Questions on the Old and New Testaments (part 2 of 2)

Ambrosiaster (4th century)

SermonIndex.net / Church Fathers

Questions on the Old and New Testaments (part 2)

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (Matthew 1:16; Luke. 3:23)

QUESTION 56. WHY IS IT THAT IN MATTHEW JOSEPH'S FATHER IS WRITTEN AS JACOB, AND IN LUKE AS HELI, SO THAT HE SEEMS TO BE IGNORANTLY DESCRIBED AS HAVING TWO FATHERS, OR AT LEAST SO THAT WHO HIS TRUE FATHER IS REMAINS UNKNOWN (Matt. 1:16; Luke 3:23)? — There is no doubt that Jacob was Joseph's father. For the line from David through Solomon maintains its course and, proceeding straight, reaches Jacob, whose son is Joseph. Heli, however, the son of Matthat, holds the line from David through Nathan, David's son, down to the time when the Savior came. Therefore each Evangelist, following from David the line of different brothers, makes, as it were, a fork: so that Matthew descends from David through Solomon to Joseph, while Luke, starting from Heli, who lived in the Savior's time, ascends through the stock of Nathan, the son of David, and joins the tribe of both Heli and Joseph, showing that both are of one and the same stock; so that when he associates Joseph with Heli, he shows them not to differ in lineage, but to be brothers. And by this not only is the Savior shown to be the son of Joseph, but also of Heli. For by the very reasoning by which the Savior is called the son of Joseph, he is also the son of Heli, and of all the others who belong to the same tribe. Therefore the Apostle says, "whose are the fathers, and from whom is the Christ according to the flesh" (Rom. 9:5).

Moved by divine prompting, Luke ascends from Heli through the line of Nathan to David, and through Thara, David's father, ascends to Shem the son of Noah, and still further, beyond the Flood, reaches Seth the son of Adam, who was given in place of Abel; and in the same way he makes the Savior the son of Adam as he was said to be the son of Joseph and of Heli. Then, going beyond Adam, he assigns Christ to be the Son of God before all flesh. The opinion held by some, that Heli had taken the wife of Jacob, as the Law commanded that if anyone died without children, his brother or kinsman should take his wife and raise up seed for his brother (Deut. 25:5), and that it therefore happened that Heli fathered Joseph for Jacob, whose wife he had taken, and that in this way the genealogies were joined, so that Joseph is rightly said to have Heli as father, is neither plausible nor useful for any-

thing. Rather, what was said above joins by genealogy two brothers, sons of one man, and shows Christ to be the Son of God before every generation. For when the Evangelist reports, saying, "And Jesus himself, when he began, was about thirty years old, being the son (as was supposed) of Joseph, who was the son of Heli" (Luke 3:23), that is: Jesus was thought to be the son of Joseph; and he was not only Joseph's son, but also Heli's.

Not because he calls Joseph the son of Heli, but because in the same sense in which Jesus was called Joseph's son, he was also Heli's son, since Joseph and Heli were sons of brothers, namely of Solomon and Nathan, the sons of David. Therefore, by ascending through David to Abraham and Noah and Seth and to Adam himself, and beyond Adam, he teaches that Christ is the Son of God. For when he says, "who was the son of Seth, who was the son of Adam, who was the Son of God," he indeed calls Christ the son of Adam in the same way that he was called the son of Joseph. For Mary says to him, "Son, why have you done this to us? Behold, your father and I have been seeking you sorrowing" (Luke 2:48). But beyond Adam he joins Christ to God the Father, so that he who was called son of these, from Adam up to Joseph and Heli, may be understood to be before them all as the true Son of God, to the confusion of Photinus, who insists that Christ is only from Mary, and did not exist before. Of those whose son he was not, he was called son; yet of God, whose true Son he was, this was denied. If, however, which is unlikely and of no benefit, Joseph is called Heli's son in the way we mentioned above, it will appear that the Evangelist did not say this of Christ, that he was the Son of God, but of Adam.

For by listing fathers in the order of successive sons, he comes to Enos, whose father he calls Seth, and Seth's father he calls Adam, and Adam's father he calls God; and I do not see what good there is in asserting it this way. But if, in the order we have described, all the fathers are said to be Christ's fathers, just as he was said to be Joseph's son, because it is written, "whose are the fathers, and from whom is the Christ according to the flesh," (Rom. 9:5) then by this order he is read as son of Seth and son of Adam. And above all these he is designated the Son of God, so that he is said to exist before those whose son he is called.

(Matthew 1:16; Luke. 3:23)

QUESTION 6. THEREFORE, IN MATTHEW JOSEPH'S FATHER IS WRITTEN AS JACOB, AND IN LUKE AS HELI; SO THAT HE IS EITHER IGNORANTLY DESCRIBED AS HAVING TWO FATHERS, OR AT LEAST IT IS UNCLEAR WHO HIS TRUE FATHER IS? — There is no doubt that Jacob was Joseph's father. In fact, the genealogy starts from David, descends by Solomon and reaches in a straight line until Jacob, of which Joseph is the son. The genealogy of Heli, on the contrary, the son of Mathat, is true of David, but descends by Nathan, also son of David, until the time of the advent of the Savior. Now, the two evangelists, following the genealogy of each of the two brothers, made a split, that is to say that St. Matthew descends from David by Solomon to Joseph; while St. Luke ascends from Eli, contemporary with the Savior, by the line of Mathat, son of Nathan, son of David, and he unites the tribes of Eli and Joseph, to show that they are of the same family. By associating Heli with Joseph, he shows that their genealogy is no different, but that they

are brothers, and that consequently the Savior is not only Joseph's son, but also Eli's son. For the same reason, in fact, that the Savior is called the son of Joseph, he is also the son of Heli and all the others who are of the same tribe, a truth which the Apostle expresses in these terms: fathers the patriarchs, and from whom came out according to the flesh, Jesus Christ.

(Rom. 9:5) It is by a divine inspiration that St. Luke ascends from Heli by the line of Nathan to David, and by Tharam his father, to Sem, son of Noah, and before the flood, to Seth, son of Adam, given to him to replace Abel, and he presents the Savior as sons of Adam for the same reason that he calls him sons of Joseph and Eli. He raises him even above Adam, and before the existence of all flesh, he declares that Christ is the son of God. There are some who think that Heli had married Jacob's wife, following the law's prescription that if a man died childless, his brother or one of his relatives would marry his wife and give children to his brother. (Deut. 25:5) It is then understood, say they, that Joseph was begotten for his brother Jacob, whose wife he had married. The two genealogies are thus united, and it is not extraordinary that the evangelist gives Heli as his father to Joseph. This explanation has no probability and does not solve the difficulty. On the contrary, the sentiment which we have expounded above unites the two brothers of one father, and shows that Christ was the Son of God before any generation. How, indeed, does St. Luke express himself? "And Jesus, beginning his mission, was about thirty years old, as it was believed of Joseph, who was of Heli," that is, that it was believed that Jesus was the son of Joseph, and was not only Joseph's son, but also Eli's son.

(Luke 3:23) He does not say that Joseph was son of Eli, but just as Jesus was called Joseph's son, he was also sons of Eli, because Joseph and Heli were sons of two brothers, that is, of Solomon and Nathan, sons of David, and thus going up by David unto Abraham, and Noah, and Seth, even unto Adam himself, and over Adam, he taught that the Christ was the Son of God. Indeed, saying: "Who was son of Seth, who was the son of Adam, who was the son of God, he shows that Christ was the son of Adam in the same way that he was called the son of Joseph, that Mary said, "and my son, why did ye do this, and behold, we, your father and I, were greatly afflicted.

(Luke 2:48) But he rises above Adam for to unite Christ to God the Father, in order to make it clear that if he were called the son of all who descend from Adam to Joseph and Heli, he had before all these generations the true Son of God, and thus to confuse the error of Photius, who maintained that Christ came only from Mary and had not existed before him, so that he was given for fathers those of whom he was not the son, and denied that he was the God's true son, when he really was, if we adopt the explanation as improbable as useless as we have reported above, and according to he is called the son of Heli, the story of the evangelist simply means that Christ was the son of Adam, but not that he was the son of God. In going up, indeed, from the sons to the fathers, he arrives at Enoch, whose father is Seth, the father of Seth is Adam, and Adam has for father God; but I do not see that he was otherwise useful to express oneself in this way. If, on the contrary, each of those who

form the continuation of the genealogy are called the fathers of Jesus Christ, in the same sense that he was called the son of Joseph, following these words: "Whose fathers are the patriarchs, and of whom went out according to the flesh Jesus Christ;

(Rom. 9:5) Following this order, we understand that the Evangelist says that he was son of Seth and son of Adam. And going back above all the patriarchs, he declares that he was the Son of God to show that he existed long before those of whom he is called the Son.

(Matthew 1:17) 1ST CATEGORY NT QUESTION 85. HOW IS IT, THEN, THAT ALTHOUGH IT IS ESTABLISHED THAT FROM DAVID DOWN TO THE BABYLONIAN EXILE THERE ARE SEVENTEEN GENERATIONS, THE EVANGELIST SAYS THERE ARE FOURTEEN (Matt. 1:17), OMITTING AHAZIAH, WHO AFTER JORAM IS THE SON OF JEHOSHAPHAT, AND JOASH THE SON OF AHAZIAH, AND AMAZIAH THE SON OF JOASH? — Nothing should seem more credible than that the Evangelist followed the intention of the Law. And therefore, not without reason, these men were removed by the Evangelist from the number of the others. For their wickedness continued in such a way that their wickedness had no break. The evil that began with Joram ran on in this way as far as Uzziah, the son of Amaziah, so that there was no support from any side by which any one of them might remain, in part by the merit of his father, in the number of the kings. For Joram, acting wickedly, is with good reason preceded by Jehoshaphat in the list; and Uzziah, with good reason, has Jotham preserved in the list. But the continuous wickedness of those three was against God. Solomon too, by the merit of his father, is restored to the kingdom; and Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, acting wickedly, leaves Asa rightly in the number of the kings. But those three, shut in among the evildoers, acting wickedly, are therefore erased. For an example is worse, to the ruin of the line, when wickedness displays itself continually. And, to speak precisely, they are passed over because Joseph did not descend from their stock. For from Abraham the Evangelist followed the line of these generations, from which Joseph, to whom Mary was betrothed, draws his origin, she who bore Christ.

(Matthew 1:18) 1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 52. IF CHRIST WAS BORN OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, THAT IS, IF BY HIS WORKING FLESH WAS MADE FROM MARY, WHY IS IT SAID, "WISDOM, WHICH IS CERTAINLY CHRIST, HAS BUILT A HOUSE FOR HERSELF" (Prov. 9:1)? — This question can be heard from a double point of view. First, the house of Jesus Christ is the Church, which was built by his blood. His body may also be called his house, just as it is called his temple. If it is called its temple because it is inhabited, it can also very well be called its home, as we read in the law. But if the body was formed by the operation of the Holy Spirit and we thought we could give it the name of house, we will ask why we attribute this formation to the person of Jesus Christ. The Son's operation is the Father's operation, because they have one and the same virtue. In the same way the operation of the Holy Spirit is the operation of the Son of God, because of the unity of nature and will. Whether the action comes from the Father, or from the Son, or from the Holy Spirit, it is the Trinity

who acts, and all that is done by the three divine persons is the work of one God. The Son's operation is the Father's operation, because the Father and the Son have one and the same virtue.

In the same way, the operation of the Holy Spirit is the operation of Christ, because the Holy Spirit has received from what was his. If we consider the action of persons, it is by the operation of the Holy Spirit that Christ was made flesh, that is, made man; but if we consider the action of the divine nature, it is Christ who has worked in the virgin to become flesh; for the Holy Spirit and Jesus Christ have one and the same divinity, and therefore the work of the Holy Spirit is the work of Jesus Christ.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 52. IF CHRIST WAS BORN OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, THAT IS, IF BY HIS WORKING FLESH WAS MADE FROM MARY, WHY IS IT SAID, "WISDOM, WHICH IS CERTAINLY CHRIST, HAS BUILT A HOUSE FOR HERSELF" (Prov. 9:1)? — This question can be understood in a twofold way. First, the house of Christ is the Church, which He built for Himself by His own blood. Next, His body also can be called His house, just as it is called His temple. For if it is called the temple of God on account of His dwelling there, it will not be incorrectly called a house as well, as we read in the Law. But since the body was made by the working of the Holy Spirit, and we judge that it can be called a house, the question arises why this is referred to the person of Christ. The work of the Son is the work of the Father, because the power of both is one. In like manner, the work of the Holy Spirit is the work of the Son of God, on account of the unity of nature and will. For whether the Father acts, or the Son, or the Holy Spirit, it is the Trinity that works; and whatever the Three have done is the operation of the one God.

QUESTION 52. IF CHRIST WAS BORN OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, THAT IS, IF BY HIS WORKING FLESH WAS MADE FROM MARY, WHY IS IT SAID, "WISDOM, WHICH IS CERTAINLY CHRIST, HAS BUILT A HOUSE FOR HERSELF" (Prov. 9:1)? — The work of the Son is the work of the Father, because the power of the Father and the Son is one. Therefore the work of the Holy Spirit is the work of Christ, because He received from Him. According to His person, therefore, Christ was made flesh, that is, born as a man, by the working of the Holy Spirit; but according to His divinity, Christ worked in the Virgin so that He might become flesh. For the divinity of the Holy Spirit and of Christ is one; and therefore the work of the Holy Spirit is the work of Christ. (Matthew 1:25; Luke 2:6-7) 1ST CATEGORY NT QUESTION 53. IF ALL THINGS HAVE BEEN MADE WITH REASON, WHY IS IT THAT THE SAVIOR IS SAID TO HAVE BEEN BORN ON THE EIGHTH DAY BEFORE THE KALENDS OF JANUARY? — No one can be so dulled as to deny that God does all things with reason. Therefore Christ, descending from the heavenly seats to grant salvation to the world, also wished to teach the world itself and the seasons which he had established. He chose to be born as a man at that time when, after a great decrease, the light which is day begins to increase again, so as to turn the decline of the human race into growth in God: that the time of his birth might reasonably agree with the divine teaching, which, from the shadow of death, began to multiply men unto life.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (Matthew 2:2) QUESTION 63. BY WHAT REASONING DID THE CHALDEAN MAGI UNDERSTAND, FROM THE APPEARANCE OF A STAR, THAT CHRIST, THE KING OF THE JEWS, HAD BEEN BORN, SINCE A TEMPORAL KING IS USUALLY SIGNIFIED BY A STAR AS A SIGN (Matt. 2:1–2)? — These Chaldean Magi did not observe the course of the stars out of malevolence, but out of a curiosity about things. For, as can be understood, they were following the tradition of Balaam: who, when he had been summoned by Balak to curse the people of God, by divine prompting began to bless them. From his report, therefore, they had learned that, by the providence of God, there would arise from Jacob one who would reign. Therefore, what is well known, he prophesied, saying, "A star shall rise out of Jacob," etc. (Num. 23, 24). Following this tradition, then, the Magi, seeing a star outside the order of the cosmos, understood this to be the one which Balaam had prophesied would appear as the sign of the future King of the Jews. This indeed was done against the enemies of religion. For from the very quarter where it is usually discredited, it received testimony. For astrologers are enemies of the truth.

(Matthew 2:2) QUESTION 39. BY WHAT REASONING DID THE CHALDEAN MAGI UNDERSTAND, THROUGH THE STAR THAT APPEARED, THAT CHRIST, THE KING OF THE JEWS, HAD BEEN BORN, SINCE A TEMPORAL KING IS INDICATED BY A STAR AS A SIGN? (Matt. 2:1–2)? — These Chaldean Magi did not out of malevolence, etc. "A star shall rise out of Jacob, and a man shall arise from Israel, and he shall crush the leaders of Moab, and shall despoil all the sons of Seth, and Edom shall be his inheritance," etc. (Num. 24:17-18) This, then, is the prophecy of Balaam, not because he was a prophet, but because God pleaded the cause of His people through him, not as a willing but as an unwilling instrument: just as those sent by Saul to seize David are found to have prophesied, and as Saul himself, when it was said, "Is Saul also among the prophets?" (1 Kings 19:20–24). For by this God wished to show how great is the majesty of the God of the Jews, who, when Balaam had come to curse, turned him so that it seemed good to him to bless the people of God. For the Lord could not fear his curse, whose heart He held in His power. It is therefore understood that this prophet revealed this to his associates, who, being inquisitive about the stars, when they saw an unknown star shining with excessive brightness, so that it surpassed the sun in light (for it was seen even by day), comparing notes among themselves, realized that this was the star which Balaam had said would one day appear.

(Matthew 2:19, 14:1-11; Mark 6) 2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 11. WHAT IS THE MEANING OF THE FACT THAT ABOVE WE READ THAT HEROD DIED (Matt. 2:19), BUT LATER ON, AFTER MANY YEARS, WE READ THAT HEROD KILLED JOHN (Matt. 14:1–11), EVEN THOUGH JOHN OUTLIVED THE EARLIER HEROD WHO HAD DIED? — Herod was king of Judea; he had four sons: Archelaus, Herod, Philip, and Lysanias. But when Herod their father died, Archelaus succeeded him; when Archelaus died, the kingdom of the aforesaid Herod was divided into four parts, in such a way that Pilate was admitted to the fourth part of the kingdom as governor, not as king (Matt. 2:22 and Luke 3:1), while the sons of Herod were called kings. Finally, when Philip also died, his brother Herod took

Philip's wife, and it was because of this that he was criticized by John the Baptist; for this reason Herod, the son of the above-mentioned Herod, killed him. For what does it say? "Herod," it says, "the tetrarch," that is, placed over the fourth part of the kingdom of his father Herod. Why then is there any doubt, when the meaning of the added surname shows that this is another Herod? He is the very one who also killed James, the brother of John, with the sword, and who later, struck by the angel of God, burst forth with worms and died.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY OT & NT (Matthew 2:18) QUESTION 62. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT, ALTHOUGH THOSE WHO WERE KILLED WERE THE SONS OF LEAH, FROM THE TRIBE OF JUDAH, RACHEL IS SAID TO BE WEEPING FOR HER SONS (Matt. 2:18)? — As far as the historical sense goes, Rachel's sons belong to the tribe of Benjamin. Now, in former times, because of their own crimes, namely the deeds of the Sodomites and the outrage committed against the concubine of the Levite, they were destroyed and wiped out by the other tribes (Judg. 19–20). Therefore she is said to refuse to accept comfort, knowing there is no hope for those who are known to have perished. But the sons of Leah were slain in early childhood for the sake of the Savior. Therefore he does not wish their case to be counted as the cause of her crying, because they were both innocent and killed for God's sake, and without doubt, by the grace of reward, have been granted eternal life by Him. For this reason he says that Rachel's crying rightly belongs to her sons, who have been erased both in the present life and in the future. The others, mourned in a bodily sense, have been comforted in a spiritual sense. But Rachel's sons, who lived in a carnal manner, will be consumed by spiritual flames. The Evangelist therefore bears witness that the crying of Rachel was fulfilled in the death of Leah's sons, because she began to weep for her sons at the moment when she saw her sister's sons killed for such a cause that they should become heirs of eternal life. For when something adverse befalls a person, he grieves more bitterly over his own misfortune when he sees the happiness of another.

(Matthew 2:18) QUESTION 12. WHY IS IT THAT, WITH LEAH'S SONS SLAIN, WHO ARE FROM THE TRIBE OF JUDAH, RACHEL IS SAID TO BE WEEPING FOR HER SONS (Matt. 2:18)? — The children of Rachel, as history teaches us, were formerly devastated and destroyed by the other tribes, in punishment for their crimes against nature, and the infamous attack they levied on the wife of a Levite etc. (Matthew 3:14) 1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 49. WHY WAS THE SAVIOR BAPTIZED, SINCE HE WAS BORN HOLY, AND WAS CALLED CHRIST THE LORD AT HIS VERY BIRTH, WHEN BAPTISM EXISTS FOR THE SAKE OF PURIFICATION AND OF SIN (Luke 2:11; Matt. 3:16)? — It is true and evident that the Savior did not need baptism; for Christ was not made but was born, as the angel said to the shepherds, "Behold, today there is born for you a Savior, who is Christ the Lord. Indeed, John, knowing His holiness, tried to prevent Him from being baptized; but the Savior insisted that it had to be done, not, of course, on account of any sin of His, but for the fulfillment of righteousness. For it was fitting that He Himself should be an example to the future children of God, whom He taught to become children of God

through Baptism; and since He promised that the Holy Spirit would be given by God to believers, He had to show this visibly in Himself, so that, once this was recognized, believers might hope to possess the Holy Spirit invisibly. For the Savior, being born of the Holy Spirit, assuredly had a purified body. The anointing of His flesh was given spiritually in the womb of the Virgin. For the Holy Spirit purified that which proceeded from the Virgin Mary into the body of the Savior; and this is the anointing of the flesh of the Savior's body. Therefore He was called Christ also at His birth.

For what God used to grant through the anointing with oil by the ministry of the prophets to those who were anointed as kings, the Holy Spirit granted to the man Christ, with an additional explanation: the predecessors of Christ received only the authority of rule through anointing, but the Savior, as man, received both authority when He was born and purification when He was born. For it would have been unfitting that the Son of God should be born in a body subject to sins. Therefore, since He took up the cause of man and taught that through rebirth people become children of God, He had to be baptized, in order to show this as confirmed in Himself. What is said is easily proved and praised if it is seen to be done by the teacher; and so, too, the marks of virtue had to be revealed, so that, now appearing as the Son of God, He might, through the mystery of regeneration, bring healing to the sufferings of the body, and be an example to His future brothers, because through regeneration each person receives the power of virtue.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (Matthew 3:13-17, Mark 1:9-11, Luke 3:21-22, John 1:32-34) QUESTION 50. IF THEREFORE THE SAVIOR WAS BAPTIZED IN ORDER TO BE AN EXAMPLE, WHY WAS HE CIRCUMCISED, YET FORBADE OTHERS TO BE CIRCUMCISED? — Circumcision is a commandment of a past time, which had to keep authority up to Christ, so that it would last as long as it was necessary for Christ, who was promised to Abraham, to be born; and thereafter circumcision should cease, once the promise had been fulfilled. For Isaac was promised as a figure of Christ. For God said to him, In your seed shall all nations be blessed (Gen. 22:18); which means Christ. For the faith that Abraham had received was restored by Christ, so that in the seed of Abraham, which is Christ, all nations might be blessed, as had been promised to Abraham. Circumcision, therefore, was the sign of the promised Son of God, that is, of Christ; and when He was born, the sign of the promise had to cease: yet in such a way that the Promised One Himself, on coming, would receive the sign of the Father, so that it might be known that He was the One who had been promised to justify all nations through faith, by the circumcision of the heart. For just as for the father Abraham, who was to have a son according to the flesh, the bodily mark of circumcision was given; so also for those who are born spiritually, the spiritual sign is the circumcision of the heart. Therefore, it was fitting that after Christ there should no longer be fleshly circumcision.

(Matthew 3:13-17, Mark 1:9-11, Luke 3:21-22, John 1:32-34) QUESTION 22. IF THEREFORE THE SAVIOR WAS BAPTIZED SO AS TO BE AN EXAMPLE, WHY, WHEN HE WAS CIRCUMCISED, DID HE FORBID THE OTHERS TO BE CIRCUMCISED? — Cir-

cumcision was granted only up to Christ; and Abraham received circumcision with Christ in view as the one promised, so that circumcision would last only until Christ, who had been promised to Abraham, should be born, He who would justify all nations by faith, just as Abraham had been justified. Therefore He had to be circumcised, so that He might be proved to be the one who had been promised to Abraham; and therefore, after that, circumcision would cease, the promise having been fulfilled. But baptism was not to cease, because it is the pattern of being born again, begun by Christ: not previously given and brought to completion up to Christ, but beginning from the time of Christ and continuing its course until the end of the world.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (Matthew 3:17; Mark 1:11; Luke 3: 22)

QUESTION 54. IF CHRIST, FROM THE SEED OF DAVID, HAS BEEN MADE THE SON OF GOD ACCORDING TO THE FLESH—THAT IS, IF HE WAS BORN ALREADY THE SON OF GOD IN BOTH RESPECTS, BECAUSE HE WAS BORN HOLY—HOW THEN, AFTER HE WAS BAPTIZED, WAS IT SAID TO HIM BY THE LORD GOD, "YOU ARE MY SON, TODAY I HAVE BEGOTTEN YOU" (Ps. 2:7)? — Christ, the Son of God, is from eternity according to the spirit of holiness; but according to the flesh, from the seed of David He was born the Son of God, so that in both respects He is not regarded as having been made the Son of God, but as having been born. Yet that which He hears at His baptism belongs to the mystery, and is not for His own sake. For this is what everyone who is baptized hears. He alone, however, is pointed out, so that from this it may be seen that in a man, by virtue, God is revealed; whereas the others are confirmed, because from this they begin to be sons of God when they receive the Holy Spirit. For although the body of the Lord was born holy, nevertheless Christ as man would not have been confirmed as the Son of God by the sacrament of regeneration, unless He had received the Holy Spirit, according to the appointed gift of being reborn.

Indeed, even the Jews were called sons of God in their devotion, not in the sacrament which now works, by which, having received the remission of sins and with the Holy Spirit coming upon them, they are called sons of God. Therefore the Savior both was born according to the flesh as the Son of God, and later was confirmed in the mystery. For that which was born of the Holy Spirit could not but be born of God; but so that the purpose of the mystery might be fulfilled, when the Spirit came upon Him nothing was diminished, but increased.

(Matthew 3:17; Mark 1:11; Luke 3: 22) QUESTION 45. IF CHRIST WAS MADE THE SON OF GOD ACCORDING TO THE FLESH FROM THE SEED OF DAVID, THAT IS, IF HE WHO WAS BORN IS ALREADY THE SON OF GOD IN BOTH RESPECTS, BECAUSE HE WAS SANCTIFIED AT BIRTH, HOW THEN, AFTER HE WAS BAPTIZED, WAS IT SAID TO HIM BY GOD, "YOU ARE MY SON; TODAY I HAVE BEGOTTEN YOU"? (Ps. 2:7)? — Christ, the Son of God according to the spirit, is from eternity; but according to the flesh, He is the Son of God from the seed of David by birth. He was not made so through baptism, because, born of the Holy Spirit, He had a purified body. In baptism, however, He hears, "You are my Son, today I have begotten you," so that He might show through the mystery of

Baptism that sons of God are made. Indeed, when the Spirit descends and remains upon Him, He hears these words, because before one has received the Holy Spirit, one is not a son of God. He hears them, therefore, not for Himself, but for us, so that in Him we might learn how we could be sons of God. For He was not baptized for Himself, but for us; just as, in another place, the Lord Himself says, "This voice has not come for my sake, but for yours, that you may believe" (Jn. 12:30), so also this was done, that He might become a pattern for us.

(Matthew 4:3) 2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 7. IT IS EVIDENT THAT THE SAVIOR WAS BORN, THE SON OF GOD AND CALLED CHRIST: WHY THEN, AFTER BAPTISM, DID THE TEMPTER APPROACH HIM, SAYING, "IF YOU ARE THE SON OF GOD," ETC. (Matt. 4:3)? — The Savior was born of the Virgin in such a way that He was both Christ and the Son of God, not by making, but by birth. Yet while He was still at a younger age, emptying His power, that is, concealing His own authority, He did not provoke the shamelessness of the Devil. But after He was baptized and the Holy Spirit descended upon Him, when He had appeared to human beings with the testimony of God the Father, the enemy was driven by the zeal of envy to insult Him, seeing that this event worked to his disadvantage: for he understood that the institution of baptism had been arranged for the salvation of human beings. Therefore he approaches the Savior, the author of this matter, not to approve it, but to find an opportunity to overthrow it. For temptation sometimes occurs for testing, sometimes under deceit for rebellion. He thought that he had drawn from the Savior a response in accordance with the trickery of his own will, so that he might securely possess his entire kingdom; for if, under the guidance of the Savior's teaching, people were brought into subjection, no one would escape His condemnation.

(Matthew 4:4-10, Mark 1, Luke 4) 2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 8. WHY DOES THE SAVIOR, WHEN THE DEVIL IS TESTING HIM, RESIST IN NO OTHER WAY THAN WITH EXAMPLES FROM THE LAW (Matt. 4:4–10)? — The Savior not only replied to the Devil who was tempting Him, but also to the Jews through whom the wickedness of their cruelty was carried out against the Savior. For, foreseeing that the Jews would call Him an enemy of the Law, He checked the shamelessness of their father, the Devil, with testimonies from the Law, so that He might condemn the father in the sons, and the sons in the father. (Matthew 4:2, Mark 1, Luke 4) 2ND CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 9. WHY DID THE SAVIOR, AFTER HIS BAPTISM, FAST FOR FORTY DAYS AND THEN AFTERWARD GROW HUNGRY (Matt. 4:2)? FOR ONE WHO FASTED FORTY DAYS COULD HAVE ALREADY CEASED TO FEEL HUNGER. — It is written: "My son, when you come to serve God, stand fast in righteousness and fear, and prepare your soul for temptation" (Sirach 2:1). Therefore the Savior, to give us a pattern, fasted; so that we too, persistently devoted to fasting in like manner, may, with God's help, overcome every movement of the Devil directed against us, knowing from the example of the Savior that we must especially beware of the snares of our adversary when we draw near to the fear of God. For he is grieved that we have departed from him; therefore he rages

more fiercely against us. The Savior did this for us, not for Himself. Likewise His growing hungry was not for His own sake, but for ours. For when, by fasting, the temptations of the Devil had been overcome, temptations which are not recorded, precisely because they do not pertain to the advancement of doctrine, then afterward, that is, after forty days, He allowed Himself to suffer hunger (which belonged to His human nature); so that the Devil, already defeated, seeing in Him the weakness of hunger, would be stirred up once more to tempt Him, recognizing that it was a man who was overcoming him. For this was the mystery of the Savior:

that because he had mocked and ruled over man when man was defeated, he should be conquered by man, so that the power of God might win victory for man; and therefore Satan became more shameful, since he sees a man and yet perceives no merely human power. He marveled, dulled with astonishment, that there was a mystery present which escaped him: that he had the power to approach, but not to ensnare. He was tormented for two reasons: seeing weakness, he drew near, and then found strength; seeing a man, he became suspicious of the power of God. Therefore He hungered, in order to make sport of Satan's cunning. And He did not fast longer, so that He might be in harmony with Moses and Elijah.

(Matthew 11:3-10, Mark 1, Luke 7) 2ND CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 10. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT, ALTHOUGH JOHN THE BAPTIST HAD PREVIOUSLY BORNE WITNESS TO THE SAVIOR, HE LATER SEEMED TO DOUBT, SAYING THROUGH HIS DISCIPLES: "ARE YOU THE ONE WHO IS TO COME, OR ARE WE TO EXPECT ANOTHER? (Matt. 11:3–10). — Those who think that doubt may have entered the soul of John the Baptist slander the Savior. For either they correctly claim that John doubted, or else they in fact accuse the Savior of lack of discernment; because, as they suppose, he praised someone who was thinking wrongly about him. But since it is impossible for the Savior to be mistaken, John was rightly praised by him. If he was rightly praised, he did not doubt. For at the very time when John sent his disciples from prison to Jesus, saying, "Are you the one who is to come, or are we to expect another? Jesus then answered his disciples, saying: "Go and tell John what you see and hear. The blind see, the deaf hear, lepers are cleansed, the lame walk, the dead are raised, and blessed is he who is not scandalized by me. (Matt. 11:3-6) And as the messengers of John were leaving, Jesus began to speak to the crowds about John the Baptist: "What did you go out into the desert to see? A reed shaken by the wind, or a man clothed in soft garments? Look, those who wear soft garments are in kings' houses. But what did you go out to see? A prophet?

I tell you, yes, and more than a prophet. This is he of whom it is written: Behold, I send my messenger before your face, who will prepare your way before you. (Matt. 11:7-10) Then the tax collectors, having been baptized with John's baptism, praised God. How great a praise was given to John, that it should be said he is more than a prophet, and that the Savior calls blessed the one who is not scandalized in him. How then is John praised if, by doubting, he was scandalized? But surely he did not doubt. For this praise proves that he is blessed, because he was not scandalized. And the Savior also, for that very reason,

broke out at that moment into praise of John, to show that John's mind was free from the doubt of his disciples. For John, wishing to strengthen his disciples, who were amazed, in faith in the Savior, knowing that his own end was near, wanted what he said about him to be confirmed by the Savior's own mouth. Therefore, in order to be a true witness, he calls upon the testimony of the greater one, so that by their agreement all uncertainty might be removed. This is John's strategy: to send his doubting disciples, as it were, with his own words, so that, hearing from the Savior the same things they had heard from John, they might be made firm, knowing that the testimony of a worthy steward and of the heavenly Lord cannot be called into question.

For this reason the Savior also answered as though to John, so that between John, who asks, and the Savior, who answers, they might learn the truth.

(Matthew 3:14; John 1:31-33) 1ST CATEGORY NT QUESTION 58. IN WHAT WAY, THEN, DOES JOHN CLAIM THAT HE DID NOT KNOW CHRIST BEFORE THE BAPTISM, WHEN, AS HE CAME TO BE BAPTIZED, HE SAYS TO HIM, "I OUGHT TO BE BAPTIZED BY YOU, AND DO YOU COME TO ME?" (John 1:31, 33; Matthew 3:14)? HOW COULD HE NOT KNOW HIM WHOM HE TRIED TO PREVENT, HUMBLING HIMSELF BEFORE HIM? — John was endowed with such holiness even from his very cradle that he is believed neither to be deceived nor to deceive, nor to be ignorant of his Lord, who had enlightened him in the womb through the Holy Spirit. And therefore it is true that he both recognized Him when the Spirit descended upon Him, and did not previously ignore Him before He came to the baptism. For he knew Him, but he did not know whether He was the very one who was to distribute the gift of God long ago promised to the Fathers. This is what he acknowledges that he then learned, when he saw the Spirit descending upon Him. For John says that he was instructed by God in this way: "Upon whom," he says, "you see the Spirit descending and remaining on Him, He it is who baptizes with the Holy Spirit." The Apostle also bears witness to this: "For I say," he says, "that Christ became a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made to the Fathers" (Rom. 15:8). This is what John did not know about the Lord: for although he was not ignorant of His greatness, yet it was hidden from him that through Him the faith of Abraham was to be fulfilled.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (Matthew 5:17)

QUESTION 69. IF, WHEN JOHN OR THE SAVIOR WAS PREACHING, THE LAW CEASED, HOW DOES THE SAVIOR SAY, "I HAVE NOT COME TO DESTROY THE LAW OR THE PROPHETS, BUT TO FULFILL" (Matt. 5:17)? FOR IF IT HAS BEEN FORBIDDEN, HOW IS IT NOT ABOLISHED, SINCE IT HAS LOST THE AUTHORITY TO BE CARRIED OUT? — Everything that was spoken about Christ has been fulfilled; and the Lord Himself therefore fulfilled the Law and the Prophets, since He did everything that was written about Him, and did not dissolve anything, but confirmed it. For the Law and the Prophets were until Him. The Prophets spoke about Him; therefore beyond Him, what was said by them about this, namely, about Christ, cannot extend; nor after Him

could the Prophets find anything of this sort, because they have neither one to speak about, and He about whom it was spoken has already come. Indeed they encompassed in their books all things: His incarnation, His manner of life, His passion, His resurrection, the revealing of His divinity, and the revelation of His future judgment. And therefore the Prophets ceased when the work of the dispensation was completed. But the Law ceased in a twofold way, and not entirely; for even that which has ceased can remain, if the condition be observed. One thing ceased in its sentence, another in the Law itself. When John preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, the sentence of the Law ceased, which held sinners guilty;

the burdens of the Law also ceased, which had been given on account of the hardness of the Jewish heart in foods, new moons, sabbaths, and the rest. For when mercy came, vengeance ceased. But the burdens of the Law have ceased forever. The sentence, however, ceases and is abolished for those who remain in the benefit obtained. But for those who return to the old man, the authority of the Law is revived, because, forgetful of benefits, they return under the sentence of the Law. Circumcision and the sabbath indeed were in force until that time when the commandment of the new law was preached. For they were given in such a way that, when the law of faith arrived, they should cease. Therefore the Apostle says, "Christ is the end of the Law" (Rom. 10:4). And Daniel signifies this also, when he prophesies both concerning the coming of the Lord and the weeks of time, that the anointing and judgment and sacrifice and the city itself were to cease (Dan. 9:24–27). For when the spiritual law arrived, it was necessary that the carnal things should cease. Then God was served in part by the body, now in part by the soul; formerly visibly, now invisibly; then in the flesh, now in the mind. For to God, who is spirit, one must serve in spirit (Jn. 4:24). Therefore the Law is not undone because it has ceased, but something has succeeded it when the time was fulfilled.

Nor is its administration or judgment accused if indulgence is given to sinners; for from this it is rather clearly shown to have been rightly and justly given, since it is not denied that those over whom it ruled were sinners, because, "The Law," he says, "is not laid down for the righteous" (1 Tim. 1:9). Therefore, because mercy is to be preferred, righteousness must not on that account be thought shameful; for if there were no reverence for it, mercy itself would have no fruit. For unless they keep righteousness after receiving mercy, indulgence will profit them nothing. For the Law said, "You shall not make for yourself an idol, nor adore the things that are in heaven above or on the earth beneath"; and, "You shall not swear falsely"; and, "Honor your father and mother"; and, "You shall not kill, nor commit fornication, nor steal, nor bear false witness, nor covet anything that is your neighbor's" (Exod. 20:4–17). Are these to be said to have ceased? Far from it. For without these, who could even in this life be judged acceptable? And therefore the other things which we mentioned above have ceased, new moons, sabbaths, the law of foods, sacrifices, circumcision, and so on. From this it is that the Apostle says among other things: "Rulers are not a terror to good work, but to evil. Do you wish not to fear the power? Do what is good, and you will have praise from it" (Rom. 13:3). Observing these makes men good, though not yet perfect.

Therefore the Savior: "Unless your righteousness exceeds that of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 5:20). By adding better things to these, the Savior did not in any way dissolve the Law, but fulfilled it. For the intention of the Law pertains to man's salvation, for example, "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth" (Lev. 24:20): so that, fearing lest he suffer what he is forbidden to do to another, he might restrain himself from wickedness. But the Savior, adding a higher righteousness to this sense, says, "But I say to you, do not resist the evil; but if anyone strikes you on your right cheek, offer him the left also" (Matt. 5:39); so that by not returning evil in kind, he may be perfect. For to repay in kind is righteousness, but not full; but if he overlooks the injury, it is full and overflowing righteousness. To retaliate brings joy for a time; to forgive brings joy for the future. Therefore the Savior fulfilled the Law, in that those whom it taught to be righteous, He made more righteous, which it could not do. Wherefore it is the joy of the Law that its disciples have become more skillful. He would indeed have destroyed the Law if He had taught men to sin with freedom. But rather He suspended the sentence, so that he who acts wickedly may have time to repent;

if not, the sentence returns upon him with increase, because he did not understand that he was forgiven for this purpose, that he might improve himself.

(Matthew 5:17)

QUESTION 13. IF, WHEN JOHN OR THE SAVIOR WAS PREACHING, THE LAW CEASED, HOW DOES THE SAVIOR SAY, "I HAVE NOT COME TO DESTROY THE LAW OR THE PROPHETS, BUT TO FULFILL" (Matt. 5:17)? FOR IF IT HAS BEEN FORBIDDEN, HOW IS IT NOT ABOLISHED, SINCE IT HAS LOST THE AUTHORITY TO BE CARRIED OUT? — The sayings of the prophets about the coming of the Savior were fulfilled when he came; for when what was foretold has taken place, it is seen as fulfilled. But the Law, which we said was given for a time, came to an end with the time that it was forbidden to overstep; for what is fulfilled, ceases. It would have lost its authority and seemed to be destroyed if it had not ceased at the time foretold. For if a successor is appointed to someone placed in authority, is that person said to be destroyed? The Law would truly be destroyed if, at the time when it was in force, it were condemned. And he did not say that he had "finished" (implevisse) the Law or the Prophets, but that he had "fully fulfilled" (adimplere) them. Now adimplere means nothing else than to add fully. What is it, then, to add to the Prophets, if not to establish the worship of God under the name of the Trinity? For although the Prophets taught and rebuked the people in the name of God, this mystery nevertheless lay hidden. But this is what it is to "fully fulfill" the Law:

to add new things while the former remain, as, for example, "You have heard," he says, "that it was said to those of old, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth. But I say to you, do not resist the evil one; but if anyone strikes you on your right cheek, offer him the other also. (Matt. 5:38-39) This was to fully fulfill. For he did not destroy that law, but added what is better, not so that the one who takes vengeance would appear to sin, but so that the one who does not repay might be better. Therefore he willed nothing other than what the Law

has in its meaning, but he brings its will to perfection. For the Law, in order to teach man righteousness and through this to make him safe, commanded that if someone struck out another's eye, he should lose his own eye; and so that, terrified by this fear, people would not do to others what they did not want done to themselves, and through this would have salvation. But since the human race is frail and inclined to sin, it comes about that a person suffers what he does not want done to himself. Therefore the Savior, by changing the words, taught what would profit salvation, so that he might fully fulfill the sense of the Law: since people could not be saved by fear of the Law, they might, overcome by patience, be corrected as they amend themselves.

This command was given so that the wicked might not live off the patience of the good, while the good do not repay them as they deserve; so that, if they wish to be corrected, the good may gain benefit from this, but the others suffer a double punishment. Justice, therefore, has not been destroyed, since we see it at work even through the Apostles: for the Apostle Peter upheld it in Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1–10). And the "chosen vessel" did not reject it, but used it, when he blinded Elymas the magician, who resisted the way of the Lord (Acts 13:8–11). There is also another way in which the Law is fulfilled. For the Lord says, "You have heard that it was said, You shall love your neighbor and you shall hate your enemy"; this is justice. But the Lord says, "But I say to you, Love your enemies" (Matt. 5:43–44). He certainly adds, which is to say he "fully fulfills," because he did not destroy the old things, but, in order to make people perfect, he commanded what is better. For his enemies, that is, the wicked, whom he could not correct and amend by revenge, carried out at the dictate of justice, he willed to make safe through love and service, which also the Law held in its inner meaning. For the Law wished to remove hatred in this way: that, frightened by revenge, people would cease to be enemies.

And since through their own boldness people despised the fear of the Law and of nature, growing in evil, the Savior willed that hate be conquered through humility, so that in this way at least people might be bent toward the good, when they saw that hatred was not repaid them; while those who remain in their hardness would be more severely dealt with, because they were not overcome even by the humility of him whose return they ought to have experienced. Justice in revenge, therefore, has not been obliterated, but held in suspense for either outcome; since it ceases with regard to the one who has come to know himself, but, if not, it punishes the stubborn.

(Matthew 5:25) 1ST CATEGORY NT QUESTION 70. THE LORD HAS CERTAINLY COMMANDED US TO MAKE THE DEVIL OUR ENEMY: WHAT THEN DOES IT MEAN WHEN IN THE GOSPEL HE SAYS, "BE IN AGREEMENT WITH YOUR ADVERSARY QUICKLY" (Matt. 5:25)? WHO IS A MAN'S ADVERSARY, IF NOT THE DEVIL? — No one doubts that the Devil is the enemy of man, especially of the faithful. For he sharpens his most violent weapons against the servants of God. Just as he is the enemy of the good, so too is the Law opposed to the wicked. For who would not oppose someone who despises him? Therefore the Lord addresses the sinner, that he may agree with the commandments

which condemn him as disobedient, so that he may subject himself to their will and, from being an enemy, become a friend. For the despiser of the Law is its enemy, since he resists its will. And so the Lord exhorts the sinner to reconcile himself to the Law by doing good, lest on the day of judgment it accuse him before the Judge, and, having been condemned, he suffer the penalties for having despised the Law. For, he says, to everyone who wishes to act wickedly, the discipline of the Lord seems hostile; and unless he consents to it, he will be sent into Gehenna, prepared for the Devil, who is truly the enemy of the human race.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (Matthew 5:44; Revelation 6:10)

QUESTION 68. SINCE THE LORD HAS CERTAINLY TAUGHT THAT WE MUST PRAY FOR OUR ENEMIES, WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT IN THE APOCALYPSE THE SOULS OF THE SLAIN SEEK TO BE AVENGED AGAINST THEM, ASKING GOD FOR VENGEANCE (Matt. 5:44; Rev. 6:10)? — For the souls of the slain cry out in this way, asking to be avenged, just as the blood of Abel cried out from the earth (Gen. 4:10). Therefore, it is the causes themselves that are said to cry out, when they cannot actually speak. For what does spilled blood ask, if not to be avenged, crying out not with a voice but with its very meaning? Likewise, a work is said to praise its maker by the very fact that it delights the one who looks upon it. The saints are not so impatient that they would press for something to happen immediately which they know will take place at its appointed time, something that can neither be anticipated nor delayed. By saying this, he wished to show that God will avenge the blood of His saints, so that, because He now appears so patient, the wicked war waged against the saints would not be thought to remain unpunished; and therefore, while striking terror into those who persecute God's servants, He might also encourage those who suffer for His sake to persevere. For the soul of the sufferer is revealed when it hears that the Mighty One will avenge it. It bears hope within itself when it hears that its death displeases the Judge:

then it is certain that it is innocent. And God indeed is merciful and patient, but in due measure. He waits for the wicked to believe and for sinners to improve themselves; otherwise, they will be punished, because they have despised the long patience of God. He has shown an example of this even in the time when mercy is proclaimed, so that He might not appear unfeeling rather than patient, as though neither anyone's suffering nor compassion could move Him. Therefore it is that He says through the prophet, "I have kept silent; shall I always keep silent? (Isa. 42:14); and the Lord says, "Will not God, then, bring about justice for His servants who cry out to Him day and night? (Luke 18:7). They cry out in just the way we have said above. Therefore, if any Christian exacts justice for a time, not harshly and not with bloodshed, he does not sin; yet he will have done better if he leaves it to God the Judge.

(Matthew 5:44; Revelation 6:10)

QUESTION 12. SINCE THE LORD HAS CERTAINLY TAUGHT THAT WE MUST PRAY FOR OUR ENEMIES, WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT IN THE APOCALYPSE THE

SOULS OF THE SLAIN SEEK TO BE AVENGED AGAINST THEM, ASKING GOD FOR VENGEANCE (Matt. 5:44; Rev. 6:10)? — Since the Apocalypse, while testifying that future evils and tribulations will come as the result of unbelief and a wicked life, with God as avenger, also shows, by a hidden, inward vision, a model of the punishments for each sin, in order to prove that no wickedness or cruelty will remain unpunished, it says that the souls of the slain ask day and night to be avenged. This is not in fact contrary: for God, who gave this law, has promised that He will avenge Himself on the day of judgment, so that He may seem to have given this command for the present which excuses the souls of the slain if, now placed there, they ask for the day of vengeance. And yet, to speak more accurately, it is the cause that is to be understood as crying out. That in itself is never silent, but always demands vengeance: as God says to Cain, "The blood of your brother cries out to me from the earth." What does this mean if not that the cause of the crime cries out, desiring to be avenged? For if we say, because of its produce, "The earth praises the Lord," although it has neither voice nor understanding, so also, because of evil deeds, blood is said to cry out. For they were certainly not so impatient nor so ignorant as to ask to be avenged before the future day of judgment, lest they should request that something be done which they knew could not happen before the appointed time. And similarly the Savior says, "Will not God bring about justice for His elect who cry to Him day and night?"

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (Matthew 8:4; Mark 1:44; Luke 5:14) QUESTION 60. IF THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS WERE UNTIL JOHN, HOW IS IT THAT THE SAVIOR SENDS THE LEPER TO THE PRIESTS TO HAVE OFFERINGS MADE FOR HIS CLEANSING (Matt. 8:4; Mark 1:44; Luke 5:14)? — This was done not because of the time, but for the condemnation of the Jews: so that when they did not understand that the summit of truth, belonging to a better time, had been established for the gain of their salvation, Truth might bend down instead to their accusation. For since they regarded the Savior as an enemy of the Law, because for the sake of mercy he wished to free them from the burden of the Law, just as had been foretold by the prophet Jeremiah, for he says among other things, "And I will give them a new covenant, not like the one I gave to their fathers" (Jer. 31:31–32), then the Savior, so that he might not appear, as they thought, to be an enemy when preaching new things, sent the man who had been cleansed from leprosy to the priests to offer gifts for his cleansing, as Moses had commanded (Lev. 14:2). And to show that this was to serve for their accusation, he said, "For a testimony to them," so that this matter might be a witness against them in judgment, they who were saying that the Savior was an enemy of the Law. The apostle Paul followed this as well: for although he preached that circumcision was no longer necessary, he himself circumcised Timothy because of the scandal of the Jews (Acts 16:3); for he preferred to do something unnecessary rather than have an uproar stirred up by false brothers; and this in fact contributed to the Jews' error. Enough was done for them for the moment, through which they might err forever.

(Matthew 8:4; Mark 1:44; Luke 5:14) QUESTION 28. IF THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS WERE UNTIL JOHN, HOW IS IT THAT THE SAVIOR SENDS THE LEPER TO THE PRIESTS TO HAVE OFFERINGS MADE FOR HIS CLEANSING (Matt. 8:4; Mark 1:44;

Luke 5:14)? — The apostle Paul followed this. For although he preached that no one ought any longer to be circumcised, he himself circumcised Timothy because of the scandal of the Jews. For he preferred to do something unnecessary rather than be a cause of offense to the unlearned, from among whom some could be saved. The Lord in a similar way, in order to remove from the Jews what they thought of him, for they said that he was an enemy of Jewish tradition, then ordered the leper to offer gifts for his cleansing, as had been commanded by Moses, and he added, "For a testimony to them"; so that this matter might be a witness against them, because the Savior was not an enemy of the Law. Therefore something was done which already ought to have ceased. But because things that are already unnecessary are usually harmless, it was done so that it might indeed benefit those who held a wrong opinion, in order that they might be satisfied that the Savior was not an enemy of the Law.

(Matthew 11:3, Luke 7:19) 2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 14. JOHN TO THE LORD: "ARE YOU THE ONE WHO IS TO COME, OR SHOULD WE EXPECT ANOTHER?" (Matt. 11) — In his own person he is acting on behalf of his disciples. For John was not doubting, he who had said: "Behold the Lamb of God, behold him who takes away the sins of the world" (Jn. 1:29); but to satisfy his disciples he sends them with his own words, so that by the mouth of the Savior he might confirm what he himself was teaching about him, in order that after his own departure his disciples might follow Christ without any doubt. (Matthew 11:13, Luke 16:16) 2ND CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 15. WHY IS IT SAID THAT THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS WERE UNTIL JOHN, AND THAT AFTERWARD THEY RIGHTLY CEASED (Matt. 11:13)? BECAUSE THE ONE ABOUT WHOM THEY PROPHESIED HAD NOW ARRIVED. WHY THEN "UNTIL JOHN" WITH REGARD TO THE LAW, SINCE THE APOSTLE SAYS THAT WE OUGHT TO BE SUBJECT TO THE LAW: "FOR THOSE THAT EXIST," HE SAYS, "HAVE BEEN ORDAINED BY GOD" (Rom. 13:1)? — Law indeed is one name, but it has a threefold meaning. For the first part of the Law concerns God. Therefore the Law is said to be from "reading," so that from many things you may know what to choose. Therefore, placed amid errors, they received it so that they might choose what is true, that is, with the Devil rejected, they might choose God. But the second part of the Law is this, which is contained in the commandments, which therefore begins: "Honor your father and your mother." The third, however, has to do with new moons and the sabbath, and with distinguishing and choosing foods, and with circumcision and the offering of animal victims. This Law, therefore, he says is to be observed only until John, and no longer. For therefore it was given, that when the appointed time was fulfilled it should cease; nor was it from the beginning, but was given for a reason, for a time, so that with the coming of the Savior the Law should cease. Therefore, what is of God remains, both the Law of the commandments and his nature, which without doubt cannot be abolished by him. For through him one progresses to the promised reward. For fear produces watchfulness.

(Matthew 11:25-26) 1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 100. ON THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW. — You have heard, dearest brothers, what the Gospel proclaims when the Lord says: I confess to you, Lord of heaven and earth, because you have hidden these things from the wise and sensible, and have revealed them to little ones. Yes, Father, for so it was pleasing in your sight (Matt. 11:25–26). Therefore, if we look into the meaning of these words, we shall see that they were spoken by the Lord for the encouragement of believers, of those who, because they despise worldly wisdom, appear as little ones to the wise of this world, who, though praised by no testimony, still wish to be called wise. So it seemed unworthy to God to show the truth to such as these; but to the humble, who presume nothing of themselves and bend themselves to the divine will, equity requires that saving things be revealed. For this is the one who is wise before God and mindful of his own salvation: the one who sets the law of God above his own learning, seeing that it is supported not by the clatter of words, but by the power of deeds. And without doubt, he is foolish and vain who commits himself to a thing that is backed by no privilege of signs. Therefore God did not promise the kingdom to the learned of this world, but to the faithful; nor does he offer eternity to the examiners of the stars, but to those who act rightly;

nor does he give glory to scholars, who try by trickery and tiny arguments to exclude the truth, but to men of good will, who are more exact in life than in speech. For God rejects those who wish to rely more on the brilliance of eloquent speech than on good deeds. Indeed, he also tries to turn the glory of God onto himself who thinks he is adorning God's cause with words. The realities themselves ought to please by their own nature, so that not speech, but meaning is praised. For if meaning is the author of writing, and words were invented to signify things, why should not the things themselves be set forth with pure sense, so as to stir the mind more effectively toward salvation? And so our Lord chose fishermen as Apostles, simple and uneducated men, who, by keeping the faith without any deceit and by living well, might show forth God's truth in themselves. Therefore also the Apostle Paul says: And I, coming to you, brothers, did not come with loftiness of speech or of wisdom (1 Cor. 2:1). And among other things: For, he says, the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power (1 Cor. 4:20); so that, because words are liable to contradiction, power might stand as witness to the law of God, before which every loftiness of speech yields.

These things, therefore, have been set forth first, dearest brothers, for the benefit of simpler folk, lest they should perhaps think themselves unworthy of the grace of God because they are by no means trained in secular learning, whereas their simplicity advances them more toward praise; since what the worldly wise, blinded by the pride of letters, do not see, these believe, being wise not in words but in judgment. For they know that God rests in good works, and seeks faith, not polished speech. For they read that the Lord says: On whom shall I rest, if not on the humble and meek and one who trembles at my words? (Isa. 66:2). Therefore, that we may be made worthy of the promised rewards, we must do the things that are commanded by the Lord, confident that the Lord loves those who keep his words. For so he says to his disciples: If you love me, keep my commandments (Jn. 14:15); so that

by serving the Lord in these things we may be able to be heirs of his kingdom through Jesus Christ our Lord.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (Matthew 12:1-8; Mark 2:23-28; Luke 6:1-5)

QUESTION 61. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT, WHEN THE JEWS ACCUSED THE DISCIPLES OF BREAKING THE SABBATH BY RUBBING EARS OF GRAIN IN THEIR HANDS AND EATING THEM, THE SAVIOR PUT FORWARD THE EXAMPLE OF DAVID, BECAUSE HE ATE THE LOAVES WHICH IT WAS NOT LAWFUL TO EAT EXCEPT FOR THE PRIESTS ALONE (Matt. 12:1–4)? BY THIS THEY DO NOT SEEM TO BE EXCUSED, BUT RATHER TO BECOME GUILTY TOGETHER WITH DAVID: ESPECIALLY SINCE DAVID DID NOT DO THIS ON THE SABBATH. — The Savior wishes to expose the hypocrisy of the Jews by many examples, showing greater transgressions committed under the Law, and that no one dared to accuse them: so that he might show not only that the sabbath was broken once and again in the Law, but also that the priestly bread, with the priest himself permitting it, was unlawfully presumed upon; and what is more, by men under the lofty authority of his Law. For first Joshua son of Nun, by divine command, did not keep the sabbath; and when he did this, the walls of Jericho fell of their own accord (Josh. 6:15–20). How much more profitable it was not to keep the sabbath, but to keep faith! And the Maccabees, after first having been slaughtered, fought on the sabbath and triumphed over their enemies (1 Macc. 2:38, 41). And the priests, in order to attend to the rites of the Lord, disregarded the sabbath in the temple.

But David, already anointed as king, after he had, by the power of God, slain the Philistine and stripped him of his arms, when he was on a journey and suffered the necessity of hunger, received bread from the priest (1 Sam. 21:6), which it was not lawful for him to eat. It was not lawful except in case of necessity; but it was lawful if necessity demanded it. Accordingly, the priest, seeing the necessity, did not refuse; and David, chosen by God, accepted it without hesitation. Such also is the case with the sabbath, for which reason circumcision too is not forbidden on the sabbath. For these commands which are not dangerous are to be observed in such a way that if, because of necessity, they are transgressed, it does no harm: because they were commanded not for salvation but for reverence. But that which is in no way permitted is never permitted, nor is it diminished by any necessity so that, once done, it does no harm. For what is always unlawful is forbidden by the laws because it is criminal. Those earlier things, however, which we said are sometimes lawful, are of the sort of legitimate fasts, which, when relaxed because of necessity, do not make people guilty if the cause is the stomach or the weakness of fevers. Knowing this, the Jews wickedly accused the disciples, as if they were breaking the sabbath, as was said above.

But the Savior did not wish to anticipate for them the time of the fulfillment of the Law, lest they should rush further into madness; rather, from the past, from which they thought the sabbath ought more to be vindicated, he showed them to be slanderers: and they were confused not only in the matter of the sabbath, but also in the matter of the priestly bread, as has been shown above.

(Matthew 12:1-8; Mark 2:23-28; Luke 6:1-5)

QUESTION 23. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT, WHEN THE JEWS ACCUSED THE DISCIPLES OF BREAKING THE SABBATH BY RUBBING EARS OF GRAIN IN THEIR HANDS AND EATING THEM, THE SAVIOR PUT FORWARD THE EXAMPLE OF DAVID, BECAUSE HE ATE THE LOAVES WHICH IT WAS NOT LAWFUL TO EAT EXCEPT FOR THE PRIESTS ALONE (Matt. 12:1–4)? BY THIS THEY DO NOT SEEM TO BE EXCUSED, BUT RATHER TO BECOME GUILTY TOGETHER WITH DAVID: ESPECIALLY SINCE DAVID DID NOT DO THIS ON THE SABBATH. — The Savior did not wish to anticipate for the Jews the time of the fulfilled sabbath. He did not judge them worthy to hear openly what is true, as being unbelievers; but he wished to convict them on the very point of which they were arrogant, that is, concerning the time when the sabbath still seemed to keep its force, when they accused the disciples because on the sabbath they plucked ears of grain and, rubbing them in their hands, ate them, although the time for keeping the sabbath was already fulfilled. Passing over this, he showed them that even then, when the law of the sabbath was still in force, the sabbath had been violated for the sake of necessity: for David did what was not lawful; and Joshua son of Nun did what was forbidden, when he ordered the armed men to march around the walls of Jericho for seven days; (Josh. 6:15–20) and the Maccabees did what was prohibited, defending themselves on the sabbath;

(1 Macc. 2:38, 41) And "in the temple," he says, "the priests violate the sabbath and are without guilt. By these things he showed that the disciples were accused by the Jews more out of hatred than out of error; since, knowing that all these things were done on the sabbath by men who were willing and by holy men indeed, they accused the innocent. For the command was given to keep the sabbath in such a way that, if there were necessity, the one who violated the sabbath would not be guilty. Therefore circumcision was not forbidden on the sabbath, because there was a necessity that it be done. Therefore the disciples, being hungry, plucked ears of grain; which was not lawful according to the former time, but was made lawful by the necessity of hunger: just as David also did what was not lawful when he was hungry, knowing that hunger would excuse this. This case is like that today with legitimate fasts. If someone who is sick breaks a fast, is he made guilty? Certainly not, because there is no danger. This is sometimes permitted, just as the sabbath was among the ancients. For what is never permitted has no excuse of necessity.

(Matthew 15:22–28, Luke 7;17) 2ND CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 17. WHY IS IT THAT THE SAVIOR AT FIRST REFUSED MERCY TO THE FOREIGN WOMAN, THAT IS, THE CANAANITE (Matt. 15:22–28), WHEN HE DID NOT DENY THE GRACE OF GRANTING SALVATION TO THE FOREIGN CENTURION AND TO THE LEPER WHOM JESUS HIMSELF CALLED A FOREIGNER (Luke 7:2–10 and 17:12–19)? — The very reason itself shows that the Savior's action was fitting. For it would have been absurd, and would have resulted in an insult to the promise made to the Fathers, if a woman who had not confessed the God of the Jews had received the benefit promised to the nation that confessed God. Therefore at the beginning it was denied to her. But

when, with neck bent, she did not deny faith in the words of the Savior, but confessed that the believing Jews are children and the Gentiles are dogs or servants, by which she joined herself to the Lord's faith; for servants point to a master, and a master does not exist without servants, a unity was formed between the subject and the one who subjects. Therefore it is that she deserved to obtain what she had prayed for. But the centurion, who received a favor from the Savior without delay, had already involved himself in the things of God. For the leading men of the Jews say to the Lord: "He is worthy that you should grant this to him; for he loves our nation, and he himself has built us a synagogue.

(Luke 7:4-5) As for the foreign leper, the Lord called him foreign not in respect of faith but of nation. For he was a Samaritan, who are known by origin to be from the Babylonians. Yet he too did not obtain the benefit without a confession. For it had been said by the Lord to the disciples: "Do not go into the way of the Gentiles, and do not enter into the cities of the Samaritans, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 10:5–6); that is, that the Gospel should not be preached first to the Samaritans and the Gentiles, but to the Jews, to whom this promise had been made. But when the Jews began to reject faith in Christ, then the Savior also presented Himself to the Samaritan woman, and after the cross to the centurion Cornelius; and when sought by the Canaanite woman, He received her, because the time had not yet come for salvation to be offered to them.

(Matthew 17:26) 1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 75. WHY DID THE SAVIOR PAY THE DIDRACHMA ONLY FOR HIMSELF AND PETER, AND NOT ALSO FOR THE OTHER APOSTLES (Matt. 17:26)? SINCE THEY HAD ALL FOLLOWED HIM AFTER LEAVING ALL THEIR POSSESSIONS, HE SEEMS TO HAVE OWED PAYMENT FOR ALL. — The didrachma is understood as a head tax, not a tax on estates [what is now called "ragged gold," because even the poor are taxed]; for indeed the Savior possessed nothing in the world, though he is Lord of the world. He was buried at the expense of others when he died; yet we, for whom the world is foreign, desire to increase our possessions, so that when we die we may protest that the world has trespassed upon us, not only by our voice but also in writing, so that by our own profession we may be condemned by him whose the world is. Therefore the Lord says, "Whoever does not leave all things and follow me, cannot be my disciple" (Luke 14:26). [Whoever therefore holds his possessions in such a way that he does not place his hope in them, but is ready to cast them aside for the faith, is walking the path that leads to Christ our Lord. Therefore the didrachma was to be exacted from those who conducted some business or practiced trades. But since the Savior cared for none of these things, nor did his disciples, he was in fact not accountable to be taxed.

Yet because the enemy, the Devil, was always lying in wait, seeking an opportunity to overthrow the Savior if he could, he took hold of the minds of the tax collectors of the didrachma, to make them do his will, so that they came to Peter, who was the first among the Apostles, and said that the didrachma ought to be paid by their master, who was free from such burdens. For they did nothing in the world that belonged to the world; so that, since he had

nothing from which to pay, he might either become a stumbling block to them, or in humility seek support from someone to pay it. Then the Lord, to show that the shortsighted Devil always plots against himself, commands the Apostle Peter to go to the sea, open the mouth of the fish he would catch, and there find the coin owed for the tax. By paying it, he would not only avoid giving offense to the collectors, nor be forced by the need of help to pay it, but would also display a sign of the greatest power, by which he might draw to himself those captured by the Devil, so that the Devil would be tormented by his own scheme and by this proof. Therefore the collectors of the didrachma say to the Apostle Peter, "Your Master does not pay the didrachma," etc. By saying this, they approached the Master as though he should pay for all the disciples.

But when the Savior orders it to be given for himself and Peter, he appears to have paid for all: for just as all were contained in the Savior because of his office as Master, so after the Savior all are contained in Peter. He appointed him to be their head, that he might be the shepherd of the Lord's flock. For among other things he says to the disciples, "Watch and pray, that you may not enter into temptation" (Matt. 26:41). And to Peter he says, "Behold, Satan has asked to sift you like wheat; but I have prayed for you, that your faith may not fail; and when you have turned back, strengthen your brothers" (Luke 22:31–32). What doubt can there be? Was he praying for Peter and not for James and John, to say nothing of the rest? It is clear that all are contained in Peter: by praying for Peter, he is recognized to have prayed for all. For it is always in the leader that the people are either rebuked or praised. For in another place he says: "I pray for those whom you have given me, Father; and I will that where I am, they also may be with me" (Jn. 17:9, 24).

(Matthew 24:20) 2ND CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 19. THEREFORE THE SAVIOR SAYS, PRAY THAT YOUR FLIGHT BE NOT IN WINTER OR ON THE SABBATH (Matt. 24:20); EVEN THOUGH THE TIME OF THIS PERSECUTION CANNOT BE POSTPONED, SINCE THE APOSTLE SAYS, HE WILL BE REVEALED IN HIS OWN TIME (2 Thess. 2:6, 8); AND IN THE ACTS THE APOSTLE SAYS, APPOINTING THE TIMES AND THE BOUNDARIES OF THEIR DWELLING (Acts 17:26). AND WHY DOES HE INDICATE THAT FLIGHT IS NOT ADVISABLE IN WINTER OR ON THE SABBATH? — In winter flight is not safe: for there is cold, continual rains, snow, frost, the rivers overflow; and so it is very hard for those who flee. For they cannot hide in the woods, nor in the mountains, nor in caves. But on the Sabbath, according to the Jews, it is not permitted to go far from the city, nor to climb high, and therefore one cannot flee on the Sabbath. Just as these seasons do not allow a safe flight, because of the obstacles mentioned above, so our flight will not be safe if that foretold persecution finds us bound by carnal obstacles. For worldly desires, that is, worldly possessions, hold men like shackles, so that they cannot escape the decrees of the Devil.

Therefore it must be prayed that, at the time when we must flee, there may not be in us the condition of winter and Sabbath, but that the help of God may grant us to be free from these obstacles, so that there may be nothing to enslave us to the world, captured by desire

for it. Since, then, the Savior was speaking of the final persecution, which is to come from the Antichrist, he therefore mentioned winter, because it is the last time; and the Sabbath likewise, because it is the last day, so that, just as in those times flight is harsh and difficult, he might signify that at that time persecutions and afflictions will be so grievous that scarcely anyone will be able to escape them.

(Matthew 26:32; Mark 14:28) 2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 20. WHEN THE SAVIOR SAID THAT HE WAS GOING TO SUFFER AND THAT HE WOULD RISE AGAIN ON THE THIRD DAY, HE ADDED, "AND AFTER I HAVE RISEN, I WILL GO BEFORE YOU INTO GALILEE, THERE YOU WILL SEE ME"; AND LIKEWISE THE ANGEL SAID TO THE WOMEN (Matt. 26:32 and 28:7). — Yet he is found by the women and by his disciples in Jerusalem. To call the Savior's words into question is unbelief; but I see that you are not doubting the Savior's words, but seeking the meaning: why, since he was seen in Jerusalem after his Passion, did he say that he would be seen by them in Galilee. He was seen in Jerusalem, but only in part, to energize the spirits of the disciples; in Galilee, however, by all at once. Therefore, for those who were going to see him in Jerusalem in separate groups, he appointed Galilee so that he might appear to them all together, and there give commands for the ordering of their discipline.

(Matthew 27:3-10)

QUESTION 94. IT MUST BE ASKED WHETHER JUDAS ISCARIOT, THE TRAITOR OF THE LORD, ENDED HIS LIFE BY HANGING BEFORE THE PASSION OF THE SAVIOR. — After the Savior was betrayed, and as the preparation day was dawning, all the chief priests and scribes and elders gathered in the house of the high priest Caiaphas, to which they knew Jesus was to be brought, so that they might hear Him. This is confirmed by the evangelists Matthew and Mark, and from them it is clear that none of these men left the house of the governor before their wicked work was completed, since all their urgency and devotion in celebrating the Passover was that the death of the Savior should take place. Since they were therefore occupied with putting the Lord to death from morning until the ninth hour, how can Judas be shown to have returned to them the price of blood which he had received, before the Lord's crucifixion, and to have said to them in the temple, "I have sinned in betraying innocent blood" (Matt. 27:1–5), when it is certain that all the chief priests and elders were not in the temple before the Lord's Passion? For even when He was on the cross they were still insulting Him (ibid. 41). Nor can it be proved from this that it was reported before the Passion, since there are many things which, though known to have happened earlier, are placed later in order;

and again, when the context allows, something that took place afterwards may be set before what came earlier. For it is evident that the fiftieth psalm is earlier than the third. Therefore it sometimes happens that later events are anticipated. Therefore also Mary, although she is shown to have anointed the Lord's feet with ointment at supper after the resurrection of her brother Lazarus, six days before the Passover, is mentioned beforehand by the evangelist because of the meaning of that act, who, among other things, says: "It was Mary," he says,

"who anointed the Lord with ointment" (Jn. 11:2). He reports this before Lazarus had died; and if we did not find that it happened later, we would not know at what time it took place. But perhaps it occurred after the ninth hour, so that when the wicked and most cruel Judas saw the Savior slain, and on account of this the veil of the temple torn, the earth shaken, the rocks split, the elements terrified, being seized with fear he was grieved, not unaware that he had betrayed the Just One, in whose Passion God the Judge had therefore shown His anger. Yet even after the ninth hour, as I think, the elders and chief priests were occupied; for that same evening they were going to celebrate the Passover, and on the Sabbath it was not permitted by the Law to carry money. Consequently, it seems unlikely to me on which day, indeed at what time, Judas Iscariot ended his life by hanging.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (Matthew 27:45; Luke 23:44; John 19:14; Mark 15:25)

QUESTION 65. IF THEY SPOKE WITH ONE MOUTH AND ONE REASONING AS EVANGELISTS, HOW DID IT HAPPEN THAT, WHILE THREE SAY—NAMELY MATTHEW, LUKE, AND JOHN—THAT THE LORD WAS CRUCIFIED AT THE SIXTH HOUR, MARK ON THE CONTRARY SAYS THAT THE SAVIOR WAS CRUCIFIED AT THE THIRD HOUR (Matt. 27:45; Luke 23:44; John 19:14; Mark 15:25)? — It is not good to wrap the truth in obscurity. For the three evangelists had one and the same meaning, but Mark wished to reveal a fact that they had omitted, knowing it to be necessary. Nor could he be mistaken, who, following the examples of the other authors, learned what he wrote with great devotion and effort, and did nothing without the Holy Spirit. Therefore what he wished to show by this must be fully explained. We must observe, then, that the Savior was crucified not by Pilate, but by the Jews. For as far as Roman law was concerned, he declared the Savior to be innocent. Pilate said to the Jews, "I find no cause in him. And when they said, "Crucify him," he replied, "For what evil has he done? Finally, persisting and wishing to rescue him from their hands, he suffered slander from them when they said, "If you release this man, you are not a friend of Caesar. For everyone who makes himself a king opposes Caesar. Therefore it came about that he handed him over to their judgment (Jn. 19:4–13). Therefore Pilate did not pronounce the sentence, but the Jews did.

Indeed, they were warned, he says, by the chief priests to say, "Let him be crucified. He (Mark) wants the sentence given at the third hour to be understood in this way: that, continuing with constant cries over an interval of almost three hours, during which there was going and returning from Herod, they crucified the Savior. For everyone who is condemned to death is already counted as dead from the moment he receives the sentence. Mark therefore has made clear that the Savior was not crucified by the sentence of the judge. For it is hard to prove innocent the one who is punished by the judge's sentence. Therefore he allowed himself to appear conflicting in wording, so that he might teach that what was begun at the third hour was completed at the sixth hour: not by laws, but by the persistent ill-will of the Jews.

Matthew 27:45; Luke 23:44; John 19:14; Mark 15:25)

QUESTION 21. THREE EVANGELISTS SAY THAT THE SAVIOR WAS CRUCIFIED AT THE SIXTH HOUR, BUT THE EVANGELIST MARK SAYS THAT HE WAS CRUCIFIED AT THE THIRD HOUR. — It is not good to wrap the truth in obscurity. For the very harmony of the three evangelists testifies that they spoke the truth. But the fact itself shows that Mark wished to reveal some hidden meaning. Nor could he be mistaken, who, following the examples of the other authors, learned what he wrote with great devotion and effort. Therefore what he wanted to reveal by this statement must be investigated with careful watchfulness. Nor did he allow himself to differ from the three evangelists in words for no reason. Let us consider whether those may be speaking truth who said that the sentence was given at the third hour and therefore that the Savior was crucified at the third hour, although they were not able to prove it. Perhaps they know the meaning, but they do not know how to defend it. And so, with Pilate's role for the moment set aside, let us see from where the sentence given against the Savior took its beginning, and then it will appear whether what we say can seem true. It is therefore clear that the leaders of the Jews had beforehand instructed the Jews to ask for Barabbas the robber to be released to them on the feast day, but that Jesus ought to be crucified.

In opposition to this, Pilate, long resisting and wishing to release the Savior, frequently going in and out to the Jews, kept saying that he saw in him no cause of death. But they, insisting, kept saying, "Let him be crucified. Therefore there were delays; and while he is mocked by the soldiers, and brought out, and clothed in a purple garment, and a crown of thorns is made for him, and he is adored, and spat upon, and scourged, and struck with the palms of the hands, for this reason he was placed on the cross at the sixth hour. He had been brought to Pilate: then Pilate went out to them, because they themselves did not enter the praetorium; and he addressed them, and heard their false accusations, and sent him to Herod, and he came back, and again Pilate questioned Jesus, and he in turn answered him, and afterward he again went out to the Jews and in conversation said that he found no cause of death in the Savior. Meanwhile, through these delays, they reached the third hour. Then, when Pilate wanted to release him, the Jews said, "Let him be crucified. Against them Pilate resisted for a long time, and when he could not prevail, he handed Jesus over to their sentence at about the sixth hour. For therefore it is written, "Then he handed him over to their will. Therefore it was rightly said that the sentence was given at the third hour, because it was not given by Pilate, but by the Jews.

Pilate, however, seems to have consented unwillingly: above all because of the envy of those who said, "If you release this man, you are not a friend of Caesar. (Jn. 19:12) Let us see, then, what Mark, wishing to clear this up, has followed. He wished to show that the Savior was not killed by the judge's sentence, because it is difficult for one who receives the sentence of a judge not to seem to have been justly killed.

(Matthew 27:62; Mark 15:42; Luke 23:54; John 19:42) 1ST CATEGORY NT QUESTION 55. WHAT WAS THE REASON THAT THE LORD ALLOWED HIMSELF TO BE CRUCIFIED AT THAT TIME, WHEN THE JEWS WERE ABOUT TO CELEBRATE PASSOVER ON

THE EIGHTH DAY BEFORE THE KALENDS OF APRIL? — The Savior accomplished all things in their proper places and times. For, in order to show that he had rightly created all things according to the will of the Father, he chose to redeem and restore the world by his passion at the same time when he had created it; that is, at the equinox, from which the world began and the day starts to grow longer than the night. Therefore, since he acted under the Roman rule, he had to suffer on the eighth day before the Kalends of April, when the Romans have their equinox. For at that time this part of the world was first illuminated, and from then on the day began to increase. And so by the Savior's passion the world was then led from darkness into light. Therefore no rebuke can be seen to fall upon the Creator, since he restored the fallen creature at the same time as he had made it. Nor can the beginning of the creation of a fallen thing be blamed, when its restoration returns to that point. For he willed that the joy of renewal should be on the same day on which there had been dedication.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (Matthew 28:1-8; Mark 16:1-8; Luke 24:1-12; John 20:1-13)

QUESTION 64. HOW IS IT PROVED THAT THE SAVIOR ROSE FROM THE DEAD AFTER THREE DAYS AND NIGHTS? — In this matter, if you seek the number of days and nights in strict sequence, you will gain no true understanding. For Moses fasted forty days and forty nights (Exod. 34:28), and yet a complete numerical count is not found: for when he went up by day and came down by day, he clearly did not fulfill the entire number; but because where there is day, night is also reckoned, and where there is night, day is likewise counted, so that the part is taken for the whole, they are called forty days and forty nights. Therefore it is with what the Savior said: "As Jonah was in the belly of the sea monster three days and three nights, so will the Son of Man be in the heart of the earth" (Matt. 12:40). And because there are three nights, three days are also to be taken. Night is indeed something that might seem new or perhaps unreasonable, since night depends on day: for before light was made, from which "day" is named, and before evening was appointed, which is followed by night, it is by no means doubted that the Lord's Passion is confirmed to have taken its beginning from the night; this is not absurd. For just as light, that is day, is an image of life, so night is a likeness of death, that is, darkness:

as Scripture clearly shows the children of light, and conversely those of darkness. Nor is it surprising that, although everywhere day precedes night and light precedes darkness, here alone the things that follow are set before those that precede; or that in such a matter the order of things is disturbed and changed, as we have already indicated. For the night of death appears rather to be what truly counts, more than the day. Therefore the beginning is taken from the night, because the prince of darkness could not otherwise be entered into except by night; that is, he could not be conquered: and so that in some manner the Lord of light, that is of eternal life, might for a time be subjected to the prince of darkness or death, so that he might free both those of the past and those of the future from death. For death would not be utterly abolished, nor would the gloom of darkness ever be dispelled, if it had

not seen the Lord enter in. Indeed, by such great light the hidden realm of death, in which he ruled, vanished, nor can he be utterly conquered except by one who is taken either in himself or in his own. Rightly then in such a matter night alone holds the primacy, in such a way that it loses its power: and so that the unbelieving Jews remain in eternal night, and the author of such a great crime, indeed, of such sacrilege, be not the day, but the night;

a day is subjected to the preceding night, contrary to the usual course of things, just as God and Lord of all things was subjected to the prince of wicked death, so that he might free all from the snares of death. If to anyone this still seems in some way contrary, let him carefully consider lest he begin to judge more harshly that God, assuming the person of a servant, not to say of a man, gave himself over to death. Why then do you seek order here, where you see everything contrary to order? For what is that light which was in the darkness, and the darkness did not comprehend it (Jn. 1:5)? The Lord of light, who yet was apprehended. For whoever knows that he is apprehended so that he may be struck down, counts that time as death. There is also the following day on which he was examined and crucified. There is also the night that falls upon the Sabbath, and the Sabbath itself. There is also the evening after the Sabbath; this is what was commanded to the Jews by Moses in figure, that they should enter the Sabbath in the evening, on which the Lord rose: which embraces the Lord's Day; for night is not counted without day, nor day without night. In this way, after three days and after three nights, the Lord rose.

(Matthew 28:1-8; Mark 16:1-8; Luke 24:1-12; John 20:1-13)

QUESTION 18. HOW IS WHAT THE SAVIOR SAID PROVEN, NAMELY THAT AFTER THREE DAYS AND THREE NIGHTS HE WOULD RISE FROM THE DEAD, SINCE IN FACT, HAVING SUFFERED ON THE PREPARATION DAY, HE ROSE AT DAYBREAK ON SUNDAY, WHILE IT WAS STILL DARK? THEREFORE, THE NUMBER OF DAYS AND NIGHTS DOES NOT SEEM TO MATCH. — The Savior, foreknowing all that was to happen to him, declared these things, certain that he would be apprehended by the Jews for this purpose, that he might be killed, and that he himself would not resist their wickedness, although he could certainly have mocked them: for when he was already held, he restored the ear of the high priest's servant, which the Apostle Peter had cut off with a drawn sword; so that he might show that he was not brought low by weakness, but had yielded for a time to their will by a certain providence, so that by this he might destroy the kingdom of hell. For the Devil, lacking foresight, plunged himself into the minds of the Jews, to inflame them to the death of the Savior, as though it would benefit him if the one who showed the way of truth were removed from life, not knowing what was to come against him. For since he triumphed over man's captivity on account of sin, he was himself found guilty by the fact that he killed Christ, the innocent one, so as to hold him who knew no sin among sinners;

therefore it came about that he even lost those whom he legitimately held in the underworld. Therefore, the Savior, foreknowing these things, counted together the night in which he was apprehended. For every prisoner who does not believe that he will escape the hands of the judge, before he is struck already calls himself dead. Add to this the day on which he

suffered, and the following night. Add also the Sabbath and the night which brightens into the Lord's Day together with the Lord's Day itself, and you will have fulfilled the mystery of the Lord's words. For in the last night, while it was still dark and the day was beginning to arise, between light and darkness he rose, so that both night and day may be counted, and therefore the number foretold by the Savior may be found complete.

MARK (Mark 1:2; Malachi 3:1) 1ST CATEGORY NT QUESTION 57. WHAT DOES THIS MEAN, THAT ALTHOUGH IT IS WRITTEN IN THE PROPHET MALACHI, "BEHOLD, I SEND MY ANGEL BEFORE YOUR FACE, WHO WILL PREPARE YOUR WAY BEFORE YOU," THE EVANGELIST MARK CLAIMS THAT THIS IS WRITTEN IN THE PROPHET ISAIAH (Mal. 3:1; Mark 1:2)? — Mark could not have been unaware of what he was writing; for he was not lacking in learning, since from childhood he had been immersed in the divine Scriptures and trained in the Law, especially as he had followed the Apostles. Knowing that all sayings must be referred back to their original author, he attributed these words to Isaiah, who had first conveyed this meaning when he said, "The voice of one crying in the wilderness: Prepare the way of the Lord, make straight the paths of our God" (Isa. 40:3). Accordingly, after the words from Malachi, the Evangelist immediately added, "The voice of one crying in the wilderness," so that he might unite the words of both prophets, which relate to one and the same sense, under the name of the earlier prophet.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (Mark 1:34)

QUESTION 66. HOW IS IT THAT MARK THE EVANGELIST SAYS THAT THE DEMONS RECOGNIZED AND PROFESSED JESUS, WHILE ON THE OTHER HAND THE APOSTLE DENIES THAT THE RULERS AND POWERS OF THIS AGE KNEW THE DIVINITY OF THE LORD JESUS? FOR MARK, AMONG OTHER THINGS, SAYS: "THEY KNEW THAT HE WAS THE ONE"; BUT THE APOSTLE SAYS, "NONE OF THE RULERS OF THIS AGE KNEW HIM. FOR IF THEY HAD KNOWN, THEY WOULD NEVER HAVE CRUCIFIED THE LORD OF GLORY" (Mark 1:34; 1 Cor. 2:8). IF THE DEMONS KNEW, HOW DID THE RULERS NOT KNOW? — To some it seems that by "the rulers of this age" he meant the leaders of the Jews, as if in line with what the Apostle Peter says: "You know, brothers, that you acted in ignorance, just as your rulers did" (Acts 3:17). Therefore they were rulers of the Jews, yet they were not rulers of this age. Hence he says "your rulers," not "the rulers of the age," since they said that they had Caesar as their king, under whose power they had been placed. But these are those rulers whom the Apostle indicated elsewhere, saying: "We do not wrestle against flesh and blood, but against the rulers and powers of this world, against the princes of these present darknesses" (Eph. 6:12). So the question is rightly asked: if these did not know Jesus, how could it be that the demons recognized him?

But what he says about the demons having known Christ is one thing, and what he says about the rulers of this age not having known him is another. For the demons knew that he was indeed the one who had been promised in the Law. They saw in him all the signs that the Prophets had said would come: that the Redeemer of Israel would come from the seed

of David and from a virgin. But they did not know the mystery of his divinity, just as their rulers did not. Accordingly, the devil, though cunningly, asks the Savior: "If you are the Son of God," etc. (Matt. 4:3). For seeing at one time divine power and at another human weakness, and hesitating as to what was true, he was in torment. Thus the Scriptures agree according to what has been revealed; for it is impossible that men inspired by one and the same Spirit should be at variance.

(Mark 1:34) QUESTION 48. THE APOSTLE SAYS ABOUT THE PRINCES AND POWERS OF THIS WORLD THAT, IF THEY HAD KNOWN, THEY WOULD NEVER HAVE CRUCIFIED THE LORD OF MAJESTY; BUT, ON THE OTHER HAND, MARK THE EVANGELIST SAYS OF THE DEMONS, "FOR THEY KNEW HIM TO BE." IF THE DEMONS KNEW, HOW DID THE POWERS NOT KNOW? — To some it seems that by "the rulers and powers of this age" he meant the leading men and chiefs of the Jews, who, according to the words of the Apostle Peter, did not know what evil they were doing. For he says: "I know, brothers, that you acted in ignorance, just as your rulers did." These were the rulers of the Jews, yet they could not be called rulers of this age, since they had been brought under the power of the Romans, confessing that they had no king but Caesar. But these are the rulers whom the Apostle means elsewhere when he says: "We do not wrestle against flesh, but against the rulers of this world and the princes of these darknesses." If, then, these are the rulers who, not knowing that the Lord of glory was Christ, crucified him, how could he have been known by the demons? The demons did not know him otherwise than as the rulers of this age knew him. For they knew that he was the one who had been promised in the Law, by the signs of prophecy; but they did not know his mystery, by which he was the eternal Son of God, nor the sacrament of the Incarnation.

(Mark 3:17) 2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 24. WHY DID THE SAVIOR CALL HIS DISCIPLES "SONS OF THUNDER" (Mark 3:17), WHO WOULD SEEM FAR MORE TO BE CALLED SONS OF GOD? FOR THUNDER IS SAID TO BE PRODUCED BY THE COLLISION OF CLOUDS. —Since thunder inspires fear, for this reason He called the disciples sons of thunder, as if they were sons of Him who is to be feared. For although thunder is caused by the collision of clouds, yet it happens by the will of God and is terrifying. 1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (Mark 7:24)

QUESTION 77. WHAT IS THE MEANING OF WHAT MARK THE EVANGELIST SAYS ABOUT CHRIST AMONG OTHER THINGS: "ENTERING THE HOUSE, HE WISHED NO ONE TO KNOW, AND HE COULD NOT REMAIN HIDDEN" (Mark 7:24)? IF THEREFORE HE WISHED AND COULD NOT, HIS WILL SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN WEAKENED. — It is utterly impossible that the Savior's will should not be fulfilled; nor can he will what he knows ought not to be done. Therefore, he must be said to have willed what in fact was done. For his will is never outside his nature. Just as his nature cannot fall under criticism, so neither can his will. For what is set forth was done in the regions of Tyre: then he entered the house and did not wish anyone to know. Now it is to be asked how or why he did not wish anyone to know. We must observe that this took place in the

territory of the Gentiles, for whom the time for preaching had not yet come. Indeed, when he sent his disciples he commanded them, saying, "Do not go into the way of the Gentiles, and do not enter the cities of the Samaritans; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 10:5–6). Therefore he did not wish it to be made known that he was in the house; yet he did not refuse to be sought out, but welcomed it gladly.

For although it was not yet the time to preach to the Gentiles, it would have been an act of envy not to receive those who came of their own accord to the faith. Therefore it came about that, while the Savior was not made known by the disciples, he was nevertheless made known by others who had seen him enter the house; and it began to be known that he was in the house, so that those who wished to obtain blessings might enter to him. By his own people, therefore, he did not wish it to be proclaimed that he was in the house. For he wished to be sought; and so it happened. For he did not remain hidden, since it was pointed out by others that he was in the house. Indeed the Canaanite woman, hearing about him, entered to him and begged that he would cast the demon out of her daughter; and she would not have obtained the blessing if she had not first subjected herself to the God of the Jews. Therefore the will of the Savior was fulfilled according to what we have explained: for when we examine those things which the Evangelist, aiming at brevity, has summarized, we discover what was concealed.

(Mark 7:24) QUESTION 25. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT, ACCORDING TO THE ACCOUNT OF THE EVANGELIST MARK, CHRIST'S WILL WAS NOT FULFILLED: FOR "ENTERING," HE SAYS, "INTO A HOUSE, HE WISHED NO ONE TO KNOW, AND HE COULD NOT REMAIN HIDDEN" (Mark 7:24)? IF THEREFORE HE WISHED TO BE HIDDEN AND COULD NOT, HIS WILL HAS BEEN WEAKENED. — This, which has been presented in brief so that it might conceal more meaning, is read as having taken place in the regions of Tyre: for when the Savior had come into the borders of Tyre, he entered a house. And because he ought not yet to preach to the Gentiles, he ordered that no one should announce his coming to anyone: that is, he did not wish anyone to know; and it is understood that he did not wish it to be reported by his own people to anyone that he was in the house. Yet he did not wish to be sought, because the time for offering grace to the Gentiles had not come. Indeed, when the woman came, having learned from others who had seen him enter the house, she begged that the demon might be cast out of her daughter. But the Savior, knowing that it was not yet the time to grant grace freely to the Gentiles, said, "Let the children first be filled. For it is not right to take the children's bread and throw it to the dogs." (Mark 7:27) Then the woman agreed with the Savior's words and received the blessing she desired. For by agreeing she joined herself to the God of the Jews. For this reason, therefore, he did not wish it to be known by his own people that he was in the house; and therefore it happened as he willed.

LUKE (Luke 1:27) 1ST CATEGORY NT QUESTION 86. WHAT PROVES THAT MARY, THE MOTHER OF THE LORD, IS OF THE TRIBE AND LINEAGE OF DAVID? — We will bring forward the testimony of a trustworthy witness. For the Angel says to Mary among

other things: "And the Lord God will give him the throne of David his father, and he will reign in the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there will be no end" (Luke 1:32–33). How could David be called by a trustworthy witness his father, if his mother Mary were not of the seed of David? (Luke 1:33) 2ND CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 26. IN THE GOSPEL WE READ THAT THE ANGEL SAYS TO MARY, THE LORD'S MOTHER, THAT HIS KINGDOM, THAT IS, CHRIST'S, WILL HAVE NO END (Luke 1:33). AND DANIEL SAYS THE SAME; FOR HE SAYS: THEN THERE SHALL ARISE AN EVERLASTING KINGDOM WHICH SHALL NEVER BE DESTROYED (Dan. 7:14). ON THE OTHER HAND, THE APOSTLE SAYS OF THE LORD: WHEN HE SHALL HAVE DELIVERED UP THE KINGDOM TO GOD AND THE FATHER (1 Cor. 15:24). HOW WILL HE HAVE AN ETERNAL KINGDOM, IF HE IS SAID TO BE GOING TO DELIVER THAT KINGDOM UP TO GOD AND THE FATHER? — In the case of the Father and the Son, that is, of God and Christ, "delivering up" is to be understood not as abolition. Consider how the Father delivered the kingdom to the Son, with the Lord Himself declaring this: All things, He says, have been delivered to Me by My Father (Matt. 11:27). If, therefore, the Father ceased to have it when He delivered it, then it could also be said of the Savior that when He delivers it, He loses it. For after the Son said that the kingdom had been delivered to Him by the Father, still preferring the Father, He said: Now this is eternal life, that they may know You, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom You have sent (Jn. 17:3).

According to this understanding, then, the Son does not lose the kingdom when He delivers it, so that what is said by the angel and by Daniel may remain true and both be said not to differ from this sense. Whoever thinks that the testimony of either of these should be withdrawn is full of unbelief. But now, remaining in this faith, let us see what it means that the Son delivers the kingdom to the Father; for this is what, among other things, the Apostle says elsewhere: Then the Son Himself will also be subject to Him who subjected all things to Him, that God may be all in all (1 Cor. 15:28). This subjection, therefore, is the very delivering up of the kingdom. Therefore in this passage an interpretation seems necessary, so that the Son being subject to the Father is not denied, and nonetheless He is said to have an eternal kingdom. This is the kingdom of the Son, because at the name of Jesus every knee bends, in heaven, on earth, and under the earth (Phil. 2:10). Peter the Apostle also confirms this, saying: There is no other name given under heaven by which we must be saved (Acts 4:12). And the Lord Himself says to the disciples: Until now you have asked nothing in My name; ask, and I will do it (Jn. 16:24). Therefore the Son reigns, since all are saved in His name, and the things that are asked are given, until the end of the world.

But after all things will have confessed Christ, whether by force or by will, and have been subjected to His power to which they had resisted, the mystery of the one God will be revealed to all, and every act of thanksgiving will be referred to the Father, from whom are all things; so that, when preaching ceases, one God may be known in the mystery of the

Trinity. For when all powers, all principalities and dominions will have bent the knee to Christ, then the Son will show that He is not the One from whom are all things, but His Son, and that He is seen in Him. This is the subjection and the delivering up of the kingdom. For by showing that the Father is the One from whom are all things, He subjected Himself to Him when He says that He is from Him. So great is the majesty and glory that will be seen in the coming of the Son, that all powers and choirs of angels will think that this is the unique God. But when the Savior will have said that He is not the One who is called the Father, but His Son, reigning He delivers the kingdom to the Father. In this fact both the subjection and the delivering up of the kingdom are revealed; because when He acknowledges that He is from the Father, He confesses that whatever He has belongs to the Father, referring the whole sum to Him.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (Luke 1:34) QUESTION 51. HOW IS IT TO BE UNDERSTOOD THAT, WHEN MARY SAID TO THE ANGEL, "AND HOW SHALL I KNOW THIS, FOR I DO NOT KNOW MAN?", THE ANGEL GABRIEL REPLIED, "THE HOLY SPIRIT WILL COME UPON YOU, AND THE POWER OF THE MOST HIGH WILL OVERSHADOW YOU" (Luke 1:34–35)? — To Mary, who was uncertain about the conception, the angel proclaims its possibility, saying, "The Holy Spirit will come upon you"; that is, Do not doubt because you do not know a man: for what I said, that you will conceive, the Holy Spirit, coming upon you, will bring about that you conceive without a man. And he says, "And the power of the Most High will overshadow you." The power of the Most High is without doubt Christ: for this relates to his own person. Therefore, when the Holy Spirit came upon the Virgin, he sanctified her by his working, producing from her a holy body, in which the Power who is called the Son of God would be born. This overshadowing of the Virgin is this: that from the immensity of the Godhead there should be something in the womb of the Virgin, as much as human nature could receive, which, as it were from the brightness, would be called an overshadowing, and would be the power of God; which power of God is also God. For there is nothing that is from God which is not called God. For this is a property of what is bodily: that there can be something in flesh that cannot be called flesh, such as hair, and bones, and strengths, and the rest.

(Luke 1:34)

QUESTION 38. HOW IS IT TO BE UNDERSTOOD THAT, WHEN MARY SAID TO THE ANGEL, "AND HOW SHALL I KNOW THIS, FOR I DO NOT KNOW MAN?", THE ANGEL GABRIEL REPLIED, "THE HOLY SPIRIT WILL COME UPON YOU, AND THE POWER OF THE MOST HIGH WILL OVERSHADOW YOU" (Luke 1:34–35)? — "To Mary, who was uncertain about the conception," etc. "The power of the Most High is without doubt Christ. For this saying pertains to his own person; for this is a sign of the Son of God, that is, when he is called the Power of God. According to the Godhead, however, the Father is power, and the Holy Spirit is power, and of these three there is one power, because there is one substance. Therefore the Holy Spirit made flesh for the Savior from the Virgin; but the power of the Most High, that is Christ, overshadowed her by coming into the flesh made

by the Spirit, so that in body and soul the power of the Son might lie hidden. But for it to lie hidden means that for a time it is not understood. It must be considered, however, what "overshadowing" is to be understood as in full. If the force of this word is expressed, the overshadowing of the power of God is understood as some kind of coming upon, so that when the body is overshadowed, it is recognized as receiving something from the power of God. But this "something" is the whole, because the divinity cannot be divided. It therefore follows:

"Therefore also the holy one who will be born of you shall be called the Son of God. (Luke 1:35) For that which is born of the Holy Spirit, having in itself the overshadowing of the power of God, which is the Son of God, is without doubt born holy; that is, the body of the Son of God. For the body of the Holy One is holy. Therefore the holy Son of God was born in a holy body. Therefore indeed David spoke of the flesh of Christ: "You will not allow your Holy One to see corruption" (Ps. 16:10), so that in the holy body he himself is signified.

(Luke 2:34) 1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 73. WHAT IS IT THAT SIMEON SAYS TO MARY, THE MOTHER OF THE LORD, AMONG OTHER THINGS: "THIS CHILD IS SET FOR THE FALL AND THE RISING OF MANY IN ISRAEL; AND A SWORD, HE SAYS, SHALL PIERCE THROUGH YOUR OWN SOUL ALSO, THAT THE THOUGHTS OF MANY HEARTS MAY BE REVEALED" (Luke 2:34–35)? — Simeon, a holy man, commended by divine oracles, spoke through the Holy Spirit about what would happen to people because of Christ, namely, that He would be a cause of ruin to those who, while they seemed to themselves to stand through their observance and skill in the Law, would nevertheless fall through distrust of Christ's works, being severed from the promise given to the Fathers; but for those who possessed almost no dignity in the Law, yet believed in Christ, He would be a resurrection in Israel. [So that those who were formerly unworthy and useless might become worthy of God, and those who thought themselves to be something might be rejected. This is what the Lord says in another place: "For judgment I came into this world, that those who do not see may see, and those who see may become blind" (Jn. 9:39). Indeed, it was not the doctors of the Law, nor the Pharisees, nor the scribes who followed Christ, but fishermen, uneducated and country men. Therefore the Lord says: "Father, I thank you because you have hidden these things from the wise and prudent, and have revealed them to little ones" (Matt. 11:25).

But when he adds, saying, "And a sword shall pierce through your own soul also, that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed," he certainly meant that even Mary, through whom the mystery of the Incarnation of the Savior was accomplished, would waver at the death of the Lord; yet in such a way that she would be strengthened by the honor of the resurrection and by the power of the Lord. For all, in a certain stupor, doubted at the death of the Lord. Yet they did not remain in doubt. For the sword therefore passes through the soul, if doubt does not remain in the mind, but is driven out when the former strength returns and renews itself. [For who would not hesitate when he saw Him who called Himself the Son of God so humbled that He descended even to death? And because, as I have said,

all uncertainty was to depart at the resurrection of the Lord, he said that the sword would pass through, not that it would fall upon, or touch some passing limb. Just as a sword that is hurled and passes close by a man causes fear and yet does not strike him, so doubt would cause grief, yet would not kill: because it did not settle in the soul, but passed through, as if touching the hearts of the disciples only as a shadow.

Indeed, Cleopas and the other disciple, as they went to Emmaus, sad along the road, said among other things to the Lord Himself, not knowing that He was the Lord, "We were hoping that it was He who would redeem Israel" (Luke 24:21). They doubted, but, as soon as they recognized the Lord, the doubt passed away. So it is also said of Joseph, that "iron passed through his soul" (Ps. 105:18). For he, though innocent, was long held in prison; it is no wonder if he doubted somewhat regarding God's judgment about him; but because he hoped more in God, he did not remain in uncertainty. For a person is judged in that point to which he is most inclined. The Apocalypse of John confirms this. For it says: "The fearful and unbelieving shall have their part in the lake which burns with fire and sulphur" (Rev. 21:8). Therefore, the one who does not remain in doubt is snatched from death: this is to escape death; for to doubt about God or about Christ is death. And therefore, the one who ceases to doubt escapes death.

(Luke 14:33) 2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 27. THE SAVIOR SAYS, IF ANYONE HAS NOT LEFT ALL THAT HE HAS, THAT IS, HOUSE, AND FIELD, AND THE REST, HE CANNOT BE MY DISCIPLE; AND ON THE OTHER HAND THE EVANGELIST SAYS: JOSEPH OF ARIMATHEA CAME, A RICH MAN, WHO WAS ALSO HIMSELF A DISCIPLE OF JESUS, WAITING FOR THE KINGDOM OF GOD (Luke 14:33 and 23:50–51). HOW IS IT THAT THE EVANGELIST ACKNOWLEDGES HIM AS A DISCIPLE WHOM THE SAVIOR DENIED? FOR ZACCHAEUS WAS RICH, AND CORNELIUS THE CENTURION WAS RICH, AND THE WOMEN WHO MINISTERED TO THEM OUT OF THEIR MEANS WERE RICH. — The Apostle resolves this point briefly, saying: Those who have, let them be as though they had not; and those who use this world, as though they did not use it; and those who buy, as though they did not possess (1 Cor. 7:30–31). Whoever therefore has these things in such a way as if he did not have them, seems to have renounced them. For when he does not rely on them, nor boast himself because of them, but walks humbly, not only in appearance but also in mind, understanding himself to be a steward and minister of these things, he seems to have left all that is his. For that is said to be left which departs from desire and has no appeal.

(Luke 16:16) 2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 29. IF THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS WERE UNTIL JOHN, FROM WHOM THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN BEGAN TO BE PREACHED (Luke 16:16), FOR HE IS INDEED THE INITIATOR OF THE NEW PREACHING, WHY DID HIS BAPTISM CEASE? — The baptism of John, once begun, did not cease; rather, what was lacking in it was added. For John only baptized; he did not give the Holy Spirit to believers, just as he himself says about the Savior: "I baptize you in water unto repentance, but he will baptize you in the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 3:11). This is

what he means: Through me there is forgiveness of sins, yet the Holy Spirit is not given, so that those purified might be called sons; for this was reserved to the Savior, as Lord, so that people might not become sons of God except by receiving the Holy Spirit from the Son of God. Therefore, the effect of John's baptism, which worked silently without questioning, yet not without mention of the Savior, so that what it accomplished might be firm, is a gift of the Trinity. This is what the Savior's goodness teaches us this by giving the form of three names, which in the beginning, under the name or person of the one God, worked one single and undivided work. Therefore, an interpretation was added to John's baptism, giving expression to the mystery that had long been hidden; and there was added a greater gift, so that those baptized, having received the Holy Spirit, might be sons of God. It was therefore enlarged, not abolished.

(Luke 21:25; 23:45) 1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 105. HOW THE PROPHECY AGREES WITH THE GOSPEL, CONCERNING THE DARKENING OF THE SUN AND CERTAIN OTHER THINGS. — Since at the Lord's first coming it was foretold that the sun would be darkened at his passion, at the very hour when it is proved to have happened, that is, at midday, for therefore it is written in the prophet Amos: "And it shall come to pass in that day, says the Lord, I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day" (Amos 8:9). On that day, therefore, from the sixth hour the sun was darkened until the ninth hour, and therefore the prophecy of the aforementioned prophet was fulfilled. The image of this event, which is to occur at the Lord's second coming, was shown in the Lord's passion; for at the end, when the Lord begins to come to judge the world, the heavenly lights will be released from their service, as the Lord says: "In those days the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light" (Matt. 24:29). Joel the prophet has not omitted this either, so that, being signified by many, it may without doubt be believed to be fulfilled. For therefore he said: "The sun shall be turned into darkness and the moon into blood, before the great and revealing day of the Lord comes" (Joel 2:31). As far as appears, this more fittingly belongs to the second coming;

for then it will be openly revealed to all, as Scripture says: "Then every eye shall see him, and all the tribes of the earth shall mourn over him, and those who crucified him" (Rev. 1:7). Therefore, if in both comings it is contained that the sun shall be darkened in those days, what is that day on which Scripture rings that the sun and moon shall be increased? For among other things Isaiah says: "And there shall be upon every high mountain, and upon every high hill, streams running with water in that day, when many shall perish and when the towers shall fall. And the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, in the day when the Lord shall heal the brokenness of his people" (Isa. 30:25–26), and so forth. What day can be understood, on which the Lord promised to heal the brokenness of his people? I think this is the day which Zacharias, the father of John, pointed out when he said: "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he has visited and performed the redemption of his people. And he has raised up a horn of

salvation for us in the house of David his servant, as he spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets, who have been since the world began, that he would deliver us from our enemies and from the hand of all who hate us, to perform mercy with our fathers" (Luke 1:68–72).

And Simeon, among other things, said: "This child is set for the fall and for the rise of many in Israel" (Luke 2:34). This fall is that of the scribes and Pharisees and the rulers of the Jews, whom the prophet signified by the towers. These, therefore, falling through unbelief, others rose up by believing, who had previously seemed weak and sick through negligence. Where the Savior says: "For judgment I have come into this world, that those who do not see may see, and those who see may become blind" (Jn. 9:39); so that those who by the practice and knowledge of the Law seem to be lights may be blinded through unbelief, but the blind, that is, the unlearned or publicans, may see by believing. Their weaknesses the prophet foretold that the Savior would bear (Isa. 53:11). And so at this time of the Savior it came to pass, as we read in the Gospel, that "he took our infirmities and bore our diseases" (Matt. 8:17). All these things indeed were completed and fulfilled in the Savior's passion: for therefore the salvation of the human race, both in heaven above and in the lower regions, was both redeemed and confirmed, since the prophecy of the aforementioned Zacharias encompasses both. For here above they were freed from the crushing of enemies by the intervention of mercy; and there below, in the underworld, when they were snatched from Tartarus.

For all who hoped in the promised Christ were awaiting his coming, that, death having been conquered, they might be freed from Hades. Therefore he said: "To perform mercy with our fathers. If anyone, however, understands this salvation also to be contained in the second coming, yet in both comings, especially in the second, the sun will be turned into darkness and the moon will not give her brightness: how then shall we perceive the sun and moon to be increased on the day when the Lord will visit his people, when in both times, in which the liberation of the people was begun and completed, we read that the sun and moon are not diminished but darkened? Unless, clearly, we understand the sun and moon to be compared to the saints; just as in another place we read that the saints are made equal to the heavenly lights, with the Apostle Paul preaching that among these men the saints in this world appear as luminaries. And in the Gospel: "Then the righteous shall shine like the sun" (Matt. 13:43). For the Lord calls righteous works "light": therefore he says, "Let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven" (Matt. 5:16). Those, therefore, who, having left all that is theirs, follow the Lord for the sake of righteousness and holiness, are compared to the sun and moon as being honored sevenfold; as the Lord says:

"There is no one who leaves house, or wife, or children, or fields, who will not receive seven times as much in this age" (see Luke 18:29–30). Those, then, who are now honored sevenfold can be understood to be believed in the future to become seven degrees brighter than the rest; so that their resurrection is compared to the sun and moon, while that of the others is like the stars. Therefore the brightness of the saints, which is honored sevenfold here, obtains another sevenfold in the resurrection, so that one who here has the brightness of

the moon will receive the brightness of the sun in the future; and one who here is compared to the sun will be believed then to receive seven times as much. Therefore the prophet Isaiah foretold that by comparison with the sun and moon the merits of the saints would be increased, and not without reason. For if the Lord himself is called the Sun of righteousness, and the saints will be like him, as the Apostle John says: "When he appears, we shall be like him" (1 Jn. 3:2), then fittingly the saints are signified in the sun, yet the aforementioned prophet shows the sun to be greater than the moon by seven degrees For when it shows that the moon, like the light of the sun, will exist in the future, but the sun will be seven times as great;

it certainly means, in the manner of speaking, that the moon will be increased sevenfold more than the sun, so that the moon will then be such as the sun is now: although the reasoning here concerns the saints, under this explanation of the luminaries it has nevertheless partly revealed their measure, so that after the increase of the sun and the moon, a saint will again be as much greater as the sun once was; and as much as one saint now differs from another saint, so much will one differ from another in the future after the reward.

(Luke 22) 1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 84. WHY DO WE, WHO ARE KEEPING THE PASSOVER FEAST (EASTER) BY THE PHASE OF THE MOON, REPROACH THE PAGANS FOR OBSERVING THE DAYS AND THE DIFFERENT PHASES OF THE MOON? — Far be it from Christians to be said to worship the stars, when they have been granted a spiritual cultivation, so that, despising what is seen, they may be united to what is invisible and above the heavens, and surpass all these things, destined to be with the Angels of God. For the worshipers of the stars will either be with them, or below them. How can it happen that someone should be above the things he worships? The pagans therefore do not observe the calculation of the moon, but worship the moon itself as a goddess. And having persuaded themselves that they have grasped the effects of its courses, they determine what must be done or avoided on particular days, subjecting their life and conduct in an ordered way to its supposed authority. Because they have dared to take these things outside God's ordinance, we frequently discover that they are deceived. For God appointed these luminaries as signs for the seasons. Therefore we too keep the count of the moon, but we do not cultivate the moon itself; so that from the fourteenth moon, which according to the Law is for us the first, we may observe the rule of Easter. For God established all things in fullness:

and therefore from the fourteenth up to the twenty-first, in these seven days it has been granted to us to celebrate Easter, so that some of these seven days may be enclosed between the preparation (Parasceve) and the resurrection of the Lord: so that neither the thirteenth day be in the Passion, nor the fourteenth or fifteenth in the Resurrection, lest the Passion of Christ be before the first moon as we count it, nor His Resurrection be on a day other than the first day on which the world was begun. For all the seasons of the world are numbered by the cycles of a single week, because in these days God composed the parts and ornaments of the world. In six days He fitted the world, and on the seventh He ceased, which He called the

sabbath. In these seven days the order and number of the entire world are contained. For they ever return into themselves, increasing the number of the seasons. After the sabbath, therefore, it always repeats from the first day up to the seventh day, that is, the sabbath; so that we may learn that the Lord's resurrection took place on the first day of the world's beginning, which is called the Lord's Day. For the Lord made that day one with the evening, and being unfolded into the sevenfold number, it begins again, so as to be the first after the week. This was so decreed from the beginning because of the mystery of the Lord's incarnation, Passion, and Resurrection.

For in the body of the Lord almost the whole world rose again and was renewed. It is settled that we do not worship the moon, but keep the number that has been established by the moon's course. But the Devil, who is Satan, in order that he may attach some authority to his deceit and color his fabricated lies with truth, in the first month in which he knows the Lord's mysteries are to be celebrated, since he is not of small power, instituted mysteries for the pagans to observe, so that he might hold their souls in error for two reasons: since deceit has anticipated truth, it might seem that deceit is something better, as if by its antiquity influencing the truth. And because in the first month, in which the Romans have the equinox, as we do, that same observance is kept by them, so that they even say that expiation is made by blood, just as we by the cross: by this trickery he keeps the pagans in error, so that they think our truth to appear rather an imitation than truth, as though invented through a certain superstition in rivalry. "For," they say, "what has been discovered later cannot be judged true. But since among us truth is for certain, and this is from the beginning, signs of powers and wonders bear witness, so that, with power as a witness, the wickedness of the Devil may be made known.

For since truth alone easily persuades, it has been set against the cunning and pre-emption of the Devil, to reveal his deception. For no one, not even among enemies, would dare deny that there is truth where power appears.

(Luke 22:50) 1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 104. ON THE GOSPEL OF LUKE. — Knowing that a Jewish war against Him was to come, the Lord told His disciples to get swords for themselves. (Luke 22:36) When this had been done and the war had begun under the leadership of Judas Iscariot, Peter the apostle, seeing the enemies rising up, drew his sword and cut off the ear of the servant of the priests. Then the Lord ordered Peter to put his sword back into its sheath: "For everyone," He said, "who takes the sword will perish by the sword" (Matt. 26:51–52). Why did He order swords to be prepared, when He forbade striking, even declaring liable to death the one who strikes with the sword, since the apostle does not seem to have struck unjustly? For as far as Peter is concerned, he struck the one whom he saw armed against him. He ought indeed to have resisted the thankless servants armed for killing the Lord. If you examine each part of the case whose force we wish to explain, you will also find other points you may seek beyond these words. For what need was there that He, who relied on spiritual power, should order carnal swords to be prepared, and He who had previously commanded that on

the way they should carry neither bag, nor money, nor staff (Matt. 10:10), should now order that those things be possessed which He had previously forbidden? Let us therefore begin to explain why He ordered swords to be prepared and yet forbade killing.

For the sake not only of the enemies, but also of His own disciples, He commanded that arms be acquired for the coming war. For a new and marvelous thing was about to happen, that He who worked new and unheard of signs should so suddenly be humbled as to be subjected both to scourging and to death. Lest He should appear to suffer these things as one unaware, as if power had somehow departed from Him, He foretold all this in such a way that He would not be doubted in these matters but, foreknowing them, would prepare Himself against them; and because He was humbled willingly, He would not command a fierce resistance to His enemies. He showed Himself to be the same as He had been to such a degree that, already arrested, He restored the ear that had been cut off, so that what had fallen by the operation of the sword He gave back: not as a bodily physician, but as the Maker of bodies He refashioned His work when it had been mutilated. For physicians cannot restore limbs once cut off from the body. But in order that the power of God in Him might appear not diminished, but present as it had been, and to confirm what He had said: "I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to take it up again" (Jn. 10:18), for this reason He ordered swords to be prepared, yet did not order killing.

Now it remains to show why, contemplating Peter the apostle's act, He said that the one who has used the sword will perish by the sword, though Peter does not seem to have struck unjustly. For as is indicated in Luke, he struck with the Lord Himself permitting it, and then, being forbidden, heard these words (Luke 22:49–50). It was permitted, indeed, so that He might appear able to avenge Himself but unwilling to do so; and so that His power might be shown to remain in Him as it had been, so that in both respects it would not be doubted that He could avenge Himself; while the enemies, on the other hand, would know for certain that power had been given to them by Him to do this. For He did not appear as one defeated, but as one giving Himself over to their will. Why then was the sentence given that whoever takes the sword will perish by the sword, unless because no one is permitted, except the judge, to kill anyone with the sword? But to the apostle Peter it was permitted only to the extent that he might inflict pain, not that he might kill. For this reason he was told not to strike again. He also learned that once people have become Christians, they are no longer allowed to kill. For those who are placed in mercy, it is not permitted to use harshly the law of justice, which has been entrusted to the world.

But that instruction which He seems to have given to the disciples going before Him on the road, that they should take nothing for the journey, is for the sake of peace, and the grace of miracles, and the charm of teaching. For what need was there to carry anything on the road for those to whom, for the sake of signs, all things were to be offered? But when the time came in which He allowed Himself to suffer, for which rather a quarrel than a war was awaiting, He commanded His disciples to be armed: not that He who wished to suffer might resist, but, as I said, that He might show Himself foreknowing this matter and having His

passion in His own power; yet humbling Himself for the sake of human salvation, which will be discussed in its proper place.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY OT & NT (Luke 23:44) QUESTION 67. WHAT IS IT THAT THE SAVIOR, PLACED UPON THE CROSS, SAYS: FATHER, FORGIVE THEM, FOR THEY DO NOT KNOW WHAT THEY ARE DOING (Luke 23:34)? — If they do not know, what is it that is being forgiven, especially since King Abimelech says to God, Will you destroy a nation that is ignorant? (Gen. 20:4). Not everyone who is ignorant is free from punishment: the one who is ignorant can be excused from punishment if he has found no one from whom he could learn. But for these, he asks that this be forgiven, who, though they had someone from whom they could learn, did not make the effort. It is not permitted to be ignorant in this way. Therefore, they will receive pardon if they are converted. (Luke 23:44)

QUESTION 4. WHAT IS IT THAT THE SAVIOR, WHEN PLACED ON THE CROSS, SAYS: FATHER, FORGIVE THEM, FOR THEY DO NOT KNOW WHAT THEY ARE DOING? IF THEY DO NOT KNOW, WHAT IS IT THAT IS FORGIVEN, ESPECIALLY SINCE ABIMELECH SAYS TO GOD, WILL YOU DESTROY THOSE WHO ARE IGNORANT? — Not everyone who is ignorant is free from punishment. For he who could have learned and did not make the effort, has made himself guilty. The opportunity was there for him to learn, and there was someone from whom he could learn; but made more negligent by indulgence or by ill will, he becomes without excuse in his crime. Therefore the Savior says, If I had not come and spoken to them, they would not be guilty of sin (Jn. 15:22). But the one who is ignorant through no fault of his own, he is ignorant because there was no one from whom he could learn, nor did he even hear by rumor any report of the teaching, is in every respect free from condemnation. Therefore, for those who did not make the effort to learn the truth when it was preached to them, but through ignorance killed its author, the Lord asks the Father to grant them pardon if they are converted. Therefore Peter the apostle says in the Acts, Repent, that your sins may be wiped out (Acts 3:19).

JOHN (John 1:1-3) 1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 122. ON THE BEGINNING. — In the beginning was the Word (Jn. 1:1). What is “in the beginning”? For we also read in the ancient Books: In the beginning God made heaven and earth (Gen. 1:1). And in the Epistle of him whose Gospel it is, and about whose “beginning” we are trying to say something, it is signified in the same sense; for he says: That which was from the beginning. (1 Jn. 1:1) The Epistle therefore and the Gospel have one and the same meaning. For it is one thing that is said in the old text, In the beginning God made heaven and earth; and another when he says, In the beginning was the Word; and, That which was from the beginning (1 Jn. 1:1). For to be in the beginning, and to be from the beginning, mean one and the same thing, in the case of that which from the beginning was what it was, and did not begin to be. For that which begins to be, was not from the beginning; and therefore it is subjected to a beginning, that is, to be the first among other things in order, because, being itself made at the beginning, it began to have others

after itself, which were made after it. As we read that in the beginning God made heaven and earth: he did not say, In the beginning were heaven and earth;

because when they did not yet exist, and God was disposing Himself to make the world, in the beginning, that is, among the other things which were to contribute to the construction of the world, God first made heaven and earth; because beginning is the starting point of one who undertakes something that is first in order. But that which is said, that in the beginning it was, that is, the Word, is meant to have existed before the beginning of the higher and lower creation; so that it should by no means be understood as having been made first among these things which have been created, as if it were made earlier, when God was disposing Himself to make creation. Therefore, if in the beginning it was, that is, it was before all things, it always was. And so too it was the Word. Where? With God, he says, lest it should be thought unworthy and in any way subject to a beginning, it which always was with God. For it is fitting that what was before all things with God should not be subjected to any beginning. Therefore he added: And the Word was God. Now he shows plainly that what was said above applies to the Word; for he says, The Word was God: and concerning God one must not think otherwise than that He should always be said to have been. For if He began to be, He is a creature; if He is a creature, He is not God.

For whatever exists is either God or a creature; and therefore the name of God does not belong to a creature. But because He did not begin to be (He was, in fact), He is rightly said to be God. But He is said to have always been with God because He is God not from Himself, but from God. On this account His name is said to be the Word of God, as the faith of the same evangelist shows in his Revelation. For he says among other things: And His name is the Word of God (Rev. 19:13). For in order that He might not be signified as the One from whom are all things, but as the One through whom are all things, that is, not as the Father but as the Son, He is called the Word of God: so that, because God cannot be without His Word, this One who is called the Word of God may be believed to have always been with God; and because the Word is not outside Him whose Word it is, this Word which was with God may be understood as signified to be not from elsewhere, but from God; and because He is from God, He is not absurdly called God. Therefore he does not make two gods by saying that God was with God. For if there were two, they would be different in nature and not of one will.

For if we men, though we are of one nature, are nevertheless of different wills, how much more, where the natures are different? and neither would God be said to be with God. For the God who was and is with God does not have from Himself that He is God; otherwise, neither would He be said to be God with God, nor would the Word of God be called God the Word; but because that which is from God does not signify any other kind of being than that which God Himself is, the Word of God is called God, so that, because He is said to be the Word of God, He should not be referred to another God. And the fact that He is called God happens for this reason, lest it should tend to the injury of God, if that which was from God were not at all called God. Therefore both the unity of God has been preserved, and

the fitting honor has been rendered, since He who is God from God has not been received in His own glory, but in that of Him from whom He is God. For this reason the Gospel begins to speak of the Word before it speaks of God the Father; because questions arise not concerning God, but concerning the Word of God. No one doubts about God, but about Him who is God from God. For every tongue of those in heaven and on earth confesses one God;

but it is disturbed in the mystery of the one God. It trembles when it hears the Word of God called God; for it is struck by bodily representations, because the word of a man cannot be called a man; whereas God is by nature simple, not composed of members, nor having an inside and an outside, nor a before and after, nor top and bottom; but, if it can be said, He is wholly and entirely the same in all respects, nowhere variable or unlike Himself; and His one brightness is measureless. For if fire has neither front nor back, nor inside and outside, how much more its Creator? Therefore, because everything that God is, is entirely one and simple, it does not conflict, when something that is from God is called God. Therefore, partly according to a human example, and partly not according to a human example, the Son of God who is the Word of God is God. For in the same way in which sons of men are men, the Son of God is God; but because sons of men are men by mixture, in this respect the Son of God is not God by that example; because from the simple God He is simply born. And just as our word is from us, by this example it is understood that the Word of God is from Him; but because our word is not what we ourselves are, in this respect the Word of God is not from God in the same manner;

because the Word of God is a reality, not a sound that fades away. Nor, because we and God share common words, will there be one and the same explanation for us and for God in the actual effect of things. For we read, In the beginning God made heaven and earth. How did He make? Perhaps as we make our works with the hand? And further on it says: And God said, Let there be light; and there was light (Gen. 1:3). Whom do we suppose God spoke to? For He surely did not speak to man, but to Him who could make, who was also going to make man, as indeed He did. But how did He speak? Perhaps as we speak, with a bodily organ? Far from it. You see, then, that certain words are indeed shared between us and God, but they differ in their effect: for God acts in a different way than we do; and He is said to speak, but not in our manner. So also the Word of God is not a word of the kind we use, which, once it is spoken, no longer exists; that Word, however, remains, because it is such a Word that it hears, and speaks, and works. Moreover, it is not only the Word of God, but also the Power and the Wisdom of God, this is the Son of God. In respect to effect, He is called the Son of God;

in respect to the speech by which God addresses us through Him, He is called the Word of God; in respect to the wisdom by which God teaches us His mystery through Him, He is called the Wisdom of God; and in respect to the operation by which God made and makes all things through Him, He is called the Power of God. These titles could fit no one except the Son of God. Precisely because He is God from God, He is said to possess all that is God's. For by being born He obtained all things of God. It would not be fitting that the Word of

God, and the Power and Wisdom of God, should be called degenerate: for this is what "God the Word, the Power, and the Wisdom" means. But Christ, because He is wholly God from the whole God, is God; and He is called the Wisdom of God, and the Power, and the Word: that is, He is God from God, and with God. Therefore it is said, This was in the beginning with God. In order to overcome the minds of unbelievers, Scripture burst forth under force, to show that Christ is God, since everywhere, for the sake of the unity of God, it intends Christ to be understood as God. Now, however, in plain words it has said that He is God, and that He has always been with God, laying open the mystery of God, lest God be thought utterly solitary.

It has declared that God is not called one in order that He be considered solitary, but that, although there be two or three, yet from the one, the unity is not discriminatory, because whatever is from the one is referred back to that very one, since He is one, even though all things are said to be from God. Yet there is a difference between that which properly came forth from God and that which was created from outside at His command: that is, there is a difference between that which proceeded from His substance and that which, when it in no way existed, was created by His will. For that which proceeded from the substance of God was never subsequent to His substance; whereas that which was created began to be a substance when it was created: and therefore the Trinity alone has no beginning. Therefore, the disclosure of the mystery has diminished the merit of faith: for the more hidden that which is believed is, the greater is the reward of the believer, and the lesser the punishment of the doubter. But the disclosure of the mystery, while it has made the merits of believers lesser, has stirred up greater punishments for the unbelieving. For a clearer law makes one more guilty. The testimony of the Saviour Himself, by which He called God His own Father, would have sufficed. For which of the believers would doubt that the Son in substance is in no way different from the Father?

But because the unreasonableness of heretics, by inventions of unbelief, began to assail the laws of faith by receiving the Son of God otherwise than He is proclaimed, it was added, for the sake of making this known, that He was before all things with God and is God, so as to reveal what the concept of a true Son mystically contained. By this, divine mercy appears to have provided for human weakness, by unveiling what had been reserved, as enclosed, for the merits of a stronger faith. Therefore it added, saying, All things were made through Him, so that if anyone from what had been said above still hesitated in any respect, since human understanding is narrow for grasping divine things, from this he might become capable, when he hears, All things were made through Him. Therefore he would by no means think Him to be a thing made, since he hears that all things were made through Him by God; for if He Himself were a thing made, it would not have said that all things were made through Him by God: nor indeed was He made through Himself. To reveal this more fully still, it added, And without Him, it says, was made nothing: in saying this, it excluded all controversy and earthly arguments. Although there are still those who refuse to believe, nevertheless, when it shows that nothing was made without Him, it has taught that in no way ought He to be suspected of being a creature.

For how can He Himself be said to be a creature, when it is said that God made nothing without Him? If God made Him, Scripture lies. But far be it. For Scripture is faithful, and, in order to cut off error, it uses as much clarity as it can for the redemption of human beings unto salvation. Finally it subjoined, What was made in Him was life (Jn. 1:2–4): in Him, that is, in the Word, it signifies that what was made is life. As the Lord Himself also says: As the Father has life in Himself, so He has given to the Son to have life in Himself (Jn. 5:26). It is not that the Word was without life, and afterwards life was either given or made in Him; rather, He wishes the Word itself to be understood as life. If one can say of God the Father that He Himself is one thing and has in Himself another; so also of His Son: for just as the Father has life in Himself, so He gave the Son to have life in Himself. Human words are not fit to explain divine realities. Therefore what is said seems flawed, in that, while the Son of God is not a creature, that which is, is said to have been made in Him. And if it had said, "what was begotten in Him," even so it would have seemed flawed.

But to show His substantial generation, it pointed to the work made in it by such language as it could use, by which it exists, demonstrating that His generation has life in itself. For we indeed live, but we cannot give life to others, since that same life is not in our power. He, however, is said to have life in Himself precisely because He is able to give life and to create what He wills to exist and to live. For this He is said to be born, that He might be able to do all that the Father does; because He has life in Himself just as the Father has. For this is what it means that He made all things through Him and in Him: He so begot Him as to have in Himself life, through which He can make all things, not because He Himself is something other than life, but since His life can both live and create others to live, He is said to have life in Himself. For we indeed live, but we do not have life itself in us in such a way that we also give life to others. This reality the Apostle Paul also recalls among other things when he says: "Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn before every creature; for in him were created all things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether Thrones or Dominions or Principalities or Powers; all things were created through him and in him" (Col. 1:15–16).

Now the Gospels agree with this teaching of the two Apostles, John and Paul: for they say the same thing, that the Son of God was begotten before every creature, so that he might create spiritual powers, and the world, and the visible things that are in it. For what John said, that "what was made, in him is life," Paul signified in the same way when he said that "in him all things in heaven and on earth were created. And further on: "All things were created through him and in him. "Through him" he created, because in substance he is the same God, that is, the Father in the Son; but "in him," because he so begot the Son that he might have the power to make all things visible and invisible. This consisted in making life in him, so that he might both live, and bestow life on others for living, understanding, acting, and upon the other living beings according as he willed, as the image of God. For when he is called the image of God, this refers to both aspects: for by his express birth he possesses in himself the full likeness of the Father, and he can do whatever the Father can do, so that it is truly the Father who is seen in the Son, who is the image of the invisible

God. Surely, because he called the Father invisible, he did not thereby make the Son visible, since the Son is by nature what the Father is.

And since the heavenly creature is invisible, how much more its Creator? But he meant this of what is in heaven, not of what is on earth; for although the Son is invisible, yet he is seen there, that is, in the heavenly realms, by the Apostles or by others of that kind, of whom he said: "Father, I will that where I am, they also may be with me, and may see my glory" (Jn. 17:24). And elsewhere: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God" (Matt. 5:8); that is, the Father in the Son, God in the image; which is God in God. As the body is the image of a bodily thing, so God is the image of God: for the Father is the pattern, and the Son is the pattern taken from the pattern, which he communicates to the Holy Spirit; "For he shall take of mine," he says (Jn. 16:14). And therefore in the Son God is seen as in his own image. For just as no one was found worthy to open the book and its seals except the Word of God (Rev. 5:4–8), so no one is worthy to see God the Father, neither by nature nor by merits, except his true Son. For there is nothing in between that could stand as an obstacle between the Father and the Son, as he himself bears witness when he says: "Neither has anyone seen the Father, except he who is from God; he has seen the Father" (Jn. 6:46).

But if in the Son the Father is seen, why is it said that no one is worthy to see God, since he is seen in the Son, because the Son does not differ from the Father? He does not differ at all in substance, because he is the true Son; it differs, however, in the degree of origin [causalitatis], because all power is from the Father in the Son; and in substance the Son is not lesser, yet in authority the Father is greater, as the Lord himself testifies, saying: "If you loved me, you would indeed rejoice, because I go to the Father, for the Father is greater than I" (Jn. 14:28). Keeping this order, the Apostle Paul also says: "One God, the Father, from whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus, through whom are all things, and we through him" (1 Cor. 8:6): so that the first degree is "from whom are all things"; the second, "through whom are all things"; the third, "in whom are all things. And because none of these is inferior, they are signified in the unity of God, as the Apostle says: "For from him and through him and in him are all things; to him be glory forever and ever" (Rom. 11:36).

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (John 1:17)

QUESTION 76. IN THE GOSPEL, JOHN SAYS, "THE LAW WAS GIVEN THROUGH MOSES, GRACE AND TRUTH CAME THROUGH JESUS CHRIST" (John 1:17). THEREFORE, GRACE AND TRUTH DID NOT EXIST BEFORE. HOW THEN IS THE LAW SAID TO HAVE BEEN GIVEN BY GOD, IF THERE WAS NO TRUTH IN IT? — This should not simply be passed over, but we must consider what it means. "The Law was given through Moses. Through Moses the given Law has clear commandments; but he also wrote the history, which is itself also called Law. Let us see if anything in its commandments is not true: perhaps what it says, "You shall not kill, you shall not commit adultery, you shall not steal" (Exod. 20:13–15)? The rest are of the same kind. But as for its history, it is clear that before the coming of Christ the truth was not present. For the things that were under a veil were uncertain in what they signified. But when it was made clear through Christ whose person

it is that speaks in Genesis, "Let us make man in our image and likeness" (Gen. 1:26), and who is the one who made him; and who it was that was seen by the patriarchs in the bush (Exod. 3:2); and who acted in the rock that gave water in the desert (Exod. 17:6), "for the Rock," he says, "was Christ" (1 Cor. 10:4), therefore truth came through Christ, when the things that had been hidden, or had become doubtful as to what they signified, were shown by Christ.

For among other things the Lord says, "Moses wrote about me" (Jn. 5:46). This had previously been concealed; indeed there was error. For he who was the Son was thought to be God the Father; and he who was supposed to be an angel was recognized as the Son of God. And a promise had been made to Abraham, which, so long as it was not fulfilled, remained in uncertainty; but when it was fulfilled with the coming of Christ, it became truth: when both what was promised was rendered, and it began to be known what it was that had been promised. For the faith of the one who promises is then proved true when he fulfills the promise.

(John 1:17)

QUESTION 30. IN THE GOSPEL, JOHN SAYS, "THE LAW WAS GIVEN THROUGH MOSES, GRACE AND TRUTH CAME THROUGH JESUS CHRIST" (John 1:17). THEREFORE, GRACE AND TRUTH DID NOT EXIST BEFORE. HOW THEN IS THE LAW SAID TO HAVE BEEN GIVEN BY GOD, IF THERE WAS NO TRUTH IN IT? — We must see what this means, "The Law was given through Moses. Through Moses, however, the given Law has clear commandments, and what in it would not be true? "You shall not kill, you shall not commit adultery"? (Exod. 20:13–15) Such are the rest as well. But he also wrote the history in which, up to the coming of the Savior, what the truth was had not been revealed. When therefore it is revealed through Christ whose person says, "Let us make," (Gen. 1:26) and who it is that acts; and who it was that was seen in the bush or by the patriarchs; (Exod. 3:2) and who it was that acted in the rock when he himself brought forth water (Exod. 17:6), "for the Rock," he says, "was Christ" (1 Cor. 10:4): truth therefore comes through Christ, as those things that had been in doubt are understood in what they signify. Therefore the Law given through Moses makes sinners guilty; but the grace that was promised in the Law, when it comes, by forgiving sins deprives sinners of death. There was therefore an order: first to give the Law, and afterwards mercy, which then becomes grace when it forgives sins.

For before, it was a promise, which afterwards becomes grace. "For," he says, "there shall come out of Zion one who will deliver and turn away ungodliness from Jacob" (Isa. 59:20, LXX). This promise, through Christ, became grace, when he freely forgives sins. But how could he forgive sins if he had not first given the Law, through which, when people had become guilty, he might grant pardon? For he would not give except what was owed to himself. But it could not be owed unless the Law had gone before.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (John 3:2)

QUESTION 59. IF BAPTISM IS A HEAVENLY MYSTERY, WHY DOES THE LORD, WHEN SPEAKING WITH NICODEMUS WHO DOUBTED CONCERNING BAPTISM, SAY: "IF I HAVE TOLD YOU EARTHLY THINGS, AND YOU DO NOT BELIEVE, HOW WILL YOU BELIEVE IF I TELL YOU HEAVENLY THINGS? (John 3:12)? — Whoever thinks Baptism consists in a merely bodily way is not a spiritual man; nor can he obtain the heavenly gift if he does not believe that he is changed not by water only, but by faith. For the water is seen, but the unseen Spirit is at work, so that faith may be in him. For just as water washes bodily filth, so the Spirit cleanses the soul from sins; so that, as visible things profit from visible means, so also the Spirit benefits spiritual things. And therefore a spiritual understanding is applied in Baptism. For there is more there in what is heard than in what is seen. Therefore, when Nicodemus, instructed by carnal reasoning, doubted, the Savior, in order to draw him to faith, used a fitting example, so as to give a visible example to confirm an invisible reality, one that consists only in hearing, not in sight, and is not disputed, and yet is earthly because it concerns a thing of this world. Therefore the Lord said to Nicodemus, urging him: "The Spirit blows where it wills, and you hear its sound, but you do not know where it comes or where it goes. So it is with everyone who is born again of water and the Holy Spirit";

so that just as the sound of the coming spirit, that is, of the wind, is indeed heard but not seen, as has been said, so also the nature of Baptism is heard when it is spoken of, yet the manner in which it is effected by the Spirit is not seen. Nevertheless, what is to come is announced by the one who conveys the words and is preached, so that what is heard may be believed to happen, although the explanation of how it happens is not given. But when even by this example Nicodemus was not led to faith, then he heard from the Savior: "If I have told you earthly things," he says, "and you do not believe, how will you believe if I tell you heavenly things? These words he called "earthly," which he had set forth by way of example; that is: "If by an earthly reasoning," he says, "from the example given, of the spirit, that is, of the wind, you do not believe that it can happen, because how it happens is not seen, how could it be that, if I were to give heavenly examples, which you certainly do not know, you would believe? For a man can be persuaded of what he does not know by means of what he does know; for instance, God says of Christ that He is truly His Son, in a way that cannot be comprehended as to how this is so.

Yet through what we know according to the flesh about how sons exist, we believe that God therefore said, "Christ is my true Son," in order to signify that He is from His own substance. In this way, the Savior, whose reality can be explained neither by words nor by the mind, wished to praise Him by means of something perceptible and audible to the ears, namely, by the example of the spirit which is the wind, which the senses grasp and the ear hears, but one does not know where it comes. In this manner He wished to make credible the work of the Holy Spirit, which cannot be comprehended. And in the Acts of the Apostles we read in the same way: "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a mighty rushing wind, and it filled the whole house" (Acts 2:2), etc. Behold, clearly by the example of the wind he indicates that the Holy Spirit therefore came from heaven and made a sound, just

as a strong wind upon the earth. For Jeremiah also calls the wind "spirit," saying, "The wind blows in every region. Because it is in this world and is carried about through various places, we do not know where it comes or where it goes. But the Holy Spirit comes from heaven, as we read, to enlighten believers.

How then does it seem to some that the Savior spoke about the Holy Spirit when He said, "The Spirit blows where it wills, and you hear its sound, but you do not know where it comes or where it goes," when it is clear that the Savior spoke this by way of example? Indeed, He added: "So is everyone who has been born again of water and the Holy Spirit. What is more obvious, that "spirit" here means "wind"? Yet they think that wind is not meant because He says, "where it wills it blows," as if every creature, subject to a law imposed upon it, were not nevertheless released to its own freedom of action. We too go and do what we will, acting under law; for which reason we shall render an account. Or is it thought possible, and not foolish, that in wishing to indicate the operation of the Holy Spirit He should give that very Spirit as the example? Therefore I consider the question to be resolved in every respect.

(John 3:2)

QUESTION 16. SINCE THE SAVIOR SAYS THAT THE BAPTISM OF JOHN IS FROM HEAVEN, WHY, WHEN HE SPEAKS TO NICODEMUS ABOUT BAPTISM AND HE IS IN DOUBT, DOES HE SAY: "IF I HAVE TOLD YOU EARTHLY THINGS AND YOU DO NOT BELIEVE," ETC.? — What he said, "If I have told you earthly things, and you do not believe," does not refer to Baptism; because we know that our baptism is spiritual, although it is celebrated through water: but the reasoning there is of a heavenly kind. For it is not the water that purifies, but God, invisibly and incomprehensibly. It does, however, apply to the imitation of the example given, that is, to what he said, "The Spirit blows where he wills, and you hear his voice, but you do not know where he comes or where he goes. By this example he wished to instruct Nicodemus unto faith, so that he would believe that a man is reborn through water and the Spirit, yet that it cannot be grasped how this happens: for it happens spiritually. For just as you hear the voice of the spirit, that is, of the wind, which is a sound, but you do not know where it comes or where it goes, so also with one who is reborn: you do not know how he is changed, yet you sense that it happens, because you perceive the change itself. For if the wind blows where it wills, how much more does the Spirit who is from God sanctify whom he wills?

But he said, "He blows where he wills," because every creature, although governed under the Law, is nevertheless left to its own choice. If, however, anyone thinks that this spirit is to be understood as the Holy Spirit, it does not stand; since for the sake of an example he set forth this spirit, by which he might persuade what he had said, that a man must be reborn of water and the Spirit, and this was not believed by Nicodemus. For surely the example is one thing, and that which is confirmed by the example is another. If therefore it is given as an example, it is not the Holy Spirit, but the worldly spirit which is called wind. For wishing to praise a spiritual reasoning to unbelieving Nicodemus, he gave the example of the spirit, so that through it the operation and working of the Holy Spirit might be believed. We do

know, however, that the Holy Spirit came from heaven, so that he might pour himself into believers, as we read that it happened to the Apostles at the beginning, and that the sound was then called a voice. For it is therefore written, "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a mighty rushing spirit. (Acts 2:2) This sound he calls a "voice" in the passage in question. By the example of the spirit, that is, the wind, he shows the works of the Holy Spirit, so that the saying of the Savior might stand.

For what else is it when he says, "And there came a sound from heaven as of a mighty rushing spirit"? Therefore indeed he said that the Holy Spirit descended and sounded like a mighty wind. This, then, is the spirit he gave as an example. Finally he says, "So is everyone who is born again. And as for this one, we do not know where he comes; but the Holy Spirit came from heaven.

(John 5:18) 2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 31. THE SABBATH IS CERTAINLY THE LAW OR A PART OF THE LAW; HOW THEN IS THE LAW NOT ABOLISHED, WHEN THE EVANGELIST SAYS, "HE NOT ONLY BROKE THE SABBATH, BUT ALSO CALLED GOD HIS FATHER" (John 5:18)? — The Savior indeed broke the Sabbath, yet without prejudice to the Sabbath that had been given. For when the time of the Sabbath was already at an end, but the Jews insisted that the Sabbath still remained in force, the Savior, by working on the Sabbaths and by commanding the sick man to carry his bed on the Sabbath, broke the Sabbath according to the understanding of the Jews. For according to true faith, to say that it had already ceased is like saying of someone that he should be called a former governor, and that he suffered an injury because the governorship itself suffered injury. Therefore the Sabbath itself was not annulled, but the men who shamelessly claimed authority from the Sabbath were confused, since a new Law had already succeeded the Sabbath.

(John 5:46) 2ND CATEGORY OT & NT

QUESTION 2. THE GOSPEL BEARS WITNESS THAT NO ONE HAS SEEN GOD (John 1:18; 6:46; and 1 Tim. 6:16); YET JACOB AND MOSES AND ISAIAH ASSERT THAT THEY HAVE SEEN GOD (Gen. 32:30 and Isa. 6:1). BUT SOMEONE SAYS, "NO ONE HAS SEEN THE FATHER. WHAT OF IT? IF THE SON HAS BEEN SEEN, THEN THE FATHER HAS BEEN SEEN AS WELL, SINCE THE FATHER AND THE SON ARE ONE AND THE SAME GOD, BOTH IN SUBSTANCE AND IN IMAGE, BECAUSE OF TWO THERE IS ONE IMAGE; AND, AS HE HIMSELF SAYS, "HE WHO SEES ME, SEES THE FATHER ALSO" (John 14:9). HOW THEN HAS NO ONE SEEN GOD THE FATHER, WHEN THE SON SAYS THAT THE FATHER IS SEEN WHEN HE HIMSELF IS SEEN? BECAUSE HE IS NOT A DIFFERENT GOD. IF THEREFORE HE IS NOT ANOTHER, THEN HE, BEING ONE AND THE SAME, IS THE GOD WHO HAS BEEN SEEN. — As far as the Evangelist is concerned, he said this about God the Father, that no one has seen God, except the only-begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, He has declared Him. Let us believe the Son; for He has declared that no one, except Himself, has seen God. But He said this in order to teach that He Himself had always appeared to the Patriarchs and

the Prophets. Therefore this does not refer to God in His unity, but to the person of the Father, of whom nothing else can be said than "God the Father.

The Son, however, says that He has been seen in such a way that He remains invisible even at the very moment when He is thought to be seen. For "seen" here is to be understood as "understood"; since He was certainly not seen with the eyes, but comprehended by the mind, and this was what it meant "to have seen": to have understood that in what appeared there God was present. But when the Savior says, "He who sees me, sees the Father also," He surely did not refer this to the sight of the eyes, but to that of the mind, and in order that nothing might be thought different between the Father and the Son. Neither of them, therefore, has been seen according to substance. Yet, in outward appearances, the Son alone has been seen by the mind, not by bodily eyes, because He is invisible just as the Father is.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (John 6:44; Romans 9:16-18)

QUESTION 79. IF WE LIVE BY OUR OWN FREE WILL, WHY DID THE SAVIOR SAY, "NO ONE COMES TO ME UNLESS THE FATHER WHO SENT ME DRAWS HIM" (John 6:44); AND WHY, AGREEING WITH THIS, DID THE APOSTLE SAY, "IT IS NOT OF HIM THAT WILLS, NOR OF HIM THAT RUNS, BUT OF GOD THAT SHOWS MERCY," AND, "HE HAS MERCY ON WHOM HE WILL, AND WHOM HE WILL HE HARDENS" (Rom. 9:16, 18)? HOW IS THE WILL'S CHOICE FREE, WHEN AT ANOTHER'S NOD IT IS LED EITHER TO GOOD OR TO EVIL? — The case stands otherwise than you propose. For in no way can the position of free will be disturbed by these texts; because if you thoroughly attend to the meaning of the words, you will realize that from this the doctrine of free will is rather strengthened. For these sayings were spoken against the ill disposed Jews. Since, from a deceit born of envy, they were asserting Joseph, his own father, and his sons, his brothers, to be the Savior's relatives, so that he might not be believed to be the Son of God, then the Savior said, "No one comes to me unless the Father who sent me draws him. But how did the Father draw to the Son, except through the works which he did through him? For therefore he says, "The Father abiding in me, he does the works" (Jn. 14:10), so that these works might draw to faith in Christ.

For the miracles that the Savior did themselves persuaded that God was the Father of Christ, so that whoever said he had another father would not be drawn by God to Christ. Therefore God worked through Christ so that credence might be given to his words, in which he said that he was the Son of God. This is a drawing, not of violence, but the testimony of God in Christ; and whoever believed this is said to be drawn by him to Christ. For no one believes in the Savior unless he calls his Father God. Now the Apostle did not say what you have brought into question in order to strike down free will, but to prevent God's judgment from being called into review; therefore he spoke, proclaiming God to be just: for he knows on whom he ought to have mercy. For the examiner of the heart foresees the mind of the suppliant, whether he deserves to receive. Therefore he says through the prophet, "This people honors me with their lips, but their heart is far from me" (Isa. 29:13). For it is just that the spirit of the pretender should be hardened. For whoever, not through error, calls

what is true false, but through hatred, so that, knowing what is good, he pretends not to know what is good, in order to turn it into evil, this man must surely have granted to him that he truly should not understand the good, lest he be saved, which he does not want.

For it is not just that he be saved against his will who rejects salvation, not through ignorance, but through wickedness or envy. By these things, then, free will is more confirmed than destroyed, so that each one is answered according to his own desire.

(John 6:44; Romans 9:16-18)

QUESTION 32. IF WE LIVE BY OUR OWN FREE CHOICE, WHY DOES THE SAVIOR SAY, "NO ONE," HE DECLARES, "COMES TO ME UNLESS THE FATHER WHO SENT ME DRAWS HIM"; AND WHY DOES THE APOSTLE, IN AGREEMENT WITH THIS, SAY, "IT IS NOT OF HIM WHO WILLS, NOR OF HIM WHO RUNS, BUT OF GOD WHO SHOWS MERCY"? BY THESE STATEMENTS THE FREEDOM OF THE WILL SEEMS TO BE DISTURBED. FOR IF NO ONE GOES UNLESS DRAWN, THEN IT WILL NOT BE THE FAULT OF THE ONE WHO DOES NOT GO, SINCE HE IS NOT DRAWN. AND IF THE ONE WHO ASKS AND STRIVES DOES NOT RECEIVE, BUT GOD GIVES TO WHOM HE WILLS, THEN THE PERSON WHO WILLS AND DOES NOT OBTAIN WILL BE WITHOUT BLAME AND GUILT; AND THE GUILT WILL FALL BACK ON THE ONE WHO SPURNS THE PETITIONER. — In no way can the position of free will be disturbed by these statements. For if you refer the words to the case for which they were spoken, you will know that from this the doctrine of free will is rather strengthened. For when the Jews, out of the zeal of their hatred, were saying about the Savior, "Is not this the son of Joseph, whose father we know? How then does this man say, 'I have come down from heaven'? (Jn. 6:42) to this Jesus replied, "No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draws him. (Jn. 6:44) Now we must see how the Father draws.

Let the word of the Savior himself be taken; for he says, "The works that I do, the Father does. (Jn. 14:12) "Believe that I am in the Father and the Father in me. (Jn. 14:11) If, then, the Father works in the Son, and the works are what invite to faith, he rightly said that no one comes to me except him whom the Father draws. But he draws when he works through the Son. For if he wants to be believed, how does he take away the will of free choice? And if he criticizes the unbeliever, on what grounds does he draw someone who is unwilling? He spoke this, of course, to the Jews, who were saying that he had another father than the one who truly is. For no one believes in the Savior unless he calls his Father God. The Apostle likewise did not say what has now been set forth in order to strike down free will, but to show that God's judgment is just, who cannot be deceived in granting or not granting mercy. For there is one who asks and does not deserve to receive; another asks and does deserve to receive. For this one pleads not with words alone, but with deeds; that one with tongue alone; this one also with a repentant heart; such a one can obtain. Indeed, what is said in the Law? "This people honors me with their lips, but their heart is far from me.

(Is. 29:13) If, then, two ask and only one of them receives, it must be understood that he asked in such a way as to be worthy to receive; for God, who is just, gives only to the one whom he knows should be given to. You see, then, that free will is not denied but confirmed. For if you had heard two men ask with one mind and one behavior, and yet one of them was heard and the other despised, you might rightly think that there is no free will and that God is a respecter of persons.

(John 7:8-14) 1ST CATEGORY NT QUESTION 78. IT IS READ IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN THAT, AFTER THE SAVIOR HAD SAID HE WOULD NOT GO UP TO THE FEAST DAY, HE WENT UP (John 7:8, 14); THIS SEEMS TO BE A SIGN OF INCONSISTENCY. — You always conceal the meaning by abbreviating the statement. For what you call into question took place when, being in Galilee because of the uproar of the Jews, and with His brothers still not believing in Him, He was being urged to go up to Judea, because the feast day of the Jews was at hand, that He might suffer agitation. But He answered them, saying: You go up to this feast day, because the world does not hate you; but it hates Me, because I expose its works. I am not going up to this feast day, because My time is not yet fulfilled. Then His brothers went up to the feast day, but He remained in Galilee. Afterwards, He also went up to the feast day. What appears contrary, when He did not go up at the time He refused, but went up later; and He went up not as if to the feast day, but as if to a dispute? For they all went up rejoicing, as though to enjoy the pleasures of the feast day. It is therefore certain that He did not go up to the feast day. But for the Savior, that was the feast day on which by His Passion He redeemed the world. Finally, He says: Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in Him (Jn. 13:31). This is His feast day, on which He conquered death.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (John 7:39; 14:15-17; 20:22; Acts 2:1)

QUESTION 93. WE MUST ASK WHETHER THE APOSTLES HAD THE HOLY SPIRIT DURING THE TIME WHEN THEY WERE ON EARTH WITH THE LORD, BECAUSE AMONG MANY THINGS THE EVANGELIST SAYS, “THE SPIRIT HAD NOT YET BEEN GIVEN, BECAUSE JESUS HAD NOT YET BEEN GLORIFIED” (John 7:39); AND IN ANOTHER PLACE, “IF YOU LOVE ME, KEEP MY COMMANDMENTS, AND I WILL ASK THE FATHER, AND HE WILL GIVE YOU ANOTHER PARACLETE, THAT HE MAY REMAIN WITH YOU FOREVER, THE SPIRIT OF TRUTH, WHOM THE WORLD CANNOT RECEIVE, BECAUSE IT NEITHER SEES HIM NOR KNOWS HIM; BUT YOU KNOW HIM, BECAUSE HE DWELLS WITH YOU AND IS IN YOU” (John 14:15-17). WHAT DOES THIS MEAN? HE DENIES THAT THE SPIRIT WAS GIVEN BEFORE THE PASSION; YET HE PROMISES THAT HE WILL ASK THE FATHER TO SEND HIM. AGAIN HE ADDS THAT THE SPIRIT WAS WITH THEM AND REMAINED AMONG THEM. AFTER THE RESURRECTION, HOWEVER, IT IS WRITTEN THAT HE BREATHED ON THEM AND SAID, “RECEIVE THE HOLY SPIRIT” (John 20:22). AND AT PENTECOST IT IS WRITTEN THAT THE HOLY SPIRIT DESCENDED UPON THE APOSTLES (Acts 2:1-4). I SEE SO MANY DIFFICULTIES IN THIS MATTER THAT I DO NOT KNOW

WHAT OUGHT TO BE HELD. — In all these things that have been set forth, there is not one single cause. For the forms of the individual causes have been briefly indicated; for although there is one Spirit, he has many gifts. Therefore, when the Holy Spirit is mentioned, his office must be understood, in which way he is meant.

For that he was both with them and was yet to come is not false, provided you do not refer this to the person, but to the nature. For Christ promised that another would come from the Father, so that since their divinity is indistinguishable, the Holy Spirit should not be thought absent when Christ is present, and when the Holy Spirit comes and appears, Christ should be considered present as well. Therefore, when he promises that he will come, he says, "You will see him, because he will dwell with you and will be in you," (Jn. 14:17) so that the Apostles might be confident that after the Lord's Ascension they would not have a lesser or inferior shepherd or king for their protection. For there is no doubt that the Spirit was not given to believers except, as the Evangelist testifies, after the Lord, having conquered death, rose again and was glorified. For these are the words of the triumphant Lord himself, who says, "For John indeed baptized with water, but you will be baptized with the Holy Spirit, whom you will receive not many days from now" (Acts 1:5); this he is seen to have said at the time when he determined to ascend to the Father. As for that which is read, that the Lord breathed upon the disciples a few days after his Resurrection and said, "Receive the Holy Spirit," (Jn. 20:22) this is understood to be the transfer of ecclesiastical power.

For since all things in the Lord's tradition are carried out through the Holy Spirit, therefore, when the rule and pattern of this discipline are handed down to them, it is said to them, "Receive the Holy Spirit. And because this truly belongs to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, he immediately added, saying, "Whose sins you retain, they shall be retained; and whose you forgive, they shall be forgiven" (John 20:23). This breathing, therefore, is a certain grace poured in through ordination, by which they might be held in greater esteem. Therefore the Apostle says to Timothy, "Do not neglect the grace that is in you, which was given you through the laying on of the hands of the presbytery" (1 Tim. 4:14). It had to be done once, so that thereafter this tradition might not be believed to exist without the gift of the Holy Spirit. For just as in the Savior a visible pattern was given, so that after Baptism the Holy Spirit might from this time be believed to be given invisibly to believers without doubt, so also in the case mentioned above a pattern was given in the beginning, so that from then on the Holy Spirit might be believed to be poured into ecclesiastical tradition. But in order that the Apostles might work miracles while the Lord was present, power was given, as it had been previously to the Prophets. Therefore the forms of three offices of the gift of the Holy Spirit were shown in the Apostles.

The first is this, which relates to ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the work of regeneration and other offices. The second is that which was given at Pentecost, which is general; for the Holy Spirit fell not only upon the Apostles, but also upon all believers. The third form is that which was granted only to the Apostles for the working of signs and wonders, until the

seeds of faith could be sown for growth. For the miracles performed by the Apostles are the seeds of faith; for they themselves were appointed overseers of this truth, who, by signs and wonders, might bear witness that our faith is not irrational. For there is no greater proof of truth than power; this is what condemns all earthly philosophy, because it has always labored only in words, not having the testimony of power, which might show that what was established by words was stable. Therefore the Holy Spirit is given once, in a general way, to all believers, by whom they are proved to be sons of God, while he remains in them. But in the working of signs and wonders, he does not remain in man, but comes when called, or suggests what is necessary, and departs. Likewise, in tradition or ordination from without he bestows grace, also bringing protection to those devoted to the faith.

(John 7:39; 14:15-17; 20:22; Acts 2:1)

QUESTION 42. WE MUST ASK WHETHER THE APOSTLES HAD THE HOLY SPIRIT DURING THE TIME WHEN THEY WERE ON EARTH WITH THE LORD, BECAUSE AMONG MANY THINGS THE EVANGELIST SAYS, "THE SPIRIT HAD NOT YET BEEN GIVEN, BECAUSE JESUS HAD NOT YET BEEN GLORIFIED" (John 7:39); AND IN ANOTHER PLACE, "IF YOU LOVE ME, KEEP MY COMMANDMENTS, AND I WILL ASK THE FATHER, AND HE WILL GIVE YOU ANOTHER PARACLETE, THAT HE MAY REMAIN WITH YOU FOREVER, THE SPIRIT OF TRUTH, WHOM THE WORLD CANNOT RECEIVE, BECAUSE IT NEITHER SEES HIM NOR KNOWS HIM; BUT YOU KNOW HIM, BECAUSE HE DWELLS WITH YOU AND IS IN YOU" (John 14:15-17). WHAT DOES THIS MEAN? HE DENIES THAT THE SPIRIT WAS GIVEN BEFORE THE PASSION; YET HE PROMISES THAT HE WILL ASK THE FATHER TO SEND HIM. AGAIN HE ADDS THAT THE SPIRIT WAS WITH THEM AND REMAINED AMONG THEM. AFTER THE RESURRECTION, HOWEVER, IT IS WRITTEN THAT HE BREATHED ON THEM AND SAID, "RECEIVE THE HOLY SPIRIT" (John 20:22). AND AT PENTECOST IT IS WRITTEN THAT THE HOLY SPIRIT DESCENDED UPON THE APOSTLES (Acts 2:1-4). I SEE SO MANY DIFFICULTIES IN THIS MATTER THAT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT OUGHT TO BE HELD. — In the matters he has set forth, there is not just one cause. Briefly, etc. For there is no doubt that the Spirit was not given to believers until after the Lord, having conquered death, was glorified.

For before the Ascension the Lord gave the disciples a pattern of how those who had been baptized ought to receive the Holy Spirit, a pattern which is now preserved by the bishops. Therefore, three forms of the office of the gift of the Holy Spirit were given to the Apostles. The first is the general one, which was given at Pentecost; for the Holy Spirit fell not only upon the Apostles, but also upon all believers, so that men of one nation spoke the mighty works of God in different tongues. The second form is specific. For it does not belong to all believers, but only to bishops, that by the laying on of hands they may give the Holy Spirit to the baptized; this, among bishops, may be called general. The third form is that which was granted to the Apostles alone, in the working of signs and miracles for the increase of faith. For the powers wrought by the Apostles are the seeds of faith. Therefore, in due order

of offices, the Holy Spirit was given to the Apostles: first, that He might fall upon them, as upon the other believers, at Pentecost. Then, as the first priests, that, like bishops, they might lay hands on believers and give them the Holy Spirit. For that wonders should be done through the Apostles is a grace of time, not of persons;

but they are blessed because the time found them when the Lord poured out His gift upon the earth, that they might receive power, as an example for believers, to work powers through the Holy Spirit. But when, while the Lord was present, they were sent to cast out demons and perform the other powers, power was given to the Apostles to command demons, or other ailments of the sick, without the call of the name, and the effect of salvation followed. This, namely, is the power of reason which the prophets used, Elijah and Elisha, in the working of powers. Finally, the Savior says to His disciples, "Amen, amen, I say to you; if you ask anything of the Father in my name, He will give it to you. Until now you have asked nothing in my name; ask, and you shall receive" (John 16:23–24). Therefore, since they worked powers without the invocation of the name, as I said above, yet not entirely without the power of the name. For by the fact that they were sent by Him who was a terror to demons and to sufferings, by that very fear the demons fled, and illnesses were cured. Therefore the name of the Lord was working silently. Finally, the Apostle Peter says to the Jews among other things: "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom you denied and crucified, this man stands before you whole" (Acts 3:16); indeed, no other name has been given under heaven in which we must be saved.

(John 8:44) 1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 98. ON THE GOSPEL OF SAINT JOHN. — You have heard what the most holy Gospel declares, when the Lord says to the Jews: "You are born of your father the Devil, and you wish to do the desires of your father. He was a murderer from the beginning, and did not stand in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaks lies, he speaks from what is his own, because he is a liar, as is his father" (Jn. 8:44). Let none of the faithful doubt that the Devil has no author of his apostasy. For he himself is the prince of all error: seeing that he was made by God of no mediocre power, he dared to imagine divinity, so that, because he saw the others beneath him, he set himself above them as a god. In fact, the names by which he is called, "Devil" and "Satan," are formed from his deeds, not from his nature. For all evil is proved by work, so that guilt lies not in substance, but in the will conceived from causes. For when he saw himself more powerful than the rest, he swelled with pride to exercise dominion. How then is he said to have a father, when he himself is held to be the author of his wickedness? Or how is it proved that he was a murderer from the beginning?

But Scripture calls the one who is his imitator by his name, so that, because he received his name from his deed, anyone who has done an evil deed is not unjustly called "devil. Therefore the Savior in this passage called Cain "devil," because, as a rival of his works, when he envied his brother he committed murder, leaving an example of the cruelty of murder. So too the Devil, when he envied man who was made in the image of God, he

increased the wickedness of his work, presenting a pattern of error. Therefore Cain also proved to be a liar, when God said to him, "Where is Abel your brother? Imbued with his father's hatred, bursting out into falsehood, he said, "I do not know" (Gen. 4:9); so that, having torn away his brother's life, he pretended not to know where he was; therefore blinded by fury, that he answered God as though He were a man whom he thought he could deceive. The Jews, therefore, having become imitators of this sort of behavior, killed even the Lord Himself, choosing to have Cain the murderer rather than God as their father, so that they might become guilty of all the blood that was shed. By killing the Author of life, they proved themselves princes of all wickedness, to such an extent that they bound even their own children to this evil, saying, "His blood be upon us and upon our children" (Matt. 27:25).

For, in order to persuade Pilate that what they asked for was not evil, they said that, if it was unjust, it should be turned upon their children: because, in order to satisfy their fury, they did not even wish to spare their own children. Now, because the Devil is not evil by nature, this is more easily stated, since punishment would not be promised to him if he had not done what he did not know. For it is unjust to punish someone who does nothing other than what belongs to his nature. And this is more truly evil, if you demand from someone what you know he cannot do. Therefore, he is justly to be punished, who, though it is clear that he knows and is able to do good, does evil. This can also be observed from the words of the Savior: for He says, as mentioned above, "Your father was a murderer from the beginning, and did not stand in the truth. (Jn. 8:44) Therefore, if he is a liar by nature, how is he said not to have stood in the truth? For he does not stand in the truth who does not remain in the truth. It is therefore clear that the Devil was in the truth, but did not persevere in it. Indeed we read in the prophet the Lord speaking therefore: "If they had stood," He says, "in my substance" (Jer. 23:22), that is, in my law.

And the Apostle to the Galatians says, "Stand firm, and do not again be held under the yoke of slavery" (Gal. 5:1). What could be clearer? For here He commands that from now they remain in His commandments. If the Devil had kept them, he would have stood in the substance and in the law of God. For the law is a foundation for those who keep it. How then does it seem to some that the Devil was either made evil by God, or has his own origin, that is, arose from nothing, since both views appear contrary to God? For whoever says that he was made for this purpose, that he might be evil, thinks that God is imperfectly good; since one who is perfectly good does not create evil. But whoever does not believe that God is the author of his origin denies His dominion. For by this, since all things are God's, he thinks that there is something which in no way belongs to God. Such people ought to suffer punishment, when they see everything judged by God through Christ.

(John 8:44) 1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 90. IF THE DEVIL HIMSELF IS SATAN, HOW IS IT THAT AMONG OTHER THINGS THE SAVIOR SAYS TO THE JEWS: "YOU ARE OF YOUR FATHER THE DEVIL, AND YOU WISH TO DO THE DESIRES OF YOUR FATHER. HE WAS A MURDERER

FROM THE BEGINNING, AND DID NOT STAND IN THE TRUTH, BECAUSE THERE IS NO TRUTH IN HIM. WHEN HE SPEAKS A LIE, HE SPEAKS FROM WHAT IS HIS OWN; FOR HE IS A LIAR, AS IS HIS FATHER" (John 8:44)? — "Devil" is not a proper name, but a common one shared with others. For in whomever the works of the Devil are found, without doubt that person must be called a devil. It is the name of a work, not of a nature. And so in this passage he means Cain as the father of the Jews; since the Jews, wanting to be his imitators, put the Savior to death. Therefore he says that Cain, because he stained himself with murder and made himself guilty of death, did not stand in the truth. For from him the pattern of brotherly murder was first given. It is this same man of whom he says, "When he speaks a lie, he speaks from what is his own," (Jn. 8:44) to show that each one sins only by his own will. But because he is an imitator of the Devil, he added, "For he is a liar, as is his father.

For when this Devil, in order to condemn the first man to death, did so, he pretended not to know what had been commanded him by God. So too Cain, when questioned, faked ignorance of where his brother Abel was, whom he had killed (Gen. 4:9). Therefore in this passage he called Cain the devil; and his father, the devil whose works he followed. For the son of a devil is a devil. But that Devil who is Satan has no father in his wickedness. He is his own author in evil. He himself sinned first, and therefore whoever imitates him will be called his children, and he their father. Indeed, in faith we have Abraham as our father, because he first believed God; and for this reason we are designated by his name. For we are called faithful, as he is.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (John 8:44)

QUESTION 80. CERTAINLY, EACH PERSON IS EITHER A SON OF GOD OR OF THE DEVIL: HE IS THEREFORE ALWAYS A SON, BUT SOMETIMES OF GOD, AND AT OTHER TIMES OF THE DEVIL. WHAT THEN WE ARE BORN AS MUST BE INQUIRED. — When the Lord, after bringing the sons of Israel out of Egypt, saw that they often sinned, He grew angry and pronounced a sentence, saying that none of them would enter the promised land except Caleb and Joshua son of Nun, who was previously called Auses. But as for those who had been born in the desert, He declared that they would enter, because they did not know good or evil. Now not to know good or evil is a certain natural simplicity, which has not yet been trained for evil. This is ignorance without hatred. For we are born without understanding, but our nature has this good, that it is capable of learning the truth. A son of the Devil, however, is one who, being born and steeped in evil things, devotes himself to those things that are hostile to the Creator, affirming that there are many gods and that sacrifices must be offered to them as if they were rulers of the world. If such a one comes to his senses and thinks in accordance with his nature, turning himself to the Creator, he will be a son of God. And therefore those who are born are neither sons of God nor sons of the Devil. For what does the Savior say to the Jews?

"You are of your father the Devil, and you wish to do the desires of your father" (Jn. 8:44). You see then that by their works and their profession people are made sons of the Devil;

but those are sons of God who, confessing that the Father of Christ is their own God, live rightly. For God has so ordered our race that we are born without understanding, yet have the capacity to learn either good or evil, so that we ourselves may acquire either evil or good: that we may rejoice in ourselves when, acting rightly, we are rewarded; or that we may blame ourselves if, following wicked ways, we are condemned.

(John 8:44)

QUESTION 41. CERTAINLY, WHOEVER IS NOT A SON OF GOD IS OF THE DEVIL: THEREFORE HE IS ALWAYS A SON, BUT SOMETIMES OF GOD, SOMETIMES OF THE DEVIL. WHAT THEN ARE WE BORN AS? — When the Lord, after bringing the sons of Israel out of Egypt, saw that they often sinned, being angered, He did not allow any of them to enter the promised land, except Caleb and Joshua son of Nun. But He said that their sons, who had been born in the desert, would enter, because they did not know good or evil. Now not to know good or evil is a certain natural simplicity, which has been trained neither to good nor to evil; that is, ignorance without hatred. For we are born without understanding, but our nature is capable of learning the truth. A son of the Devil, however, is one who, born and instilled with evil things, applies himself to what is opposed to the Creator, saying that there are many gods and that sacrifices must be offered to them as if they were rulers of the world. If such a one comes to his senses, returning to his natural righteousness and receiving faith in Christ, he will be a son of God; and therefore those who are born are neither sons of God nor of the Devil. For what does the Savior say to the Jews? "You were born of your father the Devil, and you wish to do the desires of your father.

(Jn. 8:44) You see then that by their works and profession sons of the Devil are brought forth. For God has so ordered our race that, though born without understanding, we can nonetheless be trained in either direction, so that whether to good or to evil we are in some way our own authors: that we may rejoice in ourselves when, acting rightly, we are rewarded; or blame ourselves if, following evil ways, we are subjected to punishments. For this reason He left us to our own judgment, so that we may neither complain about our evils, nor, in vain, as if sons of God by faith, boast of ourselves if we are crowned. God, the creator and author of our being, wished us to have something that is properly our own, so that we might not be ashamed to glory in the faith which we have in God. For whatever a person does not have by his own power is unfamiliar to him, so that he can neither glory in good things nor be held guilty for evil ones.

(John 9:6) 2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 33. What does it mean that, although the Savior healed almost everyone by a word, he nonetheless restored the blind man's eyes with mud made from his spittle (John 9:6–7)? — The Savior did this to confuse those who accuse the Creator. For when he corrected a defect that had occurred in the body in no other way than the Maker had formed it, he praised the author of this work. He revised it by that very thing through which it had been created. For whatever is made, if a fall is repaired by means of that through which it was made, the workmanship will be shown to be right.

And if the Savior thereby bears witness that he is God, because he repaired the damage and defects of the body, how much more is he God who is the very inventor of that body?

(John 10:9) 2ND CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 34. WHAT IS IT THAT THE SAVIOR SAYS, "I AM THE DOOR; THOSE WHO CAME BEFORE ME ARE THIEVES AND ROBBERS" (John 10:7–8)? THIS STATEMENT SEEMS TO STRIKE AT THE PROPHETS. — Because no one goes to God the Father except through faith in Christ, therefore the Savior calls himself the door of the kingdom of heaven. If, then, he uses the word "door," what need was there for him to speak about those who came before, "As many as came before me," (Jn. 15:30) when no question was being raised about people of the past, but rather, as a door now present, the concern would naturally be about those of the present? The Savior is speaking about the Jews, who thought they could enter the kingdom of God not through faith, but through the righteousness of the Law. Those who came before the Savior, that is, who stood before him, mocked him and opposed him, so as to turn others away from faith in him. Therefore they are called thieves and robbers. For these words were spoken at the time when the Pharisees were disputing with the man who had been born blind and enlightened, whose eyes the Savior restored when nature had refused them, whom they wished to turn away from faith in the Savior, saying that it was not through him that one could enter, because he violates the sabbath, but through the righteousness of the Law that one enters the kingdom of God. Then the Savior said: "I am the door;

if anyone enters through me, he will find pasture; but if anyone seeks to enter by another way, that person is a thief and a robber. (Jn. 10:9-10) How does this apply to the person of the Prophets? Did the Prophets say, against the teaching of Christ, that through the righteousness of the Law, without faith, one could win God's favor, those Prophets who knew that Christ would come in the flesh? He said this, then, about those present, so that whoever were before him, standing or sitting, might be understood as thieves and robbers. For by calling the man who had been blind, they wanted to turn him away from faith in the Savior, saying: "Give glory to God; we know that this man is a sinner. But he refuted them, saying: "From the beginning of the world it has never been heard that anyone opened the eyes of a man born blind; if this man were not from God, he could do nothing" (John 9:24, 32–33). It is therefore about this man, because he persevered in faith, and about those who said, "These are not the words of one who has a demon; can a demon open the eyes of the blind? that the Savior said, "But the sheep did not listen to them" (John 10:8–9, 21), meaning those whom he called thieves and robbers. For how could the sheep not have listened to the Prophets, when Scripture clearly shows that all good people obeyed the Prophets, and evil people the false prophets?

(John 11:35) 2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 35. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT, WHEN HE WAS GOING TO PERFORM A MARVELOUS AND UNKNOWN ACT OF POWER, NAMELY, TO RAISE LAZARUS FROM THE DEAD, HE WEPT, OR ASKED WHERE HE HAD BEEN LAID AS THOUGH HE DID NOT KNOW (John 11:34–35)? — The Savior is

both God and man, and therefore he always acted in two ways: since he has human feelings, he wept; but since he was also God, he raised the one over whom he had wept. Therefore he always proceeds from lesser things to greater: since he was seen as a man, he showed that what he appeared to be was not all he was; rather, he proved himself to be God by his works. (John 12:41; Acts 7:55; Isaiah 6:1) 1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 88. IF GRACE IS GREATER AND UNDERSTANDING CLEARER IN THE NEW TESTAMENT THAN IN THE OLD; WHY DID THE PROPHET ISAIAH SEE THE LORD OF HOSTS, WHO IS CHRIST, SEATED ON THE THRONE OF MAJESTY, ACCORDING TO THE INTERPRETATION OF JOHN THE EVANGELIST? FOR HE SAID AMONG OTHER THINGS: "ISAIAH SAID THESE THINGS WHEN HE SAW HIS MAJESTY AND SPOKE OF HIM" (Isaiah 6:1; John 12:41). BUT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT STEPHEN THE FIRST MARTYR SAYS THAT HE SAW JESUS STANDING AT THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD (Acts 7:55). WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT HERE HE APPEARS AS SUBJECT AFTER HIS VICTORIES, AND THERE AS LORD BEFORE HE HAD CONQUERED? — As the occasion required, so the Lord showed himself. To the prophet he appeared as a king rebuking the people: and he showed himself as what he was, that is, seated. For the reason lay in the peace of his divinity. But the slander of the Jews caused him to appear to Stephen as standing. In Stephen the cause of the Savior was suffering violence. Therefore, with God the judge seated, he appeared standing, as one who was pleading a case: and because his cause is good, he was at the right hand of the judge. Everyone who pleads a case must stand.

(John 14:9) 1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 97. BY WHAT REASONING CAN THE WICKEDNESS OF ARIUS BE SIMPLY REFUTED FROM THE LAW? — If we grant authority to reason, the very meaning of the names "Father" and "Son" shows their unity. You ask, how? For the true Son of God would not be so called unless He had come forth from the substance of God the Father. Truth and justice in God would not permit Him to call someone "Son" truly if that Son were not from Himself. He is not truly the Son of God if He is not from Him. But Scripture says He is true; therefore He is from Him. Whoever denies that Christ was born of God does an injustice to Scripture, which calls Him the true Son of God precisely in order to signify that He was born of God. For if He is not from God, and yet is called the true Son of God, then Scripture is deceitful. But if Scripture does not deceive, then whoever does not confess that Christ came forth from God both nullifies Scripture and denies Christ to be the true Son of God. It is not will that makes a true Son, but birth. "But," they say, "this falls under the power of God, that He can make what is false into true. On the contrary, this is the power of God, for which He is worthy of all praise: that what is true with Him is true, and what is false is false.

That is the mark of a liar, to call the false true; this does not apply to God. For God can indeed do all things, but He does nothing except what accords with His truth and justice. It is, then, clear that Christ is called the true Son of God so that He may be understood

as His own Son, that is, born of His substance. Therefore the Apostle says: "He who did not spare His own Son" (Rom. 8:32); and in another Epistle: "Who, though He was in the form of God, did not count it robbery to be equal with God" (Phil. 2:6). If then He did not consider it robbery to declare Himself equal with God, He thereby showed Himself to be the true Son of God. For He could not be equal with God unless He were from Him. Those are equal who are either both true or both false. Beginning and eternal being, or unity, do not admit equality. By saying that He is one with the Father, Christ makes Himself equal to God. "For not only," it says, "was He breaking the sabbath, but He also called God His Father, making Himself equal with God" (Jn. 5:18), that is, His peer. Is it not clear that this equality comes down from the property of His birth? In calling Himself God's own Son, that is, His true Son, He made Himself equal with God. Therefore He says: "He who sees Me, sees also My Father" (Jn. 14:9).

Because they are of one substance, he who sees one sees both. "For as the Father has life in Himself, so He has granted to the Son to have life in Himself" (Jn. 5:26); that is, the Father begot the Son equal to Himself; and "all that is the Father's is the Son's, and what is the Son's is the Father's" (Jn. 17:10); and "no one can snatch anything out of the Father's hand, nor out of the Son's hand" (cf. John 10:29). And He adds: "I and the Father are one" (Jn. 10:30); and, "The words that I speak to you, I do not speak from Myself; but the Father who dwells in Me, He Himself speaks; and the works that I do, He does. Believe Me that I am in the Father and the Father in Me; or else believe for the very works' sake" (Jn. 14:10–12). Since generation is not from oneself but from the One who begets, therefore whatever He does, He calls it the Father's work, so that by all these things it may be confirmed that Christ is called the true Son of God so that He may be believed to be born of Him, lest His substance be thought to lie outside the nature of the one God. His great humility is therefore His greatest praise. For when He appears to place Himself in subjection, saying, "The words that I speak to you, I do not speak from Myself; but the Father who dwells in Me, He Himself speaks;

and the works that I do, He does," (Jn.14:10) He proves that He has His origin from God and shows that He is His Power, since He says that what He is, is not from Himself but from Him. By this Christ is praised, not lowered. For one who speaks from himself is not a true Son. You see, then, that the Arians misunderstand Christ precisely where He ought to be rightly understood; and they reject Him and call Him false precisely where He is proved to be the true Son of God: for He asks to be glorified by the Father, and promises to glorify the Father whom He asks; and where He seems to humble Himself, He exalts Himself. For when the Father gives testimony to His Son, He bears witness to His own praise; and when the Son proclaims the Father, He reveals His own glory. The majesty and nobility of the Father are the nobility of the true Son. Therefore whatever is said to belong to the Father undoubtedly belongs also to the Son; and whatever is said to belong to the Son belongs also to the Father. For the Spirit is called the Spirit of God, and the same Spirit is called the Spirit of Christ. The Church is called the Church of God, and is called the Church of Christ.

God is adored, and Christ is adored. Service is rendered to God, and service is rendered to Christ. The saints are called priests of God, and they are called priests of Christ.

The temple of the holy city is said to be God's, and likewise Christ's. The holy city is said to be enlightened by the light of God, and in the same way by the light of Christ. It is the throne of God, and also of Christ. God is Judge, and Christ is Judge: for the prophet Isaiah saw the Lord of hosts seated on the throne of majesty, that is, Christ (Isa. 6:1), which the Arians do not deny. Of God the Father it is read that He is King of kings and Lord of lords (1 Tim. 6:15), and the same is read of Christ, the true Son of God (Rev. 17:14; 19:16). Therefore everywhere Father and Son are equated in divinity, so that the number of persons does not go beyond the measure of one God. Between Father and Son there is no difference except this alone: that the Father is unbegotten, but the Son begotten; that is, the Father is from no one, but the Son is from the Father, this, indeed, is sublime in the Son. For from this we learn the eternity of His nobility, and that He is the true Son of the true Father. From where comes that which is read in Genesis, where God says, "Let us make man in Our image and likeness" (Gen. 1:26)? Therefore, if their image and likeness are one, how are they not also one in nature? In spiritual realities, where there are, of course, no outward forms, nothing will be similar except by substance;

so where the image of two is one, how will their substance not be one as well? Therefore, we read that their image and likeness are one and the same, so that we might believe that the one is in no way different from the other; that is, that Christ is truly the Son of God, because His birth is not unlike that of the One who begets Him. Finally, the Jews, understanding that He called God His own Father, said to Pilate, "We have a Law, and according to the Law He must die, because He made Himself the Son of God" (Jn. 19:7). The Jews understood, and Christians claim they do not understand? Those who did not believe, understood; and those who claim to believe, act so that they may not understand? At least let them admit this: the prophet Isaiah, in order to show that Christ is God, not from Himself indeed, but God from God, says among other things: "After you they shall come, bound in chains, and they shall worship you, and shall pray in you, for in you is God, and there is no God besides you. For you are God, and we did not know it; the God of Israel, the Savior" (Isa. 45:14–15). As far as an upright mind is concerned, these things are clear. By them the Father is shown to be in the Son, and the Son is shown to be God of the same substance as the Father.

In Him in whom God is, and besides Him God is not, and He Himself is God, what else can He be said to be, but what God the Father is, and in no respect different? This is what it is for the two to be one. For God is in Him, because although He is God, He is not God from Himself. He is from the Father, because He is the Son. And besides Him there is no God, because He is the only-begotten Son of the Father. But He Himself is God, because the substance of God and of Christ is one and the same. Therefore no uncertainty is left, so that the substance of the Father and of the Son may be believed to be one. For He is the true Son of a true Father. So also is that saying of the prophet Jeremiah; for he says among other things: "This is our God, and another shall not be reckoned with Him. He found out every

way of knowledge, and gave it to Jacob His servant, and to Israel His beloved. Afterward He was seen upon the earth and lived among men" (Baruch 3:36–38). Can this be said of one who is of inferior stock, with whom no other can be reckoned? Or can anything be said to be God other than the Father, such that it would advance to God as an insult to the Father?

For if no other god can be reckoned with Him, and He is apart from God the Father, see whether what follows ought to be said, for it is dangerous. He would be said to be greater than the Father. Thinking that they are showing reverence to God the Father if they separate the Son from Him, they reduce from Him; so that Him whom they wish to make lesser, with wicked and blinded mind, they set above the One to whose authority they think He ought to bow. But Scripture, in order to teach that the Son differs in nothing from the Father (He would differ if He were not true), says that no other is to be reckoned with Him; because no other substance can be found similar to the substance of God, which is also that of Christ. For it could not teach in any other way that Christ is from God, than by saying that no other can be reckoned with Him. Knowing that the Son of God could in no way be called subject to God the Father, so as to show Him to be equal, it says, "No other shall be reckoned with Him"; because He is equal to God the Father, since He is God: for He is His true Son. Therefore the prophet says, "This is our God"; that is, the God of Israel. If this is He, He Himself is the one God. Of Him Scripture says, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord your God is one God" (Deut. 6:4);

and surely this is not the Father, but His Son. You see then that the person of the Son does not prejudice the one God, if He also is called one God: since Scripture bears witness to this. Where does this come from, unless because the Father and the Son are one, since unity is signified not by persons but by nature? Or they are not two in substance, but one; nor two in divinity, but one God: so that whether the Father speaks or the Son speaks, it is said that one God has spoken. For if the Lord Himself, among other things, concerning male and female, says, "They are no longer two, but one flesh" (Mark 10:8); how much more are the Father and the Son not two gods, but one substance? Now that Father and Son are said to be two, the cause is birth; but that they are not again two gods, the cause is the unity of divinity. With what dullness then do they preach that Christ is created, that is, made, when it is read that God made nothing without Christ (Jn. 1:3)? If therefore nothing was made without Him, He Himself will not be a thing made. For if He is a thing made, something was made without Him. But far be it; for nothing was without Him. Being born of God, He did not begin to exist, but has always existed. For birth is nothing else than proceeding forth; and proceeding forth is revealing. Therefore He was not made, but brought forth.

And in order that Christ might be shown to have gone forth or proceeded from the essence of God, His birth was called a proceeding forth; so that, because His birth is not unlike the Begetter, Christ's consubstantiality with God might be beyond doubt, and that mind which says, "There was a time when He was not," might be condemned. For He who is read to have proceeded from God, in order that He might be shown to have always been with God, cannot at some time not have been. No one proceeds from God in a place where he was not.

The Arians are accustomed to interpret therefore about the Son of God, saying, "Therefore Christ is called the true Son of God, because God made Him in such a way that He is true. As though there were something false that God makes. And all those things which we said above about the unity of the Father and the Son, what will they be, when they have been so strengthened and confirmed, if it is thought that one must feel differently here? Will many things solidified by divine visions be able to be torn apart by the single testimony of one degenerate? Nevertheless this must be cut off, lest iniquity flatter itself even about this very point. "So," they say, "He made Him in such a way that He is true, so that will was put in place of birth, and making in place of begetting.

For so much must be granted," they say, "to the power of God, that He can make things which are not, as though they were. Since they rely on this cunning trickery against the Son of God, we must answer them from those very points on which they believe, because they are already convicted in other matters, so that they may appear convicted in the whole sum. For this proposition, as far as its meaning is concerned, has no weight; but as far as the words are concerned, it creates obscurity so that the issue does not quickly appear. For it is as if an Egyptian were placed in the dark, because a bad cause cannot be defended with a good meaning. Therefore, to defend their wickedness, they use sacrilegious words. If, then, this is the power of God, that He could make it true that Christ is His Son, though He was not born from His own being; then He made Him such as He Himself is, so that what generation was going to bestow, the making has accomplished. If, therefore, you say there is no difference between God and Christ, it might perhaps be doubted whether this is not asserted by you unkindly, so that what is said in word might also be in meaning: that because He is called true Son, He may be understood as true, through the fact that He is of one substance with the Father, though not by generation but by making;

since, as you say, God can do everything, so that what is made may be as though it were not made. But if, following the rule of reason, you say that what has a beginning cannot be equal and consubstantial with that which is eternal, you lay bare the deceit of your hatred: for, in order to evade the meaning of the word, you falsely say that Christ is truly the Son of God, while denying Him equality with God the Father. For He is not true if He is unequal. Can He be called a true Son, if the Father is not also called true? For if the Son is true, the Father will also be true; and equality proves this truth. But if they are unequal, neither of them is true. Yet since the witness of the Scriptures, by which Christ is approved as the true Son of God, cannot be made void, He must be believed to be born of God the Father: because, in order that this truth might be established, He is read as both equal to and on a par with God. But you, who proclaim the immeasurable power of God, say that God cannot beget, because His nature is simple; and by this you also do an insult to God the Father Himself. For you call Him a liar, since you deny the Son whom He declares to be His own and true; and you betray your hypocrisy, because you falsely proclaim God to be powerful.

For if you proclaim the power of God in that which you assert to have been made true out of what was false, so as to mock what is true, how much more ought you to accept this, if

you were of sound mind, whereby what is called true is proved true, and the testimony that God the Father gave about His Son is confirmed as true? For the Lord said, "With God," He says, "all things are possible" (Matt. 19:26), so that whatever seems impossible to men may be possible to God. For if the reasoning of the flesh is followed, neither did a Virgin give birth, nor did Jonah live in the belly of the whale (Jonah 2:1), nor will the dead rise, nor did God beget a Son, because a simple nature cannot beget, since in this world nothing is generated without mixture. All these things must either be believed together or refuted together. For if the reasoning of the world must be maintained, it should have authority in all these matters. But if there is some reasoning proper to spiritual things, he must be called carnal who, infected with the reasoning of the world, denies that anything can be done otherwise than he knows. They are also accustomed to propose something else with their usual evasion. They say, "Did the Father beget the Son by will, or not?

so that when they hear, of course, that it was by will, they may at once, as enemies of the Son of God, reply, "Therefore the will is before the Son," so that from this He may appear not eternal, since He did not receive a beginning by birth, but came into existence. And yet if they think this, not only will the will be before the Son, but also before the Father; because the cause of generation is the Father and the Son. Unbelief follows carnal notions in everything. For it introduces the cause of God as if He were a man, as though He had first considered and devised that He should beget, as if subject to weakness; whereas in God neither was there generation without will, nor will without generation. For the will itself is generation. Indeed, it is a common expression, "God made," "man made"; but God makes in one way, man makes in another; and so also in other causes. Therefore must we speak of God as is worthy of Him. They also raise another question about God the Father Himself, saying, "Did it come to Him that He should beget, or is it of His nature always to beget? They bring this forward so that they may also assert that God is a liar, who testifies that He has begotten Christ, and that they may make Christ not true, but adopted. For, they say, if He has begotten, He must always beget;

so that, because He does not always beget, He may not be believed to have begotten Christ: as though it were denied that He made the world, because He does not make others. What disrespect, what lack of discipline it is, to lay down a law for God, so that if He has begotten, He must either have begotten many, or could not have begotten one; not even believing the Lord Himself, who declared Himself the only-begotten Son of God. After these things which have been shown above to be equal in the Father and the Son, let us see whether what is written about the Holy Spirit agrees with them, so that the Trinity which we hold in our saving profession may not admit a difference of nature, just as it has no diversity of faith. For although there is no salvation without any one of these, yet their power appears to be one, which gives salvation to those who believe in it. Since we have brought forward the words of the Father as testimony to the Son, now, as testimony to the Holy Spirit, let us use the words of the Son, by which he declares that the Holy Spirit does not differ from himself: so that, as the Father is witness with the Son, and the Son is witness to the Holy Spirit,

the Trinity may be understood to be of one nature. The Lord therefore says among other things:

I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Paraclete, that he may be with you forever, the Spirit of truth (Jn. 14:16–17). When he says that another Paraclete is to be sent, he clearly shows that he himself is a Paraclete. For this is read also in the Epistle of John; he says: We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, who intercedes for our sins (1 Jn. 2:1). And again the Lord says, I am the truth (Jn. 14:6). Behold the clear unity of the Holy Spirit and the Son of God. For what the Son says about himself, he says likewise about the Holy Spirit. Now we must set forth what Scripture arranges in this sense. It is read in Isaiah that he saw the Lord of hosts seated on a throne of majesty (Isa. 6:1), whom John the Evangelist understood to be Christ, saying among other things, These things said Isaiah when he saw his majesty, and spoke about him (Jn. 12:41). The Apostle says that this one is the Holy Spirit. For he says in the last part of the Acts of the Apostles, Well did the Holy Spirit speak to your fathers, saying, With hearing you shall hear and shall not understand, etc. (Acts 28:25–26). These words were spoken by the Lord of hosts. This is the one God, who, whether he be understood as the Father, or the Son, or the Holy Spirit, is not contrary to himself, because one is their divinity and one their power.

For if, in an decree from the praetorium of one captain, the other captains also are said to command, because of the authority of a single power, how much more, under the rule of one God, if one of the three has spoken, will it not be unsuitable to say that the three have spoken? For their nature and will are one. They are also accustomed to prejudice the Holy Spirit by claiming that he must therefore be considered inferior, because he is placed third in order; though there is such simplicity in the divine Scriptures that you sometimes find the third placed first. As the occasion requires, so they are set down. For it is no injury to any of them, because one is their divinity. Indeed we read in Isaiah, with the Lord saying, I am the first, and I am forever: and my hand founded the earth, and my right hand established heaven. And in what follows: I have spoken, I have called, I have brought him, and I have made his way prosperous. Come near to me, and hear these things: I have not spoken in secret from the beginning: from the time that they came to be, I was there, and now the Lord has sent me and his Spirit (Isa. 48:12–13, 15–16). Whom do you suppose to be the one who founded the earth? For it is he who says that he has been sent. Is it the Father? Far from it.

It is therefore the Son who says that he has been sent by God and by the Holy Spirit. Behold the equality between the Son and the Holy Spirit. For just as the Holy Spirit is read to have been sent by the Father and the Son, so Christ is sent by God and by the Holy Spirit. For this is proper to the Father alone, that he should not be said to be sent. Consider the words of the Apostle, who in another order embraces the Trinity: for he says among other things in the second Epistle to the Thessalonians, May the Lord direct your hearts into the love of God and into the patience of Christ (2 Thess. 3:5). Whom do you think he calls “the Lord,” if not the Holy Spirit? And what is strange in this, since he whom Isaiah saw seated on the

throne of majesty, this same one he calls the Holy Spirit, the Lord of hosts, as we showed above. And the Apostle John signifies that God is understood in the Holy Spirit, saying among other things, In this we have known that God remains in us, by the Holy Spirit whom he has given us (1 Jn. 4:13). If therefore it is through his Spirit that he himself remains in us, it is not in doubt that the Holy Spirit is of God. And there is no question that whatever is of God is God.

From this the Apostle says, No one knows the things that are in God except the Spirit of God (1 Cor. 2:11). How can he know the things that are in God unless he is of the same divinity? For a lower nature cannot know what is in a higher; how much less could a creature know what was in its Creator? And to the Corinthians, in the first Epistle, departing from the usual order which is in the tradition of the faith, he begins with the Holy Spirit when he recalls the workings of graces and mysteries; and he adds the Lord Jesus; and in the third place he sets God, whom he says to be working in the Holy Spirit and in the Lord (ibid. 12:4–6): just as the Lord also says, The Father, remaining in me, he himself does the works (Jn. 14:10). For through that by which the Holy Spirit and Christ are "of God the Father," their working is the work of God. In fact he calls the Holy Spirit also "Lord," and he calls the Lord also "God," because of the unity of nature. Therefore, since in this place he says that the same one who is God and Lord works all things in all, he concludes below, saying, But all these things are worked by one and the same Spirit, distributing to each as he wills (1 Cor. 12:11). What is more evident, that the three have one operation? For when one works, the three are said to work;

why, except because they are of one divinity? For there is no doubt that the gift of graces is properly worked by the Holy Spirit. But in order to teach that God and Lord and the Holy Spirit are one because of the sameness of nature, he shows that the work of the Holy Spirit is the work of the three. And to make clear that, as far as person is concerned, this work is the Holy Spirit's alone, he says, But all these things are worked by one and the same Spirit, distributing to each as he wills. Therefore he acts as he wills, because his will is the will of God. For he does not say "as God wills," but "as the Spirit wills. A creature compels itself to do the will of God; but the Holy Spirit wills this by nature. And in order that it may clearly shine forth that the Holy Spirit works all things, the Lord says among other things: "If I by the finger of God cast out devils," etc. (Luke 11:20). He calls the Holy Spirit the finger of God, to prove that He is from God. Finally, He testifies that the Jews, who said that He cast out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of devils, blasphemed against the Holy Spirit. Moses also, because he worked signs through the Holy Spirit, is acknowledged by the magicians, who say, "This is the finger of God" (Exod. 8:19). For in the Acts of the Apostles we read:

"As they were ministering to the Lord and fasting, the Holy Spirit said: Set apart for me Barnabas and Saul for the work to which I have called them" (Acts 13:2). Behold, service is rendered to the Lord, and the Holy Spirit claims this for Himself. From this it plainly appears that He is Lord, just as God the Father is. And Christ called Saul from heaven and sent him to preach (Acts 9:4); and in like manner the Holy Spirit claims this for Himself,

saying, “for the work to which I have called them. For no one is ignorant that the Savior appointed bishops for the Churches. Indeed, before He ascended into heaven, laying His hand upon the Apostles, He ordained them as bishops. The Apostle attributes this to the Holy Spirit when he says: “Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit has made you bishops, to rule the Church of the Lord Jesus” (Acts 20:28). And among other things Peter says to Ananias: “Ananias, why has Satan filled your heart, that you should lie to the Holy Spirit? And further on, he says: “You have not lied to men, but to God” (Acts 5:3–4). It is clear that the Holy Spirit is called God, since Ananias, who lied to the Holy Spirit, is said to have lied to God.

If he had in no way wished the Holy Spirit to be understood as God, he would have said, “You have not lied to men, but to the Holy Spirit,” so that he would indicate Him as neither God nor man. And what is surprising in this? For the Apostle at one time calls a man the temple of God (2 Cor. 6:16), and at another time the temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 6:19), because by nature they are one. For if the Holy Spirit were in no way understood to be God, with what boldness would he later say, “The temple of God is holy, and that temple are you” (2 Cor. 3:17)? For one God is proclaimed in all the Scriptures; but His mystery is adored in the Trinity. Therefore Scripture so speaks, that under the profession of one God, the things which are of Him, that is, His Son and His Holy Spirit, are understood to be in the same honor in which God Himself is. For the mystery of God has been revealed in order that His glory might be signified in the Trinity. Wherefore, what is from God is not called God with full authority, lest it be believed that another is made apart from Him who is the One. But understanding is given, so that we may believe that in this manner the salvation of the creature consists in the Trinity, because one is their divinity.

For neither could the Creator and the creatures, the Lord and the servants, eternity and those things that are under a beginning, be joined together and placed in the same order, since without one of them salvation is for none. For everything that is God, whether the Son or the Holy Spirit, is called so to its injury, if it is reckoned outside the honor and glory of the one God. Therefore the Scriptures show Christ to be God, they show the Holy Spirit to be God, so that, seeing, they may know what He is who is shown. It is as if someone were to show a gem without crying out that it is a gem: just because he does not cry out, will that which is seen not be a gem? In the same way, through the things discussed above, the Scriptures show what we ought to believe, enclosing our understanding within the faith of the one God, in the mystery of the Trinity.

(John 14:9) 2ND CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 43. WHAT REASONABLE ANSWER CAN ONE MAKE FROM THE LAW TO THE WICKEDNESS OF THE ARIANS? — If one must believe in reason, etc. It is therefore evident that Christ is called the true Son of God, as his own Son, that is, born of his substance. This is what makes the Apostle say: ”He did not spare his own Son. The very reason for the names of Father and Son teaches us that the Father and the Son share the same nature. Human reason is too weak to reach the knowledge of this mystery. That is why

these grand truths have received names which help to conceive the truth of the existence of the Father and the Son. Well, indeed, does not show better that Our Lord Jesus Christ proceeds from God than the name of Son of God given to Him. And as wickedness has found a way to misuse these names to give them a meaning different from that which they naturally have, Scripture adds, "He is the true Son," to silence these wicked mouths and to those evil spirits. We will even say that no one falls into heresy except by departing from the reason of names; simple and upright minds, which do not deviate from the meaning of names, remain unharmed attached to the Catholic faith. Simplicity calmly considers what has been taught to it by tradition.

When doubts arise, questions arise over truths clearly and simply formulated, and that not satisfied with believing what the words express, men consider it unworthy of them not to add or not to take away something, they fall from the heights of the divine tradition. For the righteous spirits, all their concern is that their faith in God is according to tradition. Now, the only meaning of the names of Father and Son leads to the truth of the perfect unity that exists between them. It cannot be supposed that there is a difference between those whom Scripture represents under the same image, and whom the Son himself confirms when he says: "He who sees me, sees my Father. (Jn. 14:9) If, then, he who sees one of them sees them both, the Father and the Son certainly have one and the same form, which can only be so long as the Father and the Son are one and the same substance. And this does not cast doubt on what happens among men, how can one determine the existence of the true Son? when the identity of nature is supported by the property of the names of the begotten and the created; for who can generate anything other than himself? If Christ was simply called the Son of God, and the Scripture did not add for greater clarity that He is the true Son of God, to the testimony of the Apostle St. John, "We are in his true Son Jesus Christ, who is the true God and eternal life;

(Jn. 5:20) and St. Paul: "He did not spare his own Son," (Rom. 8:32) there might be some doubt as to the meaning of the only name of the Son. But Scripture clearly says that He is the true Son of God; therefore those who go against the natural signification of this expression become their own enemies. They imagine, and under the influence of a false and perverse opinion, they affirm that one must believe something other than what is contained in the reason of faith, as if they wanted to give to God more than him. Even those who believe in him do not want it. If Scripture had not added to the word Son the qualification of truth, we might perhaps doubt. One could say that these words of the Savior: "He who sees me, see my father," signifies that he is like his Father, as milk is like plaster, similar in color, but very different from nature. But, no, as these words are the words of the true Son of God, we must admit that they signify in his mind that the Father and the Son have one and the same nature, and that they do not differ in any way. If indeed the Savior said of the man and the woman, because they have the same nature:

"They are no longer two but one flesh," (Matt. 19:6) how much more must one be careful not to say that the Father and the Son are two, so as not to give rise to the error that their

nature is separate, divided, or at least different and dissimilar? Finally, the apostle Saint Paul confirms this unity of nature of the Father and the Son when he says: "He did not look as a trespass to be equal to God. "(Philip. 2:6) Now, where does this equality come from, if not from the unity of nature, both have one and the same image. The Apostle said, "He did not count equality with God," the Savior Himself called himself the true Son of God, for He could not be equal to God except so much as He proceeded from God: there is no equality possible except between two subjects who are both true or both false. This equality, this unity cannot exist between what had a beginning and what is eternal. So, when Jesus Christ declares that he is one with his Father, he proclaims himself equal to God. "Not only did the Jews reproach him," says the Evangelist, (Jn. 5:18) for breaking the Sabbath, but for saying that "God was his Father and to make himself equal to God," that is, to the Father. Is it not obvious that this equality comes from birth?

For it is by asserting himself the proper Son, the true Son of God, that he made himself equal to God, and that is why he said: "He who sees me, see my Father," (Jn. 14:9) that is, to say that both are of the same nature, the one who sees one sees them both. "For as the Father has life in himself, so has he given to his Son to have life in himself," (Jn. 5:26) that is to say, an equal life, etc.

(John 14:27) 1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 92. HOW IS IT TO BE UNDERSTOOD WHEN THE SAVIOR SAYS, MY PEACE I GIVE TO YOU; MY PEACE I LEAVE WITH YOU: NOT AS THIS WORLD GIVES, DO I GIVE TO YOU (John 14:27)? — Whoever receives the peace of the Savior will suffer the hatred of the world. For unless a person becomes separated from the Devil, he will not have peace with Christ. For no one can serve two masters (Matt. 6:24). Therefore, the one who faithfully keeps the law of God is the one who is at variance with the world. Armed with the peace of Christ, he crushes the darts of all his adversaries. For who would dare to attack one whom he knows to be a friend of the King? Yet the world gives peace in a different way from that which the Savior promised to give. For the world gives peace either out of fear or out of appeal. But the Savior, since he is the strongest of all and fears no one, gives peace unasked. This, then, is the peace of the Savior, which is given for this reason: that it may be a defense against enemies. Peace indeed is called by one and the same name, yet the peace of God and the peace of the world are separated by a massive distance. For this peace is fragile, that one strong; this one carnal, that one spiritual; this one earthly, that one heavenly; this one arises from necessity, that one from free will.

For Christ, needing nothing, offers peace to the weak and unarmed, the Lord to his servants, the good to the wicked, God to human beings. Rightly, therefore, he says, Not as this world gives, do I give to you: in saying this, he wished his kindly good will to be understood. For whereas everyone else gives peace so that he himself may benefit, he, namely, the Savior, gives it in such a way that it may benefit not himself, but those to whom he gives it. Therefore the world gives peace in a different manner from that in which the Savior has given it. And the peace of the world does not teach a good life, does not encourage patience, does not

stir up to righteousness, does not encourage to be merciful, does not promise eternal life. For whoever receives the peace of Christ will be a stranger to the corruptions of this world, which wage war against the soul.

(John 16:8) 1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 89. THE SAVIOR, AMONG OTHER THINGS, SAYS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT: "WHEN HE COMES," HE SAYS, "HE WILL CONVICT THE WORLD CONCERNING SIN, AND RIGHTEOUSNESS, AND JUDGMENT. CONCERNING SIN INDEED, BECAUSE THEY DID NOT BELIEVE IN ME; BUT CONCERNING RIGHTEOUSNESS, BECAUSE I GO TO THE FATHER, AND YOU WILL SEE ME NO MORE; BUT CONCERNING JUDGMENT, BECAUSE THE PRINCE OF THIS WORLD HAS BEEN JUDGED" (John 16:8). HE APPEARS INDEED TO HAVE STATED THE REASON FOR THE WORLD'S BEING CONVICTED, BUT THIS NEEDS EXPLANATION. — Since the Jews did not believe in the Savior, nor did worldly powers; and because he wished to reveal himself not only to human beings, but also to principalities and powers in the heavenly places, as the Apostle teaches in the Epistle to the Ephesians (Eph. 3:10); he showed that after his Passion the Holy Spirit would prove that he had spoken the truth. And this is what it is to convict the world: to show it that the things it refused to believe are true. For it refused to believe that the Savior had come from God. But the Savior, having kept righteousness, did not hesitate to return to the One who had sent him; and by the fact that he returned, he proved that he had come from there. "For no one," he says, "ascends to God except the one who has descended from God" (Jn. 3:13). Therefore, when the powers saw him ascending, they were baffled, seeing that what they had despised as false was in fact true.

Therefore that righteousness convicts them, by which he was proved just, because he returned to the place from which he had come. In this way he also convicts them concerning sin, because they not only refused to believe in him, but even killed him. And concerning judgment he reproved them therefore, by showing that the prince of the world was made guilty and seized by him whose faith they did not share. For when they saw souls going from the underworld to heaven, they recognized that the prince of this world had been condemned, so that, having been made guilty in the case of the Savior, he would by right lose what he held. These things were indeed seen when the Savior ascended; but when the Holy Spirit came upon the disciples, they were clearly and openly revealed. For there was true conviction then, when after the Passion and Resurrection, as a testimony to the Savior, the dead rising again, the lame running, lepers cleansed, paralytics strengthened, the blind seeing, the deaf hearing, the mute speaking, the possessed being cleansed, and the sick giving thanks after recovering their health, were publicly seen by the faithless. In this way the Holy Spirit convicts the world, because in the name of the Savior, who was rejected by the world, he worked the powers of every kind of healing.

(John 17:9) 2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 36. WHEN THE SAVIOR SAYS, "I PRAY FOR THEM WHOM YOU HAVE GIVEN ME; I DO NOT PRAY FOR THE WORLD" (John 17:9), BUT THE APOSTLE JOHN, ON THE CONTRARY, SAYS, "WE HAVE AN ADVO-

CATE WITH THE FATHER, A MEDIATOR FOR OUR SINS, AND NOT ONLY FOR OURS, BUT FOR THE WHOLE WORLD" (1 John 2:1–2), THIS SEEMS TO BE A CONTRADICTION. — Although the sense is not far different, still what the Savior says is one thing, and what the apostle John affirms is another. For the Savior prays for the disciples, that they may be kept safe from the assaults of evil; indeed he says, "I do not ask that you take them out of the world, but that you keep them from evil." The apostle John, however, introduces another kind of prayer; for he says, "We have an advocate who intercedes for our sins, and for those of the whole world." Therefore, for Christians intercession is made in a twofold way: both that their sins may be prayed for, and that they may be kept safe from the assaults of the Devil. But for those who do not believe, there is only this kind of intercession: that although they deserve to be punished for their sins and unbelief, goodness and patience may wait for them, in case they should wish to be corrected. For it is not asked that their sins be forgiven while they remain unbelieving, but that they may receive a long delay, so that, if they improve themselves, their offenses may be forgiven them. This, then, is what the Savior asks for them, as we have said.

(John 20:17) 2ND CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 37. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT THE SAVIOR SAYS TO MARY, WHO WANTS TO TOUCH HIM OUT OF JOY, "DO NOT TOUCH ME; FOR I HAVE NOT YET ASCENDED TO THE FATHER" (John 20:1–17), WHEN IT IS READ THAT HE WAS BOTH TOUCHED AND ADORED BY THE OTHER WOMEN? — "Do not touch me" are the words of one who is impatient. For although she desired the Savior, yet while others believed in his resurrection, she stood at the tomb weeping, when she ought already to have been rejoicing. For she had heard from the apostles John and Peter that the Lord had risen. You have it therefore: "He saw the linen cloths and the napkin in one place, and he believed; for as yet he did not know the Scripture, that he must rise from the dead. (Jn. 20:7) But because Mary did not see him as risen, she did not believe. Excessive love made her doubt. Indeed, those whom we love, if they suffer hardship, we do not readily believe that they will escape it; whereas those whom we hate, if they are already near death, it seems unbelievable to us. Therefore to Mary, since she was astonished and suffered grief through love, though she ought to have followed the faith of the disciples, the Lord first showed himself, so that she might cease from her sorrow, yet not without reproach. Therefore she hears, "Do not touch me"; that is: You seek a carnal understanding. Hold back, and follow the spiritual realities which are not seen.

"For I have not yet," he says, "ascended to the Father. (Jn. 20:17) This is like that saying of blessed John the Baptist, who sent his disciples to Jesus and said, "Go, say, John the Baptist has sent us to you, saying, Are you the one who is to come, or should we expect another? (Luke 7:19–20). In his own person he is pleading the cause of his disciples. For John did not doubt, he who had said, "Behold the Lamb of God, behold him who takes away the sins of the world" (Jn. 1:29); but in order to satisfy his disciples, he sends them with his own words, so that by the mouth of the Savior he might confirm what he himself taught

about him, so that after his departure his disciples might follow Christ without any doubt. In the same way the Savior rebukes Mary in himself, saying, "I have not yet ascended to the Father"; that is: Your heart is still weighed down to the earth; if you do not see, you do not believe. For if she had lifted up her heart to God, she would have believed, together with the disciples, that the Lord had risen.

ACTS (Acts 2:1) 1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 95. WHAT WAS THE ORIGIN OF THE FEAST OF PENTECOST AND THE REASON FOR ITS INSTITUTION? — There is no doubt that every aspect of our religion is strengthened by ancient testimony and marked by the entitlement of the Old Law. For all past events of the Old Law are known to have been done and set forth as a figure of our future faith, so that we might not hesitate to hold the truth, when we see that the things which we now both hear and believe were predestined before the ages, commended not only by words, but also by the powers of signs. But now the question is whether they are understood by us in the same way as they were prefigured, so that we may rightly recognize where and for what reason the day of Pentecost is derived. For the meanings of the Lord's Scriptures are opened to those who are diligent and devout, and closed to the negligent. Nor was it fitting that things reserved for the worthy and deserving should be casually seen by all. Pentecost, therefore, which is the fiftieth day counted from Easter, has this basis:

just as after a week the Lord's Day is the first day, on which the mystery of Easter was fulfilled for the redemption of human salvation, because after the cycle of seven days it is always necessary to return to the first, so that it may be shown that the age of the world is completed in the number seven and comes to rest, so also after seven weeks the first day is Pentecost. Therefore Pentecost is never on any other day than the Lord's Day, so that everything that contributes to human salvation may be known to have been both begun and fulfilled on the Lord's Day. For on the Lord's Day the world was made, and after the Fall it was again renewed on the Lord's Day; a figure of this renewal was first given in circumcision, in which there was a sign of the faith to come. For after the week, the eighth day is, in mystery, the first. This is the day which the Lord has made. He made that one day from which the other courses of days would be derived. And therefore on this very day He rose, which He had made; and according to the number explained above, on this very day He gave the Law on Mount Sinai through His servant Moses: so that just as the lamb was a figure of the Lord's Passion in the sacrament of Easter, so the giving of the Law was a figure of the preaching of the Gospel.

For on the same day, that is, on Pentecost, the Law was given, on which also the Holy Spirit descended upon the disciples, so that they might receive authority and know that they had the right to preach the Gospel. This event is confirmed by a double testimony, because it is shown to have been predestined, and is also proved by the revealed outpouring of the Holy Spirit to be divine and heavenly, in order to bear witness to our Law. For when unlearned men, unknown to one another, speak the mighty works of God in various languages, they show that they are divinely inspired. Therefore to the sons of Israel the

Law was given by Moses on the third day of the third month, as is contained in the book of Exodus (Exod. 19:16), which day, counted from the fourteenth day of the first month, on which day the Passover was celebrated in Egypt (Exod. 12:18), is the fiftieth day, that is, Pentecost. Therefore it came about that, for the preaching of the law of faith, on Pentecost the Holy Spirit descended upon the Apostles (Acts 2:1–4), so that the deeds of the ancients might be regarded as images of future things, for the assurance of our faith, because what has been proclaimed from the beginning cannot be considered false. Therefore the time of forgiveness and renewal is described in the fiftieth Psalm, so that the same providence of the fiftieth day, which is also that of the first, might be recognized.

From this it happened that manna was given for the first time on the first day, which is the Lord's Day, from heaven to the people of the Jews; and this is proved by the sequence of six days during which they gathered it, and on the seventh day, that is the Sabbath, they rested (Exod. 16:22, 23). Now manna is a type of spiritual food, which, through the Lord's Resurrection, became reality in the mystery of the Eucharist. All things therefore were done so that they might return unharmed to the cause of the first resurrection, and that Satan might not boast but grow dull, he who cast man down by false hope, lest man remain in that which was brought about through Christ the Lord. Now it remains that we prove whether the things we have said are to be understood as we have already mentioned. The first month, in which the Passover on the fourteenth day was celebrated in Egypt, had this day as Wednesday. Therefore also the Law was given on a Wednesday. This may be understood from the fact that on the fifteenth day of the second month after the departure of the sons of Israel, a Sabbath is seen to have occurred; therefore the flock of quails was not sent to them in the daytime but in the evening. In the morning, however, manna rained from heaven (Exod. 16:13, 14), that is, on the Lord's Day, which is the first found in repetition after the week.

Indeed, for six consecutive days they gathered manna, and on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, they rested. From this day therefore up to the third day of the third month, on which the Law was given, examine and you will find that it was a Wednesday when the Law was given. For from the fifteenth day of the second month, when it was a Sabbath, up to the third day of the third month, on which the Law was given, there are nineteen days. Hold therefore these nineteen days, and go back to the fifteenth day of the second month, when it was a Sabbath, which, counted from the first day, is the fourteenth; and go back to the first day of the second month, and you will have another fourteen days; add these to the nineteen mentioned above, and you will find that the first day of the second month was a Sabbath. Add further to the beginning of the first month seventeen days, because thirteen days of the first month, which were before Passover, must be subtracted: for the Passover took place on the fourteenth day of the first month. With thirteen days removed, and seventeen added, you will find that the fourteenth of the first month was a Wednesday.

And so that you may not suffer weariness in reading, or carefully examine each part of the question, I give you a summary, so that you may be certain of the number of days from

Passover up to the giving of the Law, and from this more easily learn on which weekday Passover took place. The Law was given on the third day after the second month. There are therefore two months and three days. Subtract from these the thirteen days which were before Passover, and fifty days remain. Since the Law was given on a Wednesday, this is easily seen Manna was given on the first weekday, because they gathered it for six continuous days, and this first weekday was on the sixteenth day of the second month. From this first weekday, therefore, up to the eighteenth day, on which the Law was given, you will find a Wednesday. And from Wednesday, whether you count forward or backward to the fiftieth day, it is a Wednesday: for the Jews celebrated Passover in Egypt on a Wednesday, and on a Wednesday they received the Law; but on a Thursday they set out from Egypt. Therefore, the dedication of the Law is Pentecost.

ROMANS (Romans 1:3) 2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 44. AS WE CONFESS THAT THE SAVIOR WAS BORN, WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT THE APOSTLE SAYS HE WAS MADE FROM THE SEED OF DAVID (Rom. 1:3), SINCE TO BE MADE IS ONE THING AND TO BE BORN ANOTHER? — Although in this place "making" can be understood as "birth": for "making" does indeed differ from "generation," but only in other contexts, not where the matter concerns flesh and body. Yet the Apostle did not use such words without reason; for in another place he says, "made of a woman" (Gal. 4:4). Therefore he meant something by this expression. For the flesh of the Lord in the Virgin's womb was not formed and the body brought into being by human seed, but by the operation and power of the Holy Spirit; that is why the Apostle spoke in this way. It is one thing to thicken blood with mingled seed and therefore to generate, and another to bring forth, not by mixture, but by power. Therefore he said "made" rather than "begotten."

(Romans 4:15; 7:12) 2ND CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 46. THE APOSTLE CALLS THE LAW GIVEN BY MOSES HOLY, JUST, GOOD, AND SPIRITUAL (Rom. 7:12, 14). ELSEWHERE HE SAYS, "FOR THE LAW WORKS WRATH," AND, "WHERE THERE IS NO LAW, THERE IS NO TRANSGRESSION" (Rom. 4:15). FOR WHERE THESE THINGS ARE NOT, THERE IS SECURITY. — By comparing his statements, you ought to have been satisfied. For those who are in doubt usually raise questions in such a way that they take the statements of one whose words may not rightly be criticized and seek out things that appear to conflict and to be hostile. If the Apostle calls the Law holy, just, good, and spiritual, he, a man outstanding in all praise and defended on every side by truth, this should serve for faith; and in regard to what seems contrary in words, it should have been examined without stubbornness and envy. For this proposition aims at exemption in sinning. When the Apostle set the law of faith before the Romans, according to the merit of the time and grace, he was speaking to those who, under the faith of Christ, had been brought under the Law. By "Law" I mean not that which is natural; for indeed the Romans were under a law which the decemvirs (official ten-man commissions in the ancient Roman Republic) sent from Athens, and later

two others brought, which was written on two tablets and buried in the Capitol. Rather, I mean that law which is called the law of works:

that they should be circumcised, keep the sabbath and the new moons, separate foods, be careful about cleansing vessels, and the other things contained in such a Law. This Law, then, he says, works wrath; for these things were added by God when angry, so that they might be a burden upon the unbelief of the Jews. In matters so many, it is inevitable that something be omitted. Therefore the Apostle Peter says: "Why," he asks, "do you put a yoke upon the neck of the brothers which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? (Acts 15:10). Finally, God says through the prophet Jeremiah: "I gave them statutes that were not good" (Ezek. 20:25). For after many offenses and temptings of God, and insults against Moses and detractions from God, these things were given for them to observe, so that their stiff neck might be pressed down, and wherever they turned, they would have the Law, so that there might be no refreshment for them. Therefore, in order to remove them from this Law, the Apostle says, "Where there is no Law, there is no transgression," so that they might safely, by a shorter way, serve God spiritually. "Because," he says, "if you keep the Jewish Law, you must necessarily transgress it. For the precepts are so many that it is impossible to fulfill them. How, then, could he be speaking of that Law which is natural?

Moses wrote of it to confirm its authority, not because it did not exist before, since we read of vengeance being exacted before Moses; but he wrote to show the Romans that they ought no longer to live under the Law, though it was beneficial that they should conduct themselves under a Law. For otherwise they could not preserve justice. Accordingly he says to them: "Do you wish not to fear authority? Do good"; and, "Those who despise it bring condemnation upon themselves" (Rom. 13:3, 2). He therefore calls this Law spiritual, which he also shows to be holy, just, and good. This is the Law which we have called natural, which forbids sin: it is the guide of a good life. To this, the Law of faith being added, makes a perfect man. Now, because by a common name this Law which I called natural, and that which is called the Law of works, are both termed "law," the Apostle appears to speak against the Law. But lest he seem to empty this Law, without which this life cannot be governed, he says, "We know that the Law is spiritual," so that the Law which he annuls might be understood to be the Law of sabbath observance, circumcision, foods, and new moons. For that Law is therefore not called spiritual, because it punishes all sins.

(Romans 8:7) 2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 47. BY WHAT REASONING IS THE WISDOM OF THE FLESH HOSTILE TO GOD; OR WHAT IS THAT WISDOM ITSELF WHICH IS NOT SUBJECT TO THE LAW OF GOD (Rom. 8:7)? — This question does not differ in sense from the previous one. For by saying "flesh" it has been made clear what is signified; from this it can easily be recognized what its wisdom is. We have said, then, that all the elements are called flesh, that is, the substances of visible things: whose way of thinking is such that they believe nothing can come about without a spiritual and simple mingling, while they shrink from the notion of power and judge it foolish. For those who, distrusting spiritual things, follow carnal ones, understand and consider as true nothing

other than what is contained in the order of the elements: so that they neither admit that a virgin gave birth, nor believe in the resurrection of the flesh, because the reasoning of the flesh, that is, of the elements, does not accept this. For all things that are generated in time are produced by an operative mingling: and they say that dead and dissolved bodies cannot be restored again to life, because each element, by a separated mingling, returns to its own nature. Swollen with such notions, they deny that what we believe will happen or has happened: and therefore their assertion is hostile to God, since it considers as foolish and empty that which God has done and promised He will do.

1 CORINTHIANS (1 Corinthians 5:5) 2ND CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 49. WHOSE SPIRIT DOES THE APOSTLE SAY IS TO BE SAVED, WHEN HE SAYS, "I HAVE HANDED OVER SUCH A MAN TO SATAN FOR THE DESTRUCTION OF THE FLESH," ETC. (1 Cor. 5:5)? — The destruction of the flesh is when a person, given over to carnal pleasures and desires, obtains hell for himself: for he acquires destruction through the work of the flesh. From these things he becomes wholly carnal, because just as a man who lives according to the Law becomes wholly spiritual, so that even the flesh is called by the same name as the soul; so too, if he lives according to the desire of the world and the pleasures of lusts, the whole man becomes flesh, making progress toward the destruction of the flesh; that is, just as the flesh, because it is frail and corruptible and mortal, when it loses the soul is deformed, lacking form, and sinks into destruction, for it perishes when it loses the strength of all its members, so also the soul is deformed by such a body, whose strength it had despised, and is punished together with the flesh in which it stained itself with vices. So that there is no advantage to the flesh through the soul, but the soul has destruction through the flesh, because it did not govern the body spiritually, though it was given to the flesh as queen, but itself teaches carnal works.

Therefore, when the Church has cast out such a man, it has a spirit that is safe, namely the Holy Spirit, who is the guardian of the Church: for if they were willing to have such a man among them, who defiled his father's wife by lust, so that they would have to be compelled by the Law not to allow him to defile everyone, and the Holy Spirit would withdraw from the Church on account of the polluted one, the Church would not have a safe spirit. For what is lost is not safe, and on the day of the Lord, found naked of the Spirit, they will not be able to be counted among the sons of God. For the Spirit bears witness that we are the sons of God (Rom. 8:16). The Apostle says this to the laity, because as yet bishops had not been appointed over the Churches in every place. Therefore he commands the people to do what he would have done if he had been ordained bishop there, namely, that by joining together with one accord they should cast him out from their company, lest they seem to consent to his deeds. For he who does not rebuke someone whom he can rebuke, but receives him as though he were not in error, provides him fuel for sinning, and for this reason he himself is defiled and drives the Holy Spirit away from himself. For to the Thessalonians likewise, among other things, he says:

"May your whole spirit and soul and body be kept blameless at the coming of our Lord" (1 Thess. 5:23). The sense is the same: for to be safe is to be whole. Therefore the king says to Daniel, "Are the seals safe, Daniel? and he answered, "They are safe, O king" (Dan. 14:16); that is, intact. So that our spirit may be whole when he does not desert us. For those whom the Spirit deserts will no longer be whole in respect to the cause of regeneration, because they do not have him through whom they were called sons of God. Nor is it contrary to this if we say that the Holy Spirit, when we sin, deserts us and is not whole in us. For he is not whole in us when he deserts us, who was our leader and ruler; because if he is our head and we are his members, then when we do something contrary, it is not he who seems to desert us, but we who seem to desert him; and then he appears not to be whole when he loses us. For this is true and evident, that it is not he who turns away from us, but we from him when we sin. And to the Colossians, among other things, he says: "From whom the whole body, supplied and knit together, grows with a growth from God" (Col. 2:19). If we take this according to the sound of the words, it does not fit:

for God does not lack anything, so as to make growth through us. But when we return to the author of our life and confess him, the Godhead, by gaining us for salvation, makes growth in us; therefore, in those who depart from him there is loss. This, then, is not to be whole, which is also to suffer loss.

(1 Corinthians 5:7) 1ST CATEGORY NT QUESTION 96. IT SHOULD BE ASKED WHETHER PASCHA IS TO BE INTERPRETED AS "PASSAGE," AS IT APPEARS TO THE GREEKS. — The Apostle could not have been mistaken when he says, "Christ our Pascha has been sacrificed" (1 Cor. 5:7). This is not, of course, his own expression, but a word of the Law, as Moses says: "And it shall be, when your sons say to you, 'What is this service?' you shall say, 'This sacrifice is the Pascha of the Lord'" (Exod. 12:26–27). What more is needed as evidence? The law speaks; the Apostle proves it this remains, that the objector be cast out as stubborn. For it is plain that the passage took place after Pascha. For of the blood of the sacrificed lamb they placed it upon the doorposts and upon the threshold, so that when the angel passed by at night he would not strike the house in which the sign of blood was found. Therefore it was the blood that brought salvation, not the passage; because in order that the passage should not harm, the blood stood in the way.

(1 Corinthians 6:8) 2ND CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 50. SINCE MANY SINS SEEM TO BE COMMITTED IN THE BODY, FOR ANYONE WHO INFLICTS VIOLENCE ON ANY PART OF HIS BODY SINS, OF COURSE, AGAINST HIS OWN BODY; FOR THERE IS ONE WHO HAS MUTILATED HIMSELF, ONE WHO HAS ENDED HIS LIFE BY A NOOSE, ONE WHO HAS DRIVEN A SWORD INTO HIMSELF, WHY THEN DOES THE APOSTLE SAY, "EVERY SIN WHATSOEVER A MAN SHALL COMMIT IS OUTSIDE THE BODY; BUT HE WHO FORNICATES SINS AGAINST HIS OWN BODY" (1 Cor. 6:18)? — Do you think the Apostle was unskilled, or do you want the force of this saying explained? For when the Apostle says "body," he does not mean the individual man alone, but he includes the woman as well, because the woman is a

portion of the man. For all the above-mentioned crimes that each person violently commits against himself do not stain the whole body; it is the individual alone who sins, and therefore he alone becomes guilty. In fornication, however, the whole body is defiled, because the consent to contamination involves both the man and the woman; therefore fornication is a serious offense. It is a most wicked sin when someone seeks a partner in his crime for their joint destruction. For if a righteous man will receive a reward even on behalf of the one whom he has gained, then likewise an evil man is made guilty not only in himself, but also in the one whom he has wished to have as a sharer in his condemnation.

How much more, then, does the fornicator, who is clearly by one offense in a certain way defiling himself twice? For if he sins against the flesh that is from himself, he doubly commits adultery against himself. If anyone thinks he can reshape this question so as to apply this statement either to the Church or to the body of Christ, it will not stand. For it would be said improperly and would resemble Novatian, who, in order to support the cause of his own frenzy, declares that the one who commits fornication does not sin against his own body but against Christ's, because Christians are the members and body of Christ; so that fornication would be the same as sacrilege, and such a person would be said to sin against Christ just as one who denies Christ. But this is weak and fragile, because from every side it falls into a snare and does not escape. For if the one who fornicates sins against the body of Christ, then other sins would not be committed against Christ, such as if a Christian kills his brother, or sacrifices to idols, or commits some other kind of sin, since every sin is outside the body, except fornication.

But if not every sin is outside the body, and whatever sin there is, is committed against Christ, then the one who steals, or who fabricates himself, or who lies, or who strikes his brother, or commits some such act, would be said to sin against Christ or against the Holy Spirit, which is very absurd. And yet the Apostle calls the members of the Church the body of Christ, so that we are members one of another. How, then, does the one who fornicates sin against his own body and not rather against Christ's, since according to the mystery of the Church we are said not to be our own body, but Christ's? And this is far from the point at issue, because the one who fornicates sins against his own body for this reason: that the whole Adam is defiled.

(1 Corinthians 9:22) 2ND CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 51. WHY DID THE APOSTLE SAY THAT HE MADE HIMSELF "ALL THINGS TO ALL MEN" (1 Cor. 9:22), SOMETHING THAT SEEMS LIKE THE BEHAVIOR OF A FLATTERER AND A HYPOCRITE? — A flatterer is someone who agrees merely so as not to offend the person whose favor he wishes to gain. But someone who, in order to avoid scandal, does something that is not dangerous but only unnecessary, is working for the salvation of the one whom he does not wish to scandalize. When the Apostle Paul circumcised Timothy for the sake of the Jews and entered the temple after purification, he thereby showed himself in such a way that those who were zealous for the traditions of their fathers would not be scandalized and either kill him or think our religion was

hostile to them. He was willing to allow something lesser so that he might gain something greater. For he could have sinned gravely if he had refused to act as a Jew in order to go into the temple to pray; he therefore subjected himself so that he might benefit them. To those who were under the Law, that is, the Samaritans, he agreed in this way: it is clear that they rightly confess that the books of Moses are from God, and that circumcision and the sabbaths were given by God. From these things he showed them that the Christ they were expecting was the very one he preached. For you have it written, with the Samaritan woman speaking to the Lord:

"I know that the Messiah is coming; when he comes, he will tell us all things" (Jn. 4:25). According to this understanding, he followed the words of the books of Moses, who said, "The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet from among your brothers" (Deut. 18:15). To those who were without the Law he agreed from this standpoint: that they say the world and the human race were made by God. For he says, "As some of your own poets have said, 'For we too are his offspring'" (Acts 17:28). Therefore he made himself all things to all, so that he might promote their salvation.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (1 Corinthians 10:13)

QUESTION 99. WHAT IS THAT SAYING OF THE APOSTLE, "LET NO TEMPTATION TAKE HOLD OF YOU EXCEPT WHAT IS HUMAN" (1 Cor. 10:13)? — Not without providence, as I judge, does our Apostle, the teacher of the Gentiles, desire that temptation should take hold of us, but only such as is human; because divine temptation brings destruction. By this kind of temptation the Jews were seized by serpents and perished. For while acting under God's law, they doubted his providence; and therefore he urges us that we be not seized by divine, but by human temptation. For a person is said to be tempted by God in this sense: one who acts under his name yet looks for salvation from idols, because he does not have a God who has been approved. For everything that has not been approved is put to the test; and what is put to the test is brought into doubt. And therefore divine temptation is deadly, whereas human temptation is saving: for just as doubting God is destructive, so despairing of man for the sake of God's law is most health-giving. Accordingly, with foresight the Apostle says, "Let no temptation take hold of you except what is human," (1 Cor. 10:13) so that, being tempted by men on account of God's law, we may be found strong, while those carnal men doubt us, but we may be approved by God. For those who are not approved by God are tempted so that they may be corrected. There is therefore a twofold temptation:

at times we are tempted as though faithful, at times as though untrusting; so that the temptation of the faithful is human. For on account of faith we are afflicted by men: they tempt us to see if they can draw us away from the faith. On account of distrust, however, people are tempted so that, being pressed hard, they may repent and return to the way; as also happened to the Jews. For when they lacked trust in the providence of God, they were tempted by serpents, so that, corrected by pain, they might be corrected. For God so tempts such people that he may correct them. There is also another kind of temptation, by which

Abraham was tempted, and Job as well, and Tobias, the servants of God: so that Abraham, through the trial of offering his only and most beloved son (Gen. 22), might have a richer fruit of righteousness for eternal glory; while Job, by the loss of all his possessions, might be increased in wealth, being made rich in heaven and on earth (Job 1, 2; 42:12–13). Tobias too, having suffered the blindness of his eyes, advanced so far that in the present he became glorious when his sight was restored, and for the future there was kept for him a perpetual brightness (Tob. 2:11; 11:15). For the righteous are tested for this purpose, that they may make progress.

And therefore in temptation we ought to be strong in spirit, knowing that this tends not to our decrease but to our increase, provided only that we endure with an even mind through Christ.

(1 Corinthians 10:13) QUESTION 52. WHAT DOES THE APOSTLE MEAN WHEN HE SAYS, "LET NO TEMPTATION SEIZE YOU EXCEPT WHAT IS HUMAN" (1 Cor. 10:13); AS THOUGH HE WERE WISHING THIS TO HAPPEN? AND WHAT IS THIS HUMAN TEMPTATION? FOR BY THIS HE SHOWS THAT THERE IS ALSO A DIVINE TEMPTATION. — Every question, so that it can be made clear, must be brought back to its origin. Now the Apostle, when he was complaining about the faithlessness of the Jews, and because they tempted God in the wilderness, where he says, "Nor let us tempt Christ, as some of them tempted" (1 Cor. 10:9)—while he recalled these things and explained what they suffered on account of such evils, in order to inspire fear, so that by that very example he might draw us back from the hatred or from the temptation which is directed against the Lord (for it is a divine temptation if, while acting under God's law, someone from another quarter or from idols seeks help, distrusting God), this it is that the Apostle warns us to avoid. But that human temptation should hold us, he exhorts: because human temptation is, in a cause of God, to despair of man and to be resolute in faith toward God. For this enticement is understood as distrust, in order that they may not distrust the promises of God. In human matters, because in every error of seduction there is human temptation, which, hostile through worldly reasoning, opposes God's law, despairing of his promises. You therefore have set forth what is temptation directed toward God, and what is human temptation, which we ought not to reject, if we are sharers in the faith of God.

(1 Corinthians 12:3) 2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 53. WHAT DOES THE APOSTLE MEAN WHEN HE SAYS, "NO ONE CAN SAY, LORD JESUS, EXCEPT IN THE HOLY SPIRIT" (1 Cor. 12:3)? CAN PHOTINUS, WHO DENIES THAT CHRIST IS GOD, CONFESS OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST IN THE HOLY SPIRIT? AND MARCION AND MANICHAEUS, WHO DENY THAT CHRIST CAME IN THE FLESH, CAN THEY SAY "LORD JESUS CHRIST" IN THE HOLY SPIRIT? OR PROSTITUTES AND THE IMPURE, WHEN THE HOLY SPIRIT DOES NOT DWELL IN A BODY SUBJECT TO SINS, AND WISDOM DOES NOT ENTER INTO A HATEFUL SOUL (Wis. 1:4)? — Truth is neither proved nor disproved by a person's status; for whatever is spoken well and truly is undoubtedly spoken in the Holy Spirit. Therefore, if someone is guilty in other matters, he should

not on that account be opposed in this one also, when he speaks the truth. Yet he is not really being opposed, but the Lord Christ is being contradicted. For whoever denies that this man speaks the truth does an injury to Christ. But if what is said is true, and it is denied that what is true is spoken in the Holy Spirit, something which Christ himself accepts (for no good person reproves someone who speaks truth about him; nor is what is learned by tradition learned by revelation), no one who speaks the truth can be condemned.

2 CORINTHIANS (2 Corinthians 5:14-15) 2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 54. THE APOSTLE SAYS THAT CHRIST DIED FOR ALL; FOR THEREFORE HE SAYS, "THEREFORE ALL HAVE DIED, AND HE DIED FOR ALL" (2 Cor. 5:14–15). BUT THE LORD HIMSELF SAYS, "THE SON OF MAN CAME TO GIVE HIS LIFE AS A RANSOM FOR MANY" (Matt. 20:28). IN THIS WAY IT SEEMS CONTRARY. — The words indeed are different, but the meaning is one; just as again the same words can have a different meaning, for example, "Whatever is not from faith is sin" (Rom. 14:23); and, "The Law," he says, "is not of faith" (Gal. 3:12), and yet it is not sin. Those whom the Savior called "many," the Apostle indicated by "all." For they are many, because the greatest part from every people and nation will come to believe in the Savior. These the Apostle called "all believers." Therefore, among other things, he says, "He died for all"; that is, of course, for those who have believed and will believe. Yet He also died for those who are unwilling to believe; but since they do not accept the benefit, they are unwilling that Christ should have died for them; and therefore He does not appear to have died for those to whom He has brought no profit, but rather harm. But He is rightly said to have died for those for whom a victory has been won, who, understanding the mystery, give thanks to God through Christ our Lord.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (2 Corinthians 5:21; Isaiah 53:9)

QUESTION 74. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT THE PROPHET ISAIAH SAYS OF CHRIST, "HE COMMITTED NO SIN," WHILE THE APOSTLE, ON THE CONTRARY, SAYS, "HIM WHO KNEW NO SIN, HE MADE SIN FOR US" (Isa. 53:9; 2 Cor. 5:21)? — As far as the sense is concerned, the questions are different, but the words are similar: in one respect they are alike, in another they differ. "He made" and "did not make" are opposed; "knew not" and "did not commit" are similar. The prophet spoke in the person of Christ, because "He committed no sin, neither was deceit found in His mouth"; but the Apostle speaks of the person of God the Father, who made Him, that is, Christ, who knew no sin, "sin for us. This must be understood in two ways. First, He made Him sin by willing that He be incarnate, so that He whom fate did not touch should take a body from sinful flesh; by this He is said to have been "made sin. Then, by offering Him for sins, He made Him sin. For in the Law the victim offered for sins was called "sin. Therefore Christ did not commit sin, as the prophet says; but by the Father He Himself was made sin, as has been shown. And what is it to offer Christ for us, if not to grant power to those who wished to kill Him?

This was allowed because it would be for our benefit that He should be the cause of descending to the lower regions, to damage hell of souls. For it is an excessive and unheard-of sin to

have killed Him who not only had not sinned in any way, but had also granted life to many. By this sin the Devil was made guilty and lost the boldness to contradict. A similar passage is read in the Epistle to the Galatians: among other things, "He was made a curse for us" (Gal. 3:13). By whom was He made, if not by the Father? For by God's judgment the cross of Christ is a curse upon the Jews: the death of the Savior cries out their sin. Therefore He allowed Himself to be crucified, so that His passion might profit us, that as we go forth with His sign, we may not be held by the second death. For death fears even His servants, by whom it has been conquered.

(2 Corinthians 5:21; Isaiah 53:9)

QUESTION 40. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT THE PROPHET ISAIAH SAYS OF CHRIST, "HE COMMITTED NO SIN," WHILE THE APOSTLE, ON THE CONTRARY, SAYS, "HIM WHO KNEW NO SIN, HE MADE SIN FOR US" (Isa. 53:9; 2 Cor. 5:21)? — With regard to the point at issue, not only do the words differ, but the persons are different. "He made" and "did not make" are opposed. But since what is said to have been made is not understood as having been made by Him who is declared not to have made it, it cannot be called a contradiction. For the statement of the prophet refers to the person of Christ, but that of the Apostle to the person of the Father. For God the Father reconciled the world to Himself through Christ; and therefore it came about that He, that is, Christ, was made sin. For this is what "He made Him sin" means: He gave Him into the virginal womb, that He might be born as man, made sin in respect of the flesh, because flesh is the flesh of sin, namely that one whom fate and condition did not touch, to bring forth as man. Therefore He was born for this, that He might be offered as a victim for sinners. He is said to have been made sin because, according to the Law, the victim offered for sins was called "sin. There is a similar passage of the Apostle to the Galatians speaking of the Savior: "Made a curse for us";

(Gal. 3:13) the sense is the same: "He was made sin or a curse for us for our sake by God the Father, who allowed Him to be killed by the Jews, so that, because of their unbelief, they might be disinherited in our favor, with others brought in to take their place; as the Savior says, 'The kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation that produces its fruits'" (Matt. 21:43). For everything that God allows is said to be done by Him: because if He did not allow it, it would not happen. Therefore the Lord says to Pilate, "You would have no power over me unless it had been given you from above" (Jn. 19:11). Therefore He is said to "give" power, not by infusing it, but by permitting it, so that when a wicked mind receives power according to its will, it becomes guilty: as the Jews who, in killing the Savior, made Him their curse by God's judgment. For the cross of the Savior is a curse upon the Jews. It is not like the victim that was offered for sins, which cleansed the one who offered it; but rather, the offered Savior becomes stain and sin for those who offer Him: while justification comes to those who dissent, so that the blessing of Abraham might come to the Gentiles in Christ Jesus. For the offering of the Jews benefited the Gentiles who did not fall away from faith in Jesus Christ.

GALATIANS (Galatians 2:11, 14) 2ND CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 55. WHY DID THE APOSTLE PAUL REBUKE HIS FELLOW APOSTLE PETER BECAUSE, FEARING THOSE WHO WERE OF THE CIRCUMCISION, HE WITHDREW HIMSELF FROM THE GENTILES (Gal. 2:11, 14), WHEN PAUL HIMSELF, ALSO FEARING THOSE WHO WERE OF THE CIRCUMCISION, TOOK TIMOTHY AND CIRCUMCISED HIM, SOMETHING HE WAS FORBIDDING TO BE DONE (Acts 16:3)? — Is he therefore to be rebuked as well? It is unbelievable that so great an apostle would rebuke another for something in which he knew that he himself had done. It is not right to believe that such a thing was done by so great a man; for such things belong to those who live in a carnal way. Therefore the action of the apostle Paul is free from criticism. For while he was preaching that circumcision was not necessary, yet wanting to take Timothy with him, who, although born of a Jewish mother and a Greek father, would be a scandal to the Jews if he took him, uncircumcised, as one born of a Jewess, then he submitted himself to subjection for a time, and took him and circumcised him. He did something unnecessary, with the permission of Him who had suffered. For since he was from a Jewish mother, trained from childhood in the synagogue in the sacred writings, that is, in the books of the Hebrews, he allowed himself to be circumcised in order to remove scandal from the Jews, because they had zeal for their own race.

Indeed, “when Titus,” he says, “was a Greek, he was not compelled to be circumcised” (Gal. 2:3). But Timothy, because he was of a Jewish mother, as I said, the Jews did not allow to be received among the teachers while uncircumcised. The Apostle took him on for this purpose, that he might ordain him a bishop, as he did. For, being trained in the prophetic Scriptures, he was found to be a suitable teacher for asserting Christ. The apostle Peter would not have been rebuked if he had separated himself from the Gentiles according to Jewish custom, so as not to be a scandal to them. But this is what was condemned in the apostle Peter: that although he had previously lived in a Gentile manner among believing Greeks, when Jews came from James, subjected by fear, he began to teach that believing Gentiles ought to live as Jews. Therefore he hears, “If you, though a Jew, live like a Gentile, how do you compel the Gentiles to live as Jews? For he had caused doubt concerning the discipline of the gospel: this is a crime, in that he was destroying what he had built up. Therefore the apostle Paul calls this hypocrisy; and it is clear that if he circumcised Timothy, he did not remain silent that he was doing something unnecessary because of their scandal, and that for this reason he yielded, since he had a Jewish mother.

For the Jews would not have insisted, had they not found the excuse of his Jewish mother, since they could in no way disapprove this to the Gentiles, nor easily take scandal concerning those who were not of the stock of Israel. He did this, therefore, not out of hypocrisy, but under compulsion. For the cause mentioned above involved no small element of hypocrisy. For many were reproved in this matter, so that some of the Jews and even Barnabas consented to this hypocrisy.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (Galatians 2:15)

QUESTION 81. THE APOSTLE SAYS, "WE WHO ARE JEWS BY NATURE" (Gal. 2:15): THEREFORE HE SHOWS THAT JEWS ARE BORN FROM JEWS; I AM NOT SPEAKING OF PROSELYTES, WHO ARE CLEARLY MADE INTO JEWS. INDEED, THOSE WHO WERE BORN IN THE WILDERNESS WERE NOT CIRCUMCISED, AND YET THEY WERE JEWS. THEREFORE IT IS NOT CIRCUMCISION THAT MAKES A JEW, BUT BIRTH BROUGHT FORTH UNDER DEVOTION TO GOD THE CREATOR. IF THEN JEWS ARE BORN FROM JEWS, WHY NOT ALSO CHRISTIANS FROM CHRISTIANS? FOR PAGANS TOO ARE BORN FROM PAGANS. — Not everything that is born is the same as that from which it is born. Gold comes from the earth, and yet it is not earth; and so do gems and many other things. Food comes from wood, and a chick from an egg. But in the case of Pagans, the reason that Pagans are born from Pagans is this: since every pagan is in ignorance, and the one born from him is without understanding, both are ignorant. Yet there is this difference between the two, that the one who begets is without doubt a blasphemer, and so is a son of the Devil; but the newborn infant does not know how to blaspheme, just as it does not know how to bless; nevertheless it is pagan, because it is without understanding. From a Jew, however, a Jew is born for this reason, that he is generated under devotion to the Creator. As Adam said about Cain, "I have gotten a man through God" (Gen. 4:1).

For just as the Pagans, being without devotion to the Creator, give thanks to demons for everything they do, so the Jews, as petitioners of God the Creator, praise him in all their actions, to their own criticism in this, that they do not know Christ, through whom are all things. In this way also a Jew is born from a Jew. For it is not, as some think, that circumcision makes a Jew. Circumcision is a sign of Judaism, not Judaism itself; for it was not Abraham's circumcision that was righteousness, but the sign of righteousness, so that those born from Abraham might have a sign by which they would be proved to be Abraham's children. Since from Judas Maccabeus they were given this name, so that not only those from Judah, but also the rest from all the sons of Jacob, were called Jews, because Judas had been their leader. Therefore those born Jews receive the sign, so that those who they are may be recognized. But from a Christian, a Christian is not born, because the one who begets is not born a Christian, but made a Christian. Therefore the one who is born must likewise be made, in order to be so. For he is not born by substance, but by the faith that comes to those already born. Ignorance is born together with the flesh, but faith is afterwards grafted in by spiritual reasoning. But someone objects on the other side:

"If the one who begets has indeed been made what he is, then he ought now to beget that which he himself is, so that the dignity he has received should produce an offspring like itself. For senators beget senators. But the dignity of senators has no merit before God. Nor does nature itself, that is, substance, obtain this benefit; rather, the dignity is confined to reputation and speech alone. Therefore the title indeed is passed down through fleshly descent, but it provides nothing more than an opinion of dignity; just as those who are consuls, or are honored with statues, rejoice in vanity. But when people become Christians, dignity is added to their very nature, so that the human essence itself receives the eternal

benefit of incorruptibility, and there is not only the opinion, but also the reality in effect before God. It is like this: if some eloquent poor man is praised and yet lacks bread or other necessities. True praise would be this, if the dignity he has acquired benefited him so that he lacked nothing, while this is granted to his nature, that it might live by itself, and live well, without requiring any help from outside, that is, truly to become rich and glorious.

(Galatians 2:15)

QUESTION 56. THE APOSTLE SAYS, "WE ARE JEWS BY NATURE. (Gal. 2:15) THEREFORE HE SHOWS THAT JEWS ARE BORN FROM JEWS. INDEED, THOSE WHO WERE BORN IN THE DESERT, THOUGH NOT CIRCUMCISED, WERE JEWS. CIRCUMCISION, THEREFORE, DOES NOT MAKE SOMEONE A JEW, BUT BIRTH BROUGHT FORTH UNDER THE DEVOTION TO GOD THE CREATOR. IF, THEN, JEWS ARE BORN FROM JEWS, AND PAGANS ARE BORN FROM PAGANS, SO TOO CHRISTIANS ARE BORN FROM CHRISTIANS. — Not everything that is born is the same as that from which it is born. For gold, etc., is pagan too, because it is without sensation, having neither its own merit nor another's. But as for the Jew, for this reason a Jew is born, etc. Yet it is said on the contrary: If indeed the one who begets is made to be something, he ought to beget that which he himself is, so that the dignity he has received may produce an offspring of itself: as with the Jews, because Abraham, having been a pagan, became a worshiper of God, and from him the origin of the Jews; just as those who become senators, once senators, beget senators. But senatorial rank has no merit before God, nor does nature itself, that is, substance, obtain any benefit from it; rather, dignity is limited to fame and speech alone; and therefore the notion runs through the line of flesh, granting nothing more than the opinion of worldly honor. Why a Jew is born from a Jew has already been said;

but a Christian, since the dignity of goodness is added to his nature itself, receives benefit in the substance of the man of which he consists, so that not opinion alone, but a real thing exists in effect before God. Indeed, once the remission of sins has been received, the whole man is purified, so that even the son is adopted by God. Therefore all who are born must be reborn, because the mercy of God gives grace to individuals. For no one can receive remission for another. The soul that is born in the body, or with the body, is subject to the death discovered by Adam, and unless it receives the sign of death overcome, it does not escape the hell of Tartarus. For each one receives the benefit for himself, not also for him who does not yet exist. If, once made a Christian, a man were already immortal, then one born from him would rightly be what his parent is. For those who become Christians receive a sign so that they may not be held by the second death; yet they do not escape the present death which Adam discovered. Infants are baptized for this reason, though they are innocent, so that the untaught soul, born in the body, may bear the sign of death overcome, lest it can be held by it. Abraham did not have this sign, nor did the Prophets, because their time did not encounter it;

instead, it was reserved for the Son of God, who, when he came, would conquer death and bestow this grace upon believers. From this comes the saying of the Lord to the Jews: Your father Abraham rejoiced that he might see my day; and he saw it, and was glad (Jn. 8:56). For Abraham, knowing that Christ was promised for the deliverance of the human race, necessarily and always had to await his coming for those placed in the underworld; and when he saw that he had been born in spirit, he rejoiced, certain that in a short time he would be snatched from hell and brought into the heavens. How then should Christians be born from Christians, when whoever has not believed or has not been baptized will not be a Christian?

(Galatians 2:16) 2ND CATEGORY OT & NT QUESTION 5. IF NO ONE IS JUSTIFIED BEFORE GOD BY THE LAW, WHY IS IT WRITTEN: "CURSED IS EVERYONE WHO DOES NOT CONTINUE IN ALL THINGS THAT ARE WRITTEN IN THE BOOK OF THE LAW, TO DO THEM" (Deut. 27:26)? IF PEOPLE ARE JUSTIFIED BY FAITH AND NOT BY THE LAW (Gal. 2:16), WHY IS THE ONE WHO HAS NOT FULFILLED THE LAW CALLED CURSED, SINCE IT DOES NOT LEAD TO RIGHTEOUSNESS? — The Law given through Moses did indeed have righteousness, but an earthly one; so that those who kept the Law were righteous for the present, so that they would not become guilty. For the one who harms no one is righteous according to the Law. Therefore the Apostle says: "The Law is not of faith; but 'the one who does them shall live in them'" (Gal. 3:12): that is, the one who does the Law will not die, but lives for the present; but the righteousness that is from faith justifies people before God, so that they may be rewarded in the future age. For to temporal righteousness they added the righteousness of faith. It is right to know from whom and through whom we exist, so that the true confession of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit may lead us to the heavenly kingdoms. For the ancients also, who not only kept the precepts of the Law but also loved God, having hope in the promise, were justified before God. He says that the Law alone does not justify people before God, just as faith alone, without good works, does not praise them before God; but the observance of both earthly and divine righteousness makes them perfect. Therefore the Lord says: "Unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will not enter the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 5:20).

(Galatians 3:20) 2ND CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 57. WHAT NEED WAS THERE FOR THE APOSTLE, WHEN REBUKING THE GALATIANS, TO INSERT THIS STATEMENT? FOR TO THE GALATIANS, WHO AFTER THE GOSPEL WERE TAKING REFUGE IN THE LAW, HE SAYS AMONG OTHER THINGS: "NOW A MEDIATOR IS NOT OF ONE, BUT GOD IS ONE" (Gal. 3:20), AS THOUGH THE GALATIANS DENIED THAT GOD IS ONE. YET IT WAS PRECISELY BY THIS LINE OF REASONING THAT THEY HAD BEEN LED INTO THE LAW: SO THAT THEY MIGHT BELIEVE IN ONE, UNIQUE GOD; AND THAT CHRIST HAD COME ONLY AS A MINISTER BY PREDESTINATION, TO DISPENSE THE GIFT OF GOD'S GRACE. — It is clear that the Galatians were therefore drawn into the Law in such

a way that they did indeed profess Christ, but not as he ought to be confessed; rather, in the manner of Photinus, so that, since the Law proclaims one God, it would be contrary to the Law if Christ were called God. This is the device of the Jews, who, overcome by the great deeds of power, believed after the cross of Christ in such a way that, while professing Christ, they nevertheless kept the Law, as though all hope ought not to be placed in Christ. These are the ones whom the Apostle calls "false brethren" (Gal. 2:4; and 2 Cor. 11:26). These, therefore, after the tradition of the Apostles, corrupted the understanding of the Galatians, so that they made them Jews under the name of the Savior.

Therefore the Apostle says that Christ came as mediator of the circumcision and the foreskin, as he says to the Ephesians: "making peace in one new man" (Eph. 2:15). If, then, Christ came as mediator, a mediator makes peace between two in such a way that he lays down a new rule, taking away the professions of both, and reconciles them, so that, following his decision, they lose their former discord. For when the Jew insists on circumcision and the Gentile on uncircumcision, there is discord; but when this is taken away from both, there is peace. If, therefore, things stand therefore, how is it, he says, that you Galatians, having become Jews, corrupt the mediation of Christ? Therefore he said to them: "You have been severed from Christ. (Gal. 5:4) For, despising the right of reconciliation which he had established between them, they turned back to the former way of thinking of the Jews, thereby accusing both themselves and their reconciler. For whatever displeases is accused. And because this matter forced the Galatians to turn to the Law, so that they confessed one God without the mystery, as though it were hostile to the Law if Christ were called God, he says: "The mediator," that is, the go-between, "is not of one, but of two, of course; but you, turning to the Law, have rejected the mediator; yet God is one.

By saying this, he shows that he proclaims Christ as God in such a way that he does not make him another God, nor confess two, but one God, as is also said in the Law. For when Christ is proclaimed as God from God, this does not result in another God; because that which is from God does not allow itself to be called another God. For whether he is God, or what is from God, he is one God. For there is in fact no difference between God and that which is from God. Yet he is "another. He is "another" on account of the person by which he is called the Son; but he is the same on account of the unity of substance. Let it not seem blameworthy that I have said "person"; for some are accustomed to reject this. But let us follow the Apostle, who says: "For what I have forgiven, if I have forgiven anything, I have done so for your sakes, in the person of Christ" (2 Cor. 2:10).

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (Galatians 4:3) QUESTION 82. THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT THE PAGANS ARE SUBJECT TO THE ELEMENTS; WHAT, THEN, DOES THE APOSTLE MEAN WHEN HE SAYS, "WE TOO WERE IN BONDAGE UNDER THE ELEMENTS OF THIS WORLD"? (Gal. 4:3). IF, THEREFORE, THE JEWS ALSO WERE SERVING UNDER THE ELEMENTS, HOW WERE THEY DIFFERENT FROM THE PAGANS? — It is clear that by the addition, omission, or alteration of a single syllable the sense is distorted. Therefore it is known to all that the pagans worship the elements;

but the Jews did not worship the elements, rather they served God under the elements, on account of the new moons, and the sabbaths, and circumcision, and such things; for these are carnal. For whatever is visible is carnal and belongs to the elements. But because it was by the command of God, they were serving God, so that from the visible they might come to the invisible, and for this reason make progress to the reception of greater things, so that by meditating on these they might become worthy of spiritual promises. From that aspect, therefore, which I mentioned above, the Jews served under the elements; from another aspect they had a spiritual law, which both forbids sin and exhorts to the love of the Lord God, who was promised to come to them for the forgiveness of sins.

(Galatians 4:3)

QUESTION 59. THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT PAGANS ARE UNDER THE ELEMENTS. WHAT THEN DID THE APOSTLE MEAN WHEN HE SAID, "WE TOO WERE SERVING UNDER THE ELEMENTS OF THIS WORLD"? (Gal. 4:3) IF THEREFORE THE JEWS ALSO WERE UNDER THE ELEMENTS, HOW DO THEY DIFFER FROM THE PAGANS?

— The pagans do not serve under the elements, but the elements themselves. For they worship the stars, the sun, the moon, and the constellations in the firmament; and among the lower things, the earth and the water; in the sea, Neptune; in the underworld, Pluto: they openly worship the created world, while passing over the Creator. Now the Jews in this way served under the elements, yet they served God, who had given these very commands. For they observed the new moons, the sabbaths, the sacrifices of cattle; at the beginning of the seventh month they blow the trumpet, and on the fifteenth day of the seventh month they carry about palm-marrow and thick branches of trees and branches of willows, and dwell in booths for seven days. Therefore, as they observed these things, they are rightly said to have served under the elements; for these things are from the elements. Christians, however, do not serve under the elements, but above the elements they serve God, hurrying toward the heavenly Jerusalem; they adore God in spirit, not in visible and worldly things, but having the worship of God in the mind, serving the invisible in an invisible manner, as the Lord says in the Gospel:

"The hour is coming when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and in truth" (Jn. 4:23). This, then, is the truth: to serve God in spirit, in mind rather than in body, so that, because God is spirit, he may be worshiped spiritually. From this side he says that the Jews were subject under the elements, as I mentioned above; but from another side, the principle of the Law was spiritual, by which he both forbade sin and commanded that the Lord be loved with all the heart, and that hope be placed in Christ. But when the Apostles preached these things, they clung more strongly to what had been given carnally. The Apostle recalls these matters in order to stun the Jews, who, disapproving the spiritual Law, were subject to visible things; and to show that these are truly weak in comparison with the law of faith, he also indicates this by introducing his own person, who had once been their zealous imitator. But once he had come to know Christ, he judged these things

to be worthy of contempt, because the grace of God through Christ differs greatly from the Law of works.

(Galatians 4:12) 2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 60. WHEN THE APOSTLE SAYS TO THE GALATIANS, WHOM HE REBUKES AND REPROVES THROUGHOUT THE WHOLE EPISTLE, BE AS I AM, BECAUSE I AM AS YOU ARE (Gal. 4:12): IF THEREFORE HE HAD MADE HIMSELF SUCH AS THEY WERE, IT WAS UNNECESSARY TO SAY, BE AS I AM. OR PERHAPS IN SOME THINGS HE HAD BEGUN TO BE AN IMITATOR OF THEM, AND IN OTHERS HE WISHES THEM TO BECOME LIKE HIM? — What of theirs could the Apostle imitate? Or what was lacking to the teacher of the Gentiles? Rather, he exhorts them to be his imitators; and since it is not impossible, he reproves them in this way when he says, Because I am what you are: for you are human, just as I am; therefore do what I do. It can also be referred to that statement where he says that he became all things to all by agreeing with them in those points where they did not differ from the truth, especially the Gentiles (1 Cor. 9:22). For there was nothing of theirs, which ought no longer to be done, that had not previously been rightly done, such as circumcision, the observance of sabbaths, new moons, foods. But if he approved anything of the Gentiles, he did not show that it should still continue. For they say that the world was made by God and by men: this always stands. If therefore in these matters, by consenting to them, he was made as they were, he exhorts them that in a similar way they too should become as he is, agreeing with his doctrine.

(Galatians 5:17) 2ND CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 61. HOW ARE WE FREE IN CHOICE AND WILL, WHEN THE APOSTLE SAYS, “THE FLESH DESIRES AGAINST THE SPIRIT, AND THE SPIRIT AGAINST THE FLESH, SO THAT YOU DO NOT DO THE THINGS THAT YOU WOULD” (Gal. 5:17)? AND IF THE FLESH DESIRES AGAINST THE SPIRIT, IT IS EVIL. FOR THE SPIRIT SUGGESTS WHAT IS GOOD. — Do not understand “flesh” here as the substance of flesh, but as evil deeds and unbelief signified under the name of flesh. For since all error comes from visible and worldly things, and the flesh is akin to them, because it is composed of elements, he calls every error “flesh. He calls not only adulteries, fornications, and lusts the works of the flesh, but also idolatry, sorcery, blasphemies, and such things. Does the flesh compel to blasphemy or to idolatry? Are not these vices of the soul, when it consents to error? Yet he rightly says to those who act correctly that they are not in the flesh, but in the spirit. And yet they are in the body for this very purpose. Therefore, whoever walks well and does not despair of the hope of the faithful, though placed in the flesh, is said not to be in the flesh; but one who lives badly and is blasphemous is said to be in the flesh and to be flesh. For just as those who act well are spiritual even with the flesh, so those who live badly are carnal even with the soul itself. This is what he calls it.

This error, then, which he calls flesh, desires against the spirit, that is, it suggests evil things against that same spirit, which is the law of God. For he introduces two laws, that of God and that of the Devil. Therefore he says “spirit” because the law of God is spiritual,

to resist the flesh, that is, to resist the vices, so as to preserve a person for God; but the law of the Devil, which is error, opposes through the allurements of lust and the sweetness of worldly things. With these in conflict, the human being is in the middle: when he consents to the spirit, the flesh does not want it; but when he gives his hand to the flesh, he spurns the spirit, that is, he despises the law of God. Therefore, when he consents to the flesh, the spirit calls him back so that he does not do what he wishes; but when he agrees to the spirit, the flesh urges him not to do what he thinks beneficial. Yet the spirit rightly and sensibly resists and calls him back, so that it may snatch the person away from the counsels of Satan. But the flesh, which is the opposing law, therefore urges and resists the spirit of the law in order to deceive through trickery. The Apostle therefore proclaims this so as to show to human choice to which side it should commit its will, not to empty the freedom of choice, but to teach the will to which it should join itself.

If, however, there were no freedom of will, neither the law of the Devil, which is the flesh, nor the law of God, which is the spirit, by opposing one another, would press a person with their counsels. For whoever entices, persuades; and whoever persuades does not use force, but ensnares; and the one who is ensnared has his will changed by certain deceits. But if there were no free will, a person would, against his will, be dragged to those things which he does not want.

(Galatians 6:1) 2ND CATEGORY OT & NT

QUESTION 10. WHAT IS IT THAT THE APOSTLE SAYS TO THE GALATIANS: "I AM AMAZED THAT YOU ARE SO QUICKLY DESERTING HIM WHO CALLED YOU IN GRACE, FOR ANOTHER GOSPEL, WHICH IS NOT ANOTHER" (Gal. 1:6–7)? IF IT IS "ANOTHER," SURELY IT IS NOT THE SAME; IF IT IS NOT THE SAME, HOW IS IT NOT "ANOTHER"? — Therefore he calls it "another gospel" in relation to the gospel to which they had been called, because it is not the one that the Galatians later began to follow. For, led away from the Gospel of Christ, they had been drawn into Judaism under the name of Christ, as though that were what should be followed; and they affirmed something different from what the Apostle preached. Therefore the phrase is understood, "As they persuade you. For false apostles, when they were deceiving the believing Gentiles, claimed that what they themselves taught had been handed down by the Savior, as is contained in the Acts of the Apostles: "Unless you are circumcised according to the custom of Moses, you cannot be saved" (Acts 15:1). Moved by grief at their downfall, the Apostle writes to them, saying: "I am amazed that you are so quickly deserting him who called you in grace, for another gospel, which is not another. (Gal. 1:6-7) He is amazed because, after something light and less burdensome, they were striving after harshness and burden:

that is, that after the simplicity of faith they allowed themselves to be circumcised for the sake of the elements, that they observed new moons and the sabbath; they were subjected and driven by the elements, that is, to grace, not to the works of the Law. And lest he seem to have given the false apostles an opening, by allowing them to say that what the Galatians had received was different from what the tradition of truth holds, he immediately adds:

"Which is not another, except that there are some who trouble you and want to distort the gospel of Christ. (Gal. 1:7) So, the gospel to which they had been called by the Apostle was different from what they began to follow under the influence of the false apostles; yet it was not different from what Christ had handed down, so that by this they might recognize that they had been led into error, and follow faith alone, confessing Christ as God and that he is sufficient to grant salvation, through whom they had obtained the remission of sins, and not through the Law: for without the Law, the grace of God forgives sins.

COLOSSIANS (Colossians 2:3) 2ND CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 62. IF IN CHRIST ALL THE TREASURES OF WISDOM AND KNOWLEDGE ARE HIDDEN (Colossians 2:3), HOW IS IT THAT THE SAME SAVIOR SAYS HE DOES NOT KNOW THE DAY AND HOUR OF THE FUTURE JUDGMENT (Mark 13:32)? BUT IF HE DOES KNOW AND SAYS HE DOES NOT KNOW, HE SEEMS TO BE LYING. — This statement contains a twofold meaning. For when it says that in Christ all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden, it means that whoever has Christ yields to Him as to all wisdom and knowledge: so that to know Christ is entirely to know, and to have comprehended all wisdom. As it is said to the Colossians: "Let no one deceive you through philosophy and empty seduction, according to the elements of this world and not according to Christ; for in Christ dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. (Col. 2:8-9) That is, that the one who believes in Christ needs nothing for salvation, but rather abounds in this; because the fullness of the Godhead is in his faith. And again, in the same Epistle, among other things he says: "Let no one seduce you into lowliness of heart and into the worship of angels, which he has seen, exalting himself, vainly puffed up by the mind of his flesh, and not holding fast to the head, from whom the whole body, supplied and knit together, grows with a growth that is from God" (Col. 2:8–9, 18–19).

Therefore, if those who believe in Christ venerate Him as the head of every principality and power, they need nothing else, but have everything that is necessary for salvation; it will not harm them to be ignorant of lower things which contribute nothing to salvation, when they know what is necessary. Those, then, are said to know everything in this sense, who know that which profits them for salvation. There is also this: that in the Savior all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden. For all the mysteries of the Father are known to Him; and He measures every creature; and not even the Father judges anyone, but has given all judgment to the Son (Jn. 5:22); and no one knows the things that are in God except the Spirit of God (1 Cor. 2:11), who is also the Spirit of Christ. How then can He be said not to know the day and hour of the future judgment, whose Spirit knows the things that are in God, of whom He said that the Spirit has received from Him (Jn. 16:14–15)? If therefore the One who has received from Him knows the things that are to come, how will Christ not know, He who sent the Holy Spirit? And can it be that a judge does not know the day of the future judgment, especially since He has given all the signs by which it may be expected? Perhaps also those are truly said to be unknown to Him, to whom He says:

"Amen, I say to you, I do not know you" (Matt. 25:12). Nor will the foolish and careless virgins be said to be known, because He also said, when they themselves were saying, "Lord, Lord, open to us," "Amen, I say to you, I do not know you. The reason, then, why He says He does not know what He knows is this. Finally, He says: "Watch, because you do not know at what hour your Lord is coming" (Matt. 24:42). Therefore, in order to make us careful and watchful, when He was questioned He said that He did not know the day and hour of the future judgment; but, so that it might be for our benefit, He denied knowing what He knows. Since we, in our ignorance of what is good for us, absolutely want to know something which, if we knew it, would harm us, Christ, the provider of our salvation, said He did not know, lest we should hear what would be against us. If someone who possesses a sword is asked for it by a person in pain, so that he may kill himself, and he replies that he does not have it, is he to be accused of lying because he denies what, if he did not deny it, he would know to have the opposite effect?

PHILIPPIANS (Philippians 2:17) 2ND CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 63. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT, ALTHOUGH THE APOSTLES HEALED ALL THE AILMENTS BROUGHT BEFORE THEM, THEY DID NOT GIVE HEALING TO THEIR OWN INFIRMITIES? FOR EPAPHRODITUS CERTAINLY WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN SICK ALMOST TO DEATH (Philippians 2:27), IF THE APOSTLE'S INTERCESSION HAD BEEN HEARD. WHO COULD DOUBT THAT THE APOSTLE OFTEN PRAYED FOR THIS AND DID NOT OBTAIN IT? FOR IF HE HAD BEEN HEARD, THE SICKNESS WOULD IMMEDIATELY HAVE BEEN TAKEN AWAY. — Signs and wonders were therefore performed by the Apostles so that unbelief might be compelled to faith; so that, seeing deeds that are impossible for men, people might recognize from this that the preaching is of God, and prove by power that there is reason in the faith. Since words are always contradicted, a confirming power has been set as witness, and when words yield to that power, it shows that there is reason in faith which cannot be expressed in words. Among the faithful, therefore, signs and wonders are no longer necessary, but firm hope. For once it is learned that the promises are true, the soul arms itself for this purpose: that, despising present things, it may be found worthy of future ones, laying up merit for itself through labor. This is attested by Solomon, who says: "My son, when you come to the service of God, stand in righteousness and fear, and prepare your soul for temptation" (Sirach 2:1). Since man advances through temptations, these warnings are given. Therefore the Apostle says:

"Through tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of God" (Acts 14:21). These trials of tribulation occur in various ways, so that a persevering soul in the faith it has received may be crowned. For man is tempted not only in faith, but also in sickness, in loss, in persecution, and in the death of loved ones, so that if in these sufferings he is not drawn to seek the help of demons, he may obtain martyrdom without the shedding of blood. The Apostle therefore did not fail to obtain what he asked for Epaphroditus to his disadvantage,

but to his progress: because in his own case, when he had requested, he heard, "My grace is sufficient for you; for power is made perfect in weakness" (2 Cor. 12:9).

(Philippians 2:27) 2ND CATEGORY OT & NT QUESTION 11. THE APOSTLE PAUL INDICATES THAT WE MUST NOT BE GRIEVED OVER THE DEAD (1 Thess. 4:12). FOR IT IS THOSE WHO DESPAIR WHO ARE GRIEVED; AND HE HIMSELF SAYS ABOUT EPAPHRODITUS, "HE WAS SICK, NEAR TO DEATH, BUT GOD HAD MERCY ON HIM; AND NOT ONLY ON HIM, BUT ALSO ON ME, SO THAT I SHOULD NOT HAVE SORROW UPON SORROW" (Phil. 2:27). — How does he forbid grief, when he declares that he himself would have had to grieve if he had died? He meant that he would have had to grieve in one way if the death of Epaphroditus had come to pass, and yet in another way he forbids grief. For here he said he would have been grieved if he had died because of the comfort of his assistance, which he was using in the Gospel. But he forbids us to grieve in such a way that we mourn the dead as though they were extinguished and lost, despairing of the resurrection. It is one thing, therefore, to seek the comfort of someone as if absent, and another to lament the destruction of someone who will not be in the future. Here comfort ceases; there despair is excluded.

1 PETER (1 Peter 2:21) 2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 64. THE APOSTLE PETER SAYS, "CHRIST DIED FOR YOU" (1 Pet. 2:21). BUT THE APOSTLE PAUL DECLARES THAT HE ALSO DIED FOR HIMSELF: "HE BECAME OBEDIENT UNTO DEATH; WHEREFORE GOD HAS GIVEN HIM A NAME WHICH IS ABOVE EVERY NAME" (Phil. 2:8–9). IF THIS IS SO, HE WOULD APPEAR TO HAVE BEEN IMPERFECT, SINCE HE GAINED INCREASE THROUGH HIS WORKS. — No believer doubts that the Son of God was born perfect from God. For in being born of God the Father he received all the fullness of the Father's divinity. Then, at that moment, he received the name that is above every name, that is, that he should be called what the Father is: God. For nothing is said to be future for him; he has all things before himself. Therefore he was born for the creation and restoration of all these things. Indeed, proper order and reason require that every knee should bend to the paternal name. The Father gave this to the Son on account of what he was going to do; yet he gave it when he begot him. For he begot him in such a way that he should be in the same honor in which the Father himself is.

REVELATION 1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT (Revelation 10:8)

QUESTION 72. WHEN IT IS READ IN THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN: "GO," HE SAYS, "AND TAKE THE BOOK FROM THE HAND OF THE ANGEL, AND DEVOUR IT, AND IT WILL MAKE YOUR BELLY BITTER, BUT IN YOUR MOUTH IT WILL BE SWEET AS HONEY" (Rev. 10:8–9): WHAT IS THIS BOOK THAT MAKES THE BELLY BITTER WHILE IT IS SWEET? — All the divine volumes are bitter, but to the faithless and to the carnal. For it is displeasing to idolaters when they hear that one God is preached in Christ. And Photinus likewise is afraid, seized with horror. Sabellius too is ashamed when he hears that the Father is such that he cannot be called the Son, because all things are from him; and that the Son is therefore called Son, because he is certainly not the Father

himself, but is from the Father, and not the one "from whom" but the one "through whom" are all things. Arius also is refuted when he reads that Christ is truly the Son of God; for without doubt he could not be called "true" unless he were properly from God. Marcion too is convicted, learning that the Word was made flesh, he who thinks that flesh must be denied of Christ. Likewise the wicked Manichaean is reproved, seeing written by the Evangelist that the Savior not only graced the vows of marriage by his presence, but even honored them with cups of wine (Jn. 2:1–11), he who blocks the entrance to marriage and urges immoral intercourse.

These things are contained in the book which the Apostle received to devour. This book is the Gospel entitled "according to John," which is bitter not only to those who think wrongly, but also to the undisciplined who do not wish to be corrected, so that they may advance to what is worse. This revelation took place at the time when the Apostle John was on the island of Patmos, banished there by the Emperor Domitian for the sake of the faith. Then he was in the Spirit, so that he could see heavenly things; and while there were shown to him those things which will be, on account of wickedness and fornication and the rest, there was given to him a book which indeed was sweet in the mouth but made the belly bitter: so that, from among those who seem to be the one body of a single man, it might be sweet to those who are signified in the mouth, because, on account of their integrity of profession, they are indicated there; for this is what is sweet in the mouth, that which is one: but bitter to those who, with heretical perversity, live or think carnally, who on that account are signified in the belly. For it will accuse them in the day of God's judgment. After the revelation, therefore, he was ordered to write the Gospel, on account of these things we have mentioned above.

And something similar was said to the prophet Ezekiel, that he should receive a book which would be sweet in his mouth, when he was sent to rebuke the faithlessness of the people (Ezek. 3:1).

(Revelation 10:8)

QUESTION 65. WHEN IT IS READ IN THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN: "GO," HE SAYS, "AND TAKE THE BOOK FROM THE HAND OF THE ANGEL, AND DEVOUR IT, AND IT WILL MAKE YOUR BELLY BITTER, BUT IN YOUR MOUTH IT WILL BE SWEET AS HONEY" (Rev. 10:8–9): WHAT IS THIS BOOK THAT MAKES THE BELLY BITTER WHILE IT IS SWEET? — Very often, one who seeks brevity is accustomed to err. Why is it that you do not present everything that was spoken for the purpose at hand, but suppress some things so that the meaning becomes more obscure? For it was said to John: "Go and take the book that is in the hand of the angel, and devour it; and it will be in your mouth sweet as honey, but it will make your belly bitter. And he said: "You must," he says, "prophesy again before many peoples and nations. Therefore, as far as the reasoning of truth is concerned, he is proved to have written the Gospel after the exile. For while in exile on the island of Patmos, to which he had been banished by the Emperor Domitian, he saw the revelation, as he says, on the Lord's day; afterwards, as I said, he wrote the Gospel,

which is bitter to heretics, who are signified in the belly. For they are carnal, because they understand Christ wrongly. "But in your mouth," he says, "it will be sweet as honey":

as though he were making of all Christians one body, so that individuals are members one of another, such that in the mouth, which is, of course, a part of the head, he signifies the more honorable and more faithful, for whom the truth concerning Christ is sweet; in the belly he signifies the heretics, because they are carnal. For the truth that speaks of Christ as true God is bitter to them. The whole Gospel of John is indeed against heretics. Against Photinus, who denies that Christ existed before Mary, he proves that the Savior descended from heaven. Against Arius, moreover, he shows that Christ has no beginning: because "in the beginning" Christ the Son of God was God with God the Father, and because nothing was made without him, he himself cannot be called a creature. For if he were a creature, something would have been made without him; but because nothing was without him, he always existed. Sabellius, however, who accepts a merging of Father and Son so that one individual is called by two names, he refutes in this way, when he says: "If you loved me, you would indeed rejoice, because I go to the Father, for the Father is greater than I" (Jn. 14:28); where he made clear the persons of two, when the Son calls the Father greater. For the single one is not greater than himself. He likewise convicts Marcion, who denies the flesh of Christ. For he said: "And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us" (Jn. 1:14).

With this meaning he also reproves Manichaeus, who does not know that Christ came in the flesh and blocks the entrance to marriage, ignorant that the Savior rewarded the marriage feast. In like manner it was said also to the prophet Ezekiel by the angel that he should take a scroll (Ezek. 3:1) and devour it, and it would be sweet in his mouth but would fill his belly. This was said to the prophet when he was sent to reprove a faithless and undisciplined people, who likewise are signified in the belly because they were carnal. From these are those whom Scripture in the prophet Isaiah, though they are evil, nevertheless calls brothers. For it says: "You who fear God, say to those who hate you and have not heard my precepts, 'You are our brothers'" (Isa. 66:5, according to the LXX).

POLEMIC 1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 102. AGAINST NOVATIAN. — His disciples say to Jesus, "Lord, do you want us to say that fire should come down from heaven and consume them, as Elijah did? And the Lord answered them, saying, "You do not know of what spirit you are. For the Son of Man did not come to destroy souls, but to save them" (Luke 9:54–56). Although it was certainly fitting to take revenge on the Samaritans who did not receive him, nevertheless the Lord, who came to grant mercy, removed the sentence, so that those who were corrected afterwards might be changed. And the prophet Elisha, angered at the boys who insulted him, took vengeance on them with God as judge, so that in that place they were eaten by bears, where there is said to be no forest (2 Kings 2:23–24); but the Lord spared the prostitute who was brought before him, namely the one whom the leaders of the Jews said they had caught in adultery (Jn. 8:11), so that, since a loving declaration had begun, he might teach that she was not to be condemned, but pardoned. For the Law given through

Moses, because it had justice directed to revenge, exercised severity in its beginnings. It took funeral revenge on the man who went out to gather wood on the sabbath (Num. 15:32–36); and similarly took punishment on the son of the Egyptian woman who had blasphemed God (Lev. 24:10–14); and in the matter of the molten calf struck the sons of Israel (Exod. 32:27).

Each Law, then, in its very beginnings shows its full character: the old Law, because it was more ready to punish, appeared harsher in its early days, so that by instilling fear it might make its hearers diligent and watchful. But the new Law, because it is loving and inclined easily to mercy, showed its beginnings as most gentle and most compassionate, so that by this very charm and love it might call all to forgiveness. Afterwards, however, even that Law which seemed harsher, on account of the frailty of the human race, not only softened its severity, but also showed itself humane and loving, and this Law which seemed gentle at times took vengeance. For Ananias and his wife Sapphira were struck down by God (Acts 5:5, 10). And Elymas the magician, unbelieving and opposing the law of God, was blinded by the judgment and power of the Lord (Acts 13:8–11). And King Herod, because he did not give honor to the God of heaven, was struck by an angel of God and, swelling with worms, breathed his last (Acts 12:23). Lest, because mercy is preached, people should think there is absolutely no punishment and that they may sin with freedom, fear was imposed, showing that forgiveness of sins is given for this purpose: that, as if brought to life from the dead, they should afterwards abstain from the contrary things, so that it may be brought about that no one departs from here with guilt, because there will be a coming to judgment.

For the sentence in which each person dies is what is credited to him. Since, therefore, the new Law has the fullness of mercy, lest it be treated with contempt by lovers of sin, it took vengeance on the above-mentioned persons. The old Law, though given for vengeance, nevertheless pardoned some, lest it be called wholly cruel; but it took vengeance on many, because its disposition is ready to punish. Without doubt, then, the grace of the new Law is greater than that of the old. If, therefore, the grace is greater, how is it denied that this Law can grant what that Law granted, which had less grace? For the former was more inclined to severity. Therefore, if that Law is proved to have forgiven the repentant, how can it be that this Law, which is gentle, does not receive the repentant? For even the Jews were called sons of God, who, as we read on the authority of the apostle Paul, were baptized through Moses in the cloud and in the sea (1 Cor. 10:2). Indeed, they are known to have been purified as they were about to receive the Law, so that afterwards they might give an account of the Law they had received, and if they sinned, they might reform themselves through repentance; as the Lord says through the prophet Isaiah, “Do penance, you who err, and be converted” (Isa. 45:22). But perhaps, on the contrary, it is said: Repentance indeed was preached, but not remission.

If, therefore, repentance has been preached by God, there will be fruit for those doing repentance. For the Lord would not admonish this in vain. Moreover, since the Lord knew that remission of sins must be given to the converted, he commanded this; for he said, “I do not

desire the death of the sinner, only that he be converted and live" (Ezek. 18:32). And therefore there is fruit of repentance, as has become clear, for those who are converted to God. Therefore, the assertion wickedly fabricated by Novatian is excluded, by which he overturns the meaning of the Lord's words, saying, "The Lord said, Whoever shall deny me, I also will deny him" (Matt. 10:33); so that if any Christian, for whatever reason, has denied, he can no longer return, or certainly, if he does return, he is in no way received. And where, then, is the repentance that has been enjoined? When the Savior, after having pronounced this sentence, did not deny the apostle Peter who had denied him. Why? Because, with repentance following, he wept bitterly over his sin (Matt. 26:75), knowing, of course, that forgiveness is granted to those who are converted, and that they are reformed through repentance. But Novatian pretends that repentance is to be done. Because he does not openly dare to deny that repentance should be granted, being limited by the Law, he strives subtly to frustrate it.

For when he says that whoever has denied will by no means have pardon, but will himself be denied before the angels of God, how does he not deceitfully profess that repentance is to be done? From this his fraud clearly appears, when he adds, saying, "Whoever shall sin against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither here nor in the future" (Matt. 12:32). Although one cause is that by which there is sin against the Holy Spirit, and another to deny the Lord Jesus, Novatian, nevertheless, in order to deny pardon for this sin, wants there to be one and the same meaning for the one who denies the Lord and for the one who sins against the Holy Spirit, so that by this fudging he may cut off the fruit of repentance. For if denying the Lord is the same as having sinned against the Holy Spirit, there is no pardon to be hoped for by those who deny, nor any fruit of repentance; because this sin, neither here nor in the future, the Lord's oracles have promised to remit. From this it becomes clear that Novatian speaks deceitfully when he says that penance must be done. For why should one repent, if it is denied that the sin can be removed? For the sighs, tears, and weeping of repentance obtain this: that it both merits pardon and restoration. Therefore David, repenting and confessing his sin, both obtained forgiveness (2 Kings 12:13) and was restored to his former state;

for he remained king and afterwards prophesied. This is clearly proven: for in the fiftieth Psalm he repented, and afterwards, having suffered persecution from his son, he prophesied. For the third Psalm according to the historical order is after the fiftieth. But perhaps it will be said that a king had to be forgiven, whereas the lowly must not be forgiven, although it seems that it is rather more difficult to forgive those who are more powerful. For God does not regard the person of a man (Rom. 2:11). The higher one is, the more, even if his sin is slight, it is a grave crime. For just as humility in a powerful man is lofty and noble, so also his fault must be regarded as a crime. Except for those sins which are clearly unlawful for all, not everything is permitted to the powerful that is allowed to the lowly. For it is disgraceful for a man of rank to bargain in trade, and entering a tavern is noteworthy. For senators, lending at interest is a disgrace. If therefore in these lesser matters they are found worthy of censure, how much more must they be held guilty if they sin? From this, then,

it appears that David sinned very grievously, and in fact in a twofold way. Yet, when he turned back, he obtained forgiveness for both murder and adultery, and what is more, he was reformed with tears.

For when he was rebuked by the prophet Nathan, he did not dare hide his sin, but confessed it, saying, I have sinned against the Lord. Then the prophet answered and said, The Lord has taken away your sin, and you shall not die, because you have repented. And because he is afterwards found to have prophesied, there is no doubt that he was restored. For also Ahab, rebuked by the prophet because of the death of Naboth, went about weeping, and tore his garments, and girded himself with sackcloth; and the word of the Lord came by the hand of His servant Elijah concerning Ahab, and the Lord said: Have you seen how Ahab is moved before my face? I will not bring the evil upon him in his days (1 Kings 21:27–29). And when the Ninevites wept for their sins, with death awaiting, their life was restored (Jonah 3:10). See how great is the progress of repentance. But perhaps it may be said in reply: Repentance was granted indeed, but not for the crime of idolatry; although these sins are grave, the crime of idolatry is greater. Nevertheless, Novatian's assertion is rightly overthrown in no small part, since two grave crimes appear to have been granted to repentance. For if fornication ought not to be forgiven, as Novatian thinks, how much less murder or adultery? Yet here his vanity is evident, since those sins which are more serious are shown to have been forgiven.

Therefore now it must be asked whether God has promised that forgiveness can be granted even to idolaters. For whatever has not been lawfully granted here cannot be granted in the future. For here, as the Lord said, sins are either bound or loosed (Matt. 16:19); but in the future there will be nothing else but reward or condemnation. For everyone who is lawfully rejected here cannot be chosen or judged worthy in the future. Let us therefore hear what the Lord says about idolaters to the prophet Jeremiah: Go and say, he says, Return to me, backsliding Israel, says the Lord, and I will not set my face against you: for I am merciful, says the Lord, and I will not be angry with you forever. Nevertheless acknowledge your iniquity: you have acted wickedly, and have scattered your ways to strangers under every green tree (Jer. 3:12–13). See what God promises to those who, after their fall, turn back to Him, that after apostasy He will forgive their sins when they return. And again God says through Jeremiah: My delicate ones have walked rough ways, they were led as a flock plundered by enemies. Be steadfast, children, and cry out to God; your memory will be remembered in your captivity. For as your mind was to stray from God, being converted you will seek Him ten times as much. For He who brought evils upon you will bring upon you eternal joy with your salvation (Baruch 4:26–29). O the mercy of God!

How He calls upon those who have fallen to rise up again! How He urges them, after the error of idols, to return to Him! Like a kindly father, He promises His children everlasting joy of salvation if they correct themselves. Likewise in the same prophet among other things: And I will restore them to this land, and I will build them up and not destroy; and I will plant them and not pluck them up (Jer. 24:6). Since He had threatened and said, Who-

ever sacrifices to gods shall be rooted out, sinners against God might despair of themselves, as though those who had sacrificed to idols, once uprooted, could not be planted again; He encourages them that, if they repent, they can be restored to their former state. For the sentence remains only if the sin is not corrected. Therefore it was proclaimed to the Ninevites that after three days their city would be overthrown. Why after three days, except that either they might repent and the sentence be lifted, or, remaining as they were, they would perish more justly? This is what He said through the prophet, I do not will the death of the dying, only that he should turn back and live. Therefore it came about that, though the Ninevites were destined to die because of their sins, they were forgiven when repentance followed.

For what reason do we find the ark being built for a hundred years in the time of Noah (Gen. 5:31; 7:6), if not that, seeing and hearing what was coming, they might change themselves? For God wills no one to perish. Therefore it is that we read in Solomon: For, he says, the Most High has mercy on those who repent (Sirach 12:3). And again, You have mercy on all, because You can do all things, and You overlook the sins of men for the sake of repentance (Wis. 11:24). In this sense the Lord also, grieving over the treachery of the Jews, says: "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, you who kill the prophets and stone those sent to you; how often I wanted to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her chicks under her wings, and you were unwilling" (Matt. 23:37)! Therefore the Lord always, throughout the whole Law, urges sinners to turn back to Him, not wishing His workmanship to be accountable to destruction; since there was no other reason for the giving of the Law than that men might be turned from error to the truth. Yet in such a way that in the New Testament the Author of the Law appears more merciful, because at the time when He agreed to reveal the mystery of His Son, our Lord, He willed to be more generous and abundant in mercy, so that there might be more grace when the Son preached than there had been when the servants preached. And not without reason:

for it was fitting that greater gifts should be bestowed through the Son than through the servants. Accordingly, to those who turn to Him in faith He grants all sins together, without any preceding cry of penance. Therefore the Apostle Paul says: "For the gifts and the calling of God are without repentance" (Rom. 11:29). Afterwards, however, if they sin, they can deserve pardon through penance; so that, because they have sinned after receiving free mercy, they may no longer obtain it freely, but may reach forgiveness with intervening groans and tears. For it is impossible for a man not to sin. Therefore the Apostle John says: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness" (1 Jn. 1:8). Therefore David deserved pardon and renewal when he confessed his sin. John the Apostle is certainly speaking to Christians. For he says in what follows: "My little children, I write these things to you so that you may not sin; and if anyone sins, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ" (1 Jn. 2:1). He says this so that, if we sin after Baptism, we may humbly ask the Advocate to plead with the Father for us. For if among our ancestors

penance had its place, how can it be that in this time it has no place, when the preaching shows greater mercy?

And He who had mercy on His enemies by calling them to grace, will He not have mercy on His friends now that they are His, along with a reward? For the tribulation of the heart is the reward of the repentant. If what you say were true, men would grieve that they have been made friends from being enemies. Or what sort of person must He be thought to be, if He gave mercy to enemies who do not repent, but did not give it to friends who do? Moreover, since the Lord knows that the Devil exalts himself and rages more fiercely against the friends and servants of God, where the Apostle Peter says: "Be watchful and sober, because your adversary the Devil, like a roaring lion, goes about seeking whom he may devour" (1 Pet. 5:8), since, then, the Lord knows that we have a dreadful and powerful adversary, if we are overcome by him, He wills us to flee to His help, grieving that we have been cast down, so that, restored by His power, we may fight back bravely. For just as, unless those days which the Lord mentions were shortened (Matt. 24:22), no flesh would be saved, so also, if repentance is denied to men, no one can be saved. For "no one," he says, "can boast that he has a pure heart" (Prov. 20:9); and elsewhere, "No one is without stain, not even an infant of one day" (Job 14:4). Who then will be able to escape, if repentance is denied?

And where is that saying of the Lord, that "there will be joy in heaven over one sinner who repents" (Luke 15:7)? "But more serious crimes," you say, "must not be forgiven, fornication and idolatry. And where is the saying of the Lord in which He promises that all sins and blasphemies will be forgiven to men, "but the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven to men" (Matt. 12:31)? He declares that absolutely all sins can be forgiven, except one. Now choose, Novatian, of whom you wish this to be understood: of those who do not yet believe, or of those who already believe. If of unbelievers, how is forgiveness of sins given, when it is clear that all, before they believe, sin against God and against the Holy Spirit? For some call the deeds of the Lord magical arts, assigning the work of the Holy Spirit to demons. But if you wish it to be said of believers, your statement is excluded, since He says that all sins will be forgiven: "And whoever speaks a word against the Son of Man, it will be forgiven him. Therefore, whether one sins against God or against Christ, it will be forgiven to men. For He has included all sins, except that against the Holy Spirit. Therefore He does not wish that sin which is committed against God to be understood as the same as that against the Holy Spirit; for if this were so, He would not have excepted it.

Since therefore He signifies another kind of sin when the Holy Spirit is blasphemed (for this saying refers to the person, not to the nature, of the Holy Spirit), all sins will be forgiven, either to those who already believe through penance, or to those who shall believe through Baptism. But that the Jews sinned against the Holy Spirit has another cause, belonging to that time. Therefore He shows that this will not be forgiven them, neither here nor in the future. For they did not sin against the Holy Spirit through error, but through hatred. Knowing and understanding that the works they saw in the deeds of the Saviour were of God, in order to turn the people away from faith in Him, they pretended that these were

of the prince of demons. Therefore it is that the Lord says to them: "You have taken away the key of knowledge; you yourselves do not enter, and you hinder those who are entering" (Luke 11:52) Therefore this statement is made against the spiteful, for whom no remedy can be found so that they may be saved. For nothing is more serious than this crime: it pretends that what one knows to be true is false. For the Jews, who appeared to be under God's law and to whom the promise of Christ had been made, seeing the great works and understanding that this was what God had promised, were blinded by envy so that they denied this was so;

and not only did they deny it, but they also persecuted it even to death. It is therefore not right that this sin should ever be forgiven to those who, with their own conscience as witness, dared to resist the God to whom they said they were devoted. Now there are different reasons why one sins against God or against Christ. Either someone, envying another's happiness, rises up against the Creator out of the pain of his own abasement; or, having suddenly suffered some adverse event, stirred to anger, he becomes disrespectful toward his Father. But the incarnation of Christ itself also provokes offense. For while people are ignorant of the mystery of the incarnate Christ, they blaspheme, considering it unworthy that the Son of God, who is of incorporeal and simple nature, should be said to have been born in the manner of men. They therefore blaspheme because they are ignorant of the mystery. Wherefore a helping hand must be extended to such people when they are converted, because they oppose the truth in such a way that they think they are acting for the truth. A person of this kind, once tortured and torn by the nails, declares to be true what he had persecuted. The aforementioned Jews, however, thought one thing and did another, and without judge and executioner they are always tormented by their own conscience as witness. For the one who, through error, has been an enemy of the truth, when he is converted rejoices that he has come to know the truth;

but the spiteful man has nothing to correct: for if he were to turn back, he would begin to say that true which he previously did not know to be false. But as for an injury being done to the Holy Spirit, no cause exists: for his office produces no offense, since he appears in the power of signs and wonders. For who would dare hiss against him, seeing the dead raised? Or who would be angry with him, when through his effect he sees the paralyzed running, the blind receiving sight, the deaf hearing? Or how could he not love him, whom he sees casting out unclean spirits, cleansing lepers, and at the same time healing all diseases? The Jews preferred to do him an injury, saying that his work was the work of demons, provided only that, acting out their envy and hatred against the Savior, they could satisfy them. For this reason he shows that this sin is forgiven them neither here nor in the future. But Novatian says, More serious crimes are proved by name to be forgiven, that is, idolatry and fornication after the washing. For this reason, he says, all sins are forgiven at once in Baptism, so that thereafter, if they commit anything serious, they may in no way obtain pardon; because after the Holy Spirit has been received, nothing that is against the Holy Spirit ought to be committed. Who would deny that one ought never to sin, if it were possible?

But since God knows the human race is weak, he has always followed them with saving remedies so that, after sins, they might have a way to be restored. If, however, the Spirit once given forbids repentance to be granted to those who sin, there is no providence in the New Testament, and it will seem that better provision was made for those of old, to whom this remedy was by no means denied. And how is grace greater in the New than in the Old? For such a view belongs to an enemy, who, knowing that people cannot otherwise be provided for so as to attain salvation than by the intervention of repentance, grants the Holy Spirit in such a way that, if any injury be done to him through some fear or through some error, then satisfaction has no place for the reforming of a person: this is to have sought an opportunity to destroy people, not to save them. But perish the thought, since the Lord says, The Son of Man came not to destroy souls, but to save (Luke 9:56). For if, when we sin against one another, God has commanded that our sins be forgiven one another, if we turn back, seventy times seven (Matt. 18:22), how much more does he himself, if one sins against him, forgive those who are converted? For he wills every sinner to be converted.

Therefore the Apostle proves that forgiveness was granted to fornicators and the unclean, saying, Lest, when I come again, my God should humble me among you, and I should mourn for many of those who have sinned before, and have not repented of the uncleanness and fornication which they have committed (2 Cor. 12:21). He proves that some have done penance, for whom he does not grieve, but rejoices; but he indicates that some have not done penance for their fornication, and therefore he says that he mourns for them as not belonging to life, because they have not done penance. For if, in the case of such a crime, penance were to be done continually throughout this life, he would not say that he mourns for them because they have not done penance, but because they are not doing it. But knowing that penance both begins and is completed here, he says, because they have not done penance. For this is what he wanted, that when he came to them he might have peace in communion with them. Here, then, it has been proved that those who have committed fornication are to be admitted to communion after they have done penance. For they cannot be admitted to communion as long as they continue to commit the sin; but they are to be admitted when they cease from it, in accordance with the judgment of the Church. Now it remains to see whether we can prove that idolatry in particular can be forgiven.

For we read in the Apocalypse of the blessed Apostle John that penance is preached even for idolatry. For the bishops, whom he calls angels, that is, messengers, as also the blessed Apostle Paul says, You received me as an angel of God (Gal. 4:14), are admonished to grant penance to those who sin, and not to allow those who cause scandals in the Church to be in no way admonished, since they too belong to the Church. He therefore says, And to the angel of the Church in Pergamum write: Therefore says he who has the sharp two-edged sword, I know where you dwell, where Satan's throne is; and you hold fast my name, and you did not deny my faith even in the days of Antipas my faithful witness, who was killed among you, where Satan dwells. But I have a few things against you, because you have there those who hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balak to place a stumbling block before the eyes of the sons of Israel, to eat things sacrificed, and to commit fornication; so

you also have those who hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans. Likewise, do penance. (Rev. 2:12-16) He says that this is the doctrine of the Nicolaitans which was also that of Balaam, that is, idolatry and fornication, for which he commands that penance be done. And because he speaks to the people of the Church, he shows this by saying, "These things says the Spirit to the Churches.

And as for what the fruit of penance is, he indicates it therefore: "To the one who conquers," he says, "I will give to eat of the manna which is hidden"; (Rev. 2:17) so that by penance he may, as it were, conquer sins. For what is it to repent, if not to be grieved for past deeds, and from this time to abstain from those things which one has committed? "And to the angel of the Church in Thyatira write: These things says the Son of God, who has eyes like a flame of fire, and whose feet are like Tyrian brass: I know your works, and love, and faith, and ministry, and patience, and your works, the last of which are better than the first. But I have against you that you allow the woman Jezebel, who calls herself a prophetess, and teaches and seduces my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed to idols. And I gave her time to repent, and she was not willing to do penance for her fornication. Behold, I will cast her into a bed; and those who commit adultery with her into great tribulation, unless they do penance for their deeds; and I will kill her children with death; and all the Churches shall know that I am he who searches reins and hearts; and I will give to each of you according to his works.

But to you I say, and to the rest who are in Thyatira, who do not have this doctrine and do not know the depths of Satan, as they say, I will put upon you no other burden; only hold fast what you have until I come. But to the one who conquers and keeps my works unto the end, I will give authority over the nations" (Rev. 2:12–26). Under a single letter given to the Church of Thyatira he confuses and utterly rejects the double error of the Novatian heresy: for he promises fruit even to those doing penance on account of idolatry, and in one Church he shows that the wicked do not contaminate the good, though they were of one and the same communion; for he was not writing to those placed outside the Church when he said, "He who has ears, let him hear what the Spirit says to the Churches. (Rev. 2:29) In a similar way the Apostle Paul says, "For we know that whatever the Law says, it speaks to those who are under the Law" (Rom. 3:19). And in another place, "For what have I to do with judging those who are outside? (1 Cor. 5:12). Therefore, men of one and the same Church he partly calls to penance, and partly praises, saying, "But to you I say, and to the rest who are in Thyatira, whoever of you do not have this doctrine, that is, of idolatry, hold fast what you have until I come";

(Rev. 2:24-25) that is, persevere unto the end, because "he who perseveres unto the end, this one shall be saved" (Matt. 10:22). Likewise, the one who perseveres in evil shall be condemned. And therefore, just as the righteousness of the righteous will not free him on the day when he goes astray, so the iniquity of the unrighteous will not harm him when he is converted. Therefore it was said, "He who sacrifices to gods shall be rooted out"; (Exod. 22:20) but if he is converted, "he shall surely live. So also is that saying of the Lord, "Whoever

denies me, I will deny him" (Matt. 33). But if he is converted, he cannot be denied by the one whom he confesses. From this it is that he said in the Psalm, "In your sight no living man shall be justified" (Ps. 142:2). For this sentence is assigned to a man in which he dies. For since within the Church the wicked were to be with the good until the judgment of God, God himself indicated this, saying, "The kingdom of heaven is like a net cast into the sea, which gathers fish of every kind. When it was full, they brought it to shore; and they chose the good into their vessels, but cast the bad away. So it shall be at the end of the age: the angels will come out and will separate from the kingdom of God all offenses and those who do iniquity" (Matt. 13:47–49).

This situation is also signified in that man who was found among the guests not having a wedding garment (Matt. 22:12–13): he shows that he alone was cast out from the company of the Church, because the crime of his unworthiness did not defile the others; and because this unworthiness of his was made evident by the fact that he did not have a wedding garment, he was revealed to the others. For they saw that he was clothed differently among them. From this comes what the Apostle Paul says: "In a great house there are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and clay" (2 Tim. 2:20). He set this forth because of Hymenaeus and Philetus, who, though they were of the Church, held a perverse opinion about the resurrection; just as some of the Church of the Corinthians denied the resurrection. But Novatian says that this great house is to be understood as the world, not the Church, so that he may not be forced to acknowledge in one Church the wicked with the good, the clean with the unclean. I think this can be easily refuted. For in one house all are under one name: although they differ in conduct, yet in profession they are all counted under the one name of their master. But this world contains men of diverse professions, so that utterly unlike people profess that they have different gods and lords.

You see, therefore, that this could not have been said of the world, but of the Church, in which, living under one name, they differ in their deeds. I note that Novatian was not ignorant of this, but because he had no just grounds for the complaints of his secession, and would have been openly ashamed, he forged certain arguments for himself through a bad interpretation of the Law, by which he might try to excuse and cover the envious will of his resentment. Finally, he replies to what we have said, saying, "Nor do I refuse that penance be done for the idolatry committed, but I do not dare to grant remission, because this crime must be forgiven by him against whom it has been committed. He replies therefore with deceit. For he is exposed by his own interpretations, through which his fraud appears. For when he says, "It is written. Whoever denies me, I also will deny him, and the one whose words these are cannot lie; he shows that the repentance which he says must be done is empty and fruitless. For if a sentence has been passed, and he who passed it does not deceive, why do you compel a man to be tortured with mourning and groans, when you either deny or openly profess that you do not know the outcome of this matter? For whoever gives counsel to someone gives it precisely in order to declare what benefit may come from it.

But because you, Novatian, profess this deceitfully, in order to dupe human minds, you say that repentance must be done. For knowing that this cannot be openly denied, you act subtly, because you cut off repentance not by word but by intention. You certainly say that everyone who sacrifices to idols sins against the Holy Spirit, and you insist by the words of the law that this sin is not forgiven either here or in the future. How then do you say that repentance must be done for this offense, except because you deceive, as I showed above? But you are accustomed to try to cover this fraud with another trick, saying that the apostle Peter also spoke in the same sense to Simon: "Repent of this wickedness of yours, if perhaps it may be forgiven you" (Acts 8:22). But when the apostle Peter looked upon the man's old and venomous and intensely bitter hatred, he therefore gave him an answer worded in doubt. For which mortal ever sinned in such a way as to want to buy the gift of God with money? This answer, then, was given to ill will, not to error. For this is what has no remedy; because it is neither error, nor is there any necessity by which it might be excused so as to be able through tears to attain forgiveness. If, therefore, any are found in such a case, let them hear what Simon heard.

For this reason the apostle Peter answered him doubtfully, saying, "For I see that you are in the anger of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity. (Acts 8:23) If then in so grave a case, one which seems without remedy, the answer was given in doubtful terms, it is not doubtful that those who sin against God through some error or necessity can be forgiven, if they perform suitable repentance. For this has been granted to ecclesiastical law by its author: that it may both impose repentance and, after repentance, may receive back. And there is still something that Novatian criticizes: "Why," he says, "do they hand over the body of the Lord to those whom they know to be sinners? As though those who are judges could also be accusers. But if they are accused and exposed, they can be cast out. For what judge assumes the role of accuser? For if the Lord himself endured Judas, whom he knew to be a thief, and to carry off what was put in the money bag (Jn. 12:6), nor did he cast out the one who had not been accused, we ought to make use of this example, so that it is not permitted to cast out anyone who has not been publicly detected. For it does not suit a just man to accuse anyone. Therefore Matthew says: "Joseph, being a just man and not willing to expose her, wanted to dismiss her secretly" (Matt. 1:19).

Therefore Judas, though he was among the disciples, did not stain them with his contagion, since they, of course, were opposed to his thefts; and when he received the Eucharist among them, he did not defile the innocent. Nor did the Lord deny his body to him whom he knew to be a robber; for, according to the Apostle, "He who receives unworthily receives a sword unto himself" (1 Cor. 11:27). Therefore the Lord did not turn his eyes away from him. For sinners defile only those who consent to their evil deeds. Where it is said, "You saw a thief, and you ran with him" (Ps. 49:18). From this comes the reason why the Apostle reproves the people of Corinth, because they did not correct or avoid him who openly had his father's wife, so that he might amend himself, saying, "Do you not know that a little leaven corrupts the whole lump? (1 Cor. 5:1, 6). Since there was no leader or bishop of the Church there, it belonged to the people to correct the man whom they saw behaving among them in

such shameful and obscene ways. And therefore the Apostle rebukes them as if they were consenting to his crime. For in this matter there was no need of an accuser or of witnesses; he was publicly keeping his stepmother in the place of a wife. And so, as far as our cause is concerned, we have set forth our position, not accusing others, but defending ourselves.

But I appeal to the conscience of the Novatians, who always accuse us, whether he knows all those who are with him to be saints. He is so angry with us that he even denies that we are Christians, though he knows that we have been initiated in the same faith on which he prides himself. Certainly it is profession and life that make a Christian. If, then, you see a man profess the same things as you do, and his life is not unlike yours, why do you deny that he is what you are? Surely, "whoever says 'Lord Jesus' says it in the Holy Spirit" (see 1 Cor. 12:3); for he speaks truth. For all truth is from God. Why do you not agree with the one who speaks truth, but deny? You contradict the one who confesses God, not with reason, but in madness. Do you not appear to be an enemy of God, when you resist one who speaks true things about him? Does a pagan, hearing someone say that idols are gods, deny that he is a pagan? Why then do you deny that the man is a Christian whom you hear profess the words of the full faith, when you read, "With the heart one believes unto righteousness, but with the mouth confession is made unto salvation" (Rom. 10:10)? But you, as an enemy, in your anger fail to see that you oppose God;

you deny that the one who confesses this has salvation, though the Lord says, "Whoever confesses me, I also will confess him" (Luke 12:8). Did he say, "If Novatian confesses me"? But you establish it in such a way that you seem to defend this: that he is saved who is not only a Christian, but who is also a Novatian. Yet if confession made in Christ gives salvation, then wherever and among whoever this confession is whole, it possesses salvation. Therefore, if the handing down of this confession has been corrupted among us, or its sense altered, you rightly accuse us. For if this remains in us as it does in you, by denying us you seem also to deny yourself. But you accuse the ministers of faith: grant that what you say is true, even though you cannot prove it. Those who heard it from them, did they hear truth or falsehood? For if a flawed man has spoken the truth, it will not cease to be true because it was spoken by a flawed man; for the cause of one's conduct is one thing, and the cause of one's profession another. Does not the persecutor, out of hatred for the Christian name, persecute the profession, not the conduct? First of all, knowing that this benefits religion, when we confess that we are Christians, the sacrilegious man believes what we confess, though he does not wish to hear it, because he does in fact hear it.

Questions on the Old and New Testaments (part 3)

But you, although you bear the same profession and seal, do not believe us who confess what you yourself confess. If you knew that we were reborn in some way different from that in which you were reborn, then you would rightly not believe that we are what you are. Why then do I suffer persecution from a sacrilegious man, if I am not what you are? For if I professed concerning myself what you say about me, I would not suffer persecution. And in the end, I must be believed about myself, not you. For the judge seeks my own profession, not yours about me. Why then do you deny me when I confess, though it is true, when in this case not another's testimony, but my own profession is required, either for me or against me? I was unwilling, for the sake of the name, to have you tortured against me, so that it might appear, if you too were to deny the one confessing the truth against me, to whom belief would be given. For you propose this deceitfully, so that you may seem to have a just cause for schism. For you are not ignorant that in this matter my own testimony about myself is required, not another's; and that what I have confessed is held to be true, not what someone else has denied. It is clear that those are free who, out of love for Christ and without scrutinizing the deeds of men, press forward to obtain faith in him:

approving in them only what they know to be useful for themselves, that is, to obtain the tradition of the faith which is of Christ. For whoever thinks that, besides the sacrament, something else is necessary for a man in this matter, does an injury to the tradition; for he thinks too little of the grace of God. For whenever he denies that the gift of God can profit one who is devoted to him unless some human merit is present, he makes man either superior or equal to the tradition itself, whereas man's merit is far removed from such a role. As the apostle Paul says about this same matter: I planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase. Therefore neither he who plants is anything, nor he who waters, but God who gives the increase (1 Cor. 3:6–7). How then can anything be hoped for from man in this matter, since the words which are handed on have been given? Let us see then what advantage there will be if he is of good merit, or what disadvantage if he is of bad merit. One comes, desiring to hear the words of God, to which, by lending faith, he believes he will receive salvation. What difference does it make in this matter whether the one who

delivers the solemn words is of good or bad life, since what is sought is the devoted faith of the recipient, so that he may with his whole mind believe what he hears?

If the one who delivers them is of bad life, will he create an obstacle for the recipient, so that he will not believe what he hears and ought to believe, so that his sin might enter the other's heart so that he does not believe? Or will God, who is just, despise one devoted to him because of the sin of that man whom he himself allows to be in office? Nor does man judge in this way, although it is clear that he frequently errs or is partial. If it were so, and a man were conducting his own case, would he not say to God: Who this man is whose fault makes you despise me, I do not know. I approached him on your account, because he was said to be your priest: I sought you, I desired you, I believed in you, I hoped for nothing from the man: why then should his sins harm me, whom I would not have known unless I had sought you? If his good deeds could profit me, it might perhaps seem just that his evil deeds should harm me. But just as, if I had believed his good deeds with hesitation, they would have profited me nothing, so also his evil deeds ought to harm me nothing, if I believe rightly. For I entrusted faith to his words, which are said to be given by you, and which are inspired by you, spoken by you, and promise you: to him I believed nothing about himself nor about his deeds;

but I joined myself to the faith which is from you. According to this, the case of the believer is sound. Consider bishops after the manner of advocates: if an advocate is of bad life, will the judgment be against the client he has taken up? This is the advocate's office, that according to the order of law he should plead the case of his client: can his life, if it is shameful, harm his client's case? For the advocate's person can neither harm nor profit; for as the case is, so will the judgment be upon it. So it is also with those who wish to become Christians: they come to the bishop, they declare to him their vows: he recites the words of ecclesiastical law. If the vows are true, they are received by the Judge: in what way then can he either harm or profit, since he does not even know the case of his client? For it is known to God alone the Judge, with what mind each one approaches. It is therefore the bishop's task to perform the office delegated to him; but it is the Judge's to accept or to reject the case of the petitioner. For he himself is found to have said: Daughter, your faith has made you whole (Matt. 9:22). You see then that each one is saved by his own faith, not by anyone's assistance. For God has decreed this for faith, that if it does not doubt, it may obtain everything it wills.

Yet you, not as a friend but as if an enemy of Christ, have gathered a people under your own name, so that they are not Christians unless they are also Novatianists; whereas the Apostle condemns anyone who says that he is of Paul or of some other (1 Cor. 3:4). But you, judging yourself superior, have placed your own name above the name of Christ, as though his name were not sufficient to guard his Church.

1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 114. AGAINST THE PAGANS. — By what reasoning the pagans dare to confront us or attack our faith, while thinking themselves innocent, I do not see. For they have

no evidence for their assertions, of their superstition, I would rather say, than of religion. Whatever they have without safeguards they put forward, so that they may themselves be regarded as authors and defenders of novelties. First of all, they claim to worship gods, yet those gods give no marks, no testimonies. They call those beings gods who did not dare to be called by that name, so that men are made the authors of gods, though God ought to be the author of men; and therefore their assertion is vain and empty. Whatever is without God cannot be stable. That what I say is clear is proved by their books, in which nothing divine is read as established by God's command, but they claim that various sacrifices to their deities were instituted by individual men for certain reasons, so that those who appear to have no merit may at least be seen to have rightly established the very things they decreed. Since, therefore, those whom they call gods are nowhere read to have commanded any of these things, by what authority do these men act, or think their actions accepted, when they cannot show any command? And even if a command were shown, it ought first to be examined whether it was fitting or right to obey those whose deeds show no signs or wonders recommending them as divine.

But when they are driven from this, they usually take refuge in the elements, saying that they worship these, by whose governance human life is ruled. From them, as above, we ask whether there is any mandate or command from God, whom even they confess to be great and supreme, and yet they neglect Him. For if such worship ought to be done, it should have been commanded by Him who is said to be their author. If, however, it is not commanded by Him, it is mere presumption and will lead to punishment, not reward; for it is an insult to the Creator when, despising the Lord, men worship His servants, and, scorning the Emperor, adore his nobles. How will this go unpunished, when we see that even in this life such conduct is avenged, and indeed harshly? But if perhaps they say that the mandate has come from the elements themselves, let them show a precept somewhere; let them at some time read anything that those elements have spoken. If they cannot show this, what penalty do they deserve who are exposed as authors of a presumed and fabricated religion? The elements are free from this wickedness. For the very luminaries of the world will accuse them before God the Judge, because in this vain counsel they in no way present themselves as authors.

In like manner those whom they call gods, though it is certain that they were men, when they begin to be tormented for their sins, will by no means defend themselves as guilty in this matter, but will shift this charge onto those who, though they had not commanded it, began to worship them as gods. With what sense of shame, then, can they criticize our faith or think it deserves ridicule, when they read our law supported by testimonies of virtues, and also the voice of our Lord and God saying: "I am God, and there is none other besides me" (Isa. 45:21–22)? If He said this in bare words, He would not deserve belief, lest we appear like the pagans, who, seeing no signs of majesty in their gods, began to worship them, and, what is worse, in shameful ways. For disgraceful things are done there, which it is shameful to reveal; and they call themselves wise, because in regard to their law they are mocked like an imposter. But our God, with virtue as witness, has commanded that He

be worshipped, and, so as to leave no room for suspicion, has given a law that is upright and holy, as befits God. We, indeed, who are called foolish by the pagans, would not have believed in our God had He not satisfied us also by testimonies of power; nor would we have accepted His law if we had not recognized it as pure and worthy of its own profession.

Therefore it is that nothing among us is done in darkness or in secret. For whatever is known to be honorable does not fear to be made public; but that which is shameful and dishonorable cannot be made public because modesty forbids it. For this reason the pagans celebrate their mysteries in darkness, wise at least in this: they are ashamed to be mocked openly. The immoral rites that function in place of law there they do not wish to reveal, lest those who call themselves wise appear dull to those whom they call fools. Yet lest, perhaps on this account, we seem fools to them, because our law proclaims chastity, mercy, devotion, self-control: among them these things are foolish, since every good man is bad to the wicked, and the wise man senseless to the fool. They so thoroughly detest chastity that they delight even in womanish men [cinaedis], subject to their teaching; and unless such men are as they are, they will not be fit for their so called religion. For that reason they are mutilated and their appearance is changed, so that, from men, they become as it were women and, contrary to nature, submit to suffer what belongs to women; and only then are they deemed fit and worthy ministers of their superstition. Can one such as this be condemned, when the law makes him such? For this very reason, having lost manly conduct and dress, he is transformed into a woman, that he may freely suffer what belongs to women.

What sort of mysteries can those be, where what is honorable becomes dishonorable, and what is uncorrupted becomes corrupted, when true religious worship is precisely that which makes the shameful honorable and the undisciplined modest? How can the worshippers of such a cult be rivals of the good life, when the mysteries of their law cannot be celebrated without womanish men? If, therefore, their law delights in such people, anyone who is not of that kind will be, in their view, a sinner and a fool. Therefore they call us fools. For those who practice these shameful things are judged wise by them; those who avoid and flee them, foolish. This indeed seems cleverly and perceptively unnatural by them. They therefore attach the name of wisdom to their law, so as to cover up its blameworthy features; for where there is wisdom, there is no blame. Our law, however, they call foolish, so as to keep people away from it. But if we remove the labels of wisdom and foolishness, and set aside all the hostility that the defense of both sides breeds, let the laws themselves clash with each other, so that it may appear where wisdom is, and where foolishness. But in the presence of the sign of the cross, paganism falls silent. And if that forethought which they call wisdom is present, it does not dare answer the sacred things of those whom they call foolish. For their entrails are checked, and they are concealed out of reverence for Christian majesty.

It is a great matter, that the forethought they so name should fear what they call foolishness. Let us now compare the tone of the laws. Pagans even profess in writing that they worship gods and goddesses; and what they say is true, since they worship both males and

females. For Janus and Saturn, Jupiter and Mercury, and Apollo and the rest, likewise Minerva, and Isis, and Fruxilla, and Venus, and Flora the harlot with the others, are gods and goddesses, as the histories both of the Greeks and of the Romans confirm. Christians, however, as poor people, whom they call fools, worship one God in mystery, from whom are all things; nor do they venerate anything that has been created by Him. For they know that He alone is sufficient and abundant for their salvation, not ignorant that if they assign His glory and name to others, they offend Him; since no emperor allows tribunes and counts to be adored together with his name. Let the laws now be compared, that it may be seen where forethought lies: with the one who worships the Creator, or the one who worships the creature; the one who worships the Lord, or the one who worships servants? Can it be that in some household, besides one, another should be called lord, just as pagans, trained in forensic writings, who seem to themselves wise, in one world created by one God, worship many gods and goddesses?

For they call the stewards and managers of the world gods and by the name of God, while they are exposed as foolish. To proclaim that which brings destruction is the mark of the foolish and the irresponsible. For it is necessary that God should avenge His injury upon those who have shared the name and glory of the Lord God with their fellow-servants. Next let the teachings be considered. Our law, according to which those whom they call fools are ordered, commands that bishops and ministers be suitable, without reproach, holy and irreproachable; but, on the contrary, the tradition of the pagans lays it down that their bishops and ministers cannot be suitable for them unless they are transformed from men into women, so that they may wastefully and publicly endure women's parts, and, with their hair dishonorably let down in water, emit a soft, quivering, and shameful voice. If they did this in public, they would be stoned by all the people. And that dog-headed creature, who restlessly carries himself about all places, seeking the limbs of the adulterous Osiris, the husband of Isis. Behold, by such ministers or teachers pagans assume for themselves the name of forethought, when this is not only not forethought, but also a crime. For to love what is obscene and shameful is destructive. And what of that which they suffer in a cave, their eyes veiled? So that they may not shudder at being disgracefully dishonored, their eyes are covered; others, like birds, beat their wings, imitating the voice of a raven;

others again roar after the manner of lions; others, with their hands tied by the intestines of young chickens, are thrown over pits full of water, while someone approaches with a sword and breaks open the above-mentioned intestines, calling himself their liberator. And there are other things even more shameful. Behold in how many ways they are disgracefully misled, they who call themselves wise. But because they suffer these things in darkness, they think they can remain unknown. For all these practices, which were invented and arranged secretly by evil and shameful men, have been revealed and exposed by the holy Christian faith. When the faith was preached, those who heard, considering what good and holiness were publicly promised, joined themselves to the faith, abandoning those hidden shameful and awful things, and confessing how they had been deceived through ignorance. For at that time, long ago, almost all were involved in this error, and therefore seemed to

themselves prudent, because there was no one to reprove them. For although all erred under one deceptive name of idolatry, each one nevertheless arranged his worship according to his own customs and manner of life, so that one error might have diversity arising from the vileness and life of its authors. Finally, the rites which they call those of Bacchus [Liber] are shameful and most vain, and full of madness. For it is difficult for the impure not to be touchy; therefore everywhere he is found depicted with Priapus, with whom he lived shamefully. In this way are their other rites as well.

But so that future generations might be captured by these inventions, it was done through the subtlety and cunning of Satan: for although these things were not invented without his counsel, yet when each was devised, he sprinkled certain charms, by which he might entice men into error. And so it came about that, through the tradition of antiquity, deceit might be praised and the shameful invention excused. For through custom, what was shameful began not to seem shameful. For when some are dishonored, at first they blush; afterwards, with custom flattering them, shame departs and their expression is altered, especially if they see many such as themselves. For the profit of disgrace is then achieved when those who are called noble are seen to be dishonored: for dignified nobility easily finds imitators. If therefore long ago they seemed to themselves wise for this reason, because there was no one to whom this foul invention was displeasing; now, since by the mercy of God the human race has been enlightened, and it has been shown to be a crime which was believed to be law, and foolish that which was thought to be a wise invention, they ought at least to cease from this name, refusing to remain in a detected crime, knowing that the name of wisdom is alien to them. But, in order to add foolishness to the heap of their own confession, having been caught in foolishness they call fools those by whom they are refuted. Yet they accuse our faith and its generations to come;

but they do not deny that nothing in its teachings can be criticized. Those who accuse our faith do not take their stand so much against us as against our author. For they declare us fools, because we have put faith in a seemingly foolish matter; but Him they pronounce a liar and deceiver, and even hateful, who would deliver a faith by which we might be deceived. Let us therefore first prove that we did not believe foolishly; then we shall plead the cause of the Author. When we lived in the error in which the pagans now remain, drawn by no signs of virtue but only receiving the bare words which they call sacred, we thought they were useful, not because divinity had praised them, but because ancient custom had handed them down. In this custom (as is no secret), deceived by various vanities, we recognized no hope of salvation. For what benefit could come from a thing invented by men? But when we came to the faith of God and believed in His Son incarnate and crucified, we were not persuaded by words, but by deeds. For we saw the dead raised, lepers cleansed, sight restored to one born blind, demons cast out, and at the same time all illnesses healed. Let it now be judged when we were foolish: when we believed in bare words, or when we believed because of deeds? For without doubt deeds come before words, since words were invented to signify deeds.

Therefore, if we granted belief to human tradition, upheld by no virtue, a tradition invented to deceive the minds of men, how much more to this faith, which all the divine and deifying signs that invoke God bear witness to? Would we not rightly be judged foolish if we did not believe in virtues, we who had believed in speeches? Would we not reasonably be marked as careless and ill-advised if we did not follow the hope that calls us, we who had been subject to despair? But, they say in reply, what is believed is foolish. For it does not stand up to reason that God should have a Son, nor that bodies dead and dissolved could be restored again to life. All the philosophers and inventors of sects wounded one another with various arguments, none passing over to the other's side; for each man remained in that in which he had been trained. Through the fact that words are accountable to contradiction, none overcame another. There was no way by which anyone could show himself the victor; but tiring one another with contradictions, they in no way persuaded each other. Therefore it came to pass that the providence of God, whose mind cannot be searched out, joined virtue to His preaching, so that the truth of preaching might be proved by the testimony of virtue; so that those who were ready to contradict words, when they saw virtue, would not dare to contradict. For what greater testimony of truth can there be than the working of virtue?

If anyone, however, denies works of virtue by accusing the Scriptures, how can he call our faith foolish while denying the Scriptures? For wherever it is written about Christ that He is to be believed as the Son of God, in that same place the testimony of virtue is found. And if it seems absurd to anyone reading that Christ, the Son of God, was crucified, let him read further and he will find that He rose from the dead; and let him understand that He did not die idly nor unwillingly, He who could rise again, but that it is a mystery. Whoever he may be, he will either be silent about the cross, for if he calls the cross foolish, he will not be able to call the resurrection foolish, for the resurrection excuses the cross, or if he speaks of the cross, he will not be able to deny that there is providence in it, which he sees confirmed by the testimony of the resurrection. Either both are accepted, or both are rejected, so that whoever does not defend them does not even dare to accuse them. The reason why He allowed Himself to be crucified is a mystery to be reserved for His kindred. But He so praised this death that He declared He was glorified through it. For He says: "I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to take it up again" (Jn. 10:18).

Therefore He was not compelled to die, since He had the power both to die and to rise. Whoever denies this cannot say that death was inflicted on Him by force. For if he denies this, he cannot even declare that He died, because this is contained in the very place where He is read to have been handed over to death. No one condemns the last statements of a text by its earlier ones, or the earlier by the later; for what belongs to one and the same body is not in contradiction. They say deceitfully that it is foolish to believe that the dead rise again. Yet they see examples that make it credible. For all seeds necessary for use, unless they have decayed, cannot be born again. If God has decreed this in the world for the sake of men, why is it considered foolish if it is believed that He will grant the same to their bodies? Except that they themselves are fools, who do not grant to God the power which the world possesses, although the shadow of what has been done appears even now,

since it is no longer the time for new virtues to be performed. For they had to be performed in the beginning, that the seed of faith through them might grow. Yet even now demons are terrified at the name of the cross of Christ; and if it is invoked more earnestly, they take flight;

and the gods of the pagans, through fear and dread of the named cross, cannot give responses. If the death of Christ is a reproach, why is it a terror? For a thing that comes from a crime ought not to be feared, but despised. Who would fear a man killed for his crime? And if he were innocent, he still would not be feared, but mourned. Therefore, unless the demons, or the gods of the pagans, knew that the cross of Christ is a mystery, they would not be terrified when it is named; and, to speak more plainly, unless they were guilty, they would not be afraid. For all those who are on the Devil's side consented to the death of Christ. Therefore all demons and all the gods of the Gentiles, when the cross of Christ is named, are shaken with terror. For everyone who is guilty of the death of an innocent man, when his name is mentioned, fear seizes his heart. For when he recalls his crime, he sees himself as guilty. How much more the demons and the gods of the Gentiles, who are guilty of the killing of the Lord and Savior of the world? But the pagans, for the sake of antiquity, insist that they hold the truth, because, they say, what is earlier cannot be false. As though antiquity or old custom could take precedence over truth.

For murderers, or the unmanly, or adulterers, or other criminals could, by this means, defend their unlawful acts, because they are ancient and were begun from the very beginning of the world; whereas from this they ought rather to understand their error, since whatever is reprehensible and shameful is proved to have had an evil beginning, but whatever is honorable and holy is rightly venerated; nor can what is shameful and blameworthy have been formerly honorable and blameless. And finally, the tradition of the pagans, having been invented by man, cannot be denied; but that our Law was given by God is an evident fact. For on the mountain the majesty of God appeared to give the Law to men. And that faith might be placed in this, He first sent many signs and wonders done in Egypt, which even today books testify to, stored by Ptolemy in the library of Alexandria. Therefore, then, He consented to give the Law, that no one might doubt that it was God who delivered it. For the majesty of God was seen openly and plainly by all, with such brilliance and terror that no other god besides Him was believed to exist, and that what He commanded was held worthy of all observance. And that all things might agree with the divine order, let the given Law be examined, to see whether there is anything unjust in it, anything dishonorable, anything ridiculous. Therefore it was fitting that God should be made known;

not that He should appear in a corner by deceit, He who cannot be limited; nor in a mirror, where what is seen is other than it appears through enticing fraud; nor would He deliver precepts to be kept which, because they were dishonorable, would be performed in darkness. For since the knowledge of the one God had been obliterated in the world by the habit of sinning, because falsehood had supplied a veil for the truth, the merciful and gracious God, unwilling that His work should become accountable to destruction, consented to visit the

human race. He did not appear as those did who wished falsely to be called gods; but as He is the Truth of God, so He revealed Himself, that He might remove the error which, by the proclamation of false gods, had corrupted the understanding of the world. In short, more than six hundred thousand men, having gone out of Egypt, seeing and knowing that this Lord was above all from the revealing of unspeakable glory, were afraid to approach Him, but from afar, with knees bent, they worshiped Him (Exod. 20:18). Afterwards, as other signs followed besides those which He had done in Egypt, in all these wonders He was revealed as the one God. These things became known in almost all tongues; these were a terror to neighboring nations. What such thing is there among the gods of the Gentiles? To what nation, to what people have they shown their glory? What signs or powers have they performed as testimony of their divinity?

Where or when are they proved to have spoken? But the irrational crowd began to worship as gods either apparitions of shadows, or demons, or images of the dead; and this practice, having been drawn into the custom of antiquity, thinks that it can defend the truth of reason for itself; whereas the rule of truth comes not from custom, which arises from antiquity, but from God, who is not proved to be God by antiquity, but by eternity. Wherefore faith is not something begun, but is without beginning. For to believe in God is the beginning on our side. For that which is believed is eternal. How then do the pagans suppose themselves to be prior, when that which they worship is after God? Is not a work after its maker? Pagans worship the works, we the Maker; they the creature, we the Creator. Surely God made the world; did He not, when He had made it, show His own knowledge? Or did He make man and not wish to be worshiped by him whom He had made? But this is absurd. Therefore man, once made, began to venerate his Creator, because this is fitting and the very cause required it. When this had grown obsolete through the negligence of men, God restored it in Abraham, so that the knowledge of God which had existed in Adam might begin again in Abraham;

that those born from him might be brought up under this knowledge, and that through transmission it might not fail, nor be lacking in one who worshiped God; others also from a foreign nation being called to this knowledge of God. Therefore, the one who has come to know is under a beginning; but the one who is known is above beginning. By what reasoning, then, do the pagans say that their law existed before ours? If the world is before God, which be it far from us, then paganism can likewise be set before Christianity. Let no one be astonished at the name of Christianity. For it is to worship one God in the mystery of the Trinity. And if the name of Christ is thought to come from chrism, yet the reason of the name is prior to the chrism. For among our ancestors, those who were anointed as kings were called christs, having the image of the Christ to come, who, born of God the Father as king, is not undeservedly called Christ; because that which to these was chrism, to Him was given by birth. Him, as long as the pagans are ignorant of Him, they reject; but when they have come to know Him, they honor Him with greater devotion, rejoicing that they have passed from evil to good. For they who were so stubborn in a matter so frivolous and foolish, how much stronger and more fervent will they be when the truth is known?

What then is our Christ like, who, when He is unknown, is hated; when He is known, is loved? For every wicked man, when he is unknown, is loved, when known, is hated. How many once hated Christ who now love Him, and who grieve that they hated what they did not know? For it is the mark of the foolish to hate one whom you do not know, since it must first be tested whether a thing is worthy of hatred. In short, those who today oppose will tomorrow defend, doing penance that they came to know the truth so late. For if the thing were worthy of hatred, or had any element of deceit, every day pagans would be made out of Christians. But since this is the truth, every day, every hour, without interruption, people abandon Jupiter, among whom are sophists and nobles of the world, who had confessed him to be god, and flee to Christ, to whom be honor and glory unto the ages of ages.

1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 125. AGAINST EUSEBIUS. (widely believed to be Eusebius of Vercelli) — I remember that I once read in a certain little book by Eusebius, otherwise an outstanding man in other respects, that not even the Holy Spirit knows the mystery of the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ; and I am astonished that a man of such learning inflicted this stain upon the Holy Spirit. By saying this he has in fact implied that He is of a degenerate kind. For He cannot be said to be of God if He does not know the things that are of God; because a lower nature does not know what is in a higher. But if He is of the same substance and divinity, how can He fail to know what belongs to Himself? Indeed, the Son of God, because He says, I and the Father are one (Jn. 10:30), on account of the unity of substance, quite rightly added, saying, All things that the Father has are mine; and what is mine is the Father's (Jn. 16:15). Therefore, if the Holy Spirit is of the same divinity, on what grounds is He separated off so as not to be of the same knowledge, when He is not denied to be of the same substance? He granted what is greater while refusing what is less. A creature, after all, learns, and begins to know certain things about its author, and what it has learned will be common to it with its author;

but substance or divinity cannot be common to God and to a creature. For the substance of God has nothing to learn, because there is nothing He does not know; whereas the substance of human beings does not have by nature the capacity to know, but to learn. Therefore knowledge happens to human nature; yet the substance is not changed, because the nature of man is without knowledge: for it was so created that it should acquire knowledge through exercise. Therefore substance is greater than knowledge; because it is not knowledge that acquires substance, but substance that acquires knowledge: and substance can exist without knowledge, but knowledge cannot exist without substance. In God, however, as there is substance, so also there is knowledge: for the substance which has nothing to learn, that very substance is knowledge to itself. Therefore all things in God are said to be "substantial. For a substance to which nothing is lacking possesses all things substantially; because nothing has been added to it as a result of study. How then can it be said of the Holy Spirit that He does not know the birth of the Son of God, if He is consubstantial with

Him? Can one and the same substance both know and not know? Surely the Son of God did not learn the mystery of His own birth; He knows it substantially, not by teaching.

On what grounds then is the Holy Spirit said not to know, when in like manner He has nothing that He needs to learn, because He knows all things by substance? For just as the Son of God is, so also the Holy Spirit is the substance of God, as the Lord says, All things that the Father has are mine; by which He indicated that the substance of God the Father is His own substance. And He says that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and receives from what is His: And therefore, He says, I said that He will receive from what is mine, because all things that the Father has are mine. If He proceeds from the Father and receives from the Son, how can He be ignorant of the birth of the Son, when His substance is the substance of the Son? For all things that the Father has are the Son's. Without doubt, then, the Father's substance is also in the Holy Spirit. For the Son added, saying: And all that is mine is the Father's. Why then is it questioned whether the Holy Spirit is of the same divinity, since He is of the same substance? For just as the Lord said of Himself that He proceeded from God, so He also bears witness concerning the Holy Spirit. And lest this could be interpreted in some other way, He says, He proceeds from the Father (Jn. 15:26); and, He will receive from what is mine (Jn. 16:14):

so that to proceed from the Father is the same thing as to receive from Christ. For when it is said that He receives from the Son of God, there is no doubt that He too is from God, so that in the Holy Spirit the substance and divinity of the Father are not in doubt. Therefore whoever says that He does not know the birth of the Son of God detracts from Him from whom He is said to have received. For He does not receive something other than what He Himself is, from whom He receives; because to have received from Christ means that He has proceeded from God: and so He cannot be ignorant of the fact that He is from the One from whom He has received; nor can He be said to be ignorant of the Lord, since He has proceeded from God. Surely the Son of God, because He is from the Father as God, knows all things that are of God: why then should the Holy Spirit be denied knowledge of whatever things are Christ's, since He has received from Him? Therefore, if the Son of God knows the things that are in God, there is no doubt that the Holy Spirit also does not ignore the things that are in the Son of God: and by the fact that He knows the things that are in the Son, He cannot be said not to know the things that are in God.

For from Him from whom He receives, He has knowledge of God. And why do we labor, when the Apostle is witness in this matter, saying: No one knows the things that are in God, except the Spirit of God (1 Cor. 2:11)? Behold, in what we long labored, with the Apostle's help we have brought it to completion. And did he perhaps prejudge [praejudicavit] the Son of God, because he said that no one knows the things that are in God except the Spirit of God? Far from it. So neither did the Son prejudge the Holy Spirit when He said: No one knows the Father except the Son. For He did not say that anyone knows the things that are in God except the one who is from God: because everything that is from God knows God and the things that are in God. For the nature of God knows itself; and when you

understand that this nature is also in the Holy Spirit, by the fact that He has proceeded from the Father and received from the Son, it is not safe to say that He does not know God the Father, whose nature you acknowledge in Him. And yet the Savior so said that no one knows God the Father except the Son, as to reserve the knowledge of Him to another person: for He immediately added, saying: And to whom the Son shall choose to reveal Him (Matt. 11:27). To whom, do you think, does the Son wish to reveal Him?

He can be dearer to no one than to His own Spirit: for, If anyone, He says, does not have the Spirit of Christ, that person does not belong to Him (Rom. 8:9). How then do you think the Father God has been revealed by the Son to the Holy Spirit, except in the way that the Lord Himself says, He will receive from what is mine? For God the Father cannot be revealed to a creature; because a creature cannot bear the nature of God, unless it is of the same substance: for He dwells in light inaccessible, that is, inaccessible to a creature (1 Tim. 6:16). But to some it seems for this reason to be rightly said that the Holy Spirit does not know the mystery of the birth of the Son of God, because he is said to search all things (1 Cor. 2:10); and, they say, one who searches is of course ignorant. This must be understood from another passage: for among other things God's words are, I am God who searches the kidneys and hearts (Jer. 17:10); and in the Psalm, God, he says, searches hearts and kidneys (Ps. 7:10); and the Apostle, He who searches hearts, he says, knows what the Spirit desires, because he intercedes for the saints according to the will of God. By these examples, when the Spirit of God is said to search, it is meant that he does not ignore. He is also said to search the deep things of God:

and what are the deep things of God, which he is said to see thoroughly? For to search means to penetrate hidden things, so that by this it is believed that nothing is hidden from him. For the deep mysteries of God are God's inner realities, which cannot be searched by a creature. For it is also written that he intercedes for the saints according to God's will, which the saints of course do not know, as the Apostle says: For we do not know what we should pray for as we ought (Rom. 8:27, 26). Therefore to know the deep things of God and not to be ignorant of the will of God signify one and the same thing. For what mystery is so deep as the will of God, which is known to the Holy Spirit, but is unknown to all others? We must also consider how it is said that no one knows what is in a man, except the spirit of the man which is in him (1 Cor. 2:11): by "spirit" he meant the soul; because no one knows what is in the soul of a man, except his soul, which is spirit. So also in God no one knows the things that are God's, except the Spirit of God, that is, God himself. For one who is "of God" is understood to be nothing other than God. Therefore the Spirit of God knows what is in God, because he is of God.

For if no one knows the thoughts of men except God, how much more can no one know God's secrets and will unless he be of God, that is, the very same God? For he is known only to himself. For indeed in God there are no "thoughts. For he does not debate within himself what he should do or should not do, considering whether it is beneficial; because all that is in God exists without any doubt, not by accident, but by substance; nor by effort, but by nature;

for he is not changed. And therefore the Holy Spirit does not know the mysteries of God in any other way than by substance: for one substance has one and the same understanding and will. He is speaking of God, who is always one and unchangeable, whether in the Son or in the Holy Spirit. For what the Father wills, the Son also wills; and what the Son wills, the Holy Spirit likewise wills. Therefore he is sometimes called the Spirit of God, sometimes the Spirit of Christ: Who proceeds from God, he says; and, He will receive from what is mine. Therefore it is that the apostle John says: By this we know that God remains in us, by his Spirit whom he has given us (1 Jn. 3:24). Therefore, if by the Spirit of God dwelling in us God is said to dwell in us, the Spirit of God is signified to be God. Finally, this is the sign of believers, that they are children of God:

that when they receive him, they dare to call themselves sons of God. For unless they had the mark of deity, they could not be called sons of God. Yet no one is a true son of God so as to be wholly from the whole, as Christ is. But by adoption they become sons of God, so that by receiving the Spirit of Christ they are called sons of God through him, by reason of the Spirit whom they have in themselves, who is of God. For in sons, even if they are adopted, some part of the father's substance ought to be seen. In the world, because things are imperfect, sons adopted by men receive no pledge, but only a name. But because God is perfect, he does more, so that he gives his Spirit to those he adopts, through whom those adopted by him seem to have some reality; for names without realities are empty. Our Apostle supports this assertion of ours, saying: O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out (Rom. 11:33)! Yet what does he mean, that although he elsewhere says the deep things of God, that is, his secrets, are searchable, he here denies it, saying that they are unsearchable? But in this passage he spoke of the creature, because God's secrets or judgments are unsearchable for it;

whereas for the Holy Spirit, in that he knows all things that are God's, he said that all that is in God is searchable; so that he affirms that what is unknown to the creature is not unknown to the Spirit of God. Therefore the nature of God cannot be denied, which has knowledge of what cannot be comprehended by the creature. Those who call the Holy Spirit a degenerate being of God attack the position which has declared that the salvation of the whole creation consists in the divinity of the Trinity: because if he is not consubstantial with God and Christ, it is foolish to place him in the number of the Father and the Son, so that without him there is neither salvation nor dignity for anyone. For if he does not share the same divinity, his effect would be either stupid or pointless, which be far from us. For who among wise men would deny that the Creator cannot be counted together with the creature, nor the eternal compared with one who is under a beginning, nor the Lord equated with the servant, nor the powerful compared with the powerless, nor the knowledgeable ranked with the ignorant? But now let the slander cease. He is third in order, not in nature; in rank, not in divinity; in person, not in ignorance.

For just as the Son of God is second after the Father and is not lesser in divinity, so also the Holy Spirit, following after the Son, is not inferior, but equal in the divine substance.

Finally, what we read of the Son of God, we read likewise of the Holy Spirit, as he himself bears witness to us. For he says: I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Paraclete, the Spirit of truth (Jn. 14:16). When he said "another," he indicated himself as Paraclete. This John explains, saying that the Son of God intercedes for our sins (1 Jn. 2:2). And the apostle Paul: The Spirit of God himself, he says, intercedes for us. Behold, Scripture shows that both are advocates. And when He called Him the Spirit of truth, He showed that He in no way differs from Himself, because He said: I am the truth (Jn. 14:6). He said that He was sent by the Father, and He Himself promised that He would send the Holy Spirit. If He is not inferior to the One who sends, then neither is the Holy Spirit inferior to Him who sends Him. For neither, because the three are each distinct, are they parts of one another, so that they might be different. For there is one power of the three, such that nothing is lacking to each. Let this be the conclusion.

For already, in the little book composed against Arian wickedness, the remaining matters, which encompass the undivided unity of the Trinity, have been more fully treated.

2ND CATEGORY OT

QUESTION 1. AGAINST THOSE WHO DENY THAT ANYTHING CONCERNS GOD. — To many whom this worldly darkness has blinded, we are most displeasing if we anxiously keep God's commandments, if we avoid occasions of sinning, if we strive with saving zeal to accomplish every good thing, if we disregard the seductive allurements of temptations and vices, if we allow ourselves to be captured by no worldly sweetness, if we willingly undergo tortures and punishments for the name of God, if by the strength of the spirit we hold death itself in contempt. To those, namely, whose mortal sense has persuaded them that everything done is worthy neither of praise nor of blame. For they do not want any of these things to pertain to God. Some, so eager to defend their crimes and wicked deeds, say: It is of no benefit whether you live well or badly. For it is not God's concern now to carefully rush to look upon you as you act in different ways according to your own disposition and disease, and at some point to trouble his eyes with your foul deeds. All things that are celebrated as one pleases are vain: he who pertains to God is hidden and removed from these human affairs, and therefore neither grows angry nor is moved; he has no contemplation of human affairs, none of our actions;

the entire course of the whirling age, and a certain mysterious rolling of the worldly sphere, so seizes, snatches, and hurls him away that anyone is considered a fool who thinks he can call him back to the care of God. Not even the disposition of martyrs, then, is to be approved, who suppose that their God, whom they proclaim to be merciful, delights in the shedding of their blood. Nothing in us is dear to him, nothing is hateful; he rejoices in no circumstance of our death, in no integrity of our health; nor does he desire to know what is being done or where: not because it would be impossible for the divine majesty to have knowledge of almost all things that have been done or are being done, but because he does not wish to know the miseries of men and worldly vanities. Therefore, finally, it is written: Vanity of vanities, all is vanity (Eccles. 1:2). Their opinion, fixed in despair, is dissolved by

the authority of the divine sense, and is likewise refuted as overthrown by their own sacred popular speech, which is held in highest use. For when amid business and various dealings faith and treachery contend, divine witness is called upon, that witness which, they say, sometimes does not know what we are doing. “God is my witness,” they say; “God see, God judge, God act, God repay. And when the need for an oath arises, and the mind of the one who swears fears lest something befall him if he perjures himself;

he both demands an oath and is confident that it can be exacted from him who has sworn falsely. And when the desired recovery and good health has been obtained, thanks are rendered to the divinity. And when, in some falling matter, one who was in near danger has escaped unharmed, they say that the good God has provided it. And when, with the contrary blowing of the winds, the waves of the stirred sea rise up, and the ship, struck on all sides, is shaken, the crowd of sailors stretch their hands to heaven, with supplicating voice beg God, and are confident that they can be heard and delivered. Where comes all this, if God has no care for us, if he does not know what we are doing? That persuasion therefore is empty. All things are known to God. Let no one flatter himself concerning the freedom of his committed crimes. The good life is of a greatest reward, and of an evil life is eternal punishment and everlasting torments. Therefore, to us who believe that God knows all things, who devoutly rush to martyrdom, an immeasurable reward, eternal life shall be given; but to the wicked, who have tried to teach that God does not know their crimes and hidden wickedness, there will be supplied a consuming flame of fire and a blaze that never ceases.

MISCELLANEOUS 1ST CATEGORY OT

QUESTION 1. WHAT IS GOD? — This is what no opinion can fully grasp. For He is more than anything that can be spoken or conceived. Yet let us say something which, though unequal, may still in some way fit what seems worthy of God. For each nature, according to its own capacity, forms a notion of God; and as nature differs from nature, so does judgment differ from judgment about what God is. Since He is above all things, it must be that He surpasses every mind. Human beings, as far as they can stretch the sharpness of their mind, look toward what God is, by opinion rather than by definition. But the angels, who are above human beings, certainly have a higher sense of God; and the Archangels more still; while the Cherubim and Seraphim, those powers said to be next to God, have yet greater thoughts of Him, though they still do not fully comprehend what God is. For no one knows the Father except the Son, nor does anyone know the Son except the Father (Matt. 11:27). Therefore God, as He appears to human beings, is spirit, simple in nature, light inaccessible, invisible, beyond measure, unlimited, perfect, needing nothing, eternal, utterly immortal, from whom all things received their beginning; One to be venerated, loved, feared; outside of whom there is nothing, indeed, in whom are all things that exist above and below, highest and lowest; almighty, all sustaining, truly rich in all things, because there is nothing that is not His; good, just, merciful.

Good, because He brought into existence things that were not; just, because whatever He made to advance He left to the free judgment of their own liberty; yet because they are not so perfect that they cannot fall, He decreed that seeds of law should naturally exist in them, adding the help of revealed law, so that His authority might be complete for humankind; merciful, because He does not quickly repay those who sin, but bears with them so that He may forgive the repentant. He is also severe, so that, through fear, the things well created by Him may be preserved, lest negligence give rise to the downfall of life. And, lest we omit what is more wondrous, His mercy is so great that He endures insults from those He has made and Himself first calls them to peace. Is this not an act of greater power than having created the creature? Yet if His excessive goodness remained without limit in this, it would harm the creature. Therefore He wills that He be at times loved, at times feared, lest those who stray from Him perish. Therefore it is that, lest His patience be thought something to be despised, not indeed to His loss, but altogether to ours, He says: I have kept silence; shall I always keep silence? (Isa. 42:14). Therefore God is good, and all that He has made is good. Where then comes evil?

Nothing is evil except the violation of good, when either what is not granted is supposed upon, or what is granted is done in a disorderly way; so that in one place a command is fulfilled, in another a sin is committed. As when what is permitted in marriage is done with a prostitute; or what was to be offered to God is offered to the Devil; or when someone does not take what is his own, but what is another's; or when the transgressor, who ought to be killed, is spared and the innocent is killed. No nature, then, is proved to be evil. The will, however, is an accident of nature, arising from causes that are wrongly set in motion when it oversteps the measure, so that it performs acts that do not belong to its nature. The causes of transgression arise from the senses, when we see or hear something wrongly. This fault occurs because man is not God, who alone cannot err. Human nature, therefore, has been released and left to its own judgment, so that it can do what it wills: so that, if by the exercise of good it improves its nature, it may be more honorable; but if it weakens its strength, it may be reckoned worthy of such a criticism. For it does what is against itself. It is no small thing that has been granted to man: that, when he follows what right, he rejoices in himself through that by which he sees himself made better by his own work;

or else rightly blames himself, who, though he could, did not take pains to better himself by good things. But if man were not master of his own power, he would be subject to necessity, so that he would have neither the glory of good works nor the punishment of evil, but would be one of the beasts. Since, then, we have been made capable of both, so that by negligence we fall into sin, if what we ought to hear and see well we hear badly and outside the rule and reason; while by watchfulness we preserve the good of our nature: and since we cannot always be cautious, because, as I said, we have been made capable of both; if we sin, we are not at once condemned, unless we sin again, now as if traitors. For whoever has sinned once must restore himself so as not to sin again, lest he be equal to him who had overcome him; so that, if he does not sin again, he is now accounted superior. For he who was once cast down will triumph twice. This is righteousness: that since life in this world is a struggle,

whoever is more inclined to sin is crowned for not sinning. Nothing, therefore, in God's work is evil. But if certain things are called evils by some, such as poison or darkness, because our bodies cannot bear the force of poison; they also call fire or water evil; and iron or lead, because they are very far from gold, are called evil.

By comparison with light they condemn darkness, though they know it to be necessary in its own place, like lead or clay. For of course they give rest after labor. Therefore everyone who struggles in the world must exert himself in such a way that he does not leave conquered in some harsh affair and become guilty, scarcely or slowly restoring himself, and perhaps death comes between these things, and he departs from here with his sin. He who resists with all his strength, if he is perhaps struck down, falls as a man; and no one is angry with him, but by a kind of encouragement restores his spirit. For he sees that he had the purpose of conquering and hopes that such a one can advance to victory, whom his enemy has not thrown down without effort. For he who is easily overcome has no spirit of resistance; nor is he truly overcome, but he consents. Such a man sins more bitterly. A person of this sort should scarcely be admitted to pardon, who has a deliberate desire to sin. For he who plans how not to sin, even if he should sin, does not sin harshly. For more diligent people, lesser sins sometimes creep in. But the smaller they are, the subtler they are; and while they are despised, they are not avoided. Greater sins are plainly visible from afar. And so, when someone commits greater sins, the fault lies in his will.

Now, since we previously said that sins arise from the senses when we look at or listen to something against the command of the law or reason, that is, if when we see the sun we think it should be adored because of its beauty, then we see wrongly: for it is an insult to our common Creator when what is owed to Him alone is attributed to a creature, especially since this has been forbidden by the law. Or when we look at well-formed and handsome bodies, or at something belonging to our neighbor, if we desire it and look at these things in a way other than the law commands: then we commit the sin that is called "evil. But perhaps someone will say, "Then nothing beautiful should have been made, so that we would not sin, and our protection would depend on the ugliness of others. If that were true, there should be no iron, lest murders be committed with it; nor should there be lamps in use, lest thieves employ their light to break in, so that what is greatly useful to all would be lacking because of the vanity of a few. Yet it is clear that we are always looking at everything, and yet we do not always desire everything; for it is not their fault, but ours, when we are careless: which is evident from the fact that we are created in time, because we are not what God is.

In the same way we hear wrongly, if, when we hear that idols are gods, we consent to it; or if we lend our ear to those who sing shameful songs. But we hear well when, hearing that God is one, we take delight in it. And if anyone, hearing something against the law, gives agreement, he sins: and this will be "hearing wrongly."

1ST CATEGORY OT

QUESTION 4. WHY DID NOT GOD GIVE THE LAW FROM THE BEGINNING? — First, the Law ought not to have been given in written letters at the beginning, because it was, in a certain way, implanted in nature itself, and the knowledge of the Creator, handed down, was not hidden. For who does not know what belongs to a good life, or is ignorant that what he does not want done to himself he ought by no means to do to another? But when the natural law vanished, overwhelmed by the habit of sinning, then it was necessary for the Law to be revealed, so that in the Jews all men might hear it. Not that it had been completely erased, but because they lacked its greatest authority, there was zeal for idolatry. The fear of God was not on earth. Fornication was at work. There was greedy desire for the property of one's neighbor. Therefore the Law had to be given, so that what was already known might have authority, and what had begun to lie hidden might be brought to light. For we find that before Moses sins were not only not hidden, but even punished. And so many are found to have been righteous, who, knowing God as avenger, were afraid to sin. But when this began to be neglected, the natural law had to be revealed, so that all might know with plain reasoning that God would demand an account of human actions.

Although it is read that punishment was exacted through the flood, and in Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 7, 19), yet the forgetfulness of ancient times had covered these things. Therefore, through Moses, they were recalled for the sake of instilling fear, to correct discipline and restore faith in God. Therefore the Apostle also says: For the righteous, the Law is not laid down, but for the unrighteous, idol worshipers, fornicators (1 Tim. 1:9), and such as these. Now let us see whether this suits those who, hearing of God's judgment, laugh at the idea that it will come; whether it will benefit or harm; whether it is fortified by truth or lacks reason. The Law indeed has been given to the world, but we see it cease to operate in regard to many people. It therefore does not seem just that those who sin here by means of power should be safe. Some mock the laws, the poor are oppressed, accusations are fabricated against the righteous, those who act well are held up to criticism, the devout are in need, the wicked flourish, the unrighteous and the corrupters are in honor, the greedy and plunderers enrich themselves, the judge is for sale. Does it not seem unjust if the Maker of all things does not require an account of these matters: so that those who have been unjustly oppressed here might be relieved; and those who were in want because they lived well might be rewarded; and those who were in reproach because of righteousness might be honored;

but those who, through their power, despised the laws or mocked them by dodging, following injustice, and so glorious in these things that they seem to insult justice itself, might be humbled and confused, subjected to torments in the sight of those in whose misfortunes and humiliation they rejoiced; so that these in turn, glad at their punishment, might give thanks to God, with whom alone there is no respect of persons (Rom. 2:11)?

1ST CATEGORY NT QUESTION 48. GOD IS CERTAINLY PERFECTION AND IN NEED OF NOTHING; WHAT NEED THEN HAD CHRIST THE SAVIOR TO BE BORN OF GOD, AND FOR GOD TO HAVE A SON THROUGH WHOM HE MIGHT MAKE ALL THINGS?

— When God willed that things which had not existed should come into being, and understood that this work was in no way worthy of His majesty, He first generated from Himself, since He is by nature simple and incorporeal, the Son, who in no way differed from Him, so that an effect might correspond fittingly to His greatness. For what more could He do than to generate from Himself another who is perfect? This therefore is the perfect work, beyond which nothing else can appear more excellent. [For all other things are lesser: for the more Christ excels all these, the more the creation of those things is inferior to His generation. And there is another point:] For God, from whom are all things, wishing to create the creature, first generated the Word which He held with Himself in mystery, that is, He caused it to exist. This Word He therefore called Son, so as to show that He came forth from Himself and is consubstantial with Him: in order that the law by which sons are from their parents might make this credible, through which He would reveal to the creature the mystery that lay hidden in Him from eternity.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 83. IF SALVATION AND TRUE AND PERFECT KNOWLEDGE ARE THROUGH CHRIST, WHY DID HE NOT COME EARLIER, SO THAT OUR PREDECESSORS WHO WERE IN IGNORANCE MIGHT LEARN THE TRUTH? INDEED, AFTER THE COMING OF CHRIST MANY HAVE BEEN SAVED, MORE THAN BEFORE. WHENCE, IF HE HAD COME EARLIER, MANY MORE WOULD HAVE BEEN SAVED. IF THIS IS SO, IT SEEMS BLAMEWORTHY. — Yet no one who shows mercy ought to be slandered. For it is in the power of the giver when and how much he wishes to have mercy. Such a one must be encouraged and moved by prayers, not drawn back from a good work by disagreement. Perhaps there would be no objection if some return were made to Him in exchange for this mercy. Will anyone accuse a physician who bestows his remedies and his service freely? Or will his slowness be blamed by those who did not ask for him? We have said this according to reason, but the kindness of the Savior does not regard such calculations because of human weakness: He follows His own nature in showing mercy. Therefore He came when He ought to have come, following the counsel of His own will, not our merits. For if you weigh our merits, He ought not to have come. He came, then, when He knew both that help was needed, and that the benefit would be welcomed. If someone in danger is helped beforehand, the benefit will indeed be welcome;

yet he will not be able to recognize very clearly what has been granted to him. But if you bring help to one when he is in the very midst of necessity, he will know what kind of benefit he has obtained. Being delivered from tribulation, he will give greater thanks, just as if you offer bread to a hungry man; if you offer it when he is not hungry, it will certainly not be as welcome. Therefore it was rightly done that the Lord did not come earlier. First He allowed the human race to use its own will, yet not without testimony of Himself; for from the very structure of the world, through the yearly gifts which He decreed should be supplied to human use by the ministry of the elements, He wished His divinity to be understood and feared. Indeed, from the stock of the first man, and then in Enoch and Noah, His knowledge

was on earth. But when, through a kind of sickness of the human race, the knowledge of God among men began to fade, and morals were being changed, He agreed to choose Abraham, in whom there might be a pattern of renewed knowledge of God and of conduct. And when reverence was still sluggish, afterward through Moses He gave the Law in writing, which neither could fade away and which inspired greater fear. For fear is greater where authority is revealed.

And because the nations rejected the Law they had received, not subjecting themselves to it, and even those who received it did not keep it, the Lord, moved by mercy, sent His Son, who, offering Himself for them, destroying death, and granting remission of sins to all, might present them justified to God the Father. For He could not descend to the lower regions except through death. Neither order nor reason demanded that one who had not died should enter the gates of Tartarus. If someone wishes to deceive barbarians in his own land, does he not change his appearance to match theirs, so that he may be thought one of them, and therefore find out how to overthrow them? So it was with the Devil: because he had overthrown man by evil cunning, so that man would not remain in death, a remedy was found by which he might lose those whom he held unjustly, and be taken unawares; and the one whom he thought he had killed as a mere man, he found to be God in the lower regions. When this happened, found guilty, he lost all those whom he held, and thereafter the way to heaven was opened. See how greatly the coming of the Savior has profited, so that men, knowing from what peril they have been freed, might unceasingly give Him thanks. But perhaps it may be said on the contrary:

If many before the Law and after the Law, pressed down by sins, gave themselves entirely to the flesh and were worthy to remain in Tartarus, surely there were also those who, by devotion and reverence for the Creator, restrained their lives by the law of nature: were not these too, stripped of this life, detained in the lower regions? If He had come earlier, after the death of Adam, having freed Adam who first sinned, would He not have opened the way to heaven for the others, so that those who had lived well, having known the Creator, might be received into heaven after their death? Is it then a loss because Christ did not come earlier? It is clearly a loss; but ask whether it is just or unjust. For losses are often just, and about these one may not complain. Has a thief caught in the act and condemned fourfold according to the law ever dared to complain? Therefore the loss which the human race has suffered was justly done, and therefore was allowed. For this reason too the Savior ought not to have come at the very beginning. For when the Devil was exalting himself, man made by God was set as his enemy, that, strengthened by the help of God, for he was not his equal, he might resist him after receiving a command. But the Devil, with his usual subtlety, pretended not to know what had been commanded by God, and he found Eve unstable;

then, promising her that if they touched what was forbidden it would confer divinity on them, he deceived them. Then the Devil, having overcome man, triumphed; the conquered man subjected his race to sin. Therefore it would have been unjust to take the spoils from the victor by force, since whatever God does He does justly. Moreover, since man grievously

sinned by consenting to him, against the command of the Creator, to make himself God, he committed idolatry, by which he sinned against God; therefore help ought not to have been granted him at once; for neither would he have repented, nor would mercy have been welcome to him, if he had not known what he deserved. Although God can do all things, He does what is in harmony with reason, so that He may remain beyond blame.

QUESTION 58. IF SALVATION AND TRUE AND PERFECT KNOWLEDGE ARE THROUGH CHRIST, WHY DID HE NOT COME EARLIER, SO THAT OUR PREDECESSORS WHO WERE IN IGNORANCE MIGHT LEARN THE TRUTH? INDEED, AFTER THE COMING OF CHRIST MANY HAVE BEEN SAVED MORE THAN BEFORE; WHERE, IF HE HAD COME EARLIER, FAR MORE WOULD HAVE BEEN SAVED. IF THIS IS SO, IT APPEARS OPEN TO CRITICISM. — If help is given beforehand to someone upon whom necessity is about to press, he will indeed be grateful, yet he will not be very able to recognize what has been done for him. But if you bring help to someone placed in the very midst of necessity, he will know what kind of benefit he has obtained. For one who is delivered from tribulation gives greater thanks; just as when you offer bread to one who is hungry: but if you offer it to one who is not hungry, what thanks will there be? Therefore it was rightly arranged that the Lord did not come earlier. First, he allowed the human race to use its own free will, yet not without a witness of himself: for from the very structure of the world, through the yearly gifts which he decreed should be supplied for human use by the ministry of the elements, he willed that his divinity be known and feared.

Later, however, when the knowledge of God on earth grew dim and morals were changed, he consented to visit the human race, so that by giving the Law, or rather renewing it (for it existed in nature, but had begun to be neglected), he might restore both the knowledge of himself and the authority of the Law; so that, having recognized God and recalled the Law, they might begin to fear: being certain that the one who gave the Law would be the judge of human deeds. And because, after receiving the Law, they were unable to restrain themselves from sins, although they could have done so, and after being long admonished even through the Prophets, God, moved by mercy, sent his Son, who, offering himself for them and destroying death, granted them the remission of sins, that he might present them, justified, to God the Father; so that, knowing from what danger they have been rescued, they may give thanks to God without ceasing; so that even if necessity should require that they pour out their blood for him, they may still profess that they do not thereby repay him in kind. How pleasing and precious, then, do they deem that benefit which they do not think can be repaid even by death? But perhaps it will be argued on the other side: If many before the Law, and after the Law, weighed down by sins, gave themselves wholly over to the flesh, there were without doubt some who, devoted to God the Creator, restrained themselves from vices.

Come, did these, once removed from life, not descend into hell? But if Christ had come immediately after the death of Adam, and, having freed Adam, who was held by his own

sin, from death, had made a way to heaven for the rest who believed, so that, because they had lived well here, they might be received after death into heaven by their gracious Creator and Restorer. Therefore, is it a loss because Christ did not come earlier? It is clearly a loss. But ask whether it is just or unjust. For losses are often just. When a thief is caught and condemned to pay fourfold according to the Law, does he not suffer loss? Yet it is just; and therefore what the human race has suffered, having come about justly, is therefore permitted. For this reason the Savior ought not to have come at the very beginning. For when the Devil grew proud, and man, made by God, was set up as his enemy, so that, strengthened by God's help, for he was unequal in strength, he might resist him by the command that he had received, being the image of the one God on earth to remove error, by the fact that one was made by the One, from whom the others came, he might show this. But the Devil, with his usual subtlety, pretended not to know what had been commanded by God, and found Eve unpredictable; then, promising them that if they tasted what was forbidden they would become gods, he deceived them.

Therefore the Devil, having conquered man, triumphed; the defeated man sold his race to sin. It was therefore not just to snatch away the spoils from the victor by force at once, because whatever God does, he does justly. Moreover, since man had sinned grievously, for by consenting to become a god he committed idolatry, that is, he sinned against God, he ought not at once to have been helped, since he did not even repent. Later, however, Satan brought many evils upon the righteous: upon Job, Joseph, Jeremiah, Isaiah, Zechariah, and the other prophets and righteous ones. Therefore Christ was entrusted by God his Father to overcome him and to reveal himself, taking away his kingdom by reason, not by sheer power; although God can do all things, yet he does what is in harmony with reason, so that he may remain above blame.

1ST CATEGORY NT 2ND CATEGORY OT QUESTION 87. IF GOD IS ONE, WHY IS HOPE OF SALVATION IN THREE, AND NOT IN TWO OR FOUR, OR SURELY IN THE ONE HIMSELF? AND WHY WAS THE TRINITY NOT PREACHED FROM THE BEGINNING? — Almost nothing new has been brought about: for the Trinity is preached in such a way that one God is believed. Nothing, therefore, has been added, but the mystery of the one God has been revealed. Yet in the very beginnings it was not fitting that it should be revealed; because first it had to be preached, and afterwards that which was preached had to be revealed: so that you may know that the Father is the one from whom all things are; that the Son is so called, through whom all things are; and that the Holy Spirit is called the one through whom all things, which are indeed from the Father but through the Son, are reborn into faith in the one God. Therefore these three indeed exist, but there is one divinity. Reason therefore requires that they be three, neither more nor fewer. For every number reaches up to nine, because when three are mutually in each other, they make the number nine; since in the one there are three, and the three are one. For whoever sees the one, sees the three, since one does not differ from another. Therefore three are one, and three times three are one. For in the number nine this is perfection, as far as number is concerned, because from the one all things exist. And when the one is added, from which

or in which the three who are counted as nine come to be, they become ten or twenty. Yet one always goes only as far as nine, and one is added, because nine are one, so that the perfection of unity may be complete.

QUESTION 9. IF THERE IS ONE GOD, WHY IS HOPE OF SALVATION IN THREE, AND NOT IN TWO, OR FOUR, OR CERTAINLY IN ONE? AND WHY WAS THE TRINITY NOT PREACHED EARLIER? — God is indeed one, but he is not solitary. From eternity he has, in mystery, another who is with the other. And since God the Father has in himself the other with the other, as I have said, it was fitting that the one should first be preached, without the mystery that was in him being revealed: since the head of the Son is the Father, and the head of the Holy Spirit is the Son, because he has received from him; and just as the Father sent the Son, so also the Son sent the Holy Spirit. But after God, from whom are all things, was known, then he made his Son known to those who knew him, the Son whom he had with himself from eternity. And when the Son was revealed, he showed that the Father is the one who had previously been preached as the one God. When he was known, he openly made it clear that there is also the Holy Spirit, who is third from the Father, but second from Christ according to the ordering of number; yet according to substance, the one is not, and does not differ, from the other: and that this has been from eternity in the mystery of God, who is to be adored in the Trinity.

For he wishes to be received with the same honor as that which is from him, in whom he is received, from whom he is. For it is fitting, because in him both all things were made through the Son, and were enlightened through the Holy Spirit, that salvation should be preached in the Trinity, with the order of persons preserved, and the undivided power of the one divinity adored. Therefore reason requires that they be three, neither more nor fewer: because every number reaches up to three. For since the three are mutually in each other, the Trinity is proclaimed on all sides, because in the one there are three, and three are one. Whoever sees the one, sees the three, since one does not differ from another. Therefore three are one, and one is three. This is the Trinity, perfect on every side. And this is the understanding of the Trinity, which is then perfect, if they are called one.

1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 91. HOW TO BE SOUGHT IS HOW TO CONTRADICT THE ARGUMENTS OF PHOTINUS, WHO SAYS THAT CHRIST DID NOT EXIST BEFORE MARY. — But before we speak of John, let us first examine the Baptist, whom the Savior Himself declared to be His witness. For among other things he says of the Lord: “He who comes from above is above all; he who is from the earth is earthly and speaks of the earth. But He who comes from heaven testifies to what He has seen and heard, and no one receives His testimony” (Jn. 3:31–32). See how John, in comparison with the Lord, calls all others together with himself earthly, because he bears witness that He came from heaven, while all the rest are from the earth, that is, from the lower regions. And the Lord Himself, among other similar statements, says: “For I have come down from heaven not to do my own will, but the will of Him who sent Me, the Father” (Jn. 6:38). And again the Lord, speaking in the same

sense, says: "And I do not say to you that I will ask the Father on your behalf. For the Father Himself loves you, because you have loved Me and have believed that I came from God. For I came forth from the Father and have come into this world; again, I am leaving the world and going to the Father. (Jn. 16:26-28) Then, seeing that He had spoken plainly, the disciples say to Him:

"Behold, now You speak openly and You are not using any figure of speech. Now we know that You know all things and have no need that anyone should question You; in this we believe that You came forth from God" (Jn. 16:29–30). These statements need no interpretation, since this is the very summit of our faith: that we believe Christ to have been with God in heaven before His incarnation, as the Son with the Father. For if, because of His righteous life and heavenly teaching, He had said that He came from heaven and from God and came into the world, then all the Prophets and Apostles ought to have said the same of themselves. And because He said, "Again I am leaving the world and going to the Father," (Jn. 16:28) perhaps someone might say that He meant this: that the teaching which came from God, after leaving the world, returned to God? For they have nothing else to say. For if His coming from heaven, His going forth from God, and His coming into this world refer to the cause of virtue and teaching, and not to the person of the Savior, then when He says, "Again I am leaving the world and going to the Father," He naturally returns to the place from which He came. Yet we see that after the Lord's departure, both His power and His teaching remained in the world. You see therefore that the Lord did not speak of power and teaching, but specifically spoke of Himself.

But if you say that these words refer to the power which worked in Christ, that very power itself calls God its Father. You fall into the very thing you fear: for if the power of God is the Son of God, then that very power is the power of God of which the Apostle says that Christ is "the power of God and the wisdom of God" (1 Cor. 1:24): this power went forth from God and returned again to Him. Therefore this very Power, which is Christ, bears witness that He casts out demons by the Spirit of God (Matt. 12:28); this Spirit worked through the Apostles, so that you may know that the Holy Spirit, through whom the Lord worked, after the Lord's departure worked here in the world through the Apostles. Therefore it is more clearly shown that the Lord spoke of His own person, for He left the world and returned to God. But if you think this power is not Christ, then there will be two powers and two sons of God; and where, then, is that which is written: "The only-begotten Son of God, who is in the bosom of the Father" (Jn. 1:18)? And again: "For God so loved this world, that He gave His only Son for it" (Jn. 3:16)? You now see that the power of God which worked visibly in the world is that same one which is called both the Power of God and the Son of God.

And let us see what the Apostles believed, or in whom they believed, when they heard the Lord say: "Behold, again I am leaving the world and going to the Father. For they answered: "Behold, now You speak openly and You are not using any figure of speech. Now we know that You know all things and have no need that anyone should question You; in this we believe that You came forth from God. Now let us see whether the disciples were in doubt about

the powers, whether they came from God, after they had seen Lazarus, already stinking on the fourth day, raised from the dead (Jn. 11:44), the eyes of a man blind from birth restored (Jn. 9:7), a woman delivered from her issue of blood by touching the hem of His garment (Matt. 9:20–22), and the nature of water changed into wine (Jn. 2:9). But concerning the person of the Lord no one at all doubted, nor concerning the powers, since some were saying that He was Elijah, others Jeremiah, or one of the Prophets (Matt. 16:14). For when the Jews wanted to stone Him, Jesus answered them: "I have shown you many good works from My Father; for which of those works do you stone Me? The Jews answered Him: "We are not stoning You for a good work, but for blasphemy, and because You, being a man, make Yourself God" (Jn. 10:31–33). If, then, the Jews did not doubt that these were works of God, did the Apostles doubt?

Since therefore all the doubt concerned the person of the Savior (for this was something unheard of, and beyond human understanding, which caused amazement in people when they heard Him say that He had come forth from God and that God was His own Father), the disciples, acknowledging that the Lord's words had given them full assurance, said to Him: "Now we know that You know all things and have no need that anyone should question You; in this we believe that You came forth from God. (Jn. 16:30) For if He did not truly come forth from God, the faith of the Apostles is emptied; but this cannot be, since it was confirmed by the Savior. For He answered them, "Do you now believe? that is, seeing so many signs, you did not believe before. Therefore it was proved to the Apostles that Christ came forth from God and came, so that by this going forth it would no longer be doubtful to believe that this is the Son of God. For if "no one has seen God except Him who is from God; He has seen the Father" (Jn. 6:46), and if "no one knows the Father except the Son" (Matt. 11:27), this is truly to have been with God the Father, and to have gone forth from Him, and to have come. For no one else could go forth from God except Him who in the beginning was with God (Jn. 1:1); since no one else knew or had seen God.

Therefore it is not incredible for us to believe that this is truly the Son of God. As John says in his first Epistle: "And we are," he says, "in His true Son, Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life (1 Jn. 5:20); and the Apostle says, "He who did not spare His own Son" (Rom. 8:32); and the Evangelist, "Because He called God His own Father" (Jn. 5:18). If therefore Christ is truly the Son of God, how is He only a man? For He would not be called a true Son unless He were properly begotten of Him. Or let Photinus say why He is believed to be the true Son of God, if He is not true. Or what need was there to believe this One to be the Son of God, if He were one of the other saints who are worthy to be called sons of God? Or is there perhaps some unworthiness in this, by which He, as the Son of God, could not be believed as the others are; and therefore it is said that this One, about whom there seems to be unbelief, should be believed to be the Son of God? For if He is greater than the others, what need is there that it should be said, "Believe that Christ is the Son of God," if He were one of the others, unless because it is commanded that we believe differently about Him than about the others?

So that, because many are called sons of God on account of holiness, this One alone may be believed to be the true Son of God, for which reason He is also called the Only-begotten. For which of the saints would have dared to call himself the Son of God, not to say the only-begotten, except the Savior, conscious of His birth proceeding from God? And how would He have allowed Himself to be adored, if He did not know that He is from God, when it is written, "The Lord your God you shall adore, and Him only shall you serve" (Deut. 6:13)? For when John wished to adore the angel, the angel reproved him, saying, "Do not do that, for I am your fellow servant; adore God" (Rev. 19:10; 22:9). And although Scripture testifies that God alone is to be served, yet the Apostle says, "He who serves Christ pleases God" (Rom. 14:18). Why? Because God and Christ, the Father and the Son, are one. The Apostle confesses himself to be the servant of Christ, and says to the Corinthians, "Do not become the servants of men" (1 Cor. 7:23). And to the Galatians, "Paul, an apostle, not from men nor through a man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised Him from the dead" (Gal. 1:1): he clearly shows that Christ is God and man, so that he might demonstrate that his apostleship is not from a man, but from Christ, inasmuch as He is God, and from God the Father.

Finally, in what follows he says, "For I neither received it from man nor was I taught it, but through a revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. 1:12). What could be clearer? For he says that he attained the doctrine of God not through a man, but that he was taught by God Himself. We, indeed, receive the doctrine of God through men; but the "chosen vessel" claims that he attained nothing from the Apostles, that is, from men. For if, because it is the doctrine of God, it is therefore not learned through a man, what praise is the Apostle claiming for himself if he learned in the same way as the other Apostles? Why does he say, "For I neither received it from man nor was I taught it, but through a revelation of Jesus Christ"? Who can doubt that in this passage Christ is signified as God? But what wonder is it, when among other things he says to the Romans, "Theirs are the fathers, and from them, according to the flesh, is the Christ, who is God over all, blessed forever" (Rom. 9:5)? What does "from them, according to the flesh, is the Christ" mean? He would not have said this if He were not also according to God; so that, according to the flesh, He is from the fathers, but according to His divinity Christ is from God, God over all. But perhaps it might be said that this relates to the person of the Father?

Yet in this passage there is no mention of the name of the Father. Therefore, if it is denied that this is said of Christ, let a person be given to whom it fittingly applies. And why should it not fit Christ, in whose name every knee bows in heaven and on earth and under the earth (Philip. 2:10)? that is, that He is God over all. For besides these there are no others. Let Photinus now say whether these bend the knee to a man; or whether God has decreed that those heavenly powers and holy angels should adore a man. Far be it, for God has decreed nothing foolish; especially since it is not permitted to adore any but God, how much less in heaven? For a king is adored on earth as the minister of God. Christ, however, after completing His mediated dispensation, is adored in heaven and on earth. We read, in fact, that "the Word was made flesh" (Jn. 1:14): that is, that this Word, which in the beginning

was with God and was God, was, by the ministry of the Holy Spirit, made flesh of Mary, and that this is also called the Son of God. How then is that which was in the beginning and was God not prior to Mary? Even if, being blinded, you deny that this is God, yet you do not deny that it is the Word; nor do you ignore that this Word is called the Son of God, and that it was with God in the beginning.

On what grounds, then, do you say that what you read was in the beginning is after Mary? For in the Apocalypse we read of Christ, "And His name is the Word of God" (Rev. 19:13). This "Word" has many meanings. For nothing that is from God fails to be called God; but, because of the authority of the one God, He called that which is born from Him "Word," so that, guided by this reasoning, by which we know that our words are from none other than ourselves, we might believe that Christ is from God. Nor indeed ought it to have been said otherwise, so that He might be believed to be from Him and not outside Him. In a similar way, too, He is called the Power and the Wisdom of God, so that in the same manner He may be understood to be from Him. For if He had said "God and God," He would not have signified that the latter was from Himself, but would have made two gods, which is contrary to unity. This is the method in the divine Scriptures: that, while Christ is signified as God, He does not exceed the measure of the one God. But how foolish is that notion of yours, Photinus, by which you so punctuate the beginning of the Gospel of John that the Word may not be called God! For you read therefore: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and God was. The Word was in the beginning with God.

What is the meaning of this punctuation? What sense does it convey? What principle of virtue does it express, except sheer hostility against the Son of God? For what meaning is there in pronouncing, "And the Word was with God, and God was"? Is this then the wisdom of our Scripture, to teach that God exists? What tongue, what nation, what land, what sect denies that God exists And so, to suggest what he means, he says, "And the Word was with God. Or what does he wish this word to be understood as, unless he is showing forth His reason? For the Gospel is not written on account of God, about whom no one doubts, but on account of the Word, about whom questions arise. For it is the mystery of God, which is believed precisely because it is not revealed to all. Therefore Scripture strives to teach what the Word is, saying: "And the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. This agrees with reason, and the statement is complete. For it shows that this Word, which in the beginning was with God and was God, in the sacrament of the eternal mystery of God, which was unknown from ages and generations, is to be believed to have been God the Word with God the Father.

And because this comes into doubt for those who are carnal, who want Scripture to speak according to the capacity of their own understanding, faith has been established, so that by following the sense of Scripture it may deserve its reward. When Solomon had asked wisdom of God, the Lord answered: "Behold, I have given you," he says, "a wise and understanding heart, such as no one has had before you, and after you no man like you shall arise" (1 Kings 3:12). What shall we say? Is what God promised true? Yes, it is true. Therefore no

man will be like Solomon. And what will be thought of Christ, who among other things says, "The queen of the South came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold, something greater than Solomon is here" (Matt. 12:42)? Now choose whom you will believe, Photinus: God or Christ, the Father or the Son? If you believe the Father, you accuse the Son; if you believe the Son, you accuse the Father. For if Christ is only a man, He has vainly set Himself above Solomon contrary to the promise of God; but if He is understood also to be God, He has rightly set Himself before Solomon, and the promise of God remains unstained, because no man like Solomon has arisen. For Christ has shown Himself superior for this reason, that He is God.

O madness of Photinus, who does not wish to confess that Christ existed before Mary, when he hears Him with his own ears testifying that He existed before Abraham! For when the Jews were disputing with Him about time, saying, "You are not yet fifty years old, and have you seen Abraham? He answered them, "Amen, I say to you, before Abraham was made, I am" (Jn. 8:57–58). He did not say, "I am better," but answered the question by declaring that He existed before the time the Jews supposed. Photinus clearly cannot escape the curse of the Law, because he has his hope in Christ, whom he declares to be only a man, while he reads, "Cursed is the man who has his hope in man" (Jer. 17:5). But the Apostle, knowing that Christ is God, therefore says that our hope is in Him both in the present and in the future: "If in this life only," he says, "we are hoping in Christ, we are of all men the most pitiable" (1 Cor. 15:19). Therefore He is not merely a man, in whom we are taught to have hope; for hope placed in a man is vain. We have said these few things out of many; indeed it would have been enough, had he possessed a sound mind. For Photinus this last point alone which we have set forth would be sufficient.

1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 101. ON THE BOASTFULNESS OF ROMAN DEACONS [LEVITARUM].1 — While we wish to obey the commands of love, we may perhaps fall into reproach, since we are writing about a matter that has never been questioned by anyone; for while we do not wish to offend friendship, we entangle the effort that ought to have served to reveal some hidden matter: yet on account of the excessive foolishness of a certain person who emphasizes what we set forth below, that aforementioned love has enjoined this on us, lest, since no one answered him on this for a long time, he grow worse, and, long exercised in vain, be unable to be corrected. For this is the task of love, which does not seek its own. A certain man therefore, who bears the name Falcidius, led by folly and by the boasting of the city of Rome, strives to equal deacons [levitas] with priests and deacons with presbyters: I will not say to favor them, because that would be even more foolish and perhaps seem unbelievable, and we might be regarded not as correctors but as slanderers. By what law then, or what custom, by what example he dares to undertake this, I think no one knows: namely, that he should make equal to those who, as God's bishops, sit in the house of God and in the honor of Christ with dignity, those to whom no seat has been granted in the Church. What audacity is it to make ministers equal to presbyters themselves?

What rash presumption it is to compare with priests the bearers of the tabernacle, and the cutters of all its wood and the carriers of water? For this was the office of the deacons [levitarum]. It is as if officials were equated with captains, and slaves with masters. For this is written, with the Lord saying to Moses, Take the tribe of Levi from the midst of the children of Israel, and set them before Aaron the priest, and they shall serve him (Num. 8:13). What is clearer than this example, which is still observed in the Church? Although the deacons of the Roman Church may appear a little more shameless, yet they do not presume the dignity of sitting in the Church. And if they do not perform all the ministries of service in order, that is due to the multitude of clerics. For otherwise they would also carry the altar and its vessels, and pour water on the hands of the priest, as we see in all the Churches, and as it was appointed by the Lord through Moses. Or are they better than Elisha, who poured water on the hands of Elijah (2 Kings 3:11)? Yet he defends the deacons against the presbyters, as though deacons were ordained from presbyters, and not presbyters from deacons. But because they are ministers of the Roman Church, they are therefore thought more honorable than in the other Churches, on account of the magnificence of the city of Rome, which appears to be the head of all cities.

If this is so, then they ought to claim this also for their priests: for if those who are lower are exalted because of the magnificence of the city, how much more should those who are higher be raised up? For whatever is granted to the officials becomes an increase of the power: just as the honor of the servant contributes to the praise of the master. Yet before the just Judge, God, the honor remains for each here which has been assigned to the several offices of the Churches, so that whoever is a deacon has the honor of a deacon in all the Churches. For it is no slight honor to serve in the Church as minister to a bishop of God; only the priest is worthy of the whole honor of the ecclesiastical order. For the higher order has within itself and by itself the lower as well: for the presbyter performs the office of deacon and of exorcist and of reader. That "presbyter" is to be understood as "bishop," the Apostle Paul proves, when he instructs Timothy, whom he ordained presbyter, as to what sort of man he ought to ordain as bishop (1 Tim. 3:1–7). For what is a bishop, if not the first presbyter, that is, the chief priest? Accordingly he here calls them his fellow-presbyters and his fellow-priests. Does the bishop also call the ministers his fellow-deacons? Certainly not, because they are much lower. And it is shameful for a judge to be called the head of the office staff.

For in Alexandria and throughout all Egypt, if the bishop is lacking, the presbyter consecrates. How great the dignity of the priestly order is, the case of Caiaphas shows, who, although he was a very wicked man, prophesied. Why? Because, he says, he was the high priest (Jn. 11:49). And again, that there is a great difference between a deacon and a priest, the book we call the Acts of the Apostles proves. For when in Samaria they had believed Philip as he preached, Philip, a deacon ordained by the Apostles, they sent, it says, to Peter and John that they might come and give the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands to those who believed (Acts 8:14–15). But they, I think, defend these things either ignorant of the Scriptures or forgetful of the Law. He, therefore, who thinks these things ought to be asserted must recall what happened to the deacons [levitis] when they thought in this

way. For when they presumed that there was no difference between priests and deacons [levitas], Korah and those who agreed with him were swallowed up by the gaping earth, by the judgment of God, and a rush of fire consumed the two hundred and fifty men together (Num. 16:31–35): and King Uzziah, when he presumed to perform the priestly work, was covered with leprosy (2 Chron. 26:19–21): so that by this example, at least, others, struck with fear, might not dare to suppose what has not been granted to them.

For now we see deacons rashly doing at banquets and in prayer what belongs to priests, wanting it to be the case that people answer them, whereas this is permitted only to priests. For it is the role of the deacon to receive from the priest and so to give to the people. You see what empty presumption produces? Forgetful, in the pride of their minds, that they are ministers of the Roman Church, they do not consider what has been ordained for them by God and what they ought to observe: rather, they remove from memory these things, the constant attendance to household duties and official service, which now has great power through good or bad suggestions. For either it is feared lest they give bad advice, or they are bought so that they may grant favors. These are the people who cause them not to consider the rule of their own order. For while they unlawfully humor them with flattery, they drive them headlong, so that they think more is permitted them: since they see that priests are not so courted; and by this they suppose themselves to be preferred He says that by testimony the deacon becomes a presbyter, as though this belonged to the privilege of greatness. For we read that Peter the Apostle said to the people: “Choose from among you those whom we may appoint to serve the mysteries of the Church” (Acts 6:3). I do not wish to say, the tables. Behold, by the testimony of laypeople deacons were created.

And the Apostle wants the one who is to be ordained bishop to have testimony even from the Gentiles; for he says, “For he must also have a good testimony from those who are outside” (1 Tim. 3:7). Therefore it belongs to all to give testimony, and yet not all are worthy of this honor. For all can judge, and yet not all can be what they judge. A painter can be judged good and preferred to another by someone who does not know how to paint; and a flute-player may be approved as better than another flute-player by one who practices a different art. So too a witness for the creation of a presbyter can be someone who is lower in rank. And again, they are puffed up by this and think much is owed to them: “For it is by us,” they say, “that those who are to be ordained are brought forward,” so that, since they stand at their side, they may appear worthy of honor. Suppose this is true. For he is sent by the bishop as an attendant, to render service to the one being ordained. For even the emperor, that he may appear as emperor, is established with the service of the army; yet the army is neither better than nor equal to the emperor. For Haman too, though he was illustrious in military rank, was sent by the king to go in attendance to Mordecai (Esther 6:10), so that by such acts of service it might be known how worthy Mordecai was.

So also deacons are sent in attendance for the creation of presbyters, so that all may understand that they become worthy to be priests. For except for the priests, to whom they owe service, deacons are placed before all.

(1) I am not sure whether the common preference of 'levita' over 'diaconus' might not be adduced as an instance: but my immediate purpose is to call attention to the joint occurrence in both (Ambroisaster and Damascus) of a word that never became as popular in Christian usage as 'levita' but seems to have been fashionable in Roman church circles of that particular generation. (Journal of Theological Studies, Volume 7; CH Turner; Clarendon Press, 1906; p. 182) (2) Question 101 contains the name of a Roman deacon, veiled by the phrase quidam igitur qui nomen habet falsi dei. In all the editions the sentence reads quidam igitur qui nomen habet Falcidii. It is strange how such a sentence could have passed muster for over four centuries. In the eyes of some people anything is good enough to be Christian Latin. Yet the writer shows clearly by the use of the word quidam that he could give the name of the Roman deacon if he chose, and from friendship does not so choose. For the correct reading, now recovered from the manuscripts, is falsi dei, and Falcidius must disappear from the biographical dictionaries. Who is then to take his place? I think it probable that the deacon meant is Concordius, who is known to have lived at that time; then the divinity alluded to will be Concordia. This Concordius, according to the Liber Pontificalis, was a deacon of Rome and one of the prosecutors of Damasus on a capital charge. He was expelled from the Church by a synod of bishops about the end of 378, or the beginning of 379. (Alexander Souter; A Study of Ambrosiaster; The University Press, 1905; p. 181)

1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 113. WHY WAS THE SON OF GOD SENT, AND NOT ANOTHER? — Although everything that God does must be believed to be done reasonably and providentially, I nevertheless think it better if, after faith, the cause of what is done can also be noticed, so that what is believed is not unknown. Therefore the Lord says: "Now this is eternal life: that they may know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom you have sent" (Jn. 17:3). For first what is said by the Prophet must be believed, and then what is believed must be known; because the Holy Spirit helps the faithful and diligent person in this matter, so that by coming to know he may understand the rationale of faith. Then he enjoys the full joy of his believing, if he understands what he believes. For this is the strength of faith, this the immovable foundation of belief: to learn the mystery. For where there is only faith, devotion is not so pure, and deception can gain entrance. Therefore the chosen vessel labors so that believers may learn the rationale of their faith. For when they have come to know how great he is in whom they have trusted, and what his power is, they will by no means and in no way allow themselves to be turned away from hope in him. Therefore we read the saying:

"Taste and see that the Lord is sweet" (Ps. 34:9), so that by deliberate effort they may know the flavor of his divinity, understanding that nothing is wiser than to believe in Christ. For this reason the Teacher of the Gentiles says among other things: "In whom are hidden all the treasures of the wisdom and knowledge of God" (Col. 2:3); and again, "I know," he says, "whom I have believed, and that he is able to guard my deposit" (2 Tim. 1:12). Therefore this man knows the rationale of his faith and does not doubt the power of him who understands

that all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden in the mystery of the birth, passion, and resurrection of Christ. So, with faith remaining, I long conferred with myself to know why our Lord came incarnate from holy and heavenly seats down to earth, and not another from among those whom the Lord himself calls holy angels. For it seems unfitting to his person that he should have undertaken this work, unless the cause of the deed is known. Indeed this is what troubles many. For the providence of God the Father could have carried out this business through another person, in order both to show the truth to men who were in error, and to restrain the arrogant and envious Devil, who begrudges salvation, together with his satellites, and to despoil him once defeated.

For the stubbornness and irreverence of most wicked servants ought to have been curbed by subordinate ministers, so that the Lord of all should not experience something unworthy of himself. For Satan does not have such great force and power that he could in no way be overcome by another power of the same order, since it is clear that by God's help he is even conquered by men. For although the comparison is unequal if we take examples from earthly affairs, still it suits reason in some respect. For against the servant who rebelled against King David, Joab, his fellow-servant, was sent to pursue and kill him; and against Absalom, wicked toward his father, this task was laid upon the servants (2 Kings 20:6 and 15:14): how much more would the worth of one among many have suited to conquer the tyranny of the Devil; since we read that, challenging against Michael the archangel, he could not hold out, but was cast down to the earth (Rev. 12:7–9)? Often reflecting on this, I knew only this: that he himself was sent by the Father lest it should touch the Father as an injury if a work done by him were corrected by another; but to know this was little. For it did not avail for so great and wondrous a cause, unless something else were also grasped that would help toward the secret understanding. Therefore it came about that I noticed that the cause itself demanded that the one who came should come in just this way.

Reason itself required that he should come to subdue the one who had seized his dignity and merit. For after God the Father the Devil wanted to be called god, which he even now still strives for, though the matter did not belong to him, but to the Son of God, who after the Father is second as God, not by nature but by order. Therefore for dealing with this cause no one ought to have come but Christ our Lord: who came not only to subdue the Devil, but also to reveal himself to every creature; so that, with the Devil's person rejected, they might recognize him whose rule and majesty Satan had presumed upon; and thereafter, once the truth was known, they might abandon error, being certain that Christ is the Son of God, who alone is God from God, and the head or ruler of all things, whether those in heaven or those on earth. For by the strength and power with which he overcame the tyrant Satan, he is shown to be the very one whose dominion the wicked Devil, who is Satan, had presumed upon. For when he unjustly wished to be called god so that he might rule spiritual powers (for which he is rebuked by the prophet saying, "For you have said in your heart: I will set my throne in the clouds, and I will be like the Most High" (Isa. 14:13–14), he deceived many, by whose conspiracy he became the prince of error.

These are admonished in the Psalm to reject falsehood and receive truth. For it is said to them: "Lift up your gates, you princes; and be lifted up, you eternal gates; and the King of glory shall enter in. (Ps. 24:7-10) For unless error is removed from the minds of unbelievers, they could not receive faith in the one God in Christ. For this they are taught: that, once the gates by which one goes to death, according to the unbelief established by the Devil, are taken away, they may receive the mysteries of faith by which one goes to life. These are what he signifies by the eternal gates; because the truth of faith is eternal, but unbelief is temporal, because falsehood is the invention of the Devil. For the Devil sowed on earth the transgression he had begun in heaven, urging the worship of many gods, among whom he might hold first place. For he wished to be the head and ruler of the others, which was not owed to him, but to the Savior. Therefore the Savior pursues him even to the earth, so that by subduing him he may show the transgression of his error, with the truth revealed in himself. Where it is said: "Truth is sprung out of the earth" (Ps. 84:12). For, cast down from heaven, he took refuge on earth, so that the divinity he had contemplated in the heights he might enact in the lower regions. Therefore the Apostle says:

"So that he sits in the temple of God, showing himself as though he were God" (2 Thess. 2:4). For in whatever way he wishes to fulfill his desire, even if it means being damned: filled with madness he considers it less grievous to be damned than not to satisfy the greed of his error.

1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 115. CONCERNING FATE. — Nothing is so contrary to a Christian as paying attention to the art of astrology. For this is recognized as hostile to the law of God. For if some are born who are evil, and conversely others who are good, then the giving of the Law is said to be in vain; and not only this, but the Lawgiver will also be considered unjust. For if, having given the Law, he compels men to act against what they were born to be, knowing that their nature cannot be changed, he seems to have given the Law for this purpose, that he might have an occasion to satisfy his cruelty with the destruction of man. For why does he forbid what he knows cannot be turned aside? Or how does he condemn a man who has not done what he was unable to do? If, however, this seems unjust, as indeed it is, because it is wicked to think this of God, then he gave the Law rightly and for salvation, knowing that man is able to restrain himself from that which the Law forbids. Therefore, since he justly gave the Law, he is certainly not unjust when he enforces it. And so, if faith is to be given to God's Law, because it is proven to have been given justly, the art of astrology must be shunned and fled from. For the cunning and subtlety of the Devil discovered it.

Because he does not dare to openly oppose the Author, he works by elusion, so that he may both do injury to God and, by making man an enemy of the Law, punish him with the second death. Whoever yields to the authority of God, and judges it wicked to call his work into question, obeys the Law given by him, applying himself to its study day and night, and does not look toward anything opposite, not doubting that man is able to keep his commandments. For those who desire to sin seek a grounds by which they can make their sins seem not

to be their own; so that, while sins are said to be, as it were, attributable to nature, the sinner appears to be free from punishment. This is the plan of those who, in despair of the promised future life, desire to enjoy present pleasure. But those who, relying on the confidence of faith, await the hope of future things, strive to fulfill what they promised at the very beginning of their rebirth: that they would renounce the pomps and pleasures of Satan. With what great subtlety, then, has Satan acted, so that he might make man more eager to sin, by that through which he could satiate the wickedness of his envy? For when a man hears that he was born in such a way that he must sin, and knows that God is most just, he believes he sins with freedom;

because a judge who is just does not condemn one who sinned under the obligation of nature. Nor indeed should it be called his sin, that another committed through him. Therefore man has been deceived: weighed down by sins, he has become subject to death. Therefore, whoever takes away all evil from man, also takes away all good. For if the sinner has no punishment, neither has the righteous a crown. Why are the good praised and the wicked blamed? For if it belongs to this nature that he cannot sin, why do you praise in him what does not belong to him? And why do you condemn the sinner for his offense, when you know that what he does in sin is not his own? What else will he be but unjust, who praises the good and accuses the evil? But perhaps it might be said in reply: I praise good nature in man, and condemn evil nature; for good wine is praised, since by nature it is good, and bad wine is rejected, though by nature it equally produces this quality. If it were so, there would be no cause for blame, so that the righteous would be praised in such a way that he would not be judged worthy of a crown; nor would the unrighteous be accused in such a way that he would be declared worthy of punishment. Yet we both know and read that in the present and in the future the righteous are rewarded, and the unrighteous are burned, subjected to punishments;

which would surely seem unjust, if one who acted according to his nature were to suffer penalties from avenging fire, or another, who likewise carried out the work of his nature, were to be honored with rewards. If, however, the good man is to be praised because he did what belonged to his nature, the wicked man should also be praised, because he likewise did what belonged to his nature, so that each, remaining in what he was made, should be praised. For if one who remains in what he was made is considered blameworthy, the blame touches the Author, who caused such a one to be born as would be displeasing. But if the righteous man is rightly to be rewarded, and the wicked rightly condemned, then the response is no longer to nature but to the will; because nature is free, but the will is the cause, which undergoes approaches and withdrawals by the senses; so that the unrighteous man, seeing the righteous crowned, and himself condemned, credits it to himself, who, trusting his senses against the Law, did evil when he could have done good. Can the sun be accused because it burns, or water because it cools? Or is water to be rewarded because it refreshes men who suffer thirst, or will the sun be granted rewards because it restores men with its warmth after cold? For they do what belongs to their nature; therefore they are neither condemned nor praised, since they do not know how to do anything else.

But since things are not as the star-gazers suppose, the logic of actions proves it. For no one can be found who always does good, or always does evil. For he would then appear to have been born so as to act well, if he remained perfect; and he would rightly be judged to be evil, if he continued always to act wickedly. But since you see that the one whom you think to have been born good sometimes acts badly, and that the one whom you say was born evil sometimes is seen to do good, how do you prove this to be true, that the evil man is evil and the good man good, except that this is more certain: that in whatever direction a person has set his mind, in that he advances? For there are also causes that generate sins, so that a man may quarrel through jealousy, or become an enemy. Those things, however, which are forbidden by the Law are not committed openly and obviously, but secretly. Why, unless because they fear the Law? But if, as they claim, they had been born for this purpose, to do evil, they would not seek hiding places, nor show any reverence for the Law; rather, they would do everywhere those things which nature compels.

But when you see that sins are arranged and that ways are devised so they may be secretly committed, for they choose places, persons, and times in order to carry out the will of their evil intention, so too, in a similar way, the good also distinguish their good works by a certain judgment, so that, according to the time and for the sake of some particular cause, they may distribute their good. This, of course, is no longer to be attributed to nature, but to the will that exists within nature. For if it were natural, judgment would cease. For if we examine the matter more fully, we shall show that those who are now righteous were previously unrighteous, but, having applied themselves, they were changed. For Abraham himself is read to have been justified by faith (James 2:23 and Rom. 4:3). Therefore, before this he was not righteous, since he is understood to have worshipped idols under the guidance of his father. And Zacchaeus too, to whom after a common sort of life the Lord bears witness (Luke 19:9). And the vessel of election, who also admits this, saying, “We too were by nature children of wrath, like the rest” (Eph. 2:3); because the will yields superiority over nature. For one is judged by the will, not by nature. Without doubt all the martyrs and the righteous became good; for they were not born faithful, but reborn.

And how many do we know to have lived a shameful life, extravagant devotees of luxury, who are now self-controlled and holy? For when the fear of God draws near, the vices that once ruled are overcome. Let us consider from this how powerful the fear of the law can be. Before Julian’s edict, women were unable to dismiss their husbands. But once the power was granted, they began to do what previously they could not do; they began to dismiss their husbands freely every day. Where had fate hidden itself for so many ages? I suppose it was concealed by fear of the law. And how did that come to be which Moses handed down? I suppose fate was asleep. For so many and such great things were entrusted to them to observe, such as no other nation possesses as precepts. And lest anyone think this should be attributed to the influence of the heavens, scattered over almost the whole world they keep the commands of their law. These precepts stand against fate. For they surely did not exist for three thousand years and more from the founding of the world; but once given, they remain until the end. How then did that which did not exist for so many thousands of years

begin? For the course of the stars has been in place from the foundation of the world. And what of this:

since there is such a multitude of Jews throughout the whole world, no one among them is changed so as to become a Gentile, whereas we see that from among pagans, though rarely, some become Jews? Behold, as far as the Jewish rite is concerned, fate is excluded; for they both began to exist outside fate and remain within it. What shall we say of Sodom and Gomorrah, whose end, such as it was, lies before our eyes as an act of vengeance (Gen. 19:24)? It came to pass that all, stained with the disgrace of every kind of filth, were consumed by divine fire. In the Flood all were under one fate, so that all perished with one death and at the same time, except the household of Noah (Gen. 7). And the whole army of Pharaoh would have to be said to have been born under a single decree, so that the foolish error of astrology might be punished, since they were drowned in the Red Sea with their king (Exod. 14:24). And how many other great examples there are which we pass over, because two examples are enough for our purpose; how much more, then, with so many mysteries? For all nations have different customs: what is allowed in one place is not allowed here; and again, what is allowed here is not allowed elsewhere.

For here in the city of Rome and its territories, which is called most holy, it is permitted for women to dismiss their husbands, although in the divine law it is ordained that not even men should make use of this power, except in the case of fornication (Matt. 5:32). See, in this matter the barbarians are better. And it is not impossible that this could also be observed here, because it is shown to have been observed before. Therefore fate has been changed, because what was previously forbidden has begun to be permitted. And it is not permitted to make eunuchs in the Roman realm, whereas among others it is permitted: yet that they could be made here also is in itself clear; for the fact, though done secretly, is proven; and if fear ceased, it would be done openly. Fear therefore restrains fate; for it is overcome, if a person does not do what he wishes to do. And the Persians wear earrings in the manner of women, which here is dishonorable and unlawful: that it could also be done here is attested by the priests of the Mother (goddess) who is called the Great; and indeed she was great, but a harlot: yet in this they differ, because these are womanish men, those were men. And what shall we say? Are these the only people in the whole world who are born by this fate, to be mutilated and transformed into women, so that in the whole world these few are found;

whom it is well known are ensnared by threats and compelled by promised rewards to this pain and disgrace? If they were born for this, they would not need to be forced. The Persians are allowed to have intercourse with their own daughters, which is shown to be possible here as well, by the fact that it is proved to have been done by some. But because punishment intervened, they were corrected by fear, so that they do not do what can be done, but is not lawful. For everything that is forbidden is forbidden for this reason: that, since it can be done, it may not be done. If, however, it were of fate, it could not be done, nor would it be forbidden. For if it were not of fate and yet were forbidden, it would be indicated that something can be done which is not of fate. And what wisdom is there in forbidding what

cannot be done, as if someone forbade anyone to fly from the city of Rome to Spain, or to carry a mountain on his shoulders? Rather, those things which can be done, though they ought not to be, are forbidden. It is the custom of the Moors that women also wear earrings in their noses; is this of fate? If it were of fate, those who came here would remain so; for if something is fated, each person carries his fate with him.

But because it is not of fate, all who come from there are changed here, when they see that what is considered seemly there is regarded as shameful here. Certainly, among all nations number is number; earth is earth; and water is water; and air is air; and fire is fire. Can there anywhere be found earth that is not dry, or air that is tangible, or water that is not flowing and cold, or fire that is cold? So everywhere Jupiter is Jupiter; and Saturn is Saturn; and Venus is Venus. Likewise with the other signs. For this art is treated everywhere according to one and the same method: but because the customs remain different among all nations, this is not due to the ordering of fates, which are the same everywhere, as they (the astrologers) maintain, but to human invention. For whatever someone, who was thought to be the first among his people, decided to be reasonable and fitting for modesty, he established for those over whom he presided. From this, each region or nation has its own rules which it observes. Therefore Solon and Lycurgus established many ordinances to be kept by the Greeks with the force of law, which, as their kingdoms gradually declined, were forgotten. For the kings of the Jews preferred mules for riding; the Romans, however, not mules but horses; the Garamantes, who are above Tripoli in Africa, preferred bulls for their kings to ride: but the kings of the Persians are carried in chariots;

for the ancient kings of the Persians were not even seen by the people: and the kings of Midian take delight in camels for riding, so that they even adorn their necks with golden collars: and throughout Africa they prefer to sit on donkeys rather than on horses. Although all things exist everywhere, not all are pleasing to everyone; for each person chooses what is more pleasing to him. For even among ourselves there is a different will, in clothes, and in food, and in other usages, and in our opinions themselves. This fact shows that those who claim that many people have different fates cannot ascribe this to fate, because our will often changes. For what we have long loved later displeases us; and we begin to love what we previously did not gladly possess, and once a habit is formed we remain changed. But if they say there is an order of fates, so that they produce certain effects in certain recurring periods at returning intervals of time, so that, for example, what they do today they do again after a while: at any rate, they are not said to remain fixed in one thing. For they are overcome by discipline and habit. So, for many ages Roman women were unfamiliar with the use of wine. Discipline, having been strengthened by habit, confirmed their judgment, so that they held fast to what they had learned to be beneficial.

Were there fates of this kind in those times, and have they since died, so that this well-devised practice has ceased? But these things came not from fate, but from discipline. And when there is a departure from custom, discipline perishes. And the ancient Romans were of such self-control that they even refused gifts that were offered, considering good reputation

as wealth, and preferring virtue to pleasures: and these either were succeeded by other fates, or they passed away; but it was not a matter of fate, but of discipline, which is even the educator of fate itself. For how can something be of fate which neither had it before its time, nor has it now? And indeed I do not know why they cast such blame upon fate, as to say that it is the author of all deeds, while it both is and is not. For where discipline is, fate is not; and where habit is, fate is not; and where chance is, fate is not: and where it seems to exist, it is overcome by fear of the law; for desire itself is checked by fear, and the pursuit of money is renounced for the sake of gaining God's favor. In this area, therefore, it cannot be denied, because what is overcome cannot fail to exist; and yet it can rightly be said that even in this very point it does not exist, because what is overcome lacks authority.

Therefore, whoever follows the law of God and holds to the custom of a good life, to such a one all things that are called "fates" give way. For habit has such power that it even tames beasts. For those who choose to live wickedly appoint their own fates for themselves. For through excess and pleasure come greed and restlessness, which give birth to lack of self-control and anger. And knowing that this deserves punishment, in order to make themselves appear blameless, they attribute shame to the fates, when demons offer their help to those who think about such things; for they also ordain this, that they grant fulfillment to those who think evil: these they call fates, not understanding that they are enemies of man. For if sins did not enter the soul through the senses, but arose from within, then everything that is done wrong would rightly appear to be the work of the fates. But since they see that the desire for sins arises through sight and hearing and through the other senses (with the enemies helping, who have suggested doing what is contrary; and this is not considered while it is being done: for it seems sweet when it is being done, or before it is done; but once completed it appears to be bitter), what do they credit to the fates? That it can be overcome we notice from this: for when we are thinking and anxious about some matter, the enemies fall silent, and desire grows quiet;

for they cannot whisper suggestions to us while we are occupied. Does anyone, when someone is dedicated to some matter, suggest something else to him? He does not, knowing either that he will not be heard, or that he will be rejected as one who importunately suggests. So too with the enemies, who are known to be demons; for these are the gods of the pagans, when they see us occupied with divine things, they do not intrude to suggest the opposite, but lie in wait, looking for an opportunity to intrude. The safeguards of souls, therefore, are constant meditation on and practice of the law of God; for if they see us idle in divine matters, they are stirred up to harass us. They are the ones who sow desires through flesh and blood. For although the flesh has its own movement from its origin, since carnal nature is not idle, yet in this matter the help of demons is added for the destruction of men. For there are various demons, having different wills. Some, when they disturb souls, strike down bodies; others, mingling themselves with the blood, generate desires in souls; others, joining themselves to the heart of man, with coaxing suggest what is contrary; and there are some that only bind bodies with illnesses, as in the case of that daughter of Abraham whom the Lord healed (Luke 13:11-16).

The pagans, knowing none of this, call it fate, though the causes are different, and these things are brought about by enemies, in order that, for whatever reason, a man may be provoked and subjected to passions. They call it good fate when bodies are well-balanced or are praiseworthy for their friendliness, having a certain charm; but say that fate is evil if they have too much heat or moisture, or if someone is not sprinkled with grace, but rather is ready for misfortunes, such they call "unfortunate. Suppose these things to be true. We see the same even in animals, that they have more heat; but animals are not rational as man is, so that they could, with proper care, temper their body. For this reason the soul is the ruler of the body, to govern it with the reins of the divine law. For the divine law shows that the things suggested either by the impulse of the flesh or by the enemy are not beneficial. God gave this law as a help so that, when the enemy dictates evils as if they were good, by looking at the precepts of the law we may recognize him as a deceiver, because he persuades what the law does not teach. Therefore the body is restrained, so that, since it is hot, less is given to it, and it is held back from delights. For just as in a feverish body, if it receives food or drink, the heat increases;

so also such bodies as are inflamed by the heat of the blood will blaze the more fiercely unless they are governed. For if fire lacks fuel, it goes out. It is the soul's task to lead the body. But if it lets the body go where it wills, it will hurl it down, like a mad horse with a careless rider. And because the heat of the body flares up more strongly through the activity of the enemies to deceive the soul, for it is not the body that desires, but by its heat it generates desires in the soul, the assistance of our God must be pleaded for protection, that he may restrain them: for our struggle is not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers (Eph. 6:12). When these are removed, it will be easy to curb the motion of flesh and blood. For a inferno is extinguished if it lacks the material on which it feeds. Those things, however, happen to people about which the astrologers speak, who believe that what they say will happen in the future. For this is brought about by the craft of demons, so that they may bring to pass the things their priests have said will occur, lest they be exposed as false and cease to be believed. But in the case of those who do not give credence to their oracles, the effect of these things does not prevail;

for neither are they themselves so intent on satisfying those who do not believe in them, nor does God allow them to act in such a way that those who trust in God and do not believe the Devil are deceived. For God has ordered all things in such a way that events correspond to each person's faith, so that the freedom of the will may remain; and therefore nothing can prevail against the one who believes God and flees to his help. For he is certain that what God has made is in his power, and that nothing dares act against him whom it sees to have the common God as his gracious protector. Surely God made the world, and created the sun and the stars, assigning them courses by which mankind is governed: does he not have the power to command them at times to do something other than what has been decreed for them? For he established them in such a way that they are subject to his will, and only then do they carry out the courses decreed for them, if no other command has been given: as, for instance, if he is asked by those whom they serve, because either the rains are untimely,

or because, through excessive drought, barren fruits appear, he orders the weather to be moderated;

or if perhaps, as often happens, people live with God angry, while wandering in luxury and vanity they do not do what pleases God, he keeps the rain suspended for a very long time, so that, as we read was done in the time of Elijah and Elisha, he may stir up famine over the earth, and when he is appeased by their satisfaction, he grants that the rains may water the dry ground (1 Kings 18:43). For in the same way the ordering of the world exists as secular government does. For just as some, oppressed by the governors of provinces, have recourse to the help of emperors so that they may be lifted up again, so also, if people see adverse times for themselves, they should present themselves as petitioners to God, in whose power all things are. But this does not seem right to the astrologers. For they say that nothing else can happen than that the stars fulfill the causes decreed for them; and that they can neither be recalled nor driven to anything else, but once having been fixed they observe their duties. This is the assertion of the astrologers, namely, that they say fates cannot be changed, nor can anything be obtained by prayers; because they say that God once established the entire order of the world, and handed it over to the stars as ministers, such that things can neither be done earlier nor later than appointed. This is the error of the astrologers, with which they also attack God.

For through this assertion they deny that anything can be done outside the order of the world; so that all the things which are read as having been done by God in the world, if they are at variance with the law of the world, they deny are to be believed: but they affirm those things which are said to have been done according to the statutes of the world, so that neither can it be said that a virgin gave birth, nor that Aaron's rod flowered and produced fruit (Num. 17:8), nor that Sarah, an old woman, gave birth (Gen. 21:2). For the order of the world does not include these things, because they are read as having been done by God outside the order of the world. And what wonder is it, if the maker of the world did what the world cannot do? But, they say, he would seem to have transgressed the order which he established, if he is said to have acted otherwise himself than he decreed for the world. Come now, he established a law for the world for acting or generating; did he establish one for himself? And would it have been his humility, if he acted in the same way as the world was created by him? And how would it be understood as having been done by him, if he had done what he did by the law of the world?

But in order that it might be understood as having been done by God, not by the world, it was done according to another order. Certainly he decreed for the sun that it should unceasingly fulfill its appointed courses, and not have leave to stand still; yet will it not be permitted to him who imposed this law on it to make it stand still? Certainly it is decreed for judges that it is not lawful to revoke a sentence passed on an accused person; will the emperor himself also be under this law? For he alone is allowed to revoke a sentence and absolve a man condemned to death, and to grant pardon himself: how much more ought it to be permitted to God to do what ought not to be granted to the world, since the world is

the servant of its Creator? Indeed, by the law handed over to it, the world can kill, but it cannot make alive; through excess it can make a man blind, but it cannot restore his eyes; it can make him feeble and sick, but it cannot heal him: for this God reserved to himself, so that it might be clear that he is Lord of all. For it pertains to the overthrowing of fate that the dead have risen; that the eyes of a man born blind have been restored; that the sick and paralytics have been strengthened;

and the other things that have been done, so that, for those who flee to God, whatever there may be of fate cannot bring any hindrance. For the apostle John says: "He who is in us," he says, "is greater than he who is in this world" (1 Jn. 4:4). For when he is pleaded, God even removes what he has decreed. For he certainly decreed that sinners should be punished, and yet he forgives those who plead to him; because to him alone it is permitted to bind and to loose. Therefore, although no pause is granted to the sun, under Joshua it was ordered to stand still, and it obeyed his command (Joshua 10:12–13), contrary to what had been prescribed for it in the order of the world. Under Hezekiah, however, something greater is read to have been done; for, in order that Hezekiah might not doubt that what had been promised to him was true, he received a sign of such a kind that it was new and unheard of by human ears. For it was not, as before, that the sun was ordered to stand still, but to go back (2 Kings 20:11): seeing this, Hezekiah could be certain that he who had made the ninth hour become the sixth could add fifteen years to his life. And because what was granted to Hezekiah is against the astrologers, for they deny that life can be lengthened, he again receives a sign in this matter which is against the astrologers.

For they assert that it is impossible for the stars to do anything other than what has been fixed. Certainly they say it is fate that a man should have a slave or not have one. Granted. Where were these fates from the beginning of the world? For down to the flood and below, through many ages that passed, this condition of slavery did not exist. Or did these fates perhaps begin in the time of King Ninus, who is said to have been the first to wage wars on his neighbors and to make those he captured subject to slavery? You see, then, that this was discovered later, and is not a matter of fate but of the actions of demons; for if it were a matter of fate, it would have existed from the beginning of the world. For the stars themselves are those that were made in the beginning, and their course remains the same even now. And formerly human life was rural, and there was no pursuit of riches: how is it that now astrologers say through the stars that people become rich and poor? Have the stars perhaps been changed? No, it is the cunning and deceit of Satan, so that he may say that things are brought about by the stars which he actually performs through his angels, his ministers. For as the time approaches when his destruction draws near, he devises greater things by which people may sin. Behold, we know that Italy, Africa, Sicily, and Sardinia have suffered from famine;

let the astrologers say whether all these had one and the same fate, when it is said that among a hundred men not even the fates of two can agree with one another. Let them be ashamed and be silent, and stretch out praying hands to God, in whose power are all

things. But perhaps, one may say, in this point fate has slipped in? What shall we say of Pannonia, which has been so wiped out that it can find no remedy? O their weakness! for with a wavering faith they profess to be Christians. For while they doubt the promises, they do not even think about the things that have already been done. For if they considered the deeds accomplished by the Prophets and Apostles, they would never accept the tales of astrologers. They would know that all things are in the power of God, and they would not be terrified when evils happen to the good; for in the future judgment they will be rewarded, remembering the Apostle who says: "Through many tribulations," he says, "we must enter into the kingdom of God" (Acts 14:21). For being content, and awaiting the judgment of his God, he will both receive his reward and be avenged. For if he desires to be avenged in the present, or with all greed longs to enjoy present wealth, he doubts the life that has been promised; and by this he will be accounted in the future among the faithless, and deemed worthy of punishment.

For God made the world for the sake of discipline, and adorned it with all resources, setting forth two ends, one present and one future, one heavenly and one earthly, so that it might be a testing ground for man: that he who, spurning the future life, chose the present one, might be assigned to the flesh; but he who preferred the future to the present might be deemed worthy of spiritual things; and that he who was unjustly oppressed by the power of the unjust, if he laid down or resigned his complaints before God, might in the future judgment be lifted up and honored with spiritual glory. Therefore none of the saints has appeared glorious in the world, nor has any of them loved present delights. Therefore the Apostle: "Having," he says, "food and clothing, with these let us be content" (1 Tim. 6:8). But whoever is a Christian even grieves if he seems to be fortunate in this world, since the dignity and happiness of Christians has not been promised on earth, but in heaven. How can he call himself a Christian who does not wish to glory there, where it has been promised, but here where it is forbidden? For if it were advantageous to enjoy present things, surely heavenly rewards would not be promised to those who despise them. With what hope, then, do Christians lend their ears to astrologers, when they hear the Apostle John crying out and saying:

"Do not love this world, nor the things that are in this world" (1 Jn. 2:15)? Therefore, if these are the precepts of our faith or law, that the world should not be loved, nor the things that are in the world; why is it that some among us complain, saddened by the prosperity of others which is in the world, and which perhaps is regarded as misfortune before God; whereas they ought rather to rejoice because the world does not grant them the things by which they would be bound and held liable to earthly affairs? For this so called happiness, received as an opportunity for security, is devoid of concern for divine things. For such a man must necessarily be careless about divine oracles, who, being filled with all necessities, has nothing to trouble him. But men of this sort usually begin to be troubled by another kind of anxiety, namely, that they may increase their greatness in this world, which cannot happen without sin. Yet if one looks more closely, it will be seen that the world is rather an enemy of those whom it is said to make happy. For scarcely any one of them thinks of

heavenly things. Christians must therefore rejoice when, while they live rightly, they are oppressed in this age. For he conquers the world who, being content with how things turn out for him in this life, gives thanks to God, from whom, if certain temporal things seem to be denied here, he hopes that eternal ones will be repaid.

For why did God appoint a future judgment, if not that those who are unjustly pressed down for a time may be granted eternal life, while those are cast down who, through their power, despised or did not believe in the future judgment of God, and thought that crimes would go unpunished? But the defenders of fate deny that there will be a future judgment. For if some are born to be good, and others on the contrary to be evil, why do you praise or accuse, when the good man has not struggled in conflict to win, nor the evil man been negligent so as to perish? What is this that they peddle among private persons? For when sinners are brought before judges, they have never dared to excuse their crimes by fate; rather, confessing themselves guilty, they do not deny that they rightly receive sentence. Therefore the authority of the law tramples down the notion of fate, so that they cannot even be named when the law is set in motion. But how do those who have behaved wickedly believe that they will escape forever, who by some means avoid for a time the severity of divine law, not considering that the author of the law cannot for his part overlook this? For here there is an image of the law, there the truth itself: and he who mocks the image cannot mock the truth. Is there any place without God, or can anyone escape his hand?

Yet they, flattering themselves, think that whoever escapes here is already safe. And how do they judge this to be just, that while others are punished in such cases, these should escape? Surely God established the world and showed by what law it should be governed. For loving his work, he showed it the way that leads to life, ordaining with what guides it should be accompanied; for there is also a way that leads to death. Should he not therefore inquire whether those whom he has appointed as ministers of his kingdom have governed his people by the same law under which he established them; whether the people have received his edict; whether the ministers, if found faithful, deserve praise, or, if unfaithful, are subject to punishment? In like manner the people, if they have observed the law, are praised; if they have despised it, they are condemned. This is his right; this is what the cause demands. How then is it that some dislike believing that there will be a future judgment? But this notion has been invented by the madness of the astrologers. For how can they accept a future judgment who contradict the present, since they insist that judgment lies in the birth? And because reward is attributed to birth, they themselves are foolish, who, claiming that by a certain natural judgment people are not made good and bad but are born so, assign recompense to sinners and do not allow sins to go unpunished.

For they chastise the wicked with rods and chains within, those whom they assert to have been born hopeless outwardly. Can any sensible person correct those whom he knows cannot be improved? This would indeed be either foolish or unjust. But let them not say that this very thing happens by fate; for he who is under fate does not do what he wills, so that they too would have it as a natural property to exact vengeance on those whom they know will

remain by nature unchangeable; and in truth it must be said that whatever is said to belong to fate must be assigned to folly. For how foolish it is that, when they say someone is born evil, they do not approve as good even him whom they claim to be born good. How can he be judged good who is found doing something unjust? For what is so unjust as that a man should be thought unjust who is said to have been unable to do anything other than what he did? And if all things are under fate, how did the law come in, which does not allow what is of fate to be done? For if the law were removed, unlawful things would everywhere be done openly; the powerful could not be endured, nor would there be freedom, because even he who now does not think evil, with fear removed, would begin to be evil. Indeed we read that the law was given because of the wicked.

But perhaps it too came about by fate, that the law should be given? And how do fates stand, if they generate that which destroys them? Whatever is of fate, the law forbids to be done. Therefore they lack reason if they produce things contrary to themselves. And they are unjust, because they cause men to be born for damnation; and if they are unjust, they ought not to have authority, since everything unjust is liable to punishment. Or perhaps they may say that the law is of no benefit, because he who is born so as to be evil cannot be changed by the law; if that is so, the law was given in vain. And how did the fates bring forth something unnecessary, since nothing is without fate? Therefore the fates both act for themselves and against themselves; and if this is so, that cannot stand which, through inconsistency of reason, has no firmness. But perhaps the fates wished there to be a law for this reason, that those whom the fates cause to be born evil should be condemned by the law, so that it might suit the fates to apply punishment from the law. What can be said to this, except that both laws and fates deserve by their own judgment to be condemned, if with equal injustice they contrive that those should be killed who did evil not of their own will but under the compulsion of the fates?

To this the law is opposed, because the fates, by their own profession, are to be condemned. For they do not deny that those who are evil are such by fate. The law, however, is so far opposed to the fates that it denies that the wicked are such by fate, but by their own will; for which reason it rightly ordains that they be punished. Therefore the law and the fates have nothing in common, since the law denies what the fates affirm. And how will those be said to be born under fate who banished the astrologers from the city of Rome? It is well known that this was long maintained, and they were certainly pagans. How can things done against fate be caused by fate? But if there is fate, it does not act against itself. Those who act against fate do not have fate; and if these have no fate, there is no fate. “But there is,” they say, “a fate that determines for each person by what kind of death he shall die. If this is so, the murderer is not to be blamed. For he will defend himself in a twofold way: both that he himself acted under the agency of fate, and that the other was killed under the agency of fate. But in all this the law is struck down, because it punishes the murderer who is brought before it.

In a similar way, the one who is an adulterer is born so, and the woman who is an adulteress, and the one with whom adultery is committed. If this too is the case, even now the law is assailed, because it punishes adulterers; and if this truly were of fate, he also ought to be punished who has such a fate that he must suffer adultery. For he too is found to be a participant, because his fate allowed adultery to be committed. It was therefore just that either they be condemned together or absolved together. In all this the law appears unjust. Therefore, if the fates are from God, the law will not be from God, because it is not fitting either for God or for a wise man to condemn what he himself has made. But since no one has ever dared to speak against the law or to deny that it is from God, the fates cannot be said to be from God, because God punishes those things through the law. For when that which is done under the compulsion of the fates is condemned, without doubt the fates are condemned. "But wicked souls," they say, "are born for this purpose, that they may do evil. Granted. Yet wicked souls ought not to be born by fate, so that the innocent might be able to be killed by them. For if those souls were wicked, they ought not to be born, but to be punished, so that they might not kill the innocent.

But it is not the souls, which they imagine to be wicked, that kill the innocent; it is the fates, which cause men to be born in such a way that they are killed. And therefore it is not the souls, but the fates that are unjust; and if they are unjust, they are not from God: therefore they are from the Devil; and if they are from the Devil, they must be condemned together with him. And since they are said to determine for each person how he will die, by the sword, or the noose, or a fall, or shipwreck, or otherwise, they provide the same thing in many ways. For no one can alone depart from the fates of all. But if anyone is found to depart, then it is no longer fate, but a happening. And if in the death of one it is a mere happening, so it will be in the deaths of many; and then it will no longer be fate. Anaxarchus1, thrown into a mortar by order of the king, was crushed and died, something that has happened to no other man. And a woman drove a stake into the temples of Sisera, king of the Philistines, and so he gave up his spirit (Judges 4:21). In this way no one else has died. And formerly men used to be nailed to a cross, which afterwards, by an edict, was prohibited. If this was due to fate, how did it cease?

For when what is of fate is forbidden and does not happen, fate is overcome. Or if it was not of fate, then men were not crucified by fate, but by the judgment of the law. And therefore it is that men are not condemned by fate, but found guilty by their own evil deeds. Among the Tuscans there is said to have been a man born so handsome in face as no one ever was; and because he was a good man, lest he fall under suspicion, since he even enticed the eyes of respectable women, he wounded his own face with seven gashes, so that he might condemn the beauty which was desired by all (Valerius Maximus, book 4, chapter 5). See how, if there are fates, they have been overcome. But perhaps it may be said, It was of nature that he was born handsome, and of fate that his face was wounded. But if this is so, fate is no longer something one is born with, but an accidental cause. And if it is accidental, it will not be of fate, but of deliberation, or perhaps of mere happening, so far as the remaining circumstances are concerned. For what else is it to conquer fate than to alter nature? But

if it was so fixed that it could neither be changed nor overcome, then neither could it be conquered. For we read that it is recorded in a certain legal book that a woman once bore five children at a birth:

how was it stolen from the fates that nature decreed this for her alone, which was not of fate? But if it had been of fate, a number of women would have been burdened with this lot. And when a certain man was setting out for foreign lands, he commended his wife to a friend whom he knew to be faithful, not, of course, to a boy, but to a man of mature age. In order to be a more careful guardian of her, that man mutilated himself, so that he might sleep safely with her without anyone's suspicion. What are we to think, was this of fate or of counsel? But how could it be of fate when it is contrary to it? For whoever overcomes what is inborn in him, this one empties fate of its power. And certainly in the pursuit of studies the question of fates is involved, as to whether someone can or cannot grasp something. Therefore all senators have one and the same fate; for no senator is without education: and the peoples who are without education have one fate, and all slaves are of one fate; for none of the slaves is a senator. But if what one is born as is called fate, whatever is acquired afterwards will be outside of fate. Or if what happens comes from fate, why does it come by labor? It would then be said to be of fate if it happened to a man against his will.

For what happens without forethought is said to be of the fates; but what is devised and long weighed, and obtained by intermediate exercises, why is this said to be of fate? Someone is born a eunuch, others become eunuchs; where will fate be? In him, I suppose, who is born so; but what is to be said of those who become such? For it is one thing to be born, another to become. Or if these are made eunuchs by fate, then that one was born a eunuch against fate. And why is a eunuch so rarely born that it seems incredible? There was a certain woman in the city of Rome who is known to have had eleven husbands; and another man who had twelve wives; what fates are these that decreed this for them? For in the time of the Emperor Constantine it is well attested that a girl in a part of Campania was changed into a male and brought to Rome: what fates brought this about? Other fates, I suppose, which you do not know. Oh, if only you would be silent about this word, and refer some things to chance and accidents, and accept some to providence! For the power of virtue and the industry of souls is so great that it not only resists nature, but even corrects or fails to correct itself, because it has judgment over itself.

For it is told that the women of the Scythians, who are called Amazons, when their husbands were occupied in a distant war and long absent, for the sake of offspring united themselves with their servants, and killed every male child that was born, leaving only the females, so that none of them devoted herself to weaving, but from earliest youth they were trained in the wrestling school and in the use of arms. So great was their courage in the conduct of affairs that, reigning through a long succession of years, they subdued several nations and placed all Asia under tribute. What can be said to this? Were these things of fate which were carried out in such a way for so many years that they emptied of meaning all those things which are thought to be of fate? First, that contrary to nature women, rejecting men,

ruled; then that they mingled with their own slaves; thirdly, that all the males born were killed and the females preserved alive. So great a prosperity followed them that, without men, they propagated a kingdom begun with great forces over long periods. Certainly this deed from the foundation of the world has never taken place except in Scythia alone: lest perhaps they should say that, since the world is renewed every one thousand four hundred and sixty years, such things come about; although the world is now in its six thousandth year, during which time a person does what he has imitated.

For Crassus was called Agelastus ("the Unlaughing") because he is said to have laughed once in his life. Why was Junius surnamed Brutus? Because by shrewd counsel he pretended to be foolish, lest he be killed by the proud king on account of the greatness of his wealth. In the time of Constantine a certain man called Samatius pretended to be a jester for thirty years, so that he might, as he himself afterwards said, distract the emperor from his irritations. Where is the logic of the fates, when each person does what he wills? It is excluded. But how is this, that the supporters of fates are devoted to supplications, when these are opposed to them? For they commend to them their years, and inquire of them about marriages, and about journeys, and about purchases, and about promotions. But if it is of fate, why do you pray, why do you supplicate for what will come to pass even against your will? "But I ask," he says, "whether I ought to buy. Therefore, what you say you ought to do then, if you have learned that it is practical, does not depend on fate. For if it is of fate, you ask in vain; for whether you will or not, whether you inquire or do not inquire, you will do it. But the fact that this assertion is not fixed even among them themselves is the reason why they try uncertain things, lest they find something true other than what they are dealing with.

But those among them who seem more wise say, "We do not offer prayers because of fate, since we know it cannot in the least be changed, but for the sake of those things that are alongside fate, so they may not do anything adverse to us. Come now, if some person has a good fate, and next to him there is something that appears contrary, what can this be, since the good fate is said to be unchangeable, just like the bad? Clearly you pray that what is beside fate may not harm you; for it will harm you unless prayer is made. How then is that fate said to be unchangeable, when what is near it is feared? For it would not be feared unless it were believed that it could be changed. But since you insist most of all on this point, that fate not be said to change, you undoubtedly pray without cause. See rather whether what you pray is itself of fate, since you usually assign to fate whatever is without evil. Certainly prayer is not an evil thing: why then should it not be said to belong to fate? If therefore it will be of fate that one prays, whose will it be to pray and not obtain? For if it was of fate, he ought to obtain what he prays for. But if it is of fate to pray and not obtain, fate is foolish; for it makes a man pray whom it knows will not obtain.

And if it does not know whether he can obtain what it causes him to pray for, fate will be irresponsible and without reason; for all ignorance is folly, and folly is stupidity. Into this position falls the entire speculation of the pagans. Let the pagans consider this, who, surrounded by darkness, do not see the light. Ensnared by ancient error, they refuse to lend

their ears to the truth which previously lay hidden. What shall we say of certain Christians who, in the Savior, as if only changed in name, still defend the vanity of their former error, so dulled in mind that they struggle that God Himself acted under fate, saying, "He Himself said, My hour has not yet come" (Jn. 2:4); as though this hour were not a matter of will, but a necessity of fatal condition, whereas He meant the hour of His own will, in which He would allow Himself to be handed over. Indeed He says, "I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to take it up again" (Jn. 10:18). Therefore, where there is the power of the will, the necessity of fate ceases. And how is He called Savior by us, if the things we do or that happen to us are of fate? For He is called Savior because He showed us the way of salvation; and so, if this way has been shown by Him, it was not of fate, because before it was hidden.

And as for what is said to be of fate, they argue it comes to pass unexpectedly. But this is the merit of faith, which cannot be said to be from fate, because what is believed was not heard of in previous ages. For they say that fate grants what concerns human conduct. Yet how can fate be said reasonably to grant what it is found to be ignorant of? From this comes what the Apostle says, "None of the princes of this world knew" (1 Cor. 2:8). These are the princes and powers who have evil angels under them and, under the name of "fates," bring about their pleasures as they wish, just as sorcerers are accustomed to confess. For there are some whom they love, others they do not love, some they hate. And each of them suggests to each person that which he loves, since they themselves have different pleasures: for some they acquire lust of varied wickedness, for others gifts, for others pleasure, for others immorality, for others anger, for some greed, for others gains, for others losses, for others favor, for others hatred, and also hindrances. And sometimes, at certain times, when they are gratified, they rest in idleness; at other times for a reason, at other times they do not intrude upon an occupied mind; for they do not rule, but creep in, seeking an opportunity by which they may ensnare. Therefore the decision of the will is free;

but when through some desire we become negligent toward ourselves, those who trouble us suggest adversities: above all, if they find us thinking of something that is not of the divine law, they come at that very point to help us fulfill what the law forbids. For if the fear of God is in the soul, neither flesh, nor blood, nor princes, nor powers prevail; for with God's help they are so pursued that they are overcome without labor. But if we were not within our own power, how would the Lord say, "Ask, and it shall be given you; for everyone who asks, receives" (Matt. 7:7–8)? If then whoever wills to ask will receive, that common saying no longer holds, "We do not have what we want, but what is given"; because the will is stirred by the Savior to ask and to receive what it has asked for. But they say that this is of fate, that whether he asks or does not ask, he still obtains by fate that which is either evil or good. However, the Lord, excluding this, says, "Daughter, your faith has made you well" (Matt. 9:22). It is no longer of fate when faith receives the benefit. And again He says, "If you believe, all things are possible to the one who believes" (Mark 9:22): He has indeed placed the merit in the will; for faith is a good of the will, not of nature. Faith, moreover, is something that comes from outside, which rouses the will to exercise itself;

so that, since it is not in nature, the will, which is in nature, once it has received faith, may establish merit for itself before God. For the nature of men is like a stone which, though it does not have fire in its substance, still has it in strength, so that by work it produces what it seems not to have, because it does not yet exist, but is, as it were, in seed; it is in strength so that through exercise it may be generated, and if the exercise is lacking, it is not produced; for seed also, unless it is exercised, does not bring forth, but remains seed alone. It is the addition that makes it generate. So too man does not have faith in nature, but has the seed of faith, which, unless it is urged and stirred up, will not bear fruit, that is, will not have faith. Those who believe in the fates of astrologers destroy the seed of faith, which bears witness both to the Creator and to His justice. For the work recognizes the maker, and with right and love and deed bears witness to Him. We exhort that this craft [arte] be shunned in every way. For indeed, those who are curious about Him are enemies of God, and they are never without anxiety: for they are always on edge, awaiting what they hardly know for certain.

But we, who believe all favorable things about God, and that if any adversities arise they are restrained by His will, should live humbly, secure in His protection; yet not unaware that even if anything adverse happens to us while we act well, endured patiently it will lead to a crown.

1 The text reads “Anaxagoras,” but it is probably a scribal error because it was actually “Anaxarchus,” Greek philosopher of the school of Democritus, that Nicocreon, tyrant of Cyprus, had him crushed alive by a mortar to avenge himself for an injury he had received.
1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 120. ON FASTING. — It is fitting, dearest brothers, that the priest of God and the leader of the people of Christ should most devoutly exhort the people under his care with sound teaching, as the Apostle commands (Titus 1:9), so that we may perform the work of faith, in keeping with the season, with all care and diligence, with a cheerful and devout mind. For the fasts which are now to be observed as the feast day of Easter approaches, what they accomplish, though it is not unknown, must still not be left unsaid. Devotion is stirred up when those things which may not be unknown are nevertheless recounted. For such is the nature of our disposition that it grows sluggish if the practice of reading ceases. For just as iron, if it is not used, produces rust, so the soul, if it is not more frequently exercised in divine readings, will give birth to sins. Therefore in the Psalm he calls that man blessed who meditates on the law of the Lord day and night (Ps. 1:2). And although the divine sayings are well known, yet when they are recalled in the sacred volumes, the devout heart receives them as if they were new. For the soul’s desire for works of salvation is awakened. Therefore the Apostle says to Timothy among other things: Stir up, he says, the grace of God that is in you (2 Tim. 1:6). Therefore fasting is necessary for us, as medicine is for wounds. It brings healing for eternal life;

yet it must be praised by the witness of two things, that is, prayer and mercy. Fasting, then, softens the greed of the body, restrains contrary impulses, removes the oppression of the

soul, as the Lord says: Do not give yourselves over to eating and drunkenness, lest your hearts be overcharged (Luke 21:34). For when the soul has been freed from excessive food and drink, then it recognizes itself better. Just as in a tarnished mirror a man does not see himself as he truly is, so if he is weighed down by food and drunkenness, he feels himself to be other than he is. Then lust is roused, anger is kindled, pride is inflamed, and luxury is created. Therefore the Apostle: Do not, he says, be drunk with wine, in which is depravity (Eph. 5:18). But if the body is moderated by the addition of fasting, then, having regained knowledge of itself, the soul understands with what devotion it ought to serve its Redeemer. Therefore in great measure fasting is necessary. For under Queen Esther, when the Jewish people were in danger, they were delivered with the help of fasts (Esther 4:16). And the Ninevites, when they heard from the prophet the appointed day of their overthrow, merited to escape when a fast was proclaimed (Jonah 3:7). And our righteous ones and prophets, whenever they wished to obtain something from God, humbled themselves with fasting, as David says: I humbled my soul with fasting (Ps. 35:13).

And the Savior himself, who had no need of it, fasted in order to give us an example (Matt. 4:2). Therefore it is beyond doubt that fasting is beneficial: for in this way a man shows that he truly wishes to obtain what he asks, when he afflicts himself with fasting. Therefore it is said: Prayer is good with fasting (Tobit 12:8). So that prayer may be acceptable, it seeks to have fasting as its companion. And because none of these things is firm without holiness, he added: And almsgiving with righteousness; so that almsgiving, preserved with righteousness, may praise prayer together with fasting. Indeed, the mercy of Cornelius commended his prayer and fasting. (Acts 10) For he, though rich in possessions, fasted; and he also fed those who had nothing, so that their fullness made his fasting acceptable. Therefore fasting needs certain things, and must do without certain things, so that it may be able to obtain what it asks for.

1ST CATEGORY NT QUESTION 121. PRAISE AND GLORY OF THE PASSOVER. — O holy and saving day of Easter, to be proclaimed with every praise, on which death was conquered, the Devil's kingdom taken away, the mystery of God revealed, the decree that was against us cancelled; the gates of hell devastated, the bound released, the confined sent forth, the blind enlightened, the ignorant endowed with knowledge, the wicked made merciful, to the wicked and unjust the remission of sins granted, enemies reconciled, error corrected, truth declared; sons for God gained from the lost, pride cast down, humility exalted; the poor enriched, the rich stripped; mountains leveled, valleys filled, hills laid low; shamelessness trampled, modesty adorned, to souls the possibility of heaven given, freedom restored, captivity broken and dissolved: darkness grew dull, wickedness was baffled, filth cleansed, Satan cast down; hell made void: our Lord Jesus Christ, the true Son of God, approved, flesh to the confusion of the wise, the world lifted up to heaven, heavenly, earthly, and hellish things shown to be of one God and Lord! And so, dearest brothers, we must celebrate and venerate this feast day, devout to God with modesty of life and gladness of soul, avoiding shameful and dishonorable things, so that we may merit to come to the fruit of Easter through Christ our Lord, to whom belong honor and glory for ever and ever.

1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 124. ONE WORK VARIES ACCORDING TO PERSONS, INTO PRAISE OR CONDEMNATION. — Mercy is one and the same in rich and poor, but it is ascribed differently to the rich and to the poor, because it is more to be praised in the poor than in the rich. For the poor man did not fear to give out of his small means, hoping that God would repay him both in the present and in the future. For he believes the Scripture which says that he who gives to the poor shall not lack (Prov. 28:27). Therefore that poor widow, while the rich were putting in many gifts, she alone deserved to be highly praised by God, because she did not fear to give out of her want (Luke 21:2–4). The rich give generously, being secure in their riches, but the poor man is secure in the Lord. Therefore the rich do well when they give to those in need, but the poor do much better. And therefore the reward of the poor man is one thing, and that of the rich man another. For if the rich man does not do this, he shall be beaten: such is not so greatly required of the poor man. Therefore the merciful poor man is praiseworthy. Theft in a poor man and in a rich man is one and the same sin, but it makes the rich man more guilty:

for the poor man steals because of need, but the rich man, though he has abundance, not being content with what is his own, takes what belongs to others; and what is worse, he is accustomed to rob the poor: and therefore the punishment of each differs. Righteousness in the poor man and in the rich man is one and the same; but it is more praiseworthy in the poor man. For to keep justice in poverty is a magnificent thing. The rich man, however, seems to keep Righteousness because he is free from want. Therefore each is Righteousness, but it is greater to keep Righteousness in necessity. Pride is one thing, but it is more to be condemned in the poor man than in the rich: for the rich man is puffed up by abundance, but the poor man is proud in his hardship, which borders on madness, and therefore the poor man is more guilty. Humility is one thing, but it is more to be praised in the rich man. For what great matter is it if the poor man appears humble, whom poverty itself makes humble? But it is magnificent if the one who is praised by rank and wealth bends himself down, not claiming for himself what he knows he deserves. Therefore humility is good in all, but much more in the rich man. The cause of learning and study is one and the same; but it is more praiseworthy in the rich man.

For the poor man, since no privilege praises him, has taken pains to have something for which he might be sought after: but the rich man, since he already had that by which he might be praised, by applying effort has increased himself, so that he might be necessary in a double way; for he has not allowed his mind to be drawn off by his riches so as not to flourish by his own qualities. And therefore he is more worthy of praise than the poor man, who, if he had not devoted himself to studies, would have remained utterly of no account. The former, then, was made eager for study by his will, the latter by necessity. Lust is the same in poor and rich, but it is more damnable in the poor man than in the rich. For poverty itself ought to call the poor man back from the desire for luxury: he ought to consider that he has nothing with which to fulfill this desire, and that while he rushes to satisfy it, he

must necessarily commit many other evils, by which perhaps he will not even escape in the present; or at least, by spending even what he has, he will remain a beggar with a bad reputation. But the rich man is stirred to sensual pleasure by the abundance of delights: moreover, the rich are secure of freedom, knowing that judgments are for sale, and that they will not even be criticized by anyone.

For who would dare to rebuke a man supported by status and wealth? Therefore they are more inflamed, so that they even carry this out violently. For they are not only not criticized at all, but are held in great honor, and can glory that they are such. But if both, that is, poor and rich, are chaste, the chastity of the rich man differs greatly from the chastity of the poor man. For the poor man can be restrained by humility, so that he cannot fulfill what he desires, or by fear of the laws: but the rich man, who can be attracted to pleasure by many supporting causes, is praiseworthy if he turns his mind away from it. Therefore the chaste rich man is worthy of one sort of reward, and the chaste poor man of another. But if a king is chaste, it is a very glorious thing, that having everything in his power he does not touch what he knows he can do with liberty. He truly fears God, he truly keeps his commandments, who, having the laws in his power, contemplates the future judgment of God. And so it is a great thing that he who in the present has no one to fear, overcomes that which delights; since delight can do so much that it not only does not fear future things, but not even present ones. Therefore those who overcome this earn much, but more so those who in the present rule over laws and men.

For the others fear both men and laws; and on this account they keep their resolve. Lest they be ashamed before men, they keep what they have long maintained; and lest they be condemned, they abstain from forbidden things: but he who through his dominion fears neither laws nor is ashamed of men, is of great glory if he restrains himself.

1ST CATEGORY NT

QUESTION 126. ON THE PERSON WHO HAS RECEIVED FAITH IN CHRIST. — It is written: “The righteousness of the righteous shall not benefit him on the day that he goes astray; and the wickedness of the wicked shall not harm him when he turns back” (Ezek. 18:26–27). And the Lord in the Gospel says: “He who does not believe is already judged” (Jn. 3:18); by this indicating that the one who believes is not subject to judgment for the reception of a sentence, but will be found worthy of praise by the merit of faith. Therefore, the knowledge of God has this privilege, that it obtains the remission of sins. For the one who believes that Jesus is the Son of God is deemed worthy to be freed from all sins. Long wandering in error, tossed by the waves of ignorance in various ways, he has at last been enlightened and has received the flashing light of truth, in which, after great storms, he rests in safety. It is fitting that after this knowledge he restrain himself from those things which he used to do long before when he was set in ignorance. For what does knowledge profit if the former way of life remains? One is seen to have known God if he changes his life and corrects his conduct. For once God is known, he must be feared, because he is proclaimed as the one who will judge:

so that the faithful may receive the fruit of their righteousness, and the wicked, that is, the unbelieving, may pay the due penalties for their faithlessness. It is fitting that the righteous rejoice in the future, where Christ will reign with his own: so that righteous as in this world, where the Devil is prince, they are exposed to reproach and injuries, so in the kingdom of Christ they may appear glorious for the sake of him for whom they were judged shameful by worldly people. But the unrighteous, who seem to flourish falsely, resisting the truth by lies, are to be afflicted in punishment; so that those who appeared glorious by hoax may appear exceedingly despised and humbled by the reality. Then the righteous will rejoice that they have believed, when they see the faithless tormented; and the faithless will not even regret that they did not believe except when they see the glory of those whom they considered foolish and shameful because they believed, and their own punishment. Therefore, from the fact that someone professes to be a Christian, he must strive not to sin and arm himself against vices; and because it is impossible always to win, if he is overcome he should grieve lest he be overcome again; for the one who is grieved that he has been beaten restores himself. Whoever, then, resists has a basis on which he can excuse himself if he has been overcome. He shows that he had the desire to win, though he was by no means able.

From this there is hope that he can repair himself, so that by constant reflection he may be found more skillful and stronger in the contest. But the one who rises for the purpose of sinning, having become inexcusable, bears a very serious charge. It is worse to live under the profession of God and yet have the will to sin than for someone to be ignorant of God and live shamefully and in defilement. For such a person does not know whom he ought to fear; the other one, knowing, despises. Believers therefore receive remission of sins; yet they will not be glorious unless, after receiving faith, they live in the fear of God, so that, having struggled against the enemies of the Christian name, they may win victory and therefore deserve the reward by conquering more than they are conquered. But the one who understands God and does not approach his faith so as to live as a Christian, but instead wants to receive faith at the end so that he may die a Christian, either is ashamed to live as a Christian, or devotes himself to sins which he thinks can be forgiven him when he has believed, this person, I think, does not have a good case. For he does not want to become or live as a Christian as long as he is in the world, but wants to sin; or he is ashamed to become a Christian.

What sort of God does he hope for, from whom, while he is ashamed to serve as a soldier, he wants to receive wages? Such a man is a mocker. Knowing he no longer has time to sin, with death at hand, then he wants to become a Christian; so that, because he can no longer sin, he may say that he believes in Christ, who hates sinning, not that he no longer wishes to sin, but that he cannot, because death has come first. To such people it ought to be read that “God is not mocked” (Gal. 6:7). Indeed, such persons are even accustomed to give such instructions that faith should be given only to those already failing and out of their senses, merely still breathing, fearing that they might recover and be ashamed because they have become Christians. For them the words of the Gospel must be recited: “Whoever,” says the

Lord, "is ashamed of me and of my words in this generation, the Son of Man will be ashamed of him when he comes in the kingdom of his Father" (Matt. 10:33). But perhaps they say: knowing that the human race is frail, therefore we want to receive faith at the end of life, so that we may no longer sin. Yet faith must be received in such a way that one knows what he is receiving. Then it will bring its benefit, if he both knows it and professes it.

"For with the heart one believes unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation" (Rom. 10:10). And therefore, one who by then no longer knows where he is, how can he be said to receive? He has received who professes that he has received, knowing that he has received. If they believe that remission of sins is given to those who believe, they ought to know that this one believes whose heart bears witness that he believes. For God, who promised, is the inspector of the heart: he accepts the one whom he sees believing in his heart. Therefore, whose heart does not regard the words of faith, how will he have its benefit? So the person who does not lightly become a Christian upon receiving faith can be seen to act rightly, in that he is observed to strive not to sin easily. But the one who rushes to sin does not want to receive faith, specifically so that he may not be compelled to live well, which he appears unwilling to do; but he wants to obtain faith at death, hoping for exemption and remission of past evils, so that he may be secure both regarding the past and the future, since as a dying man he can no longer sin. But this is done neither with good counsel nor with a clean conscience, that he should want to receive faith then, when he can no longer sin, rather than when he does not want to sin. To such people the saying applies:

"Let us do evil that good may come"—that is, let us sin now, and at the last let us believe, and it will be forgiven us. And so it is added: "Their condemnation is just" (Rom. 3:8). For it is not fitting that forgiveness of sins be granted to those who, already knowing God, who wills that no one should sin and hates sinners, are eager to sin, refusing to consider that the gift of God benefits those who, ignorant of God, sin in such a way that they do not know God will judge. But the one who has heard and reflected within himself, and has the intention of sinning, not because he is overcome by some compelling cause, but because he wishes to sin, is hardly to be forgiven. For there are two causes which bring about the remission of sins: one is the gift, the other is repentance, so that whoever has sinned after receiving the gift should be restored through repentance. For since he did not remain in the grace received so as to persevere in freedom, but again subjected himself to sin, he obtains the blotting out of sin by weeping and groaning; for he sinned knowingly and deliberately: not that anyone is ignorant of sin itself, but the one who does not know that God will judge thinks that what he does in sin will be without punishment.

Therefore, if a Gentile begins to grow weak and, in the very despair of life, considers within himself the faith and hope that have been promised, he has a complete case for his sins to be forgiven when he believes, and for him not to be held in the underworld, bearing with him the sign of death overcome and despoiled, even though he does not possess dignity or reward. For there ought to be some difference between the one who, stirred by love of his

Lord, did not fear to fight against His enemies, arming himself with self control and with the observance of all virtues, so that he might resist evil, always anxious as to how he may defend the dominion of his Lord; and the one who, having made common cause with the enemies of his Lord and standing by their side, at the end of life returned to his Lord, not in order to claim the kingdom of his Lord, but so that it might benefit himself alone to be a citizen before being a soldier. For he who wishes to live as a Christian so as to be rewarded after death knows that "the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the future glory that shall be revealed in us" (Rom. 8:18). And therefore, having taken up the armor of faith, he does not hesitate to engage with principalities and powers, so that, being a victor in this world, he may be crowned after this world.

For it is fitting that the one who, among the faithless and rebels, bears witness to the kingdom of his Lord in the present should receive a reward for this in the future: so that the enemies of God, seeing the witness of Christ appear exalted in the kingdom of God because of the truth of his confession, may grieve in confusion that they judged false what has been shown to be true; and also that those who believed late, confessing God not in life but in death, when they see how great is the glory of those who, fighting under the armor of Christ, have waged the battles of their Emperor devoutly and faithfully, may regret not that they lived as Christians, but that they were Christians only in death. For one who had no intention of living as a Christian can seem hardly suitable to die as a Christian: perhaps already on the point of death he wished to be called a Christian precisely because the time for sinning was now past. "Lest," he says, "what is believed should prove true, I wish to become a Christian, losing nothing if what is believed is false"; and because at death it is not the will to sin, but the act of sinning, that ceases, he tests whether faith may be able to profit after death, whereas its usefulness would certainly have been this: that vices and sins should be corrected here, where they had been committed.

For a person then shows that he has condemned his past deeds when, following the rule of faith, he appears to change his conduct and his life. For if before he sinned on this account, that he did not know God, when he comes to know Him, he ought no longer to sin, lest it be pointless that he has come to know Him. For a person ought to be made perfect by the knowledge of God. Indeed, before his profession, a Christian ought to understand that he must prove himself more by his works than by his name. For this reason the commandments were given, superior to all other laws and belonging to holiness, so that from these the worship of God might be seen: otherwise they will hear, "Why do you call me, 'Lord, Lord,' and not do what I say? (Luke 6:46). By which He then indicated that it is beneficial to call the Lord "Lord" if His commandments are kept: for he seems a mocker who calls him Lord whose precepts he despises. To such a person the words of the Law must be recited, which say that God is not mocked. Therefore he will be condemned by his own words, because he calls Him Lord whom he shows by his deeds that he is in no way afraid of.

2ND CATEGORY OT QUESTION 11. IF THE JEWS HAD RECEIVED HARSH COMMANDMENTS ON ACCOUNT OF THEIR DISTRUST AND SLANDERS, WHAT HAD

THEIR SONS DONE WRONG THAT THEY TOO SHOULD BE BOUND BY THESE COMMANDMENTS? — The Law was given to the fathers, and it would be a burden also to their similar sons. For afterwards they sinned against God not less, but perhaps even more, than their fathers had. For God, who foreknows all, gave this Law especially for the sons, because all their fathers died in the wilderness. 2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 1. WHY HAVE THE DEEDS AND SAYINGS OF THE LORD BEEN ARRANGED IN WRITING IN FOUR BOOKS BY FOUR AUTHORS? — It was fitting that the acceptable year of the Lord, as the prophet says (Isa. 61:2), should be contained in four books as if in four seasons. For just as the year unfolds in four seasons, in such a way that they need one another, so too the deeds and sayings of the Lord have been set forth in four books, in such a way that each one needs the others; yet together they form perfect fullness. And as to why they were ordered by four writers, this was the reason: because the names of the seasons are different, so also the titles of the Gospels should be different. And if anything in their wording seems contrary, yet in meaning they do not differ, thanks to an interpretation suitably adapted to the matter: just as the seasons, although they clearly differ in name, in climate, and in the course of the stars, yet do not differ in the effects of the things they bring forth.

2ND CATEGORY NT QUESTION 2. SINCE IT IS CERTAIN THAT WE HAVE FOUR AUTHENTIC BOOKS OF THE FACTS AND WORDS OF OUR LORD, IN WHAT ORDER SHOULD WE PLACE THEM? — Since it is agreed that four books have been duly written of the deeds and words of the Lord, one must know what their order is. The Gospel is arranged more by design than by time. Matthew, therefore, must be placed first, because he took his beginning from the very promise, that is, from Abraham, to whom the promise of the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ was made. After him comes Luke, because he relates how this incarnation took place. Third is Mark, who bears witness that the Gospel preached by Christ was promised in the Law. But fourth is John, because he clearly declares as God the one who was promised to Abraham as to be incarnate, of whom Luke tells how he was incarnate, and whose Gospel Mark shows to have been preached according to the prophet Isaiah, saying in an open voice: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God” (John 1:1).

2ND CATEGORY OT & NT

QUESTION 9. ON THE ETERNITY OF THE SON. — Since there are some who, the darkness of error not yet dispelled and the decay of an old and stagnant life not yet cleansed or wiped away, still think in an earthly way and hesitate either about the Son of God, or whether the two are one (for the treacherous and stubborn nation of the Jews, to whom the fountain of the Law and the treasures of the mysteries were opened, does not merely doubt, but denies with wicked words), I will briefly explain as far as the short scope of this discussion allows. For hope is kept intact for the ignorant, if they are willing to learn; punishment is appointed as eternal for those who refuse. Since God Almighty, in His greatness and goodness, surpasses all, He ought to have brought forth and revealed from Himself something great and supremely good. But if He had produced something that fell short of the standard

of His own excellence, it would seem either that He was unable to do more, which cannot apply to the Almighty, or that He was unwilling, which cannot apply to One most gracious. Certainly, for the supreme God it would not have been great to make something placed beneath Himself, which could not possess the power of complete supremacy. Above Himself, then, there was nothing; for there is nothing that can surpass God. Beneath Himself, it would have been too little, because what is less is not fitting for what is greatest.

Therefore, creating His Son as His own very likeness, He brought forth from Himself, as it were, another Himself; and therefore that highest and greatest good which comes to us from God has overflowed to us through His extension to us. We must also understand this reasoning at the same time: God, who founded this world, and who among the other wonders of beauty and order also granted to created nature the power of generating offspring sufficient for each kind of its own, must surely first have possessed in Himself what He would later give. For no one gives what he himself does not possess. He who therefore had a Son perfectly corresponding to Himself in every aspect of likeness, that is, One with one, the virtuous with the virtuous, the good with the good, the blessed with the blessed, the greatest with the greatest, the everlasting with the eternal, certainly had before the world the primacy of a begotten offspring, from which He imparted a pattern to things that were to come into being, so that the seeds of all that would be begotten would be compelled to match their own generative principles. But when we say that the Son was brought forth, we must not understand this as if He had a birth similar to ours, and was born in the way we see mortals being born, when, at the breaking forth of offspring, things come into existence which did not exist before.

For those creatures, conceived from seeds implanted from elsewhere, are fused together from the union of underlying elements into the form proper to their kind; but this (generation) is divine: without any aid of external mixture, God brought forth and produced from Himself that which He always had in Himself and with Himself. For if we say that light is born from the sun because it proceeds and flows from it, we do not say this in such a way as though the sun could ever be, or ever was, without light, so that at some point in time it generated from itself something later than itself, but rather in the sense that what it has always possessed with itself, that light, born from it, so to speak, without any distinction of beginning from when it first started to shine, it always illuminates from itself like a renewing gift. In this way, the Son of God, adhering to the Father absolutely from eternity, has also retained this likeness to Him, so that He has neither a beginning nor an end. And as God is eternal without origin, so also the Son is eternal; and as God is one, simple, and the same, so He is joined with the Father in such a way that, though distinguished by names and relations, they are yet the same, one in both, and each in the one, united in an inseparable majesty.

Therefore God, having brought forth the Son not drawn from conflicting materials, but produced out of the simple and unique stock and seedbed of His own nature, always possessing Him in Himself, and never at any time having let Him go by any separation from Himself,

holds and embraces Him in such a way with Himself that nothing in either of them is altered from that unity.

INDEX OF QUESTIONS 1ST CATEGORY QUESTIONS ON THE OLD TESTAMENT (PL 35 2214-2250) QUESTION 1. WHAT IS GOD? (pg. 402) QUESTION 2. WHY DID GOD CREATE THE WORLD? (pg. 15) QUESTION 3. WHAT NEED WAS THERE FOR MOSES TO EXPLAIN LATER, AND NOT EARLIER, THE BEGINNING OF THE WORLD AND THE ORDER OF CREATION? (pg. 20) QUESTION 4. WHY DID NOT GOD GIVE THE LAW FROM THE BEGINNING? (pg. 406) QUESTION 5. WHY WAS ABEL'S SACRIFICE ACCEPTED, AND CAIN'S REJECTED? (pg. 63) QUESTION 6. DID LAMECH KILL CAIN, AS SOME THINK? (pg. 65) QUESTION 7. WHAT ARE THE TEN WORDS GIVEN ON THE TABLETS; OR WHAT DID EACH TABLET CONTAIN, AND HOW MANY WORDS DID EACH HAVE? (pg. 110) QUESTION 8. WHY DID MOSES, COMING DOWN FROM THE MOUNTAIN WITH THE TABLES OF THE LAW, HAVE A FACE SO BRIGHT THAT IT COULD NOT BE FIXED ON HIM? (pg. 115)

QUESTION 9. IF ALL THE CREATURES THAT GOD MADE WERE GOOD AND VERY GOOD, WHY DID HE SAY TO NOAH, "BRING WITH YOU INTO THE ARK OF PURE AND UNCLEAN ANIMALS, SINCE NO ONE CAN CALL GOOD WHAT IS UNCLEAN?" (GEN. 1:31; 7:2) (pg. 35) QUESTION 10. GOD HAVING FORETOLD TO ABRAHAM THAT THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL WOULD BE FREED FROM THE DOMINION OF THE EGYPTIANS. THE FOURTH GENERATION, WHY DOES THE LAW SAY, "THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL SHALL COME FORTH OUT OF THE LAND OF EGYPT INTO THE FIFTH GENERATION?" (pg. 95) QUESTION 11. IF THE WILL OF THE RIGHTEOUS MAN IS GOOD, WHY DID NOT ISAAC BLESS ESAU AS HE WISHED, BUT JACOB WHOM HE WOULD NOT BLESS? (pg. 101) QUESTION 12. WHY DID ABRAHAM RECEIVE THE SIGN OF HIS FAITH, THE SACRAMENT OF CIRCUMCISION? (pg. 96) QUESTION 13. IF GOD'S JUDGMENT IS JUST, WHY WERE INFANTS IN SODOM BURNED TOGETHER WITH THEIR PARENTS? (pg. 99)

QUESTION 14. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT GOD, WHO IS PROCLAIMED AS JUST, HAS PROMISED TO REPAY THE SINS OF THE FATHERS UPON THE CHILDREN TO THE THIRD AND FOURTH GENERATION? (pg. 111) QUESTION 15. SINCE THE LAW PROCLAIMS WHAT IS JUST, AND HE IS TRULY JUST WHO POSSESSES FULL JUSTICE, HOW IS IT THEN THAT SOLOMON SAYS, "DO NOT BE OVERLY JUST"? (pg. 171) QUESTION 16. WHY DID THE ANGEL WHO WANTED TO KILL MOSES, IN THE ROUTE, BE APPEASED BY THE CIRCUMCISION OF HIS CHILD? (pg. 106) QUESTION 17. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT THE LAW CALLS THOSE ACCURSED WHO HAVE NOT LEFT SEED IN ISRAEL, WHILE THROUGH ISAIAH IT IS SAID THAT EUNUCHS SUFFER NO DISADVANTAGE, BECAUSE THEY CANNOT GENERATE OFFSPRING? (pg. 113) QUESTION 18. WHY IS IT THAT SAUL, WHEN HE SINNED, ASKED THAT PRAYER BE MADE FOR HIM SO THAT HE MIGHT BE FORGIVEN AND COULD NOT

OBTAIN IT, WHILE DAVID, WHEN HE SINNED, ASKED AND OBTAINED PARDON? (pg. 127)

QUESTION 19. WAS ADAM'S BODY, WHEN IT WAS CREATED, IMMORTAL OR SUBJECT TO DEATH? (pg. 62) QUESTION 20. WHAT DOES THIS SAYING MEAN, "MAN ATE THE BREAD OF ANGELS", WHEN ANGELS DO NOT NEED FOOD, SINCE THEY ARE SIMPLE BY NATURE AND ENDOWED WITH SPIRITUAL POWER? (pg. 165) QUESTION 21. WHAT IT MEANS THAT GOD MADE MAN IN THE IMAGE AND LIKENESS OF GOD, AND WHETHER WOMAN IS THE IMAGE OF GOD? (pg. 33) QUESTION 22. WHY DOES SOLOMON SAY, "JUSTIFY YOUR SOUL BEFORE YOUR DEATH," AS WE READ IN A PSALM, "NO LIVING MAN WILL BE JUSTIFIED IN YOUR PRESENCE?" (pg. 171) QUESTION 23. CAN SOULS, THEN, BE TRANSLATED JUST LIKE BODIES? (pg. 36) QUESTION 24. WHY, SINCE MAN AND WOMAN ARE ONE FLESH, IS MAN THE IMAGE OF GOD AND NOT WOMAN? (pg. 31) QUESTION 25. WHY DID JOSEPH, AFTER PREDICTING THE FUTURE, REQUEST THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL TO CARRY HIS ASHES FROM EGYPT WHEN GOD DELIVERED THEM? (pg. 104)

QUESTION 26. QUESTION ABOUT ELISHA: DID HE OBTAIN WHAT HE IS SAID TO HAVE ASKED TOO HARSHLY OF ELIJAH? (pg. 132) QUESTION 27. WHEN SAMUEL WAS SUPPOSEDLY RAISED UP BY THE PYTHONESS, AND HE WAS SEEN BY HER AND SPOKE TO SAUL—THIS STORY IS REPORTED IN THE BOOK OF KINGS? (pg. 179) QUESTION 28. WHAT CAN WE SAY TO THOSE WHO CLAIM THAT THIS WORLD EXISTS NATURALLY FROM ALL ETERNITY, AND THAT IT HAS NEITHER BEGINNING NOR END? (pg. 19) QUESTION 29. WHY WAS IT COMMANDED THAT CIRCUMCISION TAKE PLACE ON THE EIGHTH DAY? (pg. 98) QUESTION 30. IN PROVERBS IT IS SAID, "THE RIGHTEOUS MAN IS THE ACCUSER OF HIMSELF AT THE BEGINNING OF HIS SPEECH". HOW IS HE RIGHTEOUS, IF HE IS A SINNER? (pg. 168) QUESTION 31. WHETHER, WITH THE WOMAN, A SERPENT SPOKE ACCORDING TO ITS NATURE, OR WHETHER THE SERPENT, ACTUALLY MEANING THE DEVIL, DECEIVED HER? (pg. 60)

QUESTION 32. WE READ IN SOLOMON: "THE RICH AND THE POOR HAVE MET TOGETHER; THE LORD MADE BOTH OF THEM". HOW THEN IS THERE NO RESPECT OF PERSONS WITH GOD? (pg. 168) QUESTION 33. SOLOMON SAYS, "THE YEARS OF THE UNGODLY WILL BE SHORTENED"; HOW THEN IS IT THAT WE SEE SOME UNGODLY PEOPLE LIVING TO AN OLD AGE? (pg. 167) QUESTION 34. HOW IS IT THAT THE SAME SOLOMON SAYS, "GOD," HE DECLARES, "DID NOT MAKE DEATH," WHILE IN ANOTHER PLACE HE SAYS, "GOOD THINGS AND EVIL, LIFE AND DEATH, POVERTY AND RICHES ARE FROM GOD" (Wisdom 1:13; Sirach 11:14)?" (pg. 172) QUESTION 35. HOW CAN DAVID STILL CALL SAUL THE ANOINTED OF THE LORD, AND DO HIM HONOR IN THIS EXCELLENCE AFTER THE LORD HAD DEPARTED FROM HIM? (pg. 129) QUESTION 36. IF THE SOUL THAT SINS SHALL

ITSELF DIE, WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT ACHAR, THE SON OF CHARMI, SINNED, AND THIRTY MEN WERE KILLED ON HIS ACCOUNT? (pg. 118)

QUESTION 37. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT DEATH WAS SENT INTO JACOB AND CAME INTO ISRAEL, WHEN JACOB HIMSELF IS CALLED ISRAEL? (pg. 177) QUESTION 38. IF A HORSE AND A MULE DO NOT HAVE UNDERSTANDING, HOW MUCH LESS SO DOES THE EARTH, A THING WITHOUT SENSATION? WHAT THEN DOES IT MEAN WHEN THE EARTH IS SAID TO BLESS THE LORD (Ps. 31:9; Dan. 3:74)? (pg. 145) QUESTION 39. WHAT IS THIS THAT IS READ IN SOLOMON: "THERE IS HOPE," HE SAYS, "FOR ONE WHO IS JOINED TO ALL THE LIVING; FOR A LIVING DOG IS BETTER THAN A DEAD LION" (Eccles. 9:4)?" (pg. 169) QUESTION 40. WHAT DOES THE PROPHET MEAN WHEN HE SAYS, "REJOICE, O BARREN ONE WHO DOES NOT BEAR; BREAK FORTH AND CRY ALOUD, YOU WHO DO NOT LABOR, BECAUSE THE CHILDREN OF THE DESOLATE ARE MORE THAN THOSE OF HER WHO HAS A HUSBAND." (pg. 179)

QUESTION 41. AND IS THE SPIRIT WHO WAS MOVING OVER THE WATERS TO BE UNDERSTOOD AS THE HOLY SPIRIT, BECAUSE IT IS SAID, "THE SPIRIT OF GOD WAS MOVING OVER THE WATERS" (Gen. 1:2)?" (pg. 23) QUESTION 42. WHY WAS THE ANGEL WHO WAS SENT TO SPEAK TO MOSES APPEARED TO HIM ON THE MOUNTAIN IN THE MIDST OF FIRE AND A BUSH? (pg. 105) QUESTION 43. SINCE ABRAHAM WAS FORBIDDEN TO SACRIFICE HIS SON, WHY WAS JEPHTHAH NOT FORBIDDEN TO CARRY OUT THE SACRIFICE OF HIS DAUGHTER? (Gen. 22:11–12; Judg. 11)? (pg. 119) QUESTION 44. HOW COULD IT BE SHOWN FROM THE TESTIMONY OF THE PROPHETS, ALREADY RECEIVED AMONG THE GENTILES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, THAT THE PROMISE WHICH GOD MADE TO ABRAHAM HAS BEEN FULFILLED THROUGH THE COMING OF CHRIST? (pg. 75) QUESTION 45. HOW MAN WAS MADE IN THE IMAGE OF GOD, AND WHETHER THIS WAS FOR DOMINION, AND WHETHER WOMAN TOO? (pg. 31)

QUESTION 46. WHETHER SAMUEL WAS ONE OF THE SONS OF AARON, AND WHETHER HE IS TO BE CONSIDERED A PRIEST? (pg. 121) QUESTION 47. HOW DO THE SEVEN WOMEN MENTIONED IN ISAIAH, "AND SEVEN WOMEN SHALL TAKE HOLD," ETC. (Isa. 4:1), SIGNIFY THE SEVEN CATHOLIC CHURCHES? (pg. 174) 1ST CATEGORY QUESTIONS ON THE NEW TESTAMENT (PL 35 2250-2386) QUESTION 48. GOD IS CERTAINLY PERFECTION AND IN NEED OF NOTHING; WHAT NEED THEN HAD CHRIST THE SAVIOR TO BE BORN OF GOD, AND FOR GOD TO HAVE A SON THROUGH WHOM HE MIGHT MAKE ALL THINGS? (pg. 407) QUESTION 49. WHY WAS THE SAVIOR BAPTIZED, SINCE HE WAS BORN HOLY, AND WAS CALLED CHRIST THE LORD AT HIS VERY BIRTH, WHEN BAPTISM EXISTS FOR THE SAKE OF PURIFICATION AND OF SIN (Luke 2:11; Matt. 3:16)? (pg. 196) QUESTION 50. IF THEREFORE THE SAVIOR WAS BAPTIZED IN ORDER TO BE AN EXAMPLE, WHY WAS HE CIRCUMCISED, YET FORBADE OTHERS TO BE CIRCUMCISED? (pg. 197)

QUESTION 51. HOW IS IT TO BE UNDERSTOOD THAT, WHEN MARY SAID TO THE ANGEL, "AND HOW SHALL I KNOW THIS, FOR I DO NOT KNOW MAN?", THE ANGEL GABRIEL REPLIED, "THE HOLY SPIRIT WILL COME UPON YOU, AND THE POWER OF THE MOST HIGH WILL OVERSHADOW YOU" (Luke 1:34–35)? (pg. 244) QUESTION 52. IF CHRIST WAS BORN OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, THAT IS, IF BY HIS WORKING FLESH WAS MADE FROM MARY, WHY IS IT SAID, "WISDOM, WHICH IS CERTAINLY CHRIST, HAS BUILT A HOUSE FOR HERSELF" (Prov. 9:1)? (pg. 190) QUESTION 53. IF ALL THINGS HAVE BEEN MADE WITH REASON, WHY IS IT THAT THE SAVIOR IS SAID TO HAVE BEEN BORN ON THE EIGHTH DAY BEFORE THE KALENDS OF JANUARY? (pg. 191) QUESTION 54. IF CHRIST, FROM THE SEED OF DAVID, HAS BEEN MADE THE SON OF GOD ACCORDING TO THE FLESH—THAT IS, IF HE WAS BORN ALREADY THE SON OF GOD IN BOTH RESPECTS, BECAUSE HE WAS BORN HOLY—HOW THEN, AFTER HE WAS BAPTIZED, WAS IT SAID TO HIM BY THE LORD GOD, "YOU ARE MY SON, TODAY I HAVE BEGOTTEN YOU" (Ps. 2:7)? (pg. 198)

QUESTION 55. WHAT WAS THE REASON THAT THE LORD ALLOWED HIMSELF TO BE CRUCIFIED AT THAT TIME, WHEN THE JEWS WERE ABOUT TO CELEBRATE PASSOVER ON THE EIGHTH DAY BEFORE THE KALENDS OF APRIL? (pg. 231) QUESTION 56. WHY IS IT THAT IN MATTHEW JOSEPH'S FATHER IS WRITTEN AS JACOB, AND IN LUKE AS HELI, SO THAT HE SEEMS TO BE IGNORANTLY DESCRIBED AS HAVING TWO FATHERS, OR AT LEAST SO THAT WHO HIS TRUE FATHER IS REMAINS UNKNOWN (Matt. 1:16; Luke 3:23)? (pg. 183) QUESTION 57. WHAT DOES THIS MEAN, THAT ALTHOUGH IT IS WRITTEN IN THE PROPHET MALACHI, "BEHOLD, I SEND MY ANGEL BEFORE YOUR FACE, WHO WILL PREPARE YOUR WAY BEFORE YOU," THE EVANGELIST MARK CLAIMS THAT THIS IS WRITTEN IN THE PROPHET ISAIAH (Mal. 3:1; Mark 1:2)? (pg. 236) QUESTION 58. IN WHAT WAY, THEN, DOES JOHN CLAIM THAT HE DID NOT KNOW CHRIST BEFORE THE BAPTISM, WHEN, AS HE CAME TO BE BAPTIZED, HE SAYS TO HIM, "I OUGHT TO BE BAPTIZED BY YOU, AND DO YOU COME TO ME?" (John 1:31, 33; Matthew 3:14)? HOW COULD HE NOT KNOW HIM WHOM HE TRIED TO PREVENT, HUMBLING HIMSELF BEFORE HIM? (pg. 204)

QUESTION 59. IF BAPTISM IS A HEAVENLY MYSTERY, WHY DOES THE LORD, WHEN SPEAKING WITH NICODEMUS WHO DOUBTED CONCERNING BAPTISM, SAY: "IF I HAVE TOLD YOU EARTHLY THINGS, AND YOU DO NOT BELIEVE, HOW WILL YOU BELIEVE IF I TELL YOU HEAVENLY THINGS?" (John 3:12)? (pg. 270) QUESTION 60. IF THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS WERE UNTIL JOHN, HOW IS IT THAT THE SAVIOR SENDS THE LEPER TO THE PRIESTS TO HAVE OFFERINGS MADE FOR HIS CLEANSING (Matt. 8:4; Mark 1:44; Luke 5:14)? (pg. 214) QUESTION 61. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT, WHEN THE JEWS ACCUSED THE DISCIPLES OF BREAKING THE SABBATH BY RUBBING EARS OF GRAIN IN THEIR HANDS AND EATING THEM, THE SAVIOR PUT FORWARD THE EXAMPLE OF DAVID, BECAUSE HE ATE THE LOAVES WHICH IT WAS NOT LAWFUL TO EAT EXCEPT FOR THE

PRIESTS ALONE (Matt. 12:1–4)? BY THIS THEY DO NOT SEEM TO BE EXCUSED, BUT RATHER TO BECOME GUILTY TOGETHER WITH DAVID: ESPECIALLY SINCE DAVID DID NOT DO THIS ON THE SABBATH. (pg. 219)

QUESTION 62. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT, ALTHOUGH THOSE WHO WERE KILLED WERE THE SONS OF LEAH, FROM THE TRIBE OF JUDAH, RACHEL IS SAID TO BE WEEPING FOR HER SONS (Matt. 2:18)? (pg. 194) QUESTION 63. BY WHAT REASONING DID THE CHALDEAN MAGI UNDERSTAND, FROM THE APPEARANCE OF A STAR, THAT CHRIST, THE KING OF THE JEWS, HAD BEEN BORN, SINCE A TEMPORAL KING IS USUALLY SIGNIFIED BY A STAR AS A SIGN (Matt. 2:1–2)? (pg. 192) QUESTION 64. HOW IS IT PROVED THAT THE SAVIOR ROSE FROM THE DEAD AFTER THREE DAYS AND NIGHTS? (pg. 232) QUESTION 65. IF THEY SPOKE WITH ONE MOUTH AND ONE REASONING AS EVANGELISTS, HOW DID IT HAPPEN THAT, WHILE THREE SAY—NAMELY MATTHEW, LUKE, AND JOHN—THAT THE LORD WAS CRUCIFIED AT THE SIXTH HOUR, MARK ON THE CONTRARY SAYS THAT THE SAVIOR WAS CRUCIFIED AT THE THIRD HOUR (Matt. 27:45; Luke 23:44; John 19:14; Mark 15:25)? (pg. 228)

QUESTION 66. HOW IS IT THAT MARK THE EVANGELIST SAYS THAT THE DEMONS RECOGNIZED AND PROFESSED JESUS, WHILE ON THE OTHER HAND THE APOSTLE DENIES THAT THE RULERS AND POWERS OF THIS AGE KNEW THE DIVINITY OF THE LORD JESUS? FOR MARK, AMONG OTHER THINGS, SAYS: "THEY KNEW THAT HE WAS THE ONE"; BUT THE APOSTLE SAYS, "NONE OF THE RULERS OF THIS AGE KNEW HIM. FOR IF THEY HAD KNOWN, THEY WOULD NEVER HAVE CRUCIFIED THE LORD OF GLORY" (Mark 1:34; 1 Cor. 2:8). IF THE DEMONS KNEW, HOW DID THE RULERS NOT KNOW? (pg. 237) QUESTION 67. WHAT IS IT THAT THE SAVIOR, PLACED UPON THE CROSS, SAYS: FATHER, FORGIVE THEM, FOR THEY DO NOT KNOW WHAT THEY ARE DOING (Luke 23:34)? (pg. 258) QUESTION 68. SINCE THE LORD HAS CERTAINLY TAUGHT THAT WE MUST PRAY FOR OUR ENEMIES, WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT IN THE APOCALYPSE THE SOULS OF THE SLAIN SEEK TO BE AVENGED AGAINST THEM, ASKING GOD FOR VENGEANCE (Matt. 5:44; Rev. 6:10)? (pg. 211)

QUESTION 69. IF, WHEN JOHN OR THE SAVIOR WAS PREACHING, THE LAW CEASED, HOW DOES THE SAVIOR SAY, "I HAVE NOT COME TO DESTROY THE LAW OR THE PROPHETS, BUT TO FULFILL" (Matt. 5:17)? FOR IF IT HAS BEEN FORBIDDEN, HOW IS IT NOT ABOLISHED, SINCE IT HAS LOST THE AUTHORITY TO BE CARRIED OUT? (pg. 205) QUESTION 70. THE LORD HAS CERTAINLY COMMANDED US TO MAKE THE DEVIL OUR ENEMY: WHAT THEN DOES IT MEAN WHEN IN THE GOSPEL HE SAYS, "BE IN AGREEMENT WITH YOUR ADVERSARY QUICKLY" (Matt. 5:25)? WHO IS A MAN'S ADVERSARY, IF NOT THE DEVIL? (pg. 211) QUESTION 71. JACOB IS CALLED "THE MAN WHO SEES GOD," AND MOSES SAW GOD FACE TO FACE; LIKEWISE ISAIAH SAYS, "I HAVE SEEN THE LORD OF

HOSTS WITH MY EYES." BUT ON THE OTHER HAND JOHN THE EVANGELIST SAYS, "NO ONE HAS EVER SEEN GOD" (Gen. 32:28; Exod. 33:11; Isa. 6:5; 1 John 4:12); THIS, AS FAR AS IT APPEARS, IS CONTRADICTORY. (pg. 102)

QUESTION 72. WHEN IT IS READ IN THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN: "GO," HE SAYS, "AND TAKE THE BOOK FROM THE HAND OF THE ANGEL, AND DEVOUR IT, AND IT WILL MAKE YOUR BELLY BITTER, BUT IN YOUR MOUTH IT WILL BE SWEET AS HONEY" (Rev. 10:8–9): WHAT IS THIS BOOK THAT MAKES THE BELLY BITTER WHILE IT IS SWEET? (pg. 355) QUESTION 73. WHAT IS IT THAT SIMEON SAYS TO MARY, THE MOTHER OF THE LORD, AMONG OTHER THINGS: "THIS CHILD IS SET FOR THE FALL AND THE RISING OF MANY IN ISRAEL; AND A SWORD, HE SAYS, SHALL PIERCE THROUGH YOUR OWN SOUL ALSO, THAT THE THOUGHTS OF MANY HEARTS MAY BE REVEALED" (Luke 2:34–35)? (pg. 246) QUESTION 74. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT THE PROPHET ISAIAH SAYS OF CHRIST, "HE COMMITTED NO SIN," WHILE THE APOSTLE, ON THE CONTRARY, SAYS, "HIM WHO KNEW NO SIN, HE MADE SIN FOR US" (Isa. 53:9; 2 Cor. 5:21)? (pg. 333)

QUESTION 75. WHY DID THE SAVIOR PAY THE DIDRACHMA ONLY FOR HIMSELF AND PETER, AND NOT ALSO FOR THE OTHER APOSTLES (Matt. 17:26)? SINCE THEY HAD ALL FOLLOWED HIM AFTER LEAVING ALL THEIR POSSESSIONS, HE SEEMS TO HAVE OWED PAYMENT FOR ALL. (pg. 223) QUESTION 76. IN THE GOSPEL, JOHN SAYS, "THE LAW WAS GIVEN THROUGH MOSES, GRACE AND TRUTH CAME THROUGH JESUS CHRIST" (John 1:17). THEREFORE, GRACE AND TRUTH DID NOT EXIST BEFORE. HOW THEN IS THE LAW SAID TO HAVE BEEN GIVEN BY GOD, IF THERE WAS NO TRUTH IN IT? (pg. 268) QUESTION 77. WHAT IS THE MEANING OF WHAT MARK THE EVANGELIST SAYS ABOUT CHRIST AMONG OTHER THINGS: "ENTERING THE HOUSE, HE WISHED NO ONE TO KNOW, AND HE COULD NOT REMAIN HIDDEN" (Mark 7:24)? IF THEREFORE HE WISHED AND COULD NOT, HIS WILL SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN WEAKENED. (pg. 239) QUESTION 78. IT IS READ IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN THAT, AFTER THE SAVIOR HAD SAID HE WOULD NOT GO UP TO THE FEAST DAY, HE WENT UP (John 7:8, 14); THIS SEEMS TO BE A SIGN OF INCONSISTENCY. (pg. 279)

QUESTION 79. IF WE LIVE BY OUR OWN FREE WILL, WHY DID THE SAVIOR SAY, "NO ONE COMES TO ME UNLESS THE FATHER WHO SENT ME DRAWS HIM" (John 6:44); AND WHY, AGREEING WITH THIS, DID THE APOSTLE SAY, "IT IS NOT OF HIM THAT WILLS, NOR OF HIM THAT RUNS, BUT OF GOD THAT SHOWS MERCY," AND, "HE HAS MERCY ON WHOM HE WILL, AND WHOM HE WILL HE HARDENS" (Rom. 9:16, 18)? HOW IS THE WILL'S CHOICE FREE, WHEN AT ANOTHER'S NOD IT IS LED EITHER TO GOOD OR TO EVIL? (pg. 276) QUESTION 80. CERTAINLY, EACH PERSON IS EITHER A SON OF GOD OR OF THE DEVIL: HE IS THEREFORE ALWAYS A SON, BUT SOMETIMES OF GOD, AND AT OTHER TIMES OF THE DEVIL. WHAT THEN WE ARE BORN AS MUST BE INQUIRED. (pg. 289) QUESTION 81. THE APOSTLE

SAYS, "WE WHO ARE JEWS BY NATURE" (Gal. 2:15): THEREFORE HE SHOWS THAT JEWS ARE BORN FROM JEWS; I AM NOT SPEAKING OF PROSELYTES, WHO ARE CLEARLY MADE INTO JEWS. INDEED, THOSE WHO WERE BORN IN THE WILDERNESS WERE NOT CIRCUMCISED, AND YET THEY WERE JEWS. THEREFORE IT IS NOT CIRCUMCISION THAT MAKES A JEW, BUT BIRTH BROUGHT FORTH UNDER DEVOTION TO GOD THE CREATOR. IF THEN JEWS ARE BORN FROM JEWS, WHY NOT ALSO CHRISTIANS FROM CHRISTIANS? FOR PAGANS TOO ARE BORN FROM PAGANS. (pg. 337)

QUESTION 82. THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT THE PAGANS ARE SUBJECT TO THE ELEMENTS; WHAT, THEN, DOES THE APOSTLE MEAN WHEN HE SAYS, "WE TOO WERE IN BONDAGE UNDER THE ELEMENTS OF THIS WORLD"? (Gal. 4:3). IF, THEREFORE, THE JEWS ALSO WERE SERVING UNDER THE ELEMENTS, HOW WERE THEY DIFFERENT FROM THE PAGANS? (pg. 344) QUESTION 83. IF SALVATION AND TRUE AND PERFECT KNOWLEDGE ARE THROUGH CHRIST, WHY DID HE NOT COME EARLIER, SO THAT OUR PREDECESSORS WHO WERE IN IGNORANCE MIGHT LEARN THE TRUTH? INDEED, AFTER THE COMING OF CHRIST MANY HAVE BEEN SAVED, MORE THAN BEFORE. WHENCE, IF HE HAD COME EARLIER, MANY MORE WOULD HAVE BEEN SAVED. IF THIS IS SO, IT SEEMS BLAMEWORTHY. (pg. 408) QUESTION 84. WHY DO WE, WHO ARE KEEPING THE PASSOVER FEAST (EASTER) BY THE PHASE OF THE MOON, REPROACH THE PAGANS FOR OBSERVING THE DAYS AND THE DIFFERENT PHASES OF THE MOON? (pg. 253)

QUESTION 85. HOW IS IT, THEN, THAT ALTHOUGH IT IS ESTABLISHED THAT FROM DAVID DOWN TO THE BABYLONIAN EXILE THERE ARE SEVENTEEN GENERATIONS, THE EVANGELIST SAYS THERE ARE FOURTEEN (Matt. 1:17), OMITTING AHAZIAH, WHO AFTER JORAM IS THE SON OF JEHOSHAPHAT, AND JOASH THE SON OF AHAZIAH, AND AMAZIAH THE SON OF JOASH? (pg. 188) QUESTION 86. WHAT PROVES THAT MARY, THE MOTHER OF THE LORD, IS OF THE TRIBE AND LINEAGE OF DAVID? (pg. 242) QUESTION 87. IF GOD IS ONE, WHY IS HOPE OF SALVATION IN THREE, AND NOT IN TWO OR FOUR, OR SURELY IN THE ONE HIMSELF? AND WHY WAS THE TRINITY NOT PREACHED FROM THE BEGINNING? (pg. 414) QUESTION 88. IF GRACE IS GREATER AND UNDERSTANDING CLEARER IN THE NEW TESTAMENT THAN IN THE OLD; WHY DID THE PROPHET ISAIAH SEE THE LORD OF HOSTS, WHO IS CHRIST, SEATED ON THE THRONE OF MAJESTY, ACCORDING TO THE INTERPRETATION OF JOHN THE EVANGELIST? FOR HE SAID AMONG OTHER THINGS: "ISAIAH SAID THESE THINGS WHEN HE SAW HIS MAJESTY AND SPOKE OF HIM" (Isaiah 6:1; John 12:41). BUT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT STEPHEN THE FIRST MARTYR SAYS THAT HE SAW JESUS STANDING AT THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD (Acts 7:55). WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT HERE HE APPEARS AS SUBJECT AFTER HIS VICTORIES, AND THERE AS LORD BEFORE HE HAD CONQUERED? (pg. 294)

QUESTION 89. THE SAVIOR, AMONG OTHER THINGS, SAYS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT: "WHEN HE COMES," HE SAYS, "HE WILL CONVICT THE WORLD CONCERNING SIN, AND RIGHTEOUSNESS, AND JUDGMENT. CONCERNING SIN INDEED, BECAUSE THEY DID NOT BELIEVE IN ME; BUT CONCERNING RIGHTEOUSNESS, BECAUSE I GO TO THE FATHER, AND YOU WILL SEE ME NO MORE; BUT CONCERNING JUDGMENT, BECAUSE THE PRINCE OF THIS WORLD HAS BEEN JUDGED" (John 16:8). HE APPEARS INDEED TO HAVE STATED THE REASON FOR THE WORLD'S BEING CONVICTED, BUT THIS NEEDS EXPLANATION. (pg. 312) QUESTION 90. IF THE DEVIL HIMSELF IS SATAN, HOW IS IT THAT AMONG OTHER THINGS THE SAVIOR SAYS TO THE JEWS: "YOU ARE OF YOUR FATHER THE DEVIL, AND YOU WISH TO DO THE DESIRES OF YOUR FATHER. HE WAS A MURDERER FROM THE BEGINNING, AND DID NOT STAND IN THE TRUTH, BECAUSE THERE IS NO TRUTH IN HIM. WHEN HE SPEAKS A LIE, HE SPEAKS FROM WHAT IS HIS OWN; FOR HE IS A LIAR, AS IS HIS FATHER" (John 8:44)? (pg. 288)

QUESTION 91. HOW TO BE SOUGHT IS HOW TO CONTRADICT THE ARGUMENTS OF PHOTINUS, WHO SAYS THAT CHRIST DID NOT EXIST BEFORE MARY. (pg. 416) QUESTION 92. HOW IS IT TO BE UNDERSTOOD WHEN THE SAVIOR SAYS, MY PEACE I GIVE TO YOU; MY PEACE I LEAVE WITH YOU: NOT AS THIS WORLD GIVES, DO I GIVE TO YOU (John 14:27)? (pg. 311) QUESTION 93. WE MUST ASK WHETHER THE APOSTLES HAD THE HOLY SPIRIT DURING THE TIME WHEN THEY WERE ON EARTH WITH THE LORD, BECAUSE AMONG MANY THINGS THE EVANGELIST SAYS, "THE SPIRIT HAD NOT YET BEEN GIVEN, BECAUSE JESUS HAD NOT YET BEEN GLORIFIED" (John 7:39); AND IN ANOTHER PLACE, "IF YOU LOVE ME, KEEP MY COMMANDMENTS, AND I WILL ASK THE FATHER, AND HE WILL GIVE YOU ANOTHER PARACLETE, THAT HE MAY REMAIN WITH YOU FOREVER, THE SPIRIT OF TRUTH, WHOM THE WORLD CANNOT RECEIVE, BECAUSE IT NEITHER SEES HIM NOR KNOWS HIM; BUT YOU KNOW HIM, BECAUSE HE DWELLS WITH YOU AND IS IN YOU" (John 14:15-17). WHAT DOES THIS MEAN? HE DENIES THAT THE SPIRIT WAS GIVEN BEFORE THE PASSION; YET HE PROMISES THAT HE WILL ASK THE FATHER TO SEND HIM. AGAIN HE ADDS THAT THE SPIRIT WAS WITH THEM AND REMAINED AMONG THEM. AFTER THE RESURRECTION, HOWEVER, IT IS WRITTEN THAT HE BREATHED ON THEM AND SAID, "RECEIVE THE HOLY SPIRIT" (John 20:22). AND AT PENTECOST IT IS WRITTEN THAT THE HOLY SPIRIT DESCENDED UPON THE APOSTLES (Acts 2:1-4). I SEE SO MANY DIFFICULTIES IN THIS MATTER THAT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT OUGHT TO BE HELD. (pg. 280)

QUESTION 94. IT MUST BE ASKED WHETHER JUDAS ISCARIOT, THE TRAITOR OF THE LORD, ENDED HIS LIFE BY HANGING BEFORE THE PASSION OF THE SAVIOR. (pg. 227) QUESTION 95. WHAT WAS THE ORIGIN OF THE FEAST OF PENTECOST AND THE REASON FOR ITS INSTITUTION? (pg. 316) QUESTION 96. IT SHOULD BE ASKED WHETHER PASCHA IS TO BE INTERPRETED AS "PASSAGE," AS IT APPEARS TO THE GREEKS. (pg. 325) QUESTION 97. BY WHAT REASON-

ING CAN THE WICKEDNESS OF ARIUS BE SIMPLY REFUTED FROM THE LAW? (pg. 295) QUESTION 98. ON THE GOSPEL OF SAINT JOHN. (pg. 286) QUESTION 99. WHAT IS THAT SAYING OF THE APOSTLE, "LET NO TEMPTATION TAKE HOLD OF YOU EXCEPT WHAT IS HUMAN" (1 Cor. 10:13)? (pg. 328) QUESTION 100. ON THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW. (pg. 217) QUESTION 101. ON THE BOASTFULNESS OF ROMAN DEACONS. (pg. 424) QUESTION 102. AGAINST NOVATIAN. (pg. 360) QUESTION 103. HOW HAS THE LORD IN LEVITICUS COMMANDED THAT SACRIFICES AND LIBATIONS BE OFFERED, WHICH ELSEWHERE HE REJECTS? FOR IT IS CLEAR IN LEVITICUS THAT THE LORD COMMANDED THE FATHERS TO OFFER LIBATIONS OR SACRIFICES OR BURNT OFFERINGS: YET HE SAYS THEREFORE THROUGH THE PROPHET JEREMIAH: THEREFORE SAYS THE LORD, GATHER YOUR BURNT OFFERINGS WITH YOUR SACRIFICES, AND EAT FLESH; FOR I DID NOT SPEAK TO YOUR FATHERS, NOR DID I COMMAND THEM, IN THE DAY THAT I BROUGHT THEM OUT OF THE LAND OF EGYPT (Jer. 7:21–22) ABOUT BURNT OFFERINGS AND SACRIFICES. (pg. 116)

QUESTION 104. ON THE GOSPEL OF LUKE. (pg. 255) QUESTION 105. HOW THE PROPHECY AGREES WITH THE GOSPEL, CONCERNING THE DARKENING OF THE SUN AND CERTAIN OTHER THINGS. (pg. 250) QUESTION 106. ON GENESIS. (pg. 6) QUESTION 107. ON THE ORDER OF DAY AND NIGHT. (pg. 26) QUESTION 108. ON THE HEBREW LANGUAGE, WHERE IT TOOK ITS NAME. (pg. 68) QUESTION 109. ON MELCHIZEDEK. (pg. 84) QUESTION 110. ON THE FIRST PSALM. (pg. 140) QUESTION 111. ON PSALM 23. (pg. 147) QUESTION 112. ON PSALM FIFTY. (pg. 156) QUESTION 113. WHY WAS THE SON OF GOD SENT, AND NOT ANOTHER? (pg. 428) QUESTION 114. AGAINST THE PAGANS. (pg. 380) QUESTION 115. CONCERNING FATE. (pg. 432) QUESTION 116. THE REASON FOR THE PASSOVER. (pg. 108) QUESTION 117. ON ABRAHAM. (pg. 72) QUESTION 118. ON JOB. (pg. 136) QUESTION 119. ON TOBIT. (pg. 134) QUESTION 120. ON FASTING. (pg. 457) QUESTION 121. PRAISE AND GLORY OF THE PASSOVER. (pg. 459)

QUESTION 122. ON THE BEGINNING. (pg. 259) QUESTION 123. DID ADAM HAVE THE HOLY SPIRIT? (pg. 38) QUESTION 124. ONE WORK VARIES ACCORDING TO PERSONS, INTO PRAISE OR CONDEMNATION. (pg. 460) QUESTION 125. AGAINST EUSEBIUS. (pg. 392) QUESTION 126. ON THE PERSON WHO HAS RECEIVED FAITH IN CHRIST. (pg. 463) QUESTION 127. THE SIN OF ADAM AND EVE. (pg. 46) 2ND CATEGORY QUESTIONS ON THE OLD TESTAMENT (PL 35 2386-92) QUESTION 1. AGAINST THOSE WHO DENY THAT ANYTHING CONCERNS GOD. (pg. 399) QUESTION 2. AND IS THE SPIRIT WHO WAS MOVING OVER THE WATERS TO BE UNDERSTOOD AS THE HOLY SPIRIT, BECAUSE IT IS SAID, "THE SPIRIT OF GOD WAS MOVING OVER THE WATERS" (Gen. 1:2)?" (pg. 23) QUESTION 3. WHEN ADAM WAS MADE BY GOD AND GIVEN LIFE, HE RECEIVED THE HOLY SPIRIT; FOR IT IS WRITTEN, "GOD BREATHED INTO HIS FACE THE SPIRIT OF LIFE" (Gen. 2:7). (pg. 44)

QUESTION 4. WHY DID GOD IMPOSE UPON ADAM THAT HE HAD PLACED IN THE WORLD A COMMANDMENT, A LAW, AFTER HAVING GIVEN HIM DOMINION OVER ALL CREATURES? (pg. 45) QUESTION 5. WHY DOES GOD SAY, "MY SPIRIT SHALL NOT REMAIN IN THESE MEN, BECAUSE THEY ARE FLESH; THEIR YEARS SHALL BE ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY," ETC. (Gen. 6:3)? (pg. 67) QUESTION 6. WHAT DOES THE BLESSING OF JACOB, WHICH HE GAVE TO HIS SONS (Gen. 48, 49), CONTAIN? (pg. 103) QUESTION 7. WHY DID THE ANGEL SENT TO SPEAK TO MOSES APPEAR IN THE FIRE AND IN THE BUSH? (pg. 105) QUESTION 8. THERE WAS NO OTHER SIGN THAT MOSES PERFORMED OPENLY BEFORE PHARAOH EXCEPT THE SERPENT (Exod. 7:10) (pg. 107) QUESTION 9. IF THERE IS ONE GOD, WHY IS HOPE OF SALVATION IN THREE, AND NOT IN TWO, OR FOUR, OR CERTAINLY IN ONE? AND WHY WAS THE TRINITY NOT PREACHED EARLIER? (pg. 414)

QUESTION 10. WHY WERE CIRCUMCISION AND PRECEPTS GIVEN TO THE PEOPLE, WHICH PREVIOUSLY DID NOT EXIST AND NOW ARE NO LONGER HELD IN AUTHORITY? (pg. 97) QUESTION 11. IF THE JEWS HAD RECEIVED HARSH COMMANDMENTS ON ACCOUNT OF THEIR DISTRUST AND SLANDERS, WHAT HAD THEIR SONS DONE WRONG THAT THEY TOO SHOULD BE BOUND BY THESE COMMANDMENTS? (pg. 468) QUESTION 12. WHY IS IT THAT IN THE LAW EVEN AARON HIMSELF IS TOLD THAT HE MUST OFFER BURNT OFFERINGS FOR HIS SINS, WHEN DAVID SAYS, "FOR FAULTS YOU HAVE NOT REQUIRED A BURNT OFFERING" (Ps. 39:7), AND LATER, "YOU WILL NOT TAKE PLEASURE IN BURNT OFFERINGS" (Ps. 50:18)? HOW DID HE COMMAND THAT THERE BE OFFERED WHAT HE DOES NOT TAKE PLEASURE IN? (pg. 154) QUESTION 13. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT DEATH WAS SENT INTO JACOB, THAT IT HAS COME INTO ISRAEL, SINCE JACOB HIMSELF IS ISRAEL? (pg. 177)

QUESTION 14. IF THE SOUL THAT SINS SHALL ITSELF DIE, HOW IS IT THAT, WHEN CHARMI SINS, THIRTY SIX MEN APPEAR TO HAVE BEEN KILLED ON HIS ACCOUNT? (pg. 118) QUESTION 15. WHAT IS IT THAT THE PROPHET SAYS: REJOICE, BARREN WOMAN, YOU WHO DO NOT GIVE BIRTH; BREAK FORTH AND CRY OUT, YOU WHO DO NOT LABOR IN CHILDBIRTH, BECAUSE THE CHILDREN OF THE DESOLATE ARE MORE NUMEROUS THAN THOSE OF HER WHO HAS A HUSBAND? (pg. 179) QUESTION 16. IF A HORSE AND A MULE DO NOT HAVE UNDERSTANDING, HOW MUCH LESS SO DOES THE EARTH, A THING WITHOUT SENSATION? WHAT THEN DOES IT MEAN WHEN THE EARTH IS SAID TO BLESS THE LORD (Ps. 31:9; Dan. 3:74)? (pg. 145) QUESTION 17. HE HAS, HE SAYS, SET UP HIS TABERNACLE IN THE SUN (Ps. 18:6), THAT IS, HIS BODY IN WHICH CHRIST DWELT, WHO WAS SCOURGED BY PILATE: HOW THEN IS IT SAID IN THE PSALM OF CHRIST, THE SCOURGE SHALL NOT COME NEAR YOUR TENT (Ps. 90:10)? SINCE HE CALLED HIS BODY A TEMPLE. (pg. 146)

QUESTION 18. WHY DID SOLOMON HAVE THE SPIRIT OF WISDOM (1 Kings 3), WHEN HE DID NOT HAVE A PURE LIFE? FOR HE TOOK GREAT DELIGHT IN WOMEN, AND BY THIS HE SINNED (ibid. 11). (pg. 132) QUESTION 19. IN SOLOMON IT IS SAID, "HOPE IS IN THE DARKNESS, AND A LIVING DOG IS BETTER THAN A DEAD LION." (Eccles. 9:4)." (pg. 169) QUESTION 20. IN WISDOM IT SAYS, "HE CREATED, IT SAYS, THE WORLD FROM UNSEEN MATTER"; AND ELSEWHERE, THAT WE HAVE BEEN MADE FROM NOTHING (Wis. 11:18 and 2:2). (pg. 173) 2ND CATEGORY QUESTIONS ON THE NEW TESTAMENT (PL 35 2392-2412) QUESTION 1. WHY HAVE THE DEEDS AND SAYINGS OF THE LORD BEEN ARRANGED IN WRITING IN FOUR BOOKS BY FOUR AUTHORS? (pg. 468) QUESTION 2. SINCE IT IS CERTAIN THAT WE HAVE FOUR AUTHENTIC BOOKS OF THE FACTS AND WORDS OF OUR LORD, IN WHAT ORDER SHOULD WE PLACE THEM? (pg. 469)

QUESTION 3. WHY DOES MATTHEW, WHEN WRITING THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST, SAY, "THE BOOK OF THE GENERATION OF JESUS CHRIST, THE SON OF DAVID" (Matt. 1:1), WHEN ABRAHAM CAME EARLIER? (pg. 181) QUESTION 4. WHAT IS THE REASON THAT THE APOSTLE MATTHEW, MENTIONED ABOVE, DIVIDED ALL THE GENERATIONS INTO THREE PARTS (Matt. 1:17)? (pg. 182) QUESTION 5. SO, SINCE THERE ARE FORTY-ONE GENERATIONS, THE EVANGELIST SEEMS TO HAVE COUNTED FORTY-TWO (Matt. 1:17). FOR THREE TIMES FOURTEEN, WHAT DO THEY MAKE IF NOT FORTY-TWO? (pg. 182) QUESTION 6. THEREFORE, IN MATTHEW JOSEPH'S FATHER IS WRITTEN AS JACOB, AND IN LUKE AS HELI; SO THAT HE IS EITHER IGNORANTLY DESCRIBED AS HAVING TWO FATHERS, OR AT LEAST IT IS UNCLEAR WHO HIS TRUE FATHER IS? (pg. 183) QUESTION 7. IT IS EVIDENT THAT THE SAVIOR WAS BORN, THE SON OF GOD AND CALLED CHRIST: WHY THEN, AFTER BAPTISM, DID THE TEMPTER APPROACH HIM, SAYING, "IF YOU ARE THE SON OF GOD," ETC. (Matt. 4:3)? (pg. 200)

QUESTION 8. WHY DOES THE SAVIOR, WHEN THE DEVIL IS TESTING HIM, RESIST IN NO OTHER WAY THAN WITH EXAMPLES FROM THE LAW (Matt. 4:4–10)? (pg. 201) QUESTION 9. WHY DID THE SAVIOR, AFTER HIS BAPTISM, FAST FOR FORTY DAYS AND THEN AFTERWARD GROW HUNGRY (Matt. 4:2)? FOR ONE WHO FASTED FORTY DAYS COULD HAVE ALREADY CEASED TO FEEL HUNGER. (pg. 202) QUESTION 10. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT, ALTHOUGH JOHN THE BAPTIST HAD PREVIOUSLY BORNE WITNESS TO THE SAVIOR, HE LATER SEEMED TO DOUBT, SAYING THROUGH HIS DISCIPLES: "ARE YOU THE ONE WHO IS TO COME, OR ARE WE TO EXPECT ANOTHER?" (Matt. 11:3–10). (pg. 203) QUESTION 11. WHAT IS THE MEANING OF THE FACT THAT ABOVE WE READ THAT HEROD DIED (Matt. 2:19), BUT LATER ON, AFTER MANY YEARS, WE READ THAT HEROD KILLED JOHN (Matt. 14:1–11), EVEN THOUGH JOHN OUTLIVED THE EARLIER HEROD WHO HAD DIED? (pg. 193)

QUESTION 12. SINCE THE LORD HAS CERTAINLY TAUGHT THAT WE MUST PRAY FOR OUR ENEMIES, WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT IN THE APOCALYPSE THE SOULS OF THE SLAIN SEEK TO BE AVENGED AGAINST THEM, ASKING GOD FOR VENGEANCE (Matt. 5:44; Rev. 6:10)? (pg. 211) QUESTION 13. IF, WHEN JOHN OR THE SAVIOR WAS PREACHING, THE LAW CEASED, HOW DOES THE SAVIOR SAY, "I HAVE NOT COME TO DESTROY THE LAW OR THE PROPHETS, BUT TO FULFILL" (Matt. 5:17)? FOR IF IT HAS BEEN FORBIDDEN, HOW IS IT NOT ABOLISHED, SINCE IT HAS LOST THE AUTHORITY TO BE CARRIED OUT? (pg. 205) QUESTION 14. JOHN TO THE LORD: "ARE YOU THE ONE WHO IS TO COME, OR SHOULD WE EXPECT ANOTHER?" (Matt. 11) (pg. 216) QUESTION 15. WHY IS IT SAID THAT THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS WERE UNTIL JOHN, AND THAT AFTERWARD THEY RIGHTLY CEASED (Matt. 11:13)? BECAUSE THE ONE ABOUT WHOM THEY PROPHESIED HAD NOW ARRIVED. WHY THEN "UNTIL JOHN" WITH REGARD TO THE LAW, SINCE THE APOSTLE SAYS THAT WE OUGHT TO BE SUBJECT TO THE LAW: "FOR THOSE THAT EXIST," HE SAYS, "HAVE BEEN ORDAINED BY GOD" (Rom. 13:1)? (pg. 216)

QUESTION 16. SINCE THE SAVIOR SAYS THAT THE BAPTISM OF JOHN IS FROM HEAVEN, WHY, WHEN HE SPEAKS TO NICODEMUS ABOUT BAPTISM AND HE IS IN DOUBT, DOES HE SAY: "IF I HAVE TOLD YOU EARTHLY THINGS AND YOU DO NOT BELIEVE," ETC.? (pg. 270) QUESTION 17. WHY IS IT THAT THE SAVIOR AT FIRST REFUSED MERCY TO THE FOREIGN WOMAN, THAT IS, THE CANAANITE (Matt. 15:22–28), WHEN HE DID NOT DENY THE GRACE OF GRANTING SALVATION TO THE FOREIGN CENTURION AND TO THE LEPER WHOM JESUS HIMSELF CALLED A FOREIGNER (Luke 7:2–10 and 17:12–19)? (pg. 222) QUESTION 18. HOW IS WHAT THE SAVIOR SAID PROVEN, NAMELY THAT AFTER THREE DAYS AND THREE NIGHTS HE WOULD RISE FROM THE DEAD, SINCE IN FACT, HAVING SUFFERED ON THE PREPARATION DAY, HE ROSE AT DAYBREAK ON SUNDAY, WHILE IT WAS STILL DARK? THEREFORE, THE NUMBER OF DAYS AND NIGHTS DOES NOT SEEM TO MATCH. (pg. 232)

QUESTION 19. THEREFORE THE SAVIOR SAYS, PRAY THAT YOUR FLIGHT BE NOT IN WINTER OR ON THE SABBATH (Matt. 24:20); EVEN THOUGH THE TIME OF THIS PERSECUTION CANNOT BE POSTPONED, SINCE THE APOSTLE SAYS, HE WILL BE REVEALED IN HIS OWN TIME (2 Thess. 2:6, 8); AND IN THE ACTS THE APOSTLE SAYS, APPOINTING THE TIMES AND THE BOUNDARIES OF THEIR DWELLING (Acts 17:26). AND WHY DOES HE INDICATE THAT FLIGHT IS NOT ADVISABLE IN WINTER OR ON THE SABBATH? (pg. 225) QUESTION 20. WHEN THE SAVIOR SAID THAT HE WAS GOING TO SUFFER AND THAT HE WOULD RISE AGAIN ON THE THIRD DAY, HE ADDED, "AND AFTER I HAVE RISEN, I WILL GO BEFORE YOU INTO GALILEE, THERE YOU WILL SEE ME"; AND LIKEWISE THE ANGEL SAID TO THE WOMEN (Matt. 26:32 and 28:7). (pg. 226) QUESTION 21. THREE EVANGELISTS SAY

THAT THE SAVIOR WAS CRUCIFIED AT THE SIXTH HOUR, BUT THE EVANGELIST MARK SAYS THAT HE WAS CRUCIFIED AT THE THIRD HOUR. (pg. 228)

QUESTION 22. IF THEREFORE THE SAVIOR WAS BAPTIZED SO AS TO BE AN EXAMPLE, WHY, WHEN HE WAS CIRCUMCISED, DID HE FORBID THE OTHERS TO BE CIRCUMCISED? (pg. 197) QUESTION 23. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT, WHEN THE JEWS ACCUSED THE DISCIPLES OF BREAKING THE SABBATH BY RUBBING EARS OF GRAIN IN THEIR HANDS AND EATING THEM, THE SAVIOR PUT FORWARD THE EXAMPLE OF DAVID, BECAUSE HE ATE THE LOAVES WHICH IT WAS NOT LAWFUL TO EAT EXCEPT FOR THE PRIESTS ALONE (Matt. 12:1–4)? BY THIS THEY DO NOT SEEM TO BE EXCUSED, BUT RATHER TO BECOME GUILTY TOGETHER WITH DAVID: ESPECIALLY SINCE DAVID DID NOT DO THIS ON THE SABBATH. (pg. 219) QUESTION 24. WHY DID THE SAVIOR CALL HIS DISCIPLES "SONS OF THUNDER" (Mark 3:17), WHO WOULD SEEM FAR MORE TO BE CALLED SONS OF GOD? FOR THUNDER IS SAID TO BE PRODUCED BY THE COLLISION OF CLOUDS. (pg. 239)

QUESTION 25. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT, ACCORDING TO THE ACCOUNT OF THE EVANGELIST MARK, CHRIST'S WILL WAS NOT FULFILLED: FOR "ENTERING," HE SAYS, "INTO A HOUSE, HE WISHED NO ONE TO KNOW, AND HE COULD NOT REMAIN HIDDEN" (Mark 7:24)? IF THEREFORE HE WISHED TO BE HIDDEN AND COULD NOT, HIS WILL HAS BEEN WEAKENED. (pg. 239) QUESTION 26. IN THE GOSPEL WE READ THAT THE ANGEL SAYS TO MARY, THE LORD'S MOTHER, THAT HIS KINGDOM, THAT IS, CHRIST'S, WILL HAVE NO END (Luke 1:33). AND DANIEL SAYS THE SAME; FOR HE SAYS: THEN THERE SHALL ARISE AN EVERLASTING KINGDOM WHICH SHALL NEVER BE DESTROYED (Dan. 7:14). ON THE OTHER HAND, THE APOSTLE SAYS OF THE LORD: WHEN HE SHALL HAVE DELIVERED UP THE KINGDOM TO GOD AND THE FATHER (1 Cor. 15:24). HOW WILL HE HAVE AN ETERNAL KINGDOM, IF HE IS SAID TO BE GOING TO DELIVER THAT KINGDOM UP TO GOD AND THE FATHER? (pg. 242)

QUESTION 27. THE SAVIOR SAYS, IF ANYONE HAS NOT LEFT ALL THAT HE HAS, THAT IS, HOUSE, AND FIELD, AND THE REST, HE CANNOT BE MY DISCIPLE; AND ON THE OTHER HAND THE EVANGELIST SAYS: JOSEPH OF ARIMATHEA CAME, A RICH MAN, WHO WAS ALSO HIMSELF A DISCIPLE OF JESUS, WAITING FOR THE KINGDOM OF GOD (Luke 14:33 and 23:50–51). HOW IS IT THAT THE EVANGELIST ACKNOWLEDGES HIM AS A DISCIPLE WHOM THE SAVIOR DENIED? FOR ZACCHAEUS WAS RICH, AND CORNELIUS THE CENTURION WAS RICH, AND THE WOMEN WHO MINISTERED TO THEM OUT OF THEIR MEANS WERE RICH. (pg. 248) QUESTION 28. IF THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS WERE UNTIL JOHN, HOW IS IT THAT THE SAVIOR SENDS THE LEPER TO THE PRIESTS TO HAVE OFFERINGS MADE FOR HIS CLEANSING (Matt. 8:4; Mark 1:44; Luke 5:14)? (pg. 214) QUESTION 29. IF THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS WERE UNTIL JOHN, FROM WHOM THE KINGDOM

OF HEAVEN BEGAN TO BE PREACHED (Luke 16:16), FOR HE IS INDEED THE INITIATOR OF THE NEW PREACHING, WHY DID HIS BAPTISM CEASE? (pg. 249)

QUESTION 30. IN THE GOSPEL, JOHN SAYS, "THE LAW WAS GIVEN THROUGH MOSES, GRACE AND TRUTH CAME THROUGH JESUS CHRIST" (John 1:17). THEREFORE, GRACE AND TRUTH DID NOT EXIST BEFORE. HOW THEN IS THE LAW SAID TO HAVE BEEN GIVEN BY GOD, IF THERE WAS NO TRUTH IN IT? (pg. 268) QUESTION 31. THE SABBATH IS CERTAINLY THE LAW OR A PART OF THE LAW; HOW THEN IS THE LAW NOT ABOLISHED, WHEN THE EVANGELIST SAYS, "HE NOT ONLY BROKE THE SABBATH, BUT ALSO CALLED GOD HIS FATHER" (John 5:18)? (pg. 274) QUESTION 32. IF WE LIVE BY OUR OWN FREE CHOICE, WHY DOES THE SAVIOR SAY, "NO ONE," HE DECLARES, "COMES TO ME UNLESS THE FATHER WHO SENT ME DRAWS HIM"; AND WHY DOES THE APOSTLE, IN AGREEMENT WITH THIS, SAY, "IT IS NOT OF HIM WHO WILLS, NOR OF HIM WHO RUNS, BUT OF GOD WHO SHOWS MERCY"? BY THESE STATEMENTS THE FREEDOM OF THE WILL SEEMS TO BE DISTURBED. FOR IF NO ONE GOES UNLESS DRAWN, THEN IT WILL NOT BE THE FAULT OF THE ONE WHO DOES NOT GO, SINCE HE IS NOT DRAWN. AND IF THE ONE WHO ASKS AND STRIVES DOES NOT RECEIVE, BUT GOD GIVES TO WHOM HE WILLS, THEN THE PERSON WHO WILLS AND DOES NOT OBTAIN WILL BE WITHOUT BLAME AND GUILT; AND THE GUILT WILL FALL BACK ON THE ONE WHO SPURNS THE PETITIONER. (pg. 276)

QUESTION 33. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT, ALTHOUGH THE SAVIOR HEALED ALMOST EVERYONE BY A WORD, HE NONETHELESS RESTORED THE BLIND MAN'S EYES WITH MUD MADE FROM HIS SPITTLE (John 9:6–7)? (pg. 291) QUESTION 34. WHAT IS IT THAT THE SAVIOR SAYS, "I AM THE DOOR; THOSE WHO CAME BEFORE ME ARE THIEVES AND ROBBERS" (John 10:7–8)? THIS STATEMENT SEEMS TO STRIKE AT THE PROPHETS. (pg. 292) QUESTION 35. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT, WHEN HE WAS GOING TO PERFORM A MARVELOUS AND UNKNOWN ACT OF POWER, NAMELY, TO RAISE LAZARUS FROM THE DEAD, HE WEPT, OR ASKED WHERE HE HAD BEEN LAID AS THOUGH HE DID NOT KNOW (John 11:34–35)? (pg. 293) QUESTION 36. WHEN THE SAVIOR SAYS, "I PRAY FOR THEM WHOM YOU HAVE GIVEN ME; I DO NOT PRAY FOR THE WORLD" (John 17:9), BUT THE APOSTLE JOHN, ON THE CONTRARY, SAYS, "WE HAVE AN ADVOCATE WITH THE FATHER, A MEDIATOR FOR OUR SINS, AND NOT ONLY FOR OURS, BUT FOR THE WHOLE WORLD" (1 John 2:1–2), THIS SEEMS TO BE A CONTRADICTION. (pg. 313)

QUESTION 37. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT THE SAVIOR SAYS TO MARY, WHO WANTS TO TOUCH HIM OUT OF JOY, "DO NOT TOUCH ME; FOR I HAVE NOT YET ASCENDED TO THE FATHER" (John 20:1–17), WHEN IT IS READ THAT HE WAS BOTH TOUCHED AND ADORED BY THE OTHER WOMEN? (pg. 314) QUESTION 38. HOW IS IT TO BE UNDERSTOOD THAT, WHEN MARY SAID TO THE ANGEL, "AND HOW SHALL I KNOW THIS, FOR I DO NOT KNOW MAN?", THE ANGEL GABRIEL

REPLIED, “THE HOLY SPIRIT WILL COME UPON YOU, AND THE POWER OF THE MOST HIGH WILL OVERSHADOW YOU” (Luke 1:34–35)? (pg. 244) QUESTION 39. BY WHAT REASONING DID THE CHALDEAN MAGI UNDERSTAND, THROUGH THE STAR THAT APPEARED, THAT CHRIST, THE KING OF THE JEWS, HAD BEEN BORN, SINCE A TEMPORAL KING IS INDICATED BY A STAR AS A SIGN? (Matt. 2:1–2)? (pg. 192) QUESTION 40. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT THE PROPHET ISAIAH SAYS OF CHRIST, “HE COMMITTED NO SIN,” WHILE THE APOSTLE, ON THE CONTRARY, SAYS, “HIM WHO KNEW NO SIN, HE MADE SIN FOR US” (Isa. 53:9; 2 Cor. 5:21)? (pg. 333)

QUESTION 41. CERTAINLY, WHOEVER IS NOT A SON OF GOD IS OF THE DEVIL: THEREFORE HE IS ALWAYS A SON, BUT SOMETIMES OF GOD, SOMETIMES OF THE DEVIL. WHAT THEN ARE WE BORN AS? (pg. 289) QUESTION 42. WE MUST ASK WHETHER THE APOSTLES HAD THE HOLY SPIRIT DURING THE TIME WHEN THEY WERE ON EARTH WITH THE LORD, BECAUSE AMONG MANY THINGS THE EVANGELIST SAYS, “THE SPIRIT HAD NOT YET BEEN GIVEN, BECAUSE JESUS HAD NOT YET BEEN GLORIFIED” (John 7:39); AND IN ANOTHER PLACE, “IF YOU LOVE ME, KEEP MY COMMANDMENTS, AND I WILL ASK THE FATHER, AND HE WILL GIVE YOU ANOTHER PARACLETE, THAT HE MAY REMAIN WITH YOU FOREVER, THE SPIRIT OF TRUTH, WHOM THE WORLD CANNOT RECEIVE, BECAUSE IT NEITHER SEES HIM NOR KNOWS HIM; BUT YOU KNOW HIM, BECAUSE HE DWELLS WITH YOU AND IS IN YOU” (John 14:15-17). WHAT DOES THIS MEAN? HE DENIES THAT THE SPIRIT WAS GIVEN BEFORE THE PASSION; YET HE PROMISES THAT HE WILL ASK THE FATHER TO SEND HIM. AGAIN HE ADDS THAT THE SPIRIT WAS WITH THEM AND REMAINED AMONG THEM. AFTER THE RESURRECTION, HOWEVER, IT IS WRITTEN THAT HE BREATHED ON THEM AND SAID, “RECEIVE THE HOLY SPIRIT” (John 20:22). AND AT PENTECOST IT IS WRITTEN THAT THE HOLY SPIRIT DESCENDED UPON THE APOSTLES (Acts 2:1-4). I SEE SO MANY DIFFICULTIES IN THIS MATTER THAT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT OUGHT TO BE HELD. (pg. 280)

QUESTION 43. WHAT REASONABLE ANSWER CAN ONE MAKE FROM THE LAW TO THE WICKEDNESS OF THE ARIANS? (pg. 308) QUESTION 44. AS WE CONFESS THAT THE SAVIOR WAS BORN, WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT THE APOSTLE SAYS HE WAS MADE FROM THE SEED OF DAVID (Rom. 1:3), SINCE TO BE MADE IS ONE THING AND TO BE BORN ANOTHER? (pg. 319) QUESTION 45. IF CHRIST WAS MADE THE SON OF GOD ACCORDING TO THE FLESH FROM THE SEED OF DAVID, THAT IS, IF HE WHO WAS BORN IS ALREADY THE SON OF GOD IN BOTH RESPECTS, BECAUSE HE WAS SANCTIFIED AT BIRTH, HOW THEN, AFTER HE WAS BAPTIZED, WAS IT SAID TO HIM BY GOD, “YOU ARE MY SON; TODAY I HAVE BEGOTTEN YOU”? (Ps. 2:7)? (pg. 198) QUESTION 46. THE APOSTLE CALLS THE LAW GIVEN BY MOSES HOLY, JUST, GOOD, AND SPIRITUAL (Rom. 7:12, 14). ELSEWHERE HE SAYS, “FOR THE LAW WORKS WRATH,” AND, “WHERE THERE IS NO LAW, THERE IS NO TRANS-

GRESSION" (Rom. 4:15). FOR WHERE THESE THINGS ARE NOT, THERE IS SECURITY. (pg. 320)

QUESTION 47. BY WHAT REASONING IS THE WISDOM OF THE FLESH HOSTILE TO GOD; OR WHAT IS THAT WISDOM ITSELF WHICH IS NOT SUBJECT TO THE LAW OF GOD (Rom. 8:7)? (pg. 322) QUESTION 48. THE APOSTLE SAYS ABOUT THE PRINCES AND POWERS OF THIS WORLD THAT, IF THEY HAD KNOWN, THEY WOULD NEVER HAVE CRUCIFIED THE LORD OF MAJESTY; BUT, ON THE OTHER HAND, MARK THE EVANGELIST SAYS OF THE DEMONS, "FOR THEY KNEW HIM TO BE." IF THE DEMONS KNEW, HOW DID THE POWERS NOT KNOW? (pg. 237) QUESTION 49. WHOSE SPIRIT DOES THE APOSTLE SAY IS TO BE SAVED, WHEN HE SAYS, "I HAVE HANDED OVER SUCH A MAN TO SATAN FOR THE DESTRUCTION OF THE FLESH," ETC. (1 Cor. 5:5)? (pg. 323) QUESTION 50. SINCE MANY SINS SEEM TO BE COMMITTED IN THE BODY, FOR ANYONE WHO INFLICTS VIOLENCE ON ANY PART OF HIS BODY SINS, OF COURSE, AGAINST HIS OWN BODY; FOR THERE IS ONE WHO HAS MUTILATED HIMSELF, ONE WHO HAS ENDED HIS LIFE BY A NOOSE, ONE WHO HAS DRIVEN A SWORD INTO HIMSELF, WHY THEN DOES THE APOSTLE SAY, "EVERY SIN WHATSOEVER A MAN SHALL COMMIT IS OUTSIDE THE BODY; BUT HE WHO FORNICATES SINS AGAINST HIS OWN BODY" (1 Cor. 6:18)? (pg. 326)

QUESTION 51. WHY DID THE APOSTLE SAY THAT HE MADE HIMSELF "ALL THINGS TO ALL MEN" (1 Cor. 9:22), SOMETHING THAT SEEMS LIKE THE BEHAVIOR OF A FLATTERER AND A HYPOCRITE? (pg. 327) QUESTION 52. WHAT DOES THE APOSTLE MEAN WHEN HE SAYS, "LET NO TEMPTATION SEIZE YOU EXCEPT WHAT IS HUMAN" (1 Cor. 10:13); AS THOUGH HE WERE WISHING THIS TO HAPPEN? AND WHAT IS THIS HUMAN TEMPTATION? FOR BY THIS HE SHOWS THAT THERE IS ALSO A DIVINE TEMPTATION. (pg. 328) QUESTION 53. WHAT DOES THE APOSTLE MEAN WHEN HE SAYS, "NO ONE CAN SAY, LORD JESUS, EXCEPT IN THE HOLY SPIRIT" (1 Cor. 12:3)? CAN PHOTINUS, WHO DENIES THAT CHRIST IS GOD, CONFESS OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST IN THE HOLY SPIRIT? AND MARCION AND MANICHAEUS, WHO DENY THAT CHRIST CAME IN THE FLESH, CAN THEY SAY "LORD JESUS CHRIST" IN THE HOLY SPIRIT? OR PROSTITUTES AND THE IMPURE, WHEN THE HOLY SPIRIT DOES NOT DWELL IN A BODY SUBJECT TO SINS, AND WISDOM DOES NOT ENTER INTO A HATEFUL SOUL (Wis. 1:4)? (pg. 331)

QUESTION 54. THE APOSTLE SAYS THAT CHRIST DIED FOR ALL; FOR THEREFORE HE SAYS, "THEREFORE ALL HAVE DIED, AND HE DIED FOR ALL" (2 Cor. 5:14–15). BUT THE LORD HIMSELF SAYS, "THE SON OF MAN CAME TO GIVE HIS LIFE AS A RANSOM FOR MANY" (Matt. 20:28). IN THIS WAY IT SEEMS CONTRARY. (pg. 332) QUESTION 55. WHY DID THE APOSTLE PAUL REBUKE HIS FELLOW APOSTLE PETER BECAUSE, FEARING THOSE WHO WERE OF THE CIRCUMCISION, HE WITHDREW HIMSELF FROM THE GENTILES (Gal. 2:11, 14), WHEN PAUL HIM-

SELF, ALSO FEARING THOSE WHO WERE OF THE CIRCUMCISION, TOOK TIMOTHY AND CIRCUMCISED HIM, SOMETHING HE WAS FORBIDDING TO BE DONE (Acts 16:3)? (pg. 336) QUESTION 56. THE APOSTLE SAYS, "WE ARE JEWS BY NATURE." (Gal. 2:15) THEREFORE HE SHOWS THAT JEWS ARE BORN FROM JEWS. INDEED, THOSE WHO WERE BORN IN THE DESERT, THOUGH NOT CIRCUMCISED, WERE JEWS. CIRCUMCISION, THEREFORE, DOES NOT MAKE SOMEONE A JEW, BUT BIRTH BROUGHT FORTH UNDER THE DEVOTION TO GOD THE CREATOR. IF, THEN, JEWS ARE BORN FROM JEWS, AND PAGANS ARE BORN FROM PAGANS, SO TOO CHRISTIANS ARE BORN FROM CHRISTIANS. (pg. 337)

QUESTION 57. WHAT NEED WAS THERE FOR THE APOSTLE, WHEN REBUKING THE GALATIANS, TO INSERT THIS STATEMENT? FOR TO THE GALATIANS, WHO AFTER THE GOSPEL WERE TAKING REFUGE IN THE LAW, HE SAYS AMONG OTHER THINGS: "NOW A MEDIATOR IS NOT OF ONE, BUT GOD IS ONE" (Gal. 3:20), AS THOUGH THE GALATIANS DENIED THAT GOD IS ONE. YET IT WAS PRECISELY BY THIS LINE OF REASONING THAT THEY HAD BEEN LED INTO THE LAW: SO THAT THEY MIGHT BELIEVE IN ONE, UNIQUE GOD; AND THAT CHRIST HAD COME ONLY AS A MINISTER BY PREDESTINATION, TO DISPENSE THE GIFT OF GOD'S GRACE. (pg. 342) QUESTION 58. IF SALVATION AND TRUE AND PERFECT KNOWLEDGE ARE THROUGH CHRIST, WHY DID HE NOT COME EARLIER, SO THAT OUR PREDECESSORS WHO WERE IN IGNORANCE MIGHT LEARN THE TRUTH? INDEED, AFTER THE COMING OF CHRIST MANY HAVE BEEN SAVED MORE THAN BEFORE; WHERE, IF HE HAD COME EARLIER, FAR MORE WOULD HAVE BEEN SAVED. IF THIS IS SO, IT APPEARS OPEN TO CRITICISM. (pg. 408)

QUESTION 59. THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT PAGANS ARE UNDER THE ELEMENTS. WHAT THEN DID THE APOSTLE MEAN WHEN HE SAID, "WE TOO WERE SERVING UNDER THE ELEMENTS OF THIS WORLD"? (Gal. 4:3) IF THEREFORE THE JEWS ALSO WERE UNDER THE ELEMENTS, HOW DO THEY DIFFER FROM THE PAGANS? (pg. 344) QUESTION 60. WHEN THE APOSTLE SAYS TO THE GALATIANS, WHOM HE REBUKES AND REPROVES THROUGHOUT THE WHOLE EPISTLE, BE AS I AM, BECAUSE I AM AS YOU ARE (Gal. 4:12): IF THEREFORE HE HAD MADE HIMSELF SUCH AS THEY WERE, IT WAS UNNECESSARY TO SAY, BE AS I AM. OR PERHAPS IN SOME THINGS HE HAD BEGUN TO BE AN IMITATOR OF THEM, AND IN OTHERS HE WISHES THEM TO BECOME LIKE HIM? (pg. 347) QUESTION 61. HOW ARE WE FREE IN CHOICE AND WILL, WHEN THE APOSTLE SAYS, "THE FLESH DESIRES AGAINST THE SPIRIT, AND THE SPIRIT AGAINST THE FLESH, SO THAT YOU DO NOT DO THE THINGS THAT YOU WOULD" (Gal. 5:17)? AND IF THE FLESH DESIRES AGAINST THE SPIRIT, IT IS EVIL. FOR THE SPIRIT SUGGESTS WHAT IS GOOD. (pg. 348)

QUESTION 62. IF IN CHRIST ALL THE TREASURES OF WISDOM AND KNOWLEDGE ARE HIDDEN (Colossians 2:3), HOW IS IT THAT THE SAME SAVIOR SAYS HE

DOES NOT KNOW THE DAY AND HOUR OF THE FUTURE JUDGMENT (Mark 13:32)? BUT IF HE DOES KNOW AND SAYS HE DOES NOT KNOW, HE SEEMS TO BE LYING. (pg. 351) QUESTION 63. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT, ALTHOUGH THE APOSTLES HEALED ALL THE AILMENTS BROUGHT BEFORE THEM, THEY DID NOT GIVE HEALING TO THEIR OWN INFIRMITIES? FOR EPAPHRODITUS CERTAINLY WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN SICK ALMOST TO DEATH (Philippians 2:27), IF THE APOSTLE'S INTERCESSION HAD BEEN HEARD. WHO COULD DOUBT THAT THE APOSTLE OFTEN PRAYED FOR THIS AND DID NOT OBTAIN IT? FOR IF HE HAD BEEN HEARD, THE SICKNESS WOULD IMMEDIATELY HAVE BEEN TAKEN AWAY. (pg. 353) QUESTION 64. THE APOSTLE PETER SAYS, "CHRIST DIED FOR YOU" (1 Pet. 2:21). BUT THE APOSTLE PAUL DECLARES THAT HE ALSO DIED FOR HIMSELF: "HE BECAME OBEDIENT UNTO DEATH; WHEREFORE GOD HAS GIVEN HIM A NAME WHICH IS ABOVE EVERY NAME" (Phil. 2:8–9). IF THIS IS SO, HE WOULD APPEAR TO HAVE BEEN IMPERFECT, SINCE HE GAINED INCREASE THROUGH HIS WORKS. (pg. 355)

QUESTION 65. WHEN IT IS READ IN THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN: "GO," HE SAYS, "AND TAKE THE BOOK FROM THE HAND OF THE ANGEL, AND DEVOUR IT, AND IT WILL MAKE YOUR BELLY BITTER, BUT IN YOUR MOUTH IT WILL BE SWEET AS HONEY" (Rev. 10:8–9): WHAT IS THIS BOOK THAT MAKES THE BELLY BITTER WHILE IT IS SWEET? (pg. 355) 2ND CATEGORY QUESTIONS ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT (PL 35 2412-16) QUESTION 1. WHAT IT IS TO HAVE MADE MAN IN THE IMAGE AND LIKENESS OF GOD; AND WHETHER WOMAN IS THE IMAGE OF GOD. (pg. 33) QUESTION 2. THE GOSPEL BEARS WITNESS THAT NO ONE HAS SEEN GOD (John 1:18; 6:46; and 1 Tim. 6:16); YET JACOB AND MOSES AND ISAIAH ASSERT THAT THEY HAVE SEEN GOD (Gen. 32:30 and Isa. 6:1). BUT SOMEONE SAYS, "NO ONE HAS SEEN THE FATHER." WHAT OF IT? IF THE SON HAS BEEN SEEN, THEN THE FATHER HAS BEEN SEEN AS WELL, SINCE THE FATHER AND THE SON ARE ONE AND THE SAME GOD, BOTH IN SUBSTANCE AND IN IMAGE, BECAUSE OF TWO THERE IS ONE IMAGE; AND, AS HE HIMSELF SAYS, "HE WHO SEES ME, SEES THE FATHER ALSO" (John 14:9). HOW THEN HAS NO ONE SEEN GOD THE FATHER, WHEN THE SON SAYS THAT THE FATHER IS SEEN WHEN HE HIMSELF IS SEEN? BECAUSE HE IS NOT A DIFFERENT GOD. IF THEREFORE HE IS NOT ANOTHER, THEN HE, BEING ONE AND THE SAME, IS THE GOD WHO HAS BEEN SEEN. (pg. 275)

QUESTION 3. THE OLD LAW ALLEGES THAT GOD SWORE AN OATH; FOR IT SAYS, "BY MYSELF I HAVE SWORN, SAYS THE LORD" (Gen. 22:16). BUT THE SAVIOR FORBADE SWEARING (Matt. 5:34): HOW THEN DID HE NOT DESTROY THE OLD THINGS? (pg. 100) QUESTION 4. WHAT IS IT THAT THE SAVIOR, WHEN PLACED ON THE CROSS, SAYS: FATHER, FORGIVE THEM, FOR THEY DO NOT KNOW WHAT THEY ARE DOING? IF THEY DO NOT KNOW, WHAT IS IT THAT IS FORGIVEN, ESPECIALLY SINCE ABIMELECH SAYS TO GOD, WILL YOU DESTROY THOSE WHO ARE IGNORANT? (pg. 258) QUESTION 5. IF NO ONE IS JUSTIFIED BEFORE GOD BY THE

LAW, WHY IS IT WRITTEN: "CURSED IS EVERYONE WHO DOES NOT CONTINUE IN ALL THINGS THAT ARE WRITTEN IN THE BOOK OF THE LAW, TO DO THEM" (Deut. 27:26)? IF PEOPLE ARE JUSTIFIED BY FAITH AND NOT BY THE LAW (Gal. 2:16), WHY IS THE ONE WHO HAS NOT FULFILLED THE LAW CALLED CURSED, SINCE IT DOES NOT LEAD TO RIGHTEOUSNESS? (pg. 341)

QUESTION 6. WHAT DOES IT MEAN WHEN DAVID SAYS, "LET THEM BE CONFUSED AND ASHAMED WHO SAY TO ME, 'WELL DONE, WELL DONE'" (Ps. 69:4), WHILE THE LORD SAYS, "WELL DONE, GOOD AND FAITHFUL SERVANT" (Matt. 25:21, 23), ETC.? THAT WHICH DAVID TOOK AS SOMETHING BAD, THE SAVIOR SHOWS TO BE WORTHY OF GOOD MERITS. (pg. 155) QUESTION 7. WHAT DOES IT MEAN IN THE PSALM, "MEN," HE SAYS, "AND BEASTS YOU WILL SAVE" (Ps. 35:7); AND IN THE PROPHET JONAH, "I WILL NOT SPARE," HE SAYS, "THE CITY IN WHICH LIVE ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY THOUSAND PEOPLE, AND MANY ANIMALS" (Jonah 4:11); WHEREAS THE APOSTLE SAYS, "DOES GOD CARE FOR OXEN?" (1 Cor. 9:9). (pg. 153) QUESTION 8. IN TOBIT IT IS SAID: "TO REVEAL AND CONFESS THE WORK OF GOD IS HONORABLE" (Tob. 12:7). BUT THE SAVIOR, WHEN PERFORMING THE WORK OF GOD, SAYS: "TELL NO ONE" (Mark 8:26). (pg. 136)

QUESTION 9. ON THE ETERNITY OF THE SON. (pg. 470) QUESTION 10. WHAT IS IT THAT THE APOSTLE SAYS TO THE GALATIANS: "I AM AMAZED THAT YOU ARE SO QUICKLY DESERTING HIM WHO CALLED YOU IN GRACE, FOR ANOTHER GOSPEL, WHICH IS NOT ANOTHER" (Gal. 1:6–7)? IF IT IS "ANOTHER," SURELY IT IS NOT THE SAME; IF IT IS NOT THE SAME, HOW IS IT NOT "ANOTHER"? (pg. 349) QUESTION 11. THE APOSTLE PAUL INDICATES THAT WE MUST NOT BE GRIEVED OVER THE DEAD (1 Thess. 4:12). FOR IT IS THOSE WHO DESPAIR WHO ARE GRIEVED; AND HE HIMSELF SAYS ABOUT EPAPHRODITUS, "HE WAS SICK, NEAR TO DEATH, BUT GOD HAD MERCY ON HIM; AND NOT ONLY ON HIM, BUT ALSO ON ME, SO THAT I SHOULD NOT HAVE SORROW UPON SORROW" (Phil. 2:27). (pg. 354) QUESTION 12. WHY IS IT THAT, WITH LEAH'S SONS SLAIN, WHO ARE FROM THE TRIBE OF JUDAH, RACHEL IS SAID TO BE WEEPING FOR HER SONS? (pg. 194)

Source. English translation: an older public-domain translation as collected in the Writings-Database (HistoricalChristianFaith), mostly from the Ante-Nicene, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers and similar nineteenth-century editions. SermonIndex has only divided it into chapters and short sections; the wording is the translator's own. Square brackets, Greek or Latin words and footnote-free text are as the source file prints them, and a transcription error may remain. No Greek or Latin text is shown beside it yet, and no modern English version has been made.