

SAINT AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO

AGAINST ADIMANTUS, DISCIPLE OF
MANI

Contra Adimantum Manichaei

SABBATISMUS

Saint Augustine of Hippo (354–430)
Contra Adimantum Manichaei · Against Adimantus, Disciple of Mani

Latin text: public domain.
Translation, alignment and edition © 2026 Inversiones San Juan Diego (Sabbatismus). Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International license (CC BY-SA 4.0).

Facing-page bilingual edition: Latin on the left-hand pages, English on the right.
Sabbatismus is the imprint of the Inversiones San Juan Diego foundation, San Pedro Sula, Honduras.
Set in EB Garamond and Cinzel.
sabbatismus.com

CONTENTS

Saint Aurelius Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, AGAINST ADIMANTUS, DISCIPLE OF
MANI, in One Book. (C)..... 5

CHAPTER ONE..... 5

CHAPTER TWO..... 7

CHAPTER THREE..... 9

CHAPTER FOUR..... 15

CHAPTER FIVE..... 17

CHAPTER SIX..... 19

CHAPTER SEVEN..... 21

CHAPTER VIII..... 25

CHAPTER IX..... 27

CHAPTER X..... 31

CHAPTER XI..... 33

CHAPTER XII..... 35

CHAPTER XIII..... 43

CHAPTER XIV..... 47

CHAPTER XV..... 55

CHAPTER XVI..... 61

CHAPTER XVII..... 67

CHAPTER XVIII..... 79

CHAPTER XIX..... 83

CHAPTER XX..... 83

CHAPTER XXI..... 87

CHAPTER XXII..... 89

CHAPTER XXIII..... 91

CHAPTER XXIV..... 91

CHAPTER XXV..... 93

CHAPTER XXVI..... 95

CHAPTER XXVII..... 97

CHAPTER XXVIII..... 99

S. AURELII AUGUSTINI HIPPONENSIS EPISCOPI
CONTRA ADIMANTUM MANICHAEI DISCIPULUM
LIBER UNUS. (C)

Conciliantur inter se Scripturarum sententiae, quas de Testamento Vetere ac Novo, velut invicem contrarias Adimantus, utrumque Testamentum ab uno et eodem Deo esse non posse contendens, corraserat.

CAPUT PRIMUM.

De eo quod scriptum est, In principio fecit Deus coelum et terram; usque ad id quod scriptum est, Et factum est vespere, et factum est mane dies unus (Gen. I, 1-5).

Hoc capitulum Legis adversum esse Evangelio stultissimi Manichaei arbitrantur, dicentes in Genesi scriptum esse quod Deus per se ipsum fecerit coelum et terram et lucem; in Evangelio autem scriptum esse per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum fabricatum esse mundum, ubi dictum est, Et mundus per ipsum factus est, et mundus illum non cognovit (Joan. I, 10). Tribus enim modis refelluntur. Primo, quia cum dicitur, In principio fecit Deus coelum et terram; Trinitatem ipsam christianus accipit, ubi non solum Pater, sed et Filius et Spiritus sanctus intelligitur. Non enim tres deos, sed unum Deum credimus, Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum: quamvis Pater Pater, et Filius Filius sit, et Spiritus sanctus Spiritus sanctus. De qua unitate Trinitatis hoc loco longum est disputare. Deinde, quia ubi dicitur, Dixit Deus, Fiat, et factum est; ibi necesse est intelligatur per Verbum eum fecisse quod fecit. Verbum autem Patris est Filius. Non ergo repugnat hoc capitulum Geneseos, ubi scriptum est, Et Dixit Deus, Fiat, et factum est; illi loco Evangelii ubi dicitur, Et mundus per eum factus est, id est, per Dominum nostrum; quia ipse est Verbum Patris per quod facta sunt omnia. Postremo, si propterea in Genesi non intelligitur Filius, quia non est dictum quod per Filium Deus fecerit; nec in Evangelio per Filium Deus et aves pascit, et lilia vestit (Matth. VI, 26 30), et caetera innumerabilia quae ipse Dominus dicit Deum facere Patrem: quamvis non dicat quod ea per Filium faciat.

SAINT AURELIUS AUGUSTINE, BISHOP OF HIPPO,
AGAINST ADIMANTUS, DISCIPLE OF MANI, IN
ONE BOOK. (C)

The passages of the Scriptures, which Adimantus had scraped together from the Old and New Testaments as if they were mutually contrary, contending that both Testaments could not be from one and the same God, are reconciled with each other.

CHAPTER ONE

Regarding what is written: "In the beginning God created heaven and earth" (Gen. 1:1), down to what is written: "And there was evening and there was morning, one day" (Gen. 1:5).

The most foolish Manichaeans think this chapter of the Law is contrary to the Gospel, saying that in Genesis it is written that God created heaven, earth, and light by Himself; but in the Gospel it is written that the world was fashioned through our Lord Jesus Christ, where it is said: "And the world was made through Him, and the world did not know Him" (John 1:10). For they are refuted in three ways. First, because when it is said, "In the beginning God created heaven and earth," the Christian understands the Trinity itself, where not only the Father, but also the Son and the Holy Spirit are understood. For we do not believe in three gods, but in one God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; although the Father is the Father, the Son is the Son, and the Holy Spirit is the Holy Spirit. It would be a long task to dispute about this unity of the Trinity in this place. Next, because where it is said, "God said, 'Let it be,' and it was done," there it must be understood that He made what He made through the Word. Now, the Word of the Father is the Son. Therefore, this chapter of Genesis, where it is written, "And God said, 'Let it be,' and it was done," is not repugnant to that passage of the Gospel where it is said, "And the world was made through Him," that is, through our Lord; because He is the Word of the Father through whom all things were made. Finally, if the Son is not understood in Genesis for the reason that it is not stated that God made through the Son, then neither in the Gospel does God feed the birds and clothe the lilies through the Son (Matt. 6:26, 30), and countless other things which the Lord Himself says the Father God does, although He does not say that He does them through the Son.

Quod autem etiam testimonium Apostoli adjungunt, quod ait de Domino nostro Jesu Christo, Ipse est primogenitus totius creaturae; et omnia per ipsum facta sunt in coelo et in terra, visibilia et invisibilia (Coloss. I, 15-16); et hoc capitulum adversum esse dicunt Genesi, ubi Deus ita dicitur fecisse mundum, ut specialiter Filius ibi non sit nominatus: vehementer errant; et non vident, si ita est, ipsum Apostolum sibi esse contrarium, cum alio loco unum dicit, ex quo omnia, per quem omnia, in quo omnia (Rom. XI, 36); et Filium non nominat. Quomodo autem hic Filius nominatus non est, intelligitur tamen; ita et in Genesi: et quomodo sibi haec duo capitula Pauli non adversantur; ita nec Genesis Evangelio.

CAPUT II.

1. De eo quod scriptum est: Et consummavit Deus die sexto omnia opera sua quae fecit, et in septimo requievit ab eisdem omnibus operibus quae fecerat (Gen. II, 2).

Huic etiam loco Manichaei calumniam movent, et dicunt Novo Testamento adversari quod in Genesi scriptum est, Deum septimo die requievisse ab omnibus operibus suis quae fecit: quoniam Dominus in Evangelio dicit, Pater meus usque nunc operatur (Joan. V, 17). Quod nullo modo contrarium est. Dominus enim Judaeorum refellit errorem, qui putabant Deum sic requievisse die septimo, ut ex illo prorsus nihil operaretur. Requievit autem ab omnibus operibus suis quae fecit, ut jam ultra non faceret mundum cum omnibus quae in eo sunt: non tamen ut etiam a mundi administratione requiesceret. Non enim scriptum est: Requievit Deus ab omnibus operibus suis, ut deinceps non operaretur. Sed scriptum est, Requievit Deus ab omnibus operibus suis quae fecit: ut deinde non in faciendo mundo, a quo opere post perfectionem cessaverat; sed in administrando operaretur, in quo opere eum esse Dominus intimavit. Nec illa requies, quasi post laborem Deum pausam quaesisse, sed ab instituendis rerum naturis post earum rerum perfectionem cessasse significat, quamvis usque adhuc in administrandis operetur.

2. Sabbati autem observationes non intelligebant Judaei, qui putabant ab iis etiam operibus quae ad salutem hominum valent, oportere cessari. Unde illos Dominus etiam aliis locis, de bove qui in puteum cecidit, et jumento quod solvendum est ut ad aquam ducatur, mirifica comparatione redarguit (Luc. XIV, 5, et XIII, 15). Sabbatum autem, non repudiatum, sed intellectum a Christianis destitit quidem carnaliter observari, sed spiritualiter retinetur a sanctis, qui intelligunt vocem Domini vocantis ad requiem, et dicentis: Venite ad me, qui laboratis, et ego vos reficiam.

Furthermore, regarding the testimony of the Apostle which they add, what he says about our Lord Jesus Christ: "He is the firstborn of all creation; and all things were made through Him in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible" (Col. 1:15-16); and they say this chapter is contrary to Genesis, where God is said to have made the world in such a way that the Son is not specifically named there: they err greatly. They do not see that, if it is so, the Apostle himself is contrary to himself, since in another place he says of the One: "from whom are all things, through whom are all things, in whom are all things" (Rom. 11:36), and does not name the Son. Just as the Son is not named here, yet is understood, so also in Genesis; and just as these two chapters of Paul do not oppose each other, so neither does Genesis oppose the Gospel.

CHAPTER TWO

1. Regarding what is written: "And on the sixth day God finished all His works which He made, and on the seventh day He rested from all those same works which He had made" (Gen. 2:2).

Against this passage also the Manichaeans bring a false accusation, and they say that what is written in Genesis—that God rested on the seventh day from all His works which He made—is contrary to the New Testament, because the Lord says in the Gospel: "My Father works until now" (John 5:17). This is in no way contrary. For the Lord refutes the error of the Jews, who thought that God rested on the seventh day in such a way that from then on He worked nothing at all. But He rested from all His works which He made, so that He would no longer create the world with all that is in it; not, however, so that He would rest from the administration of the world. For it is not written: "God rested from all His works, so that henceforth He should not work." But it is written: "God rested from all His works which He made," so that thereafter He should work, not in making the world—from which work He had ceased after its completion—but in administering it, in which work the Lord indicated He is engaged. Nor does that rest signify that God sought a pause as if after labor, but that He ceased from establishing the natures of things after the perfection of those things, although He works in administering them until now.

2. Moreover, the Jews did not understand the observations of the Sabbath, for they thought it necessary to cease even from those works which avail for the salvation of men. Hence the Lord also in other places, concerning the ox that fell into a pit and the beast of burden that must be untied to be led to water, refuted them with a wonderful comparison (Luke 14:5 and 13:15). But the Sabbath, not rejected but understood by Christians, has indeed ceased to be observed carnally, but it is retained spiritually by the saints, who understand the voice of the Lord calling to rest and saying: "Come to me, all you who labor, and I will refresh you."

Tollite jugum meum super vos, et discite a me quia mitis sum et humilis corde, et invenietis requiem animabus vestris. Jugum enim meum lene est, et sarcina mea levis est (Matth. XI, 28-30). Hoc sabbatum, id est, hanc requiem Scriptura illa significat, quam Judaei non intelligebant, et pro temporum dispensatione carnaliter sequebantur umbram, cujus umbrae quasi corpus, id est, veritas nobis danda erat. Sed quemadmodum illa requies Dei post fabricatum mundum insinuat; sic requiem, quae nobis promittitur, post opera quae in hoc mundo habemus, si justa fuerint, consequemur, septima scilicet eademque ultima parte saeculi, de qua longum est disputare. Non ergo Dominus rescindit scripturam Veteris Testamenti, sed cogit intelligi: nec sabbatum solvit ut pereat quod figurabatur, sed aperit potius ut appareat quod tegebatur.

CAPUT III.

1. De eo quod scriptum est in Genesi: Et dixit Deus, Non est bonum solum hominem esse; faciamus ei adiutorium. Et immisit Deus Adae somnum, et obdormivit; et sumpsit unam de costis ejus, ex qua formavit Evam, quam adduxit ad Adam; et ait, Ideo relinquet homo patrem et matrem, et adhaerebit uxori suae (Gen. II, 18-24). Huic rursus loco Manichaei calumniantur, dicentes contra Novum Testamentum esse istam sententiam, qua Deus scribitur et formasse mulierem, et viro conjunxisse: propterea, quia in Evangelio dicit Dominus, Omnis qui reliquerit domum, aut uxorem, aut parentes, aut fratres, aut filios propter regnum coelorum, centies tantum accipiet in hoc tempore, et in futuro saeculo possidebit vitam aeternam (Matth. XIX, 29; Marc. X, 29-30, et Luc. XVIII, 29-30). In qua calumnia miror eos sic esse caecatos, vel potius non miror: Excaecavit enim illos, sicut scriptum est, malitia eorum (Sap. II, 21). Sed tamen quis non videt tanta in Novo Testamento praecepta de uxore diligenda? Cur enim potius Vetus Testamentum dicunt adversari huic sententiae Domini, qua dicit relinquendam esse uxorem propter regnum coelorum, et non ipsum Novum sibi adversari? Quod nefas est dicere. Intelligenda enim sunt, non temere accusanda, quae imperitis videntur esse contraria.

Take my yoke upon you and learn from me, for I am meek and humble of heart, and you will find rest for your souls. For my yoke is easy and my burden is light" (Matt. 11:28-30). This Sabbath, that is, this rest, that Scripture signifies, which the Jews did not understand, and according to the dispensation of the times they followed carnally as a shadow; of which shadow, as it were, the body, that is, the truth, was to be given to us. But just as that rest of God is suggested after the world was fashioned, so the rest which is promised to us after the works we have in this world, if they have been just, we shall attain in the seventh and likewise the last part of the age, concerning which it would be a long task to dispute. Therefore, the Lord does not rescind the scripture of the Old Testament, but compels it to be understood; nor does He dissolve the Sabbath so that what was figured should perish, but rather He opens it so that what was covered should appear.

CHAPTER THREE

1. Regarding what is written in Genesis: "And God said, 'It is not good for man to be alone; let us make a helper for him.'" And God sent a sleep upon Adam, and he fell asleep; and He took one of his ribs, from which He formed Eve, whom He brought to Adam; and he said, 'Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife' (Gen. 2:18-24). Again at this passage the Manichaeans bring false accusations, saying that this statement—in which God is written both to have formed the woman and to have joined her to the man—is against the New Testament; for the reason that in the Gospel the Lord says: "Everyone who has left house, or wife, or parents, or brothers, or children for the sake of the kingdom of heaven, shall receive a hundredfold in this time, and in the future age shall possess eternal life" (Matt. 19:29; Mark 10:29-30, and Luke 18:29-30). In this false accusation I wonder that they are so blinded, or rather I do not wonder: "For their malice blinded them," as it is written (Wisd. 2:21). But yet, who does not see so many precepts in the New Testament about loving one's wife? For why do they say the Old Testament is contrary to this statement of the Lord, by which He says that a wife is to be left for the sake of the kingdom of heaven, and not rather that the New Testament itself is contrary to itself? Which it is wicked to say. For those things which seem to be contrary to the unskilled must be understood, not rashly accused.

2. Nam et Dominus interrogatus a Judaeis, utrum ei placeret dato libello repudii dimittere uxorem, respondit eis dicens: Non legistis quoniam qui fecit ab initio, masculum et feminam fecit eos; et dixit, Propter hoc relinquet homo patrem et matrem, et adhaerebit uxori suae, et erunt duo in carne una? Itaque jam non sunt duo, sed una caro. Quod ergo Deus conjunxit in unum, homo non separet. Dicunt illi: Quid ergo Moyses mandavit dari libellum repudii, et dimittere? Dicit illis Jesus: Quia ad duritiam cordis vestri permisit vobis Moyses dimittere uxores vestras; ab initio autem non fuit sic. Dico autem vobis, quicumque dimiserit uxorem suam, nisi ob causam fornicationis, facit eam moechari: et ipse si alteram duxerit, adulterium committit (Matth. XIX, 3-9). Ecce habent confirmatam sententiam Veteris Testamenti ab ipso Domino adversus imperitiam Judaeorum. Simul etiam Moysi perhibuit testimonium, quod propter duritiam cordis eorum repudium dari permisit. Numquid etiam Evangelium Evangelio dicunt esse contrarium? Quod si dicunt hoc capitulum falsum esse, et a corruptoribus Scripturarum esse additum (nam hoc solent, quando non inveniunt quid respondeant, dicere); quid, si alius dicat illud esse immissum et falsum, quod ipsi proferunt dicente Domino, Omnis qui reliquerit domum aut uxorem aut parentes aut filios propter regnum coelorum, etc.? Non intelligunt miseri quemadmodum omnem fidem christianam, cum ista dicunt, conentur evertere. Fides autem vera et Ecclesiae catholicae disciplina utrumque verum et a Domino dictum esse confirmat, et nullo modo esse contrarium: quia et conjunctio mariti et uxoris a Domino est, et relictio uxoris propter regnum coelorum a Domino est. Non enim quia suscitavit Jesus Christus mortuos, et dedit eis vitam, propterea ipsa vita non est relinquenda propter regnum coelorum. Sic ergo quamvis Dominus dederit uxorem viro, relinquenda est tamen, si opus est, propter regnum coelorum. Non enim hoc semper necesse est, sicut Apostolus dicit: Si quis fidelis habet uxorem infidelem, et haec consentit habitare cum illo, non dimittat eam (I Cor. VII, 12). Significat utique quod si non consentit habitare cum illo, id est, si exsecratur in illo fidem Christi, et non eum patitur, quod christianus est, relinquenda est propter regnum coelorum: sicut idem apostolus in sequentibus dicit, Quod si infidelis discedit, discedat; non est enim subjectus servituti frater aut soror in hujusmodi.

2. For the Lord also, when asked by the Jews whether it pleased Him that a wife should be dismissed by giving her a bill of divorce, answered them saying: "Have you not read that He who made them from the beginning made them male and female; and He said, 'For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and the two shall be one flesh'? Therefore they are no longer two, but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let no man put asunder." They say to Him: "Why then did Moses command a bill of divorce to be given and to dismiss her?" Jesus says to them: "Because of the hardness of your heart Moses permitted you to dismiss your wives; but from the beginning it was not so. And I say to you, whoever dismisses his wife, except for the cause of fornication, makes her commit adultery; and if he marries another, he commits adultery" (Matt. 19:3-9). Behold, they have the statement of the Old Testament confirmed by the Lord Himself against the ignorance of the Jews. At the same time He also bore testimony to Moses, that he permitted the divorce to be given because of the hardness of their heart. Do they also say that the Gospel is contrary to the Gospel? For if they say this chapter is false and was added by corrupters of the Scriptures (for they are accustomed to say this when they find nothing to answer), what if another should say that that passage which they bring forward is inserted and false, where the Lord says, "Everyone who has left house or wife or parents or children for the sake of the kingdom of heaven," etc.? These miserable people do not understand how they attempt to overturn the whole Christian faith when they say such things. But the true faith and the discipline of the Catholic Church confirms that both are true and spoken by the Lord, and are in no way contrary; because both the joining of husband and wife is from the Lord, and the leaving of the wife for the sake of the kingdom of heaven is from the Lord. For just because Jesus Christ raised the dead and gave them life, that does not mean that life itself is not to be left for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. So therefore, although the Lord gave the wife to the husband, she is nevertheless to be left, if there is need, for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. For this is not always necessary, as the Apostle says: "If any believer has an unbelieving wife, and she consents to dwell with him, let him not dismiss her" (1 Cor. 7:12). He signifies surely that if she does not consent to dwell with him, that is, if she execrates in him the faith of Christ and does not suffer him because he is a Christian, she is to be left for the sake of the kingdom of heaven; just as the same Apostle says in what follows: "But if the unbeliever departs, let him depart; for a brother or sister is not subject to servitude in such cases."

Si quis ergo relinquit regnum coelorum, dum non vult relinquere uxorem non ferentem christianum virum, improbatur a Domino: et item si quis vir relinquit uxorem dato libello repudii, cum causa non existit aut fornicationis, aut obtinendi regni coelorum, similiter improbatur a Domino. Ita nec ista duo capitula evangelica inveniuntur sibi esse contraria, nec Evangelium Veteri Testamento: quia ibi uxor conjungitur viro, ut simul mereantur possidere regnum coelorum; et ita uxor relinquenda esse praecipitur, si virum impediatur ad possidendum regnum coelorum.

3. Et ideo quando Christianos utrosque Apostolus monet, id est, maritos et uxores; nonne ita dicitur, Diligite uxores vestras, sicut et Christus dilexit Ecclesiam, et tradidit se ipsum pro ea? et, Mulieres viris suis subditae sint quasi Domino; quia et Ecclesia subdita est Christo? Nonne illud quod isti miseri irrident in Veteri Testamento, quod scriptum est, Propterea relinquet homo patrem et matrem, et adhaerebit uxori suae, et erunt duo in carne una, in magno sacramento idem apostolus accipit, cum dicit, Sacramentum hoc magnum est, ego autem dico in Christo et in Ecclesia? Deinde subiungit, Verumtamen unusquisque uxorem suam sicut se ipsum diligit; mulier autem ut timeat virum (Ephes. V, 25, 22, 31, 32, 33). Nonne alio loco evidentissime ostendit utriusque sexus et naturam et conjunctionem a Domino Deo conditore atque ordinatore consistere, cum dicit: Verumtamen neque mulier sine viro, neque vir sine muliere, in Domino. Sicut enim mulier ex viro, ita et vir per mulierem: omnia autem ex Deo (I Cor. XI, 11, 12)? Quod isti si considerare vellent, non quibusdam capitulis separatis et adversus se invicem magna fraude collatis caliginem facerent imperitis; sed omnia tam in Veteri quam in Novo Testamento uno sancto Spiritu conscripta et commendata esse sentirent.

4. Nam et in Veteri Testamento habent apud Isaiam prophetam quanta promittantur spadonibus: ne in Novo solo arbitrentur esse laudatos a Domino, ubi dicit esse quosdam qui se ipsos castraverunt propter regnum coelorum, et addidit, Qui potest capere, capiat (Matth. XIX, 12). Nam et Isaias ita dicit: Haec dicit Dominus spadonibus eis qui custodierint praecepta mea, et elegerint sibi quae ego volo, et capaces fuerint testamenti mei; dabo illis in domo mea et in muro meo locum nominatissimum, meliorem multo filiorum atque filiarum: nomen aeternum dabo illis, nec unquam deerit (Isai. LVI, 4, 5).

If anyone therefore leaves the kingdom of heaven because he is unwilling to leave a wife who does not bear a Christian husband, he is disapproved by the Lord; and likewise if any man leaves his wife by giving a bill of divorce when the cause does not exist either of fornication or of obtaining the kingdom of heaven, he is similarly disapproved by the Lord. Thus neither these two evangelical chapters are found to be contrary to each other, nor the Gospel to the Old Testament; because there the wife is joined to the husband, that together they may deserve to possess the kingdom of heaven; and so the wife is commanded to be left if she hinders the husband from possessing the kingdom of heaven.

3. And therefore when the Apostle admonishes both Christians, that is, husbands and wives, is it not said: "Love your wives, just as Christ also loved the Church and gave Himself up for her"? and, "Let women be subject to their husbands as to the Lord; because the Church also is subject to Christ"? Does not the same Apostle accept that which those miserable people deride in the Old Testament—what is written: "For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and the two shall be one flesh"—as a great sacrament, when he says: "This is a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church"? Then he adds: "Nevertheless let each one of you love his wife as himself; but let the woman fear her husband" (Eph. 5:25, 22, 31, 32, 33). Does he not in another place most evidently show that both the nature and the joining of each sex exist from the Lord God, the Creator and Ordainer, when he says: "Nevertheless neither is the woman without the man, nor the man without the woman, in the Lord. For as the woman is from the man, so also is the man through the woman: but all things are from God" (1 Cor. 11:11, 12)? If they were willing to consider this, they would not create a darkness for the unskilled with certain separate chapters brought together with great fraud and against each other; but they would perceive that all things, both in the Old and in the New Testament, were written and commended by one Holy Spirit.

4. For in the Old Testament also they have in the prophet Isaiah how great things are promised to eunuchs; lest they should think that in the New Testament alone they were praised by the Lord, where He says there are some who have castrated themselves for the sake of the kingdom of heaven, and added: "He who can take it, let him take it" (Matt. 19:12). For Isaiah also speaks thus: "Thus says the Lord to the eunuchs, those who shall have kept my precepts, and shall have chosen for themselves what I will, and shall have been capable of my testament: I will give to them in my house and in my wall a most renowned place, much better than of sons and daughters: an eternal name I will give to them, nor shall it ever fail" (Isa. 56:4, 5).

Certis enim quibusdam umbris et figuris rerum ante Domini adventum, secundum mirabilem atque ordinatissimam distributionem temporum, populus ille tenebatur, qui Testamentum Vetus accepit: tamen in eo tanta praedicatio et praenuntiatio Novi Testamenti est, ut nulla in evangelica atque apostolica disciplina reperiantur, quamvis ardua et divina praecepta et promissa, quae illis etiam Libris veteribus desint. Sed sanctae Scripturae non temerarios et superbos accusatores, sed diligentes et pios lectores desiderant.

CAPUT IV.

De eo quod scriptum est in Genesi: Et dixit Dominus ad Cain: Quid fecisti? Vox sanguinis fratris tui clamat ad me de terra. Nunc maledictus eris a facie terrae, quae absorbit et recepit sanguinem fratris tui ex caede manus tuae: te enim operari necesse est terram, quae steriles tibi fructus dabit (Gen. IV, 10-12). Huic capitulo Geneseos, quo meledictionem accepit Cain, ut terrae sterilitate puniretur, calumniantes Manichaei, et Evangelio contrarium demonstrare cupientes, non sane, mihi videntur cogitare cum hominibus se agere, sed prorsus quasi pecora forent, qui eos audirent vel eorum scripta legerent; sic abusi sunt imperitia eorum et tarditate ingenii, vel potius animi caecitate. Quippe dixerunt huic capitulo illud in Evangelio esse contrarium, quod Dominus ait discipulis suis: Nolite cogitare de crastino; nam crastinus dies ipse cogitabit sibi. Respicite volatilia coeli, quia non seminant, neque metunt, neque colligunt in horrea (Matth. VI, 34, 26). Quasi vero Cain parricida discipulis Christi comparandus sit, ut quoniam ille meruit poenam sterilitatis terrae, consequens esset ut eandem sterilitatem isti etiam paterentur, qui Dominum Jesum Christum secuti, praedicando Evangelio parabantur. Imo etiam in istis duobus capitulis, quorum unum de Genesi, alterum de Evangelio tanquam sibi inimica posuerunt, tanta invenitur amicitia atque concordia, ut nulla major desideranda sit. Quid enim congruentius, quam ut illum, cujus erat scelere frater occisus, etiam in terra laborantem sterilitas sequeretur: illis autem, per quorum ministerium in praedicando Dei verbo fratres liberabantur, etiam de crastino minime cogitantibus fructuosa terra serviret? Quod si in Veteri Testamento exhorrescunt maledicto Dei terram sterilem factam esse peccatori; cur non in Novo Testamento exhorrescunt maledicto Domini nostri Jesu Christi arborem fici aridam factam (Matth. XXI, 19), nullo peccato domini sui?

For with certain definite shadows and figures of things before the coming of the Lord, according to a most wonderful and orderly distribution of times, that people was held which received the Old Testament; yet in it there is so great a preaching and foretelling of the New Testament, that no arduous and divine precepts and promises are found in the evangelical and apostolic discipline which are lacking in those ancient Books as well. But the Holy Scriptures require not rash and proud accusers, but diligent and pious readers.

CHAPTER FOUR

Regarding what is written in Genesis: "And the Lord said to Cain: 'What have you done? The voice of your brother's blood cries out to me from the ground. Now you shall be cursed from the face of the earth, which has opened and received your brother's blood from the slaughter of your hand: for it is necessary for you to work the earth, which will give you sterile fruits'" (Gen. 4:10-12). Against this chapter of Genesis, by which Cain received a curse that he should be punished with the sterility of the earth, the Manichaeans bring false accusations; and desiring to show it to be contrary to the Gospel, they do not seem to me to think they are dealing with men, but altogether as if they were cattle who hear them or read their writings; so have they abused their ignorance and slowness of wit, or rather the blindness of their mind. Indeed, they said that that passage in the Gospel is contrary to this chapter, which the Lord said to His disciples: "Do not think about tomorrow; for tomorrow will think for itself. Look at the birds of the air, for they do not sow, nor reap, nor gather into barns" (Matt. 6:34, 26). As if indeed Cain the parricide is to be compared to the disciples of Christ, so that since he deserved the punishment of the sterility of the earth, it would follow that these also should suffer the same sterility, who, following the Lord Jesus Christ, were being prepared for preaching the Gospel. Nay, even in these two chapters, one of which they have placed from Genesis and the other from the Gospel as if they were enemies to each other, so great a friendship and concord is found that no greater is to be desired. For what is more congruent than that sterility should follow him whose brother was slain by his crime, even while he labored on the earth; but that the fruitful earth should serve those through whose ministry brothers were being liberated in preaching the word of God, even when they thought very little about tomorrow? But if in the Old Testament they are horrified that the earth was made sterile by the curse of God for a sinner; why in the New Testament are they not horrified that the fig tree was made dry by the curse of our Lord Jesus Christ (Matt. 21:19), through no sin of its master?

Item si Domini sententia delectantur, qua discipulis dicit ne de crastino cogitent, quod de victu eorum Deus curam gerat; cur non et prophetica sententia delectantur, qua cecinit dicens, Abjice in Dominum sollicitudinem tuam, et ipse te pascet (Psal. LIV, 23)? Ut hoc modo, si possint, miseri intelligant, et illa quae detestantur in Veteri Testamento de Deo dicta, usque adeo recta esse, ut etiam in Novo inveniantur; et illa quae in Novo laudant et praedicant, etiam in Veteri reperiri: unde clarescat bene intelligentibus utriusque Testamenti manifesta concordia.

CAPUT V.

1. De eo quod scriptum est in Genesi: Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram (Gen. I, 26). Hunc locum Manichaei, quo scriptum est in Genesi, hominem factum esse ad imaginem et similitudinem Dei, propterea dicunt Novo Testamento esse contrarium, quia Dominus in Evangelio dicit Judaeis, Vos ex patre diabolo estis, et desideria patris vestri facere vultis: ille homicida erat ab initio, et in veritate non stetit, quia veritas in eo non est (Joan. VIII, 44): et quod alio loco Judaei serpentum genimina et viperarum appellantur (Matth. III, 7, et XXIII, 33). Non intelligunt illud esse dictum de homine antequam peccaret, quod factus est ad imaginem et similitudinem Dei: hoc autem quod in Evangelio est, Vos ex patre diabolo estis, peccatoribus et infidelibus dici. Tribus enim modis in Scripturis sanctis filiorum nomen accipitur: uno, secundum naturam, quomodo Isaac filius Abrahae, vel etiam caeteri Judaei qui ex eadem origine veniunt: alio, secundum doctrinam, ut filius ejus in ea re quisque appelletur, a quo aliquid didicit; sicut filios suos Apostolus appellat, qui ab illo didicerunt Evangelium (I Cor. IV, 14, 15): tertio, secundum imitationem, sicut filios Abrahae nos vocat Apostolus, qui ejus fidem imitatur (Galat. III, 7). Duobus ergo modis peccatores infideles Judaei, filii diaboli vocantur a Domino; vel quod ab ipso impietatem didicerunt, sicut de ipso diabolo Apostolus dicit, Qui nunc operatur in filiis diffidentiae (Ephes. II, 2): vel quod eum imitantur, quod magis pertinet ad id quod de illo dictum est, Et in veritate non stetit; quia et ipsi Judaei in veritate legis quae sibi data est, non steterunt, Domino attestante et dicente, Si crederetis Moysi, crederetis et mihi: ille enim de me scripsit (Joan. V, 46). Secundum eorumdem peccatorum venena etiam serpentum et viperarum genimina vocantur.

Likewise if they are delighted by the sentence of the Lord, by which He tells His disciples not to think about tomorrow, because God takes care of their food; why are they not also delighted by the prophetic sentence, in which he sang saying: "Cast your care upon the Lord, and He Himself will feed you" (Ps. 54:23)? That in this way, if they can, these miserable people may understand both those things which they detest in the Old Testament said about God to be so very right that they are found also in the New; and those things which they praise and preach in the New to be found also in the Old: whence the manifest concord of each Testament may shine forth to those who understand well.

CHAPTER FIVE

1. Regarding what is written in Genesis: "Let us make man in our image and likeness" (Gen. 1:26). The Manichaeans say that this passage in Genesis—in which it is written that man was made in the image and likeness of God—is contrary to the New Testament for the reason that the Lord in the Gospel 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 he did not stand in the truth, because there is no truth in him" (John 8:44); and that in another place the Jews are called "offspring of serpents and vipers" (Matt. 3:7, and 23:33). They do not understand that that was said about man before he sinned, that he was made in the image and likeness of God; but this which is in the Gospel, "You are of your father the devil," is said to sinners and unbelievers. For the name of children is understood in the Holy Scriptures in three ways: first, according to nature, as Isaac was the son of Abraham, or also the rest of the Jews who come from the same origin; second, according to doctrine, so that anyone may be called the child of the one from whom he has learned something, as the Apostle calls those his children who learned the Gospel from him (1 Cor. 4:14, 15); third, according to imitation, as the Apostle calls us children of Abraham, we who imitate his faith (Gal. 3:7). In two ways therefore the unbelieving Jewish sinners are called children of the devil by the Lord: either because they learned impiety from him, just as the Apostle says of the devil himself, "who now works in the children of distrust" (Eph. 2:2); or because they imitate him, which pertains more to that which was said of him: "and he did not stand in the truth," because the Jews themselves also did not stand in the truth of the Law which was given to them, as the Lord bears witness and says: "If you believed Moses, you would believe also me: for he wrote of me" (John 5:46). According to the poisons of those same sins they are also called offspring of serpents and vipers.

2. Ad imaginem autem Dei factum hominem, non tantum Genesis, sed etiam Apostolus clamat, cum dicit: Vir quidem non debet velare caput, cum sit imago et gloria Dei, mulier autem gloria viri (I Cor. XI, 7). Et ut manifeste intelligatur non secundum vetustatem peccati quae corrumpitur, sed secundum spiritualem conformationem factum esse hominem ad imaginem Dei, idem apostolus monet ut exuti consuetudine peccatorum, id est, vetere homine, induamur nova vita Christi, quem novum hominem appellat. Et ut doceat hoc nos aliquando amisisse, renovationem illam vocat. Nam ita loquitur: Exspoliantes vos veterem hominem cum actibus ejus, induite novum, qui renovatur in agnitionem Dei, secundum imaginem ejus qui creavit eum (Coloss. III, 9, 10). Filii ergo Dei sunt homines renovati ad ejus imaginem, et ei similes facti usque ad dilectionem inimici: sicut Dominus dicit, diligere nos debere inimicos nostros, ut similes simus Patri nostro qui in coelis est (Matth. V, 44, 45). Quod in potestate nostra ab ipso Deo esse positum docet Scriptura, cum dicit: Dedit eis potestatem filios Dei fieri (Joan. I, 12). Filii autem diaboli dicuntur homines, cum imitantur ejus impiam superbiam, et a luce atque celsitudine sapientiae decidunt, et non credunt veritati: quales Dominus arguit, cum dicit, Vos ex patre diabolo estis, etc. Cui loco evangelico propheta consonat, dicens: Ego dixi, Dii estis, et filii Altissimi omnes: vos autem ut homines moriemini, et sicut unus ex principibus cadetis (Psal. LXXXI, 6, 7).

CAPUT VI.

De eo quod scriptum est in Exodo: Honora patrem tuum, et matrem tuam (Exod. XX, 12). Huic etiam loco, ubi de honorandis parentibus Deus praecepit, illum Evangelii locum Manichaei dicunt esse contrarium, ubi Dominus cuidam dicenti, Ibo primum ut sepeliam patrem meum; respondit, Sine mortuos, mortuos suos sepeliant; tu autem veni, and annuntia regnum Dei (Luc. IX, 59, 60). Quod eodem modo solvitur, quo illud superius, ubi de uxore relinquenda dictum est, Propter regnum coelorum: quia et parentes honorare debemus, et eos tamen propter annuntiationem regni Dei nulla impietate contemnimus. Nam si Veteri Testamento contrarium est Evangelio propter istam sententiam, incipit etiam Apostolo esse contrarium, qui et filios monet ut honorent parentes, et parentes ut diligant filios (Ephes. VI, 2-4, et Coloss. III, 20, 21). Non solum autem, sed etiam Dominus videbitur sibi ipsi esse contrarius (quod credere nefas est), quia loco alio dicit homini quaerenti vitam aeternam, Si vis venire ad vitam, serva mandata: in quibus etiam illud commemorat, Honora patrem et matrem. Quibus mandatis perfectis etiam ad dilectionem Dei crescitur, in qua est tota perfectio.

2. Moreover, not only Genesis but also the Apostle proclaims that man was made in the image of God, when he says: "A man indeed ought not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God, but the woman is the glory of the man" (1 Cor. 11:7). And so that it may be clearly understood that man was made in the image of God not according to the oldness of sin which is corrupted, but according to spiritual conformation, the same Apostle admonishes that, having stripped off the custom of sins—that is, the old man—we should put on the new life of Christ, whom he calls the new man. And so that he may teach that we once lost this, he calls that a renewal. For thus he speaks: "Stripping yourselves of the old man with his acts, put on the new, who is renewed in the knowledge of God, according to the image of Him who created him" (Col. 3:9, 10). Therefore those men are children of God who are renewed in His image, and made like Him even to the love of an enemy; just as the Lord says that we ought to love our enemies, so that we may be like our Father who is in heaven (Matt. 5:44, 45). That this is placed in our power by God Himself, the Scripture teaches when it says: "He gave them power to become children of God" (John 1:12). But men are called children of the devil when they imitate his impious pride, and fall away from the light and height of wisdom, and do not believe the truth; such as the Lord rebukes when He says: "You are of your father the devil," etc. With which evangelical passage the prophet is in harmony, saying: "I said: You are gods, and all of you children of the Most High; but you shall die like men, and you shall fall like one of the princes" (Ps. 81:6, 7).

CHAPTER SIX

Regarding what is written in Exodus: "Honor your father and your mother" (Exod. 20:12). Against this place also, where God commanded that parents be honored, the Manichaeans say that that passage of the Gospel is contrary, where the Lord, to someone saying, "I will first go to bury my father," answered, "Let the dead bury their dead; but you come and announce the kingdom of God" (Luke 9:59, 60). This is resolved in the same way as that above, where it was said about leaving a wife "for the sake of the kingdom of heaven": because we ought to honor our parents, and yet for the sake of the announcement of the kingdom of God we do not despise them with any impiety. For if the Gospel is contrary to the Old Testament because of this statement, it begins also to be contrary to the Apostle, who both admonishes children to honor their parents, and parents to love their children (Eph. 6:2-4, and Col. 3:20, 21). Not only that, but the Lord also will seem to be contrary to Himself (which it is wicked to believe), because in another place He says to a man seeking eternal life: "If you wish to come to life, keep the commandments"; among which He also mentions this: "Honor father and mother." When these commandments are perfected, one also grows toward the love of God, in which is all perfection.

Nam dilectio proximi certus gradus est ad dilectionem Dei. Et ideo respondenti quod omnia mandata illa servavit, dicit unum ei deesse, si vult esse perfectus, ut vendat omnia quae habet, et det pauperibus, et sequatur eum (Matth. XIX, 17,-21). Ex quo manifestum est, et honorem parentum in gradu suo esse servandum, et eos tamen in divini amoris comparatione, praesertim si impedimento sunt, nulla dubitatione oportere contemni. Nam et in Scripturis veteribus habes positum: Qui dicit patri aut matri, Non novi vos, et qui filios suos non agnoscit, ipse autem cognovit testamentum tuum (Deut. XXXIII, 9). Ergo si et in Novo Testamento commendatur parentum dilectio, et in Veteri commendatur parentum contemptus, ex utroque capite duo sibi Testamenta consentiunt.

CAPUT VII.

1. De eo quod in Exodo scriptum est: Ego sum Deus zelans, tribuens filiis tertiae et quartae generationis parentum peccata qui me oderunt (Exod. XX, 5).

Huic loco Manichaei illud de Evangelio dicunt esse contrarium, quod Dominus dicit, Estote benigni sicut Pater vester coelestis, qui solem suum oriri facit super bonos et malos (Matth. V, 45): et illud aliud quod idem Dominus ait, Non solum septies peccanti fratri dimittendum, sed etiam septuagies septies. (Id. XVIII, 22). A quibus tamen si quaeram utrum Deus non puniat inimicos suos, sine dubio turbabuntur. Ipsi enim dicunt, Deum genti tenebrarum aeternum carcerem praeparare, quam dicunt esse inimicam Deo. Et parum est, sed eum etiam sua membra simul cum ipsa gente puniendum esse non dubitant dicere. Sed cum ad capitula Veteris et Novi Testamenti veniunt, ut imperitos decipiant, et ea sibi adversa esse crimentur, fingunt se nimis bonos. Sed dicant nobis, quibus dicturus est Dominus, Ite in ignem aeternum, qui praeparatus est diabolo et angelis ejus (Id. XXV, 41); si omnibus parcat et neminem damnat? Quare intelligendum est et illud rectum esse, quod Deus retribuit parentum peccata filiis qui eum oderunt. Ex eo enim quod addidit, qui me oderunt, intelligitur eos puniri peccatis parentum, qui in eadem perversitate parentum perseverare voluerunt. Tales enim non saevitia, sed potius justitia Dei, et sua iniquitate puniuntur, sicut Propheta ait, Sanctus enim Spiritus disciplinae effugiet fictum, et auferet se a cogitationibus quae sunt sine intellectu, et corripietur a superveniente iniquitate (Sap. I, 5): id est, corripietur homo superveniente sibi iniquitate sua, cum ab eo recesserit Spiritus sanctus.

For love of neighbor is a certain step toward the love of God. And therefore, to the one answering that he has kept all those commandments, He says that one thing is lacking for him if he wishes to be perfect: that he should sell all things which he has, and give to the poor, and follow Him (Matt. 19:17-21). From this it is manifest both that the honor of parents is to be preserved in its own degree, and yet that they ought to be despised without any hesitation in comparison with divine love, especially if they are a hindrance. For in the ancient Scriptures also you have it placed: "Who says to father or mother: I do not know you; and who does not recognize his own children, he indeed has known your testament" (Deut. 33:9). Therefore, if both in the New Testament the love of parents is commended, and in the Old the contempt of parents is commended, on each head the two Testaments agree with each other.

CHAPTER SEVEN

1. Regarding what is written in Exodus: "I am a jealous God, visiting the sins of the parents upon the children of the third and fourth generation of those who hate me" (Exod. 20:5).

Against this passage the Manichaeans say that that from the Gospel is contrary, which the Lord says: "Be kind just as your heavenly Father, who makes His sun to rise upon the good and the bad" (Matt. 5:45); and that other which the same Lord says, that a brother is to be forgiven not only seven times when he sins, but even seventy times seven (Matt. 18:22). Yet if I ask of them whether God does not punish His enemies, they will without doubt be troubled. For they themselves say that God is preparing an eternal prison for the race of darkness, which they say is an enemy to God. And it is a small thing, but they do not hesitate to say that He will punish His own members together with that same race. But when they come to the chapters of the Old and New Testament, so that they may deceive the unskilled and accuse them of being adverse to each other, they feign themselves to be excessively good. But let them tell us, to whom is the Lord going to say: "Go into the eternal fire, which is prepared for the devil and his angels" (Matt. 25:41), if He spares everyone and condemns no one? Wherefore it is to be understood that that also is right, that God repays the sins of parents to children who hate Him. For from that which He added, "who hate me," it is understood that they are punished for the sins of their parents who have willed to persevere in the same perversity of their parents. For such people are punished not by the cruelty, but rather by the justice of God, and by their own iniquity, as the Prophet says: "For the Holy Spirit of discipline will flee from the deceitful, and will withdraw Himself from thoughts which are without understanding, and will be rebuked by the iniquity which comes over him" (Wisd. 1:5); that is, a man will be rebuked by his own iniquity coming over him, when the Holy Spirit has departed from him.

Et alio loco: Haec cogitaverunt, et erraverunt; excaecavit enim illos malitia eorum (Id. II, 21): Et alio loco: Funiculis peccatorum suorum unusquisque constringitur (Prov. V, 22). Quibus testimoniis veteris Testamenti de Novo consentit Apostolus dicens: Tradidit illos Deus in concupiscentias cordis eorum (Rom. I, 24). Qua concordia utriusque Testamenti satis ostenditur non esse saevum Deum, sed unumquemque in se saevire peccando.

2. Quod autem in tertiam et quartam scriptum est generationem vindictam procedere, non aliud significari arbitror, nisi quod ab ipso Abraham, qui pater esse incipit populi Judaeorum, quatuor aetates sunt cum ista quae nunc agitur, quas Matthaeus evangelista distinguit (Matth. I, 17). Una est ab Abraham usque ad David: alia, a David usque ad transmigrationem in Babyloniam: tertia, a transmigratione in Babyloniam usque ad Domini adventum: inde usque ad finem quarta deputatur, tanquam senectus saeculi caeteris aetatibus longior. Quas aetates pro generationibus positas credimus, quamvis singulae pluribus generationibus constent. Et quoniam tertia incipit a transmigratione Babyloniae, quando Judaeorum est facta captivitas; in quarta vero, id est, post adventum Domini nostri, gens Judaeorum a solo proprio penitus eradicata est: hoc datur intelligi quod dictum est, tertiae et quartae generationis peccata parentum redditurum Deum, his utique legitime atque debite, qui parentum peccata perseverantes tenere, quam Dei justitiam sequi maluerunt. Nam non pertinere patris peccata ad filium juste viventem, propheta Ezechiel apertissime ostendit (Ezech. XVIII, 14-17).

3. Quod autem in Evangelio dicitur, Estote benigni quemadmodum Pater vester coelestis, qui solem suum oriri facit super bonos et malos; non est Veteri Testamento contrarium. Hoc enim facit Deus ut invitet ad poenitentiam, sicut dicit Apostolus, Ignoras quia patientia Dei ad poenitentiam te invitat? Nec tamen ideo credendum est non puniturum Deum eos, qui, ut dicit idem apostolus, thesaurizant sibi iram in die irae, et revelationis justi iudicii Dei, qui reddet unicuique secundum opera sua (Rom. II, 4, 5). Namque istam Dei patientiam et bonitatem etiam Propheta praedicat, dicens, Parcis autem omnibus, quoniam tua sunt omnia, qui animas amas (Sap. XI, 27): et caetera innumerabilia quibus intelligitur et in bonitate et in severitate misericordiam et justitiam Dei Testamentum utrumque praedicare.

And in another place: "These things they thought, and they erred; for their own malice blinded them" (Wisd. 2:21). And in another place: "Each one is bound by the cords of his own sins" (Prov. 5:22). With these testimonies of the Old Testament the Apostle agrees with the New, saying: "God gave them up to the lusts of their hearts" (Rom. 1:24). By which concord of each Testament it is sufficiently shown that God is not cruel, but that each one is cruel toward himself by sinning.

2. Moreover, as to what is written, that vengeance proceeds to the third and fourth generation, I think nothing else is signified except that from Abraham himself, who begins to be the father of the people of the Jews, there are four ages with this one which is now being enacted, which Matthew the evangelist distinguishes (Matt. 1:17). One is from Abraham until David; another, from David until the transmigration into Babylon; the third, from the transmigration into Babylon until the advent of the Lord; from then until the end the fourth is computed, as if the old age of the world longer than the other ages. We believe these ages were placed for generations, although each one consists of several generations. And since the third begins from the transmigration of Babylon, when the captivity of the Jews was made; while in the fourth, that is, after the advent of our Lord, the nation of the Jews was completely eradicated from its own soil: this is given to be understood which was said, that God would repay the sins of the parents to the third and fourth generation, to those surely legitimately and deservedly who, persevering, preferred to hold the sins of their parents rather than follow the justice of God. For that the sins of the father do not pertain to a son living justly, the prophet Ezekiel most clearly shows (Ezek. 18:14-17).

3. Regarding what is said in the Gospel: "Be kind just as your heavenly Father, who makes His sun to rise upon the good and the bad," it is not contrary to the Old Testament. For God does this so that He may invite to repentance, as the Apostle says: "Do you not know that the patience of God invites you to repentance?" Nor is it therefore to be believed that God will not punish those who, as the same Apostle says, "treasure up for themselves wrath in the day of wrath and of the revelation of the just judgment of God, who will repay each one according to his works" (Rom. 2:4, 5). For the Prophet also preaches that patience and goodness of God, saying: "But You spare all, because all things are Yours, You who love souls" (Wisd. 11:27); and countless other things by which it is understood that both Testaments preach the mercy and justice of God in both goodness and severity.

4. Si autem moventur quod dictum est, Ego sum zelans; moveantur etiam illo quod dicit apostolus Paulus, Zelo Dei vos zelo; desponsavi enim vos uni viro virginem castam exhibere Christo (II Cor. XI, 2). Sancta enim Scriptura verbis nostris loquens, etiam per haec verba demonstrat, nihil digne de Deo posse dici. Cur enim non etiam verba ista dicantur de illa maiestate, de qua quidquid dictum fuerit, indigne dicitur; quia omnes opes linguarum omnium ineffabili sublimitate praecedit? Nam quoniam zelando solent mariti uxorū pudicitiam custodire, potestatem et disciplinam Dei, qua fornicari animam impune non sinit, zelum Dei Scripturae vocaverunt. Est autem animae fornicatio, aversio a fecunditate sapientiae, et ad conceptum temporalium illecebrarum corruptionumque conversio.

5. Illud vero quod dimittendum esse dicit fratri, non solum septies, sed et septuagies septies, poenitenti utique dicit. Deus autem illis se dicit retribuere peccata, qui eum oderunt, non qui ei per poenitentiam reconciliantur. Nam et apud prophetam Dominus dicit: Nolo mortem peccatoris quantum ut revertatur et vivat (Ezech. XVIII, 23, et XXXIII, 11). Ex quo facile apparet, et in ea patientia quae invitat ad poenitentiam, et in ea indulgentia quae ignoscit poenitentibus, et in ea iustitia quae punit eos qui corrigi nolunt, utrumque Testamentum convenire atque congruere, tanquam ab uno Deo utrumque conscriptum.

CAPUT VIII.

De eo quod scriptum est in Exodo, Oculum pro oculo, dentem pro dente (Exod. XXI, 24); et caetera talia. Huic loco Manichaei, quod in veteri Lege par vindicta permittitur, et dicitur oculum pro oculo, dentem pro dente esse perdendum, sic calumniantur, quasi et ipse Dominus haec duo sibi veluti adversantia atque contraria in Evangelio demonstraverit. Ipse enim ait: Audistis quia dictum est antiquis, Oculum pro oculo, et dentem pro dente: ego autem dico vobis, non resistere malo; sed si quis te percusserit in maxillam, praebe illi et alteram; et quicumque voluerit tecum iudicio contendere, et tunicam tuam auferre, dimitte illi et pallium (Matth. V, 38-40). In quibus duabus sententiis revera duorum Testamentorum differentia demonstratur, sed amborum tamen ab uno Deo constitutorum.

4. If they are moved because it was said, "I am a jealous God," let them also be moved by that which the apostle Paul says: "I am jealous of you with the jealousy of God; for I have betrothed you to one husband to present you as a chaste virgin to Christ" (2 Cor. 11:2). For the Holy Scripture, speaking with our words, demonstrates also through these words that nothing can be said worthily about God. For why should those words not also be said about that majesty, about which whatever shall have been said is said unworthily, because it precedes all the riches of all languages in ineffable sublimity? For since husbands are accustomed by being jealous to guard the chastity of their wives, the Scriptures have called "the jealousy of God" the power and discipline of God by which He does not allow the soul to commit fornication with impunity. Now, the fornication of the soul is the turning away from the fecundity of wisdom, and the conversion to the conception of temporal allurements and corruptions.

Truly that which he says—that a brother is to be dismissed [forgiven] not only seven times, but also seventy times seven—He says surely to the one who repents. But God says that He will repay sins to those who hate Him, not to those who are reconciled to Him through repentance. For in the prophet also the Lord says: "I do not wish the death of a sinner, so much as that he should return and live" (Ezek. 18:23, and 33:11). From which it easily appears that both Testaments agree and harmonize in that patience which invites to repentance, and in that indulgence which pardons the penitent, and in that justice which punishes those who refuse to be corrected, as if both were written by one God.

CHAPTER VIII.

On what is written in Exodus: "An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth" (Exod. 21:24); and other such things. Regarding this passage, the Manichaeans calumniate that in the old Law equal vengeance is permitted, and it is said that an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth must be lost, as if the Lord Himself had demonstrated in the Gospel that these two are opposed and contrary to each other. For He himself said: "You have heard that it was said to the ancients, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say to you, do not resist evil; but if anyone strikes you on the cheek, offer him the other also; and whoever wants to contend with you in judgment, and take away your tunic, let him have your cloak also" (Matt. 5:38-40). In these two sentences, the difference between the two Testaments is indeed demonstrated, yet both were established by one God.

Nam quoniam primo carnales homines ardebant multo amplius se vindicare, quam erat illa injuria, de qua querebantur, constitutus est eis primus lenitatis gradus, ut injuriae acceptae mensuram nullo modo dolor vindicantis excederet. Sic enim et donare aliquando posset injuriam, qui eam primo non superare didicisset. Unde Dominus jam per Evangelii gratiam ad summam pacem populum deducens, huic gradui superaedificavit alterum; ut qui jam audierat non ampliorem vindictam, quam quisque laesus esset, reddere, placata mente totum se donare gauderet. Quod etiam in illis veteribus Libris Propheta praedicat, dicens: Domine Deus meus, si feci istud, si est iniquitas in manibus meis, si reddidi retribuētibus mihi mala (Psal. VII, 4, 5). Et alius propheta dicit de hujusmodi viro patiente injurias, et lenissime tolerante: Dabit percutienti se maxillam, saturabitur opprobriis (Thren. III, 30). Ex quo intelligitur et mensuram vindicandi recte carnalibus constitutam, et omnimodam injuriae remissionem, non tantum in Novo Testamento esse praeceptam, sed longe ante in Vetere praenuntiatam.

CAPUT IX.

1. De eo quod scriptum est, quod locutus est Deus cum Adam et Eva, et cum serpente, et cum Cain, et caeteris antiquis (Gen. III, IV, XIII, etc.): inter quos etiam et nonnullis apparuisse scribitur, et ab eis visus esse, non uno, sed multis Scripturarum locis, in quibus et locutus esse Deus cum hominibus invenitur, et nonnullis apparuisse: insidiantur Manichaei, et dicunt omnia contraria esse Novo Testamento, quoniam Dominus dicit, Deum nemo vidit unquam, nisi unicus Filius, qui est in sinu Patris; ille annuntiavit nobis de eo (Joan. I, 18); et iterum quod dicit Judaeis, Nec vocem illius aliquando audistis, nec faciem ejus vidistis, nec verbum ejus habetis in vobis manens: quia ei quem ille misit, non credidistis (Id. V, 37, 38). Quibus respondemus eo ipso, quod in Evangelio scriptum est, Deum nemo vidit unquam, nisi unicus Filius qui est in sinu Patris; ipse annuntiavit nobis de eo, totam ipsam solvi posse quaestionem: quia ipse Filius, quod est Verbum Dei, non solum novissimis temporibus, cum in carne apparere dignatus est, sed etiam prius a constitutione mundi, cui voluit de Patre annuntiavit, sive loquendo, sive apparendo, vel per angelicam aliquam potestatem, vel per quamlibet creaturam: quia ipse est in omnibus veritas, et omnia illi constant, et omnia illi ad nutum serviunt, atque subjecta sunt; ut etiam oculis per visibilem creaturam cui vult, quando dignatur, appareat:

For since at first carnal men burned to avenge themselves much more than the injury about which they complained, the first degree of leniency was established for them, so that the grief of the avenger should in no way exceed the measure of the injury received. For thus he who had first learned not to surpass it might eventually be able to forgive the injury. Wherefore the Lord, now leading the people to supreme peace through the grace of the Gospel, built another degree upon this one; so that he who had already heard not to return a greater vengeance than that which he had suffered, might rejoice to forgive everything with a calmed mind. This also the Prophet proclaims in those ancient Books, saying: "Lord my God, if I have done this, if there is iniquity in my hands, if I have repaid those who repaid me with evil" (Ps. 7:4, 5). And another prophet says of such a man suffering injuries and tolerating them most mildly: "He shall give his cheek to the one who strikes him, he shall be filled with reproaches" (Lam. 3:30). From which it is understood both that the measure of avenging was rightly established for the carnal, and that the total remission of injury was not only commanded in the New Testament, but foretold long before in the Old.

CHAPTER IX.

1. On what is written, that God spoke with Adam and Eve, and with the serpent, and with Cain, and the other ancients (Gen. 3, 4, 13, etc.): among whom it is also written that He appeared to some, and was seen by them, not in one, but in many passages of the Scriptures, in which God is found both to have spoken with men and to have appeared to some. The Manichaeans lie in wait and say that all these things are contrary to the New Testament, because the Lord says: "No one has ever seen God, except the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father; he has announced to us concerning him" (John 1:18); and again what He says to the Jews: "You have never heard his voice, nor seen his face, nor do you have his word remaining in you: because you did not believe in him whom he sent" (John 5:37-38). To them we reply that by that very fact which is written in the Gospel, "No one has ever seen God, except the only-begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father; he himself has announced to us concerning him," this whole question can be resolved: because the Son himself, who is the Word of God, not only in the most recent times when He deigned to appear in the flesh, but also previously from the foundation of the world, announced concerning the Father to whom He willed, either by speaking or by appearing, whether through some angelic power or through any creature whatever. For He himself is the truth in all things, and all things consist in Him, and all things serve and are subject to His command; so that He may appear even to the eyes through a visible creature to whom He wills, when He deigns.

cum ipse tamen secundum divinitatem suam, et secundum id quod Verbum est Patris, coaeternum Patri, et incommutabile, per quod facta sunt omnia, non nisi purgatissimo et simplicissimo corde videatur. Et ideo quibusdam locis etiam Scriptura ipsa testatur angelum visum, ubi dicit Deum visum (Gen. XVIII, 1 et 2). Sicut in illa luctatione Jacob, et angelus dictus est ille qui apparuit (Id. XXXII, 24-30). Et cum apparuit in rubo Moysi (Exod. III, 2): et item in eremo, cum jam eduxisset populum de terra Aegypti, quando legem accepit, Deus ei locutus est (Id. XIX, 3). Sed sive in rubo, cum eum misit; sive postea, cum ei legem dedit; angelum dicit Stephanus in Actibus Apostolorum ei apparuisse (Act. VII, 30, 35). Quod ideo dicimus, ne quis arbitretur Verbum Dei, per quod facta sunt omnia, quasi per locos posse definiri, et alicui visibiliter apparere, nisi per aliquam visibilem creaturam. Sicut enim Verbum Dei est in propheta, et recte dicitur, Dixit Dominus; quia Verbum Dei, quod est Christus, in propheta loquitur veritatem: sic et in angelo ipse loquitur, quando veritatem angelus annuntiat; et recte dicitur, Deus dixit; et, Deus apparuit: et item dicitur recte, Angelus dixit, et, Angelus apparuit; cum illud dicatur ex persona inhabitantis Dei, illud ex persona servientis creaturae. Ex hac regula etiam Apostolus ait: An vultis experimentum ejus accipere, qui in me loquitur Christi (II Cor. XIII, 3)?

2. Si autem hoc movet, quod in Veteri Testamento etiam peccatoribus Deus loquitur, vel Adae vel Evae, vel serpenti; attendant etiam in Novo cujusmodi exemplum Dominus posuit de homine stulto et cupido, quomodo ei locutus est Dominus, cum ait: Stulte, hac nocte auferetur a te anima tua; haec quae praeparasti cujus erunt (Luc. XII, 20)? Cum enim veritas etiam peccatoribus dicitur, per quamlibet creaturam dicatur, non nisi ab illo dicitur, qui unus est verax. Quod autem Judaeis dicit, Nec vocem ejus aliquando audistis; ideo dicit, quia non obtemperaverunt isti duntaxat cum quibus loquebatur. Quibus dicit etiam, Nec faciem ejus vidistis; quia non potest. Quod autem dicit, Neque verbum ejus habetis in vobis manens: quia in quo manet verbum Dei, Christus in illo manet, quem isti respuerunt. Nam cum ipse Dominus dixisset, Pater, clarifica me ea claritate qua fui apud te, priusquam mundus fieret; sonuit vox de coelo, Et clarificavi, et clarificabo (Joan. XII, 28, et XVII, 5). Quam vocem multi Judaeorum praesentes audierunt, nec ideo tamen audisse dicendi sunt, quia non obtemperaverunt ut crederent.

Yet He himself according to His divinity, and according to that which is the Word of the Father, co-eternal with the Father and unchangeable, through which all things were made, is seen only by a most purified and simple heart. And therefore in certain places Scripture itself testifies that an angel was seen, where it says that God was seen (Gen. 18:1-2). Just as in that wrestling of Jacob, he who appeared was called both an angel (Gen. 32:24-30). And when He appeared to Moses in the bush (Exod. 3:2); and likewise in the desert, when He had already led the people out of the land of Egypt, when he received the law, God spoke to him (Exod. 19:3). But whether in the bush when He sent him, or afterwards when He gave him the law, Stephen in the Acts of the Apostles says that an angel appeared to him (Acts 7:30, 35). This we say so that no one may think that the Word of God, through which all things were made, can as it were be defined by locations and appear visibly to anyone, except through some visible creature. For just as the Word of God is in the prophet, and it is rightly said, "The Lord said," because the Word of God, which is Christ, speaks the truth in the prophet; so also He himself speaks in the angel when the angel announces the truth; and it is rightly said, "God said," and "God appeared"; and again it is rightly said, "The angel said," and "The angel appeared," since the former is said from the person of the indwelling God, the latter from the person of the serving creature. According to this rule the Apostle also says: "Do you wish to take an experiment of Him who speaks in me, Christ?" (2 Cor. 13:3).

2. But if this disturbs someone, that in the Old Testament God speaks even to sinners, either to Adam or to Eve or to the serpent; let them observe also in the New what kind of example the Lord set regarding the foolish and covetous man, how the Lord spoke to him, when He said: "Fool, this night your soul shall be taken from you; whose shall those things be which you have prepared?" (Luke 12:20). For when truth is spoken even to sinners, through whatever creature it may be spoken, it is spoken by no one but Him who alone is truthful. But as for what He says to the Jews, "You have never heard his voice," He says it because those at least with whom He was speaking did not obey. To them He also says, "Nor have you seen his face," because they cannot. But as for what He says, "Neither do you have his word remaining in you," it is because in whom the word of God remains, Christ remains in him, whom they rejected. For when the Lord Himself had said, "Father, glorify me with that clarity which I had with you before the world was made," a voice sounded from heaven, "I have both glorified it, and will glorify it" (John 12:28, and 17:5). Many of the Jews present heard this voice, yet they are not to be said to have heard it for that reason, because they did not obey so as to believe.

Quapropter si non est mirandum quod Verbum Dei, id est, unicus Filius Dei, qui de Patre annuntiat, cui vult per se ipsum, cui vult per aliquam creaturam manifestatur vel sonando, vel apparendo, cum tamen ipse per se ipsum mundo corde videatur, et per illum Pater; Beati enim mundicordes, quia ipsi Deum videbunt (Matth. V, 8): non est mirandum, ex utroque Testamento ista omnia testimonia consonare.

CAPUT X.

De eo quod scriptum est, quod locutus est Deus Moysi et dixit illi: Loquere ad filios Israel: Sumite primitias ab omni homine, quod mihi destinatis, hoc est, aurum, argentum, aeramentum, purpuram, byssum, coccum, pilos caprinos, pelles rubras agnorum, ligna integra, oleum ad illuminationem, thymiamata, lapides pretiosos, hoc est, beryllos; et constituite tabernaculum, in quo commorari vobiscum possim (Exod. XXV, 2-8). Commovent etiam hinc Manichaei quaestionem, et huic Scripturarum loco illud in Evangelio dicunt esse contrarium, quod ait Dominus, Non jurabis, neque per coelum, quia sedes Dei est; neque per terram, quia scabellum pedum ejus est (Matth. V, 34 et 35). Disputant enim, et magnum aliquid sibi videntur dicere, cum dicunt: Quomodo ille Deus, cujus coelum sedes, et terra scabellum pedum ejus est, in tabernaculo habitat, quod ex auro, et argento, et aere, et purpura, et pilis pecorum, pellibusque constructum est? Adhibentes etiam testem apostolum Paulum, quia dicit Deum lucem habitare inaccessibilem (I Tim. VI, 16). Quibus nos parem quaestionem referimus, et quod de Novo Testamento protulerunt, de Veteri Testamento proferimus. Ibi enim invenitur prius scriptum: Coelum mihi sedes est, terra autem scabellum pedum meorum: quam domum aedificabitis mihi, aut quis locus requiei meae? Nonne manus mea fecit haec omnia (Isai. LXVI, 1 et 2)? Ecce habent ubi libri Veteris Testamenti praedicant Deum in templis manufactis non habitare: et tamen Filius Dei nostri, flagello de restibus facto, expulit de templo eos qui boves et columbas vendebant, et nummulariorum evertit mensas; et ait, Domus Patris mei domus orationis vocabitur, vos autem fecistis illam speluncam latronum (Joan. II, 15, 16, et Matth. XXI, 12, 13). Si ergo aliquis istis duobus ex adverso capitulis constitutis, velit imperitos decipere, et dicere in Veteri Testamento magnificari Deum, cujus dicitur sedes coelum, et terra scabellum pedum, et negatur habitare in domo manufacta; in Novo autem Testamento domus ejus dicitur templum constructum ab hominibus: nonne Manichaei vel sero fatebuntur, et habitaculum Dei per manus hominum factum, ad aliquam significationem in utroque Testamento accipi; et Deum non habitare in locis ab hominibus fabricatis, in utroque Testamento praedicari?

Wherefore if it is not to be wondered at that the Word of God, that is, the only-begotten Son of God, who announces concerning the Father, is manifested to whom He wills through Himself, to whom He wills through some creature, either by sounding or by appearing, while yet He Himself is seen through Himself by the pure in heart, and through Him the Father; "For blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God" (Matt. 5:8): it is not to be wondered at that all these testimonies from both Testaments are in harmony.

CHAPTER X.

On what is written, that God spoke to Moses and said to him: "Speak to the children of Israel: Take first-fruits from every man, which you shall designate for me, that is, gold, silver, bronze, purple, fine linen, scarlet, goats' hair, red skins of lambs, whole wood, oil for light, incense, precious stones, that is, beryls; and build a tabernacle in which I may be able to dwell with you" (Exod. 25:2-8). From here also the Manichaeans raise a question, and say that to this passage of the Scriptures that which the Lord says in the Gospel is contrary: "You shall not swear, neither by heaven, for it is the throne of God; nor by the earth, for it is the footstool of his feet" (Matt. 5:34-35). For they dispute, and think they are saying something great, when they say: How does that God, whose throne is heaven and whose footstool of his feet is the earth, dwell in a tabernacle which is constructed of gold, and silver, and bronze, and purple, and the hair of cattle, and skins? Adducing also the Apostle Paul as a witness, because he says that God "dwells in inaccessible light" (1 Tim. 6:16). To them we refer a similar question, and what they brought forward from the New Testament, we bring forward from the Old Testament. For there it is found written previously: "Heaven is my throne, but the earth is my footstool: what house will you build for me, or what is the place of my rest? Has not my hand made all these things?" (Isa. 66:1-2). Behold, they have where the books of the Old Testament preach that God does not dwell in temples made by hand: and yet our Son of God, having made a whip of cords, expelled from the temple those who sold oxen and doves, and overturned the tables of the money-changers; and said, "The house of my Father shall be called a house of prayer, but you have made it a den of thieves" (John 2:15-16, and Matt. 21:12-13). If therefore someone, these two chapters having been set in opposition, wishes to deceive the unlearned, and say that in the Old Testament God is magnified whose throne is said to be heaven and the earth his footstool, and He is denied to dwell in a house made by hand; but in the New Testament his house is said to be a temple constructed by men: will not the Manichaeans even at this late hour confess that the habitation of God made by the hands of men is accepted for some signification in both Testaments; and that God does not dwell in places fabricated by men is preached in both Testaments?

CAPUT XI.

De eo quod in Exodo scriptum est, Ne adoraveritis deos alienos: et iterum, Deus vester zelans appellatur; zelans enim zelavit (Exod. XX, 5, et XXXIV, 14). Huic capitulo quod scriptum est, Ne adoraveritis deos alienos, cum calumniantur Manichaei, satis ostendunt placere sibi adorari multos deos. Nec mirum, quandoquidem in secta sua numerosissimam deorum familiam commemorant atque commendant: quippe qui etiam ad ista visibilia venerunt, quae pro istius veritatis luce venerantur et adorant; et ideo displicet eis quod scriptum est in Exodo, Ne adoraveritis deos alienos. Addunt etiam illud propter hoc dictum esse, Deus vester zelans appellatur; zelans enim zelavit: ut tanquam Deum zelantem non amemus, cujus zelo deos alienos adorare non sinimur. Et ideo dicunt ista Evangelio esse contraria, quoniam Dominus dicit, Pater juste, et mundus te non cognovit (Joan. XVII, 25): quasi non sit dicendus Deus justus, nisi nos deos alienos adorare permittat. Justum enim Deum et zelantem Deum tanquam contraria sibi esse dissertant, et decipiunt miseros, non intelligentes totam spem salutis nostrae esse zelum Dei. Hoc enim nomine illa ejus significatur providentia, qua nullam a se animam fornicari impune permittit, sicut Propheta dicit: Perdes omnes qui fornicantur abs te (Psal. LXXII, 27). Sicut enim ea quae dicitur ira Dei, non perturbatio mentis est, sed potentia vindicandi: sic zelum Dei non cruciatum animi, quo maritus adversus uxorem, vel uxor adversus maritum torqueri solent, sed tranquillissimam sincerissimamque justitiam, qua nulla anima beata esse sinitur, falsis opinionibus pravisque cupiditatibus corrupta, et quodam modo gravidata. Illi enim haec verba horrescunt, qui nondum viderunt ineffabili majestati nulla verba congruere. Sic enim ab istis verbis temperandum putant, quasi aliquid dignum Deo dicant, cum ista non dicunt. Sanctus enim Spiritus hoc ipsum hominibus intelligentibus insinuans, quam sint ineffabilia summa divina, his etiam verbis uti voluit, quae apud homines in vitio poni solent; ut inde admonerentur, etiam illa quae cum aliqua dignitate Dei se putant homines dicere, indigna esse illius majestate, cui honorificum potius silentium, quam ulla vox humana competeret.

CHAPTER XI.

On what is written in Exodus: "You shall not adore strange gods"; and again: "Your God is called jealous; for he has been jealous with zeal" (Exod. 20:5, and 34:14). When the Manichaeans calumniate this chapter which is written, "You shall not adore strange gods," they sufficiently show that it pleases them that many gods be adored. Nor is it a wonder, since in their own sect they commemorate and commend a most numerous family of gods—indeed, they have even come to these visible things, which they venerate and adore in place of the light of that truth; and therefore it displeases them that it is written in Exodus, "You shall not adore strange gods." They add also that it was said for this reason, "Your God is called jealous; for he has been jealous with zeal," so that we might not love Him as a jealous God, by whose zeal we are not permitted to adore strange gods. And therefore they say these things are contrary to the Gospel, since the Lord says: "Righteous Father, and the world has not known you" (John 17:25)—as if God were not to be called righteous unless He permitted us to adore strange gods. For they discourse upon "righteous God" and "jealous God" as if they were contrary to each other, and they deceive the wretched, not understanding that the whole hope of our salvation is the zeal of God. For by this name is signified that providence of His by which He permits no soul to fornicate from Him with impunity, as the Prophet says: "You shall destroy all who fornicate from you" (Ps. 72:27). For just as that which is called the wrath of God is not a perturbation of the mind, but the power of avenging; so the zeal of God is not a torment of the soul, by which a husband is wont to be tortured against a wife, or a wife against a husband, but a most tranquil and most sincere justice, by which no soul is permitted to be blessed if it is corrupted and as it were made heavy by false opinions and depraved desires. For they shudder at these words who have not yet seen that no words are suitable for ineffable majesty. For they think they must refrain from these words, as if they were saying something worthy of God when they do not say them. For the Holy Spirit, insinuating this very thing to men of understanding—how ineffable the supreme divine things are—wished to use even these words which among men are wont to be placed among vices; so that from this they might be admonished that even those things which men think they say with some dignity of God are unworthy of His majesty, for which an honorable silence would be more fitting than any human voice.

Quaero zelum hominis, et invenio perturbationem cruciantem cor. Tamen cum quaero causam, nihil aliud invenio, nisi quod non patitur conjugis adulterium. Maxime enim et proprie inter conjugia zelotypia dici solet. Itaque si maritus esset per se ipsum beatus et omnipotens et justus, sine ullo cruciatu, et tota facilitate, et nulla iniquitate peccatum conjugis vindicaret. Quam tamen ejus actionem humano loquendi modo etiamsi non proprie, translate tamen et recte zelum vocarem. Quis enim Tullio calumniatus est, qui certe noverat latine loqui, cum ait Caesari: Nulla de virtutibus tuis, nec admirabilior, nec gravior misericordia est (Pro Q. Ligario, in fine)? Et tamen ex eo appellatam misericordiam dicunt, quod miserum cor faciat dolentis aliena miseria. Numquid ergo virtus miserum cor facit? Quid ergo calumniosis Tullius responderet, nisi misericordiae nomine clementiam se appellare voluisse? Quoniam recte solemus loqui, non solum verba proprie, sed etiam vicina usurpantes. Cujus auctoris mentionem facere volui, quoniam non de re quaestio hic, sed de verbo est. Sicut enim nostri auctores, divinarum scilicet Litterarum, de rebus maxime cogitaverunt; sic mundanorum auctorum prope omnis cura de verbis est. Sed habeo Evangelium, et omnes Novi Testamenti libros, in quibus misericordia Dei frequentissime commendatur. Si audent ergo isti miseri, etiam inde faciant quaestionem, et negent esse misericordem Deum, ne miserum cor habere intelligatur. Sicut ergo potest esse in Deo misericordia sine cordis miseria: sic etiam sine tabe atque cruciatu animi zelum Dei non dedignemur accipere; et humani conditionem sermonis feramus, ut ad divinum perveniamus silentium. Sed si contraria dicunt esse zelantem Deum, et justum Deum; quid dicturi sunt, cum et in Novo Testamento invenio, Zelo Dei vos zelo (II Cor. XI, 2); vel adhibitum etiam de veteribus in Evangelio testimonium, Zelus domus tuae comedit me (Joan. II, 17; Psal. LXVIII, 10)? Rursus in Vetere cum legunt, Justus Dominus, et justitias dilexit, aequitatem vidit vultus ejus (Psal. X, 8): nonne fatebuntur etiam hoc modo imperitis duo Testamenta videri posse contraria, ut in Novo inveniamus zelum Dei, in Vetere justitiam Dei? bene autem intelligentibus utrumque in utroque magna sancti Spiritus unitate et pace concinere?

CAPUT XII.

I seek the zeal of a man, and I find a perturbation tormenting the heart. Yet when I seek the cause, I find nothing else but that he does not endure the adultery of his spouse. For jealousy (*zelotypia*) is wont to be said most especially and properly among marriages. Therefore if a husband were of himself blessed and omnipotent and righteous, without any torment, and with all ease, and with no iniquity, he would avenge the sin of his spouse. Which action of his, however, in the human way of speaking, even if not properly, I would nevertheless and rightly call zeal (*zelum*) figuratively. For who calumniated Tully, who certainly knew how to speak Latin, when he said to Caesar: "Of your virtues, none is more admirable nor more pleasing than mercy" (Pro Q. Ligario, at the end)? And yet they say mercy (*miser cordia*) is so named from the fact that it makes a wretched heart (*miserum cor*) of one grieving at another's misery. Does virtue, then, make a wretched heart? What, then, would Tully respond to the calumniators, except that by the name of mercy he wished to call clemency? Since we are wont to speak rightly, using not only proper words, but also neighboring ones. I wished to make mention of this author because here the question is not about the matter, but about the word. For just as our authors, of the divine Writings namely, thought most about matters; so almost all the care of worldly authors is about words. But I have the Gospel, and all the books of the New Testament, in which the mercy of God is most frequently commended. If these wretches dare, therefore, let them also make a question of that, and deny that God is merciful, lest He be understood to have a wretched heart. Just as therefore there can be mercy in God without misery of the heart: so also let us not disdain to accept the zeal of God without the decay and torment of the soul; and let us bear the condition of human speech, that we may arrive at divine silence. But if they say that "jealous God" and "righteous God" are contrary; what will they say when I find also in the New Testament, "I am jealous of you with the zeal of God" (2 Cor. 11:2); or the testimony from the ancients also applied in the Gospel, "The zeal of your house has eaten me up" (John 2:17; Ps. 68:10)? Again in the Old, when they read, "The Lord is righteous, and he has loved righteousnesses, his countenance has seen equity" (Ps. 10:8): will they not confess that even in this way to the unlearned the two Testaments can seem contrary, so that in the New we find the zeal of God, and in the Old the justice of God? But to those of good understanding, that both harmonize in both with the great unity and peace of the Holy Spirit?

CHAPTER XII.

1. De eo quod scriptum est, non esse manducandum sanguinem, quod anima sit carnis sanguis (Deut. XII, 23). Huic sententiae veteris Legis Manichaei ex Evangelio illud opponunt quod Dominus dicit, non esse timendos eos qui occidunt corpus, animae autem nocere non possunt (Matth. X, 28); et disputant dicentes: Si sanguis anima est, quomodo homines potestatem in eam non habent, cum de sanguine multa faciant, sive excipientes et canibus volucrisque in escam proponentes, sive effundentes, aut coeno lutoque miscentes? Haec enim et alia innumerabilia sine difficultate homines de sanguine possunt facere. Ideo isti quaerunt insultantes, quomodo, si sanguis est anima, non possit hominis interfector nocere animae, cum tantam in ejus sanguinem habeat potestatem. Addunt etiam quod ait apostolus Paulus, Quia caro et sanguis regnum Dei non possidebunt (I Cor. XV, 50): et dicunt, Si sanguis est anima, sicut Moyses dicit, nulla invenietur anima posse regnum Dei adipisci. Cui calumniae primo ita respondendum est, ut ipsi cogantur ostendere ubi scriptum sit in libris veteris Legis, quod anima humana sanguis sit. Nusquam enim hoc invenient in illa Scriptura, quam lacerare miseri quamdiu conantur, nullo modo permittuntur intelligere. Quod si de anima humana nihil tale ibi dictum est, quid ad nos pertinet, si anima pecoris aut laedi ab interfectore potest, aut possidere Dei regnum non potest? Sed quia de animis pecorum nimis sunt isti solliciti (cum enim sint hominum animae rationales, revolvi tamen eas in pecora existimant), clausa sibi esse arbitrantur regna coelorum, si pecorum animis clausa esse consentiant.

2. Quid, quod etiam insultare ausus est populo Israel Adimantus unus ex discipulis Manichaei, quem magnum doctorem illius sectae fuisse commemorant? Insultare ergo ausus est populo Judaeorum, quod secundum eorum intellectum, quo existimant sanguinem esse animam, parentum ipsorum animae, partim a serpentibus devoratae, partim igne consumptae, partim in desertis atque asperimis montium locis arefactae sunt. Quod si verum esse quisquam concederet, sine scelere tamen eorum quibus iste insultare voluit, factum esse convinceret. Non enim parentum suorum animas, quibus illa omnia secundum horum intellectum accidisce dixit, ipsi aliqua ex parte laeserunt: quapropter luctum inde possunt habere, non reatum. Quid autem ipse Adimantus faciet secundum opinionem suam, qua credidit etiam rationales, id est, hominum animas in belluina corpora posse contrudi? Quid ergo faciet de tanto scelere, si quando tardum jumentum plagis, aut concitatum freno fatigavit, in quo forte patris ejus anima fuerit? ut non dicam quod etiam occidere parentes suos inter pediculos et pulices potuerit, a quorum isti interfectione non temperant.

1. Regarding what is written, that blood must not be eaten, because the soul of the flesh is the blood (Deut. 12:23). To this sentence of the old Law the Manichaeans oppose from the Gospel that which the Lord says, that those who kill the body are not to be feared, but they cannot harm the soul (Matt. 10:28); and they dispute saying: If the blood is the soul, how do men not have power over it, since they do many things with blood, either receiving it and proposing it for food to dogs and birds, or pouring it out, or mixing it with dirt and mud? For men can do these and other innumerable things with blood without difficulty. Therefore they ask insultingly how, if the blood is the soul, the slayer of a man cannot harm the soul, when he has such power over its blood. They add also what the Apostle Paul says: "Because flesh and blood shall not possess the kingdom of God" (1 Cor. 15:50); and they say: If the blood is the soul, as Moses says, no soul will be found able to attain the kingdom of God. To this calumny we must first respond in such a way that they are compelled to show where it is written in the books of the old Law that the *human* soul is blood. For they will find this nowhere in that Scripture, which the wretched wretches, as long as they try to tear it apart, are in no way permitted to understand. For if nothing of the sort was said there about the human soul, what does it pertain to us if the soul of a beast can either be harmed by a slayer, or cannot possess the kingdom of God? But because they are too concerned about the souls of beasts (for although human souls are rational, they nevertheless think they are revolved back into beasts), they think the kingdoms of heaven are closed to themselves, if they consent that they are closed to the souls of beasts.

2. What about the fact that Adimantus, one of the disciples of Manichaeus, whom they commemorate as having been a great teacher of that sect, even dared to insult the people of Israel? He dared to insult the Jewish people, therefore, because according to their understanding, by which they think blood is the soul, the souls of their own parents were partly devoured by serpents, partly consumed by fire, and partly dried up in the deserts and most rugged places of the mountains. But even if anyone were to concede that this were true, he would be convinced that it happened without the crime of those whom he wished to insult. For they themselves did not in any part harm the souls of their parents, to whom he said all those things happened according to their understanding: wherefore they can have grief therefrom, but not guilt. But what will Adimantus himself do according to his own opinion, by which he believed that even rational, that is, human souls can be thrust into bestial bodies? What, therefore, will he do regarding such a great crime, if ever he fatigued a slow beast of burden with blows, or a swift one with the bit, in which perhaps the soul of his father was? Not to mention that he could even kill his parents among lice and fleas, from whose killing they do not refrain.

Quid enim eis prodest, quod aliquando negant usque ad ista minutissima animantia revolvi animas humanas posse? Hoc enim negant, ne tam multarum interfectionum rei teneantur, aut cogantur parcere pediculis et pulicibus et cimicibus, et tantas ab eis molestias sine ulla caedis eorum licentia sustinere. Nam vehementer urgentur, cur in vulpeculam revolvi anima humana possit, et non possit in mustelam; cum catulus vulpeculae fortasse etiam minor sit, quam magna mustela. Deinde si in mustelam potest, cur in murem non potest? Et si in istum potest, cur in stellionem non potest? Et si in eum potest, cur in locustam non potest? Deinde in apem, deinde in muscam, deinde in cimicem, atque inde usque in pulicem, et si quid est aliud multo minutius, pervenire? Ubi enim terminum constituent, non inveniunt: atque ita per istam nugatoriam credulitatem, conscientiae illorum innumerabilibus homicidiorum sceleribus obruuntur.

3. Nam ex eo quod scriptum est, sanguinem pecoris animam ejus esse; praeter id quod supra dixi, non ad me pertinere quid agatur de pecoris anima; possum etiam interpretari praeceptum illud in signo esse positum. Non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere, Hoc est corpus meum (Matth. XXVI, 26); cum signum daret corporis sui.

4. Quod autem ait Apostolus, Caro et sanguis regnum Dei non possidebunt: etiam in Lege dictum est, Non permanebit in istis spiritus meus, quoniam caro sunt (Gen. VI, 3). Et toties in veteribus Libris justorum animis praemium futurum promittitur. Sed tamen Apostolus volens insinuare quale corpus justorum per immutationem in resurrectione futurum sit, quia non nubent, neque uxores ducent, sed erunt sicut Angeli in coelis (Matth. XXII, 30): hanc ergo immutationem futuram corporum sanctorum volens insinuare, dixit Apostolus, Dico enim vobis, fratres, quia caro et sanguis regnum Dei non possidebunt. Quod non una separata et ad fraudem commemorata sententia, sed toto ipso Epistolae loco pertractato, vel potius lecto (non enim res obscura est) inveniri potest. Sic enim dicit: Oportet corruptibile hoc induere incorruptionem, et mortale hoc induere immortalitatem. Quod eum de corpore dicere, de superioribus manifeste invenitur, cum ait: Non omnis caro eadem caro: alia quidem hominum, alia autem pecorum; alia caro volucrum, alia piscium. Et corpora coelestia, et corpora terrestria: sed alia est coelestium gloria, alia terrestrium; alia gloria solis, alia gloria lunae, et alia gloria stellarum. Stella enim ab stella differt in gloria; sic et resurrectio mortuorum. Seminatur in corruptione, surget in incorruptione: seminatur in contumelia, surget in gloria: seminatur in infirmitate, surget in virtute: seminatur corpus animale, surget corpus spirituale, sicut scriptum est: Factus est primus homo Adam in animam viventem, novissimus Adam in spiritum vivificantem. Sed non primum quod spirituale est, sed quod animale; postea, quod spirituale. Primus homo de terra, terrenus; secundus homo de coelo, coelestis. Qualis terrenus, tales et terreni; et qualis coelestis, tales et coelestes.

For what does it profit them that they sometimes deny that human souls can be revolved back into these most minute living things? They deny this so that they may not be held guilty of so many killings, or be compelled to spare lice and fleas and bedbugs, and to endure such great molestations from them without any permission to slay them. For they are vehemently pressed: why can a human soul be revolved into a little fox, and not into a weasel; since the cub of a fox is perhaps even smaller than a large weasel? Then if it can into a weasel, why not into a mouse? And if into that, why not into a lizard? And if into that, why not into a locust? Then into a bee, then into a fly, then into a bedbug, and from there even reach a flea, and if there is anything else much smaller? For they find nowhere to establish a limit: and thus through that trifling credulity, their consciences are overwhelmed by innumerable crimes of homicide.

3. For regarding what is written, that the blood of a beast is its soul; besides what I said above, that it does not pertain to me what is done with the soul of a beast; I can also interpret that precept as having been set as a sign. For the Lord did not hesitate to say, "This is my body" (Matt. 26:26), when He was giving a sign of His body.

4. As for what the Apostle says, "Flesh and blood shall not possess the kingdom of God": it was also said in the Law, "My spirit shall not remain in them, because they are flesh" (Gen. 6:3). And so often in the ancient Books a future reward is promised to the souls of the just. But yet the Apostle, wishing to insinuate what kind of body the just will have through a change in the resurrection, because "they shall neither marry, nor take wives, but shall be as the Angels in heaven" (Matt. 22:30): wishing therefore to insinuate this future change of the bodies of the saints, the Apostle said: "For I say to you, brothers, that flesh and blood shall not possess the kingdom of God." Which can be found not by one separate sentence commemorated for fraud, but by having thoroughly treated, or rather read, the whole passage of the Epistle itself (for the matter is not obscure). For he says thus: "This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." That he is saying this about the body is found clearly from what precedes, when he says: "Not all flesh is the same flesh: one indeed of men, but another of beasts; another flesh of birds, another of fishes." And celestial bodies, and terrestrial bodies: but one is the glory of the celestial, another of the terrestrial; one glory of the sun, another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars. For star differs from star in glory; so also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it shall rise in incorruption: it is sown in dishonor, it shall rise in glory: it is sown in infirmity, it shall rise in power: it is sown an animal body, it shall rise a spiritual body, as it is written: The first man Adam was made into a living soul, the last Adam into a life-giving spirit. But not first that which is spiritual, but that which is animal; afterwards, that which is spiritual. The first man from the earth, earthy; the second man from heaven, heavenly. Such as the earthy is, such also are the earthy; and such as the heavenly is, such also are the heavenly.

Et quomodo induimus imaginem terreni, induamus et imaginem ejus qui de coelo est. Hoc autem dico, fratres, quia caro et sanguis regnum Dei haereditate possidere non possunt; neque corruptio incorruptionem haereditate possidebit. Certe jam clarum est quare hoc Apostolus dixerit. Quid ergo iste tam turpi fraude non commemorat, nisi hoc ultimum, et tacet illa superiora, quibus hoc quod male interpretatur, bene possit intelligi? Nam quoniam Domini nostri corpus post resurrectionem sic levatum est in coelum, ut pro ipsa coelesti habitatione coelestem acceperit mutationem, et hoc sperare in die ultimo jussi sumus: ideo dixit Apostolus, Qualis terrenus, tales et terreni, id est, mortales; et qualis coelestis, tales et coelestes, id est, immortales, non solum animis, sed etiam corporibus. Unde et supra dixerat, aliam esse coelestium corporum gloriam, et aliam terrestrium. Quod autem spirituale dixit corpus in resurrectione futurum, non propterea putandum est, quod non corpus, sed spiritus erit: sed spirituale corpus omni modo spiritui subditum dicit, sine aliqua corruptione vel morte. Non enim quia quod modo habemus corpus animale appellat, ideo putandum est non illud esse corpus, sed animam. Ergo quemadmodum corpus animale nunc dicitur, quia subditum est animae; spirituale autem nondum dici potest, quia nondum spiritui plene subjectum est, quamdiu corrumpi potest: sic et tunc spirituale vocabitur, cum spiritui atque aeternitati nulla corruptione resistere poterit.

5. Aut si adhuc parum videtur esse monstratum, quod sententiam istam propter immutationem quae futura est Apostolus dixerit, cum ait, Caro et sanguis regnum Dei haereditate possidere non possunt, neque corruptio incorruptionem haereditate possidebit; attendite quid continuo subjiciat, et adjungat: Ecce mysterium vobis dico: omnes quidem resurgemus, non tamen omnes immutabimur, in atomo, in ictu oculi, in novissima tuba. Canet enim tuba, et mortui resurgent incorrupti, et nos immutabimur. Deinde contextit, et dicit etiam illud quod paulo ante commemoravi, ut ostendat qualis futura sit ipsa immutatio. Statim quippe dicit: Oportet enim corruptibile hoc induere incorruptionem, et mortale hoc induere immortalitatem (I Cor. XV, 39 53). Hinc ergo apparet quia caro et sanguis regnum Dei non possidebunt, quia cum induerit incorruptionem et immortalitatem, jam non caro et sanguis erit, sed in corpus coeleste mutabitur. Quod quidem ex occasione tractavimus, quia huic quoque sententiae multum insidiari solent, negantes corporum resurrectionem.

And as we have put on the image of the earthy, let us put on also the image of him who is from heaven. But this I say, brothers, that flesh and blood cannot possess the kingdom of God by inheritance; nor shall corruption possess incorruption by inheritance. Certainly it is now clear why the Apostle said this. Why then does this man [Adimantus] not commemorate with such base fraud except this last thing, and keeps silent about those preceding things, by which this which he interprets badly could be well understood? For since the body of our Lord after the resurrection was so lifted into heaven that for that celestial habitation it received a celestial change, and we were ordered to hope for this on the last day: therefore the Apostle said, "Such as the earthy is, such also are the earthy," that is, mortals; "and such as the heavenly is, such also are the heavenly," that is, immortals, not only in souls but also in bodies. Whence he had also said above that the glory of celestial bodies is one, and of terrestrial ones another. But as for his having said that the body will be spiritual in the resurrection, it is not therefore to be thought that it will not be a body, but a spirit: but he calls it a spiritual body as being in every way subject to the spirit, without any corruption or death. For not because he calls that which we now have an "animal body" is it therefore to be thought that it is not a body, but a soul. Therefore just as it is now called an "animal body" because it is subject to the soul, but cannot yet be called "spiritual" because it is not yet fully subject to the spirit as long as it can be corrupted; so also then it shall be called "spiritual" when it shall be able to resist the spirit and eternity by no corruption.

5. Or if it still seems to have been shown too little that the Apostle said that sentence on account of the change that is to come, when he said: "Flesh and blood cannot possess the kingdom of God by inheritance, nor shall corruption possess incorruption by inheritance"; observe what he immediately subjoins and adds: "Behold, I tell you a mystery: we shall all indeed rise, but we shall not all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet. For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall rise incorrupt, and we shall be changed." Then he weaves together and says even that which I commemorated a little before, so that he may show of what kind that change itself will be. For he says immediately: "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality" (1 Cor. 15:51-53). From this therefore it appears that flesh and blood shall not possess the kingdom of God, because when it has put on incorruption and immortality, it will no longer be flesh and blood, but will be changed into a celestial body. Which indeed we have treated on this occasion because they are wont to lie in wait much for this sentence also, denying the resurrection of bodies.

Nam ista quaestio non de corpore, sed de anima proposita est, quam putant sic accipi in Lege, ut sanguis esse existimetur: quod nos nullo modo sic intelligimus. Sed quamvis de pecorum animis non curemus, cum quibus non habemus rationis aliquam societatem: tamen illud quod Lex dixit, fundendum esse sanguinem, nec in escam assumendum, quia sanguis est anima, esse positum dicimus sicut alia multa; et pene omnia Scripturarum illarum sacramenta signis et figuris plena sunt futurae praedicationis, quae jam per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum declarata est. Sic est enim sanguis anima, quomodo petra erat Christus, sicut dicit Apostolus: Bibebant enim de spirituali sequente petra, petra autem erat Christus (Id. X, 4). Notum est autem filios Israel petra percussa bibisse aquam in eremo (Num. XX, 11), de quibus loquebatur Apostolus, cum haec diceret; nec tamen ait, Petra significabat Christum; sed ait, Petra erat Christus. Quae rursus ne carnaliter acciperetur, spiritualem illam vocat; id est, eam spiritualiter intelligi docet. Longum est, et nunc non necessarium, sacramenta ejusdem Legis exponere, nisi cum breviter possint. Sufficit autem ut noverint illi qui de his calumniantur, non ea nos ita intelligere, ut illa solent irridere; sed quemadmodum Apostoli omnia intelligentes pauca exposuerunt, ut ad easdem regulas caetera posteris intelligenda relinquerent.

CAPUT XIII.

1. De eo quod scriptum est in Deuteronomio, Videte ne obliviscamini testamentum Dei vestri quod conscripsit, et faciatis vobis effigies et imagines: addit etiam dicens, Deus vester ignis est edax, et Deus zelans (Deut. IV, 23, 24). Haec verba de Scripturis hoc modo ille Adimantus proposuit. Ejus enim calumnias refutandas refellendasque suscepimus. Sed et jam superius de zelo Dei cum calumniaretur, puto satis esse responsum. Meminerimus tamen non solum ibi, sed etiam hic, sic eum de zelo Dei criminatum Scripturas, ut adjungeret etiam quod de simulacris non colendis in illis libris praecipitur a Domino Deo nostro; quasi non ob aliud reprehendat zelum Dei, nisi quod illo ipso zelo a cultu simulacrorum prohibemur: vult ergo videri favere se simulacris. Quod propterea faciunt, ut miserrimae et vesanae suae sectae etiam Paganorum concilient benevolentiam. Huic autem Legis capitulo illud evangelicum opponit, ubi quidam accessit ad Dominum, et ait illi: Magister bone, quid faciens vitam aeternam possidebo?

For this question was proposed not about the body, but about the soul, which they think is so accepted in the Law that it is thought to be blood: which we in no way understand thus. But although we do not care about the souls of beasts, with whom we have no society of reason: yet that which the Law said, that blood must be poured out and not taken for food because "the blood is the soul," we say was set just as many other things; and almost all the sacraments of those Scriptures are full of signs and figures of the future preaching, which has now been declared through our Lord Jesus Christ. For so is the blood the soul, as the rock was Christ, as the Apostle says: "For they drank of the spiritual rock following them, but the rock was Christ" (1 Cor. 10:4). For it is known that the children of Israel drank water in the desert from the struck rock (Num. 20:11), of which the Apostle was speaking when he said these things; yet he did not say: "The rock signified Christ," but he said: "The rock was Christ." Which again, lest it be accepted carnally, he calls "spiritual"; that is, he teaches it to be understood spiritually. It is long, and not now necessary, to explain the sacraments of the same Law, except when they can be briefly. But it suffices that those who calumniate regarding these things know that we do not understand them as they are wont to deride them; but just as the Apostles, understanding all things, explained a few, so that they might leave the rest to be understood by posterity according to the same rules.

CHAPTER XIII.

1. Regarding what is written in Deuteronomy: "See that you do not forget the covenant of your God which he wrote, and make for yourselves effigies and images": he adds also saying: "Your God is a consuming fire, and a jealous God" (Deut. 4:23, 24). That man Adimantus proposed these words from the Scriptures in this way. For we have undertaken to refute and repel his calumnies. But as he had already calumniated concerning the zeal of God above, I think enough has been responded. Let us remember, however, not only there but also here, that he so accused the Scriptures concerning the zeal of God that he added also what is commanded by the Lord our God in those books concerning not worshipping idols; as if he reprehends the zeal of God for no other reason than that by that very zeal we are prohibited from the worship of idols: he wishes, therefore, to seem to favor idols himself. Which they do for this reason, that they may conciliate the benevolence even of Pagans for their most wretched and insane sect. But to this chapter of the Law he opposes that evangelical one, where a certain man approached the Lord and said to Him: "Good Master, what shall I do to possess eternal life?"

Cui respondit Jesus: Quid me interrogas de bono? Nemo bonus, nisi unus Deus (Marc. X, 17 et 18). Ut ex hoc videlicet contraria ista esse arbitremur, quia in Lege dicitur, Deus ignis edax, et, Deus zelans; in Evangelio autem, Nemo bonus, nisi unus Deus.

2. Et de zelo quidem jam responsum est, non sic esse ista verba in Scripturis posita, ut aliquam Dei perturbationem cruciatumve significant: sed quia nihil dignum de Deo dici potest, propterea usque ad ista perventum est, quae cum homines indigna esse putaverint, cogantur discere, etiam illa quae convenienter de ineffabili divina excellentia se dicere existimant, indigna esse maiestate Dei; cujus sapientia cum descensura esset usque ad corpus humanum, prius usque ad humana verba descendit. Ecce dixi, descendit: quod verbum si discutere coepero, proprie me dixisse non video; non enim potest descendere, nisi quod etiam de loco in locum moveri potest. Nam qui descendit, locum superiorem deserere, et inferiorem petere videtur. Dei autem Sapientia, cum tota ubique praesto sit, nullo pacto migrare de loco in locum potest. De qua Joannes in Evangelio dicit, tanquam dominici pectoris particeps. Ait enim, In hoc mundo erat, et mundus per ipsum factus est, et mundus eum non cognovit: et tamen ipse adjungit et dicit, In sua propria venit, et sui eum non receperunt (Joan. I, 10, 11). Quomodo hic erat, et quomodo venit, nisi quia illa sublimitas ineffabilis, ut hominibus congruat, humanis sonis significanda est; ut autem deos homines faciat, divino est intelligenda silentio? Potest ergo reddi ratio, quare ita dictum sit: non tamen potest aliquid de Deo digne dici, quod ideo jam indignum est, quia potuit dici. Tolle de zelo errorem et dolorem, quid remanebit aliud, nisi voluntas custodiens castitatem, et corruptionem vindicans conjugalem? Quo igitur verbo, nisi zelo Dei melius posset insinuari, quod vocamur ad conjugium Dei, et non vult nos turpi amore corrumpi, et punit impudicitiam nostram, et diligit castitatem? Non enim frustra vulgo dici solet: Qui non zelat, non amat.

3. Ad hoc etiam pertinet quod dictum est, edax ignis: de quo disputare non debeo, sed potius ipsos interrogare, quem ignem dixerit Dominus se venisse mittere in hunc mundum. Hoc enim dictum est in Evangelio, quod illi accusare non possunt, non ut Christum honorent, sed ut decipiant Christianos. Quod cum eis commemoratum fuerit, quemadmodum Dominus dixerit, Ignem veni mittere in terram (Luc. XII, 49); miseri dicunt: Sed illud aliud est. Quibus respondemus: Et hoc aliud est, noli metuere.

To whom Jesus responded: "Why do you ask me about the good? No one is good except one, God" (Mark 10:17-18). So that from this, forsooth, we should think these things are contrary, because in the Law it is said: "God is a consuming fire," and "a jealous God"; but in the Gospel: "No one is good except one, God."

2. And concerning zeal indeed it has already been responded, that these words are not so placed in the Scriptures that they signify some perturbation or torment of God; but because nothing worthy can be said of God, therefore it has come even to these things, which when men have thought them unworthy, they are compelled to learn that even those things which they think they say fittingly concerning the ineffable divine excellence are unworthy of the majesty of God; whose Wisdom, when it was to descend even to a human body, first descended even to human words. Behold I said: "it descended": which word if I begin to discuss, I do not see that I have said it properly; for nothing can descend except what can also be moved from place to place. For he who descends seems to desert a higher place and seek a lower one. But the Wisdom of God, since it is all present everywhere, can in no way migrate from place to place. Of which John says in the Gospel, as a sharer of the Lord's breast. For he says: "He was in this world, and the world was made through him, and the world knew him not": and yet he himself subjoins and says: "He came unto his own, and his own received him not" (John 1:10, 11). How was He here, and how did He come, except because that ineffable sublimity, that it may be fitting for men, must be signified by human sounds; but that He may make men gods, He must be understood by divine silence? Therefore a reason can be rendered why it was said so: yet nothing can be said worthily of God, which is therefore already unworthy because it could be said. Take away from zeal error and pain, what else will remain except a will guarding chastity and avenging conjugal corruption? By what word, therefore, except the "zeal of God," could it be better insinuated that we are called to the marriage of God, and He does not want us to be corrupted by base love, and He punishes our impurity, and loves chastity? For it is not in vain wont to be said commonly: "He who is not jealous, does not love."

3. To this also pertains what was said, "a consuming fire": concerning which I ought not to dispute, but rather to ask them what fire the Lord said He had come to send into this world. For this was said in the Gospel, which they cannot accuse—not so that they may honor Christ, but so that they may deceive Christians. When it has been commemorated to them how the Lord said: "I came to send fire upon the earth" (Luke 12:49); the wretched men say: "But that is another thing." To whom we respond: And this is another thing, do not fear.

Nam ipse Christus loquitur etiam in Veteri Testamento, cum dicit, Ego sum ignis edax (Deut. IV, 24, et IX, 3); qui loquitur in Evangelio, quod ignem venerit in hunc mundum mittere, id est, Verbum Dei, quod est ipse. Nam veteres utique Scripturas exposuit post resurrectionem discipulis, incipiens a Moyse et Prophetis omnibus, quando ipsi discipuli ignem se accepisse confessi sunt, dicentes: Nonne cor nostrum ardens erat in nobis in via, cum aperiret nobis Scripturas (Luc. XXIV, 32)? Ipse est ignis edax: consumit enim veterem vitam divinus amor, et innovat hominem: ut ex eo quod Deus ignis est edax, faciat ut eum nos amemus; ex eo autem quod Deus zelans est, ipse nos amet. Nolite ergo timere ignem, quod est Deus : sed timete ignem, quem paravit haereticis Deus.

4. Quod enim Adimantus elegit de Evangelio locum, quem huic Legis capitulo tanquam contrarium apud imperitos objiceret, ubi ait Dominus, Nemo bonus, nisi unus Deus, quoties invenitur bonitas Dei in Veteri Testamento, quis numerare sufficiat? Unum tamen ponam, quod quotidie in Ecclesia cantatur: Confitemini Domino, quoniam bonus, quoniam in saeculum misericordia ejus (Psal. CXVII, 1, 29). Certe et hoc zelanti Deo, sicut Manichaei existimant, videtur esse contrarium, et tamen in libris Veteris Testamenti cantatur. Item rex ille, qui cum filio suo nuptias faceret, invenit inter discumbentes hominem non habentem vestem nuptialem; et eum primo amici nomine appellans, manibus et pedibus colligatis mitti jussit in tenebras exteriores (Matth. XXII, 2-13): moleste intelligentibus non videtur bonus. Et si ipsum quisquam capitulum Evangelii proponeret, et sicut facit Adimantus de Veteri Testamento, ita Evangelium calumniose accusaret, laudans potius Veteris Testamenti libros, ubi scriptum est, Confitemini Domino, quoniam bonus, quoniam in saeculum misericordia ejus; et reprehendens in Novo, quod vocatus conviva in tantum supplicium propter vestem mittitur; et hoc fraudulenta perversitate assidue faceret, ut omnia loca lenitatis de Veteri Testamento colligeret, et loca severitatis de Novo, et haec sibi adversa esse contenderet, laudans Vetus, et reprehendens Novum: similiter inveniret imperitos et divinarum Scripturarum miserabiliter ignaros, quibus persuaderet Vetus potius Testamentum, quam Novum esse retinendum. Quod cum isti ex alia parte faciunt, id est, Vetus reprehendentes, quasi contrarium Novo, miror quod non cogitant posse aliquem aliquando utrumque legere, et divina ope intellectum utrumque laudare; fraudemque istorum atque malitiam vel dolere tanquam hominum, vel cavere tanquam haereticorum, vel irridere tanquam imperitorum et superborum.

CAPUT XIV.

For Christ Himself speaks also in the Old Testament when He says: "I am a consuming fire" (Deut. 4:24, and 9:3); He who speaks in the Gospel that He came to send fire into this world, that is, the Word of God, which is He Himself. For He certainly explained the ancient Scriptures to the disciples after the resurrection, beginning from Moses and all the Prophets, when the disciples themselves confessed that they had received fire, saying: "Was not our heart burning within us on the way, when He opened the Scriptures to us?" (Luke 24:32). He is the consuming fire: for divine love consumes the old life and renews man: so that from the fact that God is a consuming fire, He makes us love Him; while from the fact that God is jealous, He Himself loves us. Therefore, do not fear the fire which is God: but fear the fire which God has prepared for heretics.

4. For as to what Adimantus chose from the Gospel—a place which he might object to this chapter of the Law as if contrary among the unlearned—where the Lord says: "No one is good except one, God"; how many times is the goodness of God found in the Old Testament, who would suffice to count? Yet I will put one, which is sung daily in the Church: "Give thanks to the Lord, for He is good, for His mercy endures forever" (Psalm 117:1, 29). Certainly even this seems to be contrary to a "jealous God," as the Manichaeans think, and yet it is sung in the books of the Old Testament. Likewise, that king who, when he made a marriage for his son, found among the guests a man not having a wedding garment; and calling him first by the name of friend, ordered him, bound hand and foot, to be sent into the outer darkness (Matt. 22:2-13): to those who understand with difficulty, he does not seem good. And if anyone were to propose that very chapter of the Gospel, and as Adimantus does with the Old Testament, so he were to calumniously accuse the Gospel, praising rather the books of the Old Testament where it is written: "Give thanks to the Lord, for He is good, for His mercy endures forever"; and reprehending in the New that a guest invited is sent into such great punishment on account of a garment; and if he were to do this assiduously with fraudulent perversity, so as to collect all the places of leniency from the Old Testament and the places of severity from the New, and contend that these were adverse to each other, praising the Old and reprehending the New: he would similarly find unlearned people and those miserably ignorant of the divine Scriptures whom he might persuade that the Old Testament rather than the New ought to be retained. Since they do this from the other side—that is, reprehending the Old as if contrary to the New—I wonder that they do not think that someone could eventually read both, and by divine help praise both as understood; and either grieve for their fraud and malice as that of men, or beware of it as that of heretics, or deride it as that of the unlearned and the proud.

CHAPTER XIV.

1. De eo quod scriptum est in Deuteronomio: Secundum desiderium animae tuae occide, et manduca omnem carnem, juxta voluptatem quam dedit tibi Dominus. Cave autem ne sanguinem manduces; sed effunde tanquam aquam super terram (Deut. XII, 15, 16). His verbis Legis Adimantus contrarium esse arbitratur quod in Evangelio Dominus ait, Ne graventur corda vestra cruditate, et vinolentia, et curis saecularibus (Luc. XXI, 34): et quod ait Apostolus, Bonum est non manducare carnem, neque bibere vinum (Rom. XIV, 21); et iterum, Non potestis mensae Domini communicare, et mensae daemoniorum (I Cor. X, 21). Nos autem omnia haec, sive quae in Veteri, sive quae in Novo Testamento scripta sunt, et suis causis exigentibus posita dicimus, et sibi adversa non esse monstramus. Quanquam et ipse in his verbis quae posuit de Veteri Testamento, animadvertere potuit, non ad immoderatam voracitatem pertinere quod dictum est, Secundum desiderium animae tuae occide, et manduca omnem carnem; quando sequitur, juxta voluptatem quam dedit tibi Dominus. Immoderatam enim voluptatem non dedit tibi Dominus, sed quanta sustentationi naturae salutique sufficiat. Quisquis autem sequitur immoderatam voracitatem, suum vitium sequitur, non eam voluptatem quam dedit Dominus: et ideo non est contrarium quod in Evangelio positum est, Non graventur corda vestra cruditate, et vinolentia, et curis saecularibus. Cum enim quisque non replet nisi eam voluptatem quam Dominus dedit, id est, modestam atque naturalem, non gravatur cor ejus cruditate, et vinolentia, et curis saecularibus.

2. De carne autem non manducanda et non bibendo vino quod ait Apostolus, non quia illa immunda arbitratus est, hoc praecepit, sicut isti exstimaunt, et errantes in errorem praecipitant, quibus talia persuasunt: sed cum ipse posuerit causam cur hoc dixerit, non est nobis haec interpretanda vel exponenda sententia. Sufficit enim ipsum de Apostoli Epistola totum locum huic sermoni contexere, ut et causa manifeste appareat cur hoc Apostolus dixerit; et istorum fraus, qui particulas quasdam de Scripturis eligunt, quibus decipiant imperitos, non connectentes quae supra et infra scripta sunt, ex quibus voluntas et intentio scriptoris possit intelligi. Sic ergo Apostolus ait: Infirmum autem in fide recipite, non in dijudicationibus cogitationum. Alius quidem credit manducare omnia : qui autem infirmus est, olera manducet .

1. On what is written in Deuteronomy: "According to the desire of your soul kill and eat all flesh, according to the pleasure which the Lord your God has given you. But beware that you do not eat the blood; but pour it out like water upon the earth" (Deut. 12:15, 16). Adimantus thinks that what the Lord says in the Gospel is contrary to these words of the Law: "Lest your hearts be weighed down with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and worldly cares" (Luke 21:34); and what the Apostle says: "It is good not to eat flesh, nor to drink wine" (Rom. 14:21); and again: "You cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils" (1 Cor. 10:21). We, however, say that all these things, whether those which are written in the Old or those in the New Testament, were placed with their causes requiring them, and we show that they are not adverse to each other. Although even he, in these words which he placed from the Old Testament, could have noticed that what was said—"According to the desire of your soul kill, and eat all flesh"—does not pertain to immoderate voracity, when there follows: "according to the pleasure which the Lord gave you." For the Lord did not give you immoderate pleasure, but as much as suffices for the sustenance of nature and for health. But whoever follows immoderate voracity follows his own vice, not that pleasure which the Lord gave: and therefore it is not contrary what is placed in the Gospel: "Lest your hearts be weighed down with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and worldly cares." For when each person does not fill himself except for that pleasure which the Lord gave—that is, modest and natural—his heart is not weighed down with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and worldly cares.

2. But concerning not eating flesh and not drinking wine, which the Apostle says, he did not prescribe this because he judged those things unclean, as they think and, being in error, precipitate into error those whom they have persuaded of such things: but since he himself placed the cause why he said this, this sentence is not to be interpreted or explained by us. For it suffices to weave together the whole passage from the Apostle's Epistle to this discourse, so that both the cause why the Apostle said this may manifestly appear, and the fraud of those who choose certain particles from the Scriptures with which to deceive the unlearned, not connecting what is written above and below, from which the will and intention of the writer can be understood. Thus, therefore, the Apostle says: "Receive him who is weak in faith, but not in disputes of thoughts. For one indeed believes he may eat all things; but he who is weak, let him eat vegetables."

Qui manducat, non manducantem non spernat; et qui non manducat, manducantem non iudicat: Deus enim illum recepit. Tu quis es, qui iudices alienum servum? Suo domino stat, aut cadit. Stabit autem: potens est enim Dominus statuere illum. Alius quidem iudicat alternos dies, alius autem iudicat omnem diem. Unusquisque in suo sensu abundet. Qui sapit diem, Domino sapit: et qui manducat, Domino manducat; gratias enim agit Deo: et qui non manducat, Domino non manducat, et gratias agit Deo. Nemo enim nostrum sibi vivit, et nemo sibi moritur. Sive enim vivimus, Domino vivimus; sive morimur, Domino morimur. Sive ergo vivimus, sive morimur, Domini sumus. Ad hoc enim Christus mortuus est, ut mortuorum et vivorum dominetur. Tu autem, quare iudicas fratrem tuum? aut tu quare spernis fratrem tuum? Omnes enim stabimus ante tribunal Domini. Scriptum est enim: Vivo ego, dicit Dominus, quia mihi curvabit omne genu, et confitebitur omnis lingua Deo. Igitur unusquisque nostrum pro se rationem reddet. Non ergo amplius invicem iudicemus: sed hoc magis iudicate, ne ponatis offendiculum aut scandalum fratribus. Scio et certus sum in Domino Jesu, quia nihil commune per illum, nisi ei qui putat aliquid esse commune, illi commune est. Nam si propter escam frater tuus contristatur, jam non secundum charitatem ambulas. Noli in esca tua illum perdere, pro quo Christus mortuus est. Non ergo blasphemetur bonum nostrum. Non est enim regnum Dei esca et potus; sed iustitia, et pax, et gaudium in Spiritu sancto. Qui enim in hoc servit Christo, placet Deo, et probatus est hominibus. Itaque quae pacis sunt sectemur, et quae ad aedificationem sunt in invicem. Noli propter escam destruere opus Dei. Omnia quidem munda, sed malum est homini qui per offensionem manducat. Bonum est non manducare carnem, neque bibere vinum, neque in quo frater tuus offenditur. Tu fidem quam habes penes teipsum, habe coram Deo. Beatus qui non iudicat semetipsum in quo probat. Qui autem discernit, si manducaverit, damnatus est, quia non ex fide. Omne autem quod non est ex fide, peccatum est (Rom. XIV). Numquid eget cujusquam interpretatione, ut intelligatur cur hoc Apostolus dixerit; et quanta illi malitia de Scripturis certa quaeque discerpunt, quibus circumveniant imperitos? Nam et munda esse omnia dixit Apostolus secundum fidem; et ei esse immunda, qui putat immunda: et tunc esse ab eis temperandum, cum per offensionem accipiuntur, id est, cum aliquis infirmus putat sibi ab omnibus carnibus temperandum, ne incidat in carnem immolatitiam; et ideo eum qui manducat, potest arbitrari in honorem idolorum id facere, et ex eo graviter offendi: cum ipsa immolatitia caro, si ex fide a nesciente accipitur, neminem maculet.

Let not him who eats despise him who does not eat; and let not him who does not eat judge him who eats: for God has received him. Who are you who judge another's servant? To his own lord he stands or falls. And he shall stand: for God is powerful to establish him. For one indeed judges day from day, but another judges every day. Let each one abound in his own sense. He who tastes the day, tastes for the Lord: and he who eats, eats for the Lord, for he gives thanks to God: and he who does not eat, for the Lord he does not eat, and he gives thanks to God. For none of us lives to himself, and no one dies to himself. For whether we live, we live for the Lord; or whether we die, we die for the Lord. Whether therefore we live or whether we die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ died, that He might be Lord of the dead and of the living. But you, why do you judge your brother? Or you, why do you despise your brother? For we shall all stand before the tribunal of the Lord. For it is written: As I live, says the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. Therefore each one of us shall render an account for himself. Let us therefore no longer judge one another: but judge this rather, that you do not place a stumbling block or a scandal for your brothers. I know and am certain in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is common through him, except to him who thinks anything to be common, to him it is common. For if because of food your brother is grieved, you are no longer walking according to charity. Do not destroy in your food him for whom Christ died. Therefore let not our good be blasphemed. For the kingdom of God is not food and drink; but justice, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit. For he who in this serves Christ pleases God and is approved by men. Therefore let us pursue the things that are of peace, and the things that are for mutual edification. Do not destroy the work of God because of food. All things indeed are clean, but it is evil for the man who eats through offense. It is good not to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor that in which your brother is offended. The faith which you have for yourself, have it before God. Blessed is he who does not judge himself in what he approves. But he who discerns, if he eats, he is damned, because it is not from faith. But everything which is not from faith is sin" (Rom. 14). Does it need anyone's interpretation to understand why the Apostle said this, and with how much malice they snatch certain things from the Scriptures with which they circumvent the unlearned? For the Apostle both said all things are clean according to faith; and that to him they are unclean who thinks them unclean: and that one must then temper from them when they are taken through offense, that is, when someone weak thinks he must temper from all flesh lest he fall upon meat offered to idols; and therefore he who eats can be thought to do it in honor of idols, and be heavily offended by it: whereas the meat offered to idols itself, if it be taken from faith by one not knowing, defiles no one.

Unde alio loco idem apostolus interrogari vetat, cum quid de macello emitur, vel ab aliquo infideli quisquam vocatus, in mensa ejus exhiberi sibi carnes videt, quas isti immundas arbitrantur, non propter immolationem, sed quia carnes sunt, cum Apostolus clamet omnia munda esse, et omnem creaturam Dei bonam esse, et omnia sanctificari per verbum et orationem: et tamen temperandum ab eis, si quis forte infirmus offenditur. Et quodam loco apertissime istos significavit, cum dicit, in novissimis temporibus futuros quosdam prohibentes nubere, abstinentes a cibis quos Deus creavit (I Tim. IV, 1-5). Hos enim proprie designat, qui non propterea temperant a cibis talibus, ut aut concupiscentiam suam refrenent, aut infirmitati alterius parcant, sed quia ipsas carnes immundas putant, et earum creatorem Deum esse negant. Nos autem teneamus apostolicam disciplinam dicentem, quod omnia munda sint mundis (Tit. I, 15), servata moderatione evangelica, ut non graventur corda nostra cruditate, et vinolentia, et curis saecularibus.

3. Nam idem illud quod Apostolus ait, Non potestis mensae Domini communicare, et mensae daemoniorum; non video cur opponendum huic loco Legis, et quasi contrarium Manichaei esse crediderint. Non enim de immolationibus Lex loquitur, cum in Deuteronomio dicitur, Secundum desiderium animae tuae occide, et manduca omnem carnem, juxta voluptatem quam dedit tibi Dominus; sed de cibis qui pertinent ad hominis alimentum. Sed quoniam Manichaei etiam cum ad hominis coenam quaeque animalia praeparantur, immolationem esse dicunt; secundum suum intellectum ista contraria esse putaverunt. Propterea et illum commemoraverunt locum, ubi Apostolus ait, Quae immolant Gentes, daemoniis immolant, et non Deo: cum Apostolus apertissime de victimis loqueretur, quae in templo offeruntur daemonibus; non de his escis quas sibi homines praeparant. Sic enim dicit: Quid ergo? dico quia idolis immolatum est aliquid, aut idolum est aliquid? Sed quia quae immolant, daemoniis, et non Deo immolant. Nolo vos socios daemoniorum fieri. Non potestis calicem Domini bibere, et calicem daemoniorum. Non potestis mensae Domini participare, et mensae daemoniorum. An aemulamur Dominum? Numquid fortiores illo sumus? Omnia licita sunt, sed non omnia expediunt: omnia licita sunt, sed non omnia aedificant. Nemo quod suum est quaerat, sed id quod alterius. Omne quod in macello venit, manducate, nihil interrogantes propter conscientiam. Domini enim est terra et plenitudo ejus. Si quis vos vocaverit ex infidelibus, et volueritis ire; omnia quae apponuntur vobis, manducate, nihil dijudicantes propter conscientiam.

Whence in another place the same Apostle forbids asking questions when anything is bought from the market, or if someone being called by some infidel sees flesh displayed to him on his table, which these men judge unclean—not because of the offering, but because they are flesh—when the Apostle cries out that all things are clean, and that every creature of God is good, and that all things are sanctified through the word and prayer: and yet one must temper from them if some weak person is perhaps offended. And in a certain place most clearly he signified these men when he says that in the last times there would be some "prohibiting to marry, abstaining from foods which God created" (1 Tim. 4:1-5). For he properly designates these who do not temper from such foods for the purpose of either refraining their concupiscence or sparing the infirmity of another, but because they think the flesh itself is unclean, and they deny that God is its creator. We, however, let us hold the apostolic discipline saying that "to the pure all things are pure" (Titus 1:15), the evangelical moderation being preserved, so that our hearts are not weighed down with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and worldly cares.

3. For that same thing which the Apostle says, "You cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils," I do not see why it should be opposed to this place of the Law, and why the Manichaeans believed it to be as if contrary. For the Law does not speak of immolations when it is said in Deuteronomy: "According to the desire of your soul kill, and eat all flesh, according to the pleasure which the Lord your God has given you"; but of foods which pertain to man's nourishment. But since the Manichaeans say that there is immolation even when any animals are prepared for a man's dinner, they have thought these things to be contrary according to their own understanding. For that reason they also commemorated that place where the Apostle says: "What the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God": when the Apostle was speaking most clearly of victims which are offered to devils in a temple, not of these foods which men prepare for themselves. For he says thus: "What then? Do I say that what is sacrificed to idols is anything, or that an idol is anything? But that what they sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God. I do not want you to become associates of devils. You cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils. You cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils. Or do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than He? All things are lawful, but not all things are expedient: all things are lawful, but not all things edify. Let no one seek what is his own, but that which is another's. Everything that comes into the market, eat, asking nothing for conscience' sake. For the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof. If any of the infidels calls you, and you wish to go; all things that are set before you, eat, judging nothing for conscience' sake.

Si quis autem vobis dixerit quia hoc immolatitium est; nolite manducare, propter illum qui indicavit, et propter conscientiam: conscientiam autem dico, non tuam, sed alterius. Quare enim libertas mea judicatur ab alia conscientia? Si ego cum gratia participo, utquid blasphemor, pro quo gratias ago? Sive igitur manducatis, sive bibitis, sive quodcumque facitis, omnia in gloriam Dei facite (I Cor. X, 19-31). Haec attendant Manichaei, et videant quomodo dictum sit in Deuteronomio, Secundum desiderium animae tuae occide, et manduca omnem carnem, juxta voluptatem quam Dominus dedit tibi. Quod enim de quibusdam carnibus non manducandis Judaeis praeceptum est, et immundae sunt dictae, ad significationem valet hominum immundorum, qui per figuras in veteribus Scripturis sunt designati. Sicuti enim bos ille, cui trituranti vetat os alligari, evangelistam significat, sicut Apostolus apertissime exponit (Deut. XXV, 4; I Cor. IX, 7-9; et I Tim. V, 17, 18); sic et illa quae prohibita sunt, quasdam hominum immunditias significant, quae in societatem corporis Christi, id est, in Ecclesiam stabilem et sempiternam non recipiuntur. Nam quod ad cibos attinet, omnino nihil immundum esse, sed malum esse homini qui per offensionem manducat, manifestissime apparet.

CAPUT XV.

1. De eo quod in Levitico scriptum est: Separate a mundo immundum, et nemo manducet carnem cameli, asini, et leporis, et porci, et aquilae, et milvi, et corvi, et vulturis, et reliquorum (Levit. XI). Nusquam manifestius plenissima dolis et fraudibus anima hujus hominis deprehendi potest, qui tanquam sibi adversa atque contraria de utroque Testamento capitula objecit, quam in hoc loco ubi commemoravit in Levitico scriptum esse, ut a nonnullis animalium carnibus temperetur. Namque huic sententiae illud ex Evangelio credidit opponendum, ubi Dominus dicit: Nihil est ingrediens in hominem, coinquinans eum; sed ea quae procedunt de eo, coinquant (Matth. XV, 11). Hoc si imprudens fecit, nihil caecius: si autem sciens, nihil sceleratius. Nonne ipse paulo ante posuerat Apostoli testimonium dicentis, Bonum est, fratres, non manducare carnem, neque bibere vinum (Rom. XIV, 21); dum cupit de Novo Testamento Veteri adversari, ubi dictum est, Secundum desiderium animae tuae occide, et manduca omnem carnem (Deut. XII, 15)?

But if anyone says to you that this is offered in sacrifice; do not eat, for his sake who indicated it, and for conscience' sake: but I say conscience, not yours, but the other's. For why is my liberty judged by another's conscience? If I participate with grace, why am I blasphemed for that for which I give thanks? Whether therefore you eat, or whether you drink, or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God" (1 Cor. 10:19-31). Let the Manichaeans attend to these things, and see how it was said in Deuteronomy: "According to the desire of your soul kill, and eat all flesh, according to the pleasure which the Lord has given you." For that which was commanded to the Jews concerning not eating certain meats, and they are called unclean, avails for the signification of unclean men, who are designated through figures in the ancient Scriptures. For just as that ox, whose mouth he forbids to be muzzled while threshing, signifies the evangelist, as the Apostle most clearly explains (Deut. 25:4; 1 Cor. 9:7-9; and 1 Tim. 5:17, 18); so also those things which were prohibited signify certain uncleannesses of men, who are not received into the society of the body of Christ, that is, into the stable and everlasting Church. For as far as pertains to foods, that absolutely nothing is unclean, but that it is evil for the man who eats through offense, appears most manifestly.

CHAPTER XV.

1. On what is written in Leviticus: "Separate the unclean from the clean, and let no one eat the flesh of the camel, the ass, and the hare, and the pig, and the eagle, and the kite, and the raven, and the vulture, and the rest" (Lev. 11). Nowhere more manifestly can the soul of this man, most full of wiles and frauds, be detected—who objected chapters from both Testaments as if adverse and contrary to each other—than in this place where he commemorated that it is written in Leviticus that one should temper from the flesh of some animals. For to this sentence he believed that place from the Gospel should be opposed where the Lord says: "There is nothing entering into a man defiling him; but the things which proceed from him, they defile" (Matt. 15:11). If he did this imprudently, nothing is blinder; but if knowingly, nothing is more wicked. Had he himself not a little before placed the testimony of the Apostle saying: "It is good, brothers, not to eat flesh, nor to drink wine" (Rom. 14:21); while he desires the New Testament to be adverse to the Old, where it was said: "According to the desire of your soul kill, and eat all flesh" (Deut. 12:15)?

Quomodo ergo nunc placet ei sententia Domini, qua dicit, nihil esse ingrediens in hominem quod coinquinet eum, sed ea coinquinare quae de homine procedunt? Ubi se iste abscondat ab hac sententia? Quo fugiet, dicat mihi, quando immunditiam carnum fugiendam et a cibis sanctorum separandam, perversa et superstitiosa imaginatione continentiae praecipit? Certe enim, si verum est, non coinquinare illa quae ingrediuntur in hominem, cum magno errore immundas esse dicunt escas Manichaei, cum homines carne vescuntur. Si autem immundae sunt tales escas, quid de isto testimonio facient, quod evangelica et divina auctoritate prolatum est, ubi Dominus dicit, non coinquinari hominem iis quae ingrediuntur in eum, sed iis quae procedunt de illo? An forte dicturi sunt, sicut solent dicere, cum Scripturarum eos urget auctoritas, hoc capitulum a corruptoribus Scripturarum insertum esse Evangelio? Cur ergo Adimantus hoc capitulo teste utitur, et inde conatur Vetus Testamentum oppugnare, unde iste prosternitur? Cum enim quispiam catholicus christianus utriusque Scripturae venerator et intellectus ei responderit, haec non esse contraria; quod illa de quorundam carnibus animalium, quibus non esse vescendum populo adhuc carnali praeceptum est, ad significationem posita sint humanorum morum, quos Ecclesia quae corpus est Domini, in suae unitatis vinculum stabile et sempiternum recipere non potest, tanquam immundas escas respuens, et in sua viscera non convertens; ut omnia illa praecepta carnali populo imposita futuram disciplinam spiritualis populi prophetarent: et ideo non ea repugnare sententiae Domini, qua verissime dicit, non coinquinari hominem iis quae per escam ingrediuntur in eum. Illa enim sententia servis onera imponit; ista jam liberis jugum excutit servitutis. Et illa tamen sic dicta est, ut servorum onera fidem praenuntient liberorum. Omnia enim, sicut dicit Apostolus, in figura contingebant illis; scripta sunt autem propter nos, in quos finis saeculorum obvenit (I Cor. X, 11). Si ergo in figuram contingebant quae patiebantur, in figuram accipiebant quae monebantur.

2. Cum ergo ista respondero, et hoc modo non esse contraria duo ista capitula de singulis Testamentis collata monstravero, quid iste facturus est, contra quem dicit gravissimum testimonium testis quem contra adversarium ipse produxit? Ipse enim commemoravit de Evangelio testimonium, Domino dicente non coinquinari hominem iis escis quae ingrediuntur in eum: et ipse a carnibus abstinendum tanquam ab immundis escis monere et docere non cessat. Et tamen sensit quantam plagam sibi infligeret, et quanto ictu percussus se ipse sauciaret.

How then does the sentence of the Lord now please him, by which He says that there is nothing entering into a man which defiles him, but that those things defile which proceed from a man? Where shall that man hide himself from this sentence? Where will he flee, tell me, when by a perverse and superstitious imagination of continence he prescribes that the uncleanness of flesh is to be fled and separated from the foods of the saints? For certainly, if it is true that those things which enter into a man do not defile, with great error do the Manichaeans say that foods are unclean when men eat flesh. But if such foods are unclean, what will they do about this testimony which was brought forth by evangelical and divine authority, where the Lord says that a man is not defiled by those things which enter into him, but by those things which proceed from him? Or perhaps they are going to say, as they are wont to say when the authority of the Scriptures presses them, that this chapter was inserted into the Gospel by corrupters of the Scriptures? Why then does Adimantus use this chapter as a witness, and from it try to assault the Old Testament, from which he himself is prostrated? For when any Catholic Christian, a venerator and understander of both Scriptures, shall have responded to him that these things are not contrary; because those things concerning the flesh of certain animals which were prescribed to the still carnal people as not to be eaten, were placed for the signification of human morals—which the Church, which is the body of the Lord, cannot receive into the stable and everlasting bond of its unity, rejecting them as if unclean foods and not converting them into its own viscera—so that all those precepts imposed on the carnal people might prophesy the future discipline of the spiritual people: and therefore those things do not resist the sentence of the Lord, by which He most truly says that a man is not defiled by those things which enter into him through food. For that sentence imposes burdens on servants; this one now shakes off the yoke of servitude from the free. And yet that one was said so that the burdens of servants might preannounce the faith of the free. "For all things," as the Apostle says, "happened to them in figure; but they were written on account of us, upon whom the end of the ages has come" (1 Cor. 10:11). If therefore the things they suffered happened in figure, they received the things they were warned about in figure.

2. When therefore I shall have responded these things, and shall have shown in this way that these two chapters brought together from each Testament are not contrary, what is that man going to do, against whom the witness whom he himself produced against his adversary gives most grave testimony? For he himself commemorated the testimony from the Gospel, the Lord saying that a man is not defiled by those foods which enter into him: and he himself does not cease to warn and teach that one must abstain from flesh as from unclean foods. And yet he felt what a great blow he was inflicting upon himself, and with what a great stroke he, being struck back, was wounding himself.

Ne quis enim eum interrogaret et diceret, Quomodo ergo prohibetis carnibus vesci, si Dominus dicit, sicut tu ipse commemoras, Nihil est ingrediens in hominem, coinquinans eum; sed ea quae procedunt de eo, coinquinant? voluit quasi adhibere medicinam sine causa in mortifero vulnere. Sic enim posuit ipsum evangelicum testimonium. In Evangelio, inquit, dicit ad turbam Dominus: Audite, et intelligite: Nihil est ingrediens in hominem, coinquinans eum, et caetera. Quod ergo commemoravit Dominum hoc ad turbam dixisse, nihil aliud ostendit, nisi non se ignorantia, sed malitia fecisse quod fecit: ut postea diceret Auditoribus suis ad turbam Dominum ista locutum esse, non ad paucos sanctos, quales se ipsi videri volunt; ut quoniam suos Auditores tanquam adhuc immundos permittunt carnibus vesci, sibi autem quasi jam mundis cum sceleratum atque nefarium esse arbitrantur, hoc etiam Dominum sensisse videatur, quod non paucos sanctos, sed turbas ista docuerit. O hominem pessimum, securum de negligentia generis humani ad occultandas deceptiones suas! Non enim credebat aliquem existere, qui arriperet Evangelium, et cum scientia legeret, et inveniret hominem in ipsis pratis, quibus greges suos Dominus pascit, laqueos incautis et minus providis abscondentem. Nam de his verbis commoti discipuli, et non credentes proprie, sed potius figurate Dominum locutum fuisse, cum diceret non coinquinari hominem iis quae per cibos ingrediuntur in eum, quoniam Judaei erant etiam ipsi discipuli, qui fugiendos quarumdam carniū cibos a pueritia institutum acceperant, accedentes ad eum dixerunt ei: Scis quia Pharisei audito verbo scandalizati sunt? At ille respondens ait: Omnis plantatio quam non plantavit Pater meus coelestis, eradicabitur. Sinite illos; caeci sunt, et duces caecorum. Caecus autem si caeco ducatum praestet, ambo in foveam cadunt. Cum ergo infidelitatem Judaeorum plantationem appellaret quam non plantavit Pater coelestis, tamen adhuc Petrus putans esse illam parabolam, et propterea reprehendens Judaeos et caecos dictos, quod eam intelligere non potuerint, respondens dixit ei: Edissere nobis parabolam istam. Et ille manifestissime ostendens non esse parabolam, sed propriam locutionem, dixit ad eos: Adhuc et vos sine intellectu estis? Non intelligitis quia omne quod in os intrat, in ventrem vadit, et in secessum emittitur? Quae autem procedunt de ore, de corde exeunt, et ea coinquinant hominem. De corde enim exeunt cogitationes malae, homicidia, adulteria, fornicationes, furta, falsa testimonia, blasphemiae; haec sunt quae coinquinant hominem. Non lotis autem manibus manducare, non coinquinat hominem (Matth. XV, 10-20).

For lest anyone should interrogate him and say: "How then do you prohibit eating flesh, if the Lord says, as you yourself commemorate, 'There is nothing entering into a man defiling him; but the things which proceed from him, they defile?'" he wished, as it were, to apply a medicine without cause in a deadly wound. For he placed the evangelical testimony itself thus. "In the Gospel," he says, "the Lord says to the crowd: 'Hear, and understand: There is nothing entering into a man defiling him,' and the rest." That he therefore commemorated that the Lord said this to the crowd, shows nothing else except that he did what he did not from ignorance, but from malice: so that he might say afterwards to his Hearers that the Lord spoke these things to the crowd, not to the few saints, such as they wish themselves to be seen; so that since they permit their Hearers to eat flesh as if still unclean, but to themselves as if now clean they think it is wicked and nefarious, the Lord also seems to have felt this, that He taught these things not to the few saints, but to the crowds. O most wicked man, secure concerning the negligence of the human race for hiding his deceptions! For he did not believe anyone existed who would snatch up the Gospel and read it with knowledge, and find the man in the very meadows where the Lord feeds His flocks, hiding snares for the incautious and less provident. For the disciples, moved by these words and not believing that the Lord had spoken properly, but rather figuratively, when He said that a man is not defiled by those things which enter into him through foods—since the disciples themselves were Jews, who had received as an institution from childhood that the foods of certain flesh were to be fled—approaching Him, they said to Him: "Do You know that the Pharisees, having heard the word, were scandalized? But He answering said: Every plantation which my heavenly Father has not planted shall be rooted out. Let them be; they are blind, and leaders of the blind. But if a blind man provides leadership to a blind man, both fall into a pit." When therefore He called the infidelity of the Jews a plantation which the heavenly Father did not plant, nevertheless Peter, still thinking it was a parable, and that the Jews were reprehended and called blind for that reason, because they could not understand it, responding said to Him: "Explain this parable to us." And He, most manifestly showing that it was not a parable but a proper speech, said to them: "Are you also still without understanding? Do you not understand that everything which enters into the mouth goes into the belly, and is emitted into the privy? But the things which proceed from the mouth go out from the heart, and they defile the man. For from the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false testimonies, blasphemies; these are the things which defile a man. But to eat with unwashed hands does not defile a man" (Matt. 15:10-20).

De non lotis autem manibus Iudaei moverant quaestionem, cujus occasione Dominus generaliter de iis quae in os intrant, et in ventrem vadunt, et in secessum emittuntur, hoc est, de alimentis nostris dixit sententiam. Quanquam ergo convocatis ad se turbis eum dixisse scriptum sit, Non quod intrat in os coinquinat hominem, sed quod procedit ex ore: tamen iste quo timore hoc addiderit verbis suis, quibus huiusmodi testimonium commemoravit, satis apparet, sicut paulo ante dictum est, ut haberet quod responderet eis qui sibi quaestionem movissent, cur primates Manichaeorum nefas sibi esse existimant carnibus vesci: videlicet ut illud quod Dominus ait, turbis tantum, non Electis concessisse videretur. Sed cum ex consequentibus declaratum sit etiam Petro seorsum interroganti, audientibusque discipulis, quos utique ad culmen Ecclesiae producebat, ita respondisse Dominum, ut neque per parabolam se illa dixisse testatus sit, et ad omnes pertinere monstraverit; non habent isti unde auferant cibos de faucibus hominum, et eas laqueo superstitionis astringant.

3. Fortassis aliquis eorum dicat: Edissere ergo quid significet caro porci, et cameli, et leporis, et milvi, et corvi, et caeterorum, a quibus abstinendum in Lege praecipitur. Nolo, quia longum est. Sed fac me non posse; numquid propterea nullus potest? Et sunt jam volumina innumerabilia in quibus ista exposita sunt. Nobis tamen ad hos refellendos satis est, quod eas observationes umbram esse futurorum, non ego, sed Apostolus dicit, cum etiam vetat serviliter observari, sed tamen aliquid significare declarat, dicens: Nemo ergo vos iudicet in cibo, aut in potu, aut in parte diei festi, aut neomeniae, aut sabbatorum, quod est umbra futurorum (Coloss. II, 16, 17). Illa itaque futura quae illis observationibus significabantur, posteaquam per Dominum Jesum Christum venerunt, ablatae sunt serviles observationes: sed earum interpretationes tenentur a liberis. Quidquid enim futuram Ecclesiam significavit, prophetia est. Habes autem eundem apostolum dicentem: Spiritum nolite spernere, prophetiam nolite exstinguere; omnia legite, quae bona sunt tenete (I Thess. V, 19-21). Legenda est ergo Scriptura divina, et Spiritus sancti dispensatio cognoscenda, et intuenda prophetia; et rejicienda carnalis servitus, et liberalis intelligentia retinenda.

CAPUT XVI.

Now, concerning unwashed hands the Jews had moved a question, on the occasion of which the Lord said the sentence generally concerning those things which enter into the mouth, and go into the belly, and are emitted into the privy, that is, concerning our nourishments. Although therefore it may be written that He said to the crowds called to Him, "Not what enters into the mouth defiles a man, but what proceeds from the mouth": yet with what fear he added this to his words, in which he commemorated a testimony of this kind, sufficiently appears, as was said a little before, so that he might have what he should respond to those who had moved a question to him, why the primates of the Manichaeans think it a nefas for them to eat flesh: to wit, so that that which the Lord said might seem to have been conceded only to the crowds, not to the Elect. But since it has been declared from the consequences that He responded thus also to Peter interrogating Him apart, and to the disciples listening, whom He was certainly leading to the summit of the Church, so that He both testified that He had not said those things through a parable, and showed that they pertained to all; they do not have from where they may take away foods from the jaws of men, and bind them with the snare of superstition.

3. Perhaps one of them may say: "Explain then what the flesh of the pig, and the camel, and the hare, and the kite, and the raven, and the others, from which it is prescribed in the Law to abstain, signifies." I do not wish to, because it is long. But suppose I cannot; does it therefore mean no one can? And there are now innumerable volumes in which these things have been explained. To us, however, for refuting these men, it is enough that the Apostle—not I—says that those observations are a "shadow of things to come," when he also forbids them to be servilely observed, yet declares that they signify something, saying: "Let no one therefore judge you in food, or in drink, or in part of a feast day, or of a new moon, or of sabbaths, which is a shadow of things to come" (Col. 2:16, 17). Those future things, therefore, which were signified by those observations, after they came through the Lord Jesus Christ, the servile observations were taken away: but their interpretations are held by the free. For whatever signified the future Church is a prophecy. You have also the same Apostle saying: "Do not despise the Spirit, do not extinguish prophecy; read all things, hold those which are good" (1 Thess. 5:19-21). Divine Scripture is therefore to be read, and the dispensation of the Holy Spirit is to be known, and prophecy is to be intuited; and carnal servitude is to be rejected, and liberal understanding is to be retained.

CHAPTER XVI.

1. De eo quod scriptum est in Deuteronomio: Observa et sanctifica diem quem praecepit tibi Dominus. Sex diebus laborabis, et facies omne opus tuum; septima vero die sabbati epulare Domino Deo tuo, nullum faciens opus ipse tu, aut filius tuus, aut filia tua, aut puer tuus, aut puella tua, bos tuus, et asinus tuus, omnia jumenta tua, et colonus tuus. Sic autem quiescet servus tuus et ancilla tua, quemadmodum et tu. Memento quoniam servus fuisti in Aegypto, et eruit te Dominus Deus tuus in manu potenti et brachio excelso. Idcirco praecepit tibi Dominus custodire diem septimum (Deut. V, 12-15). Et iterum in Genesi scriptum est quemadmodum Abrahae de circumcisione loquitur: Testamentum meum custodi, inquit, tu et semen tuum, quod erit post te. Hoc est testamentum meum quod servabis inter me, et te et semen tuum: omne masculinum circumcides in carne praeputii ipsorum; et sit hoc signum testamenti inter me et vos. Octava autem die circumcidetis omnes masculos in gente vestra, ut etiam dominatum et comparatum circumcidatis praeter alienigenam: et hoc erit testamentum in gente vestra. Et omnis masculus qui non circumcidet praeputium suum, perdet animam suam de media plebe, quia testamentum meum dissolvit (Gen. XVII, 9-14). Haec omnia verba Veteris Testamenti, ut eis de Novo Testamento adversetur, proponit Adimantus, et contraria esse affirmat ea quae Dominus dicit in Evangelio de proselyto: Vae vobis, Scribae et Pharisei hypocritae, qui circumitis mare et terram ut faciatis unum proselytum; et cum feceritis, erit filius gehennae, multo plus quam estis vos (Matth. XXIII, 15). Quasi vero propterea Dominus proselytum dicat filium gehennae, quia circumciditur, et sabbatum observat; et non potius quia Judaeorum pravam conversationem cogitur imitari, non qua observant praecepta Legis, sed qua faciunt contra Legem. Quod alio loco de his apertissime dicit, ubi ait quod rejiciunt mandatum Dei, ut suam constitutionem confirment (Id. XV, 3-6): quia cum Lex praeceperit honorari patrem et matrem, instituerunt ipsi quomodo exhonorentur parentes. Et item cum eis dicit: Vae vobis, Scribae et Pharisei, qui habetis clavem regni coelorum, nec ipsi intratis, nec alios permittitis intrare (Luc. XI, 52). Vel cum alio loco praecepit audientibus, ut dictis Phariseorum et Scribarum obtemperarent, facta vero eorum non imitarentur. Ait enim: Super cathedram Moysi sedent: quae dicunt, facite; sed quae faciunt, facere nolite: dicunt enim, et non faciunt (Matth. XXIII, 2 et 3).

1. On what is written in Deuteronomy: "Observe and sanctify the day which the Lord your God has commanded you. Six days shall you labor, and do all your work; but the seventh day of the sabbath you shall feast to the Lord your God, doing no work yourself, or your son, or your daughter, or your manservant, or your maidservant, your ox, and your ass, all your beasts, and your tenant. But thus shall your servant and your handmaid rest, just as you also. Remember that you were a servant in Egypt, and the Lord your God brought you out with a mighty hand and a high arm. Therefore the Lord commanded you to keep the seventh day" (Deut. 5:12-15). And again it is written in Genesis how He speaks to Abraham concerning circumcision: "Keep my covenant," He says, "you and your seed which shall be after you. This is my covenant which you shall keep between me, and you and your seed: every male you shall circumcise in the flesh of their foreskin; and let this be a sign of the covenant between me and you. But on the eighth day you shall circumcise all males in your nation, so that you also circumcise the household and the purchased servant besides the foreigner: and this shall be a covenant in your nation. And every male who shall not circumcise his foreskin, shall lose his soul from the midst of his people, because he has dissolved my covenant" (Gen. 17:9-14). Adimantus proposes all these words of the Old Testament so that he may be adverse to them from the New Testament, and he affirms those things which the Lord says in the Gospel concerning a proselyte to be contrary: "Woe to you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, who compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when you have made him, he will be a son of Gehenna, much more than you yourselves are" (Matt. 23:15). As if truly the Lord says the proselyte is a son of Gehenna because he is circumcised and observes the sabbath; and not rather because he is compelled to imitate the perverse conversation of the Jews, not in which they observe the precepts of the Law, but in which they do things against the Law. Which He says most clearly concerning these in another place, where He says that they reject the commandment of God so that they may confirm their own constitution (Matt. 15:3-6): because when the Law commanded that father and mother be honored, they themselves instituted how parents might be dishonored. And likewise when He says to them: "Woe to you, Scribes and Pharisees, who have the key of the kingdom of heaven, and neither enter yourselves nor permit others to enter" (Luke 11:52). Or when in another place He commanded the hearers that they should obey the words of the Pharisees and Scribes, but should not imitate their deeds. For He says: "Upon the chair of Moses they sit: what things they say, do; but what things they do, do not do: for they say, and do not" (Matt. 23:2, 3).

Quo loco et auctoritatem Legis quae per Moysen data est, confirmat Dominus, et tamen cavendos et fugiendos esse mores eorum qui Legi quam acceperant non obtemperabant, apertissime ostendit. Istis autem perversitatibus suis faciebant, ut cum aliquis gentilis ad Legem eorum transisset, id est, factus esset proselytus, haberet mores eorum, et fieret filius gehennae, multo plus quam ipsi essent. Dabant enim magnam operam ut Judaeus fieret aliquis ex Gentibus, et Judaeum factum cogebant suos mores pessimos imitari.

2. Neque illud quod de Apostolo tanquam contrarium commemorat, potuit advertere Adimantus manichaeus, omnino non esse contrarium; quia totus ejus oculus non ad inquisitionem, sed ad reprehensionem Scripturae intentus erat. Commemorat enim dicentem Apostolum: Circumcisis aliquis vocatus est? non adducat praeputium. In praeputio quis vocatus est? non circumcidatur: quia praeputium nihil est, et circumcisio nihil est, sed observatio praeceptorum Dei (I Cor. VII, 18 et 19). Quid enim manifestius quam hoc Apostolum praecipere, ut unusquisque sicut vocatus erat, sic maneret? Advenientibus enim rebus, quarum erant umbrae illae observationes, id actum est, ut ostenderetur in ipsis umbris non esse spem ponendam, sed in ipsis rebus quas illae umbrae significabant esse venturas, id est, Christum et Ecclesiam. Et propterea illa jam omnia inania erant: nec tamen ea tanquam noxia removenda, sed tanquam superflua contemnenda Apostolus praecipit; ut si quis Judaeus Christo credidisset, propter offensionem suorum non prohiberetur in ipsis superfluis remanere, nec tamen in eis salutem suam constitutam putaret: non enim signa illa, sed ea quae his significantur in salutem introducunt. Ideoque praeputium nihil est, et circumcisio nihil est, sed observatio mandatorum Dei. Et quod alio loco ait: Utinam et abscindantur qui vos conturbant (Galat. V, 12); non quia circumcisio contraria est Evangelio, dicit Apostolus, sicut Manichaei putant: sed illud est Evangelio contrarium, ut quisque rem deserens, quae per illam umbram figuratur, ipsius umbrae sequatur inanitatem. Quod volebant qui Gentibus in Christum credentibus jugum circumcisionis imponebant quasi ad salutem necessarium, cum jam non esset umbra in corpore figuranda, sed res ipsa in corde gestanda.

In which place the Lord both confirms the authority of the Law which was given through Moses, and yet shows most clearly that the morals of those who did not obey the Law which they had received were to be avoided and fled. But they did these things by their perversities, so that when some Gentile had passed over to their Law, that is, had become a proselyte, he would have their morals and become a son of Gehenna much more than they themselves were. For they gave great effort that someone from the Gentiles should become a Jew, and having been made a Jew they compelled him to imitate their worst morals.

2. Neither could Adimantus the Manichaeen notice that what he commemorates from the Apostle as contrary is not contrary at all; because his whole eye was intent not on the inquisition but on the reprehension of Scripture. For he commemorates the Apostle saying: "Was anyone called being circumcised? let him not bring on the foreskin. Was anyone called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised: because circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God" (1 Cor. 7:18, 19). For what is more manifest than that the Apostle prescribes this, that each one should remain just as he was called? For when the things of which those observations were shadows arrived, it was done so that it might be shown that hope was not to be placed in the shadows themselves, but in the things themselves which those shadows signified were to come, that is, Christ and the Church. And therefore all those things were now empty: yet the Apostle prescribes that they are not to be removed as if noxious, but to be contemned as if superfluous; so that if any Jew had believed in Christ, because of the offense of his own people he would not be prohibited from remaining in those superfluous things, yet he should not think his salvation established in them: for not those signs, but those things which are signified by them lead into salvation. And therefore "uncircumcision is nothing, and circumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God." And as to what he says in another place: "I wish even that they were cut off who trouble you" (Gal. 5:12); the Apostle does not say this because circumcision is contrary to the Gospel, as the Manichaeans think: but that is contrary to the Gospel, that anyone deserting the reality which is figured through that shadow should follow the emptiness of the shadow itself. Which they wished who imposed the yoke of circumcision on the Gentiles believing in Christ as if necessary for salvation, when now the shadow was not to be figured in the body, but the reality itself was to be carried in the heart.

3. Et quod dicit, Dies observatis, et sabbata, et solemnitates; timeo vos, ne frustra laboraverim in vobis (Id. IV, 10 et 11); non sic scriptum est ut Adimantus ponit. Non enim nominat ibi sabbatum Apostolus. Dicit enim: Dies observatis et annos, et tempora; timeo vos, ne frustra laboraverim in vobis. Sed putat esse de sabbato dictum? Numquid et nos non dicimus ista non esse observanda, sed illa potius quae his significantur? Illi enim ea serviliter observabant, non intelligentes ad quarum rerum significationem et praenuntiationem pertinerent. Hoc in eis culpat Apostolus, et in omnibus qui serviunt creaturae potius quam Creatori (Rom. I, 25). Nam nos quoque et dominicum diem et Pascha solemmniter celebramus, et quaslibet alias christianas dierum festivitates. Sed quia intelligimus quo pertineant, non tempora observamus, sed quae illis significantur temporibus. Manichaei autem sic ea reprehendunt, quasi nullos dies et tempora observent. Sed cum de his interrogantur secundum opinionem sectae suae, omnia conantur exponere, ut not ipsa tempora, sed res, quarum illa signa sunt, observare videantur. Quas quidem res fabulosas esse atque falsissimas, aliis locis ostenditur. Nunc ad hoc dictum est, ut ore suo cogantur fateri, posse talia rationabiliter celebrari: et ideo circumcisionem carnis et recte impositam servis, et recte a liberis intellectam esse manifestum est. Repudiamus ergo eam carnalem cum Apostolo, et approbamus eam spiritualem cum Apostolo: et sabbati quietem non observamus in tempore; sed signum temporale intelligimus, et ad aeternam quietem quae illo signo significatur, aciem mentis intendimus. Repudiamus itaque temporum observationem cum Apostolo, et temporalium signorum intelligentiam tenemus cum Apostolo: duorumque Testamentorum differentiam sic probamus, ut in illo sint onera servorum, in isto gloria liberorum; in illo cognoscatur praefiguratio possessionis nostrae, in isto teneatur ipsa possessio. Interpretatur Apostolus sabbatum ad Hebraeos, cum dicit: Remanet igitur sabbatismus populo Dei (Hebr. IV, 9). Interpretatur etiam circumcisionem, cum dicit de Abraham: Et signum accepit circumcisionis signaculum iustitiae fidei (Rom. IV, 11). Apostolicam itaque interpretationem spiritualiter teneo: carnalem servitutis observationem libertate contemno, utriusque Testamenti auctorem Deum venerans, qui et veteri homini fugienti tanquam dominus apposuit quod timeret, et novo redeunti tanquam pater aperuit quod amaret.

CAPUT XVII.

3. And as to what he says: "You observe days, and sabbaths, and solemnities; I fear for you, lest I have labored in vain among you" (Gal. 4:10, 11); it is not written thus as Adimantus puts it. For the Apostle does not name the sabbath there. For he says: "You observe days and years, and times; I fear for you, lest I have labored in vain among you." But does he think it was said concerning the sabbath? Do we not also say that these things are not to be observed, but rather those things which are signified by them? For they observed them servilely, not understanding to what things' signification and preannouncement they pertained. This the Apostle blames in them, and in all who serve the creature rather than the Creator (Rom. 1:25). For we also celebrate both the Lord's day and Easter solemnly, and whatever other Christian festivities of days there are. But because we understand where they pertain, we do not observe the times, but the things which are signified by those times. The Manichaeans, however, reprehend these things as if they themselves observe no days or times. But when they are interrogated concerning these things according to the opinion of their sect, they try to explain all things so that they may seem to observe not the times themselves, but the things of which those are signs. Which things indeed are shown in other places to be fabulous and most false. Now this was said for the purpose that they might be compelled to confess by their own mouth that such things can be celebrated rationally: and therefore it is manifest that the circumcision of the flesh was both rightly imposed on servants, and rightly understood by the free. We therefore repudiate it carnally with the Apostle, and approve it spiritually with the Apostle: and we do not observe the rest of the sabbath in time; but we understand the temporal sign, and we intend the gaze of the mind toward the eternal rest which is signified by that sign. We therefore repudiate the observation of times with the Apostle, and we hold the understanding of temporal signs with the Apostle: and we so approve the difference of the two Testaments, that in that one are the burdens of servants, in this one the glory of the free; in that one the prefiguration of our possession is known, in this one the possession itself is held. The Apostle interprets the sabbath to the Hebrews, when he says: "There remains therefore a sabbatism for the people of God" (Heb. 4:9). He also interprets circumcision, when he says concerning Abraham: "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the justice of faith" (Rom. 4:11). I therefore hold the apostolic interpretation spiritually: I condemn the carnal observation of servitude with liberty, venerating God as the author of both Testaments, who both set before the old man fleeing something that he should fear as a lord, and opened to the new man returning something that he should love as a father.

CHAPTER XVII.

1. De eo quod in Exodo scriptum est: Si aure audieris vocem meam, et facies quaecumque praecipio tibi; odero odientes te; et contristabo contristantes te: praecedet te angelus meus, et adducet te ad Amorrhaeum, et Pherezaeum, et Chanaanæum, et Jebusæum, et Gergesæum; et occiditis illos. Deos eorum ne adoraveritis, neque feceritis opera ipsorum; sed eversione evertite illos, et delete eorum memoriam (Exod. XXIII, 22-24). His verbis de veteribus Libris ita commemoratis, tanquam contrarium opponit Adimantus quod in Evangelio scriptum est, dicente Domino: Ego autem dico vobis: Diligite inimicos vestros, benedicite his qui vobis maledicunt, et benefacite iis qui vos oderunt, et orate pro iis qui vos persequuntur (Matth. V, 44). Quo loco primo illud videndum est, quod satis esse debuerit homini volenti quasi contraria monstrare, quod de occidendis inimicis in veteri Lege scriptum esse commonuit. Dominus enim de inimicis diligendis, utique de hominibus praecepit; quos per nostram patientiam et charitatem ad salutem posse converti, et quivis intelligit, et exemplis saepissime demonstratum est. Quid ergo sibi vult, quod adjungenda consequentia putavit, ubi scriptum est, Deos eorum ne adoraveritis, neque feceritis opera ipsorum; sed eversione evertite illos, et delete eorum memoriam; nisi quia et deos Gentium Manichaei cogunt diligere? Et quod in Evangelio Dominus ait, Diligite inimicos vestros, non solum ad homines, sed ad daemonia quoque, vel etiam ad simulacra pertinere arbitrantur. Quod si ita est, quis non istam detestetur amentiam? Si autem non hoc arbitrantur, iste plurimum erravit, qui superstitiones Gentium evertendas esse praeceptas in Veteri Testamento commemorare voluit, cum in Novo quod scriptum est de inimicis diligendis, tanquam contrarium vellet opponere.

2. Nos autem neque illud quod de hostibus hominibus occidendis in veteribus Libris illi populo dictum est contrarium esse dicimus huic praecepto evangelico, quo nobis ut inimicos nostros diligamus Dominus jubet: quandoquidem illa inimicorum interfectio carnali adhuc populo congruebat, cui Lex tanquam paedagogus data erat, sicut Apostolus dicit (Galat. III, 24). Hi vero qui tunc in illo populo sancti et spirituales homines erant paucissimi, sicut Moyses, sicut Prophetae, quo animo facerent illam inimicorum interfectionem, et utrum eos quos interficiebant, diligerent, multum latet indoctos et impios, qui diligunt caecitatem suam; qui quoniam non sunt idonei videre ista, mole potius auctoritatis urgendi sunt.

1. Concerning what is written in Exodus: "If you will listen carefully to my voice, and do all that I command you; I will be an enemy to your enemies; and I will afflict those who afflict you: my angel shall go before you, and bring you to the Amorite, and the Perizzite, and the Canaanite, and the Jebusite, and the Girgashite; and you shall kill them. You shall not adore their gods, nor do their works; but you shall utterly overthrow them, and blot out their memory" (Exod. 23:22-24). After citing these words from the old Books, Adimantus opposes to them, as if they were contrary, what is written in the Gospel, the Lord saying: "But I say to you: Love your enemies, bless those who curse you, and do good to those who hate you, and pray for those who persecute you" (Matt. 5:44). In this place, one must first see that it should have been enough for a man wishing to show seemingly contrary things, that he reminded us of what was written in the old Law about killing enemies. For the Lord, concerning the loving of enemies, certainly commanded this regarding men; whom any one understands can be converted to salvation through our patience and charity, as has been shown very often by examples. What therefore does he mean by thinking that he should add the consequence where it is written, "You shall not adore their gods, nor do their works; but you shall utterly overthrow them, and blot out their memory"; unless it is because the Manichaeans compel us to love even the gods of the Gentiles? And they think that what the Lord said in the Gospel, "Love your enemies," pertains not only to men, but also to demons, or even to idols. If this is so, who would not detest such madness? But if they do not think this, then he erred greatly who wished to mention that the superstitions of the Gentiles were commanded to be overthrown in the Old Testament, when he wished to oppose as a contrary what is written in the New about loving enemies.

2. But we do not say that what was said to that people in the old Books concerning the killing of human enemies is contrary to this evangelical precept by which the Lord commands us to love our enemies: since that killing of enemies was suitable for a people who were still carnal, to whom the Law had been given as a pedagogue, as the Apostle says (Gal. 3:24). But as for those few who were then holy and spiritual men in that people, such as Moses and the Prophets, with what mind they carried out that killing of enemies, and whether they loved those whom they were killing, remains largely hidden from the unlearned and the impious, who love their own blindness; and since they are not fit to see these things, they must rather be urged by the weight of authority.

Quid enim est quod dicit Apostolus: Ego quidem absens corpore, praesens autem spiritu, jam judicavi quasi praesens eum qui sic operatus est, in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi congregatis vobis et meo spiritu, cum potentia Domini Jesu, tradere ejusmodi satanae in interitum carnis, ut spiritus salvus sit in die Domini Jesu (I Cor. V, 3-5)? Quid enim habet illa interfectio, quam multum isti exaggerant et invidiose ventilant, nisi interitum carnis? Sed quia exposuit Apostolus quo animo faceret, satis declaravit in aliquem inimicum vindictam cum charitate posse procedere. Et tamen hic etiam alio modo fortasse interitus carnis, qui fit per poenitentiam, potest intelligi. Ipsi autem legunt scripturas apocryphas, quas etiam incorruptissimas esse dicunt, ubi scriptum est apostolum Thomam maledixisse homini, a quo per imprudentiam palma percussus est, ignorante quis esset, maledictumque illud continuo venisse ad effectum. Nam cum ille homo, quoniam minister convivii erat, ut apportaret aquam exisset ad fontem, a leone occisus et dilaniatus est. Quod ut manifestaretur ad aliorum terrorem, canis manum ejus intulit mensis, ubi convivabatur Apostolus: atque ita cum causa quaereretur a nescientibus, eisque panderetur, in magnum timorem et magnum honorem Apostoli eos esse conversos; atque hinc Evangelii exordium commendandi existisse. Si vellet aliquis dentes Manichaeorum in ipsos convertere, quam mordaciter ista reprehenderet! Sed quia et ibi tacitum non est quo animo factum sit, videtur dilectio vindicantis. Sic etenim in illa scriptura legitur, quod deprecatus fuerit Apostolus pro illo in quem temporaliter vindicatum est, ut ei parceretur in futuro iudicio. Si ergo tempore Novi Testamenti, quo maxime charitas commendatur, de poenis visibilibus divinitus injectus est carnalibus timor; quanto magis tempore Veteris Testamenti hoc congruisse illi populo intelligendum est, quem timor Legis tanquam paedagogi coercerat? Nam haec est brevissima et apertissima differentia duorum Testamentorum, timor et amor: illud ad veterem, hoc ad novum hominem pertinet; utrumque tamen unius Dei misericordissima dispensatione prolatum atque conjunctum. Et in veteri Scriptura tacetur animus vindicantium, quia paucissimi spirituales divinis revelationibus quid facerent, noverant, ut populus cui terror utilis erat, severissimo imperio domaretur: ut quemadmodum videbant dari in manus suas interficiendos inimicos impios cultoresque simulacrorum, sic ipsi formidarent in manus inimicorum suorum dari, si Dei veri jussa contemnerent, et ad cultum idolorum atque impietates Gentium laberentur. Nam et in ipsos similiter peccantes non dissimiliter vindicatum est.

For what is it that the Apostle says: "I indeed, absent in body, but present in spirit, have already judged, as though present, him who has so done, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, you being gathered together and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus, to deliver such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of our Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. 5:3-5)? For what does that killing, which these people greatly exaggerate and invidiously air, have, except the destruction of the flesh? But because the Apostle explained with what mind he did it, he sufficiently declared that vengeance against an enemy can proceed with charity. And yet here also perhaps the destruction of the flesh, which occurs through repentance, can be understood in another way. Moreover, they themselves read apocryphal scriptures, which they even say are most incorrupt, where it is written that the apostle Thomas cursed a man by whom he was struck with a palm through imprudence, the man not knowing who he was, and that curse immediately took effect. For when that man, because he was a minister of the feast, had gone out to the fountain to bring water, he was killed and torn to pieces by a lion. In order that this might be manifested for the terror of others, a dog brought his hand into the tables where the Apostle was feasting; and so when the cause was sought by those who did not know, and it was revealed to them, they were converted to great fear and great honor of the Apostle; and hence the beginning of commending the Gospel arose. If someone wished to turn the teeth of the Manichaeans against themselves, how biting he would reprove these things! But because even there it is not silent as to with what mind it was done, the love of the one taking vengeance is seen. For it is read in that scripture that the Apostle prayed for him upon whom temporal vengeance was taken, that he might be spared in the future judgment. If, therefore, in the time of the New Testament, in which charity is especially commended, fear was divinely injected into carnal people through visible punishments; how much more must it be understood that this was suitable for that people in the time of the Old Testament, whom the fear of the Law as a pedagogue restrained? For this is the briefest and most open difference between the two Testaments, fear and love: the former pertains to the old man, the latter to the new; yet both were brought forth and joined together by the most merciful dispensation of the one God. And in the old Scripture, the mind of those taking vengeance is kept silent, because very few spiritual men knew by divine revelations what they should do, so that the people for whom terror was useful might be tamed by a most severe command: so that just as they saw impious enemies and worshippers of idols given into their hands to be killed, so they themselves might dread being given into the hands of their enemies, if they should despise the commands of the true God and slip into the worship of idols and the impieties of the Gentiles. For vengeance was taken in no different way upon them when they sinned similarly.

Sed omnis haec temporalis vindicta infirmos animos terret, ut enutritos sub disciplina erudiat, et a sempiternis atque ineffabilibus suppliciis possit avertere: quia plus timent carnales homines quod in praesenti Deus vindicat, quam illud quod futurum minatur.

3. Potest ergo esse dilectio in vindicante. Quod unusquisque in filio suo probat, cum eum in mores pessimos defluentem, severissima coercitione constringit, et tanto magis, quanto magis eum diligit, atque hoc modo corrigi posse arbitratur. Non autem occidunt filios quos diligunt homines, quando eos corrigere volunt: quia multi hanc vitam pro magno bono habent, et totum quare volunt educare filios suos, in hac vita sperant. Fideles autem atque sapientes homines, qui credunt esse aliam vitam meliorem, et quanta possunt ex parte noverunt; nec ipsi vindicant occidendo, cum filios suos volunt corrigere, quia in hac vita eos posse corrigi credunt: Deus autem qui novit quid cuique tribuat, vindicat occidendo in quos voluerit, sive per homines, sive occulto rerum ordine; non quia eos odit in quantum homines sunt, sed in quantum peccatores sunt. Nam in ipsis veteribus Libris legimus dictum Deo, Et nihil odisti eorum quae fecisti (Sap. XI, 25): sed omnia, sive per poenas sive per praemia justitia moderante disponit. Nonne apostolus Paulus Christianis fidelibus loquebatur, cum diceret: Probet autem se homo, et sic de pane edat, et de calice bibat. Qui enim manducat et bibit indigne, iudicium sibi manducat et bibit, non dijudicans corpus Domini. Propterea in vobis multi infirmi et aegri, et dormiunt sufficientes. Si autem nos ipsos dijudicarem, non utique dijudicaremur. Dum judicamur autem, a Domino corripimur, ne cum mundo damnemur (I Cor. XI, 28-32)? Ecce manifestum est Deum cum dilectione corrigere, non solum infirmitatibus et aegritudinibus, sed etiam mortibus temporalibus, eos quos non vult damnare cum mundo.

4. Attendant haec isti, et videant quomodo potuerint et impiae gentes dari in manus populi, quamvis adhuc carnalis, tamen unum Deum colentis, ut ab eo interficerentur; cum in eo tamen populo si qui essent spirituales, sine alicujus odio intelligerent dispensationem Dei: et quomodo non sit contrarium quod Dominus nobis in Evangelio praecepit, ut diligamus inimicos nostros:

But all this temporal vengeance terrifies weak minds, so that it may instruct those nourished under discipline, and be able to turn them away from eternal and ineffable punishments: because carnal men fear more what God punishes in the present, than what He threatens for the future.

3. There can, therefore, be love in the one taking vengeance. Every man proves this in his own son, when he restrains him with the most severe coercion when he falls into the worst habits, and all the more so the more he loves him and thinks that he can be corrected in this way. Yet men do not kill the sons whom they love when they wish to correct them, because many regard this life as a great good, and hope for everything for which they wish to educate their sons in this life. But faithful and wise men, who believe there is another and better life, and know it as far as they are able, do not themselves take vengeance by killing when they wish to correct their sons, because they believe they can be corrected in this life: But God, who knows what He should give to each, takes vengeance by killing those whom He wills, whether through men or through the hidden order of things; not because He hates them insofar as they are men, but insofar as they are sinners. For in the old Books themselves we read it said to God: "And you hate nothing of those things which you have made" (Wisdom 11:25); but He disposes all things, whether through punishments or through rewards, with justice moderating. Was not the Apostle Paul speaking to the faithful Christians when he said: "But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the chalice. For he who eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord. Therefore there are many infirm and sick among you, and many sleep. But if we judged ourselves, we should not indeed be judged. But while we are judged, we are corrected by the Lord, that we be not condemned with the world" (1 Cor. 11:28-32)? Behold, it is manifest that God corrects with love, not only with infirmities and sicknesses, but even with temporal deaths, those whom He does not wish to be condemned with the world.

4. Let these people attend to these things, and see how even impious nations could be given into the hands of a people, who though still carnal, nevertheless worshipped the one God, to be killed by them; since in that people, if there were any spiritual men, they would understand the dispensation of God without any hatred. And see how it is not contrary to what the Lord commanded us in the Gospel, that we love our enemies:

de quibus tamen promittit ipse vindictam, cum de illo iudice similitudinem inducit, qui quotidianas interpellationes viduae mulieris petentis ut se vindicaret, quamvis esset injustus, nec Deum timens, nec homines reverens, tamen sustinere non potuit, et audivit eam, ne ulterius taedium pateretur: ex cujus comparatione multo magis Deum, qui est benignissimus atque justissimus, dixit vindicare electos suos de inimicis eorum (Luc. XVIII, 2-8). Huic isti audeant objicere quaestionem, et dicant, si possunt: Quid est, quod jussisti ut inimicos nostros diligamus, et de illis nos vindicare disponis? An forte contra voluntatem suorum sanctorum facturus est, eos quos illi diligunt, puniendo atque damnando? Imo ipsi potius ab ista calumniosa caecitate convertantur ad Deum, et in utroque Testamento intelligant ejus voluntatem, ne in sinistra parte inveniantur inter eos quibus dicturus est Dominus: Ite in ignem aeternum, qui praeparatus est diabolo et angelis ejus. Esurivi enim et non dedistis mihi manducare (Matth. XXV, 41, 42); et caetera talia. Displicet enim istis miseris, quod Deus populo suo interficiendos tradidit inimicos; et ipsi panem mendicanti dari prohibent, non inimico, sed supplici. Intelligant potius sine odio esse posse vindictam, quam pauci intelligunt: et tamen quamdiu non intelligitur, tamdiu necesse est, ut lector in libris utriusque Testamenti magno labore aut errore jactetur, et putet contrarias sibi esse Scripturas.

5. Quam vindictam sine odio nondum Apostoli animo ceperant, quando irati eis a quibus non recipiebantur hospitio, quaesiverunt de Domino utrum vellet eos petere ignem de coelo, sicut Elias fecerat, quo igne homines inhospitales consumerentur. Tunc respondit eis Dominus, dicens eos nescire cujus spiritus filii essent, et quod ipse liberare venisset, non perdere (Luc. IX, 53-56): quoniam illi animo inimico perdere cupiebant eos, quos volebant igne consumi. Postea vero cum impleti essent Spiritu sancto, et perfecti facti essent, qui jam possent etiam inimicos diligere, acceperunt potestatem vindicandi, quia jam sine odio poterant vindicare. Qua potestate Petrus apostolus usus est in eo libro quem isti non accipiunt, quoniam manifeste continet Paracleti adventum, id est, consolatoris sancti Spiritus, quem lugentibus misit, cum ab eorum oculis ipse ascendisset in coelum. Consolator enim tristibus mittitur, secundum illam ejusdem Domini sententiam. Beati lugentes, quoniam ipsi consolabuntur (Matth. V, 5). Ipse etiam dicit: Tunc lugebunt filii sponsi, cum ablatus fuerit ab eis sponsus (Id. IX, 15). In illo ergo libro, ubi apertissime Spiritus sanctus, quem Dominus consolatorem promiserat, venisse declaratur (Act. II, 4), legimus ad sententiam Petri cecidisse homines, et mortuos esse virum et uxorem, qui mentiri ausi erant Spiritui sancto (Id. V, 1-10).

concerning whom, nevertheless, He Himself promises vengeance, when He introduces the parable of that judge who, although he was unjust and neither feared God nor respected men, could not bear the daily entreaties of the widow woman asking that he vindicate her, and heard her, lest he suffer further weariness; from the comparison with whom He said much more that God, who is most kind and most just, vindicates His elect from their enemies (Luke 18:2-8). Let these people dare to object a question to this, and say if they can: What is this, that You have commanded us to love our enemies, and You dispose to take vengeance on them? Or perhaps is He going to act against the will of His saints by punishing and condemning those whom they love? Rather let them be converted from this calumnious blindness to God, and understand His will in both Testaments, lest they be found on the left side among those to whom the Lord will say: "Go into the eternal fire, which was prepared for the devil and his angels. For I was hungry and you gave me not to eat" (Matt. 25:41, 42); and other such things. For it displeases these wretched people that God handed over enemies to be killed by His people; yet they themselves prohibit bread to be given to a beggar, not an enemy, but a suppliant. Let them rather understand that there can be vengeance without hatred, which few understand: and yet as long as it is not understood, it is necessary that the reader be tossed with great labor or error in the books of both Testaments, and think that the Scriptures are contrary to themselves.

5. This vengeance without hatred the Apostles had not yet conceived in their minds when, angry with those by whom they were not received with hospitality, they asked the Lord whether He wished them to call down fire from heaven, as Elijah had done, by which fire the inhospitable men might be consumed. Then the Lord answered them, saying that they knew not of what spirit they were sons, and that He Himself had come to deliver, not to destroy (Luke 9:53-56): since they, with an inimical mind, desired to destroy those whom they wished to be consumed by fire. But afterwards, when they were filled with the Holy Spirit and had become perfect, being now able even to love their enemies, they received the power of taking vengeance, because they could now take vengeance without hatred. This power Peter the Apostle used in that book which these people do not accept, because it manifestly contains the advent of the Paraclete, that is, of the Holy Spirit the Comforter, whom He sent to those who were mourning, when He Himself had ascended into heaven from their eyes. For a Comforter is sent to the sorrowful, according to that sentence of the same Lord. "Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted" (Matt. 5:5). He also says: "Then shall the children of the bridegroom mourn, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them" (ibid. 9:15). In that book, therefore, where it is most clearly declared that the Holy Spirit, whom the Lord had promised as a Comforter, has come (Acts 2:4), we read that at the sentence of Peter men fell down, and a husband and wife died, who had dared to lie to the Holy Spirit (ibid. 5:1-10).

Quod isti magna caecitate vituperant, cum in apocryphis pro magno legant, et illud quod de apostolo Thoma commemoravi, et ipsius Petri filiam paralyticam factam precibus patris, et hortulani filiam ad precem ipsius Petri esse mortuam; et respondent, quod hoc eis expediebat, ut et illa solveretur paralyti, et illa moreretur: tamen ad preces Apostoli factum esse non negant. Quis autem illis dixit, Non expediebat gentibus impiis interfici, quas traditas esse divinitus in manus populi Judaeorum irridentes mirari se fingunt? Cum autem illa non odio, sed bono animo Apostoli fecerint; unde isti convincunt animos virorum spiritualium qui in illo populo fuerunt, quod eos oderant, qui per ipsos divina justitia de hac vita jubebantur auferri? Compescant potius temeritatem suam, et non decipiant imperitos, quibus aut non vacat legere, aut nolunt legere, aut perverso animo legunt; et non attendunt et misericordiam et severitatem Dei, utriusque Testamenti litteris commendari. Nam de inimici dilectione, ut non reddatur malum pro malo, in veteribus Libris legitur: Domine Deus meus, si feci istud, si est iniquitas in manibus meis. Si reddidi retribuētibus mihi mala, decidam merito ab inimicis meis inanis (Psal. VII, 4 et 5). Quis hoc diceret, nisi qui sciret hoc Deo placere, ut malum pro malo nemo reddat? Sed hoc perfectorum est, ut non oderint in peccatoribus nisi peccata, ipsos autem homines diligant; et cum vindicant, non vindicent acerbitate saevitiae, sed moderatione justitiae; ne ipsa relaxatio peccati plus noceat peccatori, quam poena vindictae. Nec tamen hoc fecerunt justi homines; nisi auctoritate divina: ne quis arbitretur passim sibi esse permissum necare quem velit, aut iudicio persequi, aut poenis quibuslibet affligere. Aliquando autem aperte ponitur in Scripturis ipsa divina auctoritas, aliquando autem occultatur, ut et manifestis lector instruatur, et exerceatur obscuris.

6. Certe inimicum et persecutorem suum nimis ingratum et nimis infestum Saül regem accepit David in potestatem, ut ei faceret quod vellet; et elegit parcere potius, quam occidere. Non enim erat jussus occidere, sed neque prohibitus: imo etiam divinitus audierat se impune facere quidquid vellet inimico; et tamen tantam potestatem ad mansuetudinem contulit (I Reg. XXIV, 3-8, et XXVI, 8-12). Dicatur mihi quem timuit, cum interficere noluit. Nec hominem possumus dicere timuisse, quem acceperat in potestatem; nec Deum, qui dederat.

This these people censure with great blindness, although they read in the apocrypha as a great thing both that which I mentioned concerning the apostle Thomas, and that Peter's own daughter was made paralytic by her father's prayers, and the gardener's daughter died at the prayer of Peter himself; and they answer that this was expedient for them, that the one might be released from paralysis and the other might die: yet they do not deny that it was done at the prayers of the Apostle. Who, then, told them that it was not expedient for the impious nations to be killed, which they pretend to wonder at with derision, as being divinely delivered into the hands of the people of the Jews? Since the Apostles did those things not with hatred but with a good mind, whence do these people convince themselves that the minds of the spiritual men who were in that people hated those who were commanded by divine justice to be removed from this life through them? Let them rather restrain their rashness and not deceive the unskilled, who either have no time to read, or refuse to read, or read with a perverse mind; and who do not attend to both the mercy and the severity of God being commended in the letters of both Testaments. For concerning the love of an enemy, that evil should not be rendered for evil, it is read in the old Books: "O Lord my God, if I have done this, if there be iniquity in my hands. If I have rendered to them that repaid me evils, let me deservedly fall empty before my enemies" (Ps. 7:4-5). Who would say this, unless he knew that this pleased God, that no one should render evil for evil? But this belongs to the perfect, that they should hate nothing in sinners except their sins, but love the men themselves; and when they take vengeance, they should take vengeance not with the bitterness of cruelty, but with the moderation of justice, lest the very relaxation of sin harm the sinner more than the punishment of vengeance. Nor yet did just men do this except by divine authority, lest any one should think that it is permitted to him everywhere to kill whom he wishes, or to pursue with judgment, or to afflict with any punishments whatever. Sometimes, moreover, this divine authority is openly placed in the Scriptures, sometimes it is hidden, so that the reader may be instructed by the manifest and exercised by the obscure.

6. Certainly David received his extremely ungrateful and hostile enemy and persecutor, King Saul, into his power, to do with him as he wished; and he chose to spare him rather than to kill him. For he had not been commanded to kill him, but neither was he prohibited: indeed, he had even heard divinely that he might do with impunity whatever he wished to his enemy; and yet he applied such great power to gentleness (1 Sam. 24:3-8, and 26:8-12). Let it be told to me whom he feared, when he would not kill him. We cannot say that he feared a man, whom he had received into his power; nor God, who had given him that power.

Ubi ergo nec difficultas fuit occidendi, nec timor, dilectio profecit inimico. Ecce David ille bellator implevit praeceptum Christi, quod accepimus, ut diligamus inimicos. Atque utinam hoc imitarentur isti, qui humanum affectum misericordiae ad nescio quae crudelia deliramenta torserunt! Dum enim credunt panem plorare, quod fieri non potest, non eum porrigunt homini, quem plorantem vident. Fortassis dicant, sicut solent caeci jactante insana convicia, meliorem fuisse David qui pepercit inimico, quam Deum qui dederit ei occidendi potestatem: quasi vero Deus nescierit cui dederit hanc potestatem. Noverat utique voluntatem servi sui, sed ut caeteris etiam hominibus ad imitandum innotesceret ea quae in corde David jam Deo nota erat inimici dilectio, dedit illi in potestatem inimicum, quem nondum volebat occidi, propter certam rerum dispensationem, quam per illum impleri oportebat. Ita et David bonitas commendata est, ut haberent homines quod amarent; et Saülis regis malitia ad exitum digniorem dilata est, ut haberent homines quod timerent.

CAPUT XVIII.

1. De eo quod in Deuteronomio scriptum est: Si aure audieris vocem Domini Dei tui, benedictus es in agro tuo, benedictus es in prato tuo, benedictus fructus ventris tui, et fructus terrae tuae, et generationes jumentorum tuorum, et armentum boum tuorum, et grex ovium tuarum; benedictus es in introitu tuo et egressu (Deut. XXVIII, 1-6). Huic capitulo illud dicunt in Evangelio esse contrarium: Si quis vult me sequi, abneget semetipsum sibi, et tollat crucem suam, et sequatur me. Quid enim prodest homini, si totum mundum lucretur, animae autem suae detrimentum patiatur? Aut quam dabit homo commutationem pro anima sua (Matth. XVI, 24 et 26)? Sed ex illa regula ostenditur non esse contrarium, qua notum esse jam debet, carnali adhuc populo congruenter carnalia et temporalia praemia fuisse promissa, sed tamen ab uno Deo, cujus est creatura omnis et superior et inferior. Certe enim ipse Adimantus posuit testimonium de Evangelio, ubi Dominus ait: Nolite jurare, neque per coelum, quia thronus ejus est; neque per terram, quia scabellum est pedum ejus (Id. V, 35). Quod quidem et in veteribus Libris scriptum est: Coelum mihi thronus est, terra scabellum pedum meorum (Isai. LXVI, 1). Quid ergo mirum si bona throni sui dat spiritualiter sibi servientibus, et bona scabelli pedum suorum dat carnaliter sibi servientibus; cum spiritus superior sit, et caro inferior, sicut superiora sunt coelestia, et inferiora terrestria? Quanquam illa omnia, id est, ager, et pratum, et fructus ventris, et fructus terrae, et jumentorum, et armentum boum, et grex ovium possint etiam spiritualiter intelligi. Sed nunc ad rem non pertinet ista tractatio.

Where, therefore, there was neither difficulty in killing, nor fear, love benefited the enemy. Behold, that warrior David fulfilled the precept of Christ which we have received, that we should love our enemies. And would that these people would imitate this, who have twisted the human affection of mercy into I know not what cruel delusions! For while they believe that bread weeps, which cannot be, they do not offer it to a man whom they see weeping. Perhaps they might say, as the blind are accustomed to hurl insane reproaches, that David was better for sparing his enemy than God who gave him the power of killing: as if, indeed, God did not know to whom He gave this power. He certainly knew the will of His servant, but so that to other men also for imitation there might become known that love of the enemy which in David's heart was already known to God, He gave the enemy into his power, whom He did not yet wish to be killed, because of a certain dispensation of things which had to be fulfilled through him. Thus both David's goodness was commended, so that men might have something to love; and King Saul's malice was delayed for a more worthy end, so that men might have something to fear.

CHAPTER XVIII.

1. Concerning what is written in Deuteronomy: "If you will listen carefully to the voice of the Lord your God, you are blessed in your field, you are blessed in your meadow, blessed is the fruit of your womb, and the fruit of your land, and the generations of your cattle, and the herd of your oxen, and the flock of your sheep; you are blessed in your coming in and going out" (Deut. 28:1-6). To this chapter they say that which is in the Gospel is contrary: "If any man will follow me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For what does it profit a man if he gain the whole world, but suffer the loss of his own soul? Or what exchange shall a man give for his soul?" (Matt. 16:24 and 26). But by that rule it is shown not to be contrary, by which it ought already to be known that to a people still carnal, carnal and temporal rewards were suitably promised, yet by the one God, whose is every creature both superior and inferior. For certainly Adimantus himself placed a testimony from the Gospel, where the Lord says: "Swear not, neither by heaven, for it is His throne; nor by the earth, for it is His footstool" (ibid. 5:34-35). This indeed is also written in the old Books: "Heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool" (Isa. 66:1). What wonder is it then if He gives the goods of His throne to those serving Him spiritually, and the goods of His footstool to those serving Him carnally; since the spirit is superior and the flesh inferior, just as celestial things are superior and terrestrial things inferior? Although all those things, that is, the field, and the meadow, and the fruit of the womb, and the fruit of the land, and of the cattle, and the herd of oxen, and the flock of sheep, can also be understood spiritually. But this discussion does not pertain to the matter now.

Si autem in ipso Novo Testamento, cujus praemium et haereditas ad novum hominem pertinet, tamen et Dominus iisdem ipsis quos vult esse rerum temporalium contemptores, ut in Evangelio sibi serviant, promittit multiplicationem earundem rerum in hoc saeculo, dicens quod accipient in hoc saeculo centies tantum, in saeculo autem venturo vitam aeternam (Matth. XIX, 29): sicut etiam in veteri Scriptura dicitur, Fideli homini totus mundus divitiarum est (Prov. XVII, sec. LXX). Unde exultat Apostolus dicens, Quasi nihil habentes, et omnia possidentes (II Cor. VI, 10): si ergo in Novo Testamento praeter aeternam possessionem quae promittitur sanctis, hujus quoque possessionis quae transitura est, multiplicatio non subtrahitur, et tanto fit uberius, quanto contemptius possidetur; quanto magis in Veteri Testamento carnalis populi praemia talia esse debuerunt, ipso tamen uno et vero Deo gubernatore omnium temporum omnia pro tempore moderante et administrante.

2. Sed ne in solis Novi Testamenti libris isti arbitrentur haec esse contempta, audiant prophetam abjicientem talem felicitatem, et ad unum Dominum Deum confugiendum esse cantantem. Ita enim dicit: De gladio maligno erue me, et exime me de manu filiorum alienorum, quorum os locutum est vanitatem, et dextera eorum dextera iniquitatis. Quorum filii ipsorum velut novellae constabilitae in juventute sua. Filiae eorum compositae et ornatae velut similitudo templi. Cellaria eorum plena, eructantia ex hoc in hoc. Oves eorum fecundae, multiplicantes in exitibus suis; boves eorum crassae. Non est ruina sepis, nec exitus, neque clamor in plateis eorum. Beatum dixerunt populum cui haec sunt; beatus populus cujus Dominus Deus ipsius (Psal. CXLIII, 11-15). Attendant ergo quomodo irrideatur ista felicitas in hominibus impiis, et tota beatitudo in Deo solo inconcussa figatur. Illi enim dicunt beatum populum cui haec sunt; sed beatus populus cujus est Dominus Deus ipsius. Quod autem etiam illud contrarium esse putaverunt huic loco Veteris Testamenti, quod Dominus ait, Omnis qui confusus fuerit me aut verba mea in gente ista adultera et peccatrice, et Filius hominis confundetur illum, cum venerit in gloria Patris sui et laude sanctorum (Marc. VIII, 38); quod pertineat ad contemptum rerum temporalium non video. Quod si propterea pertinet, ne aliquis territus de talium rerum damnis, Christum confiteri aut erubescat, aut timeat, quid habent quod dicant? Dicimus ita esse ista munera Dei, ut tamen sint infima, et in comparatione salutaris confessionis, non solum amittenda, sed ultro etiam projicienda: carnalibus tamen haec amantibus, et nondum capientibus promissa coelestia, ne ab idolis et daemonibus ista peterent, utiliter a Domino Deo esse pollicita.

But if in the New Testament itself, whose reward and inheritance pertain to the new man, the Lord nevertheless promises to these very ones whom He wishes to be contemners of temporal things, so that they may serve Him in the Gospel, the multiplication of those same things in this world, saying that they shall receive a hundredfold in this world, and in the world to come life everlasting (Matt. 19:29): as it is also said in the old Scripture, "To the faithful man the whole world is full of riches" (Prov. 17:6, according to the LXX). Whence the Apostle exults, saying, "As having nothing, and possessing all things" (2 Cor. 6:10). If, therefore, in the New Testament, besides the eternal possession which is promised to the saints, the multiplication of this possession also which is to pass away is not withdrawn, and becomes all the more abundant the more contemptuously it is possessed; how much more in the Old Testament ought the rewards of a carnal people to have been such, the one and true God Himself, the governor of all times, nevertheless moderating and administering all things according to the time.

2. But lest they should think that these things are condemned in the books of the New Testament alone, let them hear the prophet casting away such happiness and singing that one must flee to the one Lord God. For he says thus: "Deliver me from the evil sword, and rescue me from the hand of strange children, whose mouth has spoken vanity, and their right hand is the right hand of iniquity. Whose sons are like new plants established in their youth. Their daughters are decked and adorned after the similitude of a temple. Their storehouses are full, overflowing from this into that. Their sheep are fruitful, multiplying in their goings forth; their oxen are fat. There is no breach of wall, nor going out, nor cry in their streets. They have called the people happy that has these things; but happy is the people whose Lord is its God" (Ps. 143:11-15). Let them attend, therefore, to how that happiness is derided in impious men, and all blessedness is fixed unshaken in God alone. For they call the people happy that has these things; but happy is the people whose Lord is its God. Moreover, as for their thinking that this also is contrary to this place of the Old Testament, which the Lord says: "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me or of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of man also shall be ashamed of him, when He shall come in the glory of His Father and the praise of the saints" (Mark 8:38); I do not see how it pertains to the contempt of temporal things. But if it pertains for this reason, lest anyone, terrified by the loss of such things, should either be ashamed or afraid to confess Christ, what have they to say? We say that these gifts of God are such that they are nevertheless the lowest, and in comparison with a salutary confession, they are not only to be lost, but even to be cast away voluntarily: yet to carnal people who love these things and do not yet grasp the celestial promises, they were usefully promised by the Lord God, lest they should seek them from idols and demons.

CAPUT XIX.

1. De eo quod scriptum est in Lege: Ego sum qui divitias do amicis meis, et paupertatem inimicis meis. Huic sententiae illud opponunt quod Dominus dicit, Beati pauperes spiritu, quoniam ipsorum est regnum coelorum (Matth. V, 3): et, Vae vobis divitibus, quia percepistis consolationem vestram (Luc. VI, 24). Sed cur nolunt et alia in Evangelio contueri? Ubi enim scriptum est, Beati pauperes spiritu, quoniam ipsorum est regnum coelorum; ibi sequitur, Beati mites, quoniam ipsi haereditate possidebunt terram. Ecce habent amicos Dei haereditate terrae divites fieri. Cum autem ad tantam egestatem dives ille redigitur, ut ab eo paupere quem neglexerat, digito brevi in aqua tincto arenti linguae suae humorem stillari deprecetur (Luc. XVI, 24), intelligant quomodo fiant pauperes inimici Dei, et id esse cognoscant quod in Lege scriptum est: Ego sum qui divitias do amicis meis, et paupertatem inimicis meis.

2. Nam istas divitias temporales et in veteri Scriptura esse contemptas et superius docui, et innumerabilibus locis qui legere voluerit, inveniet. Unde est etiam illud: Melius est modicum justo, super divitias peccatorum multas (Psal. XXXVI, 16). Et illud: Bonum mihi lex oris tui, super millia auri et argenti (Psal. CXVIII, 72). Et illud: Judicia Dei vera justificata in idipsum, desiderabilia super aurum et lapidem pretiosum multum (Psal. XVIII, 10). Et illud: Beatus vir qui invenit sapientiam, et immortalis qui videt prudentiam. Melius est enim illam mercari, quam auri et argenti thesauros. Pretiosior est autem lapidibus optimis, non resistit illi ullum malum; bene nota est omnibus appropinquantibus ei, et eis qui considerant eam diligenter. Omne autem pretiosum non est illi dignum (Prov. III, 13-15). Et illud: Propter hoc optavi, et datus est mihi sensus, et invocavi, et venit in me spiritus sapientiae. Et praeposui illam regnis et sedibus, et honestatem nihil esse duxi ad comparisonem ipsius. Nec comparavi illi lapidem pretiosum: quoniam omne aurum in comparatione illius arena est exigua, et tanquam lutum aestimabitur argentum ad illam (Sap. VII, 7-9). Haec isti si aut legerent aut non impie legerent, viderent omnia in utriusque Testamenti scripturis, et ad expetendum et ad fugiendum, et ad sumendum et ad rejiciendum sibi concordantia et suis gradibus ordinata.

CAPUT XX.

CHAPTER XIX.

1. Concerning what is written in the Law: "I am he who gives riches to my friends, and poverty to my enemies." To this sentence they oppose what the Lord says: "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 5:3); and, "Woe to you that are rich, for you have received your consolation" (Luke 6:24). But why do they refuse to look at other things in the Gospel? For where it is written, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven," there follows, "Blessed are the meek, for they shall possess the land by inheritance." Behold, they have the friends of God becoming rich by the inheritance of the land. But when that rich man is reduced to such great want that he begs from that poor man whom he had neglected, that a moisture might be distilled upon his parched tongue from a finger dipped in water (Luke 16:24), let them understand how the enemies of God become poor, and let them recognize that it is what is written in the Law: "I am he who gives riches to my friends, and poverty to my enemies."

2. For I have both shown above that these temporal riches were contemned even in the old Scripture, and anyone who wishes to read will find it in innumerable places. Whence is also that: "A little is better to the just, than the many riches of the wicked" (Ps. 36:16). And that: "The law of your mouth is good to me, above thousands of gold and silver" (Ps. 118:72). And that: "The judgments of the Lord are true, justified in themselves, more to be desired than gold and many precious stones" (Ps. 18:10-11). And that: "Blessed is the man who finds wisdom, and the immortal who sees prudence. For it is better to traffic in her, than in treasures of gold and silver. She is more precious than the finest stones, no evil resists her; she is well known to all who approach her, and to those who consider her diligently. All precious things are not worthy of her" (Prov. 3:13-15). And that: "For this I wished, and understanding was given to me; and I called, and the spirit of wisdom came into me. And I preferred her before kingdoms and thrones, and esteemed riches nothing in comparison with her. Neither did I compare unto her any precious stone: for all gold in comparison with her is a little sand, and silver shall be esteemed as clay beside her" (Wisd. 7:7-9). If these people either read these things or did not read them impiously, they would see all things in the scriptures of both Testaments, both to be sought and to be fled from, and to be taken up and to be rejected, concordant with each other and ordered in their own degrees.

CHAPTER XX.

1. De eo quod scriptum est in Lege: Si ambulaveritis in lege, et praecepta mea custodieritis; dabo pluvias tempore suo, et producet terra fructus suos, et arbores poma, et vindemiae tuae messibus succedent, et satio vindemiis: et saturabimini, et sedebitis in pace in terra vestra, et dormietis, et non erit qui vos terreat: et perdam omnem belluam ex terra vestra; et persequemini inimicos vestros, et cadent ante vos in gladio: et insequentur quinque ex vobis centum, et centum ex vobis persequentur decem millia, et concident inimici vestri ante vos in gladio: et veniam, et benedicam vos, et multiplicabo vos, et disponam vos. Manducabitis vetus quod inveteravit, et projicietis vetus ante novum (Levit. XXVI, 3-10). Jam neminem oportet postulare a nobis, ut haec ostendamus quam congruenter illi populo Deus promiserit. Multa enim de hac re diximus, et cui parva sunt, nimis tardus est. Sed tamen quod etiam huic loco de Novo Testamento dicunt esse contrarium: illud videlicet quod Dominus ait, Nolite portare aurum, neque argentum, neque nummos in zonis vestris; non peram in via, neque duas tunicas, neque calceamenta, neque virgam; dignus est enim operarius mercede sua (Matth. X, 9 et 10): quid mirum si haec Evangelistis donaverit? Numquid in hoc ministerium populus Judaicus vocabatur? Quae tamen omnia spiritualiter perscrutanda sunt, ne ipse Dominus hominibus impiis contra sua praecepta fecisse videatur, qui etiam oculos habebat, quibus ad necessarium victum pecunia portabatur (Joan. XII, 6). Nisi forte dicturi sunt in zonis habere pecuniam, peccatum esse; in oculis autem, non esse peccatum. Non autem ista jussa, sed permissa esse Apostolis, ex hoc intelligitur, quod apostolus Paulus manibus suis operatus victum quaerebat, non abusus ea potestate, sicut ipse loquitur, quam Dominus Evangelistis dedit (Act. XVIII, 3; I Cor. IV, 12; I Thess. II, 9, et II Thess. III, 8 et 9). Quod enim permittitur a Domino, etiam non facere licet: quod autem jubetur, nisi fiat peccatum est.

2. Addunt etiam de illo divite, cui Deus dixerat, Stulte, hac nocte a te animam tuam expetam; quae autem praeparasti, cujus erunt (Luc. XII, 20)? et dicunt non minus huic capitulo Legis esse contrarium: cum in isto inanitas irrita sit vanae laetitiae, qui incerta illa pro certis habuit; populo autem Israel certam faciebat illam pollicitationem omnipotentia pollicentis.

1. Concerning what is written in the Law: "If you walk in my law and keep my commandments, I will give you rains in their due season, and the earth shall yield her fruit, and the trees their apples, and the vintage shall reach unto the sowing, and the sowing unto the vintage; and you shall be filled, and shall sit in peace in your land, and shall sleep, and there shall be none to make you afraid; and I will take away every evil beast from your land; and you shall pursue your enemies, and they shall fall before you by the sword; and five of you shall pursue a hundred, and a hundred of you shall pursue ten thousand, and your enemies shall fall before you by the sword; and I will come and bless you, and will multiply you, and will dispose you. You shall eat the old which has grown old, and you shall cast away the old before the new" (Lev. 26:3-10). Now no one ought to require of us that we show how suitably God promised these things to that people. For we have said many things concerning this matter, and to him for whom they are too little, he is too slow. But yet as for what they say is contrary to this place in the New Testament: namely, what the Lord says, "Do not carry gold, nor silver, nor money in your belts; nor a scrip for the journey, nor two coats, nor shoes, nor a staff; for the workman is worthy of his meat" (Matt. 10:9-10); what wonder is it if He granted these things to the Evangelists? Was the Jewish people called to this ministry? All these things, however, are to be searched out spiritually, lest the Lord Himself should seem to impious men to have acted against His own precepts, who even had money boxes, in which money was carried for necessary food (John 12:6). Unless perhaps they are going to say that to have money in belts is a sin, but in money boxes it is not a sin. But that these were not commands but permissions given to the Apostles is understood from this, that the Apostle Paul sought food by working with his hands, not using that power, as he himself speaks, which the Lord gave to the Evangelists (Acts 18:3; 1 Cor. 4:12; 1 Thess. 2:9, and 2 Thess. 3:8-9). For what is permitted by the Lord, it is allowed also not to do; but what is commanded, unless it be done, it is a sin.

2. They also add concerning that rich man, to whom God had said, "Thou fool, this night I will require thy soul of thee; whose then shall those things be which thou hast prepared?" (Luke 12:20); and they say it is no less contrary to this chapter of the Law. Yet in that case it was the vanity of empty joy that was derided, because he held those uncertain things as certain; but to the people of Israel the omnipotence of the Promiser made that promise certain.

Unde apostolus Paulus scribens ad Timotheum, de divitibus saeculi hujus, quos noverat in Ecclesiae membris habere suum locum, ita loquitur: Divitibus hujus saeculi praecipe, non superbe sapere, neque sperare in incerto divitiarum, sed in Deo vivo, qui praestat nobis omnia abundanter ad fruendum: benefaciant, divites sint in operibus bonis, facile tribuant, communicent, thesaurizent sibi fundamentum bonum in futurum, ut apprehendant veram vitam (I Tim. VI, 17-19). Quis hic non intelligat non esse culpabile habere ista, sed amare et spem in eis ponere, et ea praeferre aut etiam conferre veritati, justitiae, sapientiae, fidei, bonae conscientiae, charitati Dei et proximi, quibus omnibus anima pia dives est in secretis suis coram oculis Dei? Sed ut diligatur Deus, qui diligentibus se ista cuncta et invisibilia et aeterna largitur, id est, se ipsum his omnibus plenum donat dilectoribus suis: ut ergo ipse diligatur, illo etiam tempore quo carnalis anima, carnis videlicet affectibus implicata, nisi temporalia desiderare non novit, persuadendum illi est, quod etiam ista Deus dat homini; quia et verum est, et utilissime creditur. Hoc populo Israel factum est per illas pollicitationes, quas imperitissime miseri derident, ut etiam in ipsis infimis rebus, quomodo possent, Deum diligere assuescerent, quamvis plus ibi operetur timor. Quae tamen omnia dona temporalia figurae sunt donorum aeternorum, et illa de inimicis victoria praesignat victoriam de diabolo et angelis ejus.

3. Et quod isti adjecerunt quasi contrarium Veteri Testamento, quod Apostolus loquitur, Deum non pugna et dissensione, sed pace delectari (I Cor. XIV, 33): sciant talem Deum praedicari in Scripturis illis, cui pacem suam nemo possit auferre; non qualem ipsi praedicant, qui timens ne irrueret bellum regionibus suis, membra sua longe misit, ut peregrina bella tolerarent, et postea liberari atque purgari victa et inquinata non possent. In natura vero humana, quae peccato in inferiora defluxit, ita Deus pace delectatur, ut non relinquat libramenta justitiae, nec pacem quam diligit velit calcari a peccantibus, sed amari a certantibus, apprehendi a victoribus, et ea carnalibus figurata promittere, spiritualibus aperta monstrare.

CAPUT XXI.

Whence the Apostle Paul, writing to Timothy concerning the rich of this world, whom he knew to have their place among the members of the Church, speaks thus: "Charge the rich of this world not to be high-minded, nor to hope in the uncertainty of riches, but in the living God, who provides us all things abundantly to enjoy; let them do good, let them be rich in good works, let them distribute easily, let them communicate, let them lay up for themselves a good foundation for the time to come, that they may lay hold on the true life" (1 Tim. 6:17-19). Who does not understand here that it is not culpable to have these things, but to love them and to place hope in them, and to prefer them or even compare them to truth, justice, wisdom, faith, a good conscience, and the charity of God and neighbor, with all of which a pious soul is rich in its secrets before the eyes of God? But so that God may be loved, who bestows all these both invisible and eternal things upon those who love Him—that is, He gives Himself full of all these things to those who love Him—so that He may be loved even at that time when the carnal soul, entangled in the affections of the flesh, knows not how to desire anything but temporal things, it must be persuaded that God gives even these to man; because it is both true and most usefully believed. This was done for the people of Israel through those promises, which the wretched people most unskillfully deride, so that even in those lowest things they might become accustomed, in whatever way they could, to love God, although fear operated more there. Yet all these temporal gifts are figures of eternal gifts, and that victory over enemies prefigures the victory over the devil and his angels.

3. And as for what these people have added as if contrary to the Old Testament, which the Apostle speaks, that God is delighted not by fight and dissension, but by peace (1 Cor. 14:33): let them know that such a God is preached in those Scriptures, whose peace no one can take away; not such a one as they preach, who fearing lest war should rush into his regions, sent his members far away, that they might endure foreign wars, and afterwards could not be delivered and purged, being conquered and defiled. But in human nature, which through sin has flowed down into lower things, God so delights in peace that He does not leave behind the scales of justice, nor does He wish the peace which He loves to be trodden under foot by sinners, but to be loved by those who strive, to be laid hold of by victors, and to promise those things figured to the carnal, and show them openly to the spiritual.

CHAPTER XXI.

De eo quod scriptum est in Deuteronomio: Maledictus omnis qui in ligno pependerit (Deut. XXI, 23). Licet saepe a Manichaeis ista quaestio ventilata sit, non video tamen quid habeat huic sententiae contrarium quod ex Evangelio Adimantus opponendum putavit, ubi Dominus ait. Si vis perfectus esse, vende omnia quaecumque possides, et divide pauperibus, et tolle crucem tuam, et sequere me (Matth. XIX, 21, et XVI, 24). Hic praeterquam quod crucem nominat, nihil attendit esse contrarium ei quod dictum est, Maledictus omnis qui in ligno pependerit: quasi vero talem crucem possit quisque tollere et sequi Dominum. Sed illa tollitur, cum sequimur Dominum, de qua dicit Apostolus: Qui autem Jesu Christi sunt, carnem suam crucifixerunt cum passionibus et concupiscentiis (Galat. V, 24). Tali enim cruce vetus homo, id est, vetus vita perimitur, quam de Adam traximus, ut quod in illo fuit voluntarium, in nobis fieret naturale. Quod ostendit Apostolus dicens: Fuimus et nos aliquando natura filii irae, sicut et caeteri (Ephes. II, 3). Si ergo vetus vita de Adam, unde et nomine veteris hominis vetus vita significatur; quid absurdum habet, quod in veterem hominem maledictum prolatum est, quem Dominus suspendit in ligno? Quia ex ipsa successionem mortalitatem gestavit, de virgine Maria mortaliter natus, habens carnem non peccatricem, sed tamen similitudinem gerentem peccati (Rom. VIII, 3); quia mori poterat, et mors de peccato est. Unde etiam est illud: Scientes quia vetus homo noster simul confixus est cruci cum illo, ut evacuetur corpus peccati (Id. VI, 6). Non ergo Dominus per linguam Moysi famuli Dei, sed mors ipsa meruit maledictum, quam Dominus noster suscipiendo evacuavit. Mors itaque illa pependit in ligno, quae per mulierem ad hominem serpentina persuasionem pervenit. Unde etiam serpentem, ad significationem ipsius mortis, Moyses in eremo exaltavit in ligno. Et quoniam a mortiferis cupiditatibus per fidem sanamur crucis Domini, qua cruce mors ligno suspensa est; propterea qui serpentum morsibus venenabantur, conspecto serpente qui fixus erat atque exaltatus in ligno, continuo sanabantur (Num. XXI, 9). Huic sacramento ipse Dominus attestatus est dicens: Sicut enim Moyses exaltavit serpentem in eremo, ita exaltari oportet Filium hominis (Joan. III, 14). Suscipiendo autem ignominiosissimum apud homines mortis genus Dominus noster, Jesus Christus, hoc est, mortem crucis, commendavit nobis dilectionem suam, ut merito Apostolus diceret, accendens nos in ejus charitatem: Christus nos redemit de maledicto Legis, factus pro nobis maledictum. Scriptum est enim: Maledictus omnis qui pendet in ligno (Galat. III, 13). Ut non solum nullam mortem, sed etiam nullum mortis genus Christiana libertas, sicut Judaica servitus, formidaret.

CAPUT XXII.

Of that which is written in Deuteronomy: Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree (Deut. 21:23). Although this question has often been ventilated by the Manichaeans, I do not see, however, what that which Adimantus thought should be opposed from the Gospel has contrary to this sentence, where the Lord says. If you wish to be perfect, sell all that you possess, and divide it among the poor, and take up your cross, and follow me (Matt. 19:21, and 16:24). Here, besides the fact that he names the cross, he observes nothing to be contrary to that which was said: Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree: as if indeed anyone could take up such a cross and follow the Lord. But that cross is taken up when we follow the Lord, of which the Apostle says: Those who are of Jesus Christ have crucified their flesh with its passions and lusts (Gal. 5:24). For by such a cross the old man, that is, the old life which we drew from Adam, is destroyed, so that what was voluntary in him became natural in us. Which the Apostle shows, saying: We also were once by nature children of wrath, even as the rest (Eph. 2:3). If, therefore, the old life is from Adam, whence also by the name of the old man the old life is signified; what absurdity does it have, that a curse was brought forth against the old man, whom the Lord suspended on the tree? Because from that very succession He carried mortality, being born mortally of the Virgin Mary, having not sinful flesh, but yet bearing the likeness of sin (Rom. 8:3); because He was able to die, and death is from sin. Whence also is that: Knowing that our old man was crucified together with Him, that the body of sin might be evacuated (Rom. 6:6). Therefore not the Lord, through the tongue of Moses the servant of God, but death itself deserved the curse, which our Lord by receiving it evacuated. That death, therefore, hung on the tree, which through the woman arrived at man by serpentine persuasion. Whence also Moses in the desert exalted the serpent on a tree, for a signification of that death. And since we are healed from deadly desires through the faith of the Lord's cross, by which cross death was suspended on a tree; for that reason those who were poisoned by the bites of serpents, having beheld the serpent which was fixed and exalted on the tree, were immediately healed (Num. 21:9). To this mystery the Lord Himself bore witness, saying: For as Moses exalted the serpent in the desert, so must the Son of Man be exalted (John 3:14). But by receiving the most ignominious kind of death among men, our Lord Jesus Christ, that is, the death of the cross, He commended His love to us, so that the Apostle might deservedly say, kindling us into His charity: Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us. For it is written: Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree (Gal. 3:13). So that Christian liberty might fear not only no death, but even no kind of death, as Jewish servitude did.

CHAPTER XXII.

De homine quem lapidari Deus jussit, qui sabbato inventus est ligna colligere (Num. XV, 35). Dominus in Evangelio ubi hominis manum aridam sanavit die sabbati (Matth. XII, 10-13), divinum opus fecit, non humanum; nec ab otio recessit qui jussit et factum est. Et ideo non est simile hoc factum ligna colligenti, quod facere cum inventus esset homo die sabbati, jussu Dei lapidatus est. De servili autem observatione sabbati, et de vindicta temporalis mortis, jam multa dicta sunt. Sicut enim tempore charitatis bonitas, sic tempore timoris severitas Dei maxime commendatur. Et cum adhuc non oporteret ante adventum Domini nudare populo legitimarum sacramenta figurarum, non invitabantur significata intelligere, sed jussa cogebantur implere: nondum enim Deo inhaerebant per spiritum, sed per carnem legi serviebant. Miror autem quod isti plangunt lapidatum hominem Dei praecepto, quia contra jussum Legis ligna collegit, et non plangunt arborem arefactam verbo Christi (Id. XXI, 19), quae contra nullum praeceptum fecerat; cum talem animam arboris esse credant, qualem hominis.

CAPUT XXIII.

De eo quod scriptum est: Mulier tua sicut vinea frondescens, et filii tui ut novellae olivarum in circuitu mensae tuae, et videbis filios filiorum tuorum; et scies quia hoc modo benedicatur homo qui timet Dominum (Psal. CXXVII, 2-4). Hoc per prophetam figurate dictum, et ad significationem Ecclesiae pertinere Manichaei non intelligunt, et putant contrarium esse quod in Evangelio Dominus de spadonibus ait, qui se ipsos castrant propter regnum coelorum (Matth. XIX, 12). Sed nos jam et de viro, et de uxore, et de spadonibus, quantum satis fuit, in tertio capitulo disseruimus.

CAPUT XXIV.

De eo quod scriptum est apud Salomonem: Imitare formicam, et intueri diligentiam ejus, quia ab aestatis tempore usque ad hiemem colligit sibi alimonias (Prov. VI, 6, 8). Neque hoc intelligunt Manichaei spiritualiter esse accipiendum, et putant praeceptum esse ut thesaurizemus in terra, aut etiam curemus haec horrea, quae sine ullo praecepto multum homines implere festinant. Et ideo illud Adimantus ex Evangelio dicit adversum esse huic sententiae, ubi Dominus ait: Nolite cogitare de crastino (Matth. VI, 34).

Of the man whom God ordered to be stoned, who was found gathering wood on the Sabbath (Num. 15:35). The Lord in the Gospel, where He healed a man's withered hand on the day of the Sabbath (Matt. 12:10-13), performed a divine work, not a human one; nor did He depart from rest who commanded and it was done. And therefore this deed is not similar to the one gathering wood, because for doing that, when the man had been found on the day of the Sabbath, he was stoned by the command of God. Moreover, concerning the servile observance of the Sabbath, and concerning the vengeance of temporal death, many things have already been said. For as in the time of charity the goodness of God is most commended, so in the time of fear His severity is most commended. And since it was not yet appropriate before the arrival of the Lord to lay bare the sacraments of the lawful figures to the people, they were not invited to understand the things signified, but were compelled to fulfill the things commanded: for they did not yet adhere to God through the spirit, but served the law through the flesh. Moreover, I wonder that these people bewail the man stoned by the precept of God, because he gathered wood against the command of the Law, and they do not bewail the tree withered by the word of Christ (Matt. 21:19), which had done nothing against any precept; since they believe the soul of a tree to be such as that of a man.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Of that which is written: Your wife like a leafy vine, and your children like olive plants around your table, and you shall see your children's children; and you shall know that in this way is the man blessed who fears the Lord (Psalm 127:2-4). The Manichaeans do not understand that this was said figuratively through the prophet, and that it pertains to the signification of the Church, and they think it is contrary to what the Lord says in the Gospel concerning eunuchs, who castrate themselves for the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 19:12). But we have already discussed husbands, and wives, and eunuchs, as much as was sufficient, in the third chapter.

CHAPTER XXIV.

Of that which is written in Solomon: Imitate the ant, and consider her diligence, because from the time of summer until winter she gathers food for herself (Prov. 6:6, 8). Neither do the Manichaeans understand that this is to be taken spiritually, and they think it is a precept that we should treasure up on earth, or even care for these barns, which without any precept men hasten much to fill. And therefore Adimantus says that that from the Gospel is contrary to this sentence, where the Lord says: Do not think about tomorrow (Matt. 6:34).

Sed neque hoc intelligunt ad id pertinere, ut temporalia non amemus, neque timeamus ne nobis desint necessaria, et propter ipsa conquirenda vel Deo vel hominibus serviamus. Nam si hoc ideo dictum est, ut non servetur panis in crastinum, magis hoc implent vagi Romanorum, quos Passivos appellant, qui annona quotidiana satiato ventre, aut donant statim quod restat, aut projiciunt, quam vel Domini discipuli, qui etiam cum ipso Domino coeli et terrae in terra ambulantes loculos habebant; vel Paulus apostolus, qui omnium terrenorum contemptor, sic tamen gubernavit ea quae praesenti vitae erant necessaria, ut etiam de viduis praeceperit dicens, Si quis fidelis habet viduas, sufficienter tribuat illis, ut non gravetur Ecclesia, quo veris viduis sufficere possit (I Tim. V, 16). Sed tamen illud de formica ita positum est, ut quemadmodum illa aestate colligit unde in hieme pascatur, sic unusquisque Christianus in rerum tranquillitate, quam significat aestas, colligat verbum Dei, ut in adversitate et tribulationibus, quae hiemis nomine significantur, habeat unde spiritualiter vivat. Non enim in pane solo vivit homo, sed in omni verbo Dei (Deut. VIII, 3, et Matth. IV, 4). Si autem hoc eos movet, quod in terra condit formica quod colligit; irascantur etiam illi thesauro quem Dominus in agro dicit inventum (Matth. XIII, 44).

CAPUT XXV.

De eo quod scriptum est in Osee: Da illis ventrem vacuum et ubera arida: mortifica semen ventris ipsorum, ne pariant (Osee IX, 14). Et haec prophetica locutio est utique figurata. Nam et ventrem non carneum intelligunt in Evangelio, cum legunt: Flumina aquae vivae fluent de ventre ejus (Joan. VII, 38). Et ubera quaedam habebat Apostolus, cum diceret, Lac vobis potum dedi, non escam (I Cor. III, 2): et iterum, Factus sum parvulus in medio vestrum, tanquam si nutrix fovens filios suos (I Thess. II, 7). Et Galatas ad carnalia declinantes iterum parturit, donec Christus in eis formetur (Galat. IV, 19). Et ideo huic propheticae sententiae non repugnat quod Adimantus posuit ex Evangelio, quod in resurrectione a mortuis, neque nubent, neque uxores ducent, neque morientur, sed sunt ut Angeli Dei (Matth. XXII, 30). Nam hoc est utique quod accipiunt etiam spadones, de quibus Isaías loquitur: Locum nominatum multo meliorem filiorum et filiarum, nomen aeternum dabo eis, inquit (Isai. LVI, 5).

But neither do they understand that this pertains to that, that we should not love temporal things, nor fear lest necessities be lacking to us, and for the sake of seeking them serve either God or men. For if this was said for this reason, that bread should not be kept for tomorrow, the vagabonds of the Romans, whom they call *Passivi*, fulfill this more, who, their belly being satisfied with the daily ration, either immediately give away what remains or throw it away, than either the Lord's disciples, who even while walking on earth with the Lord of heaven and earth had money bags; or the Apostle Paul, who, a despiser of all earthly things, nevertheless so governed those things which were necessary for the present life, that he even commanded concerning widows, saying: If any faithful person has widows, let him provide for them sufficiently, that the Church may not be burdened, that it may be able to suffice for the true widows (1 Tim. 5:16). But nevertheless, that concerning the ant is so placed, that just as she gathers in summer whence she may be fed in winter, so every Christian in the tranquility of things, which summer signifies, should gather the word of God, so that in adversity and tribulations, which are signified by the name of winter, he may have whence he may live spiritually. For man does not live by bread alone, but by every word of God (Deut. 8:3, and Matt. 4:4). If, however, this moves them, that the ant hides in the earth what she gathers; let them also be angry at that treasure which the Lord says was found in a field (Matt. 13:44).

CHAPTER XXV.

Of that which is written in Hosea: Give them a vacant womb and dry breasts: mortify the seed of their womb, lest they bring forth (Hosea 9:14). And this prophetic speech is certainly figurative. For they even understand the womb to be non-fleshly in the Gospel, when they read: Rivers of living water shall flow from his womb (John 7:38). And the Apostle had certain breasts, when he said: I gave you milk to drink, not meat (1 Cor. 3:2): and again: I became a little one in your midst, as if a nurse fostering her children (1 Thess. 2:7). And he brings forth again the Galatians who were declining to carnal things, until Christ be formed in them (Gal. 4:19). And therefore that which Adimantus placed from the Gospel does not repugn this prophetic sentence, that in the resurrection from the dead, they shall neither marry, nor lead wives, nor die, but are as the Angels of God (Matt. 22:30). For this is certainly what even the eunuchs receive, of whom Isaiah speaks: A named place much better than of sons and daughters, an eternal name I will give them, he says (Isa. 56:5).

Non ergo isti arbitrentur in solo Evangelio tale praemium promitti sanctis: ventremque vacuum et ubera arida et mortificatum semen, ne pariant, intelligant de his esse dictum de quibus dicit Apostolus, Sicut enim Iamnes et Iambres restiterunt Moysi, sic et isti resistunt veritati, homines mente corrupti, reprobi circa fidem: sed ultra non proficient; dementia enim eorum manifesta erit omnibus, sicut et illorum fuit (II Tim. III, 8 et 9). Cum ergo ultra non proficient, tunc habebunt ventrem vacuum, et ubera arida, et mortificatum semen. In qua sententia se isti tanquam in speculo dignentur inspicere.

CAPUT XXVI.

De eo quod scriptum est in Amos propheta: Si fieri potest ut ambulantes duo in via minime se agnoscant, et leo sine praeda ad catulum suum revertatur; si decidet avis sine aucupe in terram, si tendunt muscipulam sine causa, ut nihil capiant; si dabit sonum tuba in civitate, ut plebs non terreatur: ita etiam malum aliquod in civitate non perpetratur, quod Dominus non faciet (Amos III, 3-6). Malum hoc loco non peccatum, sed poena intelligenda est. Dupliciter enim appellatur malum; unum quod homo facit, alterum quod patitur: quod facit, peccatum est; quod patitur, poena. De poenis ergo loquebatur Propheta, cum hoc diceret. Divina enim providentia cuncta moderante et gubernante, ita homo male facit quod vult, ut male patiatur quod non vult. Sic autem isti accusant Prophetam ista dicentem, quasi in Evangelio non legerint: Nonne duo passeris asse veneunt, et unus ex his non cadit in terram sine Patris vestri voluntate (Matth. X, 29)? Ita ergo Deus malum facit, quod non ipsi Deo malum est, sed eis in quos vindicat. Itaque ipse, quantum ad se pertinet, bonum facit; quia omne justum bonum est, et justa est illa vindicta. Et ideo non est contrarium, quod Adimantus objicit dixisse Dominum: Arbor bona fructus bonos facit; mala autem arbor malos fructus facit (Id. VII, 17). Quamvis enim malum sit gehenna damnato; justitia tamen Dei bona est, et ipse fructus est ex arbore bona. Ille autem malis peccatorum suorum thesaurizat sibi iram in die irae et revelationis justi iudicii Dei, qui reddet unicuique secundum opera sua (Rom. II, 5, 6). Quanquam istae duae arbores manifestissime in similitudine duorum hominum positae sint, id est, justi et injusti: quia nisi quisque voluntatem mutaverit, bonum operari non potest.

Therefore let these people not think that such a reward is promised to the saints in the Gospel alone: and let them understand that the vacant womb and dry breasts and mortified seed, lest they bring forth, were said of those of whom the Apostle says: For just as Jannes and Jambres resisted Moses, so also these resist the truth, men corrupt in mind, reprobate concerning the faith: but they shall not proceed further; for their madness shall be manifest to all, as theirs also was (2 Tim. 3:8-9). When therefore they shall not proceed further, then they shall have a vacant womb, and dry breasts, and mortified seed. In which sentence let these people deign to behold themselves as if in a mirror.

CHAPTER XXVI.

Of that which is written in the prophet Amos: If it can be that two walking on the way should not recognize each other, and the lion should return to his cub without prey; if a bird shall fall into the earth without a fowler, if they stretch a snare without cause, so that they take nothing; if the trumpet shall give a sound in the city, so that the people are not terrified: so also some evil is not perpetrated in the city, which the Lord shall not do (Amos 3:3-6). Evil in this place is to be understood not as sin, but as punishment. For evil is called in two ways; one which man does, the other which he suffers: that which he does is sin; that which he suffers is punishment. The Prophet, therefore, was speaking of punishments when he said this. For with divine providence moderating and governing all things, man so does evil which he wills, that he suffers evil which he does not will. But in this way these people accuse the Prophet saying those things, as if they had not read in the Gospel: Are not two sparrows sold for an as, and one of these does not fall to the earth without your Father's will (Matt. 10:29)? In this way, therefore, God does evil, which is not evil to God Himself, but to those on whom He takes vengeance. Therefore He Himself, as far as pertains to Himself, does good; because everything just is good, and that vengeance is just. And therefore it is not contrary, which Adimantus objects that the Lord said: A good tree makes good fruits; but a bad tree makes bad fruits (Matt. 7:17). For although Gehenna be evil to the one damned; nevertheless the justice of God is good, and it is itself a fruit from a good tree. But he treasures up for himself wrath for the bad things of his sins in the day of wrath and of the revelation of the just judgment of God, who will render to each according to his works (Rom. 2:5, 6). Although those two trees are most clearly placed in the similitude of two men, that is, the just and the unjust: because unless each one shall have changed his will, he cannot work good.

Quod in nostra potestate esse positum, alio loco docet, ubi ait: Aut facite arborem bonam, et fructum ejus bonum; aut facite arborem malam, et fructum ejus malum. Illis enim hoc dicit, qui putabant se bona loqui posse, cum essent mali, hoc est, bonos fructus facere, cum essent arbores malae. Sic enim et subjungit: Hypocritae, quomodo potestis bona loqui, cum mali sitis (Matth. XII, 33, 34)? Mala ergo arbor fructus bonos facere non potest: sed ex mala fieri bona potest, ut bonos fructus ferat. Fuistis enim aliquando tenebrae, inquit Apostolus; nunc autem lux in Domino. Tanquam si diceret, Fuistis aliquando arbores malae, et ideo non poteratis tunc nisi malos fructus facere: nunc autem lux in Domino, id est, et jam facti arbores bonae, date fructus bonos; quod sequitur dicens, Sicut filii lucis ambulate: fructus enim luminis est in omni justitia et veritate; probantes quid sit beneplacitum Domino (Ephes. V, 8-10). Nam et in ipso Evangelii capitulo, si non studio malevolentiae fugeret Adimantus, posset advertere quomodo dicatur Deus malum facere. Ibi enim ait Dominus, quod etiam iste commemoravit: Omnis arbor quae non facit fructus bonos, excidetur, et in ignem mittetur (Matth. VII, 19). Haec sunt mala quae Deus facit, id est, peccatoribus poenas, quod in ignem mittet arbores, quae in malitia perseverantes fieri bonae noluerint, cum hoc ipsis arboribus malum sit. Deus autem, ut saepe dixi, non dat fructus malos, quia justitiae fructus est vindicta peccati.

CAPUT XXVII.

De eo quod in Isaia propheta scriptum est: Ego sum Deus qui facio pacem, et constituo mala (Isai. XLV, 7). Etiam hoc eadem regula solvitur. Non enim reprehendit Adimantus quod dixit Deus, facio pacem; sed quod dixit, constituo mala. Cum Paulus apostolus haec duo similiter uno in loco etiam latius tractaverit dicens, Vides ergo bonitatem et severitatem Dei: in eos quidem qui ceciderunt, severitatem; in te autem bonitatem, si permanseris in bonitate: alioquin et tu excideris, et illi si non permanserint in incredulitate, inserentur. Potens est enim Deus iterum inserere illos (Rom. XI, 22 et 23). In hoc sermone apostolico satis apparet bonitas Dei, secundum quam dixit Isaïas, Ego sum Deus qui facio pacem; et severitas, secundum quam dixit, constituo mala. Simul etiam ostendit in nostra potestate esse, ut vel inseri bonitate ipsius, vel excidi severitate mereamur. Non ergo est Isaïae contrarium Evangelium, sicut putat, vel potius putari cupit Adimantus, ubi Dominus ait: Beati pacifici, quia filii Dei vocabuntur (Matth. V, 9). Vel ex ipsa enim parte debuit agnoscere, etiam Isaïam scire filios Dei esse pacificos, quia per eum dixit Deus, Ego sum qui facio pacem.

Which he teaches to be placed in our power in another place, where he says: Either make the tree good, and its fruit good; or make the tree bad, and its fruit bad. For he says this to those who thought they could speak good things, although they were bad, that is, to make good fruits, although they were bad trees. For so he also subjoins: Hypocrites, how can you speak good things, since you are bad (Matt. 12:33, 34)? Therefore a bad tree cannot make good fruits: but from a bad one a good one can be made, so that it may bear good fruits. For you were once darkness, says the Apostle; but now light in the Lord. As if he were to say: You were once bad trees, and therefore you could not then but make bad fruits: but now light in the Lord, that is, and having already been made good trees, give good fruits; which follows saying: Walk as children of light: for the fruit of light is in all justice and truth; proving what is well-pleasing to the Lord (Eph. 5:8-10). For even in that very chapter of the Gospel, if Adimantus did not flee by the study of malevolence, he could perceive how God is said to do evil. For there the Lord says, which even he mentioned: Every tree which does not make good fruits shall be cut down, and cast into the fire (Matt. 7:19). These are the evils which God does, that is, punishments to sinners, that He will cast the trees into the fire, which persevering in malice should have been unwilling to be made good, since this is evil to the trees themselves. But God, as I have often said, does not give bad fruits, because the fruit of justice is the vengeance of sin.

CHAPTER XXVII.

Of that which is written in the prophet Isaiah: I am God who makes peace, and creates evil (Isa. 45:7). This also is solved by the same rule. For Adimantus does not reprehend that God said: I make peace; but that He said: I create evil. Whereas the Apostle Paul treated these two similarly in one place even more broadly, saying: You see, therefore, the goodness and severity of God: toward those indeed who fell, severity; but toward you goodness, if you remain in goodness: otherwise you also shall be cut off, and they, if they do not remain in unbelief, shall be grafted in. For God is powerful to graft them in again (Rom. 11:22 and 23). In this apostolic speech the goodness of God sufficiently appears, according to which Isaiah said: I am God who makes peace; and severity, according to which he said: I create evil. At the same time he also shows it to be in our power, that we may deserve either to be grafted in by His goodness, or cut off by His severity. Therefore the Gospel is not contrary to Isaiah, as Adimantus thinks, or rather desires to be thought, where the Lord says: Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called children of God (Matt. 5:9). For even from that very part he ought to have recognized that Isaiah also knows that the children of God are peacemakers, because through him God said: I am He who makes peace.

Sed cum in alia parte ad male intelligendum oculum fixit, in altera se ipse excaecavit. Quod si vellet alius similiter caecus dicere bonum esse Vetus Testamentum, ubi dicit Deus, Nolo mortem peccatoris, quantum ut revertatur et vivat (Ezech. XXXIII, 11); malum autem esse Novum Testamentum, ubi dicit Christus, Ite in ignem aeternum, qui praeparatus est diabolo et angelis ejus (Matth. XXV, 41): nonne in foveam cadens omnes qui se sequerentur, indoctos et Scripturarum ignaros in imperitiae caecitatem germinante malitia secum pariter praecipitaret? Qui autem oculo pio legit, et in Novo Testamento invenit quod isti accusant in Vetere, et in Vetere quod laudant in Novo.

CAPUT XXVIII.

1. De eo quod scriptum est in Isaia: Et factum est eo anno quo mortuus est Ozias rex, vidi Dominum sedentem in sede altissima; et plena erat domus gloriae ipsius, et in circumitu Seraphim stabant, senas alas habentes, et binis quidem operiebant faciem ipsius, binis vero pedes (Isai. VI, 1 et 2). Huic loco illud opponit Adimantus, quod ait Apostolus: Regi autem saeculorum invisibili honor et laus in saecula (I Tim. I, 17). In qua quaestione quaerendum est, quid ei visum fuerit; vel in illa visione Isaiae binas alas praetermittere, quibus volabant Seraphim, dicentes. Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus Deus sabaoth: vel in Apostoli verbis non totum dicere. Nam ita dicit Apostolus: Regi autem saeculorum invisibili, incorruptibili, soli Deo honor et gloria in saecula saeculorum. An forte timuit ne Trinitatis commemoratio commendaret Prophetam lectori, et aliquid magnum ibi latere suspicaretur? Ter enim dicitur, Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus Deus sabaoth. In Apostolo autem forte vidit, quod si dixisset, incorruptibili Deo; responderetur illi quod nunc istis dicimus: Quid ergo incorruptibili Deo factura erat gens tenebrarum, si cum ea pugnare noluisset? Aut si forte mendosos codices legerat, aut iste mendosus est ubi nos ipsum Adimantum legimus, non est diutius de re dubia disserendum: sed jam quaerendum est quomodo et Propheta dixerit vidisse se Deum in sede altissima, et apostolus Paulus verum dixerit, invisibilem Deum. Interrogo itaque istos utrum invisibilia possint conspici. Si dicunt posse; quid ergo calumniantur, si Deum invisibilem Propheta conspexit?

But while in the other part he fixed his eye for understanding evilly, in the other he blinded himself. For if another similarly blind should wish to say that the Old Testament is good, where God says: I do not want the death of the sinner, as much as that he should return and live (Ezek. 33:11); but that the New Testament is bad, where Christ says: Go into eternal fire, which was prepared for the devil and his angels (Matt. 25:41); would he not, falling into the pit with all who would follow him, plunge the untaught and those ignorant of the Scriptures into the blindness of unskillfulness, malice germinating? But he who reads with a pious eye, finds both in the New Testament what these people accuse in the Old, and in the Old what they praise in the New.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

1. Of that which is written in Isaiah: And it came to pass in that year in which king Uzziah died, I saw the Lord sitting on a very high throne; and the house was full of His glory, and in the circuit Seraphim were standing, having six wings each, and with two indeed they covered His face, and with two the feet (Isa. 6:1 and 2). To this place Adimantus opposes that which the Apostle says: But to the King of ages, invisible, honor and praise forever (1 Tim. 1:17). In which question it must be asked, what it seemed to him; either in that vision of Isaiah to pass over the two wings, with which the Seraphim were flying, saying. Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of sabaoth: or in the Apostle's words not to say the whole. For the Apostle says thus: But to the King of ages, invisible, incorruptible, to the only God honor and glory forever and ever. Or did he perhaps fear lest the commemoration of the Trinity should commend the Prophet to the reader, and some great thing should be suspected to lie hidden there? For three times it is said: Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of sabaoth. But in the Apostle perhaps he saw, that if he had said, "to the incorruptible God"; it would be answered to him what we now say to these people: What therefore was the nation of darkness going to do to the incorruptible God, if He had been unwilling to fight with it? Or if perhaps he had read faulty codices, or this one is faulty where we read Adimantus himself, one must not longer discuss a doubtful matter: but it must now be asked how both the Prophet said he saw God on a very high throne, and the apostle Paul said the truth, that God is invisible. I ask these people, therefore, whether invisible things can be beheld. If they say they can; why therefore do they calumniate, if the Prophet beheld the invisible God?

Si autem dicunt non posse; ipsi Apostolo potius calumnientur, si audent, qui ait: Invisibilia enim Dei, a constitutione mundi, per ea quae facta sunt, intellecta conspiciuntur (Rom. I, 20). Ipse enim dixit esse invisibilia; et ipse rursus dicit, conspiciuntur. Nonne hic coguntur fateri oculis corporeis esse invisibilia, menti vero esse visibilia? Sic igitur et Propheta Deum, qui corporaliter invisibilis est, non corporaliter, sed spiritualiter vidit.

2. Nam multa genera visionis in Scripturis sanctis inveniuntur. Unum, secundum oculos corporis; sicut vidit Abraham tres viros sub ilice Mambre (Genes. XVIII, 1), et Moyses ignem in rubo (Exod. III, 2), et discipuli transfiguratum Dominum in monte inter Moysen et Eliam (Matth. XVII, 2, 3): et caetera hujusmodi. Alterum, secundum quod imaginamur ea quae per corpus sentimus: nam et pars ipsa nostra cum divinitus assumitur, multa revelantur, non per oculos corporis, aut aures, aliumve sensum carnalem; sed tamen his similia, sicut vidit Petrus discum illum submitti e coelo cum variis animalibus (Act. XI, 5, 6). Ex genere est etiam istud Isaiae, quod imperitissime impii reprehendunt. Non enim Deum forma corporea circumterminat: sed quemadmodum figurate, non proprie, multa dicuntur; ita etiam figurate multa monstrantur. Tertium autem genus visionis est secundum mentis intuitum, quo intellecta conspiciuntur veritas atque sapientia: sine quo genere illa duo quae prius posui, vel infructuosa sunt, vel etiam in errorem mittunt. Cum enim ea, quae sive corporeis sensibus, sive illi parti animae quae corporalium rerum imagines capit, divinitus demonstrantur, non solum sentiuntur his modis, sed etiam mente intelliguntur, tunc est perfecta revelatio. Ex hoc tertio genere est visio illa quam commemoravi, dicente Apostolo, Invisibilia enim Dei, a constitutione mundi, per ea quae facta sunt, intellecta conspiciuntur. Hac visione videtur Deus, cum per pietatem fidei et per agnitionem Dei morum optimorum corda mundantur. Quid enim profuit Balthasari regi, quod manum scribentem ante oculos suos in pariete conspexit? Cui visioni quia non potuit adjungere mentis aspectum, quaerebat adhuc videre quod viderat. Tali autem acie luminis, qua ista intelliguntur, Daniel praeditus, mente vidit, quod ille viderat corpore (Dan. V). Rursus illa parte animi, quae imagines corporum capit, vidit somnium Nabuchodonosor rex: et quoniam non habebat idoneum oculum mentis ad melius videndum quod viderat, id est, ad intelligendum quod viderat, ideo ad interpretandum visum suum, aspectum quaesivit alienum, ejusdem scilicet Danielis: cui tamen aperienti ut certam accommodaret fidem, etiam ipsum somnium ut sibi diceretur exegit. Daniel autem revelante sancto Dei Spiritu, et quid ille vidisset in somnis ea parte vidit qua corporum capiuntur imagines, et quid significaret mente conspexit (Id. II).

If, however, they say they cannot; let them rather calumniate the Apostle himself, if they dare, who says: For the invisible things of God, from the constitution of the world, being understood through those things which were made, are beheld (Rom. 1:20). For he himself said they are invisible; and he again says, they are beheld. Are they not here compelled to confess that to the bodily eyes they are invisible, but to the mind indeed they are visible? Thus therefore even the Prophet saw God, who is corporally invisible, not corporally, but spiritually.

2. For many kinds of vision are found in the holy Scriptures. One, according to the eyes of the body; as Abraham saw three men under the oak of Mamre (Gen. 18:1), and Moses the fire in the bush (Exod. 3:2), and the disciples the transfigured Lord on the mountain between Moses and Elijah (Matt. 17:2, 3); and others of this kind. Another, according to that which we imagine of those things which we perceive through the body: for even that part of ours when it is assumed divinely, many things are revealed, not through the eyes of the body, or ears, or any other carnal sense; but nevertheless similar to these, as Peter saw that disk let down from heaven with various animals (Acts 11:5, 6). From this kind is even that of Isaiah, which the impious most unskillfully reprehend. For a bodily form does not circumscribe God: but just as many things are said figuratively, not properly; so also many things are shown figuratively. But the third kind of vision is according to the intuition of the mind, by which truth and wisdom are beheld as understood: without which kind those two which I placed first are either fruitless, or even send into error. For when those things which are demonstrated divinely, whether to the bodily senses or to that part of the soul which captures the images of bodily things, are not only perceived in these ways, but are also understood by the mind, then it is a perfect revelation. From this third kind is that vision which I commemorated, the Apostle saying: For the invisible things of God, from the constitution of the world, being understood through those things which were made, are beheld. By this vision God is seen, when through the piety of faith and through the recognition of God the hearts of best morals are cleansed. For what did it profit king Belshazzar, that he beheld the hand writing before his eyes on the wall? To which vision because he could not join the aspect of the mind, he sought still to see what he had seen. But Daniel, endowed with such a keenness of light by which those things are understood, saw in his mind what that one had seen in body (Dan. 5). Again, by that part of the mind which captures the images of bodies, king Nebuchadnezzar saw a dream: and since he did not have a suitable eye of the mind for seeing better what he had seen, that is, for understanding what he had seen, therefore for interpreting his vision, he sought the aspect of another, namely of that same Daniel: to whom nevertheless as he opened it, that he might accommodate a certain faith, he even exacted the dream itself to be told to him. But Daniel, the holy Spirit of God revealing it, both saw in that part by which the images of bodies are captured what that one had seen in dreams, and beheld in his mind what it signified (Dan. 2).

Non est autem propheta veri Dei et summi, qui oblata divinitus visa, vel solo corpore, vel etiam illa parte spiritus videt qua corporum capiuntur imagines, et mente non videt. Sed plerumque in Scripturis sic posita inveniuntur, quemadmodum visa sunt, non etiam quemadmodum intellecta sunt; ut mentis visio, in qua totus fructus est, exercendis lectoribus servaretur. Sed ex multis quae aperte sunt scripta, manifestatur nobis quomodo illa intellexerint, quae sic in libris posuerunt, quomodo figurate illis demonstrata sunt. Ad duo enim genera illa visionis pertinent figuratae demonstrationes: ad mentis autem, id est, ad intelligentiae visionem simplex et propria pertinet revelatio rerum intellectarum atque certarum. Omnia tamen haec genera mirificis et ineffabilibus distributionibus exhibet atque moderatur Spiritus sanctus summae incommutabilisque sapientiae. Sed isti miseri sunt qui calumniantur Prophetam dicenti quod Deum viderit, objicientes apostolicam sententiam, ubi invisibilem dixit. Si enim alter objiciat huic apostolico verbo evangelicum verbum, quo Dominus ait, Beati mundi cordes, quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt (Matth. V, 8); quomodo respondebunt posse invisibilem videri? Verbo enim premunt imperitos, et quatenus invisibilis Deus dictus sit, etsi cognoscunt, cognosci timent. Tanta est perniciēs animorum, qui cum vincere hominem volunt, ab errore vincuntur.

Moreover, he is not a prophet of the true and highest God, who sees the visions offered divinely, either by the body alone, or even by that part of the spirit by which the images of bodies are captured, and does not see with the mind. But for the most part they are found so placed in the Scriptures, as they were seen, not also as they were understood; so that the vision of the mind, in which the whole fruit is, might be reserved for exercising the readers. But from many things which are openly written, it is manifested to us how they understood those things, which they so placed in the books as they were demonstrated to them figuratively. For figurative demonstrations pertain to those two kinds of vision: but to the vision of the mind, that is, of understanding, pertains the simple and proper revelation of things understood and certain. Nevertheless the Holy Spirit of highest and incommutable wisdom exhibits and moderates all these kinds by wonderful and ineffable distributions. But these people are wretched who calumniate the Prophet saying that he saw God, objecting the apostolic sentence, where he called Him invisible. For if another should object to this apostolic word the evangelical word, by which the Lord says: Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God (Matt. 5:8); how will they answer that the invisible one can be seen? For by a word they press the unskillful, and although they know to what extent God is said to be invisible, they fear it to be known. Such is the destruction of souls, who when they wish to conquer a man, are conquered by error.