing to

find fault with the works of God, you would not have been led into

these impious follies and blasphemous fancies with which, in your

ignorance of what evil really is, you heap all evils upon God.

21. We can now answer the question, how we know that these books were

written by the apostles. In a word, we know this in the same way that

you know that the books whose authority you are so deluded as to prefer

were written by Manich�us. For, suppose some one should raise a

question on this point, and should contend, in arguing with you, that

the books which you attribute to Manich�us are not of his authorship;

your only reply would be, to ridicule the absurdity of thus

gratuitously calling in question a matter confirmed by successive

testimonies of such wide extent. As, then, it is certain that these

books are the production of Manich�us, and as it is ridiculous in one

born so many years after to start objections of his own, and so raise a

discussion on the point; with equal certainty may we pronounce it

absurd, or rather pitiable, in Manich�us or his followers to bring such

objections against writings originally well authenticated, and

carefully handed down from the times of the apostles to our own day

through a constant succession of custodians.

22. We have now only to compare the authority of Manich�us with that

of the apostles. The genuineness of the writings is equally certain in

both cases. But no one will compare Manich�us to the apostles, unless

he ceases to be a follower of Christ, who sent the apostles. Who that

did not misunderstand Christ's words ever found in them the doctrine of

two natures opposed to one another, and having each its own principle?

Again, the apostles, as becomes the disciples of truth, declare the

birth and passion of Christ to have been real events; while Manich�us,

who boasts that he leads into all truth, would lead us to a Christ

whose very passion he declares to have been an illusion. The apostles

say that Christ was circumcised in the flesh which He took of the seed

of Abraham; Manich�us says that God, in his own nature, was cut in

pieces by the race of darkness. The apostles say that a sacrifice was

offered for Christ as an infant in our nature, according to the

institutions of the time; Manich�us, that a member, not of humanity,

but of the divine substance itself, must be sacrificed to the whole

host of demons by being introduced into the nature of the hostile

race. The apostles say that Christ, to set us an example, was baptized

in the Jordan; Manich�us, that God immersed himself in the pollution of

darkness, and that he will never wholly emerge, but that the part which

cannot be purified will be condemned to eternal punishment. The

apostles say that Christ, in our nature, was tempted by the chief of

the demons; Manich�us, that part of God was taken captive by the race

of demons. And in the temptation of Christ He resists the tempter;

while in the captivity of God, the part taken captive cannot be

restored to its origin even after victory. To conclude, Manich�us,

under the guise of an improvement, preaches another gospel, which is

the doctrine of devils; and the apostles, after the doctrine of Christ,

enjoin that whoever preaches another gospel shall be accursed. [1072]

------------------------
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Book XXXIII.

Faustus does not think it would be a great honor to sit down with

Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, whose moral characters as set forth in the

Old Testament he detests. He justifies his subjective criticism of

Scripture. Augustin sums up the argument, claims the victory, and

exhorts the Manich�ans to abandon their opposition to the Old Testament

notwithstanding the difficulties that it presents, and to recognize the

authority of the Catholic Church.

1. Faustus said: You quote from the Gospel the words, "Many shall

come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and

Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven," [1073] and ask why we do

not acknowledge the patriarchs. Now, we should be the last to grudge

to any human being that God should have compassion on him, and bring

him out of perdition to salvation. At the same time, we should

acknowledge in such a case the clemency shown in this act of

compassion, and not the merit of the person whose life is undeniably

blameworthy. Thus, in the case of the Jewish fathers, Abraham, and

Isaac, and Jacob, who are mentioned by Christ in this verse, supposing

it to be genuine, although they led wicked lives, as we may learn from

their descendant Moses, or whoever was the author of the history called

Genesis, which describes their conduct as having been most shocking and

detestable; we are ready to allow that they may, after all, be in the

kingdom of heaven, in the place which they neither believed in, nor

hoped for, as is plain enough from their books. But then it must be

kept in mind that, as you yourselves confess, if they did attain to

what is spoken of in this verse, it was something very different from

the nether dungeons of woe to which their own deserts consigned them,

and that their deliverance was the work of our Lord Christ, and the

result of His mystic passion. Who would grudge to the thief on the

cross that deliverance was granted to him by the same Lord, and that

Christ said that on that very day he should be with Him in the paradise

of His Father? [1074] Who is so hard-hearted as to disapprove of this

act of benevolence? Still, it does not follow that, because Jesus

pardoned a thief, we must approve of the habits and practices of

thieves; any more than of the publicans and harlots, whose faults Jesus

pardoned, declaring that they would go into the kingdom of heaven

before those who behaved proudly. [1075] For, when He acquitted the

woman accused by the Jews as sinful, and as having been caught in

adultery, He told her to sin no more. [1076] If, then, He has done

something of the same kind in the case of Abraham, and Isaac, and

Jacob, all the praise is His; for such actions towards souls are

becoming in Him who maketh His sun to rise upon the evil and upon the

good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. [1077] One

thing perplexes me in your doctrine: why you limit your statements to

the fathers of the Jews, and are not of opinion that the Gentile

patriarchs had also a share in this grace of our Redeemer; especially

as the Christian Church consists of their children more than of the

seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. You will say that the Gentiles

worshipped idols, and the Jews the Almighty God, and that therefore

Jesus had regard only to the Jews. It would seem from this that the

worship of the Almighty God is the sure way to hell, and that the Son

must come to the aid of the worshipper of the Father. That is as you

please. For my part, I am ready to join you in the belief that the

fathers reached heaven, not by any merit of their own, but by that

divine mercy which is stronger than sin.

2. However, there is a difficulty in deciding as regards this verse

too, whether the words were really spoken to Christ, for there is a

discrepancy in the narratives. For while two evangelists, Matthew and

Luke, both alike tell of the centurion whose servant was sick, and to

whom these words of Jesus are supposed to have applied, that He had not

seen so great faith, no, not in Israel, as in this man, though a

Gentile and a Pagan, because he said that he was not worthy that Jesus

should come under his roof, but wished Him only to speak the word, and

his servant should be healed; Matthew alone adds that Jesus went on to

say, "Verily I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and

from the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob,

in the kingdom of heaven; but the children of the kingdom shall be cast

into outer darkness." By the many who should come are meant the

Pagans, on account of the centurion, in whom, although he was a

Gentile, so great faith was found; and the children of the kingdom are

the Jews, in whom there was no faith found. Luke, again, though he too

mentions the occurrence in his Gospel as part of the narrative of the

miracles of Christ, says nothing of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. If it

is said that he omitted it because it had been already said by Matthew,

why does he tell the story at all of the centurion and his servant,

since that, too, has the advantage of being recorded at length in

Matthew's ingenious narrative? But the passage is corrupt. For, in

describing the centurion's application to Jesus, Matthew says that he

came himself to ask for a cure; while Luke says he did not, but sent

elders of the Jews, and that they, in case Jesus should despise the

centurion as a Gentile (for they will have Jesus to be a thorough Jew),

set about persuading Him, by saying that he was worthy for whom He

should do this, because he loved their nation, and had built them a

synagogue; [1078] here again taking for granted that the Son of God was

concerned in a pagan centurion having thought it proper to build a

synagogue for the Jews. The words in question are, indeed, found in

Luke also, perhaps because on reflection he thought they might be

genuine; but they are found in another place, and in a connection

altogether different. The passage is where Jesus says to His

disciples, "Strive to enter in at the strait gate; for many shall come

seeking to enter in, and shall not be able. When once the Master of

the house has entered in, and has shut to the door, ye shall begin to

stand without, and to knock, saying Lord, open to us. And He shall

answer and say, I know you not. Then ye shall begin to say, We have

eaten and drunk in Thy presence, and Thou hast taught in our streets

and synagogues; but He shall say unto you, I know not whence ye are;

depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity. There shall be weeping and

gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and

all the prophets, entering into the kingdom of God, and you yourselves

cast out. And they shall come from the east, and from the west, and

from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom

of God." [1079] The part where it is said that many shall be shut out

of the kingdom of God, who have only borne the name of Christ, without

doing His works, is not left out by Matthew; but he makes no mention

here of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob. In the same way, Luke mentions

the centurion and his servant, without alluding in that connection to

Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob. Since it is uncertain when the words

were spoken, we are at liberty to doubt whether they were spoken at

all.

3. It is not without reason that we bring a critical judgment to the

study of Scriptures where there are such discrepancies and

contradictions. By thus examining everything, and comparing one

passage with another, we determine which contains Christ's actual

words, and what may or may not be genuine. For your predecessors have

made many interpolations in the words of our Lord, which thus appear

under His name, while they disagree with His doctrine. Besides, as we

have proved again and again, the writings are not the production of

Christ or of His apostles, but a compilation of rumors and beliefs,

made, long after their departure, by some obscure semi-Jews, not in

harmony even with one another, and published by them under the name of

the apostles, or of those considered the followers of the apostles, so

as to give the appearance of apostolic authority to all these blunders

and falsehoods. But whatever you make of that, as regards this verse,

I repeat that I do not insist on rejecting it. It is enough for my

position, that, as I said before, and as you are obliged to confess,

before the coming of our Lord all the patriarchs and prophets of Israel

lay in infernal darkness for their sins. Even though they may have

been restored to light and liberty by Christ, that has nothing to do

with the hateful character of their lives. We hate and eschew not

their persons, but their characters; not as they are now, when they are

purified, but as they were, when impure. So, whatever you think of

this verse, it does not affect us: for if it is genuine, it only

illustrates Christ's goodness and compassion; and if it is spurious,

those who wrote it are to blame. Our cause is as safe as it always is.

4. Augustin replied: Poor safety, indeed! when you contradict

yourself by hating the patriarchs as impure, at the same time that you

grieve for your impure god. You allow that, since the advent of the

Saviour, the patriarchs have had purity restored, and have enjoyed the

rest of the blessed; while your god, even after the Saviour's advent,

still lies in darkness, is still sunk in the ocean of iniquity, still

wallows in the mire of all uncleanness. These men, therefore, were not

only better than your god in their lives, but also happier in their

death. Where was the abode of the just who departed from this life

before Christ's coming in the flesh, and whether their condition also

was improved by the passion of Christ, in whom they had believed as to

come, and to suffer, and to rise again, and had, moreover, foretold

this in suitable language under the guidance of the Spirit of prophecy,

is to be discovered from the Holy Scriptures, if any clear discovery in

this matter is possible; we are not called on to adopt the crude

notions of all and sundry, still less the heretical opinions of men who

have gone astray into such egregious error. There is a vain attempt

here on the part of Faustus to introduce by a side-door the idea that

we may obtain something after this life besides the due reward of our

conduct in this life. It will be better for you to abandon your error

while you are still alive, and to embrace and hold the truths of the

Catholic faith. Otherwise the expectations of the unrighteous will be

sadly disappointed when God begins to fulfill His threatenings to the

unrighteous.

5. I have already given what I considered a sufficient answer to

Faustus' calumnies of the lives of the patriarchs. That they were

punished at their death, or that they were justified after the Lord's

passion, is not what we learn from His commendation of them, when He

admonished the Jews that, if they were Abraham's children, they should

do the works of Abraham, and said that Abraham desired to see His day,

and was glad when he saw it; [1080] and that it was into his bosom,

that is, some deep recess of blissful repose, that the angels carried

the poor sufferer who was despised by the proud rich man. [1081] And

what are we to make of the Apostle Paul? Is there any idea of

justification after death in his praise of Abraham, when he says that

before he was circumcised he believed God, and that it was counted to

him for righteousness? [1082] And so much importance does he attach

to this, that the single ground which he specifies for our becoming

Abraham's children, though not descended from him in the flesh, is,

that we follow the footsteps of his faith.

6. You are so hardened in your errors against the testimonies of

Scripture, that nothing can be made of you; for whenever anything is

quoted against you, you have the boldness to say that it is written not

by the apostle, but by some pretender under his name. The doctrine of

demons which you preach is so opposed to Christian doctrine, that you

could not continue, as professing Christians, to maintain it, unless

you denied the truth of the apostolic writings. How can you thus do

injury to your own souls? Where will you find any authority, if not in

the Gospel and apostolic writings? How can we be sure of the

authorship of any book, if we doubt the apostolic origin of those books

which are attributed to the apostles by the Church which the apostles

themselves founded, and which occupies so conspicuous a place in all

lands, and if at the same time we acknowledge as the undoubted

production of the apostles what is brought forward by heretics in

opposition to the Church, whose authors, from whom they derive their

name, lived long after the apostles? And do we not see in profane

literature that there are well-known authors under whose names many

things have been published after their time which have been rejected,

either from inconsistency with their ascertained writings, or from

their not having been known in the lifetime of the authors, so as to be

banded down with the confirmatory statement of the authors themselves,

or of their friends? To give a single example, were not some books

published lately under the name of the distinguished physician

Hippocrates, which were not received as authoritative by physicians?

And this decision remained unaltered in spite of some similarity in

style and matter: for, when compared to the genuine writings of

Hippocrates, these books were found to be inferior; besides that they

were not recognized as his at the time when his authorship of his

genuine productions was ascertained. Those books, again, from a

comparison with which the productions of questionable origin were

rejected, are with certainty attributed to Hippocrates; and any one who

denies their authorship is answered only by ridicule, simply because

there is a succession of testimonies to the books from the time of

Hippocrates to the present day, which makes it unreasonable either now

or hereafter to have any doubt on the subject. How do we know the

authorship of the works of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Varro, and other

similar writers, but by the unbroken chain of evidence? So also with

the numerous commentaries on the ecclesiastical books, which have no

canonical authority, and yet show a desire of usefulness and a spirit

of inquiry. How is the authorship ascertained in each case, except by

the author's having brought his work into public notice as much as

possible in his own lifetime, and, by the transmission of the

information from one to another in continuous order, the belief

becoming more certain as it becomes more general, up to our own day; so

that, when we are questioned as to the authorship of any book, we have

no difficulty in answering? But why speak of old books? Take the

books now before us: should any one, after some years, deny that this

book was written by me, or that Faustus' was written by him, where is

evidence for the fact to be found but in the information possessed by

some at the present time, and transmitted by them through successive

generations even to distant times? From all this it follows, that no

one who has not yielded to the malicious and deceitful suggestions of

lying devils, can be so blinded by passion as to deny the ability of

the Church of the apostles--a community of brethren as numerous as they

were faithful--to transmit their writings unaltered to posterity, as

the original seats of the apostles have been occupied by a continuous

succession of bishops to the present day, especially when we are

accustomed to see this happen in the case of ordinary writings both in

the Church and out of it.

7. But Faustus finds contradictions in the Gospels. Say, rather, that

Faustus reads the Gospels in a wrong spirit, that he is too foolish to

understand, and too blind to see. If you were animated with piety

instead of being misled by party spirit, you might easily, by examining

these passages, discover a wonderful and most instructive harmony among

the writers. Who, in reading two narratives of the same event, would

think of charging one or both of the authors with error or falsehood,

because one omits what the other mentions, or one tells concisely, but

with substantial agreement, what the other relates in detail, so as to

indicate not only what was done, but also how it was done? This is

what Faustus does in his attempt to impeach the truth of the Gospels;

as if Luke's omitting some saying of Christ recorded in Matthew implied

a denial on the part of Luke of Matthew's statement. There is no real

difficulty in the case; and to make a difficulty shows want of thought,

or of the ability to think. There is, indeed, a point in the narrative

of the centurion which is discussed among believers, and on which

objections are raised by unbelievers of no great learning, who prove

their quarrelsomeness, when, after being instructed, they do not give

up their errors. The point is, that Matthew says that the centurion

came to Jesus "beseeching Him, and saying;" while Luke says that he

sent to Jesus the elders of the Jews with this same request, that He

would heal his servant who was sick; and that when He came near the

house he sent others, through whom he said that he was not worthy that

Jesus should come into his house, and that he was not worthy to come

himself to Jesus. How, then, do we read in Matthew, "He came to Him,

beseeching Him, and saying, My servant lieth at home sick of the palsy,

and grievously tormented?" [1083] The explanation is, that Matthew's

narrative is correct, but brief, mentioning the centurion's coming to

Jesus, without saying whether he came himself or by others, or whether

the words about his servant were spoken by himself or through others.

But is it not common to speak of a person as coming near to a thing,

although he may not reach it? And even the word reach, which is the

strongest form of expression, is frequently used in cases where the

person spoken of acts through others, as when we say he took his case

to court, he reached the presence of the judge; or, again, he reached

the presence of some man in power, although it may probably have been

through his friends, and the person may not have seen him whose

presence he is said to have reached. And from the word for to reach we

give the name of Perventors to those who by ambitious arts gain access,

either personally or through friends, to the, so to speak, inaccessible

minds of the great. Are we, then, in reading to forget the common

usage of speech? Or must the sacred Scripture have a language of its

own? The cavils of forward critics are thus met by a reference to the

usual forms of speech.

8. Those who examine this matter not in a disputatious but in a calm

believing spirit are invited to come to Jesus, not outwardly but in

heart, not in bodily presence but in the power of faith, as the

centurion did, and then they will better understand Matthew's

narrative. To such it is said in the Psalm "Come unto Him, and be

enlightened; and your faces shall not be ashamed." [1084] Hence we

learn that the centurion, whose faith was so highly spoken of, came to

Christ more truly than the people who carried his message. We find an

analogous case in the woman with the issue of blood, who was healed by

touching the hem of Christ's garment, when Christ said, "Some one hath

touched me." The disciples wondered what Christ meant by saying, "Who

hath touched me?" "Some one hath touched me," when the crowd was

thronging Him. In fact, they made this reply: "The crowd throngeth

Thee, and sayest Thou, Who hath touched me?" [1085] Now, as the

people thronged Christ while the woman touched Him, so the messengers

were sent to Christ, but the centurion really came to Him. In Matthew

we have a not infrequent form of expression, and at the same time a

symbolical import; while in Luke there is a simple narrative of the

whole event, such as to draw our attention to the manner in which

Matthew has recorded it. I wish one of those people who found their

silly objections to the Gospels on such trifling difficulties would

himself tell a story twice over, honestly giving a true account of what

happened, and that his words were written down and read over to him.

We should then see whether he would not say more or less at one time

than at another; and whether the order would not be changed, not only

of words, but of things; and whether he would not put some opinion of

his own into the mouth of another, because, though he never heard him

say it, he knew it perfectly well to be in his mind; and whether he

would not sometimes put in a few words what he had before related at

length. In these and other ways, which might perhaps be reduced to

rule, the narratives of the same thing by two persons, or two

narratives by the same person, might differ in many things without

being opposed, might be unlike without being contradictory. Thus are

undone all the bandages with which poor Manich�ans stifle themselves to

keep in the spirit of error, and to keep out all that might lead to

their salvation.

9. Now that all Faustus' calumnies have been refuted, those at least

on the subjects here treated of at large and explained fully as the

Lord has enabled me, I close with a word of counsel to you who are

implicated in those shocking and damnable errors, that, if you

acknowledge the supreme authority of Scripture, you should recognise

that authority which from the time of Christ Himself, through the

ministry of His apostles, and through a regular succession of bishops

in the seats of the apostles, has been preserved to our own day

throughout the whole world, with a reputation known to all. There the

Old Testament too has its difficulties solved, and its predictions

fulfilled. If you ask for demonstration, consider first what you are,

how unfit for comprehending the nature of your own soul, not to speak

of God; I mean an intelligent comprehension, such as you profess to

desire, or to have once desired, and not the notions of a credulous

fancy. Admitting this incompetency, which must continue while you

remain as you are, you may at least be referred to the natural

conviction of every human mind, unless it is corrupted by error, of the

perfect unchangeableness and incorruptibility of the nature and

substance of God. Admit this, or believe it, and you will no longer be

Manich�ans, so that in course of time you may become Catholics.
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Concerning the Nature of Good,

Against the Manich�ans.

[De Natura Boni Contra Manich�os.] c. a.d. 405.

In One Book.

Written after the year 404. It is put in the Retractations immediately

after the De Actis cum Felice Manich�o, which was written about the end

of the year 404. It is one of the most argumentative of the

Anti-Manich�an treatises, and so one of the most abstruse and

difficult. The lines of argument here pursued have already been

employed in part in the earlier treatises. The most interesting

portions of the contents of the treatise, and the most damaging to the

Manich�ans, are the long extracts from Mani's Thesaurus, and his

Fundamental Epistle.--A.H.N.
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Chapter 1.--God the Highest and Unchangeable Good, from Whom are All

Other Good Things, Spiritual and Corporeal.

The highest good, than which there is no higher, is God, and

consequently He is unchangeable good, hence truly eternal and truly

immortal. All other good things are only from Him, not of Him. For

what is of Him, is Himself. And consequently if He alone is

unchangeable, all things that He has made, because He has made them out

of nothing, are changeable. For He is so omnipotent, that even out of

nothing, that is out of what is absolutely non-existent, He is able to

make good things both great and small, both celestial and terrestrial,

both spiritual and corporeal. But because He is also just, He has not

put those things that He has made out of nothing on an equality with

that which He begat out of Himself. Because, therefore, no good things

whether great or small, through whatever gradations of things, can

exist except from God; but since every nature, so far as it is nature,

is good, it follows that no nature can exist save from the most high

and true God: because all things even not in the highest degree good,

but related to the highest good, and again, because all good things,

even those of most recent origin, which are far from the highest good,

can have their existence only from the highest good. Therefore every

spirit, though subject to change, and every corporeal entity, is from

God, and all this, having been made, is nature. For every nature is

either spirit or body. Unchangeable spirit is God, changeable spirit,

having been made, is nature, but is better than body; but body is not

spirit, unless when the wind, because it is invisible to us and yet its

power is felt as something not inconsiderable, is in a certain sense

called spirit.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 2.--How This May Suffice for Correcting the Manich�ans.

But for the sake of those who, not being able to understand that all

nature, that is, every spirit and every body, is naturally good, are

moved by the iniquity of spirit and the mortality of body, and on this

account endeavor to bring in another nature of wicked spirit and mortal

body, which God did not make, we determine thus to bring to their

understanding what we say can be brought. For they acknowledge that no

good thing can exist save from the highest and true God, which also is

true and suffices for correcting them, if they are willing to give

heed.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 3.--Measure, Form, and Order, Generic Goods in Things Made by

God.

For we Catholic Christians worship God, from whom are all good things

whether great or small; from whom is all measure great or small; from

whom is all form great or small; from whom is all order great or

small. For all things in proportion as they are better measured,

formed, and ordered, are assuredly good in a higher degree; but in

proportion as they are measured, formed, and ordered in an inferior

degree, are they the less good. These three things, therefore,

measure, form, and order,--not to speak of innumerable other things

that are shown to pertain to these three,--these three things,

therefore, measure, form, order, are as it were generic goods in things

made by God, whether in spirit or in body. God is, therefore, above

every measure of the creature, above every form, above every order, nor

is He above by local spaces, but by ineffable and singular potency,

from whom is every measure, every form, every order. These three

things, where they are great, are great goods, where they are small,

are small goods; where they are absent, there is no good. And again

where these things are great, there are great natures, where they are

small, there are small natures, where they are absent, there is no

nature. Therefore all nature is good.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 4.--Evil is Corruption of Measure, Form, or Order.

When accordingly it is inquired, whence is evil, it must first be

inquired, what is evil, which is nothing else than corruption, either

of the measure, or the form, or the order, that belong to nature.

Nature therefore which has been corrupted, is called evil, for

assuredly when incorrupt it is good; but even when corrupt, so far as

it is nature it is good, so far as it is corrupted it is evil.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 5.--The Corrupted Nature of a More Excellent Order Sometimes

Better Than an Inferior Nature Even Uncorrupted.

But it may happen, that a certain nature which has been ranked as more

excellent by reason of natural measure and form, though corrupt, is

even yet better than another incorrupt which has been ranked lower by

reason of an inferior natural measure and form: as in the estimation

of men, according to the quality which presents itself to view, corrupt

gold is assuredly better than incorrupt silver, and corrupt silver than

incorrupt lead; so also in more powerful spiritual natures a rational

spirit even corrupted through an evil will is better than an irrational

though incorrupt, and better is any spirit whatever even corrupt than

any body whatever though incorrupt. For better is a nature which, when

it is present in a body, furnishes it with life, than that to which

life is furnished. But however corrupt may be the spirit of life that

has been made, it can furnish life to a body, and hence, though

corrupt, it is better than the body though incorrupt.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 6.--Nature Which Cannot Be Corrupted is the Highest Good; That

Which Can, is Some Good.

But if corruption take away all measure, all form, all order from

corruptible things, no nature will remain. And consequently every

nature which cannot be corrupted is the highest good, as is God. But

every nature that can be corrupted is also itself some good; for

corruption cannot injure it, except by taking away from or diminishing

that which is good.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 7.--The Corruption of Rational Spirits is on the One Hand

Voluntary, on the Other Penal.

But to the most excellent creatures, that is, to rational spirits, God

has offered this, that if they will not they cannot be corrupted; that

is, if they should maintain obedience under the Lord their God, so

should they adhere to his incorruptible beauty; but if they do not will

to maintain obedience, since willingly they are corrupted in sins,

unwillingly they shall be corrupted in punishment, since God is such a

good that it is well for no one who deserts Him, and among the things

made by God the rational nature is so great a good, that there is no

good by which it may be blessed except God. Sinners, therefore, are

ordained to punishment; which ordination is punishment for the reason

that it is not conformable to their nature, but it is justice because

it is conformable to their fault.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 8.--From the Corruption and Destruction of Inferior Things is

the Beauty of the Universe.

But the rest of things that are made of nothing, which are assuredly

inferior to the rational soul, can be neither blessed nor miserable.

But because in proportion to their fashion and appearance are things

themselves good, nor could there be good things in a less or the least

degree except from God, they are so ordered that the more infirm yield

to the firmer, the weaker to the stronger, the more impotent to the

more powerful; and so earthly things harmonize with celestial, as being

subject to the things that are pre-eminent. But to things falling

away, and succeeding, a certain temporal beauty in its kind belongs, so

that neither those things that die, or cease to be what they were,

degrade or disturb the fashion and appearance and order of the

universal creation; as a speech well composed is assuredly beautiful,

although in it syllables and all sounds rush past as it were in being

born and in dying.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 9.--Punishment is Constituted for the Sinning Nature that It

May Be Rightly Ordered.

What sort of punishment, and how great, is due to each fault, belongs

to Divine judgment, not to human; which punishment assuredly when it is

remitted in the case of the converted, there is great goodness on the

part of God, and when it is deservedly inflicted, there is no injustice

on the part of God; because nature is better ordered by justly smarting

under punishment than by rejoicing with impunity in sin; which nature

nevertheless, even thus having some measure, form, and order, in

whatever extremity there is as yet some good, which things, if they

were absolutely taken away, and utterly consumed, there will be

accordingly no good, because no nature will remain.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 10.--Natures Corruptible, Because Made of Nothing.

All corruptible natures therefore are natures at all only so far as

they are from God, nor would they be corruptible if they were of Him;

because they would be what He himself is. Therefore of whatever

measure, of whatever form, of whatever order, they are, they are so

because it is God by whom they were made; but they are not immutable,

because it is nothing of which they were made. For it is sacrilegious

audacity to make nothing and God equal, as when we wish to make what

has been born of God such as what has been made by Him out of nothing.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 11.--God Cannot Suffer Harm, Nor Can Any Other Nature Except by

His Permission.

Wherefore neither can God's nature suffer harm, nor can any nature

under God suffer harm unjustly: for when by sinning unjustly some do

harm, an unjust will is imputed to them; but the power by which they

are permitted to do harm is from God alone, who knows, while they

themselves are ignorant, what they ought to suffer, whom He permits

them to harm.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 12.--All Good Things are from God Alone.

All these things are so perspicuous, so assured, that if they who

introduce another nature which God did not make, were willing to give

attention, they would not be filled with so great blasphemies, as that

they should place so great good things in supreme evil, and so great

evil things in God. For what the truth compels them to acknowledge,

namely, that all good things are from God alone, suffices for their

correction, if they were willing to give heed, as I said above. Not,

therefore, are great good things from one, and small good things from

another; but good things great and small are from the supremely good

alone, which is God.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 13.--Individual Good Things, Whether Small or Great, are from

God.

Let us, therefore, bring before our minds good things however great,

which it is fitting that we attribute to God as their author, and these

having been eliminated let us see whether any nature will remain. All

life both great and small, all power great and small, all safety great

and small, all memory great and small, all virtue great and small, all

intellect great and small, all tranquillity great and small, all plenty

great and small, all sensation great and small, all light great and

small, all suavity [1086] great and small, all measure great and small,

all beauty great and small, all peace great and small, and whatever

other like things may occur, especially such as are found throughout

all things, whether spiritual or corporeal, every measure, every form,

every order both great and small, are from the Lord God. All which

good things whoever should wish to abuse, pays the penalty by divine

judgment; but where none of these things shall have been present at

all, no nature will remain.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1086] Or sanity, according to another reading.--A.H.N.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 14.--Small Good Things in Comparison with Greater are Called by

Contrary Names.

But in all these things, whatever are small are called by contrary

names in comparison with greater things; as in the form of a man

because the beauty is greater, the beauty of the ape in comparison with

it is called deformity. And the imprudent are deceived, as if the

former is good, and the latter evil, nor do they regard in the body of

the ape its own fashion, the equality of members on both sides, the

agreement of parts, the protection of safety, and other things which it

would be tedious to enumerate.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 15.--In the Body of the Ape the Good of Beauty is Present,

Though in a Less Degree.

But that what we have said may be understood, and may satisfy those too

slow of comprehension, or that even the pertinacious and those

repugnant to the most manifest truth may be compelled to confess what

is true, let them be asked, whether corruption can harm the body of an

ape? But if it can, so that it may become more hideous, what

diminishes but the good of beauty? Whence as long as the nature of the

body subsists, so long something will remain. If, accordingly, good

having been consumed, nature is consumed, the nature is therefore

good. So also we say that slow is contrary to swift, but yet he who

does not move at all cannot even be called slow. So we say that a

heavy voice is contrary to a sharp voice, or a harsh to a musical; but

if you completely remove any kind of voice, there is silence where

there is no voice, which silence, nevertheless, for the simple reason

that there is no voice, is usually opposed to voice as something

contrary thereto. So also lucid and obscure are called as it were two

contrary things, yet even obscure things have something of light, which

being absolutely wanting, darkness is the absence of light in the same

way in which silence is the absence of voice.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 16.--Privations in Things are Fittingly Ordered by God.

Yet even these privations of things are so ordered in the universe of

nature, that to those wisely considering they not unfittingly have

their vicissitudes. For by not illuminating certain places and times,

God has also made the darkness as fittingly as the day. For if we by

restraining the voice fittingly interpose silence in speaking, how much

more does He, as the perfect framer of all things, fittingly make

privations of things? Whence also in the hymn of the three children,

light and darkness alike praise God, [1087] that is, bring forth praise

in the hearts of those who well consider.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1087] Dan. iii. 72.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 17.--Nature, in as Far as It is Nature, No Evil.

No nature, therefore, as far as it is nature, is evil; but to each

nature there is no evil except to be diminished in respect of good.

But if by being diminished it should be consumed so that there is no

good, no nature would be left; not only such as the Manich�ans

introduce, where so great good things are found that their exceeding

blindness is wonderful, but such as any one can introduce.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 18.--Hyle, Which Was Called by the Ancients the Formless

Material of Things, is Not an Evil.

For neither is that material, which the ancients called Hyle, to be

called an evil. I do not say that which Manich�us with most senseless

vanity, not knowing what he says, denominates Hyle, namely, the former

of corporeal beings; whence it is rightly said to him, that he

introduces another god. For nobody can form and create corporeal

beings but God alone; for neither are they created unless there subsist

with them measure, form, and order, which I think that now even they

themselves confess to be good things, and things that cannot be except

from God. But by Hyle I mean a certain material absolutely formless

and without quality, whence those qualities that we perceive are

formed, as the ancients said. For hence also wood is called in Greek

hule, because it is adapted to workmen, not that itself may make

anything, but that it is the material of which something may be made.

Nor is that Hyle, therefore, to be called an evil which cannot be

perceived through any appearance, but can scarcely be thought of

through any sort of privation of appearance. For this has also a

capacity of forms; for if it cannot receive the form imposed by the

workman, neither assuredly may it be called material. Hence if form is

some good, whence those who excel in it are called beautiful, [1088] as

from appearance they are called handsome, [1089] even the capacity of

form is undoubtedly something good. As because wisdom is a good, no

one doubts that to be capable of wisdom is a good. And because every

good is from God, no one ought to doubt that even matter, if there is

any, has its existence from God alone.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1088] Forma--formosus.

[1089] Species--speciosus.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 19.--To Have True Existence is an Exclusive Prerogative of God.

Magnificently and divinely, therefore, our God said to his servant: "I

am that I am," and "Thou shalt say to the children of Israel, He who is

sent me to you." [1090] For He truly is because He is unchangeable.

For every change makes what was not, to be: therefore He truly is, who

is unchangeable; but all other things that were made by Him have

received being from Him each in its own measure. To Him who is

highest, therefore nothing can be contrary, save what is not; and

consequently as from Him everything that is good has its being, so from

Him is everything that by nature exists; since everything that exists

by nature is good. Thus every nature is good, and everything good is

from God; therefore every nature is from God.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1090] Ex. iii. 14.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 20.--Pain Only in Good Natures.

But pain which some suppose to be in an especial manner an evil,

whether it be in mind or in body, cannot exist except in good natures.

For the very fact of resistance in any being leading to pain, involves

a refusal not to be what it was, because it was something good; but

when a being is compelled to something better, the pain is useful, when

to something worse, it is useless. Therefore in the case of the mind,

the will resisting a greater power causes pain; in the case of the

body, sensation resisting a more powerful body causes pain. But evils

without pain are worse: for it is worse to rejoice iniquity than to

bewail corruption; yet even such rejoicing cannot exist save from the

attainment of inferior good things. But iniquity is the desertion of

better things. Likewise in a body, a wound with pain is better than

painless putrescence, which is especially called the corruption which

the dead flesh of the Lord did not see, that is, did not suffer, as was

predicted in prophecy: "Thou shall not suffer Thy Holy one to see

corruption." [1091] For who denies that He was wounded by the

piercing of the nails, and that He was stabbed with the lance? [1092]

But even what is properly called by men corporeal corruption, that is,

putrescence itself, if as yet there is anything left to consume,

increases by the diminution of the good. But if corruption shall have

absolutely consumed it, so that there is no good, no nature will

remain, for there will be nothing that corruption may corrupt; and so

there will not even be putrescence, for there will be nowhere at all

for it to be.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1091] Ps. xvi. 10.

[1092] John xix. 18, 34.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 21.--From Measure Things are Said to Be Moderate-Sized. [1093]

Therefore now by common usage things small and mean are said to have

measure, because some measure remains in them, without which they would

no longer be moderate-sized, but would not exist at all. But those

things that by reason of too much progress are called immoderate, are

blamed for very excessiveness; but yet it is necessary that those

things themselves be restrained in some manner under God who has

disposed all things in extension, number, and weight. [1094]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1093] Modus, modica.

[1094] Wisd. xi. 21.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 22.--Measure in Some Sense is Suitable to God Himself.

But God cannot be said to have measure, lest He should seem to be

spoken of as limited. Yet He is not immoderate by whom measure is

bestowed upon all things, so that they may in any measure exist. Nor

again ought God to be called measured, as if He received measure from

any one. But if we say that He is the highest measure, by chance we

say something; if indeed in speaking of the highest measure we mean the

highest good. For every measure in so far as it is a measure is good;

whence nothing can be called measured, modest, modified, without

praise, although in another sense we use measure for limit, and speak

of no measure where there is no limit, which is sometimes said with

praise as when it is said: "And of His kingdom there shall be no

limit." [1095] For it might also be said, "There shall be no

measure," so that measure might be used in the sense of limit; for He

who reigns in no measure, assuredly does not reign at all.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1095] Luke i. 33.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 23.--Whence a Bad Measure, a Bad Form, a Bad Order May

Sometimes Be Spoken of.

Therefore a bad measure, a bad form, a bad order, are either so called

because they are less than they should be, or because they are not

adapted to those things to which they should be adapted; so that they

may be called bad as being alien and incongruous; as if any one should

be said not to have done in a good measure because he has done less

than he ought, or because he has done in such a thing as he ought not

to have done, or more than was fitting, or not conveniently; so that

the very fact of that being reprehended which is done in a bad measure,

is justly reprehended for no other cause than that the measure is not

there maintained. Likewise a form is called bad either in comparison

with something more handsome or more beautiful, this form being less,

that greater, not in size but in comeliness; or because it is out of

harmony with the thing to which it is applied, so that it seems alien

and unsuitable. As if a man should walk forth into a public place

naked, which nakedness does not offend if seen in a bath. Likewise

also order is called bad when order itself is maintained in an inferior

degree. Hence not order, but rather disorder, is bad; since either the

ordering is less than it should be, or not as it should be. Yet where

there is any measure, any form, any order, there is some good and some

nature; but where there is no measure, no form, no order, there is no

good, no nature.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 24.--It is Proved by the Testimonies of Scripture that God is

Unchangeable. The Son of God Begotten, Not Made.

Those things which our faith holds and which reason in whatever way has

traced out, are fortified by the testimonies of the divine Scriptures,

so that those who by reason of feebler intellect are not able to

comprehend these things, may believe the divine authority, and so may

deserve to know. But let not those who understand, but are less

instructed in ecclesiastical literature, suppose that we set forth

these things from our own intellect rather than what are in those

Books. Accordingly, that God is unchangeable is written in the

Psalms: "Thou shalt change them and they shall be changed; but Thou

thyself art the same." [1096] And in the book of Wisdom, concerning

wisdom: "Remaining in herself, she renews all things." [1097] Whence

also the Apostle Paul: "To the invisible, incorruptible, only God."

[1098] And the Apostle James: "Every best giving and every perfect

gift is from above, descending from the Father of light, with whom

there is no changeableness, neither obscuring of influence." [1099]

Likewise because what He begat of Himself is what He Himself is, it is

said in brief by the Son Himself: "I and the Father are one." [1100]

But because the Son was not made, since through Him were all things

made, thus it is written: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word

was with God, and God was the Word; this was in the beginning with

God. All things were made through Him, and without Him was made

nothing;" [1101] that is, without Him was not anything made.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1096] Ps. cii. 27.

[1097] Wisd. vii. 27.

[1098] 1 Tim. i. 17.

[1099] James i. 17.

[1100] John x. 30.

[1101] John i. 1-3.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 25.--This Last Expression Misunderstood by Some.

For no attention should be paid to the ravings of men who think that

nothing should be understood to mean something, and moreover think to

compel any one to vanity of this kind on the ground that nothing is

placed at the end of the sentence. Therefore, they say, it was made,

and because it was made, nothing is itself something. They have lost

their senses by zeal in contradicting, and do not understand that it

makes no difference whether it be said: "Without Him was made

nothing," or "without Him nothing was made." For even if the order

were the last mentioned, they could nevertheless say, that nothing is

itself something because it was made. For in the case of what is in

truth something, what difference does it make if it be said "Without

him a house was made," so long as it is understood that something was

made without him, which something is a house? So also because it is

said: "Without Him was made nothing," since nothing is assuredly not

anything, when it is truly and properly spoken, it makes no difference

whether it be said: "Without Him was made nothing or Without Him

nothing was made," or "nothing was made." But who cares to speak with

men who can say of this very expression of mine "It makes no

difference," "Therefore it makes some difference, for nothing itself is

something?" But those whose brains are not addled, see it as a thing

most manifest that this something is to be understood when it says "It

makes no difference," as when I say "It matters in no respect." But

these, if they should say to any one, "What hast thou done?" and he

should reply that he has done nothing, would, according to this mode of

disputation, falsely accuse him saying, "Thou hast done something,

therefore, because thou hast done nothing; for nothing is itself

something." But they have also the Lord Himself placing this word at

the end of a sentence, when He says: "And in secret have I spoken

nothing." [1102] Let them read, therefore, and be silent. [1103]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1102] John xviii. 20.

[1103] It is difficult for us to understand why Augustin should have

thought it worth while to refute so elaborately an argument so

puerile. But it is his way to be prolix in such matters.--A.H.N.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 26.--That Creatures are Made of Nothing.

Because therefore God made all things which He did not beget of

Himself, not of those things that already existed, but of those things

that did not exist at all, that is, of nothing," the Apostle Paul

says: "Who calls the things that are not as if they are." [1104] But

still more plainly it is written in the book of Maccabees: "I pray

thee, son, look at the heaven and the earth and all the things that are

in them; see and know that it was not these of which the Lord God made

us." [1105] And from this that is written in the Psalm: "He spake,

and they were made." [1106] It is manifest, that not of Himself He

begat these things, but that He made them by word and command. But

what is not of Himself is assuredly of nothing. For there was not

anything of which he should make them, concerning which the apostle

says most openly: "For from Him, and through Him, and in Him are all

things." [1107]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1104] Rom. iv. 17.

[1105] 2 Mac. vii. 28.

[1106] Ps. cxlviii. 5.

[1107] Rom. xi. 36.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 27.--"From Him" And "Of Him" Do Not Mean The Same Thing.

But "from Him" does not mean the same as "of Him." [1108] For what is

of Him may be said to be from Him; but not everything that is from Him

is rightly said to be of Him. For from Him are heaven and earth,

because He made them; but not of Him because they are not of His

substance. As in the case of a man who begets a son and makes a house,

from himself is the son, from himself is the house, but the son is of

him, the house is of earth and wood. But this is so, because as a man

he cannot make something even of nothing; but God of whom are all

things, through whom are all things, in whom are all things, had no

need of any material which He had not made to assist His omnipotence.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1108] Ex ipso and de ipso.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 28.--Sin Not From God, But From The Will of Those Sinning.

But when we hear: "All things are from Him, and through Him, and in

Him," we ought assuredly to understand all natures which naturally

exist. For sins, which do not preserve but vitiate nature, are not

from Him; which sins, Holy Scripture in many ways testifies, are from

the will of those sinning, especially in the passage where the apostle

says: "But dost thou suppose this, O man, that judgest those who do

such things, and doest them, that thou shall escape the judgment of

God? Or dost thou despise the riches of His goodness, and patience,

and long-suffering, not knowing that the patience of God leadeth thee

to repentance? But according to the hardness of thy heart and thy

impenitent heart, thou treasurest up for thyself wrath against the day

of wrath and of the revelation of the just judgment of God, who will

render unto every one according to his works." [1109]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1109] Rom. ii. 3-6.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 29.--That God is Not Defiled by Our Sins.

And yet, though all things that He established are in Him, those who

sin do not defile Him, of whose wisdom it is said: "She touches all

things by reason of her purity, and nothing defiled assails her."

[1110] For it behooves us to believe that as God is incorruptible and

unchangeable, so also is He consequently undefilable.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1110] Wisd. vii. 24, 25.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 30.--That Good Things, Even the Least, and Those that are

Earthly, are by God.

But that God made even the least things, that is, earthly and mortal

things, must undoubtedly be understood from that passage of the

apostle, where, speaking of the members of our flesh: "For if one

member is glorified, all the members rejoice with it, and if one member

suffers, all the members suffer with it;" also this he then says: "God

has placed the members each one of them in the body as he willed;" and

"God has tempered the body, giving to that to which it was wanting

greater honor, that there should be no schism in the body, but that the

members should have the same care one for another." [1111] But what

the apostle thus praises in the measure and form and order of the

members of the flesh, you find in the flesh of all animals, alike the

greatest and the least; for all flesh is among earthly goods, and

consequently is esteemed among the least.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1111] 1 Cor. xii. 26, 18, 24, 25.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 31.--To Punish and to Forgive Sins Belong Equally to God.

Likewise because it belongs to divine judgment, not human, what sort of

punishment and how great is due to every fault, it is thus written: "O

the height of the riches of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! how

inscrutable are His judgments and his ways past finding out!" [1112]

Likewise because by the goodness of God sins are forgiven to the

converted, the very fact that Christ was sent sufficiently shows, who

not in His own nature as God, but in our nature, which He assumed from

a woman, died for us; which goodness of God with reference to us, and

which love of God, the apostle thus sets forth: "But God commendeth

His love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for

us; much more now being justified in His blood we shall be saved from

wrath through Him. For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to

God through the death of His Son, much more being reconciled we shall

be saved in His life." [1113] But because even when due punishment is

rendered to sinners, there is no unrighteousness on God's part, he thus

says: "What shall we say? Is God unrighteous who visiteth with

wrath?" [1114] But in one place he has briefly admonished that

goodness and severity are alike from Him, saying: "Thou seest then the

goodness and severity of God; toward them that have fallen, severity,

but towards thee goodness, if thou shouldst continue in goodness."

[1115]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1112] Rom. xi. 33.

[1113] Rom. v. 8-10.

[1114] Ibid. iii. 5.

[1115] Ibid. xi. 22.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 32.--From God Also is the Very Power to Be Hurtful.

Likewise because the power even of those that are hurtful is from God

alone, thus it stands written, Wisdom speaking: "Through me kings

reign and tyrants hold the land through me." [1116] The apostle also

says: "For there is no power but of God." [1117] But that it is

worthily done is written in the book of Job: "Who maketh to reign a

man that is a hypocrite, on account of the perversity of the people."

[1118] And concerning the people of Israel God says: "I gave them a

king in my wrath." [1119] For it is not unrighteous, that the wicked

receiving the power of being hurtful, both the patience of the good

should be proved and the iniquity of the evil punished. For through

power given to the Devil both Job was proved so that he might appear

righteous, [1120] and Peter was tempted lest he should be presumptuous,

[1121] and Paul was buffeted lest he should be exalted, [1122] and

Judas was damned so that he should hang himself. [1123] When,

therefore, through the power which He has given the Devil, God Himself

shall have done all things righteously, nevertheless punishment shall

at last be rendered to the Devil not for these things justly done, but

for the unrighteous willing to be hurtful, which belonged to himself,

when it shall be said to the impious who persevered in consenting to

his wickedness, "Go ye into everlasting fire which my God has prepared

for the Devil and his angels." [1124]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1116] Prov. viii. 15.

[1117] Rom. xiii. 1.

[1118] Job xxxiv. 30. Compare the Revised English Version. The sense

seems to be completely missed in Augustin's text.--A.H.N.

[1119] Hos. xiii. 11.

[1120] Job i. and ii.

[1121] Matt. xxvi. 31-35, 69-75.

[1122] 2 Cor. xii. 7.

[1123] Matt. xxvii. 5.

[1124] Matt. xxv. 41.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 33.--That Evil Angels Have Been Made Evil, Not by God, But by

Sinning.

But because evil angels also were not constituted evil by God, but were

made evil by sinning, Peter in his epistle says: "For if God spared

not angels when they sinned, but casting them down into the dungeons of

smoky hell, He delivered them to be reserved for punishment in

judgment." [1125] Hence Peter shows that there is still due to them

the penalty of the last judgment, concerning which the Lord says: "Go

ye into everlasting fire, which has been prepared for the Devil and his

angels." Although they have already penally received this hell, that

is, an inferior smoky air as a prison, which nevertheless since it is

also called heaven, is not that heaven in which there are stars, but

this lower heaven by the smoke of which the clouds are conglobulated,

and where the birds fly; for both a cloudy heaven is spoken of, and

flying things are called heavenly. As when the Apostle Paul calls

those evil angels, against whom as enemies by living piously we

contend, "spiritual things of wickedness in heavenly places." [1126]

That this may not be understood of the upper heavens, he plainly says

elsewhere: "According to the presence of the prince of this air, who

now worketh in the sons of disobedience." [1127]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1125] 2 Pet. ii. 4.

[1126] Eph. vi. 12.

[1127] Ibid. ii. 2.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 34.--That Sin is Not the Striving for an Evil Nature, But the

Desertion of a Better.

Likewise because sin, or unrighteousness, is not the striving after

evil nature but the desertion of better, it is thus found written in

the Scriptures: "Every creature of God is good." [1128] And

accordingly every tree also which God planted in Paradise is assuredly

good. Man did not therefore strive after an evil nature when he

touched the forbidden tree; but by deserting what was better, he

committed an evil deed. Since the Creator is better than any creature

which He has made, His command should not have been deserted, that the

thing forbidden, however good, might be touched; since the better

having been deserted, the good of the creature was striven for, which

was touched contrary to the command of the Creator. God did not plant

an evil tree in Paradise; but He Himself was better who prohibited its

being touched.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1128] 1 Tim. iv. 4.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 35.--The Tree Was Forbidden to Adam Not Because It Was Evil,

But Because It Was Good for Man to Be Subject to God.

For besides, He had made the prohibition, in order to show that the

nature of the rational soul ought not to be in its own power, but in

subjection to God, and that it guards the order of its salvation

through obedience, corrupting it through disobedience. Hence also He

called the tree, the touching of which He forbade, the tree "of the

knowledge of good and evil;" [1129] because when man should have

touched it in the face of the prohibition, he would experience the

penalty of sin, and so would know the difference between the good of

obedience, and the evil of disobedience.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1129] Gen. ii. 9.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 36.--No Creature of God is Evil, But to Abuse a Creature of God

is Evil.

For who is so foolish as to think a creature of God, especially one

planted in Paradise, blameworthy; when indeed not even thorns and

thistles, which the earth brought forth, according to the judiciary

judgment of God, for wearing out the sinner in labor, should be

blamed? For even such herbs have their measure and form and order,

which whoever considers soberly will find praiseworthy; but they are

evil to that nature which ought thus to be restrained as a recompense

for sin. Therefore, as I have said, sin is not the striving after an

evil nature, but the desertion of a better, and so the deed itself is

evil, not the nature which the sinner uses amiss. For it is evil to

use amiss that which is good. Whence the apostle reproves certain ones

as condemned by divine judgment, "Who have worshipped and served the

creature more than the Creator." [1130] He does not reprove the

creature, which he who should do would act injuriously towards the

Creator, but those who, deserting the better, have used amiss the good.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1130] Rom. i. 25.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 37.--God Makes Good Use of the Evil Deeds of Sinners.

Accordingly, if all natures should guard their own proper measure and

form and order, there would be no evil: but if any one should wish to

misuse these good things, not even thus does he vanquish the will of

God, who knows how to order righteously even the unrighteous; so that

if they themselves through the iniquity of their will should misuse His

good things, He through the righteousness of His power may use their

evil deeds, rightly ordaining to punishment those who have perversely

ordained themselves to sins.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 38.--Eternal Fire Torturing the Wicked, Not Evil.

For neither is eternal fire itself, which is to torture the impious, an

evil nature, since it has its measure, its form and its order depraved

by no iniquity; but it is an evil torture for the damned, to whose sins

it is due. For neither is yonder light, because it tortures the

blear-eyed, an evil nature.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 39.--Fire is Called Eternal, Not as God Is, But Because Without

End.

But fire is eternal, not as God is eternal, because, though without

end, yet is not without beginning; but God is also without beginning.

Then, although it may be employed perpetually for the punishment of

sinners, yet it is mutable nature. But that is true eternity which is

true immortality, that is that highest immutability, which cannot be

changed at all. For it is one thing not to suffer change, when change

is possible, and another thing to be absolutely incapable of change.

Therefore, just as man is called good, yet not as God, of whom it was

said, "There is none good save God alone;" [1131] and just as the soul

is called immortal, yet not as God, of whom it was said, "Who alone

hath immortality;" [1132] and just as a man is called wise, yet not as

God, of whom it was said, "To God the only wise;" [1133] so fire is

called eternal, yet not as God, whose alone is immortality itself and

true eternity.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1131] Mark. x. 18.

[1132] 1 Tim. vi. 16.

[1133] Rom. xvi. 27.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 40.--Neither Can God Suffer Hurt, Nor Any Other, Save by the

Just Ordination of God.

Since these things are so, according to the Catholic faith, and

wholesome doctrine, and truth perspicuous to those of good

understanding, neither can any one hurt the nature of God, nor can the

nature of God unrighteously hurt any one, or suffer any one to do hurt

with impunity. "For he that doeth hurt shall receive," says the

apostle, "according to the hurt that he has done; and there is no

accepting of persons with God." [1134]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1134] Col. iii. 25.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 41.--How Great Good Things the Manich�ans Put in the Nature of

Evil, and How Great Evil Things in the Nature of Good.

But if the Manich�ans were willing, without pernicious zeal for

defending their error, and with the fear of God, to think, they would

not most criminally blaspheme by supposing two natures, the one good,

which they call God, the other evil, which God did not make: so

erring, so delirious, nay so insane, are they that they do not see,

that even in what they call the nature of supreme evil they place so

great good things: life, power, safety, memory, intellect, temperance,

virtue, plenty, sense, light, suavity, extensions, numbers, peace,

measure, form, order; but in what they call supreme good, so many evil

things: death, sickness, forgetfulness, foolishness, confusion,

impotence, need, stolidity, blindness, pain, unrighteousness, disgrace,

war, intemperance, deformity, perversity. For they say that the

princes of darkness also have been alive in their own nature, and in

their own kingdom were safe, and remembered and understood. For they

say that the Prince of Darkness harangued in such a manner, that

neither could he have said such things, nor could he have been heard by

those by whom he was said to have been heard, without memory and

understanding; and to have had a temper suitable to his mind and body,

and to have ruled by virtue of power, and to have had abundance and

fruitfulness with respect to his elements, and they are said to have

perceived themselves mutually and the light as near at hand, and to

have had eyes by which they could see the light afar off; which eyes

assuredly could not have seen the light without some light (whence also

they are rightly called light); and they are said to have enjoyed

exceedingly the sweetness of their pleasures, and to have been

determined by measured members and dwelling-places. But unless there

had been some sort of beauty there, they would not have loved their

wives, nor would their bodies have been steady by adaptation of parts;

without which, those things could not have been done there which the

Manich�ans insanely say were done. And unless some peace had been

there, they would not have obeyed their Prince. Unless measure had

been there, they would have done nothing else than eat or drink, or

rage, or whatever they might have done, without any society: although

not even those that did these things would have had determinate forms,

unless measure had been there. But now the Manich�ans say that they

did such things that they cannot be denied to have had in all their

actions measures suitable to themselves. But if form had not been

there, no natural quality would have there subsisted. But if there had

been no order there, some would not have ruled, others been ruled; they

would not have lived harmoniously in their element; in fine, they would

not have had their members adapted to their places, so that they could

not do all those things that the Manich�ans vainly fable. But if they

say that God's nature does not die, what according to their vanity does

Christ raise from the dead? If they say that it does not grow sick,

what does He cure? If they say that it is not subject to

forgetfulness, what does He remind? If they say that it is not

deficient in wisdom, what does He teach? If they say that it is not

confused, what does He restore? If they say that it was not vanquished

and taken captive, what does He liberate? If they say that it was not

in need, to what does He minister aid? If they say that it did not

lose feeling, what does He animate? If they say that it has not been

blinded, what does He illuminate? If it is not in pain, to what does

He give relief? If it is not unrighteous, what does He correct through

precepts? If it is not in disgrace, what does He cleanse? If it is

not in war, to what does He promise peace? If it is not deficient in

moderation, upon what does He impose the measure of law? If it is not

deformed, what does He reform? If it is not perverse, what does He

emend? For all these things done by Christ, they say, are to be

attributed not to that thing which was made by God, and which has

become depraved by its own free choice in sinning, but to the very

nature, yea to the very substance of God, which is what God Himself is.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 42.--Manich�an Blasphemies Concerning the Nature of God.

What can be compared to those blasphemies? Absolutely nothing, unless

the errors of other sectaries be considered; but if that error be

compared with itself in another aspect, of which we have not yet

spoken, it will be convicted of far worse and more execrable

blasphemy. For they say that some souls, which they will have to be of

the substance of God and of absolutely the same nature, which have not

sinned of their own accord, but have been overcome and oppressed by the

race of darkness, which they call evil, for combating which they

descended not of their own accord, but at the command of the Father,

are fettered forever in the horrible sphere of darkness. So according

to their sacrilegious vaporings, God liberated Himself in a certain

part from a great evil, but again condemned Himself in another part,

which He could not liberate, and triumphed over the enemy itself as if

it had been vanquished from above. O criminal, incredible audacity, to

believe, to speak, to proclaim such things about God! Which when they

endeavor to defend, that with their eyes shut they may rush headlong

into yet worse things, they say that the commingling of the evil nature

does these things, in order that the good nature of God may suffer so

great evils: for that this good nature in its own sphere could or can

suffer no one of these things. As if a nature were lauded as

incorruptible, because it does not hurt itself, and not because it

cannot suffer hurt from another. Then if the nature of God hurt the

nature of darkness, and the nature of darkness hurt the nature of God,

there are therefore two evil things which hurt each other in turn, and

the race of darkness was the better disposed, because if it committed

hurt it did it unwillingly; for it did not wish to commit hurt, but to

enjoy the good which belonged to God. But God wished to extinguish it,

as Manich�us most openly raves forth in his epistle of the ruinous

Foundation. For forgetting that he had shortly before said: "But His

most resplendent realms were so founded upon the shining and happy

land, that they could never be either moved or shaken by any one;" he

afterwards said: "But the Father of the most blessed light, knowing

that great ruin and desolation which would arise from the darkness,

threaten his holy worlds, unless he should send in opposition a deity

excellent and renowned, mighty in strength, by whom he might at the

same time overcome and destroy the race of darkness, which having been

extinguished, the inhabitants of light would enjoy perpetual rest."

Behold, he feared ruin and desolation that threatened his worlds!

Assuredly they were so founded upon the shining and happy land that

they never could be either moved or shaken by any one? Behold, from

fear he wished to hurt the neighboring race, which he endeavored to

destroy and extinguish, in order that the inhabitants of light might

enjoy perpetual rest. Why did he not add, and perpetual bondage? Were

not these souls that he fettered forever in the sphere of darkness, the

inhabitants of light, of whom he says plainly, that "they have suffered

themselves to err from their former bright nature?" when against his

will he is compelled to say, that they sinned by free will, while he

wishes to ascribe sin only to the necessity of the contrary nature:

everywhere ignorant what to say, and as if he were himself already in

the sphere of darkness which he invented, seeking, and not finding, how

he may escape. But let him say what he will to the seduced and

miserable men by whom he is honored far more highly than Christ, that

at this price he may sell to them such long and sacrilegious fables.

Let him say what he will, let him shut up, as it were, in a sphere, as

in a prison, the race of darkness, and let him fasten outside the

nature of light, to which he promised perpetual rest on the extinction

of the enemy: behold, the penalty of light is worse than that of

darkness; the penalty of the divine nature is worse than that of the

adverse race. But since although the latter is in the midst of

darkness it pertains to its nature to dwell in darkness; but souls

which are the very same thing that God is, cannot be received, he says,

into those peaceful realms, and are alienated from the life and liberty

of the holy light, and are fettered in the aforesaid horrible sphere:

whence he says, "Those souls shall adhere to the things that they have

loved, having been left in the same sphere of darkness, bringing this

upon themselves by their own deserts." Is not this assuredly free

voluntary choice? See how insanely he ignores what he says, and by

making self-contradictory statements wages a worse war against himself

than against the God of the race of darkness itself. Accordingly, if

the souls of light are damned, because they loved darkness, the race of

darkness, which loved light, is unjustly damned. And the race of

darkness indeed loved light from the beginning, violently, it may be,

but yet so as to wish for its possession, not its extinction: but the

nature of light wished to extinguish in war the darkness; therefore

when vanquished it loved darkness. Choose which you will: whether it

was compelled by necessity to love darkness, or seduced by free will.

If by necessity, wherefore is it damned? if by free will, wherefore is

the nature of God involved in so great iniquity? If the nature of God

was compelled by necessity to love darkness, it did not vanquish, but

was vanquished: if by free will, why do the wretches hesitate any

longer to attribute the will to sin to the nature which God made out of

nothing, lest they should thereby attribute it to the light which He

begat?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 43.--Many Evils Before His Commingling with Evil are Attributed

to the Nature of God by the Manich�ans.

What if we should also show that before the commingling of evil, which

stupid fable they have most madly believed, great evils were in what

they call the nature of light? what will it seem possible to add to

these blasphemies? For before the conflict, there was the hard and

inevitable necessity of fighting: here is truly a great evil, before

evil is commingled with good. Let them say whence this is, when as yet

no commingling had taken place? But if there was no necessity, there

was therefore free will: whence also this so great evil, that God

himself should wish to hurt his own nature, which could not be hurt by

the enemy, by sending it to be cruelly commingled, to be basely purged,

to be unjustly damned? Behold, the great evil of a pernicious,

noxious, and savage will, before any evil from the contrary nature was

mingled with it! Or perchance he did not know that this would happen

to his members, that they should love darkness and become hostile to

holy light, as Manich�us says, that is, not only to their own God, but

also to the Father from whom they had their being? Whence therefore

this so great evil of ignorance, before any evil from the nature of

darkness was mingled with it? But if he knew that this would happen,

either there was in him everlasting cruelty, if he did not grieve over

the contamination and damnation of his own nature that was to take

place, or everlasting misery, if he did so grieve: whence also this so

great evil of your supreme good before any commingling with your

supreme evil? Assuredly that part of the nature itself which was

fettered in the eternal chain of that sphere, if it knew not that this

fate awaited it, even so was there everlasting ignorance in the nature

of God, but if it knew, then everlasting misery: whence this so great

evil before any evil from the contrary nature was commingled? Or

perchance did it, in the greatness of its love (charity), rejoice that

through its punishment perpetual rest was prepared for the residue of

the inhabitants of light? Let him who sees how abominable it is to say

this, pronounce an anathema. But if this should be done so that at

least the good nature itself should not become hostile to the light, it

might be possible, perchance, not for the nature of God indeed, but for

some man, as it were, to be regarded as praiseworthy, who for the sake

of his country should be willing to suffer something of evil, which

evil indeed could be only for a time, and not forever: but now also

they speak of that fettering in the sphere of darkness as eternal, and

not indeed of a certain thing but of the nature of God; and assuredly

it were a most unrighteous, and execrable, and ineffably sacrilegious

joy, if the nature of God rejoiced that it should love darkness, and

should become hostile to holy light. Whence this so monstrous and

abominable evil before any evil from the contrary nature was

commingled? Who can endure insanity so perverse and so impious, as to

attribute so great good things to supreme evil, and so great evils to

supreme good, which is God?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 44.--Incredible Turpitudes in God Imagined by Manich�us.

But now when they speak of that part of the nature of God as everywhere

mixed up in heaven, in earth, in all bodies dry and moist, in all sorts

of flesh, in all seeds of trees, herbs, men, and animals: not as

present by the power of divinity, for administering and ruling all

things, undefilably, inviolably, incorruptibly, without any connection

with them, which we say of God; but fettered, oppressed, polluted, to

be loosed and liberated, as they say, not only through the running to

and fro of the sun and the moon, and through the powers of light, but

also through their Elect: what sacrilegious and incredible turpitudes

this kind of error recommends to them even if it does not induce them

to accept, it is horrible to speak of. For they say that the powers of

light are transformed into beautiful males and are set over against the

women of the race of darkness; and that the same powers again are

transformed into beautiful females and are set over against the males

of the race of darkness; that through their beauty they enkindle the

foulest lust of the princes of darkness, and in this manner vital

substance, that is, the nature of God, which they say is held fettered

in their bodies, having been loosed from their members relaxed through

lust, flies away, and when it has been taken up or cleansed, is

liberated. This the wretches read, this they say, this they hear, this

they believe, this they put as follows, in the seventh book of their

Thesaurus (for so they call a certain writing of Manich�us, in which

these blasphemies stand written): "Then the blessed Father, who has

bright ships, little apartments, dwelling-places, or magnitudes,

according to his indwelling clemency, brings the help by which he is

drawn out and liberated from the impious bonds, straits, and torments

of his vital substance. And so by his own invisible nod he transforms

those powers of his, which are held in this most brilliant ship, and

makes them to bring forth adverse powers, which have been arranged in

the various tracts of the heavens. Since these consist of both sexes,

male and female, he orders the aforesaid powers to bring forth partly

in the form of beardless youths, for the adverse race of females,

partly in the form of bright maidens, for the contrary race of males:

knowing that all these hostile powers on account of the deadly and most

foul lust innate in them, are very easily taken captive, delivered up

to these most beautiful forms which appear, and in this manner they are

dissolved. But you may know that this same blessed Father of ours is

identical with his powers, which for a necessary reason he transforms

into the undefiled likeness of youths and maidens. But these he uses

as his own arms, and through them he accomplishes his will. But there

are bright ships full of these divine powers, which are stationed after

the likeness of marriage over against the infernal races, and who with

alacrity and ease effect at the very moment what they have planned.

Therefore, when reason demands that these same holy powers should

appear to males, straightway also they show by their dress the likeness

of most beautiful maidens. Again when females are to be dealt with,

putting aside the forms of maidens, they show the forms of beardless

youths. But by this handsome appearance of theirs, ardor and lust

increase, and in this way the chain of their worst thoughts is loosed,

and the living soul which was held by their members, relaxed by this

occasion escapes, and is mingled with its own most pure air; when the

souls thoroughly cleansed ascend to the bright ships, which have been

prepared for conveying them and for ferrying them over to their own

country. But that which still bears the stains of the adverse race,

descends little by little through billows and fires, and is mingled

with trees and other plants and with all seeds, and is plunged into

divers fires. And in what manner the figures of youths and maidens

from that great and most glorious ship appear to the contrary powers

which live in the heavens and have a fiery nature; and from that

handsome appearance, part of the life which is held in their members

having been released is conducted away through fires into the earth:

in the same manner also, that most high power, which dwells in the ship

of vital waters appears in the likeness of youths and holy maidens to

those powers whose nature is cold and moist, and which are arranged in

the heavens. And indeed to those that are females, among these the

form of youths appears, but to the males, the form of maidens. By his

changing and diversity of divine and most beautiful persons, the

princes male and female of the moist and cold race are loosed, and what

is vital in them escapes; but whatever should remain, having been

relaxed, is conducted into the earth through cold, and is mingled with

all the races of darkness" Who can endure this? Who can believe, not

indeed that it is true, but that it could even be said? Behold those

who fear to anathematize Manich�us teaching these things, and do not

fear to believe in a God doing them and suffering them!

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 45.--Certain Unspeakable Turpitudes Believed, Not Without

Reason, Concerning the Manich�ans Themselves.

But they say, that through their own Elect that same commingled part

and nature of God is purged, by eating and drinking forsooth, (because

they say that it is held fettered in all foods); that when they are

taken up by the Elect for the nourishment of the body in eating and

drinking, it is loosed, sealed, and liberated through their sanctity.

Nor do the wretches pay heed to the fact that this is believed about

them not without good reason, and they deny it in vain, so long as they

do not anathematize the books of Manich�us and cease to be Manich�ans.

For if, as they say, a part of God is fettered in all seeds, and is

purged by eating on the part of the Elect; who may not properly

believe, that they do what they read in the Thesaurus was done among

the powers of heaven and the princes of darkness; since indeed they say

that their flesh is also from the race of darkness, and since they do

not hesitate to believe and to affirm that the vital substance fettered

in them is a part of God? Which assuredly if it is to be loosed, and

purged by eating, as their lamentable error compels them to

acknowledge; who does not see, who does not shudder at the greatness

and the unspeakableness of what follows?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 46.--The Unspeakable Doctrine of the Fundamental Epistle.

For they even say that Adam, the first man, was created by certain

princes of darkness so that the light might be held by them lest it

should escape. For in the epistle which they call Fundamental,

Manich�us wrote as follows respecting the way in which the Prince of

Darkness, whom they represent as the father of the first man, spoke to

the rest of his allied princes of darkness, and how he acted:

"Therefore with wicked inventions he said to those present: What does

this huge light that is rising seem to you to be? See how the pole

moves, how it shakes most of the powers. Wherefore it is right for me

rather to ask you beforehand for whatever light you have in your

powers: since thus I will form an image of that great one who has

appeared in his glory, through which we may be able to rule, freed in

some measure from the conversation of darkness. Hearing these things,

and deliberating for a long time among themselves, they thought it most

just to furnish what was demanded of them. For they did not have

confidence in being able to retain the light that they had forever;

hence they thought it better to offer it to their Prince, by no means

without hope that in this way they would rule. It must be considered

therefore how they furnished the light that they had. For this also is

scattered throughout all the divine scriptures and the heavenly

secrets; but to the wise it is easy enough to know how it was given:

for it is known immediately and openly by him who should truly and

faithfully wish to consider. Since there was a promiscuous throng of

those who had come together, females and males of course, he impelled

them to copulate among themselves: in which copulation the males

emitted seed, the females were made pregnant. But the offspring were

like those who had begotten them, the first obtaining as it were the

largest portion of the parents' strength. Taking these as a special

gift their Prince rejoiced. And just as even now we see take place,

that the nature of evil taking thence strength forms the fashioner of

bodies, so also the aforesaid Prince, taking the offspring of his

companions, which had the senses of their parents, sagacity, light,

procreated at the same time with themselves in the process of

generation, devoured them; and very many powers having been taken from

food of this kind, in which there was present not only fortitude, but

much more astuteness and depraved sensibilities from the ferocious race

of the progenitors, he called his own spouse to himself, springing from

the same stock as himself, emitted, like the rest the abundance of

evils that he had devoured, himself also adding something from his own

thought and power, so that his disposition became the former and

arranger of all the things that he had poured forth; whose consort

received these things as soil cultivated in the best way is accustomed

to receive seed. For in her were constructed and woven together the

images of all heavenly and earthly powers, so that what was formed

obtained the likeness, so to speak, of a full orb."

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 47.--He Compels to the Perpetration of Horrible Turpitudes.

O abominable monster! O execrable perdition and ruin of deluded

souls! I am not speaking of the blasphemy of saying these things about

the nature of God which is thus fettered. Let the wretches deluded and

hunted by deadly error give heed to this at least, that if a part of

their God is fettered by the copulation of males and females which they

profess to loose and purge by eating it, the necessity of this

unspeakable error compels them not only to loose and purge the part of

God from bread and vegetables and fruits, which alone they are seen

publicly to partake of, but also from that which might be fettered

through copulation, if conception should take place. That they do this

some are said to have confessed before a public tribunal, not only in

Paphlagonia, but also in Gaul, as I heard in Rome from a certain

Catholic Christian; and when they were asked by the authority of what

writing they did these things, they betrayed this fact concerning the

Thesaurus that I have just mentioned. But when this is cast in their

teeth, they are in the habit of replying, that some enemy or other has

withdrawn from their number, that is from the number of their Elect,

and has made a schism, and has founded a most foul heresy of this

kind. Whence it is manifest that even if they do not themselves

practise this thing, some who do practise it do it on the basis of

their books. Therefore let them reject the books, if they abhor the

crime, which they are compelled to commit, if they hold to the books;

or if they do not commit them, they endeavor in opposition to the books

to live more purely. But what do they do when it is said to them,

either purge the light from whatever seeds you can, so that you cannot

refuse to do that which you assert that you do not do; or else

anathematize Manich�us, when he says that a part of God is in all

seeds, and that it is fettered by copulation, but that whatever of

light, that is, of the aforesaid part of God, should become the food of

the Elect, is purged by being eaten. Do you see what he compels you to

believe, and do you still hesitate to anathematize him? What do they

do, I say, when this is said to them? To what subterfuges do they

betake themselves, when either so nefarious a doctrine is to be

anathematized, or so nefarious a turpitude committed, in comparison

with which all those intolerable evils to which I have already called

attention, seem tolerable, namely, that they say of the nature of God

that it was pressed by necessity to wage war, that it was either secure

by everlasting ignorance, or was disturbed by everlasting grief and

fear, when the corruption of commingling and the chain of everlasting

damnation should come upon it, that finally as a result of the conflict

it should be taken captive, oppressed, polluted, that after a false

victory it should be fettered forever in a horrible sphere and

separated from its original blessedness, while if considered in

themselves they cannot be endured?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 48.--Augustin Prays that the Manich�ans May Be Restored to

Their Senses.

O great is Thy patience, Lord, full of compassion and gracious, slow to

anger, and plenteous in mercy, and true; [1135] who makest Thy sun to

rise upon the good and the evil, and who sendest rain upon the just and

the unjust; [1136] who willest not the death of the sinner, so much as

that he return and live; [1137] who reproving in parts, dost give place

to repentance, that wickedness having been abandoned, they may believe

on Thee, O Lord; [1138] who by Thy patience dost lead to repentance,

although many according to the hardness of their heart and their

impenitent heart treasure up for themselves wrath against the day of

wrath and of the revelation of Thy righteous judgment, who wilt render

to every man according to his works; [1139] who in the day when a man

shall have turned from his iniquity to Thy mercy and truth, wilt forget

all his iniquities: [1140] stand before us, grant unto us that

through our ministry, by which Thou hast been pleased to refute this

execrable and too horrible error, as many have already been liberated,

many also may be liberated, and whether through the sacrament of Thy

holy baptism, or through the sacrifice of a broken spirit and a

contrite and humbled heart, [1141] in the sorrow of repentance, they

may deserve to receive the remission of their sins and blasphemies, by

which through ignorance they have offended Thee. For nothing is of any

avail, save Thy surpassing mercy and power, and the truth of Thy

baptism, and the keys of the kingdom of heaven in Thy holy Church; so

that we must not despair of men as long as by Thy patience they live on

this earth, who even knowing how great an evil it is to think or to say

such things about Thee, are detained in that malign profession on

account of the use or the attainment of temporal or earthly

convenience, if rebuked by Thy reproaches they in any way flee to Thy

ineffable goodness, and prefer to all the enticements of the carnal

life, the heavenly and eternal life.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1135] Ps. ciii. 8.

[1136] Matt. v. 45.

[1137] Ezek. xxxiii. 11.

[1138] Wisd. xii. 2.

[1139] Rom. ii. 4-6.

[1140] Ezek. xviii. 21.

[1141] Ps. li. 17.
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Introductory Essay.

By Rev. Chester D. Hartranft, D.D.

------------------------

Chapter I.--Bibliography.

A. Sources.

I. Of course all the Anti-Donatist writings of Augustin are found in

the general editions from Amerbach, 1506, to Migne, 1861. A few are

also collected in Du Pin's edd. of Optatus Mil. 1. In the Monumenta

vetera ad Donatistarum Historiam pertinentia. 2. In the Gesta

Collationis Carthagini habitae Honorii Caesaris iussu inter Catholicos

et Donatistas. See also the different Collections of Councils, Labbe,

Baluze, Harduin, Mansi, etc. Since these works are discussed in

Chapter II. it is unnecessary to repeat the titles here. Cp. titles in

Retractationes: and Indiculus librorum, tractatuum et epistolarum S.

Augustini, ed. cura Possidii, cap. III.

II. Separate editions of Augustin's Anti-Donatist writings.

(From Sch�nemann's Bibliotheca, and other bibliographies.)

1. S. Augustini liber seu Epistola de unitate Ecclesiae contra

Petiliani Donat. Epistolam, Argumentis, Notis atque Analysi

illustrata, studio Justi Caluini. Moguntiae. 1602.

2. SS. Cypriani et Augustini de unitate Ecclesiae tractatus. Accedit

Georgii Calixti, S. Theo. Doct. et in Acad. Julia Prof. primarii, in

eorundem librorum lectionem Introductionis fragmentum edente Frid.

Ulrico Calixto. Georgii filio. Helm�stadii ex typogr. Calixt.

1657. 8.

3. Aurelii Augustini, Episcopi Hipponensis, Liber de Unitate

Ecclesiae contra Donatistas. Ext. cum Commentariis uberrimis et

utillisimis in Melchioris Lydeckeri Historia illustrata Ecclesiae

Africanae, cujus totum p�ne tomum secundum constituit inscriptum:

Tomus secundus ad Librum Augustini de Unitate Ecclesiae contra

Donatistas, de principiis Ecclesiae Africanae, illiusque fide in

Articulis de Capite Christo et Ecclesia, de Unitate et Schismate,

plurimisque Religionis Christianae capitibus agit. Ultrajecti apud

viduam Guil. Clerck, 1690. 4.

4. D. Augustini liber de moderate coercendis haereticis ed Bonifacium

Comitem. Nic. Bergius Revalensis Holmiae, 1696, in 8.

III. Translations.

1. Epistre ou le Livre de St. Augustin de l'Unit� de l'Eglise,

contre Petilien, Evesque Donatiste, avec certaines observations pour

entendre les lieux plus difficiles par Jac. Tigeou, imprim� � Reims

par Jean de Foigny. 1567. 8.

2. L'Epistre � Vincent, Evesque de l'heresie Rogatiane, traduict

de latin par Cl�ment Vaillant. A Paris, Mathurin Prevost. 1573. 8.

3. Trait� du Bapt�me trad. par l'abb� Dujat, chapelain d'�tampes.

Paris. 1778. 12.

4. Writings in connection with the Donatist controversy,

translated by the Rev. J. R. King, M.A. In the Series of Translations

of the Works of Augustin. Edinburgh. T. & T. Clark. 1872.

5. Ausgew�hlte Schriften des heil. Aurelius Augustinus,

Kirchenlehrers, nach aem Urtexte ubersetzt. Mit einer kurzen

Lebensbeschreibung des Heiligen von J. Motzberger. 1871-1879. In the

Bibliothek der Kirchenv�ter, Kempten, 1869 sqq.

B. Literature.

This is a selected literature of the Donatist controversy so far as

Augustin was connected with it.

I. In the Benedictine editions occur:

1. Their Vita S. Aurelii Augustini. Tom. XI. Antw., pp. 1-344.

Tom. I. Migne, pp. 65-578.

2. Praefatio of Tom. IX. Antw. s. p. Migne, pp. 9-24.

3. Index opusculorum S. Augustini contra Donatistas. Tom. IX.

Antw., pp. 463, 4. Migne, pp. 757-760.

4. Excerpta et scripta vetera ad Donatistarum historiam

pertinentia. Tom. IX. Antw., App. pp. 7-50. Migne, pp. 773-842.

5. Epistolarum ordo chronologicus. Tom. II. Antw., s. p.

Migne, pp. 13-48.

II. Possidius: Vita S. Aurelii Augustini. Reprinted in

Migne Aug. Op. Tom. I., pp. 33-66. Cp. Migne Pat. Lat. L. p. 407.

III. Ecclesiastica Historia. By the Magdeburg

Centuriators. 1559-1574. Tom. II. and III., Centuria, IV. and V.,

contain the Donatist history.

IV. Balduinius, Franc.

1. Delibatio Africanae historiae ecclesticae, s. Optati libri

VII. de Schismate Donatistarum, etc. Paris, 1563. A second edition

with improved readings. Ib., 1569. In this the prefaces and

annotations are of value. Reprinted in Du Pin's ed. of Optatus Mil.

2. Historia Carthaginensis Collationis sive disputationis de

ecclesia, olim habitae inter Catholicos et Donatistas. Paris, 1566.

8. Reprinted in Du Pin. ib.

V. Baronius. Annales Ecclesiatici. 1588-1607. Tom.

III.-V., contain the Donatist history.

VI. Albaspin�us: Optati Mel. opera cum notis et

observationibus Gabrielis Albaspin�i. Paris, 1631. Valuable mainly

for the observations; reprinted in Du Pin's ed. of Optatus.

VII. Casaubonus: Optati Mel. de schismate Donatistarum

libri VII. In eosd. notae et emendationes Merici Casauboni. Lond.

1631. These notes are of value and are reproduced with those of other

editions in the Annotationes Variorum of Du Pin's ed.

VIII. Valesius Henricus: Eusebii Pamph. Historia ecc.,

libri de Vita Constantini, Panegyricus, Const. Oratio ad Sanctorum

coetum, gr. et lat. cum annotatt. Paris, 1659 and often. In this is

his dissertation: De schismate Donatistarum.

IX. Long, Thomas, B.D. History of the Donatists. Lond. 1677. 8.

X. Du Pin: Nouvelle Biblioth�que des Auteurs Eccl�siastiques.

1. St. Augustin. Tom. III. premi�re partie, pp. 522-839, 1690.

Particularly the review of vol. IX. of Augustin's collected works, pp.

792-811.

2. In Tom. II., Troisi�me partie, 1701, there are also many allusions

to the history and literature.

3. In his ed. of Optatus Mel., Historia Donatistarum.

XI. Ittig, Thomas: de Haeresiarchis oevi apostolici at apostol.

prox. Lips. 1690-1703. 4.

XII. Leydecker Melchior; Historia Ecclesiastica

Africana. 2 Tom. 4, See above. Traj. 1690. 4.

XIII. Witsius, Hermann: Miscellaneorum Sacrorum libri.

2 vols. Amst. 1692. 4. In vol. I. Dissertatio de schismate

Donatistarum.

XIV. Bernino: Historia di tutte l'heresie descritta da

Domenico Bernino. Venezia 1711. Tom. I., contains hist. of Donatism.

XV. Storren, J. Ph.: ansf�hrlicher und gr�ndlicher

Bericht von den Namen, Ursprung, v.s.w. der Donatisten. Frankf. 1723.

8.

XVI. Norisius, Henricus: Opera omnia nunc prim. collecta

et ordinata. Veronae, Tumermani, 1729-32, fol. 4vols. The fourth

volume contains his posthumous work on History of Donatism, as finished

by Ballerini.

XVII. Tillemont: in his Memoires pour servir a

l'histoire Eccl�siastique:

1. Tom. VI. Histoire du schisme des Donatistes, o� l'on marque

aussi tout ce qui regard� l'Eglise d'Afrique depuis l'an 305, jusques

en l'an 391que S. Augustin fut fait Prestre. 1732.

2. Tom. XIII. La Vie de Saint Augustin, dans laquelle on trouvera

l'histoire des Donatistes de son temps, et celle des Pelagiens. 1732.

XVIII. Orsi: Della Istoria Ecclesiastica descritta da

F. Guiseppe Agostino Orsi. Tom. IV. (1741) and V. (1749) contain the

history ot the Donatists.

XIX. Walch, Ch. Wilh. Fr.: Entwurf einer vollst�ndigen

Historie der Ketzereien, Spaltungen und Religionsstreitigkeiten, bis

auf die Zeiten der Reformation. Leipzig, 1768. Vierter Theil: Von

der Spaltung der Donatisten; with its three sections:

a. Von der historie der Donatisten.

b. Von den zwischen den Donatisten und ihren Gegnern gef�hrten

Religionsstreitigkeiten.

c. Beurtheilung der Donatistichen Streitigkeiten. This work was

the beginning of a new critical estimate of the documents.

XX. Schr�ckh, Johann Mattheus: Christliche

Kirchengeschichte. Sechster Theil: 1784, but particularly Elfter

Theil, 1786. A juster estimate of Donatism.

XXI. Morcellii, Steph. Ant.: Africa christiana in tres

partes distributa. 3 vols. 4Brixiae, 1816-17. 4. P. II. for Donatism.

XXII. Bindemann, C.: Der heilige Augustinus,

1844-1869. Bdd. II. & III. contain excellent analyses of the works on

Donatism, as well as a history during Augustin's life.

XXIII. Roux, Adrianus: Dissertatio de Aurelio

Augustino, adversario Donatistarum. Lugduni Batavorum, 1838. A brief

summary of the works and doctrine.

XXIV. Ribbeck: Donatus und Augustinus oder der erste

entscheidende Kampf zwischen Separatismus und Kirche. Ein

Kirchenhistorischer Versuch von Ferdinand Ribbeck. Elberfeld. 1857.

8. An uncritical history; but a vigorous analysis, apologetic and

polemic.

XXV. Deutsch: Drei Actenst�cke zur Geschichte

Donatismus. Neu herausgegeben und erkl�rt von Martin Deutsch. Berlin,

1875. The first work on the textual and historical criticism of the

sources.

XXVI. Voelter: Der Ursprung des Donatismus, nach den

Quellen untersucht und dargestellt von Lic Dr. Daniel Voelter.

Freiburg i. B. und T�bingen, 1883. This keen writer, at present Prof.

Ord. in Univ. of Amsterdam, has gone still further into textual and

historical criticism, and gives fair promise of a more impartial

hearing for Donatism. It is to be hoped that he will fulfill his

qualified promise of further research.

Among the general church histories particular mention may be made of

Gieseler, Neander, Lindner, Niedner, Robertson, Ritter, Hergenr�ther,

Schaff. The articles on Augustin, Donatism and related persons and

topics in Ceillier, Ersch und Gruber, Herzog, Schaff-Herzog, Smith's

Dictionary of Christian Biography, Wetzer and Welte, Lichtenberger, are

more or less noteworthy. Mention must also be made of the Patrologies,

the biographies, Hefele's Conciliengeschichte, the Analyses Patrum,

etc.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter II.--An Analysis of Augustin's Writings Against the Donatists.

The object of this chapter is to present a rudimentary outline and

summary of all that Augustin penned or spoke against those traditional

North African Christians whom he was pleased to regard as schismatics.

It will be arranged, so far as may be, in chronological order,

following the dates suggested by the Benedictine edition. The

necessary brevity precludes anything but a very meagre treatment of so

considerable a theme. The writer takes no responsibility for the

ecclesiological tenets of the great Father, nor will he enter here into

any criticism of the text and truth of the documents, upon which the

historical argument was so laboriously and peremptorily built, to the

utter ignoring of the Donatist archives, and the protests of their

scholars against the validity and integrity of their opponents'

records. Both parties claimed to be the historic Catholic church; both

were little apart in doctrine, worship, and polity; both tended toward

externalism in piety; both accused one another of fraud in inventing

records. Later Romanism in its bright spirit of selection took much

spoil from either camp.

The city of Augustin's birth, its neighborhood, indeed the whole

ecclesiastical province of Numidia, was a stronghold for this puristic

school. Is it not singular, then, that it seems to have made no

impression upon his early years? As a child he had witnessed its brief

restoration under Julian, and then the severe or lax efforts at

suppression under succeeding emperors; the Rogatian schism and the

Tychonian reformation were quite familiar to him in his Manich�an

period; but the Confessions are silent as to any such stamp or hold

upon his mind. His activity begins with his ordination to the

presbyterate, a time marked in Donatist annals by the Maximianist

separation, and increases as he becomes bishop. From about 392 to near

the close of his life, pen and voice were seldom still. In all those

years the outlinear thoughts grew in breadth and depth; endless are the

forms in which his few and radical conceptions manifest themselves;

never does he lose sight of the popular effect, so that he knows when

to relax his love of word-play and delight in mysterious inductions, in

order to make the chief themes plain to the dullest mind.

How varied the channels through which he struggled for the mastery of

his idea of the Church! In the pulpit he made Donatism the occasion of

many a polemic, many an appeal; in his correspondence it was an

ever-recurrent topic; it was the staple of many a tract and book; verse

was not shunned to destroy its fashionableness and popularity;

commentaries and manuals for the meditative hour or for the training of

the theological student, abounded in warnings against its

aggressiveness; no opportunity for debate or conference or epistolary

discussion was left unimproved. And no wonder: it was a living thing,

of the street, of the market, of the social circle, of the home; it

threatened at times to obliterate the transmarine view of the church

from North Africa; its spirit of political independence and plea for

religious liberty went to the hearts of a people, more and more restive

under the decline of the Empire.

The literary creations of Donatism had been somewhat more fertile than

that of C�cilianism. We must not belittle Donatus the Great,

Parmenian, Petilian, Gaudentius, and certainly the eminence of

Tychonius is confessed by Augustin himself. Up to this time Optatus of

Milevis had been the only forcible opponent. But against the great

Augustin whom could they bring into the field? And against the great

Augustin, backed by the energy of the State, there was little hope of

fairness. Augustin found a new and weighty school. Donatism, with its

impossible ideal, already began to despise the culture which seemed to

help its defeat and withdrew into its sensitive shell after the manner

of all puristic tendencies under persecution.

The two prevalent lines of attack are the historical on the origin of

the schism, which involved the dissection of the documents, and the

doctrinal, or the discussion of the true notes of the Church from the

basis of the Scriptures. This latter Augustin preferred, because

final; he bowed to no patristic. One or the other or both may be

traced in all his works, great or small, against them. Out of so

protracted a controversy there grew up a symmetrical and comprehensive

theory of the Church and the Sacraments on either side.

Of three fundamental points of Donatism, as perpetuated practices of

North Africa, rebaptism and the encouragement of a martyr spirit with

its attendant feasts, the continuance of the Seniores in the government

of the Church, we find Augustin aiming mainly at the overthrow of the

first two. One of his earliest letters suggests to his bishop some

means for checking the drunkenness and great excess connected with the

Natalitia. Passing to the specific subject in view:

In the early period of his presbyterate, (possibly about 392, others

place it later), Augustin journeyed through Mutugenna, which apparently

belonged to his bishop's see. He learned how pacifically disposed

Maximin, Donatist bishop of Sinaita, was. The friendly feeling thus

kindled toward him was shaken by the rumor that he had rebaptized a

defecting Catholic deacon of Mutugenna; not willing to credit the

story, he visited the deacon's home. His parents testified to their

son's reception into the same office by the Donatists. In the absence

of Bishop Valerius, he writes to Maximin with entreaty, refusing to

credit the repetition of the rite, and urging him to remain firm in the

convictions which had been imputed to him. He solicits a reply, that

both letters may be read in the public service, after the dismission of

the military. The prominent points of the letter are: while declining

to recognize the validity of Maximin's orders, he does not refuse to

salute him as Dominus dulcissimus, and Pater venerabilis. His

solicitude as a shepherd to do his duty to all the sheep, constrains

him to force himself upon their attention, and to be eager for

correspondence or conference with a view to bringing them back to the

fold. He is perfectly assured of the absolute and final correctness of

his idea of the Church, and of the hopeless error of Donatism, an error

so great as to merit eternal destruction. He discriminates, however,

between heresy and schism at this time. Rebaptism in any case is a

sin, but as applied to apostatizing Catholics, is an immanissimum

scelus. There is only one baptism; that of Christ; as there was no

double circumcision, so the sacrament of the New Testament should not

be repeated. The Church is the owner of the nations which are Christ's

inheritance, and of the ends of the earth, which are his possession;

hence it is universal; the seamless robe should not be rent. Moreover

the Lord's threshing-floor has chaff upon it along with the wheat, and

therefore he urged the disuse of imputations through unworthy members

on either side, whether Macarius or Circumcelliones. The schism made

itself disastrously felt in all domestic and social relations. He

engages to avoid anything that would look like using the power of the

state for coercing conscience, and begs that on Maximin's side the

Circumcelliones may be restrained. [Ep. xxiii.]

A Plenary council of all Africa was convened in Hippo-Regius in 393,

before which Augustin preached the sermon. His subject was Faith and

the Creed: his handling made such an impression that he was induced to

expand it into the treatise: De Fide et Symbolo. In explaining the

article credimus et sanctam ecclesiam, utique catholicam, he reflects

on heretics and schismatics as claiming the title of churches for their

congregations; and distinguishes between these two opponents of the

Catholic body, heretics erring in doctrine, schismatics, while similar

to the Catholic body in views of truth yet transgressing in the rupture

of fraternal love. Neither pertain to the true Church of God. (Cp.

Retractt. I. xvii).

Determined if possible to win the ear of all classes, the presbyter

next affected a poem, "Psalmus contra Partem Donati," in the art of an

Abecedarium, running the letters to U. The line with which it began

was to be chanted as a refrain after each group of usually twelve lines

connected with each letter, the whole closing with an extended

epilogue. A generally vulgar performance it is, and purposely

disclaimed all metrical dignity; and yet it contains the germs of his

logical and historical opinions on the controverted points. The Church

is a net in the sea of the world, enclosing the good and bad, which are

not to be separated until the net is drawn to the shore. Those who

accuse the Catholics of tradition, were themselves traditors and broke

the net. The history is repeated, and all proof of the Donatist

charges declared to be wanting. Unity is a note of the Church, and

toleration within the net essential to its preservation. Over against

Macarius he puts the violent Circumcelliones. The wicked members of

the Church do not contaminate the good by a communion which is only

outward and not of the heart. The threshing-floor has chaff upon it;

wheat and tares must grow together. The Catholics rear the Elijah

altar, the Donatist the Baal altar over against it. Christ endured

Judas. Why rebaptize us, he exclaims, when you do not repeat the rite

upon your once expelled but now restored Maximianists? Surely it is

better to draw life from the real root. The character of him who

administers the sacrament has nothing to do with its efficiency; and so

he returns to the necessity for toleration within the net, as Judas was

forborne in the apostolic company. The epilogue pictures the

personified Church expostulating with the Donatists for quarreling with

their Mother, and presents a loose summary of the previous arguments.

It is doubtful whether, even in the fashion of the times, so lengthy a

poem could become a street theme, or find many repeaters in the markets

and inns of Hippo or Carthage, although the refrain for peace and

truthful judgment might catch the ear of the more zealous. [Cp.

Retractt. I. xx.].

The Bishop of Carthage, Donatus the Great, the sphinx of Donatism, had

written a book to vindicate the claim of his church to the only

Christian baptism. The work obtained considerable currency, and

maintained its authority, even in Augustin's day, so he answered it

during the year 393, most probably, in a treatise of one book now no

longer extant, but which has been given the title: "Contra Epistolam

Donati h�retici," The Retractations (I. xxi.) correct some points

which had been held in this work. (1). According to the Ambrosian

view, Augustin here identified Peter with the rock, on which the Church

was to be built; but afterwards he regarded that rock as Christ, who

was the subject of the Petrine confession; on Christ was the Church to

be built, and to the Church as thus reared, were given the keys. (2).

The Donatus present at the Roman Synod, he had spoken of as the bishop

of Carthage, the author of the book, which error is corrected in the

Retractations. (3). He had also charged the writer with falsifying a

favorite passage of their side, Ecclus. xxxiv. 30, but afterwards found

that some codices read according to the Donatist quotation, and

apologizes for his assertions.

Doubtless many of the sermons preached during his presbyterate had

reference to the schism, but the chronology of these is too uncertain

to allow of any definite arrangement.

We pass to the period of his co-bishopric with the aged Valerius, which

dates from 395 A.D.

Evodius, a brother connected with the Church at Hippo Regius, had a

chance meeting with Proculeianus, bishop of the Donatist body in that

diocese. The two fell into a discussion of their mutual differences.

Evodius spoke in rather a lofty and censorious way, after the fashion

of his side, and wounded the feelings of the older disputant, for the

Donatists, like all kindred bodies, cultivated an undue sensitiveness

and were altogether too ready to take offense. Proculeianus, however,

expressed a perfect readiness to have a friendly debate with Augustin

in the presence of competent men. In view of this suggestion, and in

the absence of Valerius, Augustin, always anxious to improve such an

opening, addressed a letter to Proculeianus (c. 396), with courteous

recognition, and no such sharp denial of the episcopal function as in

the case of Maximin. He apologizes for the severe language of his

friend, and in every way avoids any expression which might cause the

tendrils again to be drawn in. The methods suggested for discussion

show the anxiety of Augustin to beat out the fire of Donatism; there is

the debate before chosen hearers, all the statements to be written out

for use; or there is the private discussion through mutual discourse,

to be read to one another and corrected, and so given to the people; or

the single correspondence with a view to public lections, or any

possible way that the aged bishop himself might prefer. He urges that

the dead bury their dead, and the past history be left out of the

debate; the present with its burning dissensions affords sufficient

topics. As the people seek the bishop to arbitrate in their private

litigations, let these worthies cultivate peace in this broader field;

to this end he invites to prayer and conference. (Ep. xxxiii.).

Apparently the letter led to nothing practical. A new turn was given

to matters. A son had beaten his mother, and threatened her life; to

avoid Catholic discipline, he joined the Donatists and was rebaptized

by them: as Augustin says, he wounded also his spiritual mother by

contemning her sacrament. Public registration of the facts were made

by Augustin, all the more because the reported instructions, given by

bishop Proculeianus to his presbyter Victor concerning the affair, had

already been denied. The case presented an opportunity for getting at

some rule for the recognition of one another's discipline. Accordingly

Augustin addresses himself to Eusebius, a judicious Donatist of higher

rank. He professes that his aim is peace; he emphasizes with impatient

vehemence his opposition to coercive measures in matters of

conscience: neque me id agere ut ad communionem catholicam quisquam

cogatur invitus. He asks Eusebius to find out whether Proculeianus had

given the order to his presbyter as recorded; whether the bishop would

consent to a collation between themselves and ten selected men on each

side, agreeably to the original suggestion so that the whole question

might be discussed from the Scriptural grounds, not the historical.

Some proposals for a meeting either at the Donatist region of

Constantina, or at their projected council at Milevis, he could not

accept, because both lay outside of his diocese. If Proculeianus

objected to the dialectic and rhetorical skill of his counter bishop,

the latter would propose Samsucius, bishop of Turris, an earnest but

uncultivated man, as a substitute to lead the Catholic side. (Ep.

xxxiv.).

Eusebius declined to interfere on the ground that he could not be a

judge, so Augustin replies (Ep. xxxv.) that he had only asked him to

make some inquiries, because the bishop refused to have any direct

communication. The need for some adjustment concerning discipline had

become very pressing; a Catholic subdeacon and some nuns under rebuke

had been received into full standing by the Donatists, yet their

subsequent career had been even more scandalous. Augustin claimed that

the Catholics always respected the penal enactments of their

opponents. To show his own hostility to compulsory conversions, he

cites the case of a daughter, who against the paternal will had joined

the Donatists, and had professed among them; when the father was about

to use violence for her recall, he was dissuaded by Augustin, and when

a presbyter of Proculeianus had shouted abusive epithets at him,

although upon the property of a Catholic woman, he neither replied nor

allowed others to resent the insult.

A practical treatise is ascribed by some to this time, called de Agone

Christiano. In expounding the faith he warns against different groups

of heretics and schismatics. In Chap. xxix. 31, he cautions against

listening to the Donatist party, who deny the one holy Catholic church

to be diffused throughout the whole world, and claim it to be alone in

Africa, and there among themselves, against the plain Scripture

teaching of its universality; they affirm that the prophecies of its

extension have already been fulfilled, after which the whole church

perished outside of their remnant. He alludes to the divisions which

have befallen them as a retribution for their separation. If the end

shall come after the preaching of the gospel to all nations, how can

all nations have lapsed from the faith, when there remain some who are

yet to hear and believe? This system robs Christ of His glory, and is

to be avoided by all who love the Church. (Cp. Retractt. II. iii.).

In 397 A.D., at the death of Valerius, he became sole bishop. In this

year, while on a visit to Tibursi, he had met with Glorius and other

Donatists, with whom he held a friendly disputation on the origin and

history of the schism, during which some Donatist documents were

produced which he declared to be false, and from memory recapitulated

the archives current on his side. Augustin pursued his journey to

Gelizi, where he attended to some episcopal duties, and brought back

with him a copy of the Catholic Gesta, and spent a day with these

friends in reading them, but could not quite finish. He subsequently

reproduces this story with the arguments in a letter. (Ep. xliii.).

The chief burden is a criticism of the Acts, highly important in its

place, but it must be passed by here save to remark that in speaking of

Bishop Secundus, he suggests that it would have been better to appeal

to the principalities of Rome or of some other apostolic church, than

to have proceeded as he did; he should have preserved the unity at all

hazards; had the case been inexplicable, he should have left it to God;

if definable, he should have addressed the transmarine bishops, after

finding that his peers at home could not adjust the difficulty;

disobedience on the part of C�cilian to such an order, would have made

him the author of the schism; but now the Donatist altar is set up

against the Universal Church. It may be well to note that throughout

the survey of these acts, there appears a manifest contradiction as to

the beginning of the appellations. In the next place, the Donatists

are held guilty of schism, rebaptism, and resistance to civil

correction; of non-communion with those churches concerning whom they

read in their lections; and of the demand for purism against the Lord's

parable. The angels of the churches in the apocalypse are

ecclesiastical powers, not heavenly messengers. The Church cannot be

charged with the crimes of the evil men in it. Toleration is the only

practice by which unity can be conserved; Moses bore with murmurers,

David with Saul, Samuel with the sons of Eli, Christ with Judas. They

themselves forbear with Circumcelliones, with Optatus bishop of

Thamugada. The emphasis, however, is not so much upon those matters as

upon schism. He would rather leave the archives and elucidate the

doctrine, in which he claims to have the book of the world; that the

Catholics are the Lord's inheritance; that they stand in fellowship

with the churches of the New Testament; they are the light of the

world. A divine rebuke has befallen Donatism in all the tenets of its

particularity, by the schism and return of the Maximianists.

No open door was passed by. On a journey to Cirta, possibly about the

beginning of 398 A.D., he visited with clerical friends the aged

Donatist, bishop Fortunius, at Tibursi. A great company gathered who

interrupted the debate; all attempts at taking notes were finally given

up. In a letter (Ep. xliv.) to the Donatists, Eleusius, Glorius, and

the two Felixes, who were of the number of those addressed in the

previous epistle, he speaks of their witness to the conciliatory

disposition of Fortunius, and recounts the substance of the interview,

with the desire that it may be submitted to that bishop for

correction. The discussion had opened with the question of the

Church. Fortunius regretted that Augustin was not in it; the latter

reversed the wish. What is the Church? Is it diffused throughout the

whole world, or is it confined to Africa? Can the Donatists send

letters of communion to any of the apostolic churches? Thence they

dissected the Donatist claim to be the people of God, on account of

their subjection to persecution; in which it appears that they recorded

the schism of the whole world from themselves as the true Church as due

to sympathy with the Macarian persecution; up to that time they had

held fellowship with the whole world, and as proof thereof brought

forward a letter of a council of Sardica addressed to them. From the

condemnation of Athanasius and Julius by this document, Augustin, to

whom it was new, concluded that this was an Arian council, and was only

the more damaging to their theory. The note of persecution being

resumed, he maintained that there was no approved suffering unless for

a just cause, and hence the justice of the cause must first be

established. Though Ambrose had endured violence at the hand of the

soldiery, they would deny him to be a Christian, for they would

rebaptize even him. Maximianists on the other hand were confessed to

be just, although they had been dispossessed of their basilicas by the

Primianist appeal to the state. As an offset, Fortunius urged the

curious fact that before the election of Majorinus, an interventor had

been chosen, whom the C�cilianists put out of the way. On the

following day Augustin had to confess that there was no example in the

New Testament to justify compulsion in matters of faith. The next

topic was Discipline. Augustin pleaded for toleration in order to keep

unity. A point as to Johannic baptism sprang up, but was not pressed.

From this time the debate became miscellaneous and repetitious; in its

progress Fortunius confessed reluctantly that rebaptism was a fixed

practice among them, and that even a Catholic bishop so highly esteemed

among the Donatists for his non-persecuting spirit as was Genethlius,

would have to submit to the rite before he could be recognized by their

body. Augustin proposes a further examination of matters, with a view

to peace, but the pacific Fortunius doubts whether many of the

so-called Catholics really desire concord, to which Augustin replies

that he can find ten men who would heartily enter into such a

conference.

On the next day the venerable Donatist calls upon his opponent to

resume their talk, until an ordination called Augustin away; we also

obtain information of the Coelicol� professing a new sort of baptism,

with whose leader he desired to confer. The letter closes with a

proposition to meet in the little village of Titia, near Tibursi, where

there was no church, and the population pretty equally divided, and

where no crowd could disturb the progress of the investigation; thither

all documents should be brought and the whole subject canvassed for as

long a time as it might take to terminate the discussion.

During the year Augustin issued a weighty work, which stands closely

related to these visits to Fortunius. It was in two books named by

himself: Contra partem Donati. Unhappily it is lost, but in the

Retractations (II. v.), he says, that in the first book he had opposed

the use of the secular power for compelling the schismatics to return

to the communion of the State Church, a form of discipline which

experience afterwards persuaded him was necessary and wholesome.

Possibly it was at the close of the year 398 that a hint from the

Donatist bishop Honoratus was brought by Herotes to Augustin, to the

effect that they carry on a correspondence on the questions in dispute

between them, and avoid the uproar of public debates. Augustin

acquiesces heartily, and at once plunges (Ep. xlix.) into the doctrinal

aspect of the matter. He begins with the note of Universality, the

Church is diffused through the whole world, to establish which he

brings forward some of his key passages, Ps. ii. 7, 8, Matt. xxiv. 14,

Rom. i. 5. With all the apostolic churches Catholics communicate,

Donatists do not. How then can this universality be limited? Why call

the Catholic church Macarian, when the name of Macarius or Donatus is

not known in any of these gospel regions? It rests with Donatists to

prove how the Church is lost from the whole world and is confined to

them. Catholics can rely on the Scriptures only for their theory.

Correspondence seems to him also the better plan for discussion.

Whether this mutual approach went further is not known.

It may have been in 399 A.D. that the Donatist presbyter Crispinus had

met Augustin at Carthage; the two joined words, and both seem to have

become heated; the former made promise to resume the parley at a later

date, to the fulfillment of which the bishop had occasionally urged

him. When Crispinus was elevated to the see of Calama, c. 400 A.D.,

and was not far from Augustin's diocese, the latter addressed him a

letter (Ep. li.) rehearsing these facts. A new rumor credited

Crispinus with being ready to enter the arena once more. All

salutation is avoided in Augustin's letter, because the Donatists had

accused him of servility. For the sake of accuracy and instruction he

proposes simply to correspond, whether by one interchange of letters or

by many. He pleads that present interests alone may be touched upon.

Schism according to the Old Testament was more severely punished than

idolatry or the burning of the sacred scroll. The charge of

traditorship is set off by the acceptance of the Maximianists, whom the

council of Bagai had condemned in such severe terms. If a mistake was

made with regard to them why not in C�cilian's case? If these were

really guilty, you consulted the wider duties of unity and toleration,

and why not carry these principles farther and apply them to communion

with the Catholics? As to the charge of persecution, Augustin will not

enter into the merits of the matter theoretically, nor stop to plead

the mildness of the measures used, but at once asks why the Donatists

used the State to dislodge the Maximianists, and to deny the Catholics

the possession of genuine baptism is made foolish by the recognition of

the rite as existing among the Maximianists who had been cut off, and

were restored without a renewal of the ceremony. The whole world had

been condemned by the Donatists without an opportunity of being heard,

and yet they accept the sacrament of the condemned Felicianus and

Pr�textatus. While they deny the validity of the symbol as

administered by apostolic communions, and by the missionary churches

which brought the light to Africa, they maintain that their little

fraction alone is its possessor. Summarizing these arguments as a

weight for the bishop to stagger under, he invokes the peace of Christ

to conquer his heart.

In this same year one of his relatives, Severinus, who was a Donatist,

sent a communication to him at Hippo by a special messenger, with a

view of reopening friendly intercourse with his kinsman; and Augustin

seizes it as a way to reestablish as well the higher kinship in Christ

(Ep. lii.). The Church is an unconcealable city set on a hill; it is

Catholic, being diffused throughout the whole world. The party of

Donatus is cut off from the historic root of the Oriental churches, and

therefore cannot bring forth the fruits of peace and love; indeed it

suppresses Christ by its rebaptism. Had their charges been genuine the

transmarine bishops would have supported them; at any rate they should

not have withdrawn from the Unity, but rather have practiced

toleration. He hopes that the bonds of custom may be broken by

Severinus, and that both may find their truest relationship in Christ,

since the state of schism is a despising of the eternal heritage and of

perpetual salvation.

Further along in the year, a Donatist presbyter had sent to Generosus

an ordo Christianitatis, or episcopal succession of Constantina, his

native city, asserting that it had been delivered by an angel from

heaven. About nothing were the church externalists of every camp so

eager as the preservation of the succession in proof of antiquity.

Generosus had only laughed at the man's stupidity, but nevertheless

wrote to the bishop of Hippo about it. Fortunatus, Alypius and

Augustin combine in a reply, undeniably written by the latter,

commending him (Ep. liii.). The ordo Christianitatis of the whole

world is theirs, from which the Donatists do not hesitate to separate

themselves. This presbyter's fiction would have to be rejected at any

rate, even had it come from an angel, since all other gospels than that

which teaches the universality of the Church are anathema. That

doctrine is in Matt. xxiv. 14, Gen. xii. 3, Gal. iii. 16. The true

ordo is the Roman, which he gives from Peter to Anastasius, the

cotemporary pope; no Donatist is found in this list; yet as Montenses

and Cutzupit�, they have intruded into Rome. Had there been an actual

tradition, or any wicked man in the Church, that would not have

vitiated the ordo, or the Church, for the law of Christ is plain, Matt.

xxiii. 3, a passage again and again quoted by Augustin to substantiate

this thought. They are separated from the peace of these very

churches, concerning which they read in their codices, and sing pax

tecum. There follows a very full and notable summary of the acts, as a

refutation of the schism. He prefers the Scriptural proofs, which

certify to the world-wide reach of Christ's inheritance, and its

existence among all nations; from this they are separated by a

nefarious schism, and charge upon the Catholics the crimes of the chaff

on the threshing-floor, which must be mixed with the grain until the

winnowing; these accusations do not affect the wheat which grows with

the tares in the field until the end. Their divinely appointed

retribution is in the history of the Maximianists, with whom they now

commune, and affirm that they are not stained thereby; let them apply

that lenity of judgment to the inheritance of Christ. The angel then

was either Satan, or the man is Satanic, yet his salvation is desired;

the sharp writing concerning him is without odium, and seeks only his

correction.

Celer was a Donatist, a man of middle age and of considerable estate

and civil position. He afterwards rose to the proconsulship. Augustin

expresses (Ep. lvi.) a peculiar respect and affection for him, as a man

of integrity and seriousness. He had desired direct instruction from

the bishop, both in a matter of Christian culture and in the

controversies between the two parties. Weighed down with the cares of

visitation, Augustin had to delegate his presbyter Optatus to the

reading and explanations of the bishop's works and views in Celer's

leisure hours. The superior claims of the life beyond are set before

him, together with the overwhelming force of the proofs against the

schism, so that the dullest with patience and attention can get

correction. The sundering of the bonds of custom and of a perversity

that has become familiar, is a matter requiring great strength of

character, for which step however, he, under God, would be readily

capable.

But Celer was not persuaded to change his church connection by this

first endeavor. On the contrary, Augustin thought he saw a laxity in

the enforcement of the repressive measure ordered by the government,

and so wrote a second time (Ep. lvii.). He affirms that there is no

just cause for separation from that Catholic church which prophets and

evangelist have declared should be diffused through the whole world. A

long retained codex of Augustin, which had been loaned to Celer through

C�cilian, his own son, who seems to have been under the special

tutelage of the bishop, was designed to convince the state official on

this very point (we do not know which writing it may have been), should

inclination or leisure lead him to its perusal, and whatever

difficulties might occur, Augustin was ready to answer. He desires him

also to stir up his subordinates to greater care in restoring the

Catholic unity in the region of Hippo; indeed he cautions him to

diligence on his own estates; a friend there, who fears to be strict in

the carrying out of the statutes, could have his position alleviated by

a word from Celer his patron. From this point we notice a decided

sympathy with the effort to break up Donatism by force.

Parmenian, the successor of Donatus the Great in the see of Carthage,

was one of the brightest disputants on their side. Against him Optatus

of Milevis had directed his review of the schism, full indeed of grave

historical blunders, but not lacking in that suavity which those who

think they have the keys of heaven sometimes affect. When Tychonius

had exposed some of the inconsequences and weaknesses of the Donatist

theory of the Church, Parmenian undertook a reply, whose main object

was to fortify the propositions, (1) that the evil defile the good in

the Church, and must therefore be cut off; and (2) that puristic folly,

that the Donatist community was absolutely pure in its membership and

priesthood. To this much-esteemed work, Augustin replies (c. 400 A.D.)

in three books: Contra Epistolam Parmeniani.

In Book I. the main question is, who really incurred the guilt of

schism, and initiated the appeal to the State? He opens with the

praise of Tychonius as man and author, but misses the acute drift of

that great man's argument. He seeks to answer the data of the origin

of the separation as given by Parmenian, who attributes it to the joint

movement of Gaul, Spain and Italy in seeking to make their views

universal, and to the influence of Hosius over Constantine, in winning

him to their opinion; nor does Parmenius cease to deprecate the

imperial intervention. Augustin defends this use of the secular arm,

but accuses the Donatists by their history of beginning it in the

appeal to Constantine, in the treatment of the Rogatists and

Maximianists, in the abuses of the Circumcelliones, in their petition

to Julian.

Book II. discusses the texts alleged by the Donatists in support of the

purity of the Church, the need of discipline, the sole validity of

their baptism and ordination, the blamelessness of their members and

clergy. While both fail in exegetical principles, Parmenian, after the

manner of his school, is aggravatingly guilty of using mere

catch-words, without regard to text or context. He quotes

indiscriminately whatever sounds favorable to his cause. Some of the

passages are: Is. v. 20, Prov. xvii. 15, Is. lix. 1-8, Ecclus. x. 2,

Is. lxvi. 3, Prov. xxi. 27, and others. Augustin gives his

interpretations, and does not fail to prod his opponent with barbs of

Optatus, Maximianists, and Circumcelliones.

Book III. handles further the theory of purism in the light of

Scriptural proofs. The first part is mainly an endeavor to give the

true significance of I Cor. v. 12, 13. (Compare his correction in the

Retractt. II. xvii.). Augustin is constrained to confess the need of

some internal discipline, and then enforces with wider range the notes

of universality, unity and toleration, especially as illustrated by

Cyprian. [Cp. Retractt.. II. xvii.].

In the work against Parmenian, he had promised to write more fully on

this subject of baptism, the frequent persuasions of the brethren also

moved him so that in this same year (400 A.D.) he issued the seven

books De Baptismo: Contra Donatistas. The double purpose is to define

that sacrament as the property of Christ, and to overthrow the Donatist

appeal to the authority of Cyprian and the famous council of Carthage,

with its eighty-seven deliverances in favor of the repetition of the

rite. Since this is one of the works translated in the accompanying

volume any further analysis may be passed by. [Cp. Retractt. II.

xviii.].

In this period of frequent and heated controversy, a Donatist layman,

Centurius by name, brought some of their quotations and writings, and

supported with Scriptural proofs to the Church in Hippo. It seems to

have begun with an exposition of Prov. ix. 17. (N. Afr. version and

LXX). Augustin answered them briefly in a tractate, which he

entitles: Contra quod attulit Centurius a Donatistis. It is however

not extant. In the Retractations (II. xix.) it is placed immediately

after the work on Baptism.

Meanwhile, and as the Retractations tell us, before he had finished his

work on the Trinity, and his literal commentary on Genesis, he found it

desirable to reply to the pastoral letter of Petilian, Donatist bishop

of Constantina; unfortunately only a part of the epistle came into his

hand, so strenuous and vigilant were the efforts to hide their

literature from the eyes of this ardent foe. He replied with one book

to so much as he had received, c. 400 A.D. Some of his clergy

subsequently obtained and wrote out a complete copy, so that he

composed the second book, c. 401 A.D. Meanwhile Petilian responded to

the first issue, and this necessitated a third book, c. 401 or 402

A.D. The three books were collected into one treatise, and are known

under the title Contra Litteras Petiliani. The main object of the

series is the refutation of Petilian's proposition: "Conscientia

namque (sancte) dantis attenditur, qu� (qui) abluat accipientis." "Nam

qui fidem (sciens) a perfido sumpserit, non fidem percipit, sed

reatum." "What we look for is the conscience of the giver (him who

gives in holiness), to cleanse that of the recipient." "For he who

(wittingly) receives faith from the faithless receives not faith, but

guilt." Since the work is also a part of this volume, we need not

dwell on it farther. [Cp. Retractt. II. xxv.]

The civil restraints were applied with vigor on the one side and

resented on the other by the retaliatory Circumcelliones. To

Pammachius, a man of senatorial rank, Augustin, in 401 A.D., sends a

letter [Ep. lviii.] of exuberant congratulations and flatteries,

because he had compelled some of his Numidian tenants to return to the

mother Church; a converting agency which he condemns unmercifully when

practiced by the Donatists. The plan, he says, would have been urged

upon other landholders, had the clergy not been afraid of the scornful

finger of the Donatists, who were in such favor with the proprietors,

that an effort like this might have failed. He desires the senator to

circulate this letter wherever there was promise of effect. The

bishop, now thoroughly committed to these arbitrary procedures, was in

some trepidation lest the plausible arguments which the Donatists were

urging, might shake the resolution of Pammachius himself, and so he

sends a secret commission of instruction.

The coercive measures yielded fruit, and the question about the status

of recedent Donatist clergy now became pressing. Augustin had already

met with a certain Theodore on this subject, and in a letter addressed

to him [Ep. lxi.] c. 401, recapitulated the proposition then agreed

upon, to be used as a basis for treatment with all who wanted to come

over. The Catholic church opposed only the schism and the rebaptism

among the Donatists; what was good she was ready to acknowledge.

Baptism itself, ordination, self-denial, celibacy, doctrinal views,

especially as to the Trinity, these were confessedly right, only to

reap the profit of them, it was essential for Donatists to be in the

unity and in the root.

The Council of Carthage of September 13, 401, adopted this view, Can.

2. There had also been a remarkable scarcity of Catholic clergy, so

that application had been made to Rome and Milan for relief; probably

this had its influence upon so charitable a view of schismatic

ordination.

It was alleged that Crispinus, the bishop of Calama, had bought a state

farm at Mappalia, and had rebaptized the tenants. Augustin was roused

by this counter-irritant and wrote him a letter, c. 402 A.D. [Ep.

lxvi.], wondering what he would do if the authorities were to impose

the fine for every offense. He pleads for an answer to Christ, whose

was all the world, because bought with his blood, while the Donatist

would affirm that Christ had lost all the world save Africa. He urges

a public discussion of the mooted points before these converts, which

should be reported and done into Punic as a test of their freedom in

this conversion, and frankly enough offers to do the same for any case

of coercion on his side. Unless Crispinus and his helpers acquiesce,

he will hold them guilty.

The uppermost talk of those times was the extraordinary charity of the

Donatists toward the Maximianists. One form of apology for such a

seeming vacation of all their tenets was to say, e.g., of Felicianus of

Musti, that he was ignorantly condemned when innocent and absent, so in

his absence, he was reinstated. This statement was made by a Donatis

bishop, Clarentius, in reply to the inquiries of Naucelio. Alypius and

Augustin, who were made aware of this defense, urged in criticism [Ep.

lxx.] that the Council of Bagai was therefore guilty in condemning

Felicianus unheard, and all the more in that they afterward found him

to be innocent. Either he ought not to have been condemned if he was

innocent, or if guilty, he ought not to have been received back. If

the council erred, why not apply such a liability to error to the

origin of the schism; might not C�cilian, unheard, have been condemned

although innocent? But, as a matter of fact, Felicianus was found

guilty while in thorough and declared sympathy with Maximian, and the

state was called upon to enforce his ejection. If he was welcomed

without rebaptism, why not treat the Church diffused through the whole

world with the same consideration?

It was probably in the year 402 that he addressed a general appeal to

the Donatist [Ep. lxxvi.], not to endanger their salvation by

continuance in schism. If they counted the surrender of the sacred

books so great a sin, how much more grievous a transgression ought the

refusal to obey the plain commands of these books as to unity be

considered. He brings forward the usual array of passages to

demonstrate the universality of the Church, and that any limitation of

this note, can only be at the end of the world. The attempt to

separate the wheat from the tares before the harvest, is only a proof

that they are of the tares. A rapid survey of the origin of the schism

follows, and all the archives are made to tell against them. He asks

how they can hold any theory of purism while they regard Optatus as a

martyr and welcome the excommunicated Maximianists? Schism in the

Scriptures is punished more severely than the burning of the books.

Why complain about traditorship when Maximianists are received? Why

abuse the imperial laws directed against them, when they had invoked

the same against the Maximianists? If theirs is the only baptism, what

is the baptism of these Maximianists, which is without question

validated? He challenges the Donatist bishops to discuss these matters

with their laity, if they persist in declining to meet the Catholics,

and bids the sheep beware of the wolves and their den.

The ad Catholicos Epistola, popularly known as de Unitate Ecclesi�, is

pretty generally attributed to Augustin, and is addressed to the

brethren of his charge; it may be taken as a contrast to the previous

letter directed to the Donatists, and not unlikely saw the light in 402

A.D. This book is designed as a continuance of the controversy with

Petilian, and indeed a further correspondence is proposed, so that the

work must have appeared before that bishop's death, which is generally

placed in this year. The chief question between the two parties is,

Where is the Church? Is it with Catholic or Donatist? The Church is

one and Catholic: it is the body of Christ, consisting of Him as its

Head and those in Him as members. The historical issue in any of four

possibilities of truth or falsity does not justify separation from this

body. The point is, What does the Lord say? The Donatist should

believe in the books, which he says were delivered up, and put aside

all other documents except the divine canons. Do the Scriptures say

that the Church is in Africa only, and in the few Cutzupitan� or

Montenses at Rome, and in the house or patrimony of one woman in Spain,

or is it in the whole world? A second time does he start out with a

definition of the Church, as having for its head the Only Begotten Son,

and for its body the members in Him; as bridegroom and bride, two in

one flesh. Any divergence from the Head or the body, whether caused by

difference in doctrine or government, is per se outside of the Church.

He meets the two favorite Donatistic comparisons of the divine

institution with the ark and Gideon's fleece, and then enlarges upon

the note of universality, with included unity, by Scripture texts from

the Law, the Prophets, especially Isaiah, and the Psalms. From the

Donatist position these are not fulfilled, because, say they, men are

unwilling. Men were created with free will; they believe or disbelieve

according to that. When the Church began to increase in the world, men

refused to persevere, and the Christian religion was lost from all the

nations with the exception of the Donatists. All this, replies

Augustin, as if the Spirit of God did not know the future volitions of

men. But Christ, after the resurrection, said that the Law, the

Prophets and the Psalms testified of Him, and that the fulfillment of

his kingdom should begin from Jerusalem. He then follows out the

expansion of the Church as given in the Acts, and the foundation of

Christian communities as mentioned in the Epistles and the Revelation.

The Donatists reply to this theory of development that the Church

perished save among them in North Africa. It is among the few: for

which they cite a similar state of things under Enoch, Noah, Lot,

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the Kingdom of Judah. The spread of the

Church did indeed begin from Jerusalem, but afterwards an apostasy

befell it, in the progress of which the communion of the Donatists

alone remained faithful. Augustin says the fact that there are evil

persons in the Church is simply a proof of the fulfillment of those

parables of our Lord, which illustrate the mixed characters in his

kingdom. There is indeed a paucity of the good, but within that

communion. Then follows a discussion of the geographical limitation,

the Donatists maintaining that the Oriental churches and the rest

mentioned in the sacred canon had receded from the faith. Especially

is their favorite paragraph, a passage from Cant. i. 7, commented

upon. He presses the continuous preaching among all nations, after

which event the end is to come; there must be such a universal growth

to that end. Let us cease drawing from the acts and sayings of men

about this great matter, and take the simple testimony of the

Scriptures. But the Donatists object: If the Church be among you why

do you compel us by force to enter its peace? Or if we are evil why do

you desire us? and if we are tares why hinder us from growing until the

harvest? Augustin then justifies the system of correction adopted in

loving care for their salvation, not failing to remind them of the

Circumcelliones and their own action with regard to the Maximianists.

Another inquiry of the Donatists was, How will you recognize us if we

come to you? Augustin says, as the universally founded Church is wont

to receive, put away all hatred and your sacraments are acknowledged.

This leads to the discussion of baptism and of that related topic, the

effect, of the celebrant's character, upon the recipient. He returns

finally to the note of universality as essential to the unity, with the

one Head and the one body.

Somewhere about 404 A.D. two official cases of discipline had occurred

in Augustin's monasterium, which had grieved the pride of the clergy,

because they had boasted of their establishment as really purer than

the puristic body gathered about the Donatist bishop Proculeianus.

They were more troubled about this than about the sins of the suspected

brethren, one of whom, however, seemed to have considerable injustice

done him. While discussing this matter [in Ep. lxxviii.] he

incidentally mentions the lapse of two Donatists, who had been received

into Augustin's communion, and whose conduct the clergy had regarded as

a proof of the laxity of discipline under Proculeianus.

A sermon on the 95th Ps. (96) may have been preached in the year 404 or

thereabouts, in which he rebukes the Donatists for their pride in

claiming either that they, the few in Africa, are the ones bought by

Christ, or that they are so great because this large gift was bestowed

on them alone. And in commenting on v. 10, dicite in nationibus,

Dominus regnavit a ligno, etc., he twits them with seeking this reign

by the wood through the cudgels of the Circumcelliones; and enlarges

too upon the theme of universality, against their undiscoverable here

and there.

C�cilianus, whose exact civil office, whether vicar or pr�fectus annon�

is yet undetermined, Augustin addresses as pr�ses in Ep. lxxxvi., which

is ascribed to 405 A.D. The severer edicts of Honorius had just been

published. This official had carried them out with telling

earnestness. His administration in the greater part of Africa is

particularly commended; the bishop begs of him to restore the Catholic

unity also in Hippo and the frontiers of Numidia. The ill-success of

his own work is not due to lack of episcopal duty, and he asks

C�cilianus to inquire of the clergy, or of the bearer, a commissioned

presbyter, about the true state of matters; he would have the State

begin with monitions in the hope of preventing a resort to severer

remedies.

Emeritus, the bishop of Julia C�sarea, one of the seven Donatist

disputants at the later conference, did not shun correspondence or

association with his opponents. He is described as a man of parts and

character. Augustin had written a letter to him, which is not

preserved, and it had received no reply. He once more seeks to win him

to a friendly discussion or correspondence [Ep. lxxxvii.], in this time

of general return to the mother Church. He would have all men of

culture come back to the true fellowship. What Emeritus's particular

ground for continuing in separation may be he does not know. He

proceeds to discuss universality, purism, the validity of the

documents, the heinousness of schism, the paucity of numbers, and the

right of coercion.

The enforcement of the civil edicts was followed by violent outbreaks

of the Circumcelliones, especially in Augustin's diocese. The clergy

united in a protest [Ep. lxxxviii.] addressed to the venerable Bishop

Januarius, a Donatist, probably in 406 A.D. They claim (1) that they

are receiving evil for good. (2) The appeal to the state was begun by

the Majorinists, and two full documents are given in proof. (3) All

decrees of the empire since, are the simple execution of the edict of

Constantine against the party of Donatus which these had wanted to be

issued against C�cilian. (4) The acts of the Circumcelliones; were the

real occasion for sharper efforts at suppression; instances of their

cruelty are mentioned. (5) The Catholics have pursued a conciliatory

policy by conferences and by desiring a mitigation of the penalties,

which were frustrated the one by refusals, the other by a gross assault

on the Catholic bishop of Bagai; all who come into the hands of the

state clergy, are treated with merciful persuasion. (6) Various

proposals for peace are suggested.

Festus, a government official and a landed proprietor apparently in

Hippo, had written a letter urging a return of the Donatists to the

mother Church. It bore little fruit, and he asks Augustin first to

instruct him and also to give him a tractate for general use.

Augustin, c. 406. [Ep. lxxxix.], enforces the duty of perseverance in

the civil reclamation of the Donatists; their claim of persecution as a

note attesting them to be the true people of God is folly, because it

is not the mere suffering but the cause for which one suffers that

makes a martyr. He exhorts him to read the archives and see how the

schismatics initiated the appeal to the secular power, and how all

things that have befallen them through that arm would have been the

just fate of the C�cilianists, had the Donatist course been approved.

Besides, why this unjust treatment of the Church universal in

condemning it unheard, and rebaptizing its members, who have done them

no wrong? The theory that baptism alone is valid when administered by

the just, is putting a trust in man which the Scriptures condemn; the

sacrament is not man's but Christ's; further, one would prefer to be

baptized by a bad man, for then he would receive grace from Christ

directly, according to their subterfuge. He is vexed with their active

and passive opposition; the mother has to correct, although her

obstinate child may not like it. They aver that the Catholics accept

them without requiring any change in them, but the change required is

great, no less a one than from error to truth. The bishop proposes as

a substitute for Festus's plan, the sending of an authorized messenger

secretly to himself, and they would devise together a method for the

correction of the Donatists.

In the second sermon on Ps. cii. (ci.) preached about this time, when

enlarging upon the unity he ridicules the Donatist assertion that the

Church which was among all the nations had perished, as the impudent

voice of those who are not in it declares. So is their affirmation

that Scripture prophecies about the spread of the kingdom have been

fulfilled; all nations have believed, but this diffused communion

apostatized and perished. He rebukes the conceit that the Lord's

saying, I am with you, even to the end of the world, was designed for

them alone, the Lord foreseeing that the party of Donatus would be in

the earth. If emperors have propounded laws against heretics, it is a

part of the predictions which foretold how kings would serve the Lord.

Thence he expands the notes of universality and perpetuity.

Cresconius, a layman and philologist, read Augustin's first book in

answer to Petilian, and wrote a reply, which, however, was circulated

among the Donatists only. Augustin at last secured a copy, and wrote

(406 A.D., some say as late as 409) Contra Cresconium Grammaticum

Partis Donati, libri IV. Three of these books controvert the arguments

of Cresconius; part of the third and the fourth entire is a detailed

polemic history of the Maximian schism.

In Book I. he alludes to the occasion of the writing, and hesitates

between being regarded as contumelious if he declined an answer, and

arrogant, should he reply. Cresconius had attacked eloquence, which

Augustin defends as simply the art of speaking, and as not to be

condemned because it has been abused. You do not condemn military

armament for your country because others have taken up arms against the

country; the physician does not refuse to use all drugs because some

are baneful; because there are sophists one is not to deny the value of

eloquence. Cresconius seemed to regard its cultivation as injurious to

the simplicity of Christian law and teaching. He also had accused

Augustin of persistent arrogance in his pertinacious pursuit of the

Donatists. Augustin claims to do a good work with good ends in view,

and says its fruit has been a rich harvest for the Church. So the

discussion passes on to the use of dialectics, which Cresconius

assails, but Augustin defends as nothing else than a demonstration of

results, either the true from the true or the false from the false. He

justifies not disputatiousness, but the arguments by which truth is

built up, for Christ employed it, and St. Paul wielded its weapons not

only with the Jews but with Epicureans and Stoics. In all this we have

an illustration of that unfortunate tendency to undervalue culture

whenever a puristic community passes into the fires. Augustin applies

the art to one of the points which Cresconius had discussed, viz.,

rebaptism. He had endeavored to prove that it was solely among them.

Augustin concedes that the rite is there, but not its profit; in order

to enjoy its profit, it must be administered lawfully. The oneness of

baptism as a ceremony is not dependent on the oneness of the Church,

whereas its profit is. A reprobate society of heretics can have a good

baptism, but it is not properly and not profitably administered among

them; the proper and profitable administration is solely in the Church

to salvation; the rite outside is to judgment.

In Book II. after a r�sum� of the previous book, he notices first the

criticism as to the true construction of the name Donatistoe; it should

rather be Donatiani as Cresconius claimed. He is ready to concede

this, and in his controversy with the philologist will use that form,

but on all other occasion he would prefer the more familiar

termination. Cresconius also protests against the term heretic as

applied to them, which he regards as a divergence of views from the

Christian faith; while a schism has sprung up among those for whom the

same Christ was born, died and rose again, who have one religion, the

same sacraments, and no diversity in Christian observance. Augustin,

however, while not particularly dwelling on these agreements, presses

upon him the articles of divergence, and asks why they rebaptize? The

recognition of Donatist ordination concerning which Cresconius had

asked, Augustin declares to be a matter of charity. As to the question

of Cresconius, Why, if the Donatists are such heretics and so

sacrilegious, if they are indeed guilty of a nefarious and inexpiable

crime, some purification is not adopted when they come over to the

Catholic church? Augustin answers: We do not regard it as inexpiable,

and baptism is not to be repeated, it is Christ's; on coming to us the

Donatist receives the Spirit signified by that rite; he begins to have

healthfully what he previously had hurtfully and unworthily. The

relation of the celebrant to the symbol as presented by Cresconius is a

modification of Petilianism. "Regard is had," says he, "to the

conscience of the giver, not according to its actuality, which cannot

be perceived but according to his reputation, whether that be true or

false." Augustin does not fail to crowd him for the change of base.

The favorite passages of Ps. cxli. 5, Jer. xv. 18, and Ecclus. xxxiv.

31, are gone over. Then he answers the charge made by Cresconius, as

to the right of any sinner to baptize among the Catholics. Finally, he

reviews Cyprian's relation to rebaptism, who is not a canonical

authority for him; the Scriptures alone are such; but the Donatists

ought to consider that decision of his to remain in unity from the fact

that the mixed nature of its membership requires toleration.

Book III. Augustin contends that the Donatists by their schism from

especially the Eastern churches had violated the principle of

toleration, which their boasted leader had so strenuously enforced.

There follows then a seriatim consideration of the points made by

Cresconius, similar to those maintained by Petilian, as to the

importance of the origin and the head and root in baptism, or the

character of the celebrant, and the rebaptism by Paul of John's

disciples. The case of Optatus and the Maximianists next come under

review, as witnesses against their testimonies. Cresconius says he

will neither absolve nor condemn Optatus, and as to the Maximianists,

he professes to have made special inquiry into the whole history. The

Synod had granted a season of delay during which all who returned

should be held innocent. Of this very many availed themselves; the

baptism of these was valid; those who remained outside lost both

baptism and the church. Augustin refutes the statement from its

inherent contradictions and from the language of the Synod against the

Maximianists. Cresconius also brings forward the Sardican council's

letter to Donatus as a proof of sustained fellowship. Augustin

declares it to be an Arian council; and he insists on paralleling all

Cresconius would say about C�cilianism with the career of the

Maximianists. With reference to persecution, he cites in extenso their

own persecutions, the case of Severus, bishop of Thubursicubur; the

acts of Optatus; his own treatment at a collation by the

Circumcelliones; the case of Crispinus, the Donatist bishop of Calama;

their own invocation of the state against the Maximianists. Thence he

returns to the doctrine of the unity as universal with many of the

familiar Scripture texts, and asserts by the documents that the

Donatists were the occasion of the rupture.

Book IV. is a review of Cresconius's work by the light of the

Maximianist records. Beginning with a pleasantry as to their eloquence

and dialectic spirit, he follows in detail the points of Cresconius

whether doctrinal or historical as to C�cilian, mainly with Maximianist

data as offsets. Cresconius charges Augustin with having called

Petilian Satan, and so violating the peace he professes. Augustin

claims that he only compared the error not the person, to Satan. Nor

had Cresconius forgotten to bring out the Manich�ism of his opponent.

Augustin reminds him both of what he had written against them and also

of what sins were forgiven in the return of Maximian, who was an old

man when Augustin was but young; these were the sins of his youth. The

theories of fellowship, of persecution, of baptism, are all considered

in the light of their own council of Bagai and its sequences. [Cp.

Retractt. II. xxvi.].

After concluding his work against Cresconius, he issued, probably in

this same year, a little treatise he had promised, containing a

collection of proofs both for Donatist and Catholic popular use. To

the pledge itself an unknown Donatist replied, which led to the

production of a second book, whose title Augustin designed to be:

Contra nescio quem Donatistam. The original promise was fulfilled in

the publication of the Probationes et Testimonia contra Donatistas,

embracing all the ecclesiastical and public acts and Scripture proofs

bearing on the questions between them. It was designed mainly for

public reading in the basilicas. Both were joined in one book,

although apparently afterwards separated. In each he confesses to the

error of placing the purgation of Felix after instead of before the

vindication of C�cilian. At this writing he still regarded the

Donatists as psychics and babes, but in his old age corrects his

application of the words to them, since he came to consider them rather

as dead and lost. Unfortunately neither treatise has been preserved.

[Cp. Retractt. II. xxvii. and xxviii.].

He also conceived the plan of preparing a polemic for the people who

had little time for extended reading, by refuting the entire theory of

the schism through the story of the excision and restoration of the

Maximianists. It appeared c. 406 A.D. under the name of Admonitio

Donatistarum de Maximianistis: this too is lost. [Cp. Retractt. II.

xxix.].

An acquaintance of earlier days in Carthage, Vincentius, had become

bishop of the little Rogatist fragment as the immediate successor of

Rogatus himself at Cartenna. He, or some one of that little band, had

written a letter to Augustin with a pretty strong plea against

persecution. This was not unlikely in c. 408 A.D., and Augustin

answers in one of his most weighty epistles (Ep. xciii.), under the

supposition that Vincentius was the author, and vindicates the help of

the State. Evidently a change had come over Numidia, for he boasts of

the multitudes who had been converted, and rejoices in the fruitful use

of the secular arm for their salvation. Even Circumcelliones had

become steadfast Catholics. Coercion stimulates the thoughtless and

those bound by custom, and delivers these held back by fear; it is like

a wholesome medicine, or the wounds inflicted by a friend. God

chastens in order to better the life and to bring men to repentance.

The householder instructs us to compel them to come in. Sarah and

Hagar are types; so the mother Church corrects her children.

Everything depends on the aim in persecution, whether it be done for

oppression or for good; it is the difference between Pharaoh and Moses

in their treatment of Israel. The Father gave up the Son, and the Son

gave Himself up; while Judas betrayed Him. The righteousness of the

end for which one suffers alone constitutes martyrdom. The Rogatist is

not suffering for righteousness but for unrighteousness. Augustin is

constrained to confess that there are no persecutions recorded in the

New Testament as inflicted by Christians, but explains the omission as

due to the fact that rulers were not yet members of the Church. He

thinks, too, that the moderate and discriminating form of the

correction employed, helps to justify a resort thereto. If the

Rogatists have nothing to do with the violence of the Circumcelliones,

and use no force as the rest of the Donatists do, it is because they

are so few and feeble. The Donatists, however, did use the secular arm

against the Maximianists, and in the appeal to Julian. He will not

allow a distinction between resort to law for the recovery of property

and for the coercion of the conscience. He claims that to regain one's

own in this way has no apostolic warrant. The Donatists, too, sought

imperial aid to coerce C�cilianus. Why shall not Catholics return in

kind? The very edict of confiscation which had hit them they had hoped

might fall on the head of C�cilian and his followers. What Tychonius

said describes the very essence of Donatist arbitrariness: quod

volumus sanctum est. The sin of separation from the whole world

followed; the universal church was condemned unheard, and the

toleration which Cyprian urged disregarded. He traces his own change

of views from the non-coercive to the coercive policy, the success of

the method in hastening conversions won him wholly as an enthusiastic

and persistent supporter. He bids Vincentius flee from the wrath to

come. What is his little handful compared with the universal Church?

This note of universality he develops in extenso against their

limitation, and especially their new definition of Catholic, as

obedience to all the laws and the sacraments, and to their childish

allegory of Cant. i. 7. He hints that in the ancient times there might

have been a little schism which anticipated the Rogatists, and which

had called itself exclusively the Church. He thinks it is also the

duty of the State to suppress idolatry. The passage quoted from Hilary

by Vincentius, as to the few who in Asia in his day were believers in

spite of the spread of the Church, Augustin softens into an excited

picture of the dark times of persecution. Next, he discusses the

position of Cyprian. All patristic testimony, however, is of no final

value; the only authority is the Word of God. Moreover, if Cyprian be

quoted, why not on the side of his love for unity and toleration? The

averment that the Church, with the exception of the Rogatists, perished

by fellowship with the unbaptized, is met with the fact that in

Cyprian's time men had been received without rebaptism into the Church,

and therefore the Church, according to their theory, must have perished

before their day; if it, however, survived that condition, then there

is no excuse left for a schism on that ground. One is not of higher

merit than Cyprian simply because he may abhor that father's error, any

more than they who did not fall into Peter's mistake are above him in

worth on that account. Indeed Cyprian may have rectified his fault

before death; and some say that those passages are interpolations.

Augustin, however, concedes their authenticity. Cyprian, in his

Epistle to Antonianus, shows how the African bishops maintained unity

in spite of the corrupt lives of some colleagues; variations of opinion

were allowed; neither were they contaminated by such a fellowship, nor

was the Church destroyed. Tychonius states the result of a Donatist

council which granted fellowship to those in their own body who had

been guilty of tradition, and that without rebaptism, in case the

restored should oppose such a repetition of the rite. Deuterius,

bishop of Macriana, had admitted traditors to his communion without

renewing the sacrament, and many witnesses of both facts were living in

Tychonius's own day. Parmenian had indeed replied to the arguments,

but could not gainsay the facts. Augustin professes in all sincerity

his anxiety for the salvation of the jeopardized Donatists; the Church

acknowledges the Sacrament which they have administered, and desires

them to have the profit thereof. In defence of rebaptism Vincentius

had alleged the case of Paul, repeating the ceremony after John.

Augustin asks was John then a heretic? If not, it is for you to say

why the ordinance was iterated; Christ's baptism is always the same and

must not be iterated; it has nothing to do with the merit or demerit of

the individual, or else Paul would not have declined its continuous

administration. He begs him to put no confidence in the accident of

their being a little company, and not to arrogate to themselves the

title of Catholic, in the sense of being keepers of the entire law and

all the sacraments, nor to peculiar sanctity as the few who were to

have faith at the coming of the Son of Man. The Church does not take

pleasure in correction, save for conversion; she abhors those who seek

Donatist property out of sheer covetousness, yet all property does

belong to the true Church. She has also no delight in any who

disregard Donatist discipline, by receiving members who have been

ejected from that body for sin. The Catholic Church sustains the

unity, and recognizes the mixture of chaff and wheat, good and bad

fish, the goats and the sheep. He bids him come to that Church into

whose fellowship Vincentius had described Augustin as entering. He

closes with reflections on the aggravations in the sin of schism and on

the need of repentance.

Olympius had recently been elevated to the dignity of magister

officiorum. He had written to Augustin soliciting his advice on the

best way for the civil authority to help the Church. Augustin, c. 408

[Ep. xcvii.], welcomes his elevation, commends his devotion to the body

of Christ, and is glad to have his own timidity relieved by this

invitation to lay before the highest official the exacting needs of the

hour. These had become grave; the very success of coercion had

precipitated new commotions among the Circumcelliones and their

clerical abettors. A commission had sailed in mid-winter to solicit

imperial help against their fury. The first point he would suggest,

but without having had the opportunity of consultation, save probably

with bishop Severus, is to declare by proclamation that the imperial

edicts were not the invention of Stilicho, as the Donatists and heathen

boasted. As to further plans, the episcopal commission would doubtless

consult with him on their return from court. He invites Olympius to

rejoice with him on the practical benefits of coercion thus far.

It may have been a little later (c. 408 or 409) that Augustin writes to

Donatus the proconsul (Ep. c.) regretting indeed that the Church must

avail herself of the State, but he is gratified that so devoted a son

is wielding the sword for her. The crimes against the Church are

greater than all other crimes, but in her discipline he deprecates any

spirit of revenge, and pleads most beseechingly against the infliction

of capital punishment; that would be a deterrent to the bringing in of

any charges against the guilty. He asks for a republication of the

repressive laws, since the enemy is boasting of their repeal.

Augustin wrote a general letter to the Donatist people in c. 409 [Ep.

cv.], in which he declares that the Catholic effort at their conversion

is the work of peacemakers. Some Donatist presbyters had ordered the

Catholics to let their people alone, if they did not want to be killed,

but Augustin would all the rather ask the people to recede from the

schismatics because they were separated from that body for which Christ

died. Catholics must seek for the stolen sheep that had on them the

mark of Christ. The charge of being traditors, says he, we meet with a

like accusation against you, and then you bid us leave. You claim to

be the Church on this unproved charge, unmindful of what law, prophecy,

Psalms, Apostles and Gospels say as to its universality beginning at

Jerusalem. You are not in communion with that universal body, and you

prevent the escape of others from a similar perdition. The objection

as to persecution he meets with an invitation to look at the deeds of

clergy and Circumcelliones, and cites instances of grievous

ill-treatment toward voluntary converts: Marcus, presbyter of

Casphalia, Restitutus of Victoria, Marcianus of Urga, Maximinus and

Possidius, and then protests against their general violence and

robberies, and especially against attributing martyrdom to those who

had only been punished for their crimes. To all this compulsion we

oppose the State, he affirms, and many of your own people rejoice in

deliverance from your oppressions. You have filled Africa with false

charges as to C�cilian, Felix, etc., and though we do not place our

hope in man, yet we do recognize the State as the servant of the

Church. Nebuchadnezzar is an example both of the persecutor and the

correctionist. You despise the baptism of Christ; ought this not to be

punished? He then reviews the history of the case in the light of the

documents; commenting on them as forms of their own appeal to the

State. The liberty of error is most deadly to the soul. Christ and

the Apostles command unity, and this command the Emperors seek to

enforce. Only Julian and the heathen emperors were persecutors; the

only martyrs are those who suffer for Catholic truth. The whole

imperial legislation against Donatism is the outcome of the original

statute of Constantine and sprang after all from their appeal. He next

discusses their view of baptism and insists that the rite is

independent of the character of the celebrant; were it dependent, then,

according to their notion, we should rather desire to be baptized by a

bad man, in order to receive the grace directly from Christ. The

appeal to unity follows. Make concord with us he urges; we love you

and desire to serve you, even by the aid of the temporal laws; we do

not want you to perish as aliens from your Catholic mother. Your

charges you are unable to substantiate, and yet you avoid all

conference with us, as if to shun fellowship with sinners; a false

pride, which is rebuked by Paul's conduct, by the Lord's in his

treatment of Judas; the Lord held conference even with the devil. This

he follows with extended Scriptural proofs of the universality of the

Church. He reminds them again of the unproved charges which apply

rather to themselves; but he has no desire for the historical argument,

rather for the doctrinal. The Catholic aim is their conversion,

whether by the persuasion of argument or the correction of laws. They

should remember the mixed nature of the Church, and that mere contact

with evil does not defile. If you hold to Christ, hold also to His

Church; you kill us who seek to tell you the truth, and do not want you

to perish in evil. May God vindicate us and his cause by slaying your

errors and making you rejoice with us in the truth.

On the death of Proculeianus, Macrobius succeeded to the see of Hippo

Regius. Augustin hears that he is about to rebaptize a subdeacon

(Rusticianus) who under discipline left the Catholics. Augustin urges

him [Ep. cvi.], c. 409, not to do this by his desire to have life in

God, and to please God by not making the sacraments vain, and by his

hope of not being separated from the body of Christ eternally. The

Donatists have admitted the validity of baptism as administered by

Felicianus and Primianus, why then rebaptize others? and begs him to

search that case as a test of the whole matter.

Maximus and Theodore had been commissioned to deliver the previous

letter to Bishop Macrobius. He at first declined to listen to its

reading, but was at last persuaded to attend, and in reply said: It

was his duty to receive all who came, and to give faith to those who

asked it. Into the question about Primian he would not enter, because

of his own recent ordination; he was not a judge of his father, and he

would remain in what his predecessors had accepted. These replies were

conveyed to Augustin in the letter cvii. (c. 409) by the two

commissioners.

In still further hope of reaching Bishop Macrobius, Augustin addressed

another epistle, (cviii. ) c. 409, to him in answer to the objections

offered by him at the interview with the commissioners. 1. As to the

point that he must receive those who come and give them the faith they

ask: Augustin proposes the case of some one who has received the rite

in their communion, but had been separated from it for a time, and

having returned, conscientiously desires to be rebaptized; Macrobius,

according to his objection, could not repeat the rite, but would

proceed to instruct him. Why repeat it when Augustin administers it?

May be you will quote, "keep thyself from strange water and do not

drink from a strange fountain." How then will you explain the

reception of Felicianus? 2. As to the second conclusion, that you

would remain in the faith of your predecessors: It is a pity for a

young man of good parts to say so; nothing compels you to remain in

evil; you had better be in the Church which began in Jerusalem and

spread thence through the world. 3. And if you will not judge your

fathers why judge my fathers? If not Primian, why C�cilian? Why deny

us to be brethren? why rend the body? why extinguish the baptism of

Christ, who baptizes with the Spirit, and who gave Himself for the

Church? Yet your colleagues in effect do yield to the truth in their

recognition of the Maximianists. Judge not the evil but do judge what

was good in Primian. That act of his, the reception of the

Maximianists, absolves the nations who are ignorant of what you accuse

us. He then traces the whole development of that schism and its

overthrow, to show that those schismatics were not rebaptized at their

return. That history Augustin considers a divinely appointed

refutation of all the Donatist tenets. He proceeds to criticise their

Scripture proofs, Prov. ix. 18, Jer. xv. 18, Eccl. xxxiv. 30, Ps. cxli.

5, which he turns against them through the story of the schism. He

next addresses himself to their theory of fellowship, and discusses

their proof texts, I Tim. v. 22, Is. lii. 11, I Cor. v. 6; Ezekiel,

Daniel, the Apostles, Christ and Paul all rebuke this purism.

Cyprian's authority for rebaptism is reviewed. Augustin repeats the

doubts of very many as to the authenticity of those parts of his works

which favor this view; but granted that they are valid, Cyprian,

nevertheless, maintained unity and toleration, and by martyrdom purged

his mistake. There is, however, no martyrdom outside of the unity, as

that father also testified. Cyprian acknowledged as well the presence

of many evil persons in the ministry and in the Church, but stood to it

that unity must not be sacrificed on that account. The Church is a

mixed society; this is Christ's law. Had Macrobius's associates

remembered the parable of the wheat and tares they would not have

separated. This argument is concluded with a sort of summary of the

points traversed before. As to the note of persecution: that alone is

a martyrdom which surrenders the life for a good cause. The Donatists

too used the State in the case of the Maximianists, and to them belong

the Circumcelliones. The matter of unity and the connected points of

toleration and fellowship are again enlarged upon.

A sermon attributed to Augustin, De Rusticiano subdiacono a Donatistis

rebaptizato et in diaconum ordinato, falls in the same year, 409, with

the letter to Bishop Macrobius. There is an outburst of deep grief

over the act. It would appear that Rusticianus had been a special

favorite of Augustin, on whom he had expended much care; but he had

become involved in scurrilous deeds, in feasting and intemperance, day

and night, and was plunged in debt, and at last was excommunicated by

his presbyter, and so fled to the Donatists, by whom he was rebaptized

and made a deacon; this defection happened in the diocese of the bishop

Valerius (?); so Augustin interposed through Maximius and Theodorus

with Bishop Macrobius, but in vain. He deplores the disgrace done to

the sacrament, as dishonor done to the sign of the King. The

repetition is contradicted by the procedure with regard to the

returning Maximianists. He corrects the misinterpretation of Ecclus.

xxxiv. 30. He wishes for the Donatists the experience of the prodigal,

that they may be forgiven by return to the Church and so attain to the

profit of charity.

Great calamities were befalling the Church in all parts of the world.

Victorianus, a presbyter, wrote to Augustin for relief from doubts as

to the office of such afflictions; in the bishop's reply, [Ep. cxi.]

possibly of Nov., 409, he mentions the cruelties of the Donatists at

Hippo exceeding those of the Barbarians, especially in the resort to

acidified lime, clubbing, robberies, and other destructive measures to

compel rebaptism; forty-eight in one place were thus forced to a

repetition. The coercion policy, in other words, had stimulated some

of the Donatists to retaliation.

Donatus had resigned his proconsulship. Augustin writes [Ep. cxii.] at

the end of 409 or beginning of 410 A.D., to express his regrets at not

meeting him on his visit to Tibilis; his retirement would now give

leisure for a larger development in graces, and would lead him to

esteem the superiority of eternal things. He praises him for his

official worth, which indeed was in everybody's mouth, but he urges him

not to defer to that popularity, but to seek the higher approbation.

After reminding him of the duty of Christian progress, he asks for a

reply and an exhortation to be addressed to all his dependents at

Sinitis and Hippo to return to the Church. Greetings are sent to his

father, whom the son had been instrumental in converting to the faith.

Petilian of Constantina had written a treatise, de unico baptismo,

which Constantinus had come into possession of through some Donatist

presbyter, and then gave it to Augustin while they were in the country,

imploring him to answer it. He did so, c. 410, in the book bearing the

same title. He scorns those who desire secrecy in such matters; when

the deeds are public let the discussion be. Petilian claims that the

only true baptism is theirs: and therefore it is not repeated by the

sacrilegious theorists. Yes, replies Augustin, baptism is indeed one,

but it is Christ's, not yours; yours is only a repetition of the rite.

We correct what is yours and recognize what is Christ's. Therefore we

do not repeat it. So Christ corrected what was evil and recognized

what was good among the Jews. So Paul exposed the sin of the heathen

world but acknowledged what truth it had. Moreover you perform the

ceremony, but it is to destruction: there is no real advantage in

baptism outside of the Church. Petilian pleads for rebaptism because

Paul rebaptized John's disciples; but, says Augustin, that is to

declare John a heretic. These are two different things, as indeed

Petilian himself suggests, some might say, and then gives two

irrelevant passages, Matt. xii. 30, and vii. 21-23, as if the Catholics

had no fellowship with Christ and were not recognized by Him.

Augustin, after considering the import of these passages, avers the

readiness of the Church to recognize the baptism of Christ as

administered by Donatists when they return to the Church; for to deny

Christ's baptism because it is administered by heretics, is to say

Christ Himself should be denied, when even demons confess Him. There

is a belief in God outside of the Church; the devils believe in Him

outside of the Church. So there is one baptism of Christ which may

exist also outside of the Church. Petilian's declaration that true

baptism is where the true faith is, Augustin disproves by citing the

case of the unbelieving and schismatic, yet baptized Corinthians. So

all the ages of the kingdom bear witness to a like state of things.

The action of Agrippinus and Cyprian on the one side, and of Stephen on

the other, as to rebaptism is reviewed; differing in this, they yet

maintained unity, especially Cyprian. Further, if the contact of evil

men within the fellowship really defiles the good, then the Church

perished in Cyprian's time; where could Donatus then have been

spiritually born? If there is no such pollution, then there is no

occasion to rage for separation. The origin of the schism is then

denied from documentary testimony, and the charges declared to be not

sustained; on the other hand, these archives prove the schismatics to

have been traditors. A summary of the main points concludes his plea

for the sole baptism as that of Christ. [Cp. Retractt. II. xxxiv.].

After this book against Petilian just mentioned had been finished, he

wrote another work of larger proportions and with more thoroughness, in

refutation of their schism, by the data of the Maximian schism, which

he considered a full surrender of all their particularism. This has

been styled: De Maximianistis contra Donatistas. It is lost, but

noticed in the Retractations (II. xxxv.) immediately after de unico

Baptismo.

At Carthage, about May 15, 411, he preached in praise of peace (Sermo

ccclvii.). After its eulogy, he summons his hearers to the love of

that peace; and recalls Donatists as alienated from the unity unto the

concord which exists in the Church only. Patience and prayer are

better means to their conquest than reproof. After the pentecostal

fast he bade them exercise hospitality toward the guests who should

attend the Conference.

The two edicts concerning the great Conference had been issued by

Marcellinus. The Donatists had sent in their protest to the second,

while the Catholic bishops sent in their acquiescence in a letter [Ep.

cxxviii.], which is ascribed to Augustin's hand. It was of course

written before June 1, 411, the day appointed for the opening. They

agree to all the provisions for maintaining an orderly discussion; to

the time and place of meeting; to the numbers to be present; to the

requirement that all the delegated disputants sign their deliverances;

to the countersignatures; to the order prohibiting the people from

access to the Conference. If the Donatists prove the Church universal

to have been lost and to be solely with them, the Catholic bishops will

resign their sees; if, however, the collation prove the universality of

the Church, then they suggest the recognition of the ordination and

office of the Donatist clergy, and propose details for the succession

in case of any jointure. The conciliatory example of Christ persuades

them to this step; the peace of Christ in the Church is higher than the

episcopate. The Donatist use of the civil authority against the

Maximianists, and their gladness in receiving the returning schismatics

without rebaptism, and without any diminution of their honors, give

hope of a return to the root.

Before the meeting of the Conference, Augustin preached a sermon (No.

ccclviii.) in Carthage, on peace and love, of which the main thoughts

were the peace to which the Catholics cling and which they love under

the persuasion of the divine testimonies; the victory of truth is

love. He presents the Scripture proofs of charity and universality;

the inheritance should not be divided. Donatus and C�cilian were but

men, but baptism is Christ's and not man's. The charity spread abroad

in the heart is a broad commandment. He invites the Donatists to share

in the Church's possessions, and to be bishops along with the

Catholics, and pleads for a joint fraternal recognition; the Catholics

seek peace and want to build up the Church. He finally requests the

people to keep aloof from the place of dispute, but invokes their

prayers in its behalf.

The objection to the second edict on the part of the Donatists

respecting the restriction upon the number to be present at the

collation, led the Catholics to write a second letter to Marcellinus,

which is most likely also from the pen of Augustin. [Ep. cxxix.].

Solicitude over the opposition is expressed; some seem disposed to

present a hindrance to the peaceful progress of the Conference; and yet

the writers hope that the thought and suspicion may not prove true, but

that the desire of the whole body may after all be to press into the

unity of the Catholic Church. Then they go on, very wrongfully in such

a document, to discuss their favorite note of the universality of the

Church, as the body of Christ was not stolen, so neither are His

members outside of the few in Africa, dead. From Jerusalem outward was

to be its progress and thence it filled the whole world. The fact that

the Donatists have the very same Scriptures as the Catholics which

contain these proofs of universality, fills the complainants with grief

for them. The Jews who denied the resurrection rejected also the New

Testament; but the Donatists receive it, and yet they deny the note of

universality, and accuse the Catholics of being traditors of the sacred

books. Now at the collation probably they wish to be in full numbers,

in order to search completely the Scriptures; and through their

innumerable testimonies they long to come en masse, not to create a

tumult, but to put an end to the old discord. It is true that they

have found fault with our use of the State; and yet the Scriptures

vindicate such a recourse, and the Donatists themselves appealed to

Constantine. The Scriptures too show the mixed character of the

Church, wheat and chaff, good and bad fish, to the final harvest, the

winnowing, and the further shore. Perhaps they see the wrong of their

opposition to the Church. The case of the Maximianists has shown their

willingness to use the power of the State and to ignore rebaptism; and

probably moved by these things, they want to come in such large numbers

in the interest not of tumult but of peace. They desire to show that

they are not so few as their enemies report them to be. The Catholic

numbers exceed in proconsular Africa, and, except in Numidia, are more

numerous than in the rest of the African provinces; and most of all

when one comes to compare the whole world with the few Donatists. Why,

however, could not the number be just as well certified by the

subscription? Even though quiet be preserved, yet at such a Conference

the murmur of such a crowd will impede the progress of the work. If

they all are allowed to be present, the writers, nevertheless, will

limit themselves to the delegation suggested by the Judge, and then no

blame for disorder can attach to them. If, however, the protest has

been made in behalf of unity, they all will be present joyfully to

welcome the Donatists as brethren.

The Mandatum Catholicorum, a sort of voucher and letter of instruction

for the disputants on the side of the State Church, was undoubtedly the

product of Augustin's pen. After a preamble which attests the

sufficiency of the Church through her divine proofs against all

heretics and schismatics, and the desire of Church and State to settle

the long pending controversy in Africa, and the duty to enlighten men

as to the eternal salvation, which things had induced them to convene

and to select defenders, there follows the note of the universality,

which, as the great proposition, is expanded with many proof texts from

the Old and the New Testament. This truth is to be defended against

the Donatist assertion that the universal Church had perished through

contamination with C�cilian; for the Church is a mixed society of good

and evil, and not to be condemned on this account, but its unity is to

be preserved by toleration. If they maintain this view, the documents

concerning C�cilian's character must be examined. The contestants must

prove that the Church was thus defiled, or else the evil do not defile

the good in this unity. The mandate then gives Scriptural and also

post-apostolic proofs on this point, especially from Cyprian, and

quotes the Donatist action concerning the Maximianists. The next topic

is baptism as a sacrament of Christ and not of man, and as independent

of the character of the celebrant: the Maximian schism again affords

material for the confutation of this Donatistic tenet. They are

instructed also to use the archives to show that their opponents

initiated civil appellation.

In the session of the second day, Augustin is the speaker, mainly on

the matter of delay and adjournment.

In the third session, he appears as the chief disputant on the

doctrinal and historical points, and also as answering the letter of

the Donatists in reply to the mandate.

In a sermon preached after the close of the Conference, (Sermo ccclix.

on Ecclus. xxv. 2), he exhorted all Christians to be brethren; the

Catholics desire to have the Donatists unite with them in worship in

the universal Church. The history of C�cilian should not affect the

doctrine of the body. He claims a triumph indeed for his side and

rejoices over the many who are returning to the mother Church, but

candidly confesses that many harden themselves in their opposition.

His exordium appeals for a restoration of brotherly harmony.

A little later in the year, probably, Augustin preached from Gal. vi.

2-5 (Sermo clxiv.), in which he rebukes those who say: "We are saints,

we do not carry your burdens, therefore we do not communicate with

you;"and says: "your ancestors carry burdens of separation, burdens of

schism, burdens of heresy, burdens of dissension, burdens of animosity,

burdens of false proofs, burdens of calumnious accusations." In your

boast of non-participation in other's sins, you desert the flock, the

threshing-floor and the net. The traditors who had condemned the

absent C�cilian dissolved connection with the whole world. He reminds

them of the Maximianists; he charges them with breaking the parables,

and yet inculcates patience. The whole sermon indicates that the

effect of the conference had been to embitter both sides.

Another sermon (xcix.) on Luke vii. 36, 50, was also preached about

this time, in which he conceives that the Puristic noli me tangere may

develop into a system for sin-pardoning, and justification and

sanctification; the men of the Gesta Collationis are likely to bring

about such a machine religion. Already do they say: if men do not

remit sins, then what Christ says is false as to loosing on earth and

in heaven. With this conception of the tendency of their tenets he

further says against them, that the cleansing in baptism does not

depend on the man.

In a fragment of another sermon (ccclx.), preached on the vigils of

Maximian, he personates a Donatist, who has returned to the unity,

thanking the Lord that the lost is found, and expressing his joy in the

vine, the unity, the baptism and peace of Christ.

The authorized acts of the council of 411 were too unwieldy for either

general or popular use, and a compendium framed from them was too

obscure; so Augustin, about the close of 411, determined to make a

digest, called the Breviculus collationis cum Donatistis. It gives the

collations of the three days, but it is thoroughly disconnected without

the official account, for too many links known to the actors alone are

not apparent to the uninitiated; too much of what would throw light on

the animus of the parties in power is passed over, and a considerable

deal of the minor business necessary to the understanding of the spirit

of the debate does not appear. A reader would certainly get a still

more one-sided and intolerant idea of the Conference from the digest

than from the Gesta. The analysis of the order of business would

require a comparison with the Gesta Collationis, and that lies outside

of our present purpose. [Cp. Retractt. II. xxxix.].

The decision of the Conference again stirred up a counter movement by

the Circumcelliones, especially in Augustin's diocese, during which

some terrible outrages were perpetrated; the presbyter Restitutus was

killed; the presbyter Innocentius was clubbed and mutilated. A trial

was instituted by Marcellinus and the crimes confessed. Augustin

hastens to write to him [Ep. cxxxiii.], somewhere about the opening of

412 A.D., imploring that the punishment be not capital or retaliatory;

restraint and labor would be just. He commends the tribune-notary's

moderation in the examination, in that he did not resort to torture for

extorting evidence, but only to whipping. He commands him, as bishop,

not to proceed to extremity, which would be an injury to the Church, or

at least to the diocese of Hippo. Since the pronouncing of the

sentence presumably belonged to the proconsul, he had also indicted a

letter to him.

Apringius, the proconsul, was a brother of Marcellinus. To him

Augustin addressed a letter in the same interest, and at the same date.

[Ep. cxxxiv.] For the use of his newly gained authority, he was

accountable to God; he was also a Christian, so that Augustin felt a

greater confidence in petitioning and in warning, and begs that he may

regard his interference as a part of a bishop's zeal for the welfare of

the Church. He repeats the story of the arrest of the Circumcelliones

and Donatist clergy, the trial by Apringius's own brother, the

tribune-notary, Marcellinus, and the gentleness of the hearing, in

which the accused confessed their crime, especially as to the

copresbyters. He now begs for a mild punishment; in the one case it

cannot be strictly retaliatory; in that of the homicide he fears it may

be capital punishment. Apringius must not only consider the State, but

the Church, and respect her clemency. He is not only a ruler of

exalted power but a son of Christian piety. Our enemies boast of

persecution; we must give them no occasion for it. These acts should

be read for the cure of the minds which have been perverted. If the

extreme penalty has to fall, spare at least the children. He implores

him to imitate the patience and mildness of the Church and of Christ.

Augustin, in 412, writes to Marcellinus [Ep. cxxxix.] expressing his

delight that the proceedings connected with the trial are in

preparation, and for the intention of having them read in the churches

of the city, and, if possible, in all the churches of his diocese. The

crimes mentioned are the same as before, with added confessions of many

who were in some degree abettors. These are the men who refuse to

commune with the Catholic Church for fear of pollution from wicked men,

and yet refuse to leave a schism debased by such a fellowship. It was

a question in Marcellinus's mind whether the Gesta should be read in

the Donatist church of Theoprepia in Carthage. Augustin urges it, and

if it be too small then in some other quarter, in that region of the

city. Augustin pleads for a mild punishment in imitation of the

clemency of the Church; however weak it may seem at the outset, men

will afterward regard it with favor, and the reading of the Gesta will

be more welcome and more effective by the contrast between Donatist

cruelty and Catholic moderation. He speaks of the commission of the

bishop Bonifacius and the bearer Peregrinus, who were empowered to

treat upon some new measures for the benefit of the Church. The

Donatist Bishop Macrobius was busy reopening the churches of his sect,

followed by a band of both sexes. In the absence of Celer, a Donatist,

his procurator, Spondeus, a Catholic, had broken their audacity. He is

commended to the favorable notice of Marcellinus. While Spondeus was

on a visit to Carthage, Macrobius had actually reopened the Donatist

churches on the estates of Celer. He was assisted by Donatus, a

rebaptized deacon and a leader in the slaughter; from which fact other

outrages might be expected. Should the plea for mildness not be

granted, Augustin asks that his letters urging clemency [Epp. cxxxiii.

and cxxxiv.] be read along with the Gesta. At least let a remission be

granted to give time for an appeal to the Emperors, for no martyrs

desire their blood to be avenged by death. In apologizing for his

inability to complete his work on the baptism of infants, he urges the

variety of his labors; among other things he had completed the

Breviculus Collationis, as a compend for those who had not the leisure

to read the entire proceedings of the Conference; also a letter

addressed to the Donatist laity.

The Donatists were charged with circulating the story of the bribery of

the cognitor or judge of the Conference. The letter from the council

of Zerta, June 14, 412, in refutation of this was written by Augustin,

[Ep. cxli.] in which it is said that they had become acquainted with

this rumor so easily credited by the common people. The vote of the

council was to authorize a refutation of it as a falsehood. The

Donatists had been convicted of mendacity in the charge which they had

made and signed against the Catholics as traditors; they had also

invented stories to account for the signature of an absent bishop. How

can they be believed in such a charge against the cognitor? Since the

acts of the Collation are so voluminous we present herewith a digest.

The meeting, the election of disputants and scribes, the matter of the

subscriptions, are then recapitulated. In the attempt at discussion,

the whole aim of the Donatist disputants was to avoid coming to the

point to be debated, while the Catholic representatives exerted

themselves to reach just that goal and nothing else. When at last the

Donatists were forced to the issue, they were vanquished by the clear

testimony of the Scriptures to the universality of the Church. Any one

separated from this unity has not life; the wrath of God abides upon

him. The communion with the wicked does not defile any one by the mere

participation in the sacraments, but only by agreement with their

deeds. All these truths they had to acknowledge. The Catholics had

prevented a confusion between the doctrinal and historical sides of the

question. In the discussion of the documents, the chief offset to all

the points was found in the case of the Maximianists, although the

Donatists plead that a case should not be prejudged by a case, nor a

person by a person. All the accusations which had been concentrated

against C�cilian they were unable to meet with proofs. Defeated men

are wont to suggest such a defense as the corruption of the judge.

Then says the paper in effect: If you will believe us, let us hold

fast to the unity which God commands and loves. But if you are

unwilling to believe us, read the proceedings themselves, or allow them

to be read to you, and do you yourselves test whether what we have

written to you be true. If you decline all these, and will still

cleave to the Donatists, we are clear from your judgment. If you will

renounce the schism, we will welcome you to the peace of Christ, and

you will have the profit of that sacrament which was administered among

you to judgment.

The Donatist presbyters Saturninus and Eufrates had joined the Catholic

Church and maintained their rank. Augustin writes [Ep. cxlii.], c. 412

A.D., to express his joy at their arrival and bids them not to grieve

at his absence, for they are now in the one Church whose note of

universality he expands as the one Body of the one Head, and as the one

house in all the earth; in the unity of this house we rejoice as

embracive of those transmarine churches, to whom the appeal had vainly

been made by the Donatists. He who lives evilly in this Church eats

and drinks condemnation to himself, but whoever lives correctly,

another case and another person cannot prejudge him. The Donatists had

protested against the parallel proofs drawn from the Maximianists, on

the ground that a case should not be prejudged by a case nor a person

by a person. On the Lord's threshing-floor the chaff must be

tolerated. He exhorts them to a faithful discharge of their clerical

duties, especially in mercifulness and also in prayer for the removal

of the schism.

The hostility of the Donatists was increased by the Collation. Their

clergy charged the judge with bribery, and protested against the

unfairness of the trial, the compulsion of the meeting, the unjust

decision. Augustin felt compelled to write, c. 412 A.D., to the people

in order to stay the fury of their leaders. The treatise is known as

Ad Donatistas post Collationem. Why make such a charge? Why does

Primian say, it is unworthy for the sons of the martyrs to meet in the

same place with the offspring of traditors? Why did they come? Why

were they unable to prove the old accusations? And how are they the

sons of martyrs? The universality of the Church was demonstrated at

the Conference. Donatists do not commune with the churches addressed

in those epistles which they read at their services, because they say

these perished by communion with the African C�cilians, and yet they

put in the plea that a case should not be prejudged by a case nor a

person by a person. He meets the C�cilian charge by the Maximianists

in spite of this caveat. He represents all the New Testament churches

and the East as expostulating on the basis of this very plea with the

Donatists for separation from them. So the case and the person of the

bad does not prejudice the case and the person of the good; they must

abide together until the end. He condemns their arrogant pretense to

holiness. The wicked must be tolerated in the Church, but their deeds

are not to be participated in. Cyprian would not destroy the unity

because bad people were in it; frequent are the examples of such

forbearance in the Scriptures, and the principle was not changed after

the resurrection of Christ; it continued in force in the New Testament

Church; the winnowing and severance come at the end of the world. They

would perhaps deny their own words as uttered in the Conference were

they not written; that was the beauty of requiring subscription. They

charge too that the sentence against them was pronounced in the night.

Augustin playfully speaks of many good things which have been said and

done in the night. He subsequently reminds them of the days in which

they tried to prove the origin of heresy, and their defeat at every

point of the C�cilian history. It appears here again that the

Donatists had a considerable body of acts of their own. The plea of

persecution as a note of the Church and as an experience of the

Donatists was one of the points urged at the conference in the Donatist

reply to the Catholic mandate, and by Primian, to which we have the

usual answer. Another complaint of the Donatists was that they were

tried by those who had been condemned by themselves, and were compelled

to unite with sinners; to which Augustin gives a little Maximianist

parallel and then considers the questions of purism, the paucity of

believers, the need of discipline, the fellowship of a mixed community

which ought not to degenerate into a participation in the deeds of the

wicked therein. These are discussed with considerable detail of

quotations from the Old and New Testaments. Some who thought C�cilian

guilty would not break the unity; they imitated Cyprian. He charges

their clergy with duplicity. He reminds them of the deception

practiced in presenting the signature of a Donatist, who was already

dead; so with regard to the show of numbers in attendance and the

alleged multitude absent, and also the means adopted for securing

delay, the interruptions and turnings of the debate from the true

object in view. He vindicates the cognitor's method and rulings. He

then renews the discussion concerning the archival origin of the

schism. In conclusion he addresses them as brethren and exhorts them

to love peace and unity.

The Donatists of Cirta, clergy and people, had returned to the Catholic

Church and had written a letter of thanks to Augustin for his

preaching, under which they had been persuaded to renounce the schism.

Augustin in reply [Ep. cxliv.], probably at end of 412 A.D., says that

this is not man's work, but God's. Their allusion to the conversion of

the drunken and luxurious Polemo by Xenocrates, draws from him the

reflection, that such a change of character, though not a Christian

repentance, is, nevertheless, a work of God. So he bids them not to

give thanks to himself but to God, for their return to the unity.

Those who still are alienated, whether from love or fear, he charges to

remember the undeceived scrutiny of God; to weigh Scripture testimony

as to the universality of the Church; and the documents as to the

origin of the schism. The case has been tried or not been tried by the

transmarine churches; if not, then there is no existing ground for the

separation; if it has, the defeated ones are the separatists. But

alas! the obstacles to their persuasion are well-nigh insuperable. He

hopes that the mutual desire for his visit to them may be fulfilled.

About the beginning of the year 413, appeared the book De Fide et

Operibus. In Chap. iv. 6, he speaks of the need of coercion against

the Donatists as disturbers of the peace of the Church, as separaters

of the tares from the wheat before the time, as those who have blindly

preferred to cut themselves off from the unity; commixture of evil and

good is a necessity, and we ought to remain in that fellowship which is

not at all destitute of discipline. [Cp. Retractt. II. xxxviii.]

Donatus, a Donatist presbyter, and another person connected with that

body, had been arrested by order of Augustin about the beginning of 416

A.D. Mounted upon a beast against his will, he dashed himself to the

ground and so received injuries which his less obstinate companion

escaped. Augustin writes [Ep. clxxiii.] to vindicate himself as

concerned about the salvation of the recusants, and puts the blame of

the wounds upon the offender. Donatus urged in opposition to this

style of conversion that no one should be compelled to be good.

Augustin claims on the other hand that many are compelled to take the

good office of a bishop against their will. Donatus argues that God

had given us free will, therefore a man should not be compelled even to

be good. Augustin replies that the effort of a good will is to

restrain and change the evil will, because of the awful results which

follow a vitiated will. Why were the Israelites compelled to go to the

land of promise? Why was Paul forced to turn from persecution to the

embrace of the truth? Why do parents correct children? Why are

negligent shepherds blamed? You are an errant sheep, with the Lord's

mark upon you, and I as shepherd must save you from perishing. Of your

own will you threw yourself into a well, but it would have been wicked

to leave you there where you had cast yourself according to your will,

and hence the attendants took you out; how much more is it a duty to

save you from eternal death. Besides, it is unlawful to inflict death

upon yourself. He reminds him that the Scriptures do not allow

suicide; and controverts his use of I. Cor. xiii. 3, "though I give my

body to be burned." Severed from charity and unity, nothing can

profit, not even the surrender of the body to burning. The points of

the recent joint Conference are then dwelt upon. Donatus was

understood to have criticized the saying of his party as to the

Maximianist parallel: do not prejudge a case by a case or a person by

a person. Augustin twits him in this wise: If you object to this,

then you are deceived concerning it, because you oppose your authority

to theirs, and if you say it is not true, the hope of vindicating the

great schism falls through entirely. He presses him to weigh all the

proceedings. But Donatus objects also that the Lord did not cause the

seventy to come back, and did not put a barrier in the way of the

twelve when he asked, "Will ye also go away?" Augustin says that was

in the beginning of Christianity; kings were not yet converted; now the

State helps the Church. Our Lord said prophetically, Compel them to

come in. So we hunt you in the hedges; the unwilling sheep is brought

to the true pasture.

The series of Tractatus on the Gospel of John, which are ascribed to

416 A.D., contain many reflections on Donatism. We can only notice the

passages:

Tractatus IV. in Jo. i. 19-33.

Tractatus V. in Jo. i. 33.

Tractatus VI. in Jo. i. 32, 33. Quite fully.

Tractatus IX. in Jo. ii. 1-11.

Tractatus X. in Jo. ii. 12-21.

Tractatus XI. in Jo. ii. 23-25, and iii. 1-5.

Tractatus XII. in Jo. iii. 6-21.

Tractatus XIII. in Jo. iii. 22-29.

To the same year are ascribed the Tractatus on the I. Ep. of John.

Tractatus I. 1 Jo. i. and ii. 1-11.

Tractatus II. 1 Jo. ii. 12-17.

Tractatus III. 1 Jo. ii. 18-27.

Tractatus IV. 1 Jo. iii. 1-8.

In the Retractations, II. xlvi., we read of a book addressed to

Emeritus, the Donatist bishop of C�sarea, in the province of Mauritania

C�sariensis. [See Ep. lxxxvii.] He speaks of him as the best of the

seven Donatist disputants at the Conference. The work marked briefly

the lines on which the Donatists were defeated. Its title is: Ad

Emeritum Donatistarum Episcopum, post collationem, liber unus. Since

the Retractations place it before De Gestis Pelagii, and De Correctione

Donatistarum, it was most likely written in the beginning of 417 A.D.

Boniface had requested from Augustin a letter of instructions on the

relation of the Donatists to the Arians. The bishop replies, c. 417

[Ep. clxxxv.], which he himself calls a book de Correctione

Donatistarum. [Cp. Retractt. II. xlviii.]. Since this is translated

in the present volume, we will omit any further notice.

The above-mentioned Emeritus was present at a Synod of the Catholics,

near Deuterius, September 20, 418. At a service held two days after,

Augustin preached the Sermo ad C�sariensis Ecclesi� plebem. Emeritus

was present. In the church during a previous colloquy with Augustin he

had said: I cannot will what you will, but I can will what I will.

Augustin in this sermon (and the writing has all the abruptness and

repetition of an extempore address) urges him to will what God wills,

viz., peace, and that now, in response to the cry of the people; and if

you ask why I, who call you schismatics and heretics, desire to receive

you, it is because you are brethren; because you have the baptism of

Christ; because I want you to have salvation: one can have everything

outside the Church except salvation; he can have honor, he can have the

sacraments, he can sing Allelulia, he can respond Amen, he can hold to

the gospels, he can have faith in the name of the Father and the Son

and the Holy Spirit, and can preach. Persecution after all is rather

of you. The failure of the archival evidence as to C�cilian is alleged

as usual, and hence no reason for separation exists. He recites too

the story of the seizure, escape, reseizure, compulsory baptism and

ordination of Petilian, while at the time a Catholic catechumen. This

occurred at Constantina, when that city and region were largely

Donatist. He was seized unto death, do we not draw him to salvation?

Here or nowhere, says Augustin, repeating the voice of the people, is

the place for peace.

There was a gathering of clergy (the bishops Alypius, Augustinus,

Possidius, Rusticus Palladius, etc., many presbyters and deacons and a

considerable number of people) in the exedra of the larger church at

C�sarea, c. 418 A.D. Emeritus, the Donatist bishop of the city, was

also present. Augustin addresses those devoted to the unity, and says

that when he came to the city on the day before yesterday he found

Emeritus returned from a journey. Augustin met him in the street and

invited him to the Church, and Emeritus consented without any demur.

The sermon of Augustin is full of the peace, love and related themes of

the Church, in hope of winning Emeritus. He alludes to the many

conversions in the city and since the collation; if Emeritus has

anything new to say in defense of his side, he invites him to state

it. Emeritus had been reported as affirming that at the Conference the

Donatists were overcome by power rather than by truth. Augustin then

addresses inquiries to Emeritus directly: as to why he had come if he

was defeated at the council; or if he thought his party had triumphed,

then to state the ground for such an opinion. Emeritus said: The acts

show whether I am defeated or not, whether I am defeated by truth or

oppressed by power. Augustin: Then why do you come? Emeritus: That

I might say this very thing which you ask, and so on. Under some

taunting and arrogant observations to the brethren, Emeritus keeps

quiet. From Augustin's statement it appears that the Acts were read

during Lent, at Thagaste, Constantina, Hippo, and all the faithful

churches. Part of these Gesta are then read by Alypius, viz, the

imperial convocation of the Conference, and comments are made by

Augustin. Then follows his application of the lessons afforded by the

Maximianist schism, in which he says the Donatists make shipwreck of

all their tenets. Emeritus, however, remained a silent hearer. The

account of the above meeting is given in the treatise: De Gestis cum

Emerito, C�sariensi Donatistarum Episcopo liber unus. [Cp. Retractt.

II. li.]

The book de Patientia is assigned to 418 A.D. In Chapter xiii. he

contrasts genuine and false martyrdom.

Dulcitius had been appointed Tribune-notary. The effect of his

carrying out of the renewed edicts against the Donatists was signalized

by many conversions, but also by many suicides. He had written to

Augustin requesting directions about how he ought to proceed against

the heretics. Augustin replies [Ep. cciv.], c. 420 A.D., that his work

had indeed persuaded many to return to their salvation, but others were

stirred either to kill the Catholics or themselves. We indeed do

desire the return of all to unity, yet some are doubtless predestinated

to perish by an occult yet just decree of God. They perish not only in

their own fires but in that of Gehenna. The Church grieves over them

as David over his son, although they have met the deserved punishment

of rebels. Augustin does not find fault with the notary's edict at

Thamugada, only with the phrase: You may know that you are to be given

over to the death which you deserve; for that is not contained in the

rescripts. In the second edict there is a clearer statement of the

notary's aim. Augustin also criticizes his courtesy toward Gaudentius,

the Donatist bishop of Thamugada. As to a special reply to that bishop

Augustin urges a more diligent refutation of the fallacious doctrines

by which the Donatists are accustomed to be seduced. He had already

done this in very many works, but adds some points by way of

suggestion. He alone is a martyr who dies for a true cause. Man's

will is free, but nevertheless amenable to divine and human laws. The

State can punish not only adulteries and homicides, but also

sacrileges. Many think it strange that we do not rebaptize, but the

sacrament once given ought not to be repeated. Suicides are utterly

prohibited by the Scriptures. The case of Razius gives the Donatist no

pretext, for the deed is simply mentioned but not commended. (II. Mac.

xiv. 37-46). In conclusion he intimates that in answer to the united

wish of the people of Thamugada, of himself and of Eleusinus, the

tribune of that place, that Augustin should answer both epistles of

Gaudentius, the Donatist bishop, and especially the latter of the two,

which contained Scriptural proofs, he will write such a criticism.

Dulcitius had written a pacific letter to Gaudentius, the Donatist

bishop of Thamugada, one of the quieter members of the seven Donatist

disputants, concerning the enforcement of the imperial edicts.

Gaudentius replied in two epistles, one short, the other longer and

fortified by Scripture proofs. Augustin was requested to answer these,

which he does (c. 420) in the work Contra Gaudentium Donatistarum

Episcopum, Libra duo. In Book I. he makes a change of form from the

Petilian cast of personal dialogue, because of the captious fault found

with that way as savoring of untruth, and takes a duller formula,

"Verba Epistol�" and "ad h�c responsio," whose dryness and literality

the most sensitive Donatist could take no exception to. In the first

epistle of Gaudentius, the fairly courteous strain in which he had

replied to the tribune-notary, with titles and recognition of

character, Augustin rather resents by saying that the Catholic had

treated the heretic too kindly and incautiously, and bids Gaudentius

consider what he had said at the Collation. Gaudentius proposes to

remain in the communion where the name of God and of his Christ is and

where the Sacraments are, and pleads for religious liberty against

compulsion as to matters of faith; and concludes, by another hand, with

wishing him well and desiring his recession from the disquieting of

Christians. Augustin objects that Gaudentius had not reproduced the

language of Dulcitius correctly, and accuses the Donatists of holding

the truth of baptism in the iniquity of human error; he comments on

their false eagerness for death; he responds to all the good wishes for

the tribune, but not that he should cease from correcting the heretics.

The second epistle of Gaudentius is mainly a protest from Scriptural

grounds; against persecution he brings forward the case of Gabinus,

who, if bad, should not have been received without correction, that is,

baptism; but if innocent, why kill the innocent Donatists from whom he

came to you? The false rumor about Emeritus, as having turned

Catholic, is another instance of this persecution. The duty of a

persecuted pastor is to be a doer of the law and to lay down his life

for the sheep; there is no place whither the persecuted may now flee;

the divine right of free will is restrained by the arbitrary laws of

the emperor; persecution is a note of the Church from the blessings

attached to it by Christ and the apostles. The peace of Christ invites

the willing but does not compel the unwilling; a thing very different

from the war-bearing peace and the bloody unity which their oppressors

present. We rejoice in the hatred of the world; there is a martyr host

of the apocalypse; Christians may yield up their souls in testimony

against sacrilege, as Razius did. He begs Dulcitius to turn to the few

who have the solidity and not the semblance of truth. God gave

prophets not kings to teach the people: the Saviour sent fishermen not

soldiers. God never needs the aid of soldiers. Gaudentius charges the

Catholics with coveting the Donatist possessions. The farewell is in

another handwriting, in which he wishes Dulcitius well, and advises him

to pursue a lenient and temperate course.

The points of Augustin's reply are in no way different save form from

those so constantly presented, unless there be an increase of roughness

and a more hardened idea of the Church's right to use coercion. As to

Gabinus, the Church's course with regard to him is a vindication of the

right to receive a convert without rebaptism: in communion with

charity and unity he received the profit of that rite which had been

administered among the Donatists. In the case of Emeritus, Augustin

confesses that the rumor of his having turned Catholic was false; but

Emeritus came to C�sarea of his own will; he came to the Church where a

multitude was present; he could say nothing for his or his party's

defense; he kept quiet. The argument against suicide from the case of

Razius is well made; he died rather in suffering for the state; and

besides the narrative does not commend the deed, but only states it;

then too the books have not the weight that the Law, the Prophets and

the Psalms carry with them. The plea for correction is precisely as

usual. The doctrines of universality and unity and charity are

incidentally brought forward. Circumcelliones, Secundus and

Maximianists furnish the concluding parallels.

Book II. Gaudentius had written a reply to Augustin's first book. He

had taken refuge under the example of Cyprian; but Augustin now refers

him to the writings of Cyprian on De Simplicitate Pr�latorum seu De

Catholic� Ecclesi� unitate, showing Cyprian's belief in the

universality of the Church which Augustin expands by the explanation of

the term Catholic. Purgation of the Church is not by separation, but

by toleration, as Cyprian too held in his letter to Maximus and

others. The explanation of the field not as the Church, but rather as

the world outside of the Church, had been supported at the Conference

and is repeated by Gaudentius; and also its alternative, that were the

field the Church then it must have perished from the tares which were

in it. If so, says Augustin, then the ancestors of the Donatists would

have perished. The period of separation is at the end, when the Gospel

shall have been preached in the whole world. As to their theme of

rebaptism, Augustin replies that he had already before referred him to

his Maximianist practice, so that the action of Agrippinus and Cyprian

are vain for him. And then too, according to Cyprian's own confession,

and Stephen's testimony, there were crimes in the Church in their day;

did the Church perish then? If so where was Donatus born? If not,

then why did the party of Donatus separate? They are guilty of the

very schism which Cyprian particularly deprecated as a cure, instead of

toleration and discipline, for the ills of the Church. As to baptism:

The Catholics recognize the Donatist rite, for the sacrament cannot be

lost upon those who receive it among Catholics and then pass over to

heretics; they have the truth but in iniquity; the truth is not the

property of the Donatists. The apostle recognized such truth as he

found among the Gentiles. Gaudentius had vindicated his reference to

the tribune's letter, as to the Donatists having the names of God and

of his Christ, and quoted the passage in proof. Augustin acknowledges

his mistake, which, however, was not intentional, and he apologizes for

the tribune's error as that of a military man who was not familiar with

theology. Since Gaudentius had called the tribune religious in his

first letter, Augustin accuses him of insincerity and berates him as

superstitious. He also corrects Gaudentius for saying that God sent

Jonah not to the king but only to the people of Nineveh, for the king

compelled the humiliation of his subjects. In conclusion he quotes

from Cyprian's letter to Maximus in behalf of universality and tolerant

unity. His exordium is an earnest appeal to the Catholics to maintain

all the notes of the Church. [Cp. Retractt. II. lix.].

Felicia had been a Donatist originally and was converted by force. She

had devoted herself to the virgin life and apparently had become head

of a religious house; but by reason of some wicked deeds of the clergy,

possibly the extortion and rapacity of Antonius at Fussala, she was

much disturbed and seemed inclined to relapse into her earlier puristic

notions, if not to return to the body that upheld them. To quiet her

doubts Augustin writes Ep. ccviii. c. 423. The Lord had predicted

offenses. There are two kinds of shepherds over the flock, and will be

to the end: the flock too has the good and the bad in it. The

gathering is the present duty, the separation will be the future one;

this latter is the Lord's prerogative. To abide in unity under such

circumstances is a duty until the winnowing, and one is to believe what

these shepherds teach, not what they do. Good and bad are therefore in

the world under the widely diffused Catholic Church; the Donatist has

no such note of universality. Love Christ and the Church, and then He

will not permit you to lose the fruit of your virginity and to perish

with the lost. If you go out of this life, separated from the unity of

the body of Christ, this preserved integrity of the body will not

profit you. You were compelled to come in; be thankful to those who

compelled you. Show your devotion to the Lord, as your only hope, by

being unmoved with these offenses, and by cleaving to his body, the

Church.

A letter addressed to Pope Coelestine is ascribed to Augustin [Ep.

ccix. c. 423]; its authenticity has been disputed. The author, in

giving an account of the appointment of Antonius as bishop of Fussala,

remarks that at Fussala, a castellum about forty miles distant from

Hippo, as in all the adjoining region, there had been a Donatist

population; in Fussala itself there had not been a solitary Catholic;

the Punic was the common language. The coercive measures had converted

the whole territory, but the process had also aroused a violent

opposition in the form of robbery, beating, blinding, murder. After

its conversion, the distance from Hippo and the great numbers to be

instructed, required a new bishopric, the history of which and the

troubles growing out of it, the author further relates.

In that valuable book De doctrina christiana, (begun in 397, but ended

in 426, including the part having reference to our subject III. xxx.

42), Augustin quotes approvingly from the book of Tychonius the De

septem regulis, and prefaces a discussion of these rules by an allusion

to the treatise of Tychonius, which had refuted some of the narrow and

puristic doctrines of the Church, as held by his own party; this we

have already seen was answered by Parmenian, whose letter in turn was

dissected by Augustin. The first, second, fourth and seventh of these

rules bear especially upon the doctrinal points under discussion. [Cp.

Retractt. II. iv. and Tychonius de Septem Regulis is reprinted in

Migne. Pat. Lat. xviii.]

In his de Hoeresibus [c. 428 A.D.] Chapter lxix. gives a brief account

of the Donatiani or Donatist�: (a) as to origin and progress; (b)

Donatus's view of the Trinity; (c) the Montenses at Rome; (d) the

Circumcelliones; (e) the schism of Maximian.

This was his parting arrow after the thirty-six years of battle.

Catholics and Donatists passed under the persecutions of the Arian

Vandals. Two years after this treatise Augustin laid aside his weapons

to enter the land of eternal peace and unity.

More or less extended allusions are made to Donatism in the following

sermons, arranged in the order of the Benedictine editions; for the

years in which they were delivered cannot be determined. Want of space

prevents the presentation of any analysis.

Sermo X. 1 Kings iii. 16-28.

Sermo XLV. Is. lvii. 13 and 2 Cor. vii. 1.

Sermo XLVI. Ez. xxxiv. 1-16.

Sermo XLVII. Ez. xxxiv. 17-31.

Sermo LXXI. Matt. xii. 32.

Sermo LXXXVIII. Matt. xx. 30-34.

Sermo XC. Matt. xxii. 1-14.

Sermo CVII. Luc. xii. 13-21.

Sermo CXXIX. Jo. v. 39-47.

Sermo CXXXVII. Jo. x. 1-16.

Sermo CXXXVIII. Jo. x. 11-16.

Sermo CLXXXIII. 1 Jo. iv. 2.

Sermo CCXVIII. Luc. xxiv. 38-47.

Sermo CCXLIX. Jo. xxi. 1-14.

Sermo CCLII. Jo. xxi. 1-14.

Sermo CCLXV. The Ascension.

Sermo CCLXVI. Ps. cxli. (cxl.) 5.

Sermo CCLXVIII. Pentecost.

Sermo CCLXIX. Pentecost.

Sermo CCLXXXV. Anniversary of the martyrs Castus and �milus.

Sermo CCXCII. John the Baptist.

Sermo CCCXXV. Anniversary of the Twenty Martyrs.

Similar references are to be found in the expositions and sermons based

on the Psalms. The first column is the Hebrew and English order; the

second that of LXX. and Vulgate.

Exposition of Psalms XI. (X.)

Exposition of Psalms XXVI. (XXV.) Sermon.

Exposition of Psalms XXXI. (XXX.) Sermons I. and II.

Exposition of Psalms XXXIII. (XXXII.) Sermon II.

Exposition of Psalms XXXIV. (XXXIII.) Sermon II.

Exposition of Psalms XXXVI. (XXXV.) Sermon.

Exposition of Psalms XXXVII. (XXXVI.) Sermons II. (archival) and III.

Exposition of Psalms XL. (XXXIX.) Sermon.

Exposition of Psalms LV. (LIV.) Sermon.

Exposition of Psalms LVIII. (LVII.) Sermon.

Exposition of Psalms LXXXVI. (LXXXV.) Sermon.

Exposition of Psalms XCIX. (XCVIII.) Sermon.

Exposition of Psalms CXX. (CXIX.) Sermon.

Exposition of Psalms CXXV. (CXXIV.) Sermon.

Exposition of Psalms CXXXIII. (CXXXII.) Sermon.

Exposition of Psalms CXLVI. (CXLV.) Sermon.

Exposition of Psalms CXLVII. 12-20 (CXLVII.) Sermon.

Exposition of Psalms CXLIX. Sermon.

The time of writing the de Utilitate Jejunii is unknown. Chapter V. 9,

contrasts pagan, heretical and Catholic fasts; heretics claim indeed to

fast in order to please God; how can they, when they sever the unity?

All heretics perish; they are the dividers of the inheritance of

Christ.

------------------------

In conclusion the reviser desires to commend the fidelity and lucidity

of the translation made by the Rev. J. R. King, M.A.

No changes made by the reviser have been indicated, since all could not

be without confusion. The translation had taken most of its notes and

references from the Benedictines. The citations of Cyprian are

according to the numerals in Hartel's edition.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Preface

------------------------

The schism of the Donatists, with which the treatises in the present

volume are concerned, arose indirectly out of the persecution under

Diocletian at the beginning of the fourth century. At that time

Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, and his archdeacon C�cilianus, had

endeavored to check the fanatical spirit in which many of the

Christians courted martyrdom; and consequently, on the death of

Mensurius in 311, and the elevation of C�cilianus to the see of

Carthage in his place, the opposing party, alleging that Felix, bishop

of Aptunga, by whom C�cilianus had been consecrated, had been a

traditor, and that therefore his consecration was invalid, set up

against him Majorinus, who was succeeded in 315 by Donatus. The party

had by this time gained strength, through the professions that they

made of extreme purity in the discipline which they maintained, and had

gone so far, under the advice of another Donatus, bishop of Cas� Nigr�

in Numidia, as to accuse C�cilianus before the Roman Emperor

Constantine,--thus setting the first precedent for referring a

spiritual cause to the decision of a civil magistrate. Constantine

accepted the appeal, and in 313 the matter was laid for decision before

Melchiades, bishop of Rome, and three bishops of the province of Gaul.

They decided in favor of the validity of the consecration of

C�cilianus; and a similar verdict was given by a council held at Arles,

by direction of the Emperor, in the following year. The party of

Majorinus then appealed to the personal judgment of the Emperor, which

was likewise given against them, not without strong expressions of his

anger at their pertinacity. This was followed by severe laws directed

against their schism; but so far from crushing them, the attack seemed

only to increase their enthusiasm and develope their resources. And,

under the leadership of Donatus, the successor of Majorinus, their

influence spread widely throughout Africa, and continued to prevail, in

spite of various efforts at their forcible suppression, during the

whole of the fourth century. They especially brought on themselves the

vengeance of the civil powers, by the turbulence of certain fanatical

ascetics who embraced their cause, and who, under the name of

Circumcelliones, spread terror through the country, seeking martydom

for themselves, and offering violence to every one who opposed them.

Towards the close of the century, this schism attracted the attention

of Augustin, then a priest of Hippo Regius in Numidia. The controversy

seems to have had for him a special attraction, not merely because of

its intrinsic importance, but also because of the field which it

presented for his unrivalled powers as a dialectician. These the

Donatists had recently provoked, by inconsistently receiving back into

their body a deacon of Carthage named Maximianus who had separated

himself from them, and by recognizing as valid all baptism administered

by his followers. Hence they naturally shrank from engaging in a

contest with an antagonist who was sure to make the most of such a

deviation from the very principles on which they based their schism;

and, on the other hand, Augustin was so firmly convinced that his own

position was impregnable, that he seems to have thought that if he

could only secure a thorough and dispassionate discussion of the

matter, the Donatists must necessarily be brought to acknowledge not

only their theoretical errors, but also the practical sinfulness of

their separation from the Church. Throughout the controversy, however,

he appears to have put out of sight two considerations: first, the

influence of party spirit and prejudice in blinding men to argument;

and, secondly, the necessity of treating his opponents in a logical

discussion as on an equal footing with himself. The first was in some

degree an unavoidable element of disappointment; but Augustin made

concession yet more difficult on the part of his opponents, by

expecting them to acknowledge his superior position as a member of the

Catholic Church, whose duty it was to expose the error of their views.

He practically begs the very point at issue, by assuming that he, and

not the Donatists, was in the Catholic communion; and though his

argument is conducted independently of this premise, yet it naturally

rendered them more unwilling to admit its force.

This dogmatism was of less consequence in the first pamphlet which

Augustin published on the subject,--his Alphabetical Psalm, in which he

set forth the history and errors of the Donatists in a popular

form,--since it was not intended as a controversial treatise, but only

as a means of enlightening the less educated as to the Catholic tenets

on the question in dispute. His next work, written in answer to a

letter of Donatus of Carthage, in which the latter tried to prove that

the baptism of Christ existed only in his communion, is unfortunately

lost; and we can only gather hints as to the further part which he took

in the controversy during the next few years from certain of his

letters, especially those to the Donatist Bishops Honoratus and

Crispinus. [1142] From the former he claims the admission that the

exclusiveness of the Donatists proves that they are not the Church of

Christ; and his letter to the latter contains an invitation to discuss

the leading points at issue, which Crispinus seems to have declined.

In the year 400 he wrote two books Against the Party of Donatus, which

are also lost; and about the same time he published his refutation of

the letter of Parmenianus in answer to Tichonius, in which he handles

and solves the famous question, whether, while abiding in unity in the

communion of the same sacraments, the wicked pollute the good by their

society. [1143]

Then followed his seven books On Baptism, included in this volume, in

which he shows the emptiness of the arguments of the Donatists for the

repetition of baptism; and proves that so far was Cyprian from being on

their side, that his letters and conduct are of the highest value as

overthrowing their position, and utterly condemning their separation

from the Church.

Not long after this, Petilianus, bishop of Cirta or Constantina, the

most eminent theologian among the Donatist divines, wrote a letter to

his clergy against the Catholics, of which Augustin managed to obtain a

copy, though the Donatists used their utmost care to keep it from him;

and he replied to it in two books, written at different times,--the

first in the year 400, before he was in possession of the whole letter,

the remainder in 402. To the first book Petilianus made an answer, of

which we gather the main tenor from a third book written by Augustin in

reply to it. It appears to have been full of vehement abuse, and to

have assumed the question in dispute, that the existence of the true

Church, and the catholicity of any branch of it, depended on the purity

and orthodoxy of all its ministers; so that the guilt or heresy of any

minister would invalidate the whole of his ministerial acts. Hence he

argued that C�cilianus being the spiritual father of the so-called

Catholics, and having been a traditor, none of them could possibly have

been lawfully baptized, much less rightfully ordained.

Augustin admits neither of his assumptions; but, leaving the guilt or

innocence of C�cilianus as a point which was irrelevant (though

practically the case against him utterly broke down), he addresses

himself to the other point, and argues most conclusively that all the

functions of the clergy in celebrating the rites of the Church being

purely ministerial, the efficacy of those rites could in no way depend

upon the excellence of the individual minister, but was derived

entirely from Christ. Hence there was a certainty of the grace

bestowed through the several ordinances, which otherwise there could

not possibly have been, had their virtue depended on the character of

any man, in whom even an unblemished reputation might have been the

fruit of a skilled hypocrisy.

The third treatise in this volume belongs to a later period, being a

letter written to Bonifacius, the Roman Count of Africa under

Valentinian the Third. He had written to Augustin to consult him as to

the best means of dealing with the Donatists; and Augustin in his reply

points out to him his mistake in supposing that the Donatists shared in

the errors of the Arians, whilst he urges him to use moderation in his

coercive measures; though both here and in his answer to Petilianus we

find him countenancing the theory that the State has a right to

interfere in constraining men to keep within the Church. Starting with

a forced interpretation of the words, "Compel them to come in," in Luke

xiv. 23, he enunciates principles of coercion which, though in him they

were subdued and rendered practically of little moment by the spirit of

love which formed so large an element in his character, yet found their

natural development in the despotic intolerance of the Papacy, and the

horrors of the Inquisition. It is probable that he was himself in some

degree misled by confounding the necessity of repressing the violence

of the Circumcelliones, which was a real offense against the State,

with the expediency of enforcing spiritual unity by temporal authority.

The Donatist treatises have met with little attention from individual

editors. There is a dissertation, De Aur. Augustino adversario

Donatistarum, by Adrien Roux, published at Louvain in 1838; [1144] but

it is believed that no treatises of this series have ever before been

translated into English, nor are they separately edited. They are in

themselves a valuable authority for an important scene in the history

of the Church, and afford a good example both of the strength and the

weakness of Augustin's writing,--its strength, in the exhaustive way in

which he tears to pieces his opponent's arguments, and the clearness

with which he exposes the fallacies of their reasoning; its weakness,

in the persistency with which he pursues a point long after its

discussion might fairly have been closed, as though he hardly knew when

he had gained the victory; and his tendency to claim, by right of his

position, a vantage-ground which did not in reality belong to him till

the superiority of his cause was proved.

J. R. King

Oxford, March, 1870.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1142] Epist. xlix. li.

[1143] Bened. Ed. Vol. ix. pp. 7-52. Migne, Vol. ix. pp. 33-108.

[1144] The other works bearing on this controversy are mentioned in the

exhaustive volume of Ferd. Ribbeck, Donatus und Augustinus (Elberfeld,

1858).--Ed.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

the

SEVEN BOOKS OF AUGUSTIN,

BISHOP OF HIPPO,

ON

BAPTISM, AGAINST THE DONATISTS

[DE BAPTISIMO CONTRA DONATISTAS.]

CIRCA A.D. 400.

translated by the

rev. j. r. king, m.a.,

vicar of st. peter's in the east, oxford; and late fellow and tutor of

mERTON COLLEGE, OXFORD

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

The

Seven Books of Augustin,

Bishop of Hippo

On Baptism, Against the Donatists

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

This treatise was written about 400 A.D. Concerning it Aug. in

Retract. Book II. c. xviii., says: I have written seven books on

Baptism against the Donatists, who strive to defend themselves by the

authority of the most blessed bishop and martyr Cyprian; in which I

show that nothing is so effectual for the refutation of the Donatists,

and for shutting their mouths directly from upholding their schism

against the Catholic Church, as the letters and act of Cyprian.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Book I.

He proves that baptism can be conferred outside the Catholic communion

by heretics or schismatics, but that it ought not to be received from

them; and that it is of no avail to any while in a state of heresy or

schism.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 1.--1. In the treatise which we wrote against the published

epistle of Parmenianus [1145] to Tichonius, [1146] we promised that at

some future time we would treat the question of baptism more

thoroughly; [1147] and indeed, even if we had not made this promise, we

are not unmindful that this is a debt fairly due from us to the prayers

of our brethren. Wherefore in this treatise we have undertaken, with

the help of God, not only to refute the objections which the Donatists

have been wont to urge against us in this matter, but also to advance

what God may enable us to say in respect of the authority of the

blessed martyr Cyprian, which they endeavor to use as a prop, to

prevent their perversity from falling before the attacks of truth.

[1148] And this we propose to do, in order that all whose judgment is

not blinded by party spirit may understand that, so far from Cyprian's

authority being in their favor, it tends directly to their refutation

and discomfiture.

2. In the treatise above mentioned, it has already been said that the

grace of baptism can be conferred outside the Catholic communion, just

as it can be also there retained. But no one of the Donatists

themselves denies that even apostates retain the grace of baptism; for

when they return within the pale of the Church, and are converted

through repentance, it is never given to them a second time, and so it

is ruled that it never could have been lost. So those, too, who in the

sacrilege of schism depart from the communion of the Church, certainly

retain the grace of baptism, which they received before their

departure, seeing that, in case of their return, it is not again

conferred on them whence it is proved, that what they had received

while within the unity of the Church, they could not have lost in their

separation. But if it can be retained outside, why may it not also be

given there? If you say, "It is not rightly given without the pale;"

we answer, "As it is not rightly retained, and yet is in some sense

retained, so it is not indeed rightly given, but yet it is given." But

as, by reconciliation to unity, that begins to be profitably possessed

which was possessed to no profit in exclusion from unity, so, by the

same reconciliation, that begins to be profitable which without it was

given to no profit. Yet it cannot be allowed that it should be said

that that was not given which was given, nor that any one should

reproach a man with not having given this, while confessing that he had

given what he had himself received. For the sacrament of baptism is

what the person possesses who is baptized; and the sacrament of

conferring baptism is what he possesses who is ordained. And as the

baptized person, if he depart from the unity of the Church, does not

thereby lose the sacrament of baptism, so also he who is ordained, if

he depart from the unity of the Church, does not lose the sacrament of

conferring baptism. For neither sacrament may be wronged. If a

sacrament necessarily becomes void in the case of the wicked, both must

become void; if it remain valid with the wicked, this must be so with

both. If, therefore, the baptism be acknowledged which he could not

lose who severed himself from the unity of the Church, that baptism

must also be acknowledged which was administered by one who by his

secession had not lost the sacrament of conferring baptism. For as

those who return to the Church, if they had been baptized before their

secession, are not rebaptized, so those who return, having been

ordained before their secession, are certainly not ordained again; but

either they again exercise their former ministry, if the interests of

the Church require it, or if they do not exercise it, at any rate they

retain the sacrament of their ordination; and hence it is, that when

hands are laid on them, [1149] to mark their reconciliation, they are

not ranked with the laity. For Felicianus, [1150] when he separated

himself from them with Maximianus, was not held by the Donatists

themselves to have lost either the sacrament of baptism or the

sacrament of conferring baptism. For now he is a recognized member of

their own body, in company with those very men whom he baptized while

he was separated from them in the schism of Maximianus. And so others

could receive from them, whilst they still had not joined our society,

what they themselves had not lost by severance from our society. And

hence it is clear that they are guilty of impiety who endeavor to

rebaptize those who are in Catholic unity; and we act rightly who do

not dare to repudiate God's sacraments, even when administered in

schism. For in all points in which they think with us, they also are

in communion with us, and only are severed from us in those points in

which they dissent from us. For contact and disunion are not to be

measured by different laws in the case of material or spiritual

affinities. For as union of bodies arises from continuity of position,

so in the agreement of wills there is a kind of contact between souls.

If, therefore, a man who has severed himself from unity wishes to do

anything different from that which had been impressed on him while in

the state of unity, in this point he does sever himself, and is no

longer a part of the united whole; but wherever he desires to conduct

himself as is customary in the state of unity, in which he himself

learned and received the lessons which he seeks to follow, in these

points he remains a member, and is united to the corporate whole.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1145] Parmenianus was successor to Donatus the Great in the See of

Carthage, circ. 350 A.D., and died circ. 392 A.D.

[1146] Tichonius, who flourished circ. 380, was the leader of a

reformatory movement in Donatism, which Parmenianus opposed, in the

writing here alluded to. The reformer was excommunicated. He had the

clearest ideas concerning the church and concerning interpretation of

any of the ancients.

[1147] Contra Epist. Parmen. ii. 14, also written circ. 400 A.D.

[1148] Cyprian, in his controversy with Pope Stephen of Rome, denied

the validity of heretical or schismatical baptism. The Donatists

denied the validity of Catholic baptism. See Schaff, Church History,

vol. ii. 262 sqq.

[1149] Comp. v. 23, and iii. 16, note.

[1150] Felicianus, bishop of Musti, headed the revolt against

Primianus, the successor of Parmenianus in the Carthaginian See.

Listening to the complaint of the deacon Maximianus, who had been

deposed by Primianus, a synod was convened in 393 at Cabarsussis, which

ordained Maximianus as bishop of Carthage. Hence the title

Maximianist�. Primianus, in 394, at the council of Bagai, was

recognized by 310 bishops. The larger fraction, according to the

Catholics, was subsequently forced into reunion. Pr�textatus, bp. of

Assuris, was also one of the leaders in this separation.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 2.--3. And so the Donatists in some matters are with us; in

some matters have gone out from us. Accordingly, those things wherein

they agree with us we do not forbid them to do; but in those things in

which they differ from us, we earnestly encourage them to come and

receive them from us, or return and recover them, as the case may be;

and with whatever means we can, we lovingly busy ourselves, that they,

freed from faults and corrected, may choose this course. We do not

therefore say to them, "Abstain from giving baptism," but "Abstain from

giving it in schism." Nor do we say to those whom we see them on the

point of baptizing, "Do not receive the baptism," but "Do not receive

it in schism." For if any one were compelled by urgent necessity,

being unable to find a Catholic from whom to receive baptism, and so,

while preserving Catholic peace in his heart, should receive from one

without the pale of Catholic unity the sacrament which he was intending

to receive within its pale, this man, should he forthwith depart this

life, we deem to be none other than a Catholic. But if he should be

delivered from the death of the body, on his restoring himself in

bodily presence to that Catholic congregation from which in heart he

had never departed, so far from blaming his conduct, we should praise

it with the greatest truth and confidence; because he trusted that God

was present to his heart, while he was striving to preserve unity, and

was unwilling to depart this life without the sacrament of holy

baptism, which he knew to be of God, and not of men; wherever he might

find it. But if any one who has it in his power to receive baptism

within the Catholic Church prefers, from some perversity of mind, to be

baptized in schism, even if he afterwards bethinks himself to come to

the Catholic Church, because he is assured that there that sacrament

will profit him, which can indeed be received but cannot profit

elsewhere, beyond all question he is perverse, and guilty of sin, and

that the more flagrant in proportion as it was committed wilfully. For

that he entertains no doubt that the sacrament is rightly received in

the Church, is proved by his conviction that it is there that he must

look for profit even from what he has received elsewhere.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 3.--4. There are two propositions, moreover, which we

affirm,--that baptism exists in the Catholic Church, and that in it

alone can it be rightly received,--both of which the Donatists deny.

Likewise there are two other propositions which we affirm,--that

baptism exists among the Donatists, but that with them it is not

rightly received, of which two they strenuously confirm the former,

that baptism exists with them; but they are unwilling to allow the

latter, that in their Church it cannot be rightly received. Of these

four propositions, three are peculiar to us; in one we both agree. For

that baptism exists in the Catholic Church, that it is rightly received

there, and that it is not rightly received among the Donatists, are

assertions made only by ourselves; but that baptism exists also among

the Donatists, is asserted by them and allowed by us. If any one,

therefore, is desirous of being baptized, and is already convinced that

he ought to choose our Church as a medium for Christian salvation, and

that the baptism of Christ is only profitable in it, even when it has

been received elsewhere, but yet wishes to be baptized in the schism of

Donatus, because not they only, nor we only, but both parties alike say

that baptism exists with them, let him pause and look to the other

three points. For if he has made up his mind to follow us in the

points which they deny, though he prefers what both of us acknowledge,

to what only we assert, it is enough for our purpose that he prefers

what they do not affirm and we alone assert, to what they alone

assert. That baptism exists in the Catholic Church, we assert and they

deny. That it is rightly received in the Catholic Church, we assert

and they deny. That it is not rightly received in the schism of

Donatus, we assert and they deny. As, therefore, he is the more ready

to believe what we alone assert should be believed, so let him be the

more ready to do what we alone declare should be done. But let him

believe more firmly, if he be so disposed, what both parties assert

should be believed, than what we alone maintain. For he is inclined to

believe more firmly that the baptism of Christ exists in the schism of

Donatus, because that is acknowledged by both of us, than that it

exists in the Catholic Church, an assertion made alone by the

Catholics. But again, he is more ready to believe that the baptism of

Christ exists also with us, as we alone assert, than that it does not

exist with us, as they alone assert. For he has already determined and

is fully convinced, that where we differ, our authority is to be

preferred to theirs. So that he is more ready to believe what we alone

assert, that baptism is rightly received with us, than that it is not

rightly so received, since that rests only on their assertion. And, by

the same rule, he is more ready to believe what we alone assert, that

it is not rightly received with them, than as they alone assert, that

it is rightly so received. He finds, therefore, that his confidence in

being baptized among the Donatists is somewhat profitless, seeing that,

though we both acknowledge that baptism exists with them, yet we do not

both declare that it ought to be received from them. But he has made

up his mind to cling rather to us in matters where we disagree. Let

him therefore feel confidence in receiving baptism in our communion,

where he is assured that it both exists and is rightly received; and

let him not receive it in a communion, where those whose opinion he has

determined to follow acknowledge indeed that it exists, but say that it

cannot rightly be received. Nay, even if he should hold it to be a

doubtful question, whether or no it is impossible for that to be

rightly received among the Donatists which he is assured can rightly be

received in the Catholic Church, he would commit a grievous sin, in

matters concerning the salvation of his soul, in the mere fact of

preferring uncertainty to certainty. At any rate, he must be quite

sure that a man can be rightly baptized in the Catholic Church, from

the mere fact that he has determined to come over to it, even if he be

baptized elsewhere. But let him at least acknowledge it to be matter

of uncertainty whether a man be not improperly baptized among the

Donatists, when he finds this asserted by those whose opinion he is

convinced should be preferred to theirs; and, preferring certainty to

uncertainty, let him be baptized here, where he has good grounds for

being assured that it is rightly done, in the fact that when he thought

of doing it elsewhere, he had still determined that he ought afterwards

to come over to this side.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 4.--5. Further, if any one fails to understand how it can be

that we assert that the sacrament is not rightly conferred among the

Donatists, while we confess that it exists among them, let him observe

that we also deny that it exists rightly among them, just as they deny

that it exists rightly among those who quit their communion. Let him

also consider the analogy of the military mark, which, though it can

both be retained, as by deserters, and, also be received by those who

are not in the army, yet ought not to be either received or retained

outside its ranks; and, at the same time, it is not changed or renewed

when a man is enlisted or brought back to his service. However, we

must distinguish between the case of those who unwittingly join the

ranks of these heretics, under the impression that they are entering

the true Church of Christ, and those who know that there is no other

Catholic Church save that which, according to the promise, is spread

abroad throughout the whole world, and extends even to the utmost

limits of the earth; which, rising amid tares, and seeking rest in the

future from the weariness of offenses, says in the Book of Psalms,

"From the end of the earth I cried unto Thee, while my heart was in

weariness: Thou didst exalt me on a rock." [1151] But the rock was

Christ, in whom the apostle says that we are now raised up, and set

together in heavenly places, though not yet actually, but only in hope.

[1152] And so the psalm goes on to say, "Thou wast my guide, because

Thou art become my hope, a tower of strength from the face of the

enemy." [1153] By means of His promises, which are like spears and

javelins stored up in a strongly fortified place, the enemy is not only

guarded against, but overthrown, as he clothes his wolves in sheep's

clothing, [1154] that they may say, "Lo, here is Christ, or there;"

[1155] and that they may separate many from the Catholic city which is

built upon a hill, and bring them down to the isolation of their own

snares, so as utterly to destroy them. And these men, knowing this,

choose to receive the baptism of Christ without the limits of the

communion of the unity of Christ's body, though they intend afterwards,

with the sacrament which they have received elsewhere, to pass into

that very communion. For they propose to receive Christ's baptism in

antagonism to the Church of Christ, well knowing that it is so even on

the very day on which they receive it. And if this is a sin, who is

the man that will say, Grant that for a single day I may commit sin?

For if he proposes to pass over to the Catholic Church, I would fain

ask why. What other answer can he give, but that it is ill to belong

to the party of Donatus, and not to the unity of the Catholic Church?

Just so many days, then, as you commit this ill, of so many days' sin

are you going to be guilty. And it may be said that there is greater

sin in more days' commission of it, and less in fewer; but in no wise

can it be said that no sin is committed at all. But what is the need

of allowing this accursed wrong for a single day, or a single hour?

For the man who wishes this license to be granted him, might as well

ask of the Church, or of God Himself, that for a single day he should

be permitted to apostatize. For there is no reason why he should fear

to be an apostate for a day, if he does not shrink from being for that

time a schismatic or a heretic.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1151] Ps. lxi. 2, 3. Cp. Hieron, and LXX.

[1152] Eph. ii. 6.

[1153] Ps. lxi. 2, 3. Cp. Hieron, and LXX.

[1154] Matt. vii. 15.

[1155] Matt. xxiv. 23.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 5.--6. I prefer, he says, to receive Christ's baptism where

both parties agree that it exists. But those whom you intend to join

say that it cannot be received there rightly; and those who say that it

can be received there rightly are the party whom you mean to quit.

What they say, therefore, whom you yourself consider of inferior

authority, in opposition to what those say whom you yourself prefer,

is, if not false, at any rate, to use a milder term, at least

uncertain. I entreat you, therefore, to prefer what is true to what is

false, or what is certain to what is uncertain. For it is not only

those whom you are going to join, but you yourself who are going to

join them, that confess that what you want can be rightly received in

that body which you mean to join when you have received it elsewhere.

For if you had any doubts whether it could be rightly received there,

you would also have doubts whether you ought to make the change. If,

therefore, it is doubtful whether it be not sin to receive baptism from

the party of Donatus, who can doubt but that it is certain sin not to

prefer receiving it where it is certain that it is not sin? And those

who are baptized there through ignorance, thinking that it is the true

Church of Christ, are guilty of less sin in comparison than these,

though even they are wounded by the impiety of schism; nor do they

escape a grievous hurt, because others suffer even more. For when it

is said to certain men, "It shall be more tolerable for the land of

Sodom in the day of judgment than for you," [1156] it is not meant that

the men of Sodom shall escape torment, but only that the others shall

be even more grievously tormented.

7. And yet this point had once, perhaps, been involved in obscurity

and doubt. But that which is a source of health to those who give heed

and receive correction, is but an aggravation of the sin of those who,

when they are no longer suffered to be ignorant, persist in their

madness to their own destruction. For the condemnation of the party of

Maximianus, and their restoration after they had been condemned,

together with those whom they had sacrilegiously, to use the language

of their own Council, [1157] baptized in schism, settles the whole

question in dispute, and removes all controversy. There is no point at

issue between ourselves and those Donatists who hold communion with

Primianus, which could give rise to any doubt that the baptism of

Christ may not only be retained, but even conferred by those who are

severed from the Church. For as they themselves are obliged to confess

that those whom Felicianus baptized in schism received true baptism,

inasmuch as they now acknowledge them as members of their own body,

with no other baptism than that which they received in schism; so we

say that that is Christ's baptism, even without the pale of Catholic

communion, which they confer who are cut off from that communion,

inasmuch as they had not lost it when they were cut off. And what they

themselves think that they conferred on those persons whom Felicianus

baptized in schism, when they admitted them to reconcilation with

themselves, viz., not that they should receive that which they did not

as yet possess, but that what they had received to no advantage in

schism, and were already in possession of, should be of profit to them,

this God really confers and bestows through the Catholic communion on

those who come from any heresy or schism in which they received the

baptism of Christ; viz., not that they should begin to receive the

sacrament of baptism as not possessing it before, but that what they

already possessed should now begin to profit them.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1156] Matt. xi. 24.

[1157] The Council of 310 Donatist bishops, held at Bagai in Numidia,

A.D. April 24, 394. Cp. Contra. Crescon. iii. 52, 56.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 6.--8. Between us, then, and what we may call the genuine

[1158] Donatists, whose bishop is Primianus at Carthage, there is now

no controversy on this point. For God willed that it should be ended

by means of the followers of Maximianus, that they should be compelled

by the precedent of his case to acknowledge what they would not allow

at the persuasion of Christian charity. But this brings us to consider

next, whether those men do not seem to have something to say for

themselves, who refuse communion with the party of Primianus,

contending that in their body there remains greater sincerity of

Donatism, just in proportion to the paucity of their numbers. And even

if these were only the party of Maximianus, we should not be justified

in despising their salvation. How much more, then, are we bound to

consider it, when we find that this same party of Donatus is split up

into many most minute fractions, all which small sections of the body

blame the one much larger portion which has Primianus for its head,

because they receive the baptism of the followers of Maximianus; while

each endeavors to maintain that it is the sole receptacle of true

baptism, which exists nowhere else, neither in the whole of the world

where the Catholic Church extends itself, nor in that larger main body

of the Donatists, nor even in the other minute sections, but only in

itself. Whereas, if all these fragments would listen not to the voice

of man, but to the most unmistakable manifestation of the truth, and

would be willing to curb the fiery temper of their own perversity, they

would return from their own barrenness, not indeed to the main body of

Donatus, a mere fragment of which they are a smaller fragment, but to

the never-failing fruitfulness of the root of the Catholic Church. For

all of them who are not against us are for us; but when they gather not

with us, they scatter abroad.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1158] Quodam modo cardinales Donatistas.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 7.--9. For, in the next place, that I may not seem to rest on

mere human arguments,--since there is so much obscurity in this

question, that in earlier ages of the Church, before the schism of

Donatus, it has caused men of great weight, and even our fathers, the

bishops, whose hearts were full of charity, so to dispute and doubt

among themselves, saving always the peace of the Church, that the

several statutes of their Councils in their different districts long

varied from each other, till at length the most wholesome opinion was

established, to the removal of all doubts, by a plenary Council of the

whole world: [1159] --I therefore bring forward from the gospel clear

proofs, by which I propose, with God's help, to prove how rightly and

truly in the sight of God it has been determined, that in the case of

every schismatic and heretic, the wound which caused his separation

should be cured by the medicine of the Church; but that what remained

sound in him should rather be recognized with approbation, than wounded

by condemnation. It is indeed true that the Lord says in the gospel,

"He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with

me scattereth abroad." [1160] Yet when the disciples had brought word

to Him that they had seen one casting out devils in His name, and had

forbidden him, because he followed not them, He said, "Forbid him not:

for he that is not against us is for us. For there is no man which

shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me."

[1161] If, indeed, there were nothing in this man requiring

correction, then any one would be safe who, setting himself outside the

communion of the Church, severing himself from all Christian

brotherhood, should gather in Christ's name; and so there would be no

truth in this, "He that is not with me is against me; and he that

gathereth not with me scattereth abroad." But if he required

correction in the point where the disciples in their ignorance were

anxious to check him, why did our Lord, by saying, "Forbid him not,"

prevent this check from being given? And how can that be true which He

then says, "He that is not against you is for you?" For in this point

he was not against, but for them, when he was working miracles of

healing in Christ's name. That both, therefore, should be true, as

both are true,--both the declaration, that "he that is not with me is

against me, and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad;" and

also the injunction, "Forbid him not; for he that is not against you is

for you,"--what must we understand, except that the man was to be

confirmed in his veneration for that mighty Name, in respect of which

he was not against the Church, but for it; and yet he was to be blamed

for separating himself from the Church, whereby his gathering became a

scattering; and if it should have so happened that he sought union with

the Church, he should not have received what he already possessed, but

be made to set right the points wherein he had gone astray?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1159] See below, on ii. 9.

[1160] Matt. xii. 30.

[1161] Mark ix. 38, 39; Luke ix. 50.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 8.--10. Nor indeed were the prayers of the Gentile Cornelius

unheard, nor did his alms lack acceptance; nay, he was found worthy

that an angel should be sent to him, and that he should behold the

messenger, through whom he might assuredly have learned everything that

was necessary, without requiring that any man should come to him. But

since all the good that he had in his prayers and alms could not

benefit him unless he were incorporated in the Church by the bond of

Christian brotherhood and peace, he was ordered to send to Peter, and

through him learned Christ; and, being also baptized by his orders, he

was joined by the tie of communion to the fellowship of Christians, to

which before he was bound only by the likeness of good works. [1162]

And indeed it would have been most fatal to despise what he did not yet

possess, vaunting himself in what he had. So too those who, by

separating themselves from the society of their fellows, to the

overthrow of charity, thus break the bond of unity, if they observe

none of the things which they have received in that society, are

separated in everything; and so any one whom they have joined to their

society, if he afterwards wish to come over to the Church, ought to

receive everything which he has not already received. But if they

observe some of the same things, in respect of these they have not

severed themselves; and so far they are still a part of the framework

of the Church, while in all other respects they are cut off from it.

Accordingly, any one whom they have associated with themselves is

united to the Church in all those points in which they are not

separated from it. And therefore, if he wish to come over to the

Church, he is made sound in those points in which he was unsound and

went astray; but where he was sound in union with the Church, he is not

cured, but recognized,--lest in desiring to cure what is sound we

should rather inflict a wound. Therefore those whom they baptize they

heal from the wound of idolatry or unbelief; but they injure them more

seriously with the wound of schism. For idolaters among the people of

the Lord were smitten with the sword; [1163] but schismatics were

swallowed up by the earth opening her mouth. [1164] And the apostle

says, "Though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and

have not charity, I am nothing." [1165]

11. If any one is brought to the surgeon, afflicted with a grievous

wound in some vital part of the body, and the surgeon says that unless

it is cured it must cause death, the friends who brought him do not, I

presume, act so foolishly as to count over to the surgeon all his sound

limbs, and, drawing his attention to them, make answer to him, "Can it

be that all these sound limbs are of no avail to save his life, and

that one wounded limb is enough to cause his death?" They certainly do

not say this, but they entrust him to the surgeon to be cured. Nor,

again, because they so entrust him, do they ask the surgeon to cure the

limbs that are sound as well; but they desire him to apply drugs with

all care to the one part from which death is threatening the other

sound parts too, with the certainty that it must come, unless the wound

be healed. What will it then profit a man that he has sound faith, or

perhaps only soundness in the sacrament of faith, when the soundness of

his charity is done away with by the fatal wound of schism, so that by

the overthrow of it the other points, which were in themselves sound,

are brought into the infection of death? To prevent which, the mercy

of God, through the unity of His holy Church, does not cease striving

that they may come and be healed by the medicine of reconciliation,

through the bond of peace. And let them not think that they are sound

because we admit that they have something sound in them; nor let them

think, on the other hand, that what is sound must needs be healed,

because we show that in some parts there is a wound. So that in the

soundness of the sacrament, because they are not against us, they are

for us; but in the wound of schism, because they gather not with

Christ, they scatter abroad. Let them not be exalted by what they

have. Why do they pass the eyes of pride over those parts only which

are sound? Let them condescend also to look humbly on their wound, and

give heed not only to what they have, but also to what is wanting in

them.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1162] Acts x.

[1163] Ex. xxxii.

[1164] Num. xvi.

[1165] 1 Cor. xiii. 2.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 9.--12. Let them see how many things, and what important

things, are of no avail, if a certain single thing be wanting, and let

them see what that one thing is. And herein let them hear not my

words, but those of the apostle: "Though I speak with the tongues of

men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass,

or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and

understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all

faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am

nothing." [1166] What does it profit them, therefore, if they have

both the voice of angels in the sacred mysteries, and the gift of

prophecy, as had Caiaphas [1167] and Saul, [1168] that so they may be

found prophesying, of whom Holy Scripture testifies that they were

worthy of condemnation? If they not only know, but even possess the

sacraments, as Simon Magus did; [1169] if they have faith, as the

devils confessed Christ (for we must not suppose that they did not

believe when they said, "What have we to do with Thee, O Son of God?

We know Thee who Thou art" [1170] ; if they distribute of themselves

their own substance to the poor, as many do, not only in the Catholic

Church, but in the different heretical bodies; if, under the pressure

of any persecution, they give their bodies with us to be burned for the

faith which they like us confess: yet because they do all these things

apart from the Church, not "forbearing one another in love," nor

"endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace,"

[1171] insomuch as they have not charity, they cannot attain to eternal

salvation, even with all those good things which profit them not.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1166] 1 Cor. xiii. 1, 2.

[1167] John xi. 51.

[1168] 1 Sam. xviii. 10.

[1169] Acts viii. 13.

[1170] Mark i. 24.

[1171] Eph. iv. 2, 3.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 10.--13. But they think within themselves that they show very

great subtlety in asking whether the baptism of Christ in the party of

Donatus makes men sons or not; so that, if we allow that it does make

them sons, they may assert that theirs is the Church, the mother which

could give birth to sons in the baptism of Christ; and since the Church

must be one, they may allege that ours is no Church. But if we say

that it does not make them sons, "Why then," say they, "do you not

cause those who pass from us to you to be born again in baptism, after

they have been baptized with us, if they are not thereby born as yet?"

14. Just as though their party gained the power of generation in

virtue of what constitutes its division, and not from what causes its

union with the Church. For it is severed from the bond of peace and

charity, but it is joined in one baptism. And so there is one Church

which alone is called Catholic; and whenever it has anything of its own

in these communions of different bodies which are separate from itself,

it is most certainly in virtue of this which is its own in each of them

that it, not they, has the power of generation. For neither is it

their separation that generates, but what they have retained of the

essence of the Church; and if they were to go on to abandon this, they

would lose the power of generation. The generation, then, in each case

proceeds from the Church, whose sacraments are retained, from which any

such birth can alone in any case proceed,--although not all who receive

its birth belong to its unity, which shall save those who persevere

even to the end. Nor is it those only that do not belong to it who are

openly guilty of the manifest sacrilege of schism, but also those who,

being outwardly joined to its unity, are yet separated by a life of

sin. For the Church had herself given birth to Simon Magus through the

sacrament of baptism; and yet it was declared to him that he had no

part in the inheritance of Christ. [1172] Did he lack anything in

respect of baptism, of the gospel, of the sacraments? But in that he

wanted charity, he was born in vain; and perhaps it had been well for

him that he had never been born at all. Was anything wanting to their

birth to whom the apostle says, "I have fed you with milk, and not with

meat, even as babes in Christ"? Yet he recalls them from the sacrilege

of schism, into which they were rushing, because they were carnal: "I

have fed you," he says, "with milk, and not with meat: for hitherto ye

were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able. For ye are yet

carnal: for whereas there is among you envying and strife, are ye not

carnal, and walk as men? For while one saith, I am of Paul; and

another, I am of Apollos; are ye not men?" [1173] For of these he

says above: "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord

Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no

divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the

same mind, and in the same judgment. For it hath been declared unto me

of you, my brethren, by them which are of the house of Chl�e, that

there are contentions among you. Now this I say, that every one of you

saith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of

Christ. Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye

baptized in the name of Paul?" [1174] These, therefore, if they

continued in the same perverse obstinacy, were doubtless indeed born,

but yet would not belong by the bond of peace and unity to the very

Church in respect of which they were born. Therefore she herself bears

them in her own womb and in the womb of her handmaids, by virtue of the

same sacraments, as though by virtue of the seed of her husband. For

it is not without meaning that the apostle says that all these things

were done by way of figure. [1175] But those who are too proud, and

are not joined to their lawful mother, are like Ishmael, of whom it is

said, "Cast out this bond-woman and her Son: for the son of the

bond-woman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac." [1176]

But those who peacefully love the lawful wife of their father, whose

sons they are by lawful descent, are like the sons of Jacob, born

indeed of handmaids, but yet receiving the same inheritance. [1177]

But those who are born within the family, of the womb of the mother

herself, and then neglect the grace they have received, are like

Isaac's son Esau, who was rejected, God Himself bearing witness to it,

and saying, "I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau;" [1178] and that though

they were twin-brethren, the offspring of the same womb.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1172] Acts viii. 13, 21.

[1173] 1 Cor. iii. 1-4.

[1174] 1 Cor. i. 10-13.

[1175] 1 Cor. x. 11. In figura; tupikos; A.V., "for ensamples."

[1176] Gen. xxi. 10.

[1177] Gen. xxx. 3.

[1178] Mal. i. 2, 3; Gen xxv. 24.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 11.--15. They ask also, "Whether sins are remitted in baptism

in the party of Donatus:" so that, if we say that they are remitted,

they may answer, then the Holy Spirit is there; for when by the

breathing of our Lord the Holy Spirit was given to the disciples, He

then went on to say, "Baptize all nations in the name of the Father,

and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." [1179] Whose soever sins ye

remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain,

they are retained." [1180] And if it is so, they say, then our

communion is the Church of Christ; for the Holy Spirit does not work

the remission of sins except in the Church. And if our communion is

the Church of Christ, then your communion is not the Church of Christ.

For that is one, wherever it is, of which it is said, "My dove is but

one; she is the only one of her mother;" [1181] nor can there be just

so many churches as there are schisms. But if we should say that sins

are not there remitted, then, say they, there is no true baptism there;

and therefore ought you to baptize those whom you receive from us. And

since you do not do this, you confess that you are not in the Church of

Christ.

16. To these we reply, following the Scriptures, by asking them to

answer themselves what they ask of us. For I beg them to tell us

whether there is any remission of sins where there is not charity; for

sins are the darkness of the soul. For we find St. John saying, "He

that hateth his brother is still in darkness." [1182] But none would

create schisms, if they were not blinded by hatred of their brethren.

If, therefore, we say that sins are not remitted there, how is he

regenerate who is baptized among them? And what is regeneration in

baptism, except the being renovated from the corruption of the old

man? And how can he be so renovated whose past sins are not remitted?

But if he be not regenerate, neither does he put on Christ; from which

it seems to follow that he ought to be baptized again. For the apostle

says, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on

Christ;" [1183] and if he has not so put on Christ, neither should he

be considered to have been baptized in Christ. Further, since we say

that he has been baptized in Christ, we confess that he has put on

Christ; and if we confess this, we confess that he is regenerate. And

if this be so, how does St. John say, "He that hateth his brother

remaineth still in darkness," if remission of his sins has already

taken place? Can it be that schism does not involve hatred of one's

brethren? Who will maintain this, when both the origin of, and

perseverance in schism consists in nothing else save hatred of the

brethren?

17. They think that they solve this question when they say: "There is

then no remission of sins in schism, and therefore no creation of the

new man by regeneration, and accordingly neither is there the baptism

of Christ." But since we confess that the baptism of Christ exists in

schism, we propose this question to them for solution: Was Simon Magus

endued with the true baptism of Christ? They will answer, Yes; being

compelled to do so by the authority of holy Scripture. I ask them

whether they confess that he received remission of his sins. They will

certainly acknowledge it. So I ask why Peter said to him that he had

no part in the lot of the saints. Because, they say, he sinned

afterwards, wishing to buy with money the gift of God, which he

believed the apostles were able to sell.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1179] Matt. xxviii. 19.

[1180] John xx. 23.

[1181] Song of Sol. vi. 9.

[1182] 1 John ii. 11.

[1183] Gal. iii. 27.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 12.--18. What if he approached baptism itself in deceit? were

his sins remitted, or were they not? Let them choose which they will.

Whichever they choose will answer our purpose. If they say they were

remitted, how then shall "the Holy Spirit of discipline flee deceit,"

[1184] if in him who was full of deceit He worked remission of sins?

If they say they were not remitted, I ask whether, if he should

afterwards confess his sin with contrition of heart and true sorrow, it

would be judged that he ought to be baptized again. And if it is mere

madness to assert this, then let them confess that a man can be

baptized with the true baptism of Christ, and that yet his heart,

persisting in malice or sacrilege, may not allow remission of sins to

be given; and so let them understand that men may be baptized in

communions severed from the Church, in which Christ's baptism is given

and received in the said celebration of the sacrament, but that it will

only then be of avail for the remission of sins, when the recipient,

being reconciled to the unity of the Church, is purged from the

sacrilege of deceit, by which his sins were retained, and their

remission prevented. For, as in the case of him who had approached the

sacrament in deceit there is no second baptism, but he is purged by

faithful discipline and truthful confession, which he could not be

without baptism, so that what was given before becomes then powerful to

work his salvation, when the former deceit is done away by the truthful

confession; so also in the case of the man who, while an enemy to the

peace and love of Christ, received in any heresy or schism the baptism

of Christ, which the schismatics in question had not lost from among

them, though by his sacrilege his sins were not remitted, yet, when he

corrects his error, and comes over to the communion and unity of the

Church, he ought not to be again baptized: because by his very

reconciliation to the peace of the Church he receives this benefit,

that the sacrament now begins in unity to be of avail for the remission

of his sins, which could not so avail him as received in schism.

19. But if they should say that in the man who has approached the

sacrament in deceit, his sins are indeed removed by the holy power of

so great a sacrament at the moment when he received it, but return

immediately in consequence of his deceit: so that the Holy Spirit has

both been present with him at his baptism for the removal of his sins,

and has also fled before his perseverance in deceit so that they should

return: so that both declarations prove true,--both, "As many of you

as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ;" and also, "The

holy spirit of discipline will flee deceit;"--that is to say, that both

the holiness of baptism clothes him with Christ, and the sinfulness of

deceit strips him of Christ; like the case of a man who passes from

darkness through light into darkness again, his eyes being always

directed towards darkness, though the light cannot but penetrate them

as he passes;--if they should say this, let them understand that this

is also the case with those who are baptized without the pale of the

Church, but yet with the baptism of the Church, which is holy in

itself, wherever it may be; and which therefore belongs not to those

who separate themselves, but to the body from which they are separated;

while yet it avails even among them so far, that they pass through its

light back to their own darkness, their sins, which in that moment had

been dispelled by the holiness of baptism, returning immediately upon

them, as though it were the darkness returning which the light had

dispelled while they were passing through it.

20. For that sins which have been remitted do return upon a man, where

there is no brotherly love, is most clearly taught by our Lord, in the

case of the servant whom He found owing Him ten thousand talents, and

to whom He yet forgave all at his entreaty. But when he refused to

have pity on his fellow-servant who owed him a hundred pence, the Lord

commanded him to pay what He had forgiven him. The time, then, at

which pardon is received through baptism is as it were the time for

rendering accounts, so that all the debts which are found to be due may

be remitted. Yet it was not afterwards that the servant lent his

fellow-servant the money, which he had so pitilessly exacted when the

other was unable to pay it; but his fellow-servant already owed him the

debt, when he himself, on rendering his accounts to his master, was

excused a debt of so vast an amount. He had not first excused his

fellow-servant, and so come to receive forgiveness from his Lord. This

is proved by the words of the fellow-servant: "Have patience with me,

and I will pay thee all." Otherwise he would have said, "You forgave

me it before; why do you again demand it?" This is made more clear by

the words of the Lord Himself. For He says, "But the same servant went

out, and found one of his fellow-servants which was owing [1185] him a

hundred pence." [1186] He does not say, "To whom he had already

forgiven a debt of a hundred pence." Since then He says, "was owing

him," it is clear that he had not forgiven him the debt. And indeed it

would have been better, and more in accordance with the position of a

man who was going to render an account of so great a debt, and expected

forbearance from his lord, that he should first have forgiven his

fellow-servant what was due to him, and so have come to render the

account when there was such need for imploring the compassion of his

lord. Yet the fact that he had not yet forgiven his fellow-servant,

did not prevent his lord from forgiving him all his debts on the

occasion of receiving his accounts. But what advantage was it to him,

since they all immediately returned with redoubled force upon his head,

in consequence of his persistent want of charity? So the grace of

baptism is not prevented from giving remission of all sins, even if he

to whom they are forgiven continues to cherish hatred towards his

brother in his heart. For the guilt of yesterday is remitted, and all

that was before it, nay, even the guilt of the very hour and moment

previous to baptism, and during baptism itself. But then he

immediately begins again to be responsible, not only for the days,

hours, moments which ensue, but also for the past,--the guilt of all

the sins which were remitted returning on him, as happens only too

frequently in the Church.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1184] Wisd. i. 5.

[1185] Debebat. Hieron, debebat, LXX. opheilen.

[1186] Matt. xviii. 23-35.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 13.--21. For it often happens that a man has an enemy whom he

hates most unjustly; although we are commanded to love even our unjust

enemies, and to pray for them. But in some sudden danger of death he

begins to be uneasy, and desires baptism, which he receives in such

haste, that the emergency scarcely admits of the necessary formal

examination of a few words, much less of a long conversation, so that

this hatred should be driven from his heart, even supposing it to be

known to the minister who baptizes him. Certainly cases of this sort

are still found to occur not only with us, but also with them. What

shall we say then? Are this man's sins forgiven or not? Let them

choose just which alternative they prefer. For if they are forgiven,

they immediately return: this is the teaching of the gospel, the

authoritative announcement of truth. Whether, therefore, they are

forgiven or not, medicine is necessary afterwards; and yet if the man

lives, and learns that his fault stands in need of correction, and

corrects it, he is not baptized anew, either with them or with us. So

in the points in which schismatics and heretics neither entertain

different opinions nor observe different practice from ourselves, we do

not correct them when they join us, but rather commend what we find in

them. For where they do not differ from us, they are not separated

from us. But because these things do them no good so long as they are

schismatics or heretics, on account of other points in which they

differ from us, not to mention the most grievous sin that is involved

in separation itself, therefore, whether their sins remain in them, or

return again immediately after remission, in either case we exhort them

to come to the soundness of peace and Christian charity, not only that

they may obtain something which they had not before, but also that what

they had may begin to be of use to them.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 14.--22. It is to no purpose, then, that they say to us, "If

you acknowledge our baptism, what do we lack that should make you

suppose that we ought to think seriously of joining your communion?"

For we reply, We do not acknowledge any baptism of yours; for it is not

the baptism of schismatics or heretics, but of God and of the Church,

wheresoever it may be found, and whithersoever it may be transferred.

But it is in no sense yours, except because you entertain false

opinions, and do sacrilegious acts, and have impiously separated

yourselves from the Church. For if everything else in your practice

and opinions were true, and still you were to persist in this same

separation, contrary to the bond of brotherly peace, contrary to the

union of all the brethren, who have been manifest, according to the

promise, in all the world; the particulars of whose history, and the

secrets of whose hearts, you never could have known or considered in

every case, so as to have a right to condemn them; who, moreover,

cannot be liable to condemnation for submitting themselves to the

judges of the Church rather than to one of the parties to the

dispute,--in this one thing, at least, in such a case, you are

deficient, in which he is deficient who lacks charity. Why should we

go over our argument again? Look and see yourselves in the apostle,

how much there is that you lack. For what does it matter to him who

lacks charity, whether he be carried away outside the Church at once by

some blast of temptation, or remain within the Lord's harvest, so as to

be separated only at the final winnowing? And yet even such, if they

have once been born in baptism, need not be born again.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 15.--23. For it is the Church that gives birth to all, either

within her pale, of her own womb; or beyond it, of the seed of her

bridegroom,--(either of herself, or of her handmaid. [1187] ) But

Esau, even though born of the lawful wife, was separated from the

people of God because he quarrelled with his brother. And Asher, born

indeed by the authority of a wife, but yet of a handmaid, was admitted

to the land of promise on account of his brotherly good-will. Whence

also it was not the being born of a handmaid, but his quarrelling with

his brother, that stood in the way of Ishmael, to cause his separation

from the people of God; and he received no benefit from the power of

the wife, whose son he rather was, inasmuch as it was in virtue of her

conjugal rights that he was both conceived in and born of the womb of

the handmaid. Just as with the Donatists it is by the right of the

Church, which exists in baptism, that whosoever is born receives his

birth; but if they agree with their brethren, through the unity of

peace they come to the land of promise, not to be again cast out from

the bosom of their true mother, but to be acknowledged in the seed of

their father; but if they persevere in discord, they will belong to the

line of Ishmael. For Ishmael was first, and then Isaac; and Esau was

the elder, Jacob the younger. Not that heresy gives birth before the

Church, or that the Church herself gives birth first to those who are

carnal or animal, and afterwards to those who are spiritual; but

because, in the actual lot of our mortality, in which we are born of

the seed of Adam, "that was not first which is spiritual, but that

which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual." [1188] But

from mere animal sensation, because "the natural man receiveth not the

things of the Spirit of God," [1189] arise all dissensions and

schisms. And the apostle says [1190] that all who persevere in this

animal sensation belong to the old covenant. that is, to the desire of

earthly promises, which are indeed the type of the spiritual; but "the

natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God." [1191]

24. At whatever time, therefore, men have begun to be of such a nature

in this life, that, although they have partaken of such divine

sacraments as were appointed for the dispensation under which they

lived, they yet savor of carnal things, and hope for and desire carnal

things from God, whether in this life or afterwards, they are yet

carnal. But the Church, which is the people of God, is an ancient

institution even in the pilgrimage of this life, having a carnal

interest in some men, a spiritual interest in others. To the carnal

belongs the old covenant, to the spiritual the new. But in the first

days both were hidden, from Adam even to Moses. But by Moses the old

covenant was made manifest, and in it was hidden the new covenant,

because after a secret fashion it was typified. But so soon as the

Lord came in the flesh, the new covenant was revealed; yet, though the

sacraments of the old covenant passed away; the dispositions peculiar

to it did not pass away. For they still exist in those whom the

apostle declares to be already born indeed by the sacrament of the new

covenant, but yet capable, as being natural, of receiving the things of

the Spirit of God. For, as in the sacraments of the old covenant some

persons were already spiritual, belonging secretly to the new covenant,

which was then concealed, so now also in the sacrament of the new

covenant, which has been by this time revealed, many live who are

natural. And if they will not advance to receive the things of the

Spirit of God, to which the discourse of the apostle urges them, they

will still belong to the old covenant. But if they advance, even

before they receive them, yet by their very advance and approach they

belong to the new covenant; and if, before becoming spiritual, they are

snatched away from this life, yet through the protection of the

holiness of the sacrament they are reckoned in the land of the living,

where the Lord is our hope and our portion. Nor can I find any truer

interpretation of the scripture, "Thine eyes did see my substance, yet

being imperfect" [1192] considering what follows, "And in Thy book

shall all be written." [1193]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1187] The words in parenthesis are wanting in the Mss., and seem to

have crept from the margin into the text.

[1188] 1 Cor. xv. 46.

[1189] 1 Cor. ii. 14.

[1190] Gal. iv.

[1191] 1 Cor. ii. 14.

[1192] Ps. cxxxix. 16.

[1193] Cf. Hieron, and LXX. A.V. "In Thy book were all my members

written."

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 16.--25. But the same mother which brought forth Abel, and

Enoch, and Noah, and Abraham, brought forth also Moses and the prophets

who succeeded him till the coming of our Lord; and the mother which

gave birth to them gave birth also to our apostles and martyrs, and all

good Christians. For all these that have appeared have been born

indeed at different times, but are included in the society of our

people; and it is as citizens of the same state that they have

experienced the labors of this pilgrimage, and some of them are

experiencing them, and others will experience them even to the end.

Again, the mother who brought forth Cain, and Ham, and Ishmael, and

Esau, brought forth also Dathan and others like him in the same people;

and she who gave birth to them gave birth also to Judas the false

apostle, and Simon Magus, and all the other false Christians who up to

this time have persisted obstinately in their carnal affections,

whether they have been mingled in the unity of the Church, or separated

from it in open schism. But when men of this kind have the gospel

preached to them, and receive the sacraments at the hand of those who

are spiritual, it is as though Rebecca gave birth to them of her own

womb, as she did to Esau; but when they are produced in the midst of

the people of God through the instrumentality of those who preach the

gospel not sincerely, [1194] Sarah is indeed the mother, but through

Hagar. So when good spiritual disciples are produced by the preaching

or baptism of those who are carnal, Leah, indeed, or Rachel, gives

birth to them in her right as wife, but from the womb of a handmaid.

But when good and faithful disciples are born of those who are

spiritual in the gospel, and either attain to the development of

spiritual age, or do not cease to strive in that direction, or are only

deterred from doing so by want of power, these are born like Isaac from

the womb of Sarah, or Jacob from the womb of Rebecca, in the new life

and the new covenant.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1194] Non caste; ouch agnos. Phil. i. 16. Hieron. non sincere.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 17.--26. Therefore, whether they seem to abide within, or are

openly outside, whatsoever is flesh is flesh, and what is chaff is

chaff, whether they persevere in remaining in their barrenness on the

threshing-floor, or, when temptation befalls them, are carried out as

it were by the blast of some wind. And even that man is always severed

from the unity of the Church which is without spot or wrinkle, [1195]

who associates with the congregation of the saints in carnal

obstinacy. Yet we ought to despair of no man, whether he be one who

shows himself to be of this nature within the pale of the Church, or

whether he more openly opposes it from without. But the spiritual, or

those who are steadily advancing with pious exertion towards this end,

do not stray without the pale; since even when, by some perversity or

necessity among men, they seem to be driven forth, they are more

approved than if they had remained within, since they are in no degree

roused to contend against the Church, but remain rooted in the

strongest foundation of Christian charity on the solid rock of unity.

For hereunto belongs what is said in the sacrifice of Abraham: "But

the birds divided he not." [1196]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1195] In the Retractations, ii. 18, Augustin notes on this passage,

that wherever he uses this quotation from the Epistle to the Ephesians,

he means it to be understood of the progress of the Church towards this

condition, and not of her success in its attainment; for at present the

infirmities and ignorance of her members give ground enough for the

whole Church joining daily in the petition, "Forgive us our debts."

[1196] Gen. xv. 10.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 18.--27. On the question of baptism, then, I think that I have

argued at sufficient length; and since this is a most manifest schism

which is called by the name of the Donatists, it only remains that on

the subject of baptism we should believe with pious faith what the

universal Church maintains, apart from the sacrilege of schism. And

yet, if within the Church different men still held different opinions

on the point, without meanwhile violating peace, then till some one

clear and simple decree should have been passed by an universal

Council, it would have been right for the charity which seeks for unity

to throw a veil over the error of human infirmity, as it is written

"For charity shall cover the multitude of sins." [1197] For, seeing

that its absence causes the presence of all other things to be of no

avail, we may well suppose that in its presence there is found pardon

for the absence of some missing things.

28. There are great proofs of this existing on the part of the blessed

martyr Cyprian, in his letters,--to come at last to him of whose

authority they carnally flatter themselves they are possessed, whilst

by his love they are spiritually overthrown. For at that time, before

the consent of the whole Church had declared authoritatively, by the

decree of a plenary Council, [1198] what practice should be followed in

this matter, it seemed to him, in common with about eighty of his

fellow bishops of the African churches, that every man who had been

baptized outside the communion of the Catholic Church should, on

joining the Church, be baptized anew. And I take it, that the reason

why the Lord did not reveal the error in this to a man of such

eminence, was, that his pious humility and charity in guarding the

peace and health of the Church might be made manifest, and might be

noticed, so as to serve as an example of healing power, so to speak,

not only to Christians of that age, but also to those who should come

after. For when a bishop of so important a Church, himself a man of so

great merit and virtue, endowed with such excellence of heart and power

of eloquence, entertained an opinion about baptism different from that

which was to be confirmed by a more diligent searching into the truth;

though many of his colleagues held what was not yet made manifest by

authority, but was sanctioned by the past custom of the Church, and

afterwards embraced by the whole Catholic world; yet under these

circumstances he did not sever himself, by refusal of communion, from

the others who thought differently, and indeed never ceased to urge on

the others that they should "forbear one another in love, endeavoring

to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." [1199] For so,

while the framework of the body remained whole, if any infirmity

occurred in certain of its members, it might rather regain its health

from their general soundness, than be deprived of the chance of any

healing care by their death in severance from the body. And if he had

severed himself, how many were there to follow! what a name was he

likely to make for himself among men! how much more widely would the

name of Cyprianist have spread than that of Donatist! But he was not a

son of perdition, one of those of whom it is said, "Thou castedst them

down while they were elevated;" [1200] but he was the son of the peace

of the Church, who in the clear illumination of his mind failed to see

one thing, only that through him another thing might be more

excellently seen. "And yet," says the apostle, "show I unto you a more

excellent way: though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels,

and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling

cymbal." [1201] He had therefore imperfect insight into the hidden

mystery of the sacrament. But if he had known the mysteries of all

sacraments, without having charity, it would have been nothing. But as

he, with imperfect insight into the mystery, was careful to preserve

charity with all courage and humility and faith, he deserved to come to

the crown of martyrdom; so that, if any cloud had crept over the

clearness of his intellect from his infirmity as man, it might be

dispelled by the glorious brightness of his blood. For it was not in

vain that our Lord Jesus Christ, when He declared Himself to be the

vine, and His disciples, as it were, the branches in the vine, gave

command that those which bare no fruit should be cut off, and removed

from the vine as useless branches. [1202] But what is really fruit,

save that new offspring, of which He further says, "A new commandment I

give unto you, that ye love one another?" [1203] This is that very

charity, without which the rest profiteth nothing. The apostle also

says: "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace,

long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance;"

[1204] which all begin with charity, and with the rest of the

combination forms one unity in a kind of wondrous cluster. [1205] Nor

is it again in vain that our Lord added, "And every branch that beareth

fruit, my Father purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit,"

[1206] but because those who are strong in the fruit of charity may yet

have something which requires purging, which the Husbandman will not

leave untended. Whilst then, that holy man entertained on the subject

of baptism an opinion at variance with the true view, which was

afterwards thoroughly examined and confirmed after most diligent

consideration, his error was compensated by his remaining in catholic

unity, and by the abundance of his charity; and finally it was cleared

away by the pruning-hook of martyrdom.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1197] 1 Pet. iv. 8.

[1198] See below, ii. 9.

[1199] Eph. iv. 2, 3.

[1200] Ps. lxxiii. 18; cp. Hieron.

[1201] 1 Cor. xii. 31, xiii. 1.

[1202] John xv. 1, 2.

[1203] John xiii. 34.

[1204] Gal. v. 22, 23.

[1205] Botrum.

[1206] John xv. 2.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 19.--29. But that I may not seem to be uttering these praises

of the blessed martyr (which, indeed, are not his, but rather those of

Him by whose grace he showed himself what he was), in order to escape

the burden of proof, let us now bring forward from his letters the

testimony by which the mouths of the Donatists may most of all be

stopped. For they advance his authority before the unlearned, to show

that in a manner they do well when they baptize afresh the faithful who

come to them. Too wretched are they--and, unless they correct

themselves, even by themselves are they utterly condemned--who choose

in the example set them by so great a man to imitate just that fault,

which only did not injure him, because he walked with constant steps

even to the end in that from which they have strayed who "have not

known the way of peace." [1207] It is true that Christ's baptism is

holy; and although it may exist among heretics or schismatics, yet it

does not belong to the heresy or schism; and therefore even those who

come from thence to the Catholic Church herself ought not to be

baptized afresh. Yet to err on this point is one thing; it is another

thing that those who are straying from the peace of the Church, and

have fallen headlong into the pit of schism, should go on to decide

that any who join them ought to be baptized again. For the former is a

speck on the brightness of a holy soul which abundance of charity

[1208] would fain have covered; the latter is a stain in their nether

foulness which the hatred of peace in their countenance ostentatiously

brings to light. But the subject for our further consideration,

relating to the authority of the blessed Cyprian, we will commence from

a fresh beginning.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1207] Rom. iii. 17; from which it has been introduced into the

Alexandrine Ms. of the Septuagint at Ps. xiv. 3, cf. Hieron.; it is

also found in the English Prayer-book version of the Psalms.

[1208] Charitatis ubera.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Book II.

In which Augustin proves that it is to no purpose that the Donatists

bring forward the authority of Cyprian, bishop and martyr, since it is

really more opposed to them than to the Catholics. For that he held

that the view of his predecessor Agrippinus, on the subject of

baptizing heretics in the Catholic Church when they join its communion,

should only be received on condition that peace should be maintained

with those who entertained the opposite view, and that the unity of the

Church should never be broken by any kind of schism.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 1.--1. How much the arguments make for us, that is, for

catholic peace, which the party of Donatus profess to bring forward

against us from the authority of the blessed Cyprian, and how much they

prove against those who bring them forward, it is my intention, with

the help of God, to show in the ensuing book. If, therefore, in the

course of my argument, I am obliged to repeat what I have already said

in other treatises (although I will do so as little as I can,) yet this

ought not to be objected to by those who have already read them and

agree with them; since it is not only right that those things which are

necessary for instruction should be frequently instilled into men of

dull intelligence, but even in the case of those who are endowed with

larger understanding, it contributes very much both to make their

learning easier and their powers of teaching readier, where the same

points are handled and discussed in many various ways. For I know how

much it discourages a reader, when he comes upon any knotty question in

the book which he has in hand, to find himself presently referred for

its solution to another which he happens not to have. Wherefore, if I

am compelled, by the urgency of the present questions, to repeat what I

have already said in other books, I would seek forgiveness from those

who know those books already, that those who are ignorant may have

their difficulties removed; for it is better to give to one who has

already, than to abstain from satisfying any one who is in want.

2. What, then, do they venture to say, when their mouth is closed

[1209] by the force of truth, with which they will not agree?

"Cyprian," say they, "whose great merits and vast learning we all know,

decreed in a Council, [1210] with many of his fellow-bishops

contributing their several opinions, that all heretics and schismatics,

that is, all who are severed from the communion of the one Church, are

without baptism; and therefore, whosoever has joined the communion of

the Church after being baptized by them must be baptized in the

Church." The authority of Cyprian does not alarm me, because I am

reassured by his humility. We know, indeed, the great merit of the

bishop and martyr Cyprian; but is it in any way greater than that of

the apostle and martyr Peter, of whom the said Cyprian speaks as

follows in his epistle to Quintus? "For neither did Peter, whom the

Lord chose first, and on whom He built His Church, [1211] when Paul

afterwards disputed with him about circumcision, claim or assume

anything insolently and arrogantly to himself, so as to say that he

held the primacy, and should rather be obeyed of those who were late

and newly come. Nor did he despise Paul because he had before been a

persecutor of the Church, but he admitted the counsel of truth, and

readily assented to the legitimate grounds which Paul maintained;

giving us thereby a pattern of concord and patience, that we should not

pertinaciously love our own opinions, but should rather account as our

own any true and rightful suggestions of our brethren and colleagues

for the common health and weal." [1212] Here is a passage in which

Cyprian records what we also learn in holy Scripture, that the Apostle

Peter, in whom the primacy of the apostles shines with such exceeding

grace, was corrected by the later Apostle Paul, when he adopted a

custom in the matter of circumcision at variance with the demands of

truth. If it was therefore possible for Peter in some point to walk

not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, so as to compel the

Gentiles to judaize, as Paul writes in that epistle in which he calls

God to witness that he does not lie; for he says, "Now the things which

I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not;" [1213] and, after

this sacred and awful calling of God to witness, he told the whole

tale, saying in the course of it, "But when I saw that they walked not

uprightly, according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter

before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the

Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to

live as do the Jews?" [1214] --if Peter, I say, could compel the

Gentiles to live after the manner of the Jews, contrary to the rule of

truth which the Church afterwards held, why might not Cyprian, in

opposition to the rule of faith which the whole Church afterwards held,

compel heretics and schismatics to be baptized afresh? I suppose that

there is no slight to Cyprian in comparing him with Peter in respect to

his crown of martyrdom; rather I ought to be afraid lest I am showing

disrespect towards Peter. For who can be ignorant that the primacy of

his apostleship is to be preferred to any episcopate whatever? But,

granting the difference in the dignity of their sees, yet they have the

same glory in their martyrdom. And whether it may be the case that the

hearts of those who confess and die for the true faith in the unity of

charity take precedence of each other in different points, the Lord

Himself will know, by the hidden and wondrous dispensation of whose

grace the thief hanging on the cross once for all confesses Him, and is

sent on the selfsame day to paradise, [1215] while Peter, the follower

of our Lord, denies Him thrice, and has his crown postponed: [1216]

for us it were rash to form a judgment from the evidence. But if any

one were now found compelling a man to be circumcised after the Jewish

fashion, as a necessary preliminary for baptism, this would meet with

much more general repudiation by mankind, than if a man should be

compelled to be baptized again. Wherefore, if Peter, on doing this, is

corrected by his later colleague Paul, and is yet preserved by the bond

of peace and unity till he is promoted to martyrdom, how much more

readily and constantly should we prefer, either to the authority of a

single bishop, or to the Council of a single province, the rule that

has been established by the statutes of the universal Church? For this

same Cyprian, in urging his view of the question, was still anxious to

remain in the unity of peace even with those who differed from him on

this point, as is shown by his own opening address at the beginning of

the very Council which is quoted by the Donatists. For it is as

follows:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1209] Pr�focantur.

[1210] The Council of Carthage, A.D. 256, in which eighty-seven African

bishops declared in favor of rebaptizing heretics. The opinions of the

bishops are quoted and answered by Augustin, one by one, in Books vi

and vii.

[1211] Matt. xvi. 18.

[1212] Cypr. Ep. lxxi.

[1213] Gal. i. 20.

[1214] Gal. ii. 14.

[1215] Luke xxiii. 40-43.

[1216] Matt. xxvi. 69-75.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 2.--3. "When, on the calends of September, very many bishops

from the provinces of Africa, [1217] Numidia, and Mauritania, with

their presbyters and deacons, had met together at Carthage, a great

part of the laity also being present; and when the letter addressed by

Jubaianus [1218] to Cyprian, as also the answer of Cyprian to

Jubaianus, on the subject of baptizing heretics, had been read, Cyprian

said: Ye have heard, most beloved colleagues, what Jubaianus, our

fellow-bishop, has written to me, consulting my moderate ability

concerning the unlawful and profane baptism of heretics, and what

answer I gave him,--giving a judgment which we have once and again and

often given, that heretics coming to the Church ought to be baptized,

and sanctified with the baptism of the Church. Another letter of

Jubaianus has likewise been read to you, in which, agreeably to his

sincere and religious devotion, in answer to our epistle, he not only

expressed his assent, but returned thanks also, acknowledging that he

had received instruction. It remains that we severally declare our

opinion on this subject, judging no one, nor depriving any one of the

right of communion if he differ from us. For no one of us sets himself

up as a bishop of bishops, or, by tyrannical terror, forces his

colleagues to a necessity of obeying, inasmuch as every bishop, in the

free use of his liberty and power, has the right of forming his own

judgment, and can no more be judged by another than he can himself

judge another. But we must all await the judgment of our Lord Jesus

Christ, who alone has the power both of setting us in the government of

His Church, and of judging of our acts therein.'"

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1217] That is, the proconsular province of Africa, or Africa

Zeugitana, answering to the northern part of the territory of Tunis.

[1218] The letters of Jubaianas, Mauritanian bishop, are not extant.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 3.--4. Now let the proud and swelling necks of the heretics

raise themselves, if they dare, against the holy humility of this

address. Ye mad Donatists, whom we desire earnestly to return to the

peace and unity of the holy Church, that ye may receive health therein,

what have ye to say in answer to this? You are wont, indeed, to bring

up against us the letters of Cyprian, his opinion, his Council; why do

ye claim the authority of Cyprian for your schism, and reject his

example when it makes for the peace of the Church? But who can fail to

be aware that the sacred canon of Scripture, both of the Old and New

Testament, is confined within its own limits, and that it stands so

absolutely in a superior position to all later letters of the bishops,

that about it we can hold no manner of doubt or disputation whether

what is confessedly contained in it is right and true; but that all the

letters of bishops which have been written, or are being written, since

the closing of the canon, are liable to be refuted if there be anything

contained in them which strays from the truth, either by the discourse

of some one who happens to be wiser in the matter than themselves, or

by the weightier authority and more learned experience of other

bishops, by the authority of Councils; and further, that the Councils

themselves, which are held in the several districts and provinces, must

yield, beyond all possibility of doubt, to the authority of plenary

Councils which are formed for the whole Christian world; and that even

of the plenary Councils, the earlier are often corrected by those which

follow them, when, by some actual experiment, things are brought to

light which were before concealed, and that is known which previously

lay hid, and this without any whirlwind of sacrilegious pride, without

any puffing of the neck through arrogance, without any strife of

envious hatred, simply with holy humility, catholic peace, and

Christian charity?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 4.--5. Wherefore the holy Cyprian, whose dignity is only

increased by his humility, who so loved the pattern set by Peter as to

use the words, "Giving us thereby a pattern of concord and patience,

that we should not pertinaciously love our own opinions, but should

rather account as our own any true and rightful suggestions of our

brethren and colleagues, for the common health and weal," [1219] --he,

I say, abundantly shows that he was most willing to correct his own

opinion, if any one should prove to him that it is as certain that the

baptism of Christ can be given by those who have strayed from the fold,

as that it could not be lost when they strayed; on which subject we

have already said much. Nor should we ourselves venture to assert

anything of the kind, were we not supported by the unanimous authority

of the whole Church, to which he himself would unquestionably have

yielded, if at that time the truth of this question had been placed

beyond dispute by the investigation and decree of a plenary Council.

For if he quotes Peter as an example for his allowing himself quietly

and peacefully to be corrected by one junior colleague, how much more

readily would he himself, with the Council of his province, have

yielded to the authority of the whole world, when the truth had been

thus brought to light? For, indeed, so holy and peaceful a soul would

have been most ready to assent to the arguments of any single person

who could prove to him the truth; and perhaps he even did so, [1220]

though we have no knowledge of the fact. For it was neither possible

that all the proceedings which took place between the bishops at that

time should have been committed to writing, nor are we acquainted with

all that was so committed. For how could a matter which was involved

in such mists of disputation even have been brought to the full

illumination and authoritative decision of a plenary Council, had it

not first been known to be discussed for some considerable time in the

various districts of the world, with many discussions and comparisons

of the views of the bishop on every side? But this is one effect of

the soundness of peace, that when any doubtful points are long under

investigation, and when, on account of the difficulty of arriving at

the truth, they produce difference of opinion in the course of

brotherly disputation, till men at last arrive at the unalloyed truth;

yet the bond of unity remains, lest in the part that is cut away there

should be found the incurable wound of deadly error.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1219] See above, c. i. 2.

[1220] Bede asserts that this was the case. Book VIII. qu. 5.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 5.--6. And so it is that often something is imperfectly

revealed to the more learned, that their patient and humble charity,

from which proceeds the greater fruit, may be proved, either in the way

in which they preserve unity, when they hold different opinions on

matters of comparative obscurity, or in the temper with which they

receive the truth, when they learn that it has been declared to be

contrary to what they thought. And of these two we have a

manifestation in the blessed Cyprian of the one, viz., of the way in

which he preserved unity with those from whom he differed in opinion.

For he says, "Judging no one nor depriving any one of the right of

communion if he differ from us." [1221] And the other, viz., in what

temper he could receive the truth when found to be different from what

he thought it, though his letters are silent on the point, is yet

proclaimed by his merits. If there is no letter extant to prove it, it

is witnessed by his crown of martyrdom; if the Council of bishops

declare it not, it is declared by the host of angels. For it is no

small proof of a most peaceful soul, that he won the crown of martyrdom

in that unity from which he would not separate, even though he differed

from it. For we are but men; and it is therefore a temptation incident

to men that we should hold views at variance with the truth on any

point. But to come through too great love for our own opinion, or

through jealousy of our betters, even to the sacrilege of dividing the

communion of the Church, and of founding heresy or schism, is a

presumption worthy of the devil. But never in any point to entertain

an opinion at variance with the truth is perfection found only in the

angels. Since then we are men, yet forasmuch as in hope we are angels,

whose equals we shall be in the resurrection, [1222] at any rate, so

long as we are wanting in the perfection of angels, let us at least be

without the presumption of the devil. Accordingly the apostle says,

"There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man."

[1223] It is therefore part of man's nature to be sometimes wrong.

Wherefore he says in another place, "Let us therefore, as many as be

perfect, be thus minded: and if in anything ye be otherwise minded,

God shall reveal even this unto you." [1224] But to whom does He

reveal it when it is His will (be it in this life or in the life to

come), save to those who walk in the way of peace, and stray not aside

into any schism? Not to such as those who have not known the way of

peace, [1225] or for some other cause have broken the bond of unity.

And so, when the apostle said, "And if in anything ye be otherwise

minded, God shall reveal even this unto you," lest they should think

that besides the way of peace their own wrong views might be revealed

to them, he immediately added, "Nevertheless, whereto we have already

attained, let us walk by the same rule." [1226] And Cyprian, walking

by this rule, by the most persistent tolerance, not simply by the

shedding of his blood, but because it was shed in unity (for if he gave

his body to be burned, and had not charity, it would profit him nothing

[1227] ), came by the confession of martyrdom to the light of the

angels, and if not before, at least then, acknowledged the revelation

of the truth on that point on which, while yet in error, he did not

prefer the maintenance of a wrong opinion to the bond of unity.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1221] See above, c. ii. 3.

[1222] Matt. xxii. 30.

[1223] 1 Cor x. 13.

[1224] Phil. iii. 15.

[1225] Rom. iii. 17; see on i. 19, 29.

[1226] Phil. iii. 16.

[1227] 1 Cor. xiii. 3.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 6.--7. What then, ye Donatists, what have ye to say to this?

If our opinion about baptism is true, yet all who thought differently

in the time of Cyprian were not cut off from the unity of the Church,

till God revealed to them the truth of the point on which they were in

error, why then have ye by your sacrilegious separation broken the bond

of peace? But if yours is the true opinion about baptism, Cyprian and

the others, in conjunction with whom ye set forth that he held such a

Council, remained in unity with those who thought otherwise; why,

therefore, have ye broken the bond of peace? Choose which alternative

ye will, ye are compelled to pronounce an opinion against your schism.

Answer me, wherefore have ye separated yourselves? Wherefore have ye

erected an altar in opposition to the whole world? Wherefore do ye not

communicate with the Churches to which apostolic epistles have been

sent, which you yourselves read and acknowledge, in accordance with

whose tenor you say that you order your lives? Answer me, wherefore

have ye separated yourselves? I suppose in order that ye might not

perish by communion with wicked men. How then was it that Cyprian, and

so many of his colleagues, did not perish? For though they believed

that heretics and schismatics did not possess baptism, yet they chose

rather to hold communion with them when they had been received into the

Church without baptism, although they believed that their flagrant and

sacrilegious sins were yet upon their heads, than to be separated from

the unity of the Church, according to the words of Cyprian, "Judging no

one, nor depriving any one of the right of communion if he differ from

us."

8. If, therefore, by such communion with the wicked the just cannot

but perish, the Church had already perished in the time of Cyprian.

Whence then sprang the origin of Donatus? where was he taught, where

was he baptized, where was he ordained, since the Church had been

already destroyed by the contagion of communion with the wicked? But

if the Church still existed, the wicked could do no harm to the good in

one communion with them. Wherefore did ye separate yourselves?

Behold, I see in unity Cyprian and others, his colleagues, who, on

holding a council, decided that those who have been baptized without

the communion of the Church have no true baptism, and that therefore it

must be given them when they join the Church. But again, behold I see

in the same unity that certain men think differently in this matter,

and that, recognizing in those who come from heretics and schismatics

the baptism of Christ, they do not venture to baptize them afresh. All

of these catholic unity embraces in her motherly breast, bearing each

other's burdens by turns, and endeavoring to keep the unity of the

Spirit in the bond of peace, [1228] till God should reveal to one or

other of them any error in their views. If the one party held the

truth, were they infected by the others, or no? If the others held the

truth, were they infected by the first, or no? Choose which ye will.

If there was contamination, the Church even then ceased to exist;

answer me, therefore, whence came ye forth hither? But if the Church

remained, the good are in no wise contaminated by the bad in such

communion; answer me, therefore, why did ye break the bond?

9. Or is it perhaps that schismatics, when received without baptism,

bring no infection, but that it is brought by those who deliver up the

sacred books? [1229] For that there were traditors of your number is

proved by the clearest testimony of history. And if you had then

brought true evidence against those whom you were accusing, you would

have proved your cause before the unity of the whole world, so that you

would have been retained whilst they were shut out. And if you

endeavored to do this, and did not succeed, the world is not to blame,

which trusted the judges of the Church rather than the beaten parties

in the suit; whilst, if you would not urge your suit, the world again

is not to blame, which could not condemn men without their cause being

heard. Why, then, did you separate yourselves from the innocent? You

cannot defend the sacrilege of your schism. But this I pass over. But

so much I say, that if the traditors could have defiled you, who were

not convicted by you, and by whom, on the contrary, you were beaten,

much more could the sacrilege of schismatics and heretics, received

into the Church, as you maintain, without baptism, have defiled

Cyprian. Yet he did not separate himself. And inasmuch as the Church

continued to exist, it is clear that it could not be defiled.

Wherefore, then, did you separate yourselves, I do not say from the

innocent, as the facts proved them, but from the traditors, as they

were never proved to be? Are the sins of traditors, as I began to say,

heavier than those of schismatics? Let us not bring in deceitful

balances, to which we may hang what weights we will and how we will,

saying to suit ourselves, "This is heavy and this is light;" but let us

bring forward the sacred balance out of holy Scripture, as out of the

Lord's treasure-house, and let us weigh them by it, to see which is the

heavier; or rather, let us not weigh them for ourselves, but read the

weights as declared by the Lord. At the time when the Lord showed, by

the example of recent punishment, that there was need to guard against

the sins of olden days, and an idol was made and worshipped, and the

prophetic book was burned by the wrath of a scoffing king, and schism

was attempted, the idolatry was punished with the sword, [1230] the

burning of the book by slaughter in war and captivity in a foreign

land, [1231] schism by the earth opening, and swallowing up alive the

leaders of the schism while the rest were consumed with fire from

heaven. [1232] Who will now doubt that that was the worse crime which

received the heavier punishment? If men coming from such sacrilegious

company, without baptism, as you maintain, could not defile Cyprian,

how could those defile you who were not convicted but supposed

betrayers of the sacred books? [1233] For if they had not only given

up the books to be burned, but had actually burned them with their own

hands, they would have been guilty of a less sin than if they had

committed schism; for schism is visited with the heavier, the other

with the lighter punishment, not at man's discretion, but by the

judgment of God.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1228] Eph. iv. 3.

[1229] Traditores sanctorum librorum.

[1230] Ex. xxxii.

[1231] Jer. xxxvi.

[1232] Num. xvi.

[1233] Non convicti sed conficti traditores.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 7.--10. Wherefore, then, have ye severed yourselves? If there

is any sense left in you, you must surely see that you can find no

possible answer to these arguments. "We are not left," they say, "so

utterly without resource, but that we can still answer, It is our

will. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own

master he standeth or falleth.'" [1234] They do not understand that

this was said to men who were wishing to judge, not of open facts, but

of the hearts of other men. For how does the apostle himself come to

say so much about the sins of schisms and heresies? Or how comes that

verse in the Psalms, "If of a truth ye love justice, judge uprightly, O

ye sons of men?" [1235] But why does the Lord Himself say, "Judge not

according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment," [1236] if

we may not judge any man? Lastly, why, in the case of those traditors,

whom they have judged unrighteously, have they themselves ventured to

pass any judgments at all on another man's servants? To their own

master they were standing or falling. Or why, in the case of the

recent followers of Maximianus, have they not hesitated to bring

forward the judgment delivered with the infallible voice, as they aver,

of a plenary Council, in such terms as to compare them with those first

schismatics whom the earth swallowed up alive? And yet some of them,

as they cannot deny, they either condemned though innocent, or received

back again in their guilt. But when a truth is urged which they cannot

gainsay, they mutter a truly wholesome murmuring: "It is our will:

Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he

standeth or falleth.'" But when a weak sheep is espied in the desert,

and the pastor who should reclaim it to the fold is nowhere to be seen,

then there is setting of teeth, and breaking of the weak neck: "Thou

wouldst be a good man, wert thou not a traditor. Consult the welfare

of thy soul; be a Christian." What unconscionable madness! When it is

said to a Christian, "Be a Christian," what other lesson is taught,

save a denial that he is a Christian? Was it not the same lesson which

those persecutors of the Christians wished to teach, by resisting whom

the crown of martyrdom was gained? Or must we even look on crime as

lighter when committed with threatening of the sword than with

treachery of the tongue?

11. Answer me this, ye ravening wolves, who, seeking to be clad in

sheep's clothing, [1237] think that the letters of the blessed Cyprian

are in your favor. Did the sacrilege of schismatics defile Cyprian, or

did it not? If it did, the Church perished from that instant, and

there remained no source from which ye might spring. If it did not,

then by what offense on the part of others can the guiltless possibly

be defiled, if the sacrilege of schism cannot defile them? Wherefore,

then, have ye severed yourselves? Wherefore, while shunning the

lighter offenses, which are inventions of your own, have ye committed

the heaviest offense of all, the sacrilege of schism? Will ye now

perchance confess that those men were no longer schismatics or heretics

who had been baptized without the communion of the Church, or in some

heresy or schism, because by coming over to the Church, and renouncing

their former errors, they had ceased to be what formerly they were?

How then was it, that though they were not baptized, their sins

remained not on their heads? Was it that the baptism was Christ's, but

that it could not profit them without the communion of the Church; yet

when they came over, and, renouncing their past error, were received

into the communion of the Church by the laying on of hands, then, being

now rooted and founded in charity, without which all other things are

profitless, they began to receive profit for the remission of sins and

the sanctification of their lives from that sacrament, which, while

without the pale of the Church, they possessed in vain?

12. Cease, then, to bring forward against us the authority of Cyprian

in favor of repeating baptism, but cling with us to the example of

Cyprian for the preservation of unity. For this question of baptism

had not been as yet completely worked out, but yet the Church observed

the most wholesome custom of correcting what was wrong, not repeating

what was already given, even in the case of schismatics and heretics:

she healed the wounded part, but did not meddle with what was whole.

And this custom, coming, I suppose, from apostolical tradition (like

many other things which are held to have been handed down under their

actual sanction, because they are preserved throughout the whole

Church, though they are not found either in their letters, or in the

Councils of their successors),--this most wholesome custom, I say,

according to the holy Cyprian, began to be what is called amended by

his predecessor Agrippinus. [1238] But, according to the teaching

which springs from a more careful investigation into the truth, which,

after great doubt and fluctuation, was brought at last to the decision

of a plenary Council, we ought to believe that it rather began to be

corrupted than to receive correction at the hands of Agrippinus.

Accordingly, when so great a question forced itself upon him, and it

was difficult to decide the point, whether remission of sins and man's

spiritual regeneration could take place among heretics or schismatics,

and the authority of Agrippinus was there to guide him, with that of

some few men who shared in his misapprehension of this question, having

preferred attempting something new to maintaining a custom which they

did not understand how to defend; under these circumstances

considerations of probability forced themselves into the eyes of his

soul, and barred the way to the thorough investigation of the truth.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1234] Rom. xiv. 4.

[1235] Ps. lviii. 1. Aug.: Si vere justitiam diligitis, recte judicate

filii hominum. Cp. Hieron.: Si vere utique justitiam loquimini, recta

judicate filii hominum.

[1236] John vii. 24.

[1237] Matt. vii. 15.

[1238] Agrippinus was probably the second (some place him still

earlier) bishop before Cyprian. He convened the council of 70

(disputed date), who were the first to take action in favor of

rebaptism. Cp. Cypr. Ep. lxxi. 4, bon� memori� vir. Cp. lxxiii. 3.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 8.--13. Nor do I think that the blessed Cyprian had any other

motive in the free expression and earlier utterance of what he thought

in opposition to the custom of the Church, save that he should

thankfully receive any one that could be found with a fuller revelation

of the truth, and that he should show forth a pattern for imitation,

not only of diligence in teaching, but also of modesty in learning; but

that, if no one should be found to bring forward any argument by which

those considerations of probability should be refuted, then he should

abide by his opinion, with the full consciousness that he had neither

concealed what he conceived to be the truth, nor violated the unity

which he loved. For so he understood the words of the apostle: "Let

the prophets speak two or three, and let the other judge. If anything

be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace."

[1239] "In which passage he has taught and shown, that many things

are revealed to individuals for the better, and that we ought not each

to strive pertinaciously for what he has once imbibed and held, but if

anything has appeared better and more useful, he should willingly

embrace it." [1240] At any rate, in these words he not only advised

those to agree with him who saw no better course, but also exhorted any

who could to bring forward arguments by which the maintenance of the

former custom might rather be established; that if they should be of

such a nature as not to admit of refutation, he might show in his own

person with what sincerity he said "that we ought not each to strive

pertinaciously for what he has once imbibed and held, but that, if

anything has appeared better and more useful, he should willingly

embrace it." [1241] But inasmuch as none appeared, except such as

simply urged the custom against him, and the arguments which they

produced in its favor were not of a kind to bring conviction to a soul

like his, this mighty reasoner was not content to give up his opinions,

which, though they were not true, as he was himself unable to see, were

at any rate not confuted, in favor of a custom which had truth on its

side, but had not yet been confirmed. And yet, had not his predecessor

Agrippinus, and some of his fellow-bishops throughout Africa, first

tempted him to desert this custom, even by the decision of a Council,

he certainly would not have dared to argue against it. But, amid the

perplexities of so obscure a question, and seeing everywhere around him

a strong universal custom, he would rather have put restraint upon

himself by prayer and stretching forth his mind towards God, so as to

have perceived or taught that for truth which was afterwards decided by

a plenary Council. But when he had found relief amid his weariness in

the authority of the former Council [1242] which was held by

Agrippinus, he preferred maintaining what was in a manner the discovery

of his predecessors, to expending further toil in investigation. For,

at the end of his letter to Quintus, he thus shows how he has sought

repose, if one may use the expression, for his weariness, in what might

be termed the resting-place of authority. [1243]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1239] 1 Cor. xiv. 29, 30.

[1240] Cypr. Ep. lxxi.

[1241] Cypr. Ep. lxxi.

[1242] The former Council of Carthage was held by Agrippinus early in

the third century, the ordinary date given being 215-7 A.D.; others

186-7.

[1243] Tanquam lectulo auctoritatis.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 9.--14. "This, moreover," says he, "Agrippinus, a man of

excellent memory, with the rest, bishops with him, who at that time

governed the Church of the Lord in the province of Africa and Numidia,

did establish and, after the investigation of a mutual Council had

weighed it, confirm; whose sentence, being both religious and

legitimate and salutary in accordance with the Catholic faith and

Church, we also have followed." [1244] By this witness he gives

sufficient proof how much more ready he would have been to bear his

testimony, had any Council been held to discuss this matter which

either embraced the whole Church, or at least represented our brethren

beyond the sea. [1245] But such a Council had not yet been held,

because the whole world was bound together by the powerful bond of

custom; and this was deemed sufficient to oppose to those who wished to

introduce what was new, because they could not comprehend the truth.

Afterwards, however, while the question became matter for discussion

and investigation amongst many on either side, the new practice was not

only invented, but even submitted to the authority and power of a

plenary Council,--after the martyrdom of Cyprian, it is true, but

before we were born. [1246] But that this was indeed the custom of

the Church, which afterwards was confirmed by a plenary Council, in

which the truth was brought to light, and many difficulties cleared

away, is plain enough from the words of the blessed Cyprian himself in

that same letter to Jubaianus, which was quoted as being read in the

Council. [1247] For he says, "But some one asks, What then will be

done in the case of those who, coming out of heresy to the Church, have

already been admitted without baptism?" where certainly he shows

plainly enough what was usually done, though he would have wished it

otherwise; and in the very fact of his quoting the Council of

Agrippinus, he clearly proves that the custom of the Church was

different. Nor indeed was it requisite that he should seek to

establish the practice by this Council, if it was already sanctioned by

custom; and in the Council itself some of the speakers expressly

declare, in giving their opinion, that they went against the custom of

the Church in deciding what they thought was right. Wherefore let the

Donatists consider this one point, which surely none can fail to see,

that if the authority of Cyprian is to be followed, it is to be

followed rather in maintaining unity than in altering the custom of the

Church; but if respect is paid to his Council, it must at any rate

yield place to the later Council of the universal Church, of which he

rejoiced to be a member, often warning his associates that they should

all follow his example in upholding the coherence of the whole body.

For both later Councils are preferred among later generations to those

of earlier date; and the whole is always, with good reason, looked upon

as superior to the parts.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1244] Cypr. Ep. lxxi. 4.

[1245] Transmarinum vel universale Concilium.

[1246] The plenary Council, on whose authority Augustin relies in many

places in this work, was either that of Arles, in 314 A.D., or of

Nic�a, in 325 A.D., both of them being before his birth, in 354 A.D.

He quotes the decision of the same council, contra Parmenianum, ii. 13,

30; de H�resibus 69: Ep. xliii. 7, 19. Contra Parmenianum, iii. 4,

21: "They condemned," he says, "some few in Africa, by whom they were

in turn vanquished by the judgment of the whole world;" and he adds,

that "the Catholics trusted ecclesiastical judges like these in

preference to the defeated parties in the suit." Ib. 6, 30: He says

that the Donatists, "having made a schism in the unity of the Church,

were refuted, not by the authority of 310 African bishops, but by that

of the whole world." And in the sixth chapter of the first book of the

same treatise, he says that the Donatists, after the decision at Arles,

came again to Constantine, and there were defeated "by a final

decision," i.e. at Milan, as is seen from Ep. xliii. 7, 20, in the year

316 A.D. Substance of note in Benedictine ed. reproduced in Migne.

[1247] See above, ch. ii. 3.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 10.--15. But what attitude do they assume, when it is shown

that the holy Cyprian, though he did not himself admit as members of

the Church those who had been baptized in heresy or schism, yet held

communion with those who did admit them, according to his express

declaration, "Judging no one, nor depriving any one of the right of

communion if he differ from us?" [1248] If he was polluted by

communion with persons of this kind, why do they follow his authority

in the question of baptism? But if he was not polluted by communion

with them, why do they not follow his example in maintaining unity?

Have they anything to urge in their defense except the plea, "We choose

to have it so?" What other answer have any sinful or wicked men to the

discourse of truth or justice,--the voluptuous, for instance, the

drunkards, adulterers, and those who are impure in any way, thieves,

robbers, murderers, plunderers, evil-doers, idolaters,--what other

answer can they make when convicted by the voice of truth, except "I

choose to do it;" "It is my pleasure so"? And if they have in them a

tinge of Christianity, they say further, "Who art thou that judgest

another man's servant?" [1249] Yet these have so much more remains of

modesty, that when, in accordance with divine and human law, they meet

with punishment for their abandoned life and deeds, they do not style

themselves martyrs; while the Donatists wish at once to lead a

sacrilegious life and enjoy a blameless reputation, to suffer no

punishment for their wicked deeds, and to gain a martyr's glory in

their just punishment. As if they were not experiencing the greater

mercy and patience of God, in proportion as "executing His judgments

upon them by little and little, He giveth them place of repentance,"

[1250] and ceases not to redouble His scourgings in this life; that,

considering what they suffer, and why they suffer it, they may in time

grow wise; and that those who have received the baptism of the party of

Maximianus in order to preserve the unity of Donatus, may the more

readily embrace the baptism of the whole world in order to preserve the

peace of Christ; that they may be restored to the root, may be

reconciled to the unity of the Church, may see that they have nothing

left for them to say, though something yet remains for them to do; that

for their former deeds the sacrifice of loving-kindness may be offered

to a long-suffering God, whose unity they have broken by their wicked

sin, on whose sacraments they have inflicted such a lasting wrong. For

"the Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, plenteous in mercy

and truth." [1251] Let them embrace His mercy and long-suffering in

this life, and fear His truth in the next. For He willeth not the

death of a sinner, but rather that he should turn from his way and

live; [1252] because He bends His judgment against the wrongs that have

been inflicted on Him. This is our exhortation.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1248] Ib.

[1249] Rom. xiv. 4.

[1250] Wisd. xii. 10.

[1251] Not Ps. ciii. 8, but lxxxvi. 15.

[1252] Ezek. xxiii. 11.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 11.--16. For this reason, then, we hold them to be enemies,

because we speak the truth, because we are afraid to be silent, because

we fear to shrink from pressing our point with all the force that lies

within our power, because we obey the apostle when he says, "Preach the

word; be instant in season out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort."

[1253] But, as the gospel says, "They love the praise of men more

than the praise of God;" [1254] and while they fear to incur blame for

a time, they do not fear to incur damnation for ever. They see, too,

themselves what wrong they are doing; they see that they have no answer

which they can make, but they overspread the inexperienced with mists,

whilst they themselves are being swallowed up alive,--that is, are

perishing knowingly and willfully. They see that men are amazed, and

look with abhorrence on the fact that they have divided themselves into

many schisms, especially in Carthage, [1255] the capital and most noted

city of all Africa; they have endeavored to patch up the disgrace of

their rags. Thinking that they could annihilate the followers of

Maximianus, they pressed heavily on them through the agency of Optatus

the Gildonian; [1256] they inflicted on them many wrongs amid the

cruellest of persecutions. Then they received back some, thinking that

all could be converted under the influence of the same terror; but they

were unwilling to do those whom they received the wrong of baptizing

afresh those who had been baptized by them in their schism, or rather

of causing them to be baptized again within their communion by the very

same men by whom they had been baptized outside, and thus they at once

made an exception to their own impious custom. They feel how wickedly

they are acting in assailing the baptism of the whole world, when they

have received the baptism of the followers of Maximianus. But they

fear those whom they have themselves rebaptized, lest they should

receive no mercy from them, when they have shown it to others; lest

these should call them to account for their souls when they have ceased

to destroy those of other men.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1253] 2 Tim. iv. 2.

[1254] John xii. 43.

[1255] He is alluding to that chief schism among the Donatists, which

occurred when Maximianus was consecrated bishop of Carthage, in

opposition to Primianus, probably immediately after the Synod of

Cabarsussum, 393.

[1256] Optatus, a Donatist bishop of Thamogade in Numidia, was called

Gildonianus from his adherence to Gildo, Count of Africa, and

generalissimo of the province under the elder Theodosius. On his

death, in 395 A.D., Gildo usurped supreme authority, and by his aid

Optatus was enabled to oppress the Catholics in the province, till, in

398 A.D., Gildo was defeated by his brother Mascezel, and destroyed

himself, and Optatus was put in prison, where he died soon afterwards.

He is not to be confounded with Optatus, Bishop of Milevis, the

strenuous opponent of the Donatists.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 12.--17. What answer they can give about the followers of

Maximianus whom they have received, they cannot divine. If they say,

"Those we received were innocent," the answer is obvious, "Then you had

condemned the innocent." If they say, "We did it in ignorance," then

you judged rashly (just as you passed a rash judgment on the

traditors), and your declaration was false that "you must know that

they were condemned by the truthful voice of a plenary Council." [1257]

For indeed the innocent could never be condemned by a voice of

truth. If they say, "We did not condemn them," it is only necessary to

cite the Council, to cite the names of bishops and states alike. If

they say, "The Council itself is none of ours," then we cite the

records of the proconsular province, where more than once they quoted

the same Council to justify the exclusion of the followers of

Maximianus from the basilicas, and to confound them by the din of the

judges and the force of their allies. If they say that Felicianus of

Musti, and Pr�textatus of Assav�, whom they afterwards received, were

not of the party of Maximianus, then we cite the records in which they

demanded, in the courts of law, that these persons should be excluded

from the Council which they held against the party of Maximianus. If

they say, "They were received for the sake of peace," our answer is,

"Why then do ye not acknowledge the only true and full peace? Who

urged you, who compelled you to receive a schismatic whom you had

condemned, to preserve the peace of Donatus, and to condemn the world

unheard, in violation of the peace of Christ?" Truth hems them in on

every side. They see that there is no answer left for them to make,

and they think that there is nothing left for them to do; they cannot

find out what to say. They are not allowed to be silent. They had

rather strive with perverse utterance against truth, than be restored

to peace by a confession of their faults.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1257] The Council of Bagai. See above, I. v. 7.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 13.--18. But who can fail to understand what they may be

saying in their hearts? "What then are we to do," say they, "with

those whom we have already rebaptized?" Return with them to the

Church. Bring those whom you have wounded to be healed by the medicine

of peace: bring those whom you have slain to be brought to life again

by the life of charity. Brotherly union has great power in

propitiating God. "If two of you," says our Lord, "shall agree on

earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for

them." [1258] If for two men who agree, how much more for two

communities? Let us throw ourselves together on our knees before the

Lord. Do you share with us our unity; let us share with you your

contrition and let charity cover the multitude of sins. [1259] Seek

counsel from the blessed Cyprian himself. See how much he considered

to depend upon the blessing of unity, from which he did not sever

himself to avoid the communion of those who disagreed with him; how,

though he considered that those who were baptized outside the communion

of the Church had no true baptism, he was yet willing to believe that,

by simple admission into the Church, they might, merely in virtue of

the bond of unity, be admitted to a share in pardon. For thus he

solved the question which he proposed to himself in writing as follows

to Jubaianus: "But some will say, What then will become of those who,

in times past, coming to the Church from heresy, were admitted without

baptism?' The Lord is able of His mercy to grant pardon, and not to

sever from the gifts of His Church those who, being out of simplicity

admitted to the Church, have in the Church fallen asleep." [1260]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1258] Matt. xviii. 19.

[1259] 1 Pet. iv. 8.

[1260] Cypr. Ep. lxxiii. 23 to Jubaianus.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 14.--19. But which is the worse, not to be baptized at all, or

to be twice baptized, it is difficult to decide. I see, indeed, which

is more repugnant and abhorrent to men's feelings; but when I have

recourse to that divine balance, in which the weight of things is

determined, not by man's feelings, but by the authority of God, I find

a statement by our Lord on either side. For He said to Peter, "He who

is washed has no need of washing a second time;" [1261] and to

Nicodemus, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot

enter into the kingdom of God." [1262] What is the purport of the

more secret determination of God, it is perhaps difficult for men like

us to learn; but as far as the mere words are concerned, any one may

see what a difference there is between "has no need of washing," and

"cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven." The Church, lastly, herself

holds as her tradition, that without baptism she cannot admit a man to

her altar at all; but since it is allowed that one who has been

rebaptized may be admitted after penance, surely this plainly proves

that his baptism is considered valid. If, therefore, Cyprian thought

that those whom he considered to be unbaptized yet had some share in

pardon, in virtue of the bond of unity, the Lord has power to be

reconciled even to the rebaptized by means of the simple bond of unity

and peace, and by this same compensating power of peace to mitigate His

displeasure against those by whom they were rebaptized, and to pardon

all the errors which they had committed while in error, on their

offering the sacrifice of charity, which covereth the multitude of

sins; so that He looks not to the number of those who have been wounded

by their separation, but to the greater number who have been delivered

from bondage by their return. For in the same bond of peace in which

Cyprian conceived that, through the mercy of God, those whom he

considered to have been admitted to the Church without baptism, were

yet not severed from the gifts of the Church, we also believe that

through the same mercy of God the rebaptized can earn their pardon at

His hands.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1261] John xiii. 10. "Qui lotus est, non habet necessitatem iterum

lavandi." The Latin, with the A.V., loses the distinction between ho

leloumenos, "he that has bathed," and niptein, "to wash:" and further

wrongfully introduces the idea of repetition.

[1262] John iii. 5.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 15.--20. Since the Catholic Church, both in the time of the

blessed Cyprian and in the older time before him, contained within her

bosom either some that were rebaptized or some that were unbaptized,

either the one section or the other must have won their salvation only

by the force of simple unity. For if those who came over from the

heretics were not baptized, as Cyprian asserts, they were not rightly

admitted into the Church; and yet he himself did not despair of their

obtaining pardon from the mercy of God in virtue of the unity of the

Church. So again, if they were already baptized, it was not right to

rebaptize them. What, therefore, was there to aid the other section,

save the same charity that delighted in unity, so that what was hidden

from man's weakness, in the consideration of the sacrament, might not

be reckoned, by the mercy of God, as a fault in those who were lovers

of peace? Why, then, while ye fear those whom ye have rebaptized, do

ye grudge yourselves and them the entrance to salvation? There was at

one time a doubt upon the subject of baptism; those who held different

opinions yet remained in unity. In course of time, owing to the

certain discovery of the truth, that doubt was taken away. The

question which, unsolved, did not frighten Cyprian into separation from

the Church, invites you, now that it is solved, to return once more

within the fold. Come to the Catholic Church in its agreement, which

Cyprian did not desert while yet disturbed with doubt; or if now you

are dissatisfied with the example of Cyprian, who held communion with

those who were received with the baptism of heretics, declaring openly

that we should "neither judge any one, nor deprive any one of the right

of communion if he differ from us," [1263] whither are ye going, ye

wretched men? What are ye doing? You are bound to fly even from

yourselves, because you have advanced beyond the position where he

abode. But if neither his own sins nor those of others could stand in

his way, on account of the abundance of his charity and his love of

brotherly kindness and the bond of peace, do you return to us, where

you will find much less hindrance in the way of either us or you from

the fictions which your party have invented.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1263] See above, cii. 3.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Book III.

Augustin undertakes the refutation of the arguments which might be

derived from the epistle of Cyprian to Jubaianus, to give color to the

view that the baptism of Christ could not be conferred by heretics.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 1.--1. I think that it may now be considered clear to every

one, that the authority of the blessed Cyprian for the maintenance of

the bond of peace, and the avoiding of any violation of that most

wholesome charity which preserves unity in the Church, may be urged on

our side rather than on the side of the Donatists. For if they have

chosen to act upon his example in rebaptizing Catholics, because he

thought that heretics ought to be baptized on joining the Catholic

Church, shall not we rather follow his example, whereby he laid down a

manifest rule that one ought in no wise, by the establishment of a

separate communion, to secede from the Catholic communion, that is,

from the body of Christians dispersed throughout the world, even on the

admission of evil and sacrilegious men, since he was unwilling even to

remove from the right of communion those whom he considered to have

received sacrilegious men without baptism into the Catholic communion,

saying, "Judging no one, nor depriving any of the right of communion if

he differ from us?" [1264]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1264] See above, II. ii. 3.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 2.--2. Nevertheless, I see what may still be required of me,

viz., that I should answer those plausible arguments, by which, in even

earlier times, Agrippinus, or Cyprian himself, or those in Africa who

agreed with them, or any others in far distant lands beyond the sea,

were moved, not indeed by the authority of any plenary or even

regionary Council, but by a mere epistolary correspondence, to think

that they ought to adopt a custom which had no sanction from the

ancient custom of the Church, and which was expressly forbidden by the

most unanimous resolution of the Catholic world in order that an error

which had begun to creep into the minds of some men, through

discussions of this kind, might be cured by the more powerful truth and

universal healing power of unity coming on the side of safety. And so

they may see with what security I approach this discourse. If I am

unable to gain my point, and show how those arguments may be refuted

which they bring forward from the Council and the epistles of Cyprian,

to the effect that Christ's baptism may not be given by the hands of

heretics, I shall still remain safely in the Church, in whose communion

Cyprian himself remained with those who differed from him.

3. But if they say that the Catholic Church existed then, because

there were a few, or, if they prefer it, even a considerable number,

who denied the validity of any baptism conferred in an heretical body,

and baptized all who came from thence, what then? Did the Church not

exist at all before Agrippinus, with whom that new kind of system

began, at variance with all previous custom? Or how, again after the

time of Agrippinus, when, unless there had been a return to the

primitive custom, there would have been no need for Cyprian to set on

foot another Council? Was there no Church then, because such a custom

as this prevailed everywhere, that the baptism of Christ should be

considered nothing but the baptism of Christ, even though it were

proved to have been conferred in a body of heretics or schismatics?

But if the Church existed even then, and had not perished through a

breach of its continuity, but was, on the contrary, holding its ground,

and receiving increase in every nation, surely it is the safest plan to

abide by this same custom, which then embraced good and bad alike in

unity. But if there was then no Church in existence, because

sacrilegious heretics were received without baptism, and this prevailed

by universal custom, whence has Donatus made his appearance? From what

land did he spring? or from what sea did he emerge? or from what sky

did he fall? And so we, as I had begun to say, are safe in the

communion of that Church, throughout the whole extent of which the

custom now prevails, which prevailed in like manner through its whole

extent before the time of Agrippinus, and in the interval between

Agrippinus and Cyprian, and whose unity neither Agrippinus nor Cyprian

ever deserted, nor those who agreed with them, although they

entertained different views from the rest of their brethren--all of

them remaining in the same communion of unity with the very men from

whom they differed in opinion. But let the Donatists themselves

consider what their true position is, if they neither can say whence

they derived their origin, if the Church had already been destroyed by

the plague-spot of communion with heretics and schismatics received

into her bosom without baptism; nor again agree with Cyprian himself,

for he declared that he remained in communion with those who received

heretics and schismatics, and so also with those who were received as

well: while they have separated themselves from the communion of the

whole world, on account of the charge of having delivered up the sacred

books, which they brought against the men whom they maligned in Africa,

but failed to convict when brought to trial beyond the sea; although,

even had the crimes which they alleged been true, they were much less

heinous than the sins of heresy and schism; and yet these could not

defile Cyprian in the persons of those who came from them without

baptism, as he conceived, and were admitted without baptism into the

Catholic communion. Nor, in the very point in which they say that they

imitate Cyprian, can they find any answer to make about acknowledging

the baptism of the followers of Maximianus, together with those whom,

though they belonged to the party that they had first condemned in

their own plenary Council, and then gone on to prosecute even at the

tribunal of the secular power, they yet received back into their

communion, in the episcopate of the very same bishop under whom they

had been condemned. Wherefore, if the communion of wicked men

destroyed the Church in the time of Cyprian, they have no source from

which they can derive their own communion; and if the Church was not

destroyed, they have no excuse for their separation from it. Moreover,

they are neither following the example of Cyprian, since they have

burst the bond of unity, nor abiding by their own Council, since they

have recognized the baptism of the followers of Maximianus.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 3.--4. Let us therefore, seeing that we adhere to the example

of Cyprian, go on now to consider Cyprian's Council. What says

Cyprian? "Ye have heard," he says, "most beloved colleagues, what

Jubaianus our fellow-bishop has written to me, consulting my moderate

ability concerning the unlawful and profane baptism of heretics, and

what answer I gave him,--giving a judgment which we have once and again

and often given, that heretics coming to the Church ought to be

baptized and sanctified with the baptism of the Church. Another letter

of Jubaianus has likewise been read to you, in which, agreeably to his

sincere and religious devotion, in answer to our epistle, he not only

expressed his assent, but returned thanks also, acknowledging that he

had received instruction." [1265] In these words of the blessed

Cyprian, we find that he had been consulted by Jubaianus, and what

answer he had given to his questions, and how Jubaianus acknowledged

with gratitude that he had received instruction. Ought we then to be

thought unreasonably persistent if we desire to consider this same

epistle by which Jubaianus was convinced? For till such time as we are

also convinced (if there are any arguments of truth whereby this can be

done), Cyprian himself has established our security by the right of

Catholic communion.

5. For he goes on to say: "It remains that we severally declare our

opinion on this same subject, judging no one, nor depriving any one of

the right of communion if he differ from us." [1266] He allows me,

therefore, without losing the right of communion, not only to continue

inquiring into the truth, but even to hold opinions differing from his

own. "For no one of us," he says, "setteth himself up as a bishop of

bishops, or by tyrannical terror forces his colleagues to a necessity

of obeying." What could be more kind? what more humble? Surely there

is here no authority restraining us from inquiry into what is truth.

"Inasmuch as every bishop," he says, "in the free use of his liberty

and power, has the right of forming his own judgment, and can no more

be judged by another than he can himself judge another,"--that is, I

suppose, in those questions which have not yet been brought to perfect

clearness of solution; for he knew what a deep question about the

sacrament was then occupying the whole Church with every kind of

disputation, and gave free liberty of inquiry to every man, that the

truth might be made known by investigation. For he was surely not

uttering what was false, and trying to catch his simpler colleagues in

their speech, so that, when they should have betrayed that they held

opinions at variance with his, he might then propose, in violation of

his promise, that they should be excommunicated. Far be it from a soul

so holy to entertain such accursed treachery; indeed, they who hold

such a view about such a man, thinking that it conduces to his praise,

do but show that it would be in accordance with their own nature. I

for my part will in no wise believe that Cyprian, a Catholic bishop, a

Catholic martyr, whose greatness only made him proportionately humble

in all things, so as to find favor before the Lord, [1267] should ever,

especially in the sacred Council of his colleagues, have uttered with

his mouth what was not echoed in his heart, especially as he further

adds, "But we must all await the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who

alone has the power both of setting us in the government of His Church,

and of judging of our acts therein." [1268] When, then, he called to

their remembrance so solemn a judgment, hoping to hear the truth from

his colleagues, would he first set them the example of lying? May God

avert such madness from every Christian man, and how much more from

Cyprian! We have therefore the free liberty of inquiry granted to us

by the most moderate and most truthful speech of Cyprian.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1265] See above, II. ii. 3.

[1266] See above, II. ii. 3.

[1267] Ecclus. iii. 18.

[1268] See above, II. ii. 3.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 4.--6. Next his colleagues proceed to deliver their several

opinions. But first they listened to the letter written to Jubaianus;

for it was read, as was mentioned in the preamble. Let it therefore be

read among ourselves also, that we too, with the help of God, may

discover from it what we ought to think. "What!" I think I hear some

one saying, "do you proceed to tell us what Cyprian wrote to

Jubaianus?" I have read the letter, I confess, and should certainly

have been a convert to his views, had I not been induced to consider

the matter more carefully by the vast weight of authority, originating

in those whom the Church, distributed throughout the world amid so many

nations, of Latins, Greeks, barbarians, not to mention the Jewish race

itself, has been able to produce,--that same Church which gave birth to

Cyprian himself,--men whom I could in no wise bring myself to think had

been unwilling without reason to hold this view,--not because it was

impossible that in so difficult a question the opinion of one or of a

few might not have been more near the truth than that of more, but

because one must not lightly, without full consideration and

investigation of the matter to the best of his abilities, decide in

favor of a single individual, or even of a few, against the decision of

so very many men of the same religion and communion, all endowed with

great talent and abundant learning. And so how much was suggested to

me on more diligent inquiry, even by the letter of Cyprian himself, in

favor of the view which is now held by the Catholic Church, that the

baptism of Christ is to be recognized and approved, not by the standard

of their merits by whom it is administered, but by His alone of whom it

is said, "The same is He which baptizeth," [1269] will be shown

naturally in the course of our argument. Let us therefore suppose that

the letter which was written by Cyprian to Jubaianus has been read

among us, as it was read in the Council. [1270] And I would have

every one read it who means to read what I am going to say, lest he

might possibly think that I have suppressed some things of

consequence. For it would take too much time, and be irrelevant to the

elucidation of the matter in hand, were we at this moment to quote all

the words of this epistle.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1269] John i. 33.

[1270] The Council of Carthage.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 5.--7. But if any one should ask what I hold in the meantime,

while discussing this question, I answer that, in the first place, the

letter of Cyprian suggested to me what I should hold till I should see

clearly the nature of the question which next begins to be discussed.

For Cyprian himself says: "But some will say, What then will become of

those who in times past, coming to the Church from heresy, were

admitted without baptism?'" [1271] Whether they were really without

baptism, or whether they were admitted because those who admitted them

conceived that they had partaken of baptism, is a matter for our future

consideration. At any rate, Cyprian himself shows plainly enough what

was the ordinary custom of the Church, when he says that in past time

those who came to the Church from heresy were admitted without baptism.

8. For in the Council itself Castus of Sicca says: "He who, despising

truth, presumes to follow custom, is either envious or evil-disposed

towards the brethren to whom the truth is revealed, or is ungrateful

towards God, by whose inspiration His Church is instructed." [1272]

Whether the truth had been revealed, we shall investigate hereafter; at

any rate, he acknowledges that the custom of the Church was different.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1271] Epist. lxxiii. 23, to Jubianus.

[1272] Seventh Conc. Carth. under Cyprian, the third which dealt with

baptism, A.D. 256, sec. 28. These opinions are quoted again in Books

VI. and VII.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 6.--9. Libosus also of Vaga says: "The Lord says in the

gospel, I am the Truth.' [1273] He does not say, I am custom.'

Therefore, when the truth is made manifest, custom must give way to

truth." [1274] Clearly, no one could doubt that custom must give way

to truth where it is made manifest. But we shall see presently about

the manifestation of the truth. Meanwhile he also makes it clear that

custom was on the other side.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1273] John xiv. 6.

[1274] Conc. Carth. sec. 30.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 7.--10. Zosimus also of Tharassa said: "When a revelation of

the truth has been made, error must give way to truth; for even Peter,

who at the first circumcised, afterwards gave way to Paul when he

declared the truth." [1275] He indeed chose to say error, not custom;

but in saying "for even Peter, who at the first circumcised, afterwards

gave way to Paul when he declared the truth," he shows plainly enough

that there was a custom also on the subject of baptism at variance with

his views. At the same time, also, he warns us that it was not

impossible that Cyprian might have held an opinion about baptism at

variance with that required by the truth, as held by the Church both

before and after him, if even Peter could hold a view at variance with

the truth as taught us by the Apostle Paul. [1276]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1275] Ib. sec. 56.

[1276] Gal. ii. 11-14.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 8.--11. Likewise Felix of Buslacene said: "In admitting

heretics without the baptism of the Church, let no one prefer custom to

reason and truth; because reason and truth always prevail to the

exclusion of custom." [1277] Nothing could be better, if it be

reason, and if it be truth; but this we shall see presently.

Meanwhile, it is clear from the words of this man also that the custom

was the other way.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1277] Conc. Carth. sec. 63.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 9.--12. Likewise Honoratus of Tucca [1278] said: "Since

Christ is the Truth, we ought to follow truth rather than custom."

[1279] By all these declarations it is proved that we are not

excluded from the communion of the Church, till it shall have been

clearly shown what is the nature of the truth, which they say must be

preferred to our custom. But if the truth has made it clear that the

very regulation ought to be maintained which the said custom had

prescribed, then it is evident both that this custom was not

established or confirmed in vain, and also that, in consequence of the

discussions in question, the most wholesome observance of so great a

sacrament, which could never, indeed, have been changed in the Catholic

Church, was even more watchfully guarded with the most scrupulous

caution, when it had received the further corroboration of Councils.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1278] Thucca.

[1279] Conc. Carth. sec. 77.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 10.--13. Therefore Cyprian writes to Jubaianus as follows,

"concerning the baptism of heretics, who, being placed without, and set

down out of the Church," seem to him to "claim to themselves a matter

over which they have neither right nor power. Which we," he says,

"cannot account valid or lawful, since it is clear that among them it

is unlawful." [1280] Neither, indeed, do we deny that a man who is

baptized among heretics, or in any schism outside the Church, derives

no profit from it so far as he is partner in the perverseness of the

heretics and schismatics; nor do we hold that those who baptize,

although they confer the real true sacrament of baptism, are yet acting

rightly, in gathering adherents outside the Church, and entertaining

opinions contrary to the Church. But it is one thing to be without a

sacrament, another thing to be in possession of it wrongly, and to

usurp it unlawfully. Therefore they do not cease to be sacraments of

Christ and the Church, merely because they are unlawfully used, not

only by heretics, but by all kinds of wicked and impious persons.

These, indeed, ought to be corrected and punished, but the sacraments

should be acknowledged and revered.

14. Cyprian, indeed, says that on this subject not one, but two or

more Councils were held; always, however, in Africa. For indeed in one

he mentions that seventy-one bishops had been assembled, [1281] --to

all whose authority we do not hesitate, with all due deference to

Cyprian, to prefer the authority, supported by many more bishops, of

the whole Church spread throughout the whole world, of which Cyprian

himself rejoiced that he was an inseparable member.

15. Nor is the water "profane and adulterous" [1282] over which the

name of God is invoked, even though it be invoked by profane and

adulterous persons; because neither the creature itself of water, nor

the name invoked, is adulterous. But the baptism of Christ,

consecrated by the words of the gospel, is necessarily holy, however

polluted and unclean its ministers may be; because its inherent

sanctity cannot be polluted, and the divine excellence abides in its

sacrament, whether to the salvation of those who use it aright, or to

the destruction of those who use it wrong. Would you indeed maintain

that, while the light of the sun or of a candle, diffused through

unclean places, contracts no foulness in itself therefrom, yet the

baptism of Christ can be defiled by the sins of any man, whatsoever he

may be? For if we turn our thoughts to the visible materials

themselves, which are to us the medium of the sacraments, every one

must know that they admit of corruption. But if we think on that which

they convey to us, who can fail to see that it is incorruptible,

however much the men through whose ministry it is conveyed are either

being rewarded or punished for the character of their lives?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[1280] Ctpr. Ep. lxxiii. 1.

[1281] Ctpr. Ep. lxxiii. 1.

[1282] Ctpr. Ep. lxxiii. 1.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chapter 11.--16. But Cyprian was right in not being moved by what

Jubaianus wrote, that "the followers of Novatian [1283] rebaptize those

who come to them from the Catholic Church." [1284] For, in the first

place, it do