

SAINT AMBROSE OF MILAN

ON PARADISE

De Paradiso

SABBATISMUS

Saint Ambrose of Milan (340–397)
De Paradiso · On Paradise

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

[ON PARADISE.] 5

SAINT AMBROSE, BISHOP OF MILAN, ON PARADISE: ONE BOOK. (C) 7

CAPUT II. 11

CAPUT III. 15

CAPUT IV. 25

CHAPTER V. 27

CHAPTER VI. 33

CHAPTER VII. 39

CHAPTER VIII. 41

CHAPTER IX. 47

CHAPTER X. 53

CHAPTER XI. 57

CHAPTER XII. 61

CHAPTER XIII. 73

CHAPTER XIV. 79

CHAPTER XV. 85

[DE PARADISO.]

IN LIBRUM DE PARADISO ADMONITIO.

Librum de Paradiso ut Ambrosii primum esse opus non audemus asserere, ita illum in primorum ordinem referre haud quaquam dubitamus. Est quidem cur non aliter existimemus. Cum enim varia multiplicative doctrina referta sit ea lucubratio, illam primo statim anno, quo ut ipse aiebat (Lib. I Offic. 1), raptus est a tribunalibus atque administrationis infulis ad sacerdotium, composuisse vix cuiquam videatur. Verum non facile consentiemus eandem ultra insequentem annum esse rejiciendam; quandoquidem Vir sanctus epistola ad Sabinum a se, cum nondum esset veteranus sacerdos (Epist. 42), hoc idem opus jamdudum elucubratum commemorat. Id autem circiter annum reparatae salutis 375 contigisse hinc licet colligas, quod cum 374 ad episcopatum cooptatus sit Ambrosius, nihil videatur prohibere, quominus illi manum ultimam prius adjiceret, quam primam libris de Virginibus, quos nondum triennalis sacerdos (Lib. II de Virgin., circ. finem) scripsit, admoveret.

Hoc in libro de Paradiso disputat, ac perbrevis sacri textus expositione ostendit quid, qualis, et ubi fuerit (Cap. 1): quid egerint in eo primi parentes; qua fraude, quo ordine, qua arte (Ibid) a diabolo tentati in peccatum tandem lapsi sint. Praecipuam vero istic operam ponit in Apellis discipulis (Cap. 2, 5, 6 et seq.) qui foederis antiqui auctoritatem impugnabant, revincendis: sed per eorum, ut videtur, latus in Manichaeos, qui tum temporis Mediolanensem infestabant Ecclesiam, telum adigit, cum forte hactenus palam et aperto Marte illos aggredi non esset ausus. Vanas Apellistarum solvit argutias, et in eos tanto vehementius insurgit, quanto sollicitius formidabat, ne populo vigilantiae suae nuper commisso haereticorum fallaciis illuderetur. Non tamen sola haereticorum confutatione circumscribitur sancti Antistitis labor atque industria. Ad Judaeos quoque protenditur, quos ille opportunitatem nactus non levi brachio impetit ac debellat. Varias praeterea catholicorum hominum subinde sententias refert: at iis tantum modo subscribit, quas putat esse veriores.

[ON PARADISE.]

ADMONITION ON THE BOOK ON PARADISE.

While we do not dare to assert that the Book on Paradise was the first work of Ambrose, we certainly do not hesitate to place it among his earliest. Indeed, there is reason for us to think so. For since that labor is filled with varied and manifold doctrine, it would hardly seem to anyone that he composed it in the very first year in which—as he himself said (Book I, Offices, 1)—he was snatched from the tribunals and the insignia of administration to the priesthood. Yet we shall not easily agree that the same work should be deferred beyond the following year; since the holy man, in a letter to Sabinus when he was not yet a veteran priest (Letter 42), mentions that this same work had already been elaborated long before. You may gather that this happened around the year of restored salvation 375 from the fact that, since Ambrose was chosen for the episcopate in 374, nothing seems to prevent him from putting the final touch to it before applying his hand for the first time to the books *On Virgins*, which he wrote when he was not yet a priest of three years' standing (Book II, *On Virgins*, near the end).

In this book *On Paradise* he disputes and shows by a very brief exposition of the sacred text what, of what sort, and where it was (Chapter 1); what our first parents did in it; by what fraud, in what order, and by what art (*Ibid.*) they were tempted by the devil and finally fell into sin. He places his chief labor here in refuting the disciples of Apelles (Chapters 2, 5, 6, and following), who impugned the authority of the Old Covenant; but, as it seems, he strikes through their side at the Manichaeans, who at that time were infesting the Church of Milan, since perhaps he had not yet dared to attack them openly and in a declared war. He solves the vain subtleties of the Apellists, and rises against them all the more vehemently as he more anxiously feared lest the people recently committed to his vigilance should be deceived by the fallacies of the heretics. Yet the labor and industry of the holy Bishop is not circumscribed by the refutation of heretics alone. It is also extended to the Jews, whom he, having found the opportunity, attacks and overcomes with no light arm. Furthermore, he frequently reports various opinions of Catholic men, but he subscribes only to those which he thinks are truer.

Quin immo saepe saepius evenit, ut nulla earum non repudiata suam ipsius in medium proponere haud vereatur. Et his fortasse adducti sunt, qui disputationis titulum eidem huic operi adscripsere. Subjicitur quippe ad calcem antiquissimorum codicum Remensis Ecclesiae et Claromontani collegii, in illo quidem, explicit disputatio de Paradiso, in hoc autem, explicit Paradisi disputatio de servanda animae puritate. At vero in utroque inscribitur, Incipit domni Ambrosii de Paradiso, ubi vocem, disputatio, omissam esse ex verbis quibus finiuntur, conjicias. Verumtatem cum ab Augustino (Lib. II contra Jul. c. 5 et caet.) libri nomine non semel haec ipsa commentatio laudata fuerit, nobis veri videtur similis eandem ipsi inscriptionem ab Ambrosio inditam esse; atque adeo in memoratis codicibus vocem, disputatio, eo sensu, quo librum aut quodcumque scriptionis genus significat, intelligendam.

Porro illud non in promptu fuerit definire, num ea quae hoc in opere continentur, prius ad populum pronuntiata, postmodum in libro formam more suo concinnaverit Ambrosius. Id quidem ita habere haud male forsitan inde probaveris, tum quia in eo exstent bene multa quae ad informandos Christianorum mores pertineant, tum vel maxime quia tota disputatio videatur eo collineare, ut ne haeretici simplices mentes malitiosa interpretatione traducant. (Cap. 5) Verum cum aliorum Doctoris nostri operum, quae in libros et concionibus conversa sunt, characterem in hoc minime deprehendamus, statuendum est vel commentationem hanc nullo modo constare concionibus, vel certe istas in eum ordinem esse redactas, qui concionantem Ambrosium ne minimo quidem indicio redolet.

Hic autem non praetermittendum quaedam illum non tantum e Philonis Judaei libris Allegoriarum legis, ut putarunt nonnulli, desumpsisse, verum etiam ex ejusdem opere de mundi opificio. Sed praeterquam quod ea pauca sunt, et ad allegoricum Scripturae sensum pertinent, in iis ipsis Philonis mentem non verba consecratur, et quae apud illum auctorem Judaico spiritu inspersa fuerant, ea in sententiam Evangelicae congruentem christianae doctrinae admodum convertit Ambrosius.

SANCTI AMBROSII MEDIOLANENSIS EPISCOPI DE PARADISO LIBER UNUS. (C)

145 CAPUT I.

Quam difficile sit de paradiso disserere. Ejus tamen auctor, natura, situs, incola indicantur; et res ad mysterium sensum traducitur.

Indeed, it very often happens that, not having rejected any of them, he does not fear to propose his own in their midst. And perhaps by these things they were led who ascribed the title of "disputation" to this same work. For it is added at the end of the most ancient codices of the Church of Reims and the college of Clermont: in the former, "here ends the disputation on Paradise"; in the latter, "here ends the disputation of Paradise on the preservation of the purity of the soul." But in both it is inscribed, "Here begins the work of Lord Ambrose on Paradise," where you might conjecture that the word "disputation" was omitted from the words with which they end. Nevertheless, since this same commentary has been praised more than once by Augustine (*Against Julian*, Book II, ch. 5, etc.) under the name of a book, it seems to us more likely that the same inscription was given to it by Ambrose himself; and thus in the mentioned codices the word "disputation" is to be understood in the sense in which it signifies a book or any kind of writing.

Furthermore, it would not be easy to define whether those things contained in this work were first pronounced to the people and afterwards arranged by Ambrose in the form of a book according to his custom. One might perhaps not incorrectly prove that this is so from the fact that there are many things in it that pertain to the instruction of Christian morals, and most especially because the whole disputation seems to aim at this: that the heretics might not "lead astray simple minds by a malicious interpretation" (Chapter 5). Yet since we by no means detect the character of other works of our Doctor, which were converted into books from sermons, in this one, it must be determined either that this commentary in no way consists of sermons, or certainly that they were redacted into that order which does not smack of Ambrose preaching in even the slightest indication.

Here, however, it should not be omitted that he took certain things not only from the books of Philo the Jew, *Allegories of the Law*, as some have thought, but also from the same author's work *On the Creation of the World*. But besides the fact that these are few and pertain to the allegorical sense of Scripture, in these very things Ambrose follows Philo's mind, not his words, and those things which had been interspersed with a Jewish spirit in that author, Ambrose converted quite significantly into an opinion congruent with Evangelical Christian doctrine.

SAINT AMBROSE, BISHOP OF MILAN, ON
PARADISE: ONE BOOK. (C)
145 CHAPTER I.

How difficult it is to discourse on Paradise. Yet its author, nature, site, and inhabitant are indicated; and the matter is translated to a mystical sense.

1. Et plantavit Deus paradisum in Eden secundum Orientem: et posuit ibi hominem quem finxit (Gen. II, 8). De paradiso adoriundus sermo non mediocrem aestum nobis videtur incutere, quidnam sit paradisus, et ubi, qualisve sit, investigare et explanare cupientibus: maxime cum Apostolus sive in corpore, sive extra corpus nesciat, raptum se tamen dicat usque ad tertium coelum. Et rursus: Scio, inquit, huiusmodi hominem, sive in corpore, sive extra corpus nescio, Deus scit; quoniam raptus est in paradisum, et audivit ineffabilia verba, quae non licet homini loqui . . . Pro huiusmodi gloriabor, pro me autem non gloriabor, nisi in infirmitatibus meis: si enim voluero gloriari, non ero stultus: nam veritatem dico (II Cor. XII, 5 et 6). Ergo si huiusmodi paradisus est, ut eum solus Paulus, aut vir aliquis Pauli similis, cum in hac vita degeret, videre potuerit; idem tamen sive in corpore, sive extra corpus viderit, meminisse non possit; audierit tamen verba, quibus prohibitus sit vulgare quod audierat: quo tandem nos modo paradisi situm poterimus absolvere, quem nec videre potuimus: et si potuissemus videre, prohiberemur tamen aliis intimare 146? Simul cum Paulus extollere se revelationum sublimitate sit veritus, quanto magis nobis timendum est id sollicitius indagare, cujus etiam revelationi obnoxia sit periculo? Non igitur hylen hunc paradisum aestimare debemus; et ideo relinquamus Pauli esse secretum.

2. Tamen quoniam hic legimus in Genesi a Deo paradisum esse plantatum secundum Orientem, et ibi esse positum hominem, quem plasmavit Deus; istius paradisi auctorem jam possumus invenire. Quis est enim qui potuit fingere paradisum, nisi omnipotens Deus, qui dixit et facta sunt, numquam indigens eorum quae generari vellet? Ipse ergo plantavit paradisum de quo dicit Sapientia: Omnis plantatio quam non plantavit Pater meus, eradicabitur (Matth. V, 13). Bona angelorum plantatio, bona sanctorum. Sancti enim sub ficu et vite dicuntur in illo pacis futuri tempore, in quibus typus est angelorum (Micheae. IV, 4).

3. Ergo paradisus est plurima ligna habens, sed ligna fructifera, ligna plena succi atque virtutis, de quibus est: Exultabunt omnia ligna silvarum (Ps. XCV, 13); ligna semper florentia viriditate meritorum, sicut illud lignum quod plantatum est secus decursus aquarum, cujus folium non defluet; quia totus in eo fructus exuberat. Hic ergo paradisus est.

1. "And God planted a paradise in Eden toward the East: and there He placed the man whom He had formed" (Gen. 2:8). A discourse to be undertaken on Paradise seems to strike us with no small agitation when we desire to investigate and explain what Paradise is, and where, or of what sort it is: especially since the Apostle does not know whether he was in the body or out of the body, yet says that he was caught up as far as the third heaven. And again: "I know such a man," he says, "whether in the body or out of the body I know not, God knows; that he was caught up into Paradise, and heard ineffable words, which it is not lawful for a man to speak... For such a one I will glory, but for myself I will not glory, except in my infirmities: for if I should wish to glory, I shall not be a fool; for I speak the truth" (2 Cor. 12:5-6). If, therefore, Paradise is of such a sort that only Paul, or some man like Paul, could see it while living in this life; and yet that same man, whether he saw it in the body or out of the body, could not remember it; and heard words which he was forbidden to publish—how, finally, shall we be able to settle the site of Paradise, which we could not even see; and if we could have seen it, we would nevertheless be forbidden to intimate it to others? At the same time, since Paul feared to exalt himself by the sublimity of his revelations, how much more must we fear to search into that more anxiously, the very revelation of which is subject to danger? Therefore we ought not to consider this Paradise to be matter (*hylon*); and so let us leave it as Paul's secret.

2. However, since we read here in Genesis that Paradise was planted by God toward the East, and that the man whom God fashioned was placed there, we can already find the author of that Paradise. For who is he who could have fashioned Paradise except the almighty God, who spoke and they were made, never standing in need of those things which He wished to be generated? He Himself therefore planted the Paradise of which Wisdom says: "Every plant which my Father has not planted shall be rooted up" (Matt. 15:13). Good is the planting of angels, good that of the saints. For the saints are said to be under the fig tree and the vine in that future time of peace, in which there is a type of the angels (Micah 4:4).

3. Therefore Paradise is a place having many trees, but fruitful trees, trees full of sap and virtue, of which it is written: "All the trees of the forests shall exult" (Ps. 95:13); trees always blooming with the greenness of merits, like that tree which is planted near the courses of waters, whose leaf shall not fall away; because the whole fruit in it is exuberant. This, therefore, is Paradise.

4. Locus autem ejus in quo est plantatus, voluptas dicitur. Unde et sanctus David ait: Ex torrente voluptatis tuae potabis eos (Ps. XXXV, 9). Legisti enim: Quia fons procedit ex Eden, qui rigat paradysum (Gen., II, 10). 147 Haec igitur sanctorum ligna, quae plantata sunt in paradiso, quasi profluvio quodam torrentis spiritus irrigantur. De quo etiam alibi ait: Fluminis impetus laetificat civitatem Dei (Ps. XLV, 5). Est autem civitas illa quae sursum est Hierusalem libera, in qua diversa sanctorum merita pullularunt.

5. In hoc ergo paradiso hominem Deus posuit quem plasmavit. Intellige etiam quia non eum hominem qui secundum imaginem Dei est, posuit, sed eum qui secundum corpus. Incorporalis enim in loco non est. Posuit autem eum in paradiso sicut solem in coelo, expectantem regnum coelorum, quemadmodum creatura expectat revelationem filiorum Dei.

6. Ergo si paradysus est in quo erant exorta virgulta, videtur paradysus anima esse quae multiplicat semen acceptum, in qua virtus unaquaeque plantatur, in qua erat etiam lignum vitae, hoc est sapientia, sicut dixit Salomon (Sap. VII, 25): quia sapientia non de terra exorta est, sed de Patre. Est enim splendor lucis aeternae, et emanatio omnipotentis gloriae.

CAPUT II.

Quod lignum scientiae boni et mali in paradiso fuerit, quodque ibidem serpens exstiterit, non reprehendendum. Et quid nonnulli per serpentem, Adamum, et Evam intellexerint.

7. Erat autem lignum scientiae boni et mali in paradiso. Sic enim habes: Quia produxit Deus lignum speciosum ad aspectum, et bonum ad escam, et lignum vitae in paradiso, et lignum scientiae boni et mali (Gen. II, 9) Postea videbimus utrum et hoc lignum speciosum ad aspectum, et bonum ad escam fuerit sicut caetera. Eo enim loco hoc opportunius disputabitur, quo hominem ex hoc gustantem ligno invenimus esse deceptum. Interim nihil habemus, quod nunc reprehendere debeamus, etsi rationem scire non possimus. Neque enim in hac creatura mundi, si qua nobis difficilia intellectu videntur, et incomprehensibilia ingenio nostro, temerario quodam debemus condemnare iudicio, ut creaturam serpentium, venenatique alicujus animantis; quippe homines qua ratione singula quaeque sint facta intelligere adhuc et scire non possumus. Sic ergo et in Scripturis divinis non facile reprehendamus aliquid quod intelligere non possumus. Sunt enim plurima quae non nostro ingenio metienda sunt; sed ex altitudine divinae dispositionis et verbi sunt aestimanda.

Moreover, the place in which it is planted is called "pleasure" (*voluptas*). Whence also holy David says: "Thou shalt give them to drink of the torrent of thy pleasure" (Ps. 35:9). For you have read: Because "a fountain goes out from Eden, which waters Paradise" (Gen. 2:10). 147 These trees of the saints, therefore, which are planted in Paradise, are irrigated as if by a certain overflow of a torrent of the spirit. Of which also he says elsewhere: "The impetus of the river makes glad the city of God" (Ps. 45:5). Moreover, that city is the Jerusalem which is above, which is free, in which various merits of the saints have sprouted.

5. In this Paradise, therefore, God placed the man whom He fashioned. Understand also that He did not place that man who is according to the image of God, but him who is according to the body. For the incorporeal is not in a place. But He placed him in Paradise like the sun in heaven, awaiting the kingdom of heaven, just as the creature awaits the revelation of the sons of God.

6. Therefore, if Paradise is that in which the shoots had sprung up, Paradise seems to be the soul which multiplies the seed received, in which every virtue is planted, and in which there was also the tree of life, that is, wisdom, as Solomon said (Wisdom 7:25): because wisdom did not spring from the earth, but from the Father. For she is the brightness of eternal light, and the emanation of the glory of the Almighty.

CAPUT II.

That the presence of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in Paradise, and the existence of the serpent there, is not to be reprove. And what some have understood by the serpent, Adam, and Eve.

7. Now there was the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in Paradise. For so you have it: Because "God brought forth a tree beautiful to the sight, and good for food, and the tree of life in Paradise, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil" (Gen. 2:9) Afterward we shall see whether this tree also was beautiful to the sight and good for food like the others. For in that place it will be more opportunely disputed, where we find the man who tasted of this tree to have been deceived. In the meantime, we have nothing that we ought now to reprove, even if we cannot know the reason. For neither in this creation of the world, if any things seem difficult for us to understand and incomprehensible to our genius, ought we to condemn them with some rash judgment, as the creation of serpents or of some venomous living creature; since we as men cannot yet understand and know for what reason each single thing was made. Thus, therefore, also in the divine Scriptures let us not easily reprove anything which we cannot understand. For there are very many things which are not to be measured by our genius, but are to be estimated from the height of the divine disposition and word.

8. Pone enim, sine praejudicio tamen assertionis futurae, ideo tibi hoc lignum de scientia boni et mali displicere, quia posteaquam gustaverunt ex eo homines, intellexerunt se esse nudos; attamen ad consummationem divinae operationis dicam tibi et hoc lignum in paradiso exortum, et ideo a Deo esse permissum, ut possimus supereminentiam boni scire. Quomodo 148 enim si non esset scientia boni et mali, inter bonum et malum discretionem aliquam disceremus? Nam neque quod malum erat, malum judicaremus esse, nisi esset scientia boni: scientia autem boni esse non posset, nisi esset et bonum: neque rursus quod bonum erat, sciremus bonum esse, nisi esset scientia mali. Cape exemplum de ipsa conditione humani corporis. Nempe habet et amaritudinem quamdam fellis, quae si in commune prospicias, ad salutem hominis utilis invenitur. Ergo et quod malum putamus, plerumque non per omnia malum est, sed in commune utile. Nam sicut fel in parte est corporis, et tamen ad totius utilitatem corporis prodest: ita utilitati omnium profuturam sciens Deus scientiam boni et mali, in parte constituit, ut in commune prodesset.

9. Denique serpentem in paradiso invenis, utique non sine Dei voluntate generatum. In serpentis autem figura diabolus est. Fuisse enim diabolum in paradiso etiam Ezechiel propheta docet, qui dicit super principem Tyri: In voluptate, inquit, paradisi factus es (Ezech. XXVIII, 13). Principem autem Tyri in figura accipimus diaboli. Numquid et hinc accusabimus Deum, quia thesauros ejus altitudinis et scientiae absconditos in Christo et occultos comprehendere non possumus, nisi quos ipse revelare dignatus est? Revelavit tamen, ut sciamus etiam diaboli malitiam ad salutem prodesse hominibus. Non quod diabolus prodesse velit, sed quod malitiam ejus etiam repugnantis convertit nobis Dominus ad salutem. Denique hujus malitia Job sancti viri fecit esse virtutem et patientiam clariorem. Hujus malitia justitiam ejus exercuit; ut certaret et vinceret, et victoriam corona sequeretur. Nemo enim nisi qui legitime certaverit, coronatur. Joseph quoque castimonia numquam ad nostri memoriam pervenisset, nisi mulier domini ejus contubernalis ignitis diaboli spiculis incitata tentasset ejus affectum, nisi postremo affectasset ejus interitum, quo clarior esset castimonia viri, qui mortem pro castitate contempserit. Vis scire consilium Dei? Nempe diabolo auctore neces videntur justis hominibus praeparari, exerceri quoque parricidia filiorum; attamen Dominus etiam Abraham hac arte tentavit, ut immolari sibi filium ab eodem postulare.

8. For suppose—without prejudice, however, to future assertion—that this tree of the knowledge of good and evil displeases you because after men tasted of it they understood that they were naked; yet for the consummation of the divine operation I will tell you that this tree also sprang up in Paradise, and was therefore permitted by God, that we might be able to know the supereminence of good. 148 For how, if there were no knowledge of good and evil, would we learn any discretion between good and evil? For we would not judge that which was evil to be evil unless there were a knowledge of good: but the knowledge of good could not exist unless there were also good: nor again would we know that what was good was good, unless there were a knowledge of evil. Take an example from the very condition of the human body. Certainly it has also a certain bitterness of gall, which if you look at it in common, is found to be useful for the health of man. Therefore even what we think to be evil is for the most part not evil in all respects, but useful in common. For just as gall is in a part of the body, and yet profits the utility of the whole body: so God, knowing that the knowledge of good and evil would profit the utility of all, constituted it in a part, so that it might profit in common.

9. Finally, you find the serpent in Paradise, generated certainly not without the will of God. Moreover, the devil is in the figure of the serpent. For the prophet Ezekiel also teaches that the devil was in Paradise, who says concerning the prince of Tyre: "Thou wast in the pleasure of paradise" (Ezek. 28:13). Moreover, we take the prince of Tyre in the figure of the devil. Shall we also on this account accuse God, because we cannot comprehend the treasures of His height and knowledge hidden and concealed in Christ, except those which He Himself has deigned to reveal? Yet He has revealed them, so that we might know that even the malice of the devil profits men for salvation. Not that the devil wishes to profit them, but that the Lord converts his malice, even when he resists, to our salvation. Finally, his malice made the virtue and patience of the holy man Job more illustrious. His malice exercised Job's justice, so that he might strive and conquer, and the crown of victory might follow. For no one is crowned unless he has striven lawfully. The chastity of Joseph also would never have come to our memory, unless the wife of his lord, his house-mate, incited by the fiery darts of the devil, had tempted his affection, and finally had sought his destruction, whereby the chastity of the man who despised death for the sake of chastity might be more illustrious. Do you wish to know the counsel of God? Certainly deaths seem to be prepared for just men at the instigation of the devil, and parricides of sons to be practiced; yet the Lord also tempted Abraham by this art, so as to demand from him that his son be immolated to Him.

Qua tentatione Abraham fidelis est Domino comprobatus, quod a devotionis obsequio nec dilecti filii miseratione revocatus sit. Ita ergo et lignum scientiae boni et mali in paradiso; quod erat speciosum ad visum, et bonum ad escam specie videbatur. Non enim usu bonum ad escam erat; quoniam esca ejus videtur hominibus obfuisse. Ergo est quod singulis noceat, in commune prosit, ut Judae nocuit diabolus, sed praeter illum omnes apostolos coronavit, qui malitiae ejus tentamenta vicerunt.

149 10. Itaque neque dubitandum, neque reprehendendum quod in paradiso diabolus erat; quando quidem occludere sanctis non potuit iter, ne quis ascenderet. Neque enim justis habitationem incolatus tamquam possessor eripuit. Esto enim ut aliquos desides atque vitiosos ab incolatu supernae possessionis averterit, illud multo augustius multoque pulchrius quod sanctorum orationibus excludetur, cum completum fuerit illud: Videbam satanam sicut fulgur de coelo cadentem (Luc. IX, 18). Ergo non metuamus eum, qui eousque infirmus est, ut et ipse casurus sit in terram. Accepit quidem tentandi licentiam: sed non accepit copiam subruendi, nisi sua sponte labatur infirmus affectus, qui sibi auxilium non norit accessere. Et ideo qua fraude tentaverit primum hominem, quidve in homine putaverit esse tentandum, quo ordine, qua arte cognoscere opus est, ut cavere possimus.

11. Plerique tamen qui volunt in paradiso diabolum non fuisse, licet in coelo astantem cum angelis legerimus, ne nostro sermone videantur offendi, secundum suam accipiant voluntatem interpretationem istius lectionis. Namque ante nos fuit (Philo in lib. de Mundi opificio), qui per voluptatem et sensum praevaricationem ab homine memoraverit esse commissam, in specie serpentis figuram accipiens delectationis, in figura mulieris sensum animi mentisque constituens, quam αἰσθησιν vocant Graeci: decepto autem sensu praevaricatricem secundum historiam mentem asseruit, quam Graeci νοῦν vocant. Recte igitur in Graeco νοῦς viri figuram accepit, αἰσθησις mulieris. Unde et quidam Adam νοῦν terrenum interpretati sunt. Dominus autem virgines illas in Evangelio (Matth., XXV, 1 et seq.) accensis facibus vel extinctis exspectantes sponsi adventum pro sensibus vel integris sapientium, vel corruptis insipientium posuit. Nam si Eva, hoc est, sensus primae mulieris accensas habuisset facies, numquam praevaricationis suae nos crinibus implicasset, neque ex illa virtutis immortalitate cecidisset.

CAPUT III.

By which temptation Abraham was proven faithful to the Lord, because he was not recalled from the obedience of devotion even by the pity for his beloved son. Thus therefore also was the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in Paradise; which was beautiful to the sight and seemed good for food in appearance. For it was not good for food in use, since its food is seen to have harmed men. Therefore there is that which harms individuals but profits in common, as the devil harmed Judas, but beyond him he crowned all the apostles who overcame the temptations of his malice.

149 10. Therefore it is neither to be doubted nor reproved that the devil was in Paradise; since he could not block the way for the saints, lest anyone should ascend. For he did not snatch away the habitation of the indwelling from the just as a possessor. Let it be that he turned away some lazy and vicious ones from the indwelling of the heavenly possession; yet that is much more august and much more beautiful which shall be excluded by the prayers of the saints, when that word shall be fulfilled: "I saw Satan falling like lightning from heaven" (Luke 10:18). Therefore let us not fear him, who is so weak that he himself is about to fall to the earth. He received indeed the license of tempting, but he did not receive the power of overthrowing, unless a weak affection, which knows not how to summon help for itself, should fall of its own accord. And therefore it is necessary to know by what fraud he tempted the first man, or what he thought was to be tempted in man, in what order, and by what art, so that we might be able to beware.

11. Yet many who wish that the devil had not been in Paradise, although we read of him standing in heaven with the angels, lest they should seem to be offended by our discourse, let them receive an interpretation of this reading according to their own will. For there was one before us (Philo in his book *On the Creation of the World*), who mentioned that prevarication was committed by man through pleasure and sense, taking the figure of delight in the species of the serpent, and constituting the sense of the soul and mind in the figure of the woman, which the Greeks call *aisthesis*: moreover, he asserted that the mind, which the Greeks call *nous*, was the prevaricator according to the history, once the sense was deceived. Correctly, therefore, in Greek *nous* took the figure of the man, and *aisthesis* that of the woman. Whence also some have interpreted Adam as the earthly *nous*. Moreover, the Lord in the Gospel (Matt. 25:1 ff.) placed those virgins with lamps lit or extinguished for the senses of the wise, which are intact, or of the foolish, which are corrupted. For if Eve, that is, the sense of the first woman, had had her lamps lit, she would never have entangled us in the snares of her prevarication, nor would she have fallen from that immortality of virtue.

CAPUT III.

Per fontem paradisi, Christum; per quatuor flumina inde orientia, virtutes cardinales, et quatuor mundi aetates designari.

12. Est ergo paradisi terra quaedam fertilis, hoc est, anima fecunda, in Eden plantata, hoc est in voluptate quadam vel exercitata terra, in qua animae sit delectatio. Est etiam νοῦς tamquam Adam: est et sensus, tamquam Eva. Ac ne haberes quod ad infirmum retorqueres naturae, vel ad obnoxiam in tolerandis periculis conditionem, considera quae habeat anima ista subsidia.

13. Erat fons qui irrigaret paradysum. Qui fons, nisi Dominus Jesus-Christus! Fons vitae aeternae est, sicut et Pater; quia scriptum est: 150 Quoniam apud te fons vitae (Ps. XXXV, 10). Denique, flumina de ventre ejus fluent aquae vivae (Joan. VII, 38). Et fons legitur, et fluvius legitur qui irrigat paradisi lignum fructuosum, quod ferat fructum in vitam aeternam. Hic ergo fons, sicut legisti, fons enim inquit, procedit ex Eden, id est, in anima tua fons est. Unde Salomon ait: Bibe aquam de tuis vasis, et de puteorum tuorum fontibus (Prov. V, 15). Hic est fons qui procedit ex illa exercitata ut plena voluptatis anima: hic fons qui irrigat paradysum, hoc est, virtutes animae eminentissimo merito pullulantis.

Et dividitur, inquit, hic fons in quatuor initia. Nomen est uni Phison: hic est qui circuit omnem terram Evilath, ubi est aurum. Terrae autem illius aurum bonum est, ubi est carbunculus, et lapis prasinus. Et nomen secundo Geon: hic est qui circuit omnem Aethiopiam. Et flumen tertium Tigris: hic est qui vadit contra Assyrios. Et flumen quartum est Euphrates (Gen. II, 10 et seq.). Haec igitur quatuor sunt flumina, hoc est, secundum Hebraeos. Ganges autem secundum Graecos, qui fluit contra Indiam. Geon autem Nilus, qui circuit terram Aegypti vel Aethiopiam. Mesopotamia autem dicitur, quod Tigris et Euphrates incluserint eam; eo quod inter duo haec flumina constituta sit, quod etiam longe positus nomen ipsum et opinio communis expressit. Sed quemadmodum fons dicitur Sapientia Dei. Fons enim est secundum Evangelium dicens: Si quis sitit, veniat ad me, et bibat (Joan. VII, 37); fons est et secundum prophetam qui ait: Venite et edite de meis panibus, et bibite vinum quod miscui vobis (Prov. IX, 5). Sicut ergo fons vitae est Sapientia, fons gratiae spiritalis: ita fons virtutum est caeterarum, quae nos ad aeternae cursum dirigunt vitae.

That by the fountain of Paradise, Christ is designated; and by the four rivers rising from there, the cardinal virtues and the four ages of the world are signified.

12. Paradise, therefore, is a certain fertile land, that is, a fecund soul, planted in Eden, that is, in a certain pleasure or exercised land, in which there is delight for the soul. There is also nous as Adam, and sense as Eve. And lest you should have anything to retort concerning the weakness of nature or the condition subject to enduring dangers, consider what aids this soul has.

13. There was a fountain which watered Paradise. What fountain, except the Lord Jesus Christ! He is the fountain of eternal life, as is also the Father; because it is written: 150 "For with thee is the fountain of life" (Ps. 35:10). Finally, "rivers of living water shall flow from his belly" (John 7:38). Both "fountain" is read and "river" is read which waters the fruitful tree of Paradise, so that it may bear fruit unto eternal life. This fountain, therefore, as you have read—for it says, "a fountain goes out from Eden"—that is, the fountain is in your soul. Whence Solomon says: "Drink water from your own vessels, and from the fountains of your own wells" (Prov. 5:15). This is the fountain which proceeds from that soul which is exercised and full of pleasure; this fountain waters Paradise, that is, the virtues of the soul sprouting with most eminent merit.

"And it is divided," it says, "this fountain into four beginnings. The name of one is Pison: this is it which encircles all the land of Havilah, where there is gold. And the gold of that land is good; where there is bdellium (carbunculus), and the onyx stone (lapis prasinus). And the name of the second is Gihon: this is it which encircles all Ethiopia. And the third river is the Tigris: this is it which goes toward the Assyrians. And the fourth river is the Euphrates" (Gen. 2:10 ff.). These, therefore, are the four rivers, that is, according to the Hebrews. Moreover, it is the Ganges according to the Greeks, which flows against India. Gihon, moreover, is the Nile, which encircles the land of Egypt or Ethiopia. Moreover, it is called Mesopotamia because the Tigris and the Euphrates have enclosed it, in that it is situated between these two rivers; which fact the name itself and common opinion have expressed even to those situated far off. But just as Wisdom of God is called a fountain. For He is a fountain according to the Gospel, saying: "If any man thirst, let him come to me and drink" (John 7:37); He is also a fountain according to the prophet, who says: "Come and eat of my bread, and drink the wine which I have mixed for you" (Prov. 9:5). so as the fountain of life is Wisdom, the fountain of spiritual grace, so He is the fountain of the other virtues which direct us to the course of eternal life.

Ex hac igitur anima quae culta est, non ex ea quae inculta fons iste procedit, ut irriget paradisum, hoc est, quaedam diversarum fruteta virtutum, quarum sunt quatuor initia in quae sapientia ista dividitur. Quae sunt quatuor initia virtutum, nisi unum prudentiae, aliud temperantiae, tertium fortitudinis, quartum iustitiae (Plato, lib. IV, de Repub.)? Quae etiam sapientes istius mundi ex nostris assumpta, in suorum scripta librorum transtulerunt. Itaque sicut fons sapientiae, ita etiam flumina ista quatuor quaedam ex illo fonte manantia sunt fluentia virtutum.

15. Phison igitur prudentia est, and ideo habet bonum aurum, splendidum carbunculum, et prasinum lapidem. Aurum enim pro inventis prudentibus frequenter accipimus. Unde et Dominus per Prophetam ait: Dedi illi aurum et argentum (Oseae II, 8). Et David de prudentibus dicit: Si dormiatis inter meaios cleros, pennae columbae deargentatae, et posteriora dorsi ejus in specie auri (Ps. LXVII, 14): eo quod veteri et novo qui inhaeserit Testamento, in ipsa secreta sapientiae Dei disputationis possit ubertate procedere. Hoc ergo bonum aurum dicit, non illud monetale quod corruptibile ac terrenum est. Habet etiam splendidum, inquit, carbunculum, 151 in quo quidam animae nostrae vivit igniculus. Habet et prasinum lapidem, qui viride quiddam atque vitale coloris sui specie ostentare videtur. Virent enim arbusta quae vivunt, arescunt contra quaecumque moriuntur: viret terra dum floret, virent et semina dum prorumpunt. Et bene primo loco hic fluvius positus est Phison, qui secundum Hebraeos Phison dicitur, hoc est, oris mutatio; quia non unam gentem circumfluit, sed etiam per Lydiam fluit. Non enim angusta quaedam, sed dives utilitatum prudentia est, quae pluribus prosit. Ideo prima, ut si quis de paradiso fuerit egressus, velut quoddam eum prudentiae flumen excipiat, ne cito possit arescere: sed per hanc ad paradisum facile revertatur. Hic fluvius a multis hominibus frequentatur, pulchritudinemque et fertilitatem maximam habere perhibetur. Et ideo prudentia in specie hujus accipitur, quae plurimos fructus attulit in Domini adventu. Atque in extrema terrarum fluit, quia per Sapientiam omnes homines sunt redempti. Unde et dictum est: In omnem terram exivit sonus eorum, et in fines orbis terrae verba eorum (Ps. XVIII, 5).

16. Secundus est fluvius Geon, juxta quem lex data est Israelitis, cum essent in Aegypto constituti; ut ex Aegypto recederent, et succincti lumbos ederent agnum, quod insigne est temperantiae. Castos enim et sanctificatos oportet Domini pascha celebrare. Et ideo juxta istum fluvium legitima primo observantia constituta est; quia significat nomen hoc quemdam terrae hiatum. Sicut igitur terram et quaecumque vel purgamenta vel frondes in ea sunt, hiatus absorbet: ita castitas omnes corporis passiones abolere consuevit.

From this soul, therefore, which is cultivated, and not from that which is uncultivated, this fountain proceeds, so as to water Paradise, that is, certain groves of various virtues, of which there are four beginnings into which this wisdom is divided. Which are the four beginnings of the virtues, but one of prudence, another of temperance, a third of fortitude, a fourth of justice (Plato, Book IV, Republic)? Which things also the wise of this world, taken from ours, transferred into the writings of their own books. Therefore, just as there is a fountain of wisdom, so also these four rivers are certain streams of virtues flowing from that fountain.

15. Pison, therefore, is prudence, and therefore it has good gold, a splendid carbuncle, and an onyx stone (*lapis prasinus*). For we frequently take gold for prudent discoveries. Whence also the Lord says through the Prophet: "I gave her gold and silver" (Hosea 2:8). And David says of the prudent: "If you sleep among the midst of the lots, the wings of a dove are silvered, and the hinder parts of her back in the likeness of gold" (Ps. 67:14): because he who shall adhere to the Old and the New Testament can proceed in the very secrets of the wisdom of God with abundance of discourse. This, therefore, he calls "good gold," not that of the mint which is corruptible and earthly. It has also a splendid, he says, "carbuncle," 151 in which a certain little fire of our soul lives. It has also an onyx stone, which seems to display something green and vital in the species of its color. For the groves which live are green, whereas whatever things die wither away: the earth is green while it blooms, and the seeds are green while they burst forth. And well in the first place is this river Pison placed, which according to the Hebrews is called Pison, that is, "change of the mouth"; because it does not flow around one nation, but also flows through Lydia. For prudence is not some narrow thing, but rich in utilities, which may profit many. Therefore it is first, so that if anyone should go out from Paradise, a certain river of prudence might receive him, lest he should quickly be able to wither away: but through this he might easily return to Paradise. This river is frequented by many men, and is said to have the greatest beauty and fertility. And therefore prudence is taken in the species of this, which brought forth very many fruits at the coming of the Lord. And it flows to the ends of the earth, because through Wisdom all men have been redeemed. Whence also it was said: "Their sound has gone forth into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world" (Ps. 18:5).

16. The second is the river Gihon (Geon), beside which the law was given to the Israelites when they were situated in Egypt; that they should recede from Egypt, and having their loins girt should eat the lamb, which is an ensign of temperance. For it behooves those who are chaste and sanctified to celebrate the Pasch of the Lord. And therefore beside this river a legitimate observance was first constituted; because this name signifies a certain opening of the earth. As therefore an opening absorbs the earth and whatever refuse or leaves are in it, so chastity has been accustomed to abolish all the passions of the body.

Meritoque ibi primum observantiae constitutio, quia per legem absorbetur carnale peccatum. Bene ergo Geon, in quo figura est castitatis, circumire terram Aethiopicam dicitur; ut abluat corpus abjectum, et carnis vilissimae restinguat incendium. Aethiopia enim abjecta et vilis Latina interpretatione signatur. Quid autem abjectius nostro corpore? Quid tam Aethiopiae simile, quod etiam nigrum est quibusdam tenebris peccatorum?

17. Tertius est fluvius Tigris, qui vadit contra Assyrios, ad quem praevaricator Israel captivus est ductus. Hic fluvius dicitur velocior esse omnibus, quem incolunt Assyrii, hoc est dirigentes hoc enim significat interpretatio. Ergo quicumque fortitudine animi praevaricantia corporis vitia captivaverit dirigens ad superna, iste hujus fluminis similis aestimatur. Et ideo etiam fortitudo de illo qui est in paradiso, fonte emanat. Fortitudo autem quodam cursu rapido resistentia quaeque transverberat, nec aliquibus cursus ejus impedimentorum haeret obstaculis.

18. Quartus est fluvius Euphrates, qui Latine fecunditas atque abundantia fructuum nuncupatur, praeferens quoddam insigne iustitiae, quae omnem pascit animam. Nulla enim abundantiores 152 videtur fructus habere virtus, quam aequitas atque iustitia, quae magis aliis quam sibi prodest, et utilitates suas negligit communia emolumenta praeponens. Plerique Euphratem ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐφραίνεσθαι dictum putant, hoc est a laetando, eo quod hominum genus nullo magis quam iustitia et aequitate laetetur. Causam autem cur caeteri qua commeant fluvii, describuntur regiones locorum, qua Euphrates commeat, non describantur, illam accepimus, quia aqua ejus vitalis asseritur, et quae foveat atque augeat. Unde eum Auxen Hebraeorum et Assyriorum prudentes dixerunt: contra autem fertur esse aqua aliorum fluminum. Deinde quia ubi prudentia, ibi et malitia: ubi fortitudo, ibi et iracundia: ubi temperantia plerumque, ibi intemperantia est, aut alia vitia sunt: ubi autem iustitia, ibi concordia virtutum est caeterarum; ideo non ex locis qua fluit, hoc est, non ex parte cognoscitur. Non enim pars est iustitia, sed quasi mater est omnium. In his ergo fluminibus quatuor virtutes principales quatuor exprimuntur, quae veluti mundi istius incluserunt tempora.

19. Primum igitur tempus ex mundi principio usque ad diluvium prudentiae fuit, quo in tempore justi numerantur Abel a Deo justus dictus (Matth., XXIII, 35); et Enos, hoc est homo ad imaginem Dei factus, qui speravit invocare nomen Domini Dei; et Enoch qui dicitur Latine Dei gratia, raptus ad coelum; et Noe qui et ipse justus, et quaedam requiei directio.

And deservedly is the constitution of observance first there, because through the law carnal sin is absorbed. Well, therefore, is Gihon, in which is the figure of chastity, said to encircle the Ethiopian land; so that it may wash away the abject body, and extinguish the fire of the vilest flesh. For Ethiopia is signified by "abject and vile" in the Latin interpretation. But what is more abject than our body? What is so like Ethiopia, which is also black with certain darkneses of sins?

17. The third is the river Tigris, which goes toward the Assyrians, to which prevaricating Israel was led captive. This river is said to be swifter than all, which the Assyrians inhabit, that is "directing" (*dirigentes*), for this the interpretation signifies. Therefore whoever shall have captivated the prevaricating vices of the body by fortitude of soul, directing himself to the things above, he is estimated similar to this river. And therefore also fortitude emanates from that fountain which is in Paradise. Moreover, fortitude transfixes all resistances with a certain rapid course, nor does its course stick in any obstacles of impediments.

18. The fourth is the river Euphrates, which in Latin is called "fecundity" and "abundance of fruits," bearing a certain ensign of justice, which feeds every soul. For no virtue seems to have more abundant 152 fruits than equity and justice, which profits others more than itself, and neglects its own utilities, preferring common emoluments. Many think Euphrates is named *apo tou euphrainesthai*, that is, from "rejoicing," because the human race rejoices in nothing more than in justice and equity. Moreover, for the reason why the regions of the places through which the other rivers pass are described, but those through which the Euphrates passes are not described, we have received this: because its water is asserted to be vital, and such as may foster and increase. Whence the prudent of the Hebrews and Assyrians called it *Auxen* (Increaser): on the contrary, however, the water of other rivers is said to be [less so]. Furthermore, because where there is prudence, there is also malice; where fortitude, there also wrath; where temperance frequently, there is intemperance or other vices; but where there is justice, there is the concord of the other virtues; therefore it is not known from the places through which it flows, that is, it is not known from a part. For justice is not a part, but is as it were the mother of all. In these rivers, therefore, the four principal virtues are expressed, which have as it were enclosed the times of this world.

19. The first time, therefore, from the beginning of the world until the flood, was of prudence, in which time are numbered the just: Abel, called just by God (Matt. 23:35); and Enos, that is, man made to the image of God, who hoped to call upon the name of the Lord God; and Enoch, who in Latin is called "grace of God," caught up to heaven; and Noah, who himself was also just, and a certain direction of rest.

20. Secundum tempus est Abraham et Isaac et Jacob, reliquorumque numerus patriarcharum, in quibus casta et pura quaedam temperantia religionis effulsit. Immaculatus enim Isaac per repromissionem Abrahae datus est filius, non tam corporalis partus quam divinae munus praeferebat indulgentiae, in quo vere immaculati figura praecessit, ut Apostolus docet dicens: Quia Abrahae dictae sunt repromissiones, et semini ejus. Non dicit, et seminibus, tanquam in multis sed sicut in uno, et semini tuo, qui est Christus. (Gal. III, 16).

21. Tertium tempus est in Moysi lege et caeteris prophetis. Deficiet enim me tempus enarrando de Gedeon, Barac, Samson, David, Salomone, et Samuel, et caeteris prophetis, Anania, Azaria, Misael, et Daniel, Elia, et Elisaeo qui per fidem devicerunt regna, operati sunt justitiam, perceperunt repromissiones, obstruxerunt ora leonum, extinxerunt virtutem ignis, effugaverunt acies gladii, evaluerunt de infirmitate, fortes fuerunt in bello, castra ceperunt exterorum (Heb. XI, 32 et seq.). Non immerito igitur in his species fortitudinis est. Secti enim sunt, sicut infra habes, tentati, in mactatione gladii mortui. Circumierunt in caprinis pellibus, egentes, angustati, et doloribus afflicti, quorum meritis non erat dignus orbis. In solitudinibus errantes, in montibus, in speluncis, et in foveis terrae (Ibid. XVII, 38). Recte igitur in his speciem fortitudinis collocamus.

22. Secundum autem Evangelium digna est figura justitiae quia virtus est in salutem omni 153 credenti. Denique ipse Dominus ait: Sine modo; sic enim decet nos implere omnem justitiam (Matth., III, 15): quae quidem parens caeterarum est fecunda virtutum. In quo quamvis aliqua harum quas diximus, principalis est virtus; in eo etiam caeterae praesto sunt; quia ipsae sibi sunt connexae concretaeque virtutes. Nam utique Abel justus, et fortissimus ac patientissimus Abraham, et prudentissimi prophetae: Moyses vero eruditus in omni sapientia Aegyptiorum, majorem honestatem aestimavit Aegypti thesauris opprobrium Christi. Et quis sapientior quam Daniel? Salomon quoque sapientiam poposcit, et meruit. Dictum est ergo de quatuor virtutum fluminibus, quorum potus est utilis. Et quia Phison aurum bonum terrae, et carbunculum, et lapidem prasinum habere dictus est, hoc quoque quale sit consideremus.

23. Videtur enim nobis tamquam aurum bonum Enos, qui prudenter Dei nomen scire desideravit. Enoch autem qui translatus est, et mortem non vidit, carbunculus quidam est lapis boni odoris, quem operibus suis sanctus Enoch Deo detulit, gratiam quamdam factis, et moribus spirans. Noe vero tamquam prasinus lapis vitalem colorem praetulit. Siquidem diluvii tempore solus velut ad futurae constitutionis vitale semen in illa arca est reservatus.

20. The second time is of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and the number of the remaining patriarchs, in whom a certain chaste and pure temperance of religion shone forth. For immaculate Isaac was given as a son through the promise to Abraham, not so much a corporal birth as preferring the gift of divine indulgence, in whom the figure of the truly Immaculate preceded, as the Apostle teaches, saying: "Because to Abraham were the promises spoken, and to his seed. He does not say: 'and to seeds,' as of many, but as of one: 'and to thy seed,' which is Christ" (Gal. 3:16).

21. The third time is in the law of Moses and the other prophets. "For time would fail me in narrating of Gideon, Barak, Samson, David, Solomon, and Samuel, and the other prophets, Ananias, Azarias, Misael, and Daniel, Elijah and Elisha, who through faith conquered kingdoms, wrought justice, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the power of fire, escaped the edges of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, were made valiant in battle, took the camps of foreigners" (Heb. 11:32 ff.). Not undeservedly, therefore, is the species of fortitude in these. "For they were stoned," as you have below, "they were tempted, they died by the slaughter of the sword. They wandered about in goat-skins, being in want, distressed, and afflicted with sorrows, of whom the world was not worthy. Wandering in solitudes, in mountains, in dens, and in caves of the earth" (Heb. 11:37-38). Rightly, therefore, do we place the species of fortitude in these.

Moreover, according to the Gospel is the worthy figure of justice, because it is "the power unto salvation to everyone 153 that believeth." Finally, the Lord Himself says: "Suffer it now; for so it becometh us to fulfill all justice" (Matt. 3:15): which indeed is the parent of the other fecund virtues. In which although any of these which we have mentioned is the principal virtue, yet the others also are present; because the virtues themselves are connected and concrete among themselves. For certainly Abel was just, and Abraham most brave and most patient, and the prophets most prudent: moreover Moses, learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt. And who wiser than Daniel? Solomon also asked for wisdom and merited it. It has been said, therefore, concerning the four rivers of the virtues, the drinking of which is useful. And because Pison is said to have the good gold of the land, and the carbuncle, and the onyx stone, let us consider what sort of thing this also is.

23. For Enos seems to us as it were good gold, who prudently desired to know the name of God. Moreover Enoch, who was translated and did not see death, is as it were a certain carbuncle stone of good odor, which holy Enoch offered to God by his works, breathing a certain grace by his deeds and morals. But Noah as it were an onyx stone (prasinus lapis) preferred a vital color. Since in the time of the flood he alone was reserved in that ark as it were for the vital seed of the future constitution.

Ergo bene paradisu qui pluribus fluminibus irrigatur, secundum Orientem est, non contra Orientem, hoc est, secundum illum Orientem cui nomen est Oriens, id est secundum Christum, qui jubar quoddam aeternae lucis effudit, et est in Eden, hoc est, in voluptate.

CAPUT IV.

Virum in paradiso non factum, sed positum: at in eo factam mulierem, per quam ille fuit deceptus. Tum quid sit operari, et custodire?

24. Et apprehendit Deus hominem quem fecit, et posuit eum in paradiso operari, et custodire. Vides quoniam qui erat, apprehenditur. Erat autem in terra plasmationis suae. Apprehendit ergo eum virtus Dei inspirans processus et incrementa virtutis: denique in paradiso eum collocavit; ut scias apprehensum quasi afflatum divina esse virtute. Quo loci illud adverte, (Dist. 40, c. Illud autem) quia extra paradisu vir factus est, et mulier intra paradisu, ut advertas quod non loci, non generis nobilitate, sed virtute unusquisque gratiam sibi comparat. Denique extra paradisu factus, hoc est, in inferiori loco, vir melior invenitur; et illa quae in meliore loco hoc est, in paradiso facta est, inferior reperitur. Mulier enim prior decepta est, et virum ipsa decepit. Unde apostolus Petrus subjectas fortiori vasi mulieres sanctas viris suis velut dominis obedire memoravit (I Pet. III, 1). Et Paulus ait: Quia Adam non est seductus: mulier autem seducta in praevaricatione fuit (I Tim. II, 14). Et inde contuendum quia nemo debet sibi facile praesumere. Nam ecce illa quae in adjumentum facta est viro, praesidio virili indiget; quia vir caput est mulieris: ille autem qui adjumentum uxoris habiturum se esse credebat, lapsus est per uxorem. Unde nemo debet facile alteri se credere, nisi cuius virtutem probarit, nec arrogare sibi qui se pro auxilio putarit adscitum: sed magis si invenerit fortiozem cui se putabat esse praesidio, ab ipso gratiam mutuetur, sicut et viros mulieribus honorem impertire apostolus Petrus praecipit dicens: Viri similiter cohabitantes secundum scientiam tamquam infirmiori vasi muliebri impartientes honorem, tamquam cohaeredi gratiae vitae; ut ne impediatur orationes vestrae (I Pet. III, 7).

Therefore well is Paradise, which is irrigated by many rivers, toward the East, not against the East, that is, according to that East whose name is East (Oriens), that is according to Christ, who poured forth a certain radiance of eternal light, and is in Eden, that is, in pleasure.

CAPUT IV.

That the man was not made in Paradise, but placed there; but the woman was made in it, through whom he was deceived. Then what is "to work" and "to keep"?

24. "And God took the man whom He had made, and placed him in Paradise to work and to keep." You see that he who was, is taken. Moreover, he was in the land of his fashioning. Therefore the virtue of God took him, inspiring the processes and increments of virtue: finally He placed him in Paradise, so that you might know that he who was taken was as it were inspired by divine virtue. In which place observe this—because outside Paradise the man was made, and the woman inside Paradise—so that you may observe that not by nobility of place or of race, but by virtue everyone prepares grace for himself. Finally, made outside Paradise, that is, in an inferior place, the man is found better; and she who was made in a better place, that is, in Paradise, is found inferior. For the woman was deceived first, and she herself deceived the man. Whence the apostle Peter mentioned that holy women, subject to the stronger vessel, should obey their husbands as lords (1 Pet. 3:1). And Paul says: Because "Adam was not seduced: but the woman being seduced was in prevarication" (1 Tim. 2:14). And thence it is to be considered that no one ought easily to presume for himself. For behold she who was made for a help to the man, needs the masculine protection; because the man is the head of the woman: moreover he who believed that he would have the help of a wife, fell through his wife. Whence no one ¹⁵⁴ ought easily to trust himself to another, unless he has proven his virtue; nor should he who thought himself called for help arrogate it to himself: but rather if he has found a stronger one for whom he thought he would be a protection, let him borrow grace from him, just as the apostle Peter commands husbands to impart honor to their wives, saying: "Husbands similarly cohabiting according to knowledge, imparting honor to the womanly vessel as to the weaker, as to the co-heir of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered" (1 Pet. 3:7).

25. Ergo positus est in paradiso vir, facta est in paradiso mulier. Sed etiam tunc priusquam a serpente mulier deciperetur, habuit viri gratiam, quoniam de viro sumpta est: licet hoc sacramentum magnum sit, sicut Apostolus dixit (Ephes. V, 32). Et ideo causam vitae ex eo traxit. Ideoque de viro tantum Scriptura dixit, quia posuit eum in paradiso operari et custodire. Non idem est operari et custodire. In opere enim quidam virtutis processus est, in custodia quaedam consummatio operis deprehenditur; eo quod quasi consummata custodiat. Haec duo ab homine requiruntur, ut et operibus nova quaerat, et parta custodiat, quod est generale. Philon autem, quoniam spiritalia Judaico non capiebat affectu, intra moralia se tenuit, ut dice et haec duo quaeri, opera in agro, custodiam domus. Et quamvis paradisu operibus, inquit, ruralibus non egeret; tamen quia primus homo lex posteritatis futurus erat, ideo legitimi etiam in paradiso speciem suscepit laboris, ut nos ad operationem et custodiam debiti officii, et haereditariae successionis munus astringeret. Haec duo ergo a te exiguntur sive moraliter, sive spiritualiter. Quod etiam psalmus te propheticus docet, quia scriptum est: Nisi Dominus aedificaverit domum; in vanum laboraverunt qui aedificant eam. Nisi Dominus custodierit civitatem, in vanum vigilant qui custodiunt eam. (Ps. CXXVI, 1.) Vides illos laborare qui in operis sunt aedificationisque processu; istos vero vigilare qui jam custodiam perfecti operis receperunt. Unde et Dominus Apostolis quasi jam perfectioribus: Vigilate, inquit, et orate, ne intretis in tentationem (Matth. XXVI, 41); docens perfectae naturae munus, et plenae virtutis gratiam esse servandam, nec quemquam etiam perfectiorem nisi vigilaverit, sui debere esse securum.

CAPUT V.

Examinatur praeceptum de non edendo de ligno scientiae boni et mali, et circa id emergentes difficultates dissolvuntur.

26. Et praecepit Dominus Deus Adae dicens: Ex omni ligno quod est in paradiso ad escam, edes: de ligno autem quod est scientiae boni et mali non editis. Qua die autem manducaveritis ex eo morte moriemini (Gen., II, 16 et 17). Qua ratione, ubi praecepit ex omni ligno edendum, singulariter dixerit, Edes: ubi autem de ligno scientiae boni et mali pluraliter, Non edetis, dixerit, non otiosa quaestio. Verum si diligenter intendas, Scripturarum auctoritate absolvi potest.

25. Therefore the man was placed in Paradise, and the woman was made in Paradise. But even then, before the woman was deceived by the serpent, she had the grace of the man, because she was taken from the man: although this is a great sacrament, as the Apostle said (Eph. 5:32). And therefore she drew the cause of life from him. And therefore concerning the man only did Scripture say, that "He placed him in Paradise to work and to keep." It is not the same thing to work and to keep. For in work there is a certain process of virtue, in keeping a certain consummation of work is detected; in that he keeps things as it were consummated. These two things are required of man, that he both seek new things by works, and keep those already acquired, which is a general rule. Philo, however, because he did not grasp spiritual things with his Jewish affection, kept himself within moral things, so as to say that these two things are required: work in the field and custody of the house. And although Paradise did not need rural works, he says; yet because the first man was to be the law of posterity, therefore even in Paradise he took up the species of legitimate labor, so that he might bind us to the operation and custody of due office and the duty of hereditary succession. These two things, therefore, are required of you either morally or spiritually. Which also the prophetic psalm teaches you, because it is written: "Except the Lord build the house, they have labored in vain that build it. Except the Lord keep the city, they watch in vain that keep it" (Ps. 126:1). You see that those labor who are in the process of work and building; but those watch who have already received the custody of the perfected work. Whence also the Lord said to the Apostles as to those already more perfect: "Watch and pray, that you enter not into temptation" (Matt. 26:41); teaching that the gift of a perfect nature and the grace of full virtue is to be preserved, nor ought anyone, even the more perfect, unless he watches, to be secure of himself.

CHAPTER V.

The command not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is examined, and the difficulties emerging around it are resolved.

26. And the Lord God commanded Adam, saying: Of every tree that is in paradise you shall eat for food: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat. For on the day that you eat of it, you shall die the death (Gen. 2:16-17). It is no idle question why, where He commanded that they should eat of every tree, He said in the singular, "You shall eat" (Edes): but where He spoke of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, He said in the plural, "You shall not eat" (Non edetis). But if you attend diligently, it can be resolved by the authority of the Scriptures.

Quod enim bonum, hoc est faciendum: quod autem bonum et faciendum, consonans et adhaerens: quod vero turpe, hoc dissonans, incompositum, atque discretum est. Et ideo Dominus unitatem semper intendens, secundum unitatem praecepit. Denique unitatem operatur, qui fecit utraque unum. Nec solum utraque, sed etiam omnes unum. Omnes enim unum corpus, et unum spiritum esse nos iussit. Per omnia autem primogenitus, cum sit in unitate cum Patre, conjunctissimus Patri semper est: quia Verbum erat apud Deum. Denique ait: Ego et Pater unum sumus (Joan. X, 30); ut unitatem sibi majestatis et divinitatis cum Patre esse monstraret. Sed et nos unum esse praecepit, et suae naturae unitatisque similitudinem in nos gratiae adoptione transfudit dicens: Pater sicut ego et tu unum sumus, ita et isti nobis unum sint (Joan. XVII, 22). Ergo ubi bonum praecipit, tamquam ad unum praecipit dicens, Edes. Unitas enim praevaricari non potest. Ubi vero de ligno scientiae boni et mali, dicit non esse gustandum, quasi ad plures dicit, Non edetis. Quod enim prohibitorium est, tamquam pluribus imperatur. Ego tamen aliud puto, et quid futurum sit, in ipso jam Dei sermone reperio. De omni ligno gustandum Adae soli praecepit, quem servaturum sciebat: de ligno autem scientiae boni et mali non esse gustandum, jam non singulariter, sed pluraliter dicit. Sciebat enim praevaricaturam mulierem, et ideo per pluralitatem ostendit non servaturos, quia plurium discreta sententia est.

27. Et quantum ad Septuaginta virorum sententiam spectat, solutum est quod movebat. Sed quia Symmachus utrumque singulariter dixit, intelligimus id secutum, quia in lege quoque cum populum alloquitur Deus, singulariter loquitur, sicut habes: Audi, Israel, Dominus Deus tuus, Deus unus est (Deut. VI, 4); et, Diliges dominum Deum tuum (Ibid. 6). Nec mihi praejudicat Symmachi interpretatio, qui unitatem Patris et Filii videre non potuit; etsi aliquoties in sermone et Aquila et ipse confessi sint. Nec quisquam de eo quod praevaricaturum populum divina mandata singulariter alloquitur, putet superiori nostro obvium esse sermoni; quia populus Judaeorum etiam singulariter data praescripta violavit. Lex enim spiritualis est: et ideo alterum in sermone, alterum in praedestinatione, divino populum Deus alloquebatur oraculo. Denique ait: Non coques agnum in lacte matris suae (Exod. XXXIV, 26).

For that which is good, this is to be done: and that which is good and to be done is consonant and adhering: but that which is shameful, this is dissonant, uncomposed, and discrete. And therefore the Lord, always intending unity, commanded according to unity. Finally, He works unity, who made both one. And not only both, but even all one. For He commanded us all to be one body and one spirit. But in all things the first-born, since He is in unity with the Father, is most closely joined to the Father always: because the Word was with God. Finally He says: "I and the Father are one" (John 10:30); that He might show the unity of majesty and divinity with the Father to be in Him. But He also commanded us to be one, and He poured the likeness of His nature and unity into us by the adoption of grace, saying: "Father, as I and You are one, so let these also be one in Us" (John 17:22). Therefore, where He commands what is good, He commands as if to one, saying, "You shall eat." For unity cannot prevaricate. But where He says that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is not to be tasted, He speaks as if to many, "You shall not eat." For that which is prohibitory is commanded as if to many. I, however, think otherwise, and what is to be I find already in the very word of God. He commanded Adam alone to taste of every tree, whom He knew would keep it: but concerning the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, that it was not to be tasted, He now speaks not singularly, but plurally. For He knew that the woman would prevaricate, and therefore by the plurality He showed that they would not keep it, because the opinion of many is discrete.

27. And as far as the opinion of the seventy men [the Septuagint] is concerned, what moved us is resolved. But because Symmachus said both in the singular, we understand that this followed because in the Law also, when God addresses the people, He speaks in the singular, as you have it: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord your God is one God" (Deut. 6:4); and, "You shall love the Lord your God" (Deut. 6:6). Nor does the interpretation of Symmachus prejudice me, who could not see the unity of the Father and the Son; although sometimes in speech both Aquila and he himself confessed it. Nor let anyone think that because God addresses the people in the singular when they were to prevaricate the divine mandates, it is contrary to our superior discourse; because the people of the Jews violated even the prescriptions given in the singular. For the Law is spiritual: and therefore God addressed the people with a divine oracle, one thing in speech, another in predestination. Finally He says: "You shall not boil a lamb in its mother's milk" (Exod. 34:26).

28. Facilis abhinc praeceptorum coelestium series videretur; nisi quaestionem plurimi commoverent, quibus responderi oportet a nobis; ne simplices mentes malitiosa interpretatione traducant. Plerique enim, quorum auctor Apelles, sicut habes in trigesimo et octavo tomo ejus, has quaestiones proponunt: Quomodo lignum vitae plus operari videtur ad vitam, quam insufflatio Dei? Deinde si hominem non perfectum fecit Deus; unusquisque autem per industriam propriam perfectionem sibi virtutis adsciscit: nonne videtur plus sibi homo acquirere, quam ei Deus contulit? Tertium obijciunt: Et si homo non gustaverat mortem, utique quam non gustaverat, scire non poterat. Ergo si non gustaverat, nesciebat; si nesciebat timere non poterat. Frustra igitur Deus mortem pro terrore objecit, quam homines non timebant.

29. Discamus igitur quod ibi lignum vitae ubi etiam lignum scientiae boni et mali produxerit Deus. Habes enim quia produxit lignum vitae ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ παραδείσου, hoc est, in medio paradisi. Apud nos enim ἐν μέσῳ intelligitur, quod in medio produxerit. Ergo in medio paradiso et vita erat, et causa mortis. Intellige quia non homo fecit vitam, sed vel operando, vel custodiendo mandata Dei potuit invenire. Erat autem vita, sicut Apostolus dixit, abscondita cum Christo in Deo (Colos. III, 3). Homo ergo sive in umbra vitae erat propter vitam futuram, quia umbra est haec quae nunc nostra est vita in terra, sive in quodam pignore vitae erat, quia habebat insufflationem Dei. Habebat ergo pignus immortalitatis: sed in umbra vitae positus absconditam vitam cum Christo in Deo vulgari quodam tactu et aspectu videre et capere non poterat. Et si nondum peccator, non tamen incorruptae, inviolabilisque naturae; ut pote qui postea peccato lapsus est, nequaquam autem adhuc peccator. Denique in umbra vitae erat: qui autem peccatores sunt, in umbra mortis sunt. Peccatorum enim populus, sicut Esaias docet (Esai. IX, 2), sedebat in umbra mortis, cui lux orta per Dei gratiam, non per sua virtutis est meritum. Ergo inter insufflationem Dei, et escam ligni vitae nulla discretio. Nec hominem quis potest dicere plus sibi posse acquirere, quam divina ei largitate collatum est. Utinam acceptum tenere possemus. Labor etenim noster eo proficit, ut quae tributa sunt, resumamus. Tertium illud quod propositum est, quia qui mortem non gustaverat, mortem timere non poterat, facile ex communis naturae usu absolutionem habet.

28. The series of heavenly commands would henceforth seem easy; unless many moved a question, to which we must respond, lest they lead simple minds astray by a malicious interpretation. For many, whose author is Apelles, as you have it in the thirty-eighth volume of his work, propose these questions: How does the tree of life seem to work more toward life than the insufflation of God? Then, if God made man not perfect; and each one acquires for himself the perfection of virtue through his own industry: does not man seem to acquire more for himself than God conferred upon him? Thirdly they object: And if man had not tasted death, he certainly could not know what he had not tasted. Therefore, if he had not tasted it, he did not know it; if he did not know it, he could not fear it. In vain, therefore, did God set up death as a terror, which men did not fear.

29. Let us learn, therefore, that God produced the tree of life in the same place where He also produced the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. For you have it that He produced the tree of life **en mesō tou paradeisou**, that is, in the middle of paradise. For among us **en mesō** is understood to mean that He produced it in the middle. Therefore, in the middle of paradise there was both life and the cause of death. Understand that man did not make life, but either by working or by keeping the commands of God he was able to find it. But life was, as the Apostle said, "hidden with Christ in God" (Col. 3:3). Man, therefore, was either in the shadow of life because of the future life—since this life of ours now on earth is a shadow—or he was in a certain pledge of life, because he had the insufflation of God. He had, therefore, a pledge of immortality: but being placed in the shadow of life, he could not see or grasp the life hidden with Christ in God by any common touch or sight. And if he was not yet a sinner, he was not yet of an incorrupt and inviolable nature; as one who afterwards fell by sin, but was by no means yet a sinner. Finally, he was in the shadow of life: but those who are sinners are in the shadow of death. For the people of sinners, as Isaiah teaches (Isa. 9:2), sat in the shadow of death, for whom light arose by the grace of God, not by the merit of their own virtue. Therefore, there is no distinction between the insufflation of God and the food of the tree of life. Nor can anyone say that man can acquire more for himself than was conferred upon him by divine bounty. Would that we could hold what we have received! For our labor profits to this end, that we may resume what has been granted. That third point which was proposed—that he who had not tasted death could not fear death—easily has its resolution from the common use of nature.

Est enim natura insitum omnibus animantibus, ut etiam quae nondum sibi nocere experta sunt, quasi noxia reformident. Unde enim columbae in ipso sui ortu visit terror accipitris? Unde lupi ovibus formidabiles, pullis milvi? Quod si in iis quae irrationabilia sunt animantia, quidam de adverso genere animantium naturalis est terror, ut etiam irrationabilia sensum fugiendae mortis accipiant: quanto magis in primo homine rationis utique plenissimo, naturalis quaedam opinio mortis debuit esse vitandae.

CAPUT VI.

Alias plures dubitationes circa praeceptum Adae datum, et Evae praevaricationem excitatas diluit.

30. Rursus faciunt alias quaestiones hoc modo: Non semper malum est non obedire praecepto. Si enim bonum est praeceptum, honesta est obeditio: quod si improbum praeceptum, non obedire utile. Ergo non semper malum est non obedire praecepto: sed bono praecepto non obedire improbum est. Bonum autem est operatorium cognitionis boni et mali lignum; quandoquidem Deus et bonum et malum novit. Denique ait: Ecce Adam factus est tamquam unus nostrum (Gen. III, 22). Si igitur bonum est scientiam habere boni et mali, bona autem est quam etiam Deus habet, videtur qui interdicere eam hominibus, non recte interdicere; idque proponunt. Sed si intelligant quid sit cognoscere, quam vim habeat hoc verbum: si sic intelligant quemadmodum oportet, cognovit enim Dominus qui sunt ipsius (II Tim. II, 19); cognovit utique eos qui unum ex pluribus facti sunt, in quibus inhabitat, et in quibus perambulat. Cognoscere utique non in sola et perfunctoria scientia est, sed in eorum operatione quae oporteat fieri. Oportuit autem hominem obedire mandato, non obediendo autem praevaricatus est. Igitur qui non obedivit, erravit, quia praevaricatio peccatum est. Verumetiam si extenuare velint vim cognitionis, ut perfunctoriam scientiam boni et mali interdictam putent, in eo quoque praevaricationis culpa est non obeditum esse mandato; quia etiam tumultuariam scientiam boni et mali Dominus Deus putavit inhibendam.

For it is naturally implanted in all living things that they dread even those things which they have not yet experienced as harmful to them, as if they were noxious. For whence does the terror of the hawk visit doves at their very birth? Whence are wolves formidable to sheep, and kites to chicks? But if in those living things which are irrational there is a certain natural terror of an opposing kind of living thing, so that even irrational beings receive a sense of death to be avoided: how much more in the first man, who was certainly most full of reason, ought there to have been a certain natural opinion that death was to be avoided.

CHAPTER VI.

Many other doubts raised concerning the command given to Adam and the prevarication of Eve are dissolved.

30. Again they raise other questions in this manner: It is not always an evil thing not to obey a command. For if the command is good, obedience is honorable: but if the command is wicked, it is useful not to obey. Therefore, it is not always an evil not to obey a command: but it is wicked not to obey a good command. Now the tree that is the worker of the knowledge of good and evil is good; since God knows both good and evil. Finally He says: "Behold, Adam is become as one of us" (Gen. 3:22). If, therefore, it is good to have the knowledge of good and evil, and that which even God has is good, he who forbids it to men seems not to forbid it rightly; and this they propose. But if they would understand what it is to know, what force this word has: if they would understand it as it is proper, for "the Lord knew those who are His" (2 Tim. 2:19); He knew those, at least, who have become one out of many, in whom He dwells and in whom He walks. To know, certainly, is not in solitary and perfunctory knowledge, but in the operation of those things which ought to be done. Now it was proper for man to obey the mandate, but by not obeying he prevaricated. Therefore, he who did not obey erred, because prevarication is sin. But even if they wish to attenuate the force of knowledge, so as to think that a perfunctory knowledge of good and evil was forbidden, in that also there is the fault of prevarication in not having obeyed the mandate; because the Lord God thought that even a tumultuous knowledge of good and evil was to be inhibited.

31. Alia quaestio: Qui non cognoscit bonum et malum, nihil a parvulo distat. Parvuli autem apud justum judicem nulla est culpa. Justus autem operator mundi numquam parvulum vocasset in culpam, propter quod non cognoverat bonum et malum; quia parvulus sine ullo est crimine praevaricationis et culpae. Verum cum in superioribus dixerimus duplicem esse intellectum scientiae boni et mali, si perfunctoriam scientiam accipimus, utique falsum est quod nihil distet a parvulo, qui non cognovit bonum et malum. Si autem falsum est quod nihil distet a parvulo; ergo non parvulus Adam. Si non parvulus, ascribitur utique ei quasi non parvulo peccatum. Si peccatum ascribitur, sequitur poena peccatum; quia dignus invenitur poena, qui peccatum vitare non procuravit. Potest etiam fieri, ut etiam qui scientiam non habet boni et mali (Esa. VII, 16), parvulus non sit; quoniam priusquam scivit puer bonum et malum, non credidit malitiae. Et iterum habes: Quia priusquam sciat puer vocare patrem et matrem, accipiet virtutem Damasci, et spolia Samariae (Esa., VIII, 4). Perfectus ergo qui operatur bonum, etiam si boni et mali scientiam non adeptus sit, ut multi priusquam sciant legem, ipsi sibi lex sunt. Quod Apostolus priusquam diceret: Non concupisces (Rom. II, 14), malum esse concupiscentiam nesciebat. Peccatum non cognovi nisi per legem. Nam concupiscentiam nesciebam, nisi lex diceret: Non concupisces (Rom. VII, 7). Ad quam partem etiam puer potest esse perfectus jure naturae, priusquam sciat concupiscentiam crimen esse, vel concupiscentiae crimen admittat. Ergo secundum perfunctoriam scientiam noluit Deus hominem scire quod malum est, ne quasi imperfectus vitare non posset. Non obediendo autem mandato incurrimus in culpam: ergo culpam fatemur. Rursus autem si altam et profundam scientiam dicimus boni et mali, quae quidem profunda scientia perfectum facit; non statim autem parvulus qui ad altam et profundam scientiam pervenire non potuit, recte sicut non parvulus condemnatur.

32. Iterum quaestiones serunt: Qui nescit, inquiunt, bonum et malum, ne ipsum quidem novit esse malum non servare mandatum, nec ipsum bonum novit, quod est obedire mandato. Et ideo quia non noverat, venia, inquiunt, dignus fuit qui non obedivit, non condemnatione. Quae quidem quaestio de his absolutionem habet, quae ante memoravimus. Considerare enim potuit homo ex iis quae Deus ante ei contulerat, quod insufflationem Dei accepit, quod erat in paradiso voluptatis locatus, summam auctori obedientiam deferendam.

31. Another question: He who does not know good and evil differs in nothing from a small child. Now there is no fault in a small child before a just judge. But the just operator of the world would never have called a small child into fault on account of that which he did not know was good and evil; because a small child is without any crime of prevarication and fault. But since we have said in the previous sections that there is a double understanding of the knowledge of good and evil, if we accept a perfunctory knowledge, it is certainly false that he who did not know good and evil differs in nothing from a small child. If, however, it is false that he differs in nothing from a small child, then Adam was not a small child. If he was not a small child, sin is certainly ascribed to him as to one who is not a small child. If sin is ascribed, punishment follows sin; because he is found worthy of punishment who did not take care to avoid sin. It can also happen that even he who does not have knowledge of good and evil (Isa. 7:16) is not a small child; since before the boy knew good and evil, he did not believe in malice. And again you have it: "Because before the boy knows how to call his father and mother, he shall receive the strength of Damascus and the spoils of Samaria" (Isa. 8:4). Perfect, therefore, is he who works good, even if he has not attained the knowledge of good and evil, just as many before they know the law are a law unto themselves. Which the Apostle, before he said "You shall not covet" (Rom. 2:14), did not know that concupiscence was evil. Finally he says: "I did not know sin except through the law. For I did not know concupiscence, unless the law said: You shall not covet" (Rom. 7:7). To which part even a boy can be perfect by the law of nature, before he knows that concupiscence is a crime, or admits the crime of concupiscence. Therefore, according to perfunctory knowledge, God did not want man to know what is evil, lest he be unable to avoid it as one who is imperfect. But by not obeying the mandate we incur fault: therefore we confess fault. But again, if we speak of a high and profound knowledge of good and evil, which profound knowledge indeed makes one perfect; a small child who could not arrive at a high and profound knowledge is not immediately condemned as if he were not a small child.

32. Again they sow questions: He who does not know, they say, good and evil, does not even know it to be evil not to keep the mandate, nor does he know the good itself, which is to obey the mandate. And therefore because he did not know it, he was worthy of pardon, they say, who did not obey, not of condemnation. This question indeed has its resolution from those things which we mentioned before. For man was able to consider from those things which God had previously conferred upon him—that he received the insufflation of God, that he was placed in the paradise of pleasure (**paradyso voluptatis**)—that the highest obedience was to be deferred to the Author.

Et ideo si vim nesciebat boni et mali; tamen quia tantorum auctor dixerat de ligno scientiae boni et mali non esse gustandum, fidem praeceptori servare debuerat. Non enim ab eo peritia, sed fides exigebatur. Intelligebat utique Deum omnibus praeeminere, ideoque personam iubentis spectare debuerat. Et si non intelligebat vim qualitatemque jussorum; sciebat tamen praeceptori deferendam esse reverentiam. Habebat in natura hanc opinionem; etsi non habebat iudicium boni et mali. Denique et mulier serpenti dixit: Ex omni ligno paradisi manducabimus: de fructu autem ligni quod est in medio paradiso dixit Deus: Non manducabitis ex eo (Gen. III, 3). Ita ergo sciebat obediendum esse mandato, ut diceret: Ex omni fructu manducabimus, quod Dominus imperaverat: de ligno autem quod est in medio paradiso, imperatum a Deo dicit non esse gustandum, ne morte morerentur. Ergo quia scivit deferendum esse mandato, scivit utique malum esse praevaricari, et ideo juste praevaricata damnatur.

33. Accipite aliud: Si assumptio de ligno scientiae boni et mali ita operatoria erat, ut bonum et malum agnosceretur; quod videtur Scriptura ostendere, dum dicit: Quia ubi manducaverunt ambo, aperti sunt oculi eorum, et cognoverunt quod nudi essent (Ibid. 6 et 7); hoc est, aperti sunt oculi cordis, et cognoverunt turpe esse nudos se degere: sine dubio ubi gustavit mulier de ligno scientiae boni et mali, peccavit et se peccasse cognovit. Quae igitur se peccasse cognoverat, vel virum ad peccati communionem invitare non debuit. Illiciendo autem virum, et dando ei quod ipsa gustaverat, non vitavit, sed iteravit peccatum. Nam utique si vere rationem spectes, eum quem diligebat, non trahere ad consortium poenae, sed magis ab eo quod cognoverat ipsa esse peccatum, vel inscientem revocare debuerat; quamvis videatur haec mulier sciens quod post culpam in paradiso esse non posset, metuisse ne sola de paradiso ejiceretur. Denique absconderunt se ambo post culpam. Excludendam igitur se esse cognoscens, consortio viri quem diligebat, noluit defraudari.

34. Iterum accipe: Non cognitio mali malum est; sed cum actus implet malitiam. Non enim statim qui novit malum, quod malum est, facit: sed qui quod malum esse novit, operatur. Incentivum autem ad operandum quod malum est, aut iracundia, aut cupiditas esse consuevit. Nec statim necesse, ut habens scientiam mali faciat quod improbum novit, nisi aut iracundia aut cupiditate vincatur. Unde quod diximus incentivum peccandi, vel ira, vel cupiditas est, vel plerumque formido, licet ex formidine oriatur cupiditas, dum unusquisque vult vitare quod metuit.

And therefore if he did not know the force of good and evil; nevertheless, because the Author of so many things had said that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was not to be tasted, he ought to have kept faith with the teacher. For not skill (*peritia*), but faith (*fides*) was required of him. He understood, at least, that God was preeminent over all, and therefore he ought to have looked at the person of the one commanding. And even if he did not understand the force and quality of the commands, he knew, nevertheless, that reverence was to be deferred to the teacher. He had this opinion in his nature, even if he did not have the judgment of good and evil. Finally the woman said to the serpent: "Of every tree of paradise we shall eat: but of the fruit of the tree which is in the middle of paradise God has said: You shall not eat of it" (Gen. 3:3). Thus, therefore, she knew that the mandate was to be obeyed, so that she said: Of every fruit we shall eat, as the Lord had commanded: but concerning the tree which is in the middle of paradise, she says it was commanded by God not to be tasted, lest they should die the death. Therefore because she knew that obedience was to be deferred to the mandate, she knew at least that it was an evil to prevaricate, and therefore she is justly condemned for prevaricating.

33. Accept another point: If the taking of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was so operational that good and evil were recognized—as the Scripture seems to show when it says: "For when they both ate, their eyes were opened, and they knew that they were naked" (Gen. 3:6-7); that is, the eyes of the heart were opened, and they knew it was shameful to live naked—without doubt when the woman tasted of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, she sinned and knew that she had sinned. She, therefore, who had known that she had sinned, ought not at least to have invited the man to a communion in sin. But by enticing the man, and giving him that which she herself had tasted, she did not avoid, but repeated the sin. For indeed, if you truly look at reason, she ought not to have drawn him whom she loved to a consortium of punishment, but rather she ought to have recalled him, even in his ignorance, from that which she herself had recognized to be sin; although this woman seems, knowing that after the fault she could not be in paradise, to have feared lest she alone be cast out of paradise. Finally they both hid themselves after the fault. Recognizing, therefore, that she was to be excluded, she did not wish to be defrauded of the consortium of the man whom she loved.

34. Accept again: The knowledge of evil is not an evil; but it is when the act fulfills the malice. For he who knows an evil does not immediately do that which is an evil: but he who works that which he knows to be an evil. Now the incentive for working that which is an evil is usually either anger (*iracundia*) or desire (*cupiditas*). Nor is it immediately necessary that one having the knowledge of evil should do what he knows to be wicked, unless he be overcome by either anger or desire. Whence what we called the incentive to sin is either anger, or desire, or often fear (*formido*), although desire may arise from fear, while each one wishes to avoid what he fears.

Et ideo recte iracundiam et cupiditatem duorum reliquorum posuimus incentiva vitiorum. Consideremus igitur utrum Eva his ad vitium stimulis incitata sit. Sed neque irascebatur marito, neque cupiditate victa est: in secundo dumtaxat errat, ut edendum viro daret, quod jam ipsa gustaverat. Primo fuerat cupiditas auctor erroris ut ipsa ederet, sequentisque fuit causa peccati. Quod enim jam gustaverat, desiderare non poterat: et gustando, mali fuerat scientiam consecuta. Malum igitur quod adverterat, in virum derivare non debuit, neque conjugem proprium praevaricatorem divini facere mandati. Sciens igitur prudensque peccavit, et sciens virum in suum traxit errorem. Alioquin invenietur falsus esse de ligno scientiae boni et mali sermo, si etiam posteaquam de ea arbore manducavit, scientiam mali habere non potuit. Quod si verus est sermo, cupiditatis utique causam habere non potuit: licet plerique sic excusandum putent, quod diligens virum ab eo timuerit separari, et hanc causam cupiditatis praetendant, quod esse voluerit cum marito.

CAPUT VII.

Quaeritur utrum a Deo, vel a ligno, vel demum aliunde mors homini acciderit; atque objectio multiplici responsione diluitur.

35. Iterum alia quaestio subrepat unde mors acciderit Adae, utrum a natura ligni ejusmodi, an vero a Deo. Si naturae ligni hoc ascribimus, videtur ligni hujus fructus vivificandi insufflationi Dei praestare; siquidem quem vivificaverat insufflatio, fructus hujus ligni traxit ad mortem. Aut si Deum operatorem mortis esse memoramus, dicunt quod gemina eum opinione accusemus: quod aut ita immitis, ut noluerit ignoscere, cum posset; aut si ignoscere non potuerit, videatur infirmus. Videamus igitur quomodo diluendum sit. Nisi fallor, mortis causa inobedientia fuit; et ideo homo ipse sibi mortis est causa, non habens Deum suae mortis auctorem. Neque enim si medicus praescripsit aegrotanti a quibus videatur cavendum, atque ille ab interdictis non putaverit abstinendum, causa ei mortis est medicus: sed utique ipse sibi reus mortis est propriae. Itaque Deus quasi bonus medicus prohibuit, ne Adam nocitura gustaret.

And therefore we have rightly placed anger and desire as the incentives of the two remaining vices. Let us consider, therefore, whether Eve was incited to vice by these stimuli. But she was neither angry with her husband, nor was she overcome by desire: in the second part, at least, she errs, in giving to the man to eat what she herself had already tasted. In the first part, desire had been the author of the error, that she herself should eat, and it was the cause of the subsequent sin. For that which she had already tasted, she could no longer desire: and by tasting, she had attained the knowledge of evil. Therefore, she ought not to have derived the evil which she had noticed unto the man, nor to have made her own spouse a prevaricator of the divine mandate. Knowing, therefore, and prudent, she sinned, and knowing she drew the man into her error. Otherwise, the discourse concerning the tree of the knowledge of good and evil will be found to be false, if even after she ate of that tree, she could not have the knowledge of evil. But if the discourse is true, she certainly could not have a cause of desire: although many think she is to be excused in this way, that loving the man she feared to be separated from him, and they pretend this to be the cause of desire, that she wished to be with her husband.

CHAPTER VII.

It is asked whether death happened to man from God, or from the tree, or finally from elsewhere; and the objection is dissolved by a manifold response.

35. Again, another question creeps in: whence did death happen to Adam, whether from the nature of a tree of this kind, or indeed from God? If we ascribe this to the nature of the tree, the fruit of this tree seems to surpass the life-giving insufflation of God; since the fruit of this tree drew unto death him whom the insufflation had made alive. Or if we mention that God is the operator of death, they say that we accuse Him with a twofold opinion: that He was either so harsh as to be unwilling to forgive when He could; or if He could not forgive, He would seem weak. Let us see, therefore, how this is to be dissolved. Unless I am mistaken, the cause of death was disobedience; and therefore man himself is the cause of death to himself, not having God as the author of his death. For neither if a physician has prescribed to a sick man those things which seem to be avoided, and he has not thought that he should abstain from the forbidden things, is the physician the cause of death to him: but certainly he himself is guilty of his own death. And so God, like a good physician, prohibited Adam from tasting harmful things.

36. Iterum accipe: Scire bonum melius est, quam nescire; et ei qui bonum sciat, pulchrum est scire quod malum est, ut sciat cavere quod malum est, et ut prudens subeat custodiae cautionem. Rursus autem non satis est hoc solum scire quod malum est; ne cum malum scias, scientia boni incipias defraudari. Pulchrius est igitur ut utrumque norimus; ut et quia scimus bonum, fugiamus quod malum est; et ex eo quod cognoscimus malum, boni gratiam praeferamus. Sed ita debes utrumque scire, ut et profunde noveris, et quod noveris exsequaris, actusque scientiae congruat. Alioquin tolerabiliorem Scriptura indicat cum (Luc. XII, 47), qui utrumque nesciat, quam qui perfunctorie utrumque cognovit. Gravatur enim scire, quod vel exsequi vel vitare non possit: gravatur scire sine usu atque opere cognitionis profundae. Denique obest ad existimationem medico scire quid prosit, et quid noceat aegro; nisi cognitione ea quemadmodum oportet, utatur: et ideo non est cognitio bona, nisi ea utaris ut oportet.

37. Item accipe: Non frustra lignum scientiae boni et mali productum est in medio paradiso: et si cuicumque homini productum esset, superflua interdictio. Sed neque frustra factum est, neque alii, nisi homini factum est, qui mandatum accepit; ut non solo eo, sed eo cum caeteris uteretur. Nam si multa discutias, complura reperiens et plane innumera, quae ei qui uti nesciat, possint nocere. Nec ipsas divitias invenies fructuosas, si habens dives subsidia largitatis, neget alimenta pauperibus, excludat inopem subsidio destitutum, aliena extorqueat, quia praevalet potestate. Pulchritudo ipsa et gratior corporis forma frequenter in vitium, quam deformitas trahit. Numquid igitur quisquam deformiores, quam pulchriores filios habere desiderat, et inopes potius liberos suos cupit esse, quam divites? Plura sunt huiusmodi quae non ad imprudentiam largientis referenda sunt, sed ad male utentis errorem. Et ideo utentem accusandum potius quam donantem.

CAPUT VIII.

Solvuntur quaestiones de praescientia Dei circa praevaricationes Adae, et opinionem boni et mali humanis mentibus divinitus impressam.

36. Accept again: To know the good is better than not to know; and for him who knows the good, it is beautiful to know what is evil, so that he may know how to beware of what is evil, and that as a prudent man he may undergo the caution of guardianship. But again, it is not enough to know this alone, what is evil; lest when you know the evil, you begin to be defrauded of the knowledge of the good. It is more beautiful, therefore, that we know both; so that because we know the good, we may flee from what is evil; and from that which we recognize as evil, we may prefer the grace of the good. But you ought to know both in such a way that you know them profoundly, and that you follow through on what you know, and the act should agree with the knowledge. Otherwise, the Scripture indicates that he who knows neither is more tolerable (Luke XII, 47) than he who has known both perfunctorily. For it is a burden to know what you can neither follow through on nor avoid: it is a burden to know without the use and work of profound recognition. Finally, it hinders the reputation of a physician to know what is beneficial and what is harmful to a sick man, unless he uses that knowledge as he ought: and therefore knowledge is not good unless you use it as you ought.

37. Likewise accept: Not in vain was the tree of the knowledge of good and evil produced in the midst of paradise: and if it had been produced for any man whatsoever, the interdiction would be superfluous. But neither was it made in vain, nor was it made for any other than man, who received the mandate; so that he might use not only it, but it with the others. For if you should discuss many things, you will find several and plainly innumerable things which can harm him who does not know how to use them. Nor will you find riches themselves fruitful, if a rich man having the resources of bounty denies food to the poor, excludes the needy destitute of help, or extorts the goods of others because he prevails in power. Beauty itself and a more pleasing form of the body frequently draws into vice more than deformity. Does anyone, therefore, desire to have more deformed rather than more beautiful children, and wish his children to be poor rather than rich? There are many things of this kind which are not to be referred to the imprudence of the giver, but to the error of the one who uses them wrongly. And therefore the one who uses them is to be accused rather than the one who gives.

CHAPTER VIII.

Questions concerning the foreknowledge of God regarding the prevarications of Adam are solved, and the opinion of good and evil divinely impressed upon human minds.

38. Iterum quaestio: Sciebat praevaricaturum Deus Adam mandata sua, an nesciebat? Si nesciebat, non est ista divinae potestatis assertio: si autem sciebat, et nihilominus sciens negligenda mandavit, non est Dei aliquid superfluum praecipere. Superfluum autem praecepit protoplasto illi Adae, quod cum noverat minime servaturum: nihil autem Deus superfluum facit; ergo non est Scriptura ex Deo. Hoc enim obijciunt, qui Vetus non recipiunt Testamentum, et has interserunt quaestiones. Verum hi sua sententia et opinione vincendi sunt. Cum enim novi Testamenti non refutant fidem, exemplo sunt arguendi, ut vetus credant: quoniam cum sibi divina praecepta et facta convenient, unius auctoris Testamentum utrumque liquet esse credendum. Discant igitur non superfluum, non injustum etiam praevaricaturum praescriptum esse mandatum. Nam et ipse Dominus Jesus elegit Judam, quem proditorem sciebat. Quem si per imprudentiam electum putant, divinae derogant potestati. Sed hoc aestimare non possunt, cum Scriptura dicat: Quia sciebat Jesus quis eum proditurus esset (Joan. VI, 65). Conticescant igitur repugnatores isti veteris Testamenti.

39. Sed quoniam etiam gentilibus, si forte istud objecerint, respondendum videtur, qui exemplum non recipiunt, rationem exigunt; accipiant etiam ipsi qua ratione Dei Filius vel praevaricaturum mandaverit, vel elegerit proditurum. Venerat Dominus Jesus omnes salvos facere peccatores, etiam circa impios ostendere suam debuit voluntatem. Et ideo nec proditurum debuit praeterire; ut adverterent omnes, quod in electione etiam proditoris sui servandorum omnium insigne praetendit, nec in eo laesus est vel Adam, quia mandatum accepit, vel Judas, quia electus est. Non enim necessitatem Deus vel illi praevaricationis, vel huic prodicionis imposuit, quia uterque si quod acceperat, custodisset, a peccato abstinere potuisset. Denique nec Judaeos omnes credituros sciebat, et tamen ait: Non veni nisi ad oves perditas domus Israel (Matth. XV, 24). Ergo non in mandante culpa est, sed in praevaricante peccatum est. Et quod in Deo fuit, ostendit omnibus quod omnes voluit liberare. Nec tamen dico quia praevaricationem nesciebat futuram, immo quia sciebat assero: sed non ideo pereuntis proditoris invidiam in se debuit derivare, ut ascriberetur Deo, quod uterque sit lapsus. Nunc autem uterque redarguitur, atque reconvincitur; quia et ille mandatum ne laberetur accepit, et hic etiam in apostolatus munus adscitus est, ut vel beneficio Dei revocaretur a prodicionis affectu; simul ut dum alii revincuntur, prodesset omnibus. Non enim consisteret peccatum, si interdictio non fuisset.

38. Again a question: Did God know that Adam would prevaricate His mandates, or did He not know? If He did not know, that is not an assertion of divine power; but if He did know, and nonetheless knowingly commanded things to be neglected, it is not like God to prescribe anything superfluous. But He prescribed something superfluous to that first-formed Adam, which He knew he would by no means keep: now God does nothing in vain; therefore the Scripture is not from God. For those who do not receive the Old Testament object this, and interpose these questions. But these are to be overcome by their own judgment and opinion. For since they do not reject the faith of the New Testament, they are to be argued by example to believe the Old: since, as the divine precepts and facts agree with each other, it is clear that the Testament of both is to be believed to be of one author. Let them learn, therefore, that it was not superfluous, nor unjust, that a mandate was prescribed even to one who would prevaricate. For the Lord Jesus Himself chose Judas, whom He knew to be a traitor. If they think he was chosen through imprudence, they detract from divine power. But they cannot estimate this, since the Scripture says: "Because Jesus knew who it was that should betray Him" (John VI, 65). Therefore, let these opponents of the Old Testament be silent.

39. But since it seems necessary to respond also to the Gentiles, if perchance they should object this—who do not receive the example, but demand a reason—let them also accept for what reason the Son of God either commanded one who would prevaricate, or chose one who would betray. The Lord Jesus had come to make all sinners safe; He ought to have shown His will even regarding the impious. And therefore He ought not to have passed over even the one who would betray; so that all might notice that in the election even of His traitor, He held forth a sign of the saving of all; nor was Adam harmed in this, because he received a mandate, nor Judas, because he was chosen. For God did not impose the necessity either of prevarication upon the former, or of betrayal upon the latter, because each one, if he had kept what he had received, could have abstained from sin. Finally, He knew that not all the Jews would believe, and yet He said: "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. XV, 24). Therefore, the fault is not in the one commanding, but the sin is in the one prevaricating. And what was in God, He showed to all: that He wished to liberate all. Nor yet do I say that He did not know the prevarication would be; rather, I assert that He knew it: but He ought not therefore to have derived upon Himself the envy of the perishing traitor, so that it might be ascribed to God that each had fallen. But now each is refuted and reconvinced; because both the former received a mandate lest he should fall, and the latter was also admitted into the office of the apostleship, so that even by the benefit of God he might be recalled from the affection for betrayal; at the same time so that while others are reconvinced, it might profit all. For sin would not consist if there had been no interdiction.

Non consistente autem peccato, non solum malitia, sed etiam virtus fortasse non esset: quae nisi aliqua malitiae fuissent semina, vel subsistere vel eminere non posset. Quid est enim peccatum, nisi praevaricatio legis divinae, et coelestium inobedientia praeceptorum? Non enim auribus corporis de mandatis coelestibus judicamus: sed cum esset Dei verbum, opiniones quaedam nobis boni et mali pullularunt; dum id quod malum est, naturaliter intelligimus esse vitandum, et id quod bonum est naturaliter nobis intelligimus esse praeceptum. In eo igitur vocem Domini videmur audire, quod alia interdicat, alia praecipiat. Et ideo si quis non obedierit illis quae semel a Deo praecepta credimus, poenae obnoxius aestimatur. Dei autem praeceptum non quasi in tabulis lapideis atramento legimus inscriptum, sed cordibus nostris tenemus impressum spiritu Dei vivi. Ergo opinio nostra ipsa sibi legem facit. Si enim gentes quae legem non habent, naturaliter ea quae legis sunt, faciunt; ejusmodi legem non habentes ipsi sibi sunt lex, qui ostendunt opus legis scriptum in cordibus suis. Opinio igitur humana sibi tamquam Dei lex est.

40. Iterum hinc aliam faciunt quaestionem, ut ad invicem mandati ejus quod diximus in hominis opinione consistere, hanc ipsam opinionem impressam a Deo nobis tamquam praescriptum divinae legis accusent. Noverat, inquit, hominem peccaturum qui creavit eum, et has opiniones boni et mali impressit, an non noverat? Ut if dixeris quia non noverat, alienum a majestate Dei sentias: si autem dixeris quia sciens Deus peccaturum hominem, communes tamen opiniones ei boni et mali impressit; ut propter admixtionem malorum vitae perpetuitatem servare non posset, sicut in illo non praesagum futuri, ita in hoc non bonum Deum significare videaris. Atque hinc argumentantur quia non est creatura hominis a Deo facta. Nam sicut supra ostendimus eos dicere quod non est mandatum Dei, sic et hic dicunt: Non ergo creatura hominis a Deo, quia Deus malum non fecit. Homo autem opinionem accepit mali, dum a malis praecipitur abstinere. Hoc autem genere alium bonum Deum, alium operatorem hominis conantur asserere. Quibus respondendum est illico secundum opinionem suam. Si enim hominem nolunt a Deo factum, quia peccator est homo, et hoc refugiunt, ne bonus Deus peccatorem fecisse videatur, quia non putant bonum qui fecerit peccatorem; dicant utrum operatorem hominis a Deo factum putent. Si enim a Deo factus est ille, ut dicunt, operator hominis, quomodo bonus Deus operatorem mali fecit?

Now, if sin did not consist, perhaps not only malice, but also virtue would not exist: which, unless there had been some seeds of malice, could not either subsist or be eminent. For what is sin, except the prevarication of the divine law, and the disobedience of celestial precepts? For we do not judge concerning celestial mandates with the ears of the body: but since it was the word of God, certain opinions of good and evil sprouted in us; while we naturally understand that which is evil is to be avoided, and we naturally understand that which is good is prescribed for us. In that, therefore, we seem to hear the voice of the Lord, in that He interdicts some things and prescribes others. And therefore if anyone shall not have obeyed those things which we believe were once prescribed by God, he is estimated to be subject to punishment. Now, we do not read the precept of God as if inscribed with ink on stone tablets, but we hold it impressed on our hearts by the Spirit of the living God. Therefore, our opinion makes a law for itself. For if the Gentiles, who have not the law, do by nature the things of the law; not having a law of this kind, they are a law unto themselves, who show the work of the law written in their hearts. Therefore, human opinion is to itself as the law of God.

40. Again, they make another question from this, so that they may accuse this very opinion, impressed upon us by God as a prescription of divine law, as being in place of that mandate which we said consists in the opinion of man. God knew, they say, that the man whom He created would sin, and did He impress these opinions of good and evil, or did He not know? So that if you should say that He did not know, you would feel something alien to the majesty of God: but if you should say that God, knowing that man would sin, nonetheless impressed upon him common opinions of good and evil, so that because of the admixture of evils he could not keep the perpetuity of life, you would seem to signify that in the former He was not a foreknower of the future, and in the latter not a good God. And from this they argue that the creature of man was not made by God. For just as we showed above that they say that there is no mandate of God, so also here they say: Therefore, the creature of man is not from God, because God did not make evil. But man received the opinion of evil while he is commanded to abstain from evils. By this kind of reasoning, they try to assert that one is a good God and another is the operator of man. To whom a response must be given immediately according to their own opinion. For if they do not wish man to have been made by God because man is a sinner, and they flee from this lest a good God should seem to have made a sinner, because they do not think him good who made a sinner; let them say whether they think the operator of man was made by God. For if he, the operator of man as they call him, was made by God, how did a good God make an operator of evil?

Utique non bonus, nam qui peccatorem facit non bonus; cavendum ne gravius sit operatorem peccatoris fecisse. Debuit enim bonus Deus prohibere nativitatem ejus, qui peccati substantiam habebat inducere. Quod si dicunt non esse genitum operatorem mali, requirendum utrum bonus Deus potuerit inhibere quoquo modo incipientem malitiam, an non potuerit? Si enim non potuit, infirmus: si potuit, et non fecit, non bonus. Ergo si sibi ista non congruunt, nec suae sibi haereticorum conveniunt opiniones, requiramus ne forte rationis fuerit, qua causa Deus sive geniti sive non geniti illius operatoris siverit malitiam introire in hunc mundum, cum possit inhibere.

41. Itaque servantes unum et eundem Deum bonum atque operatorem, id si possumus, astruamus, quod gratiae utrique conveniat, nec accusationis eorum declinemus invidiam, qui ita dicunt: Quomodo bonus Deus qui non solum passus est introire in hanc mundum malitiam: sed etiam in tantam confusionem venire permisit. Verum haec accusatio tunc locum haberet, si ita animae vim et intima secreta mentis inficeret: ut nullo pacto posset aboleri, et immedicabilium vulnorum menti atque animae nostrae virus insideret; esset enim aptior hujus querelae locus, quod cum omnia possit Deus, hominem tamen perire sit passus. Verum cum Deus nostri misericors respuendi erroris remedia reservaverit, abolendique omnis contagii non aboleverit facultatem; quomodo irrationabile vel injustum est, si permisit nostrum materiale tentari quadam trepidatione fragilitatis humanae; ut foeneratio postea gratia per poenitentiam delictorum in hominis rediret affectum, et fragilitatis suae conscius quod tam facile a divinorum mandatorum serie deviando trepidaverit, tamquam clavum animae fluctuantis mandata coelestia timeret amittere; divinae misericordiae plus tribuens quod recepit amissum, et sibi aliquid usurpans gratiae quod revertatur.

CAPUT IX.

An decuerit a Deo praeceptum homini de cibo dari; et cur in proponenda poena non dictum fuerit, moriemini, sed morte moriemini?

Certainly not good, for he who makes a sinner is not good; care must be taken lest it be more grave to have made the operator of a sinner. For a good God ought to have prohibited the birth of him who was about to introduce the substance of sin. But if they say that the operator of evil was not begotten, it must be asked whether a good God could have inhibited in any way the beginning malice, or could He not? For if He could not, He is weak; if He could and did not do it, He is not good. Therefore, if these things do not agree among themselves, nor do the opinions of the heretics agree with themselves, let us inquire whether perhaps it was of reason, for what cause God permitted the malice of that operator, whether begotten or not begotten, to enter into this world, when He could have inhibited it.

41. And so, preserving one and the same God as good and as the operator, let us establish, if we can, that which may agree with the grace of both, nor let us decline the envy of the accusation of those who speak thus: How is He a good God who not only suffered malice to enter into this world, but also permitted it to come into such great confusion? But this accusation would then have a place if it so infected the power of the soul and the intimate secrets of the mind that it could by no means be abolished, and the virus of incurable wounds should settle in our mind and soul; for there would be a more apt place for this complaint, that since God can do all things, He nonetheless suffered man to perish. But since our merciful God has reserved remedies for rejecting error, and has not abolished the faculty of abolishing every contagion; how is it irrational or unjust if He permitted our material part to be tempted by a certain trepidation of human fragility; so that afterwards a more abundant grace through the penitence of sins might return into the affection of man, and being conscious of his own fragility because he so easily trembled by deviating from the series of divine mandates, he might fear to lose the celestial mandates as if the rudder of a fluctuating soul; ascribing more to divine mercy because he received back what was lost, and usurping for himself something of grace because he might return?

CHAPTER IX.

Whether it was fitting that a precept concerning food be given to man by God; and why in proposing the punishment it was not said, "you shall die," but "you shall die the death"?

42. Nunc quae sit illa ratio consideremus, quid sit istud quod cum mandatum daret homini, de illa admirabili beataque vita praescribens, ne contra faciens morte moreretur, de manducando et non manducando putaverit esse mandandum. Sunt enim qui putant nequaquam mandatum istud convenire coeli et terrae atque omnium Creatori; nequaquam dignum incolis paradisi, eo quod illa vita similis Angelorum sit. Et ideo non terrenum et corruptibilem hunc cibum esui fuisse possumus aestimare; quia qui non bibunt, neque manducant, erunt sicut angeli in coelo. Cum igitur in cibo neque praemium sit, quia esca nos non commendat Deo; neque magnum periculum sit, quia non quod intrat in os, coinquinat hominem, sed quod exit de ore: videtur sine dubio a tanto auctore non esse praeceptum, nisi hunc cibum ad illum propheticum referas, quia pro magno praemio Dominus sanctis pollicetur suis: Ecce qui serviunt mihi, manducant: vos autem esuriatis (Esai. LXV, 13). Hic est enim cibus in quo vita definitur aeterna, quo quisquis fuerit defraudatus, morte morietur. Quandoquidem panis vivus atque coelestis ipse Dominus est, qui vitam dat huic mundo. Unde et ipse ait: Nisi manducaveritis carnem meam, et biberitis sanguinem meum, non habebitis vitam aeternam (Joan., VI, 54). Erat ergo panis aliquis de quo praescripserat edendum paradisi incolis. Quis ille? Accipe quem dicat: Panem, inquit, angelorum manducavit homo (Ps. LXXVII, 25). Est enim bonus panis, si facias voluntatem Dei. Vis scire quam bonus panis? Ipse Filius manducat hunc panem, de quo ait: Meus cibus est ut faciam voluntatem Patris mei qui in coelis est (Joan. IV, 34).

43. Iterum videamus qua ratione Dominus Deus Adae dixerit, morte moriemini: quid intersit, utrum aliquis dicat, moriemini, an addat, morte moriemini. Ostendere enim debemus nihil superfluum in Dei esse mandato. Itaque hoc arbitror. Cum duo sibi sint contraria mors et vita, secundum simplicem sermonem a vita vivere dicimus, a morte mori. Si autem geminare velis utramque, quia vita vitam facit, dicitur, vita vivit, sicut habes in lege. Et quia mors mortem facit, dicitur, morte morietur. Non est autem superflua ista geminatio: est enim vita ad mortem, et est mors ad vitam; quia quis et dum vivit, moritur; et dum moritur vivit. Fiunt ergo quatuor distinctiones vita vivere, morte mori, morte vivere, vita mori. Cum igitur haec ita se habeant, usus et consuetudinis praejudicium debemus excludere; quia usus hoc habet ut communiter dicatur vivere, et qui vitae vivit, et qui morti vivit: et communiter dicatur mori vel ille qui morti moritur, vel ille qui vitae moritur. Itaque ex quatuor illis duo significat, ut dicat viventem vivere, nec melius deteriusque distinguat, et dicat morientem mori, nec inter malam et bonam mortem videatur esse discretio. Nam indiscreta quaedam vita significatur, qualis irrationabilium aut etiam parvulorum, et indiscreta mors aequae.

42. Now let us consider what that reason is: what is this, that when He gave a mandate to man, prescribing concerning that admirable and blessed life, lest by doing otherwise he should die the death, He thought that it should be commanded concerning eating and not eating. For there are those who think that this mandate by no means befits the Creator of heaven and earth and of all things; that it is by no means worthy of the inhabitants of paradise, because that life is like that of the Angels. And therefore we can estimate that this earthly and corruptible food was not for eating; because those who neither drink nor eat shall be like the angels in heaven. Since, therefore, there is no reward in food, because meat does not commend us to God; nor is there great danger, because not that which enters into the mouth defiles a man, but that which comes out of the mouth: it seems without doubt not to have been prescribed by so great an author, unless you refer this food to that prophetic one, because for a great reward the Lord promises to His saints: "Behold, they that serve me shall eat: but you shall be hungry" (Isa. LXV, 13). For this is the food in which eternal life is defined, of which whoever shall have been defrauded, shall die the death. Since the living and celestial bread is the Lord Himself, who gives life to this world. Whence also He Himself says: "Except you eat my flesh, and drink my blood, you shall not have eternal life" (John VI, 54). There was, therefore, some bread concerning which He had prescribed that the inhabitants of paradise should eat. Which bread? Accept what he says: "Man," he says, "ate the bread of angels" (Ps. LXXVII, 25). For it is good bread, if you do the will of God. Do you wish to know how good the bread is? The Son Himself eats this bread, of which He says: "My food is to do the will of my Father who is in heaven" (John IV, 34).

43. Again, let us see for what reason the Lord God said to Adam, "you shall die the death": what is the difference whether someone says "you shall die," or adds "you shall die the death." For we ought to show that nothing is superfluous in the mandate of God. And so I think this. Since two things are contrary to each other, death and life, according to simple discourse we say "to live" from life, and "to die" from death. But if you wish to double each, because life makes life, it is said "to live the life," as you have in the law. And because death makes death, it is said "he shall die the death." Now this doubling is not superfluous: for there is life unto death, and there is death unto life; because someone also dies while he lives, and lives while he dies. Therefore, four distinctions are made: to live the life, to die the death, to live by death, to die by life. Since these things are so, we ought to exclude the prejudice of use and custom; because use has it that "to live" is commonly said both of him who lives for life and of him who lives for death: and "to die" is commonly said either of him who dies for death or of him who dies for life. And so from those four it signifies two, as when it says the living lives, it distinguishes neither better nor worse, and says the dying dies, nor does there seem to be a discretion between a bad and a good death. For a certain indiscrete life is signified, such as that of irrational beings or even of small children, and an indiscrete death likewise.

44. Sequestrato igitur usu communi, quid sit vita vivere, et quid sit morte mori, et quid sit vivere morti, et mori vitae consideremus. Puto enim secundum Scripturas, quia vita vivere admirabilem quamdam illam vitam beatamque significet, et hunc vivendi usum spirandique munus cum beatæ vitæ gratia veluti conjunctum, et quadam participatione permixtum demonstrare videatur. Hoc est enim vita vivere, virtute vivere, beatæ vitæ actus habere in istius corporis vita. Contra autem morte mori quid est aliud, nisi cum morte corporis deformitatem significare morientis, cuius et caro communi vivendi munere defraudetur, et anima vitæ æternæ usum habere non possit? Est etiam qui vita moritur, ut qui vivit corpore, sed actu moritur suo: quales illi sunt, de quibus ait Propheta: Descendunt in infernum viventes (Ps. LIV, 16). Et illa de qua Apostolus dicit: Quoniam vivens mortua est (I Tim. V, 6). Quantum superest, quod sunt qui etiam morte vivunt, ut martyres sancti, qui utique moriuntur ut vivant. Moritur caro, sed vivit gratia mortuorum. Ergo absit a nobis, ut participes mortis vivamus: sed contra participes vitæ moriamur. Sanctus enim nec vitæ istius se vult esse participem, qui ait: Cupio dissolvi, et cum Christo esse; multo enim melius (Philip. I, 23). Et alius, Heu me, quod incolatus meus prolongatus est (Ps. CXIX, 5)? Dolens utique cum consortia vitæ speret æternæ, istius vitæ fragilitate se contineri. Et ideo possum e contrario dicere, quia etsi vitæ vivere bonum est; vitæ tamen vivere ambiguum sit. Potest enim dici quis vitæ vivere, hoc est, vitæ æternæ istius vita corporis militare. Potest etiam dici vitæ vivere, hoc est, vel quemcumque, vel sanctum istius vitæ habere desiderium corporalis; ut verbi gratia, si quis ideo honeste putet esse vivendum, ut is longaevitatem vitæ bonis actibus consequatur, quales plerique infirmiores sunt quos hæc vita delectat.

45. Sicut ergo vitæ vivere quid sit accepimus, quid sit morti mori accipiamus, vel morti vivere. Possunt enim esse qui moriantur morti, et qui vivant vitæ. Nam qui non ita vivit, ut secundum mortem animæ suæ vivat, is morti moritur, quia non est obnoxius morti, id est, nexus eum aerumnosæ mortis amisit, non constringitur vinculis mortis æternæ. Mortuus est morti, hoc est, mortuus est peccato, mortuus est poenæ: cui contrarium est poenæ vivere, hoc est, quando quis vivit ad poenam, vivit ad mortem. Qui autem moritur ad poenam, moritur ad mortem.

44. Setting aside, therefore, common use, let us consider what it is to live the life, and what it is to die the death, and what it is to live for death, and to die for life. For I think, according to the Scriptures, that to live the life signifies that certain admirable and blessed life, and it seems to demonstrate this use of living and the gift of breathing as if conjoined with the grace of the blessed life, and mixed by a certain participation. For this is to live the life: to live by virtue, to have the acts of the blessed life in the life of this body. On the contrary, what else is to die the death, except to signify with the death of the body the deformity of the dying person, whose flesh is defrauded of the common gift of living, and whose soul cannot have the use of eternal life? There is also he who dies by life, as he who lives in the body but dies in his own act: such as those are, concerning whom the Prophet says: "They go down alive into hell" (Ps. LIV, 16). And she of whom the Apostle says: "For while she lives, she is dead" (1 Tim. V, 6). The fourth remains, which is that there are those who even live by death, as the holy martyrs, who certainly die that they may live. The flesh dies, but the grace of the dead lives. Therefore, far be it from us that we should live as participants of death: but on the contrary, let us die as participants of life. For the saint does not even wish to be a participant of this life, who says: "I desire to be dissolved, and to be with Christ; for it is much better" (Phil. I, 23). And another: "Woe is me, that my sojourn is prolonged" (Ps. CXIX, 5)? Grieving certainly, while he hopes for the fellowships of eternal life, that he is contained by the fragility of this life. And therefore I can say on the contrary, that although to live for life is good, yet to live for life may be ambiguous. For someone can be said to live for life, that is, to serve for eternal life by the life of this body. It can also be said to live for life, that is, for anyone, or even a saint, to have a desire for this corporal life; as for example, if someone thinks he ought to live honestly so that he may attain longevity of life by good acts, such as many weaker ones are whom this life delights.

45. As we have received what it is to live the life, so let us receive what it is to die the death, or to live for death. For there can be those who die for death, and who live for life. For he who does not live so as to live according to the death of his soul, he dies for death, because he is not subject to death, that is, the bond of calamitous death has let him go, he is not constrained by the chains of eternal death. He is dead to death, that is, he is dead to sin, he is dead to punishment: the contrary of which is to live for punishment, that is, when someone lives for punishment, he lives for death. But he who dies for punishment, dies for death.

Est etiam qui in hac vita positus moriatur ad vitam, sicut ille qui ait: Vivo autem jam non ego, vivit autem in me Christus (Galat. II, 20). Peccato enim mortuus est, Deo vivit, hoc est, mors in eo mortua est, sed vita vivit, qui est Dominus Jesus. Ergo bona vita eorum qui Deo vivunt, mala vita eorum qui peccato vivunt. Est etiam media vita, ut animantium caeterorum, sicut habes scriptum: Producat terra animam viventem secundum genus (Gen. I, 24). Est etiam vita mortuorum, ut Deus Abraham, et Deus Isaac, et Deus Jacob; quia Deus mortuorum non est, sed vivorum. Sunt etiam quibus communitas est quaedam mortis et vitae, de quibus ait Apostolus dicens: Si commortui estis, et convivetis. Si enim complantati, inquit, sumus similitudini mortis ejus, simul et resurrectionis erimus: scientes quia vetus homo noster simul confixus est cruci; ut destruat corpus peccati, ut ultra non serviamus peccato. Qui enim mortuus est, justificatus est a peccato (Rom. VI, 5). Sicut autem figuras multas vitae diximus, ita etiam mortis inveniemus. Dicitur enim mors mala, secundum illud: Anima quae peccat, ipsa morietur (Ezech. XVIII, 20). Dicitur et mors communiter, sicut habes verbi gratia: Quia Adam vixit tot annos, et mortuus est, et appositus est ad patres suos. Dicitur etiam mors per baptismatis sacramentum, sicut habes: Consepulti sumus cum illo per baptismum in morte (Rom. VI, 4). Et alibi: Si autem mortui sumus cum Christo, credimus etiam quod simul vivemus cum illo (Ibid. 8). Vides quia mors quidem appellatione dicatur, sed haec vita sit nostra.

CAPUT X.

Cur hominem Deus non approbarit nisi post factam mulierem, et id maxime quod per hanc ille deceptus peccaverit; itemque cur eadem non de terra, ut Adam, sed de costa ejus creatu sit?

46. Item alia quaestio, quia dixit Dominus: Non est bonum solum esse hominem (Gen. II, 18). Primo omnium cognosce quia in superioribus, ubi hominem finxit Deus de limo terrae, non addidit: Et vidit Deus quia bonum est (Gen. I, 11 et seq.), quemadmodum in singulis operibus suis. Nam si dixisset illic bonum esse, quia homo factus est, inveniretur hoc esse contrarium, ut hic non esse bonum diceret, cum in superioribus bonum esse dixisset. Sed hoc ibi cognosce, ubi solum Adam fecit. Caeterum ubi communiter comprehendit et virum et mulierem factos, licet ne ibi quidem dixerit specialiter; tamen quia postea habes: Vidit Deus omnia quae fecit, et ecce erant bona valde (Gen. I, 31), evidenter declaratur bonum esse quod et vir sit factus, et mulier.

There is also he who, being placed in this life, dies for life, like him who says: "But I live, now not I, but Christ lives in me" (Gal. II, 20). For he is dead to sin, he lives to God, that is, death is dead in him, but life lives, which is the Lord Jesus. Therefore, good is the life of those who live to God, bad is the life of those who live to sin. There is also a middle life, as of other living things, as you have it written: "Let the earth bring forth the living soul according to its kind" (Gen. I, 24). There is also the life of the dead, like the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; because God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. There are also those for whom there is a certain community of death and life, concerning whom the Apostle says, saying: "If you are dead with Him, you shall also live with Him." For if we have been planted together," he says, "in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection: knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is justified from sin (Rom. VI, 5). Now as we have said there are many figures of life, so also we shall find many of death. For death is called evil, according to that: "The soul that sins, the same shall die" (Ezek. XVIII, 20). And death is also spoken of commonly, as you have for example: "Because Adam lived so many years, and died, and was gathered to his fathers." Death is also spoken of through the sacrament of baptism, as you have: "We are buried together with Him by baptism into death" (Rom. VI, 4). And elsewhere: "But if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live together with Him" (Ibid. 8). You see that it is indeed called death by name, but this is our life.

CHAPTER X.

Why God did not approve of man except after woman was made, and especially because he was deceived and sinned through her; likewise why she was created not from the earth, like Adam, but from his rib?

46. Likewise another question, because the Lord said: "It is not good for man to be alone" (Gen. II, 18). First of all, recognize that in the previous parts, where God fashioned man from the slime of the earth, He did not add: "And God saw that it was good" (Gen. I, 11 et seq.), as in His individual works. For if He had said there that it was good because man was made, it would be found to be contrary here to say it was not good, since in the previous parts He would have said it was good. But recognize this there, where He made Adam alone. For the rest, where He commonly comprehends both man and woman as made, although He did not say it specially even there; nonetheless, because you have afterwards: "God saw all things that He had made, and behold they were very good" (Gen. I, 31), it is evidently declared to be good that both man was made and woman.

47. Sed ex hac quaestione alia quaestio rursus emergit. Quomodo enim quando solus factus est Adam, non dictum est bonum esse factum Adam: quando autem et mulier ex eo facta est, tunc esse bona omnia comprehensum est? Licet illic omnem laudaverit creaturam, et universitatis creatio sit probata, quoniam in homine naturae praedicta communitas est: tamen non videtur otiosum, qua ratione ubi solus factus est Adam, non solum nequaquam praedicatio boni complacito operi adjecta sit; sed etiam dictum sit non esse bonum solum hominem: cum sciamus quod antequam fieret mulier, non erraverit Adam; postea vero quam mulier est facta, prior divinum praevaricata mandatum, etiam virum suum traxerit in errorem, et incentivum ejus extiterit. Si igitur vero culpa auctor est mulier, quemadmodum pro bono videtur adjecta? Verum si consideres quia Deo universitatis est cura, invenies plus placere Domino debuisse id in quo esset causa universitatis, quam condemnandum fuisse illud in quo esset causa peccati. Et ideo quia ex viro solo non poterat humani generis propagatio, pronuntiavit Dominus non esse bonum solum esse hominem. Maluit enim Deus plures esse quos salvos facere posset, et quibus donaret peccatum, quam unum solum Adam, qui liber esset a culpa. Denique quia idem utriusque auctor est operis, venit in hunc mundum, ut salvos faceret peccatores. Postremo nec Cain parri-cidii reum priusquam generaret filios, passus est interire. Ergo propter generationem successionis humanae debuit mulier adjici viro (Vid. S. Aug. I. II contra Jul. Pel., c. 7, n. 20). Denique hoc ipsa verba declarant dicentis Dei, non bonum solum esse hominem. Nam etsi mulier prior peccatura erat, tamen redemptionem sibi paritura non debuit ab usu divinae operationis excludi. Quamvis enim Adam non est seductus, mulier autem seducta et in praevaricatione fuerit, salva tamen, inquit, erit per filiorum generationem, inter quos generavit et Christum (I Tim. II. 14 et 15).

Nec illud otiosum (33, q. 5, c. Nec illud), quod non de eadem terra de qua plasmatus est Adam, sed de ipsius Adae costa facta sit mulier; ut sciremus unam in viro et muliere corporis esse naturam, unum fontem generis humani. Ideo non duo a principio facti vir et mulier, neque duo viri, neque duae mulieres, sed primum vir, deinde ex eo mulier. Unam enim naturam volens hominum constituere Deus, ab uno principio creaturae hujus incipiens multarum et disparium naturarum eripuit facultatem. Faciamus, inquit, ei adjutorium simile sibi (Gen. II, 18).

47. But from this question another question emerges again. For how is it that when Adam alone was made, it was not said that it was good for Adam to be made: but when woman also was made from him, then it was comprehended that all things were good? Although He praised every creature there, and the creation of the universe was approved, since in man there is the aforesaid community of nature: nonetheless, it does not seem idle to ask by what reason, where Adam alone was made, not only was the preaching of good by no means added to the well-pleasing work, but it was even said that it was not good for man to be alone: since we know that before woman was made, Adam did not err; but after woman was made, she, being first to prevaricate the divine mandate, also drew her man into error, and stood forth as his incentive. If, therefore, woman is indeed the author of the fault, how is she added for good? But if you consider that God has care for the universe, you will find that it ought to have pleased the Lord more, that in which there would be the cause of the universe, than that ought to have been condemned in which there would be the cause of sin. And therefore because the propagation of the human race could not be from the man alone, the Lord pronounced that it was not good for man to be alone. For God preferred that there be many whom He could make safe, and to whom He might give forgiveness for sin, than Adam alone, who would be free from fault. Finally, because the same is the author of both works, He came into this world to make sinners safe. Lastly, He did not even suffer Cain, guilty of parricide, to perish before he begot sons. Therefore, for the sake of the generation of human succession, woman ought to have been added to the man. Finally, the words themselves of God saying that it is not good for man to be alone declare this. For although woman was about to sin first, nonetheless she who was about to bring forth redemption for herself ought not to have been excluded from the use of divine operation. For although Adam was not seduced, but the woman was seduced and was in prevarication, "she shall be saved," he says, "through the generation of children," among whom she also generated Christ (1 Tim. II. 14 and 15).

Nor is that idle, that woman was made not from the same earth from which Adam was molded, but from the rib of Adam himself; so that we might know that there is one nature of the body in man and woman, one source of the human race. Therefore, not two were made from the beginning, man and woman, nor two men, nor two women, but first the man, then from him the woman. For God, wishing to constitute one nature of men, beginning from one principle of this creature, took away the possibility of many and disparate natures. Let us make," He says, "a helper like unto himself (Gen. II, 18).

Adjutorium ad generationem constitutionis humanae intelligimus. Et vere bonum adjutorium. Nam si pro meliore accipis adjutorium, major quaedam in causa generationis operatio mulieris reperitur; sicut istius terrae quae semina primo accepta cohibendo paulatim fotu suo adolescere facit, et producit in segetem. In eo igitur adjutorium bonum mulieris, quamquam etiam inferior dicatur adjutor; ut et in usu reperimus humano, quia dignitate potiores plerunque adiutorem meriti inferioris adsciscunt.

CAPUT XI.

Quomodo animalia ducta fuerint ad Adam; quid sopor ejusdem et costae aedificatio nos doceat; quid etiam memorata animalia in paradysum adducta significant; et quo pacto justı in paradysum rapiantur?

49. Specta nunc cur Deus adhuc finxerit de terra omnes bestias agri, et omnia volatilia coeli et adduxerit ea ad Adam, ut videret quid vocaret ea. Qua ratione hoc factum est, cum tantummodo bestias agri, et volatilia coeli ad Adam adduxerit Deus? Erant enim pecora secundum genus suum. Denique habes infra: Quia imposuit Adam nomina omnibus pecoribus, et omnibus bestiis agri. Adae autem non est inventus adjutor similis illi (Gen. II, 20). Quae igitur absolutio est, nisi quia indomitae bestiae, et volatilia coeli divina potestate ad hominem deducuntur? De pecoribus autem domitis congregandis et homo habuit potestatem. Itaque illud divinae operationis fuerit, hoc humanae diligentiae. Simul accipe qua causa omnia deducta sint ad Adam, ut in omnibus videret ex utroque sexu substantiam constare naturae, id est, ex masculo et femina, et ipse usu exemploque cognosceret necessarium sibi consortium mulieris adjectum.

50. Et immisit, inquit, Deus soporem in Adam, et obdormivit (Ibid., 21). Quis est iste sopor, nisi quia paulisper ad conjugium copulandum cum intendimus animum, veluti intentos oculos ad Dei regnum inclinare atque inflectere videmur ad quemdam somnum istius mundi, et paulisper obdormire divinis, dum in saecularibus mundanisque requiescimus? Denique posteaquam soporem immisit in Adam, et dormivit, tunc aedificavit Dominus Deus costam quam sumpsit de Adam in mulierem. Bene, aedificavit, dixit, ubi de mulieris creatione loquebatur, quia in viro et muliere domus videtur quaedam plena esse perfectio. Qui sine uxore est, quasi sine domo sit, sic habetur. Sicut enim vir publicis officiis, ita mulier domesticis ministeriis habilior aestimatur. Considera quia ex corpore costam sumpsit, non ex anima portionem; hoc est, non anima ex anima, sed os de ossibus meis et caro de carne mea haec vocabitur mulier.

We understand a helper for the generation of the human constitution. And truly a good helper. For if you take "helper" for something better, a certain greater operation of woman is found in the cause of generation; just as of this earth which, by containing the seeds first received, little by little by its own nourishment makes them grow and produces them into a crop. In that, therefore, is the good helper of woman, although a helper is also called inferior; as we also find in human use, because those superior in dignity frequently take a helper of inferior merit.

CHAPTER XI.

How the animals were led to Adam; what his sleep and the building of the rib teach us; what the mentioned animals brought into paradise also signify; and in what way the just are caught up into paradise.

49. Behold now why God still formed from the earth all the beasts of the field, and all the birds of heaven, and brought them to Adam, that he might see what he would call them. For what reason was this done, since God brought only the beasts of the field and the birds of heaven to Adam? For there were cattle according to their kind. Finally, you have below: Because Adam gave names to all the cattle, and to all the beasts of the field. But for Adam there was not found a helper like unto himself (Gen. 2:20). What then is the explanation, unless it be that the untamed beasts and the birds of heaven are led to man by divine power? But over the gathering of the tamed cattle, man himself had power. Therefore, that would be a work of divine operation, this of human diligence. At the same time, receive the cause for which all things were led to Adam: so that in all things he might see that the substance of nature consists of both sexes, that is, of male and female, and he himself by use and example might recognize the necessary companionship of woman added to him.

50. "And God," it says, "cast a deep sleep (soporem) upon Adam, and he slept" (Ibid., 21). What is this sleep, except that when for a little while we intend our mind toward joining in marriage, we seem to turn and bend our intent eyes from the kingdom of God toward a certain sleep of this world, and for a little while to sleep to divine things, while we rest in secular and worldly things? Finally, after He cast a sleep upon Adam, and he slept, then the Lord God built the rib which He took from Adam into a woman. Well did he say "built" where he was speaking of the creation of woman, because in man and woman a certain full perfection of the house is seen. He who is without a wife is regarded as if he were without a house. For as the man is considered more fit for public duties, so the woman for domestic services. Consider that He took a rib from the body, not a portion from the soul; that is, not soul from soul, but "bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh she shall be called woman."

51. Ergo causam humanae generationis agnovimus. Sed quia plerosque movet qui diligentius intuentur, quomodo si vel primo magnum munus Dei fuit circa homines, ut in paradiso homines collocarentur, vel postea magnorum remuneratio videretur esse meritorum, ut ad paradysum justus unusquisque rapiatur, dicuntur etiam bestiae et pecora agri, et volatilia coeli in paradiso fuisse. Unde plerique paradysum animam hominis esse voluerunt, in qua virtutum quaedam germina pullulaverint: hominem autem et ad operandum, et ad custodiendum paradysum esse positum, hoc est, mentem hominis cujus virtus animam videtur excolere, nec solum excolere, sed etiam cum excoluerit, custodire. Bestiae autem agri, et volatilia coeli quae adducuntur ad Adam, nostri irrationabiles motus sunt, eo quod bestiae vel pecora, quaedam diversae sint corporis passiones, vel turbulentiores, vel etiam languidiores. Volatilia autem coeli quid aliud aestimamus, nisi inanes cogitationes quae velut volatiliu more nostram circumvolant animam, et huc atque illuc vario motu saepe traducunt? Propterea nullus inventus est menti nostrae similis adjutor, nisi sensus, hoc est, αἴσθησις. Similem sibi solam νοῦς noster potuit invenire.

52. Sed forte arguas, quia haec quoque Deus in tali paradiso locavit, hoc est, passiones corporis, et vanitatem quamdam fluctuantium vel inanium cogitationum, quod ipse nostri fuerit auctor erroris. Considera quid dicat: Habete, inquit, potestatem piscium maris, et volatiliu coeli, et omnium repentium quae repunt super terram (Gen. I, 28). Vides quod ille tibi tribuerit potestatem; ut de omnibus judicare tu debeas, singulorum genera iudicii tui sobria definitione discernere. Vocavit ad te omnia Deus; ut supra omnia mentem tuam cognosceres. Cur quae tibi similia minime reperisti, adsciscere tibi et copulare voluisti? Dedit tibi certe sensum quo universa cognosceres, et de cognitis iudicares, meritoque de illo fecundo paradisi agro ejectus es, quia non potuisti servare mandatum. Sciebat enim Deus esse te fragilem, sciebat iudicare non posse; ideo dixit quasi fragilioribus: Nolite iudicare ut non iudicemini (Matth. VII, 1). Ergo quia scivit infirmum te esse ad iudicandum, voluit obedientem esse mandato; ideo praeceptum posuit. Quod si non praevaricatus esses, periculum incerti iudicii incidere nequivisses. Itaque quoniam iudicare voluisti, ideo addidit: Ecce Adam factus est tamquam unus ex nobis, ut sciat bonum et malum (Gen. III, 22). Voluisti tibi arrogare iudicium, ideo poenam pravi iudicii refutare non debes. Posuit tamen te contra paradysum, ne memoriam eius possis abolere.

53. Denique iusti in paradysum saepe rapiuntur, sicut et Paulus raptus est in paradysum, et audivit verba ineffabilia.

51. Therefore, we have recognized the cause of human generation. But because it moves many who look more carefully: how, if either at first it was a great gift of God toward men that men should be placed in paradise, or afterwards it should seem to be the reward of great merits that each just man is caught up to paradise, the beasts and cattle of the field and the birds of heaven are also said to have been in paradise. Whence many have wished paradise to be the soul of man, in which certain seeds of virtues have sprouted; and that man was placed both to work and to keep paradise, that is, the mind (*mens*) of man whose virtue seems to cultivate the soul, and not only to cultivate it, but also, when it has cultivated it, to keep it. But the beasts of the field and the birds of heaven which are brought to Adam are our irrational movements, because the beasts or cattle are certain diverse passions of the body, either more turbulent or even more sluggish. And the birds of heaven, what else do we consider them to be, if not vain thoughts which, after the manner of birds, fly around our soul and often lead it hither and thither by various movement? Therefore, no helper similar to our mind (*mens*) was found, except sense (*sensus*), that is, *aisthesis* (αἴσθησις). Only sense could our nous (νοῦς) find similar to itself.

52. But perhaps you may argue that because God also placed these things in such a paradise—that is, the passions of the body and a certain vanity of fluctuating or vain thoughts—He Himself was the author of our error. Consider what He says: "Have," He says, "dominion over the fish of the sea, and the birds of heaven, and all creeping things that creep upon the earth" (Gen. 1:28). You see that He has bestowed power upon you, so that you ought to judge concerning all things, and discern the kinds of each by the sober definition of your judgment. God called all things to you, so that you might recognize your mind (*mens*) above all things. Why did you wish to adopt and join to yourself those things which you found to be not at all similar to yourself? Certainly He gave you sense (*sensus*) by which you might know all things and judge concerning what is known, and deservedly were you ejected from that fertile field of paradise because you could not keep the command. For God knew that you were fragile; He knew that you could not judge; therefore He said, as if to the more fragile: "Judge not, that you may not be judged" (Matth. 7:1). Therefore, because He knew you were weak in judging, He wished you to be obedient to the command; for this reason He placed the precept. But if you had not transgressed, you could not have fallen into the danger of uncertain judgment. Therefore, because you wished to judge, for that reason He added: "Behold, Adam has become as one of us, to know good and evil" (Gen. 3:22). You wished to arrogate judgment to yourself; therefore you ought not to refuse the punishment of a perverse judgment. Yet He placed you opposite paradise, lest you be able to abolish the memory of it.

53. Finally, the just are often caught up into paradise, just as Paul was caught up into paradise and heard ineffable words.

Et tu si a primo coelo ad secundum, a secundo ad tertium mentis tuae vigore rapiaris, hoc est, quod primum unusquisque homo est corporalis, secundo animalis, tertio spiritalis: si ita rapiaris ad tertium coelum, ut videas fulgorem gratiae spiritalis (animalis enim homo quae sunt spiritus Dei nescit), et ideo tertii coeli ascensio tibi est necessaria, ut rapiaris in paradysum: rapieris jam sine periculo, ut possis dijudicare omnia, quia spiritalis dijudicat omnia, ipse autem a nemine dijudicatur. Et fortasse quasi adhuc fragilis, audies verba ineffabilia quae non liceat homini loqui: et tunc quod acceperis reservato, et quod audieris custodito. Paulus apostolus custodiebat ne laberetur, vel alios certe faceret errare. Aut fortasse ideo dicit Paulus, quae non liceat homini loqui (II Cor. XII, 6 et 7); quia erat adhuc in corpore constitutus, hoc est, videbat istius corporis passiones, videbat legem carnis suae repugnantem legi mentis suae. Hoc enim malo intelligi, ne videamur quemdam adhuc futuri periculi jactare terrorem. Si enim vel propter hanc vitam securitas, ut nullos praevaricationis post hanc futurae laqueos formidemus: ergo quicumque fuerit in paradiso ascensione virtutis audiet mysteria Dei arcana illa atque secreta: audiet dicentem Dominum tamquam latroni illi a scelere ad confessionem, et ad fidem a latrocinio revertenti: Hodie mecum eris in paradiso (Luc. XXIII, 43).

CAPUT XII.

Serpentis qualis fuerit sapientia: quomodo mulierem aggressus sit; qualisve hujus responsio, quam longa digressio de quadam circa eam rem dubitatione consequitur.

54. Serpens autem erat sapientior omnium bestiarum quae erant super terram, quas fecit Dominus Deus, et dixit serpens mulieri: Quid utique dixit Deus, ne edatis ab omni ligno quod est in paradiso (Gen. III, 1)? Cum dicit sapientiozem serpentem, intelligis quem loquatur, id est, illum adversarium nostrum qui tantum habet hujus sapientiam mundi. Sed et voluptas atque delectatio bene sapiens dicitur, quia et sapientia carnis appellatur sapientia, sicut habes: Quia sapientia carnis inimica est Deo (Rom. VIII, 7). Et ad exquirenda delectationum genera astuti sunt, quia appetentes sunt voluptatum. Sive ergo delectationem intelligas, quaedam est divino adversa mandato, et inimica sensibus nostris. Unde sanctus Paulus ait: Video aliam legem in membris meis repugnantem legi mentis meae, et captivantem me in lege peccati (Rom. VII, 23). Si autem ad diabolium referas, verus inimicus est generis humani. Quae autem causa inimicitiarum nisi invidia? Sicut Salomon ait: Quia invidia diaboli mors introivit in orbem terrarum (Sap. II, 24).

And you, if you are caught up by the vigor of your mind from the first heaven to the second, and from the second to the third—that is, because first every man is corporal, second animal, third spiritual—if you are thus caught up to the third heaven so that you see the brightness of spiritual grace (for the animal man does not know the things that are of the Spirit of God), and for that reason the ascent of the third heaven is necessary for you, so that you may be caught up into paradise: you will be caught up now without danger, so that you can judge all things, because the spiritual man judges all things, while he himself is judged by no one. And perhaps, as if still fragile, you will hear ineffable words which it is not lawful for a man to speak; and then what you have received, keep in reserve, and what you have heard, guard. Paul the apostle guarded lest he should fall, or certainly make others err. Or perhaps Paul says "which it is not lawful for a man to speak" (2 Cor. 12:4 and 7) for this reason: because he was still constituted in the body, that is, he saw the passions of this body, he saw the law of his flesh resisting the law of his mind. For I prefer this to be understood, lest we seem to cast a certain terror of still future danger. For if there is security even on account of this life, so that we dread no snares of a transgression future after this: therefore whoever shall be in paradise by the ascent of virtue will hear those hidden and secret mysteries of God; he will hear the Lord saying, as if to that thief returning from crime to confession and from robbery to faith: "Today you shall be with me in paradise" (Luke 23:43).

CHAPTER XII.

Of what kind the wisdom of the serpent was; how he attacked the woman; or of what kind her response was, which a long digression follows concerning a certain doubt about that matter.

54. "Now the serpent was wiser than all the beasts which were upon the earth, which the Lord God made, and the serpent said to the woman: Why indeed did God say, 'You shall not eat of every tree that is in paradise'?" (Gen. 3:1). When he says the serpent was wiser, you understand of whom he speaks—that is, that adversary of ours who has so much of the wisdom of this world. But also pleasure (*voluptas*) and delight are rightly called wise, because even the wisdom of the flesh is called wisdom, as you have: "Because the wisdom of the flesh is an enemy to God" (Rom. 8:7). And they are astute in seeking out kinds of delights, because they are desirous of pleasures. Whether therefore you understand delight, it is a certain thing adverse to the divine command and an enemy to our senses. Whence Saint Paul says: "I see another law in my members resisting the law of my mind, and captivating me in the law of sin" (Rom. 7:23). But if you refer it to the devil, he is the true enemy of the human race. And what is the cause of the enmities except envy? As Solomon says: "Because by the envy of the devil death entered into the world" (Wisd. 2:24).

Invidiae autem causa beatitudo hominis in paradiso positi, et ideo quoniam ipse diabolus acceptam gratiam tenere non potuit, invidit homini, eo quod figuratus e limo, ut incola paradisi esset, electus est. Considerabat enim diabolus quod ipse qui fuisset superioris naturae, in haec saecularia et mundana deciderat; homo autem inferioris naturae sperabat aeterna. Hoc est ergo quod invidet dicens: Iste inferior adipiscitur quod ego servare non potui? Iste de terris migrabit ad coelum, cum ego de coelo lapsus in terra sim? Multas vias habeo quibus hominem decipere possim. De limo factus est, terra ei mater est, corruptibilibus involutus est. Et si anima superioris naturae, tamen et ipsa lapsui potest esse obnoxia, in corporis carcere constituta; quando ego lapsum vitare non potui. Est igitur via prima, ut decipiatur, dum conditione sua majora desiderat. Hic enim quidam conatus est industriae. Deinde carnis est, quod non habeat, desiderare. Postremo in quo videor ego omnibus esse sapientior, nisi circumscribam hominem, et versutia et fraude contendam? Itaque machinatus est, ut non primo Adam adoriretur, sed Adam per mulierem circumscribere conaretur. Non adorsus est eum qui coram acceperat coeleste mandatum: sed eam adorsus est quae a viro didicerat, non a Deo quid observaret, acceperat. Neque enim habes quia mulieri dixit Deus, sed quia Adae dixit; et ideo per Adam cognovisse mulier aestimanda est.

55. Cognoscens igitur hoc loco tentamenti genus, plurima etiam aliis locis tentamenti genera reperies. Alia sunt per principem istius mundi, qui quaedam venena sapientiae in hunc mundum evomuit; ut vera putarent homines esse quae falsa sunt, et specie quadam hominum caperetur affectus. Non enim semper quasi apertus hostis ingreditur: sed sunt quaedam potestates quae amorem simulent, gratiamque praetendant; ut paulatim cogitationibus nostris venenum suae iniquitatis infundant, a quibus oriuntur illa peccata quae vel ex delectatione, vel ex quadam mentis facilitate nascuntur. Sunt etiam aliae potestates quae veluti colluctantur nobiscum. Unde et Apostolus ait: Quia non est nobis colluctatio adversus carnem et sanguinem, sed adversus principatus, et potestates, et rectores hujus mundi, tenebrarum harum, adversus nequitiam spiritalium quae sunt in coelestibus (Ephes. VI, 12). Volunt enim hac quadam contentione nos frangere, et veluti quoddam animae nostrae corpus elidere. Unde et Paulus quasi bonus athleta non solum ictus adversantium potestatum vitare cognoverat, verum etiam adversantes ferire. Unde et ait: Percutio pugnis, non ut aera caedens (I Cor. IX, 26).

But the cause of the envy was the happiness of man placed in paradise, and therefore since the devil himself could not hold the grace received, he envied man, because he who was fashioned from mud (limo) was chosen to be an inhabitant of paradise. For the devil considered that he himself, who had been of a superior nature, had fallen into these secular and worldly things; but man, of an inferior nature, hoped for eternal things. This therefore is what he envies, saying: "Does this inferior one obtain what I could not keep?" Shall this one migrate from the lands to heaven, when I have fallen from heaven to earth? I have many ways by which I can deceive the man. He was made from mud, the earth is his mother, he is involved in corruptible things. And if the soul is of a superior nature, yet even it can be subject to a fall, being constituted in the prison of the body; since I could not avoid a fall. There is therefore a first way, that he be deceived while he desires things greater than his condition. For here is a certain effort of industry. Then it belongs to the flesh to desire what it does not have. Finally, in what do I seem to be wiser than all, unless I circumvent the man and contend with craft and fraud?" Therefore he plotted so that he should not first attack Adam, but should try to circumvent Adam through the woman. He did not attack him who had received the heavenly command in person; but he attacked her who had learned from her husband, and had not received from God what she was to observe. For you do not have that God spoke to the woman, but that He spoke to Adam; and therefore it must be considered that the woman learned through Adam.

55. Recognizing, therefore, in this place a kind of temptation, you will find many other kinds of temptation in other places as well. Some are through the prince of this world, who has vomited certain poisons of wisdom into this world, so that men might think those things to be true which are false, and the affection of men might be captured by a certain appearance. For he does not always enter as if an open enemy, but there are certain powers (potestates) which simulate love and pretend grace, so that little by little they may infuse the poison of their iniquity into our thoughts, from which those sins arise which are born either from delight or from a certain facility of the mind. There are also other powers which, as it were, wrestle with us. Whence also the Apostle says: "Because our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, and powers, and the rulers of this world, of these darknesses, against the spiritual wickedness which is in the high places" (Ephes. 6:12). For they wish to break us by this certain contention, and as it were to crush a certain body of our soul. Whence also Paul, like a good athlete, had learned not only to avoid the blows of the opposing powers, but also to strike those opposing. Whence also he says: "I strike with my fists, not as one beating the air" (1 Cor. 9:26).

Et ideo quasi bonus athleta ad coronam meruit pervenire. Ergo multiplicia tentamenta sunt diaboli. Et ideo bilinguis serpens habetur atque lethalis, eo quod diaboli minister aliud lingua loquatur, aliud corde meditetur. Sunt et alii ministri qui et cordis et vocis suae infectas veneno veluti verborum suorum jactant sagittas, quibus Dominus ait: Generatio viperarum, quomodo potestis bona loqui, cum sitis mali (Matth. XII, 34)?

56. Et dixit serpens mulieri: Quid utique dixit Deus, ne edatis ex omni ligno quod est in paradiso? Et dixit mulier serpenti: Ex omni ligno paradisi manducabimus: de fructu autem ligni quod est in medio paradisi, dixit Deus: Non manducabitis ex eo, neque tangetis ex eo, ne moriamini (Gen. III, 2 et 3). Cum audieris sapientiores bestiis omnibus esse serpentem, hic ejus jam quaere versutiam. Simulat se verba Dei dicere, et proprios intexit dolos. Cum enim dixisset Deus: Ex omni ligno quod est in paradiso edetis ad escam: de ligno autem quod est scientiae boni et mali non edetis, qua die autem manducabitis ex eo, morte moriemini (Ibid. II, 16 et 17); serpens quasi interrogans mulierem, cum dixisset Deus: Ex omni ligno quod est in paradiso edetis: de ligno autem uno non edetis, inseruit mendacium, ut diceret: Ab omni ligno non edetis: cum de uno tantum ligno scientiae boni et mali praeceperit Deus non esse gustandum. Qua ratione autem fefellerit, nihil mirum, quia iis qui aliquem circumscribere conantur, consuetudo est fallere. Non est igitur interrogatio otiosa serpentis. Sed ut scias in mandato nullum vitium esse potuisse, respondit mulier, ut habes: Ex omni ligno paradisi manducabimus: de fructu autem ligni quod est in medio paradiso, dixit Deus: Non manducabitis ex eo, neque tangetis ex eo, ne morte moriemini. In mandato quidem nullum vitium est, sed in relatione mandati. Etenim quantum praesens lectio docet, discimus nihil vel cautionis gratia jungere nos debere mandato. Si quid enim vel addas, vel detrahas, praevericatio quaedam videtur esse mandati. Pura enim et simplex mandati forma servanda, vel testimonii series intimanda est. Plerumque testis dum aliquid ad seriem gestorum ex suo adjicit, totam testimonii fidem partis mendacio decolorat. Nihil igitur vel quod bonum videtur, addendum est. Namque hic quid offensionis habet prima specie quod addidit mulier: Neque tangetis ex eo quidquam? Tangetis enim Deus non dixerat, sed non edetis. Sed tamen lapsus incipit esse principium. Nam quae addidit, superfluum addidit, vel addendo de proprio semiplenum intellexit Dei esse mandatum.

And for that reason, as a good athlete, he deserved to reach the crown. Therefore, the temptations of the devil are manifold. And for this reason the serpent is held to be double-tongued (*bilinguis*) and lethal, because as a minister of the devil he speaks one thing with his tongue and meditates another in his heart. There are also other ministers who throw the arrows of their words, infected with the poison of both their heart and their voice, to whom the Lord says: "Generation of vipers, how can you speak good things, when you are evil?" (Matth. 12:34).

56. "And the serpent said to the woman: Why indeed did God say, 'You shall not eat of every tree that is in paradise'? And the woman said to the serpent: 'Of every tree of paradise we shall eat; but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of paradise, God said: You shall not eat of it, neither shall you touch it, lest you die'" (Gen. 3:2 and 3). When you hear that the serpent is wiser than all beasts, seek here his craftiness. He pretends to say the words of God, and weaves in his own deceits. For when God had said: "Of every tree that is in paradise you shall eat for food; but of the tree which is of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you shall eat of it, you shall die the death (*morte moriemini*)" (Ibid. 2:16 and 17); the serpent, as if questioning the woman, although God had said: "Of every tree that is in paradise you shall eat; but of one tree you shall not eat," inserted a lie, so as to say: "From every tree you shall not eat," whereas God had commanded that only from one tree, of the knowledge of good and evil, must there be no tasting. But for what reason he deceived is no wonder, because it is the custom of those who try to circumvent someone to deceive. Therefore, the interrogation of the serpent is not idle. But so that you may know that there could be no fault in the command, the woman responded, as you have: "Of every tree of paradise we shall eat; but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of paradise, God said: You shall not eat of it, neither shall you touch it, lest you die the death." In the command indeed there is no fault, but in the reporting of the command. For as much as the present lesson teaches, we learn that we ought to join nothing to a command, even for the sake of caution (*cautionis gratia*). For if you either add or subtract anything, it seems to be a certain transgression (*praevaricatio*) of the command. For the pure and simple form of the command must be kept, or the series of the testimony must be made known. Frequently a witness, while adding something of his own to the series of deeds, discolors the entire faith of the testimony with a part of a lie. Therefore, nothing, even what seems good, must be added. For here what offense does it have at first sight that the woman added: "Neither shall you touch anything of it"? For God had not said "you shall touch," but "you shall not eat." But yet a slip begins to be the beginning. For what she added, she added superfluously, or by adding of her own she understood the command of God to be semi-complete.

Docet igitur nos praesentis series lectionis neque detrahere aliquid divinis debere mandatis, neque addere. Nam si Joannes hoc iudicavit de suis scriptis: Si quis apposerit, inquit, ad hoc, adjiciet in illum Deus plagas, quae scriptae sunt in libro isto: et qui dempserit de verbis his prophetiae hujus, delebit Deus partem illius de libro vitae (Apoc. XXII, 18 et 19): quanto nihil divinis mandatis est detrahendum! Hinc ergo coepit praevaricatio prima esse mandati. Et plerique putant hoc vitium non esse mulieris, sed Adae fuisse: ita Adam dixisse mulieri, dum eam vellet facere cautiorem, ut adderet mandasse Deum: Neque tangetis ex eo quidquam. Habemus enim quia Adam, non Eva mandatum acceperit a Deo. Nondum enim mulier formata fuerat. Ipsa quidem verba Adae quibus mulieri dixit formam seriemque mandati, non prodit lectio: sed intelligimus per virum ad mulierem seriem transisse mandati. Viderint tamen alii quid sentiant; mihi tamen videtur a muliere coepisse vitium, inchoasse mendacium. Nam etsi de duobus videatur incertum, tamen sexus prodit qui prius potuerit errare. Adde quia praepudicio illa constringitur, cujus et postea prior error inventus est. Viro enim mulier, non mulieri vir auctor erroris est. Unde et Paulus ait: Adam, inquit, non est deceptus: mulier autem seducta in praevaricatione fuit (I Tim. II, 14).

57. Nunc videamus utrum praeter adjectionem quae mandato est applicata, quod additum est obfuisse videatur. Nam re vera si bonum est: Neque tangetis ex eo, et ad cautionem proficiebat, cur Deus hoc minime interdixit, immo non interdicens permisisse videatur? Itaque utrumque quaerendum, qua ratione nec permiserit, nec interdixit. Sunt enim qui dicant, Qua ratione quod fecit videri, non jussit et tangi? Verum cum in eo ligno audieris naturam fuisse scientiae boni et mali, potest aestimari quia noluit te malum tangere. Satis est enim nobis videre Satanam sicut fulgur de coelo cadentem, secundum vocem Domini (Luc. X, 18), et dantem escam non luminis, sed noctis et tenebrarum filiis; quia scriptum est: Dedit eum in escam populis Aethiopum (Ps. LXXIII, 14). Hoc igitur de eo dictum est, quod non mandaverit tangi. Quod autem non prohibuerit, quid intelligam accipe. Sunt multa quae noceant, si ante voluerimus haurire, quam quae sint illa cognoscere. Nam et de cibis et potu plerumque usu venit.

Therefore, the series of the present lesson teaches us that we ought neither to subtract anything from divine commands, nor to add. For if John judged this of his own writings: "If anyone," he says, "shall add to this, God shall add upon him the plagues which are written in this book; and he who shall take away from these words of this prophecy, God shall take away his part from the book of life" (Rev. 22:18 and 19), how much more must nothing be subtracted from divine commands! From here, therefore, the first transgression of the command began. And many think that this fault was not of the woman, but was of Adam: that Adam had so spoken to the woman, while he wished to make her more cautious, that he added God had commanded: "Neither shall you touch anything of it." For we have that Adam, not Eve, received the command from God. For the woman had not yet been formed. The lesson does not produce the very words of Adam in which he told the woman the form and series of the command; but we understand that the series of the command passed through the man to the woman. Yet let others see what they think; but it seems to me that the fault began with the woman, that the lie started with her. For even if it seems uncertain concerning the two, yet the sex betrays which could have erred first. Add that she is constrained by the prejudice whose first error was also found later. For the woman is the author of error to the man, not the man to the woman. Whence also Paul says: "Adam," he says, "was not deceived; but the woman, being seduced, was in the transgression" (1 Tim. 2:14).

57. Now let us see whether, besides the addition which was applied to the command, what was added seems to have been harmful. For in truth, if it is good: "Neither shall you touch of it," and it was profitable for caution, why did God not at all forbid this—nay, by not forbidding it He seems to have permitted it? Therefore, both must be asked: for what reason He neither permitted nor forbade. For there are those who say, "For what reason did He not command that what He made to be seen should also not be touched?" But when you hear that in that tree was the nature of the knowledge of good and evil, it can be estimated that He did not wish you to touch evil. For it is enough for us to see Satan falling like lightning from heaven, according to the voice of the Lord (Luke 10:18), and giving food not of light, but to the children of night and darkness; because it is written: "He gave him for food to the people of the Ethiopians" (Ps. 73:14). This, therefore, was said of him, that He did not command him to be touched. But what I understand of the fact that He did not prohibit it, receive. There are many things which harm if we wish to drink them in before we know what they are. For this often happens with food and drink.

Quippe si id quod amarum est, ante cognoscas, induis patientiam; et si intelligas illa quae sunt amara prodesse, induis tolerantiam, ne offendant amaritudo te repentina, et incipias rejicere profutura. Prodest ergo ante cognoscere; ut ex eo quod cognoveris profuturum, nec amara fastidias. Sed haec minus nocere possunt: illud quod magis, nisi provideatur, nocere possit, adverte.

58. Gentilis quidam est, ad fidem tendit: catechumenus est, majorem vult accipere doctrinae et fidei plenitudinem; caveat ne dum vult discere, male discat, et discat a Photino, discat ab Ario, discat a Sabellio: tradat se hujusmodi magistris quorum quaedam eum teneat auctoritas; et inductus quadam magistrorum praesumptione, teneris sensibus impressa dijudicare non noverit. Prius igitur oculis mentis perspiciat quid sequatur: videat ubi vita sit: tangat denique divinarum vitalia lectionum, ut nullo pravo offendatur interprete. Legit illi Sabellius: Ego in Patre, et Pater in me (Joan. XIV, 10), et dicit unam esse personam. Legit Photinus: Quia mediator Dei et hominum homo Christus Jesus (I Tim. II, 5). Et alibi: Quid me vultis occidere hominem (Joan. VIII, 40)? Legit etiam Arius quia dixit: Quoniam Pater major me est (Joan. XIV, 28). Legitur quidem manifestum: sed qua ratione dictum sit, debet ante pertractare secum, ut rationem dictorum possit advertere. Ducitur quadam magistrorum auctoritate; et profuisset ei non quaesisse, quam talem invenisse doctorem. Sed etiam gentilis si quis Scripturas accipiat, legit: Oculum pro oculo, dentem pro dente (Lev. XXIV, 20). Legit etiam: Si scandalizaverit te dextera tua, abscinde illam (Matth. V, 30); non intelligit sensum, non advertit divini arcana sermonis, pejus labitur, quam si non legisset. Et ideo docuit quemadmodum Dei Verbum investigare deberent, non perfunctorie, non improvide, sed diligenter atque sollicitè: Quod erat, inquit, ab initio, quod audivimus, et quod vidimus, oculis nostris perspeximus, et manus nostrae perscrutatae sunt de Verbo vitae: et vidimus et testamur, et annuntiamus vobis (I Joan. I, 1 et 2). Vides quod ante velut manibus quibusdam perscrutatus sit Dei verbum, et postea annuntiaverit: et ideo nihil Adae et Evae fortasse nocuisset verbum, si pertractantibus diligenter mentis quibusdam manibus ante tetigissent.

Indeed, if you know beforehand that which is bitter, you put on patience; and if you understand that those things which are bitter are profitable, you put on tolerance, lest a sudden bitterness offend you, and you begin to reject what will be profitable. It is profitable, therefore, to know beforehand, so that from that which you know will be profitable, you do not loathe even bitter things. But these things can harm less; notice that which, unless it is provided for, can harm more.

58. There is a certain Gentile, he tends toward the faith: he is a catechumen (catechumenus), he wishes to receive a greater fullness of doctrine and faith; let him beware lest while he wishes to learn, he learns badly, and learns from Photinus, learns from Arius, learns from Sabellius: let him hand himself over to such teachers whose certain authority may hold him; and led by a certain presumption of teachers, he may not know how to judge things impressed upon his tender senses. First, therefore, let him perceive with the eyes of the mind (mens) what he follows: let him see where life is: finally, let him touch the vital parts of the divine lessons, so that he is offended by no perverse interpreter. Sabellius reads to him: "I in the Father, and the Father in me" (John 14:10), and says there is one person. Photinus reads: "Because the mediator of God and men is the man Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. 2:5). And elsewhere: "Why do you wish to kill me, a man?" (John 8:40). Arius also reads because He said: "Since the Father is greater than I" (John 14:28). It is read indeed as manifest; but for what reason it was said, he ought first to discuss with himself, so that he can notice the reason of the things said. He is led by a certain authority of teachers; and it would have been more profitable for him not to have sought, than to have found such a teacher. But also if any Gentile receives the Scriptures, he reads: "An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth" (Lev. 24:20). He reads also: "If your right hand scandalizes you, cut it off" (Matth. 5:30); he does not understand the sense, he does not notice the secrets of the divine speech, he falls worse than if he had not read. And for that reason he taught how they ought to investigate the Word of God, not perfunctorily, not improvidently, but diligently and solicitously: "That which was," he says, "from the beginning, which we have heard, and which we have seen, we have perceived with our eyes, and our hands have handled concerning the Word of life: and we have seen and we testify, and we announce to you" (1 John 1:1 and 2). You see that he first, as if with certain hands, handled the Word of God, and afterwards announced it; and for that reason perhaps the word would have harmed Adam and Eve nothing, if they had first touched it with certain hands of the mind while discussing it diligently.

Infirmi enim pertractando, et diligentius requirendo, uniuscujusque quam non intelligunt, possunt investigare naturam. Certe illi infirmi id lignum in quo scientiam mali esse cognoverant, ante quemadmodum tangerent, debuerant perscrutari. Nam et mali saepe nobis potest prodesse cognitio. Et ideo diaboli fraudes vel in hac lectione, vel in prophetia (Ezech. XXVIII, 18), ut discamus quemadmodum artes ejus cavere possimus. Cognoscenda sunt enim tentamenta ejus, non ut sequamur, sed ut docti instructique caveamus.

59. Sunt hoc loco qui dubitationem habeant, utrum ex omni ligno ita dixerit Deus esse gustandum, ut cum de omni ligno, ita de scientiae boni et mali ligno gustaretur; an vero de omni ligno gustandum, de solo ligno scientiae boni et mali dixerit non esse gustandum? Qui ne id quidem putant inutilis esse rationis, quod quamvis noxia esca hujus ligni fuerit; tamen si cum caeteris ederetur, noxia esse non possit: quandoquidem etiam antidotum theriacum de corpore serpentis confici solere dicatur, quod utique virus corpusque serpentis, cum solum sumitur, nocet; cum admiscetur aliis, sanitati est et saluti. Scientia quoque boni et mali, si quid sapientiae habeat, si quis vitae semper intendat, si quis caetera virtutum genera consequatur, nequaquam inutilis aestimatur. Hac igitur ratione plerique putaverunt posse etiam illud intelligi; ut videatur Deus id inhibuisse, ne absque caeteris solum lignum scientiae boni et mali gustaretur, non prohibuisse cum caeteris. Et hoc ideo putant dictum, quia ait Deus ad Adam: Quis tibi indicavit quoniam nudus es, nisi de ligno a quo praeceperam tibi, ab hoc solo ne manducares, manducasti (Gen. III, 11)? Quod videretur dare aliquem interpretandi locum, nisi mulier in superioribus, dicente serpente: Quid utique dixit Deus, ne edatis ab omni ligno quod est in paradiso: respondisset: Quod est in medio paradiso, dixit Deus: Non manducabitis ex eo. In quo quamvis mulieris praevaricationis fides videatur infirmior, tamen non omnibus Adam spoliabo virtutibus, ut videatur in paradiso nullam assecutus fuisse virtutem, nihil de caeteris gustavisse lignis, priusque culpam incidisse, quam fructus esse aliquos consecutus. Non spoliabo ergo Adam, ne genus humanum omne dispoliem, quod innocens est antequam sensum accipiat scientiae boni et mali. Neque enim otiose dictum est: Nisi conversi fueritis, et efficiamini sicut puer iste, non intrabitis in regnum coelorum (Matth. XVIII, 3). Puer enim cum maledicitur, non remaledicit: cum percutitur non repercutit: ambitionum et rapinarum tentamenta non novit.

For the weak, by discussing and more diligently inquiring, can investigate the nature of each thing which they do not understand. Certainly those weak ones ought first to have investigated how they should touch that tree in which they had recognized the knowledge of evil to be. For even the knowledge of evil can often be profitable to us. And for that reason we read the frauds of the devil either in this lesson, or in the prophecy (Ezek. 28:18), so that we may learn how we can beware of his arts. For his temptations are to be known, not that we may follow them, but that, being taught and instructed, we may beware.

59. There are some in this place who have a doubt: whether God so said that from every tree there was to be a tasting, that just as from every tree, so also from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil there should be a tasting; or whether He said that from every tree there was to be a tasting, but from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil alone there was not to be a tasting? They do not think even this to be of useless reason: that although the food of this tree was harmful, yet if it were eaten with the others, it could not be harmful; since even the theriac antidote (*antidotum theriacum*) is said to be usually prepared from the body of a serpent, which indeed, when the venom and body of the serpent is taken alone, harms, but when mixed with others, it is for health and safety. The knowledge of good and evil also, if it has anything of wisdom, if one always intends toward life, if one follows the other kinds of virtues, is by no means estimated as useless. By this reason, therefore, many have thought that this also can be understood: that God seems to have forbidden this, lest the tree of the knowledge of good and evil be tasted alone without the others, but did not prohibit it with the others. And they think this was said for this reason, because God said to Adam: "Who indicated to you that you are naked, unless you have eaten from the tree from which I had commanded you, from this alone that you should not eat?" (Gen. 3:11). This would seem to give some place for interpreting, unless the woman in the previous parts, when the serpent said: "Why indeed did God say, 'You shall not eat of every tree that is in paradise?'" had responded: "That which is in the midst of paradise, God said: You shall not eat of it." In which, although the faith of the woman about to transgress seems weaker, yet I will not despoil Adam of all virtues, as if he had attained no virtue in paradise, had tasted nothing of the other trees, and had fallen into fault before he had attained some fruits. I will not, therefore, despoil Adam, lest I despoil the whole human race, which is innocent before it receives the sense of the knowledge of good and evil. For it was not said idly: "Unless you are converted and become like this child, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matth. 18:3). For a child, when he is cursed, does not curse back; when he is struck, he does not strike back; he knows not the temptations of ambitions and robberies.

60. Unde verius puto, quod ne cum aliis quidem fructibus lignum edendum esse praeceperit. Nam etsi bona scientia perfecto, imperfecto tamen inutilis est. Imperfectum ausim omnem hominem dicere, quando ipse Paulus quasi imperfectus dicat: Non quoniam acceperim, aut quo jam perfectus sim: sequor autem si comprehendam (Philipp. I, 12). Et ideo imperfectis dicit Dominus: Nolite judicare, ut non judicemini (Matth. VII, 1). Ergo imperfecto inutilis scientia. Denique, peccatum nesciebam, nisi lex diceret: Non concupisces (Rom. VII, 7). Et infra: Sine lege enim peccatum mortuum est (Ibid., 8). Quid enim mihi proderat scire quod vitare non poteram? Quid mihi proderat scire quod lex carnis meae impugnaret? Impugnatur Paulus, et videt legem carnis suae repugnantem legi mentis suae, et captivari se in lege peccati (Rom. VII, 23), nec de conscientia sua praesumit; sed per Christi gratiam confidit se a mortis corpore liberandum: et tu quemquam opinaris scientem non posse peccare? Paulus dicit: Non enim quod volo facio bonum; sed quod nolo malum, hoc ago (Rom. VII, 19): et tu arbitraris homini prodesse scientiam, quae delicti augeat invidiam? Esto tamen ut perfectus peccare non possit. In Adam Deus omnes homines praevidebat, et ideo promiscue generi non conveniebat humano habere scientiam boni et mali, quam per carnis vitia, ut oportebat, exercere non poterat.

CAPUT XIII.

Quomodo tentamenta diaboli plena sint mendacii; et de deceptione mulieris, et lapsu Adae. Quemadmodum etiam cognoverint se esse nudos, et succinctoria sibi fecerint, quidve per ea significetur.

61. Discamus igitur tentamenta diaboli plena esse mendacii; vix enim unum verum videtur ex iis quae pollicitus est, reliqua falsa composuit. Sic enim habes: Et dixit serpens mulieri: Non morte moriemini (Gen. III, 4). Ecce unum falsum; nam morte mortuus est homo, qui secutus est promissa serpentis. Deinde addidit: Scit, inquit, Deus quia quacumque die manducaveritis ex eo, adaperientur oculi vestri (Ibid., 5). Hoc solum verum, quia infra habes: Quia manducaverunt ambo, et aperti sunt oculi eorum (Ibid., 7). Sed hoc verum quod noceret.

60. Whence I think more truly that He commanded that the tree must not be eaten even with other fruits. For even if knowledge is good for the perfect, yet for the imperfect it is useless. I would dare to call every man imperfect, since Paul himself, as if imperfect, says: "Not as though I had already attained, or were already perfect; but I follow after, if I may apprehend" (Philip. 3:12). And for that reason the Lord says to the imperfect: "Judge not, that you may not be judged" (Matth. 7:1). Therefore, for the imperfect, knowledge is useless. Finally, "I did not know sin, unless the law said: You shall not covet" (Rom. 7:7). And below: "For without the law sin is dead" (Ibid., 8). For what did it profit me to know what I could not avoid? What did it profit me to know what the law of my flesh attacked? Paul is attacked, and he sees the law of his flesh resisting the law of his mind (mens), and himself being captivated in the law of sin (Rom. 7:23), and he does not presume concerning his own conscience; but through the grace of Christ he trusts that he is to be liberated from the body of death (mortis corpore). And do you suppose anyone knowing is not able to sin? Paul says: "For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do" (Rom. 7:19). And do you think knowledge profits a man, which increases the envy of the fault? Let it be, however, that the perfect cannot sin. In Adam, God foresaw all men, and for that reason it was not suitable for the race in common to have the knowledge of good and evil, which it could not exercise, as it ought, through the vices of the flesh.

CHAPTER XIII.

How the temptations of the devil are full of lies; and concerning the deception of the woman and the fall of Adam. In what way they also knew that they were naked and made aprons for themselves, and what is signified by them.

61. Let us learn, therefore, that the temptations of the devil are full of lies; for scarcely one true thing is seen from those things which he promised, the rest he composed as false. For thus you have: "And the serpent said to the woman: You shall not die the death" (Gen. 3:4). Behold, one falsehood; for the man died the death who followed the promises of the serpent. Then he added: "God knows," he says, "that in whatever day you shall eat of it, your eyes shall be opened" (Ibid., 5). This alone was true, because below you have: "Because they both ate, and their eyes were opened" (Ibid., 7). But this truth was what would harm.

Denique non omnibus aperire oculos utile, quia scriptum est: Videbunt et non videbunt (Esai. VI, 9). Sed statim agglutinatum mendacium est, quia adjunxit: Et eritis sicut dii scientes bonum et malum (Gen. III, 5). In quo licet advertere idololatriae auctorem esse serpentem, eo quod plures deos induxisse in hominum videatur errorem quaedam serpentis astutia. Et hoc fefellit, quia homo sicut dii. Non solum enim sicut dii esse homines desierunt, sed etiam qui quasi dii erant, quibus dictum est: Ego dixi, dii estis, sui gratiam perdiderunt (Ps. LXXXI, 6).

62. Et vidit mulier quia bonum est lignum ad manducandum, et quia gratum oculis ad videndum, et speciosum est ad intuendum (Gen. III, 6). Infirma auctor iudicii quae de eo quod non gustaverat, iudicabat. Et ideo non facile, nisi id quod diligentius pertractaverimus, quod interiore probaverimus affectu, videtur ad opus aliquod esse sumendum. Accipiens, inquit, de fructu ejus manducavit, et dedit viro suo simul, et manducaverunt ambo. Bene praetermissum est ubi decipitur Adam; quia non sua culpa, sed vitio lapsus uxoris est.

63. Et aperti sunt, inquit, oculi eorum, et cognoverunt quod nudi essent (Ibid., 7). Et ante quidem nudi erant, sed non sine virtutum integumentis (De Poenit. dist. 2, c. Ut cognoverunt). Nudi erant propter morum simplicitatem, et quod amictum fraudis natura nesciret. Nunc autem multis simulationum involucris mens humana velatur. Ergo posteaquam spoliatos se illa sinceritate et simplicitate viderunt integrae incorruptaeque naturae, quaerere mundana et manufacta coeperunt, quibus nuda suae mentis operirent: delectationes delectationibus, et mundi hujus umbratiles voluptates velut folia foliis assuentes, quibus obumbrarent genitale secretum. Nam quomodo clausos oculos corporis habuit Adam, qui omnia animantia ita vidit, ut his et nomen imponeret? Quomodo cognoverunt, id est, interiore et altiore scientia non tunicam sibi, sed virtutum deesse velamina?

64. Et assuerunt, inquit, folia ficus, et fecerunt sibi succinctoria (Ibid. 7). Ficum hoc loco pro qua specie debeamus accipere divinarum nos docet series lectionum: quandoquidem sanctos esse qui sub vite et ficu requiescunt Scriptura memoraverit (Mich. IV, 4), et Salomon dixerint: Quis plantat ficum, et de fructu ejus non manducat (Prov. XXVII, 18), et Dominus ad ficum venerit; sed ideo sit offensus, quia non invenerit fructum, sed folia tantum.

Finally, to open the eyes is not useful for all, because it is written: "They shall see and they shall not see" (Is. 6:9). But immediately a lie was glued on, because he added: "And you shall be as gods, knowing good and evil" (Gen. 3:5). In which it is permitted to notice that the serpent is the author of idolatry (*idololatriae*), because by a certain craftiness of the serpent he seems to have introduced several gods into the error of men. And this deceived, because the man was as gods. For not only did men cease to be as gods, but even those who were as gods, to whom it was said: "I said, you are gods," lost the grace of their state (Ps. 81:6).

62. "And the woman saw that the tree was good for eating, and that it was pleasing to the eyes to see, and beautiful to look upon" (Gen. 3:6). A weak author of judgment who judged concerning that which she had not tasted. And for that reason, not easily, unless what we have discussed more diligently, what we have proved by interior affection, does it seem that it should be taken up for any work. "Taking," it says, "of its fruit, she ate, and gave to her husband with her, and they both ate." Well was it passed over where Adam is deceived, because it is not by his own fault, but by the vice of his wife that he fell.

63. "And their eyes were opened," it says, "and they knew that they were naked" (Ibid., 7). And before indeed they were naked, but not without the coverings of virtues (*virtutum integumentis*). They were naked on account of the simplicity of their manners, and because nature did not know the cloak of fraud. But now the human mind is veiled by many wrappings of simulations. Therefore, after they saw themselves despoiled of that sincerity and simplicity of a whole and uncorrupted nature, they began to seek worldly and handmade things with which to cover the nakedness of their mind: sewing delights to delights, and the shadowy pleasures of this world like leaves to leaves, with which they might overshadow the genital secret. For how did Adam have the eyes of the body closed, who saw all living things so that he even imposed a name on them? How did they know—that is, by an interior and deeper knowledge—not that a tunic was lacking to them, but the veils of virtues?

64. "And they sewed," it says, "fig leaves, and made for themselves aprons (*succinctoria*)" (Ibid. 7). In what kind we ought to take the fig tree (*figus*) in this place, the series of the divine lessons teaches us: since the Scripture has recorded that they are saints who rest under the vine and the fig tree (Micah 4:4), and Solomon has said: "Who plants a fig tree and does not eat of its fruit?" (Prov. 27:18), and the Lord came to the fig tree; but for that reason He was offended, because He did not find fruit, but leaves only.

Docet ergo me Adam quid sint folia, qui posteaquam peccavit, de foliis ficus fecerit sibi succinctorium, qui de fructibus magis ejus gustare debuerit. Justus fructum eligit, folia peccator. Quis est fructus? Fructus, inquit, spiritus est charitas, gaudium, pax, patientia, benignitas, modestia, continentia, dilectio (Galat. V, 22). Non habebat fructum, qui gaudium non habebat. Non habebat fidem, qui praevaricatus erat mandatum Dei. Non habebat continentiam, qui de interdicto sibi gustaverat ligno.

65. Ergo quicumque praevaricatur mandatum Dei, spoliatur atque nudatur; et fit ipse sibi turpis: vult se operire quibusdam ficus foliis, fortasse quibusdam inanibus, vel umbratilibus sermonibus, quos compositis mendaciis assuens, et verbum de verbo struens, ad operiendam conscientiam suae mentis, factique velamen peccator intexit, ut pudenda sua contegat. Jacit enim supra se folia, qui culpam velare desiderans aut diabolum delicti memorat auctorem, aut carnis praetendit illecebras, aut alium quempiam persuasorem prodit erroris. Et de Scripturis divinis frequenter promit exempla, quibus justos in culpam perhibet incidisse, dicens si forte in stupris fuerit deprehensus: Et Abraham cum ancilla concubuit (Gen. XVI, 4), et David alienam adamavit et sibi adscivit uxorem (II Reg. XI, 4 et 27). Assuit enim sibi quaedam folia, quaedam exempla de propheticarum serie scripturarum, fructum earum non putat requirendum.

66. Nonne tibi videntur etiam Judaei folia assuere, dum legis spiritalis verba corporaliter interpretantur? Quorum interpretatio fructum omnem viriditatis amittit, damnata maledicto ariditatis aeternae. Bona igitur interpretatio, hoc est, spiritalis ficus est fructuosa, sub qua justis sanctique requiescunt. Quam qui plantaverit in animis singulorum, sicut Paulus ait: Ego plantavi, Apollo rigavit (I Cor. III, 6), manducabit ex ea fructum. Mala autem interpretatio fructum ferre, viriditatem servare non poterit.

67. Quod igitur gravius est, hac se Adam interpretatione succinxit eo loco, ubi fructu magis castitatis se succingere debuisset. In lumbis enim quibus praecingimur, quaedam semina generationis esse dicuntur; et ideo male ibi succinctus est Adam foliis inutilibus, ubi futurae generationis non fructum futurum, sed quaedam peccata signaret, quae manserunt usque in adventum Domini Salvatoris. Caeterum posteaquam Dominus advenit, ficum invenit incultam: rogatus ne eam juberet excidi, ut coleretur permisit. Et ideo jam non foliis, sed divino sermone succingimur; quia ipse Dominus ait: Sint lumbi vestri succincti, et lucernae ardentes (Luc. XII, 35). Unde etiam pecuniam in zonis nostris portare prohibet (Matth. X, 9); non enim saecularia, sed aeterna debet zona nostra servare.

Therefore Adam teaches me what leaves are, who, after he sinned, made for himself an apron of fig leaves, who rather ought to have tasted of its fruits. The just chooses the fruit, the sinner the leaves. What is the fruit? "The fruit," he says, "of the spirit is charity, joy, peace, patience, benignity, modesty, continence, love" (Galat. 5:22). He had no fruit, who had no joy. He had no faith, who had transgressed the command of God. He had no continence, who had tasted of the tree forbidden to him.

65. Therefore, whoever transgresses (*praevaricatur*) the command of God is despoiled and stripped; and he becomes shameful to himself: he wishes to cover himself with certain fig leaves, perhaps with certain vain or shadowy words, which, sewing together with composed lies and building word upon word, the sinner weaves as a veil for the conscience of his mind and for his deed, so that he may cover his shameful parts. For he throws leaves over himself who, desiring to hide his fault, either records the devil as the author of the crime, or pretends the allurements of the flesh, or produces some other persuader of error. And from the divine Scriptures he frequently brings forth examples by which he asserts that the just have fallen into fault, saying if perhaps he has been caught in adultery: "And Abraham lay with his handmaid" (Gen. 16:4), and David loved another's wife and took her to himself (2 Sam. 11:4 and 27). For he sews certain leaves to himself, certain examples from the series of the prophetic scriptures; he does not think their fruit should be sought.

66. Do not the Jews also seem to you to sew leaves, while they interpret the words of the spiritual law corporally? Whose interpretation loses all the fruit of greenness, condemned by the curse of eternal dryness. Therefore, a good interpretation—that is, a spiritual one—is a fruitful fig tree, under which the just and holy rest. He who shall have planted it in the souls of individuals, as Paul says: "I have planted, Apollos watered" (1 Cor. 3:6), shall eat of its fruit. But a bad interpretation will not be able to bear fruit nor to preserve greenness.

67. What therefore is more grave, Adam girded himself with this interpretation in that place where he ought rather to have girded himself with the fruit of chastity (*castitas*). For in the loins with which we are girded, certain seeds of generation are said to be; and therefore Adam was badly girded there with useless leaves, where he might mark not the future fruit of a future generation, but certain sins which remained until the coming of the Lord the Savior. Furthermore, after the Lord came, He found the fig tree uncultivated: being asked not to command it to be cut down, He permitted it to be cultivated. And therefore now we are girded not with leaves, but with the divine word (*divino sermone*); because the Lord Himself says: "Let your loins be girded, and your lamps burning" (Luke 12:35). Whence also He prohibits carrying money in our belts (Matth. 10:9); for our belt ought to guard not secular things, but eternal ones.

CAPUT XIV.

De voce Domini deambulantis ad vesperam, et increpatione Adam, Ubi es? Cur praeterea primus increpatur Adam, cum prior mulier gustaverit: et de mulieris excusatione, ac mysteriis per illa designatis.

68. Et auferunt, inquit, vocem Domini Dei deambulantis in paradiso ad vesperam (Gen. III, 8). Quae est deambulatio Dei qui ubique semper est? Sed puto deambulationem quamdam esse Dei per divinarum seriem Scripturarum, in quibus Dei quaedam versatur praesentia; cum audimus quia ipse aspicit omnia, et oculi Domini super justos: cum legimus quia Jesus sciebat cogitationes eorum (Luc. VI, 8): cum legimus: Quid cogitatis mala in cordibus vestris (Matth. IX, 4)? Ergo dum haec recensemus, quasi deambulantes cognoscimus Deum. Fugerat ergo peccator, non quo Dei posset latere conspectum: sed intra conscientiam suam latere cupiebat, opera sua lucere nolebat. Justus enim est facie ad faciem videre; quia justus mens non solum Deo praesens est, sed etiam cum Deo disputat, sicut scriptum est: Judicate pupillo, et justifyate viduam, et venite disputemus, dicit Dominus (Esai. I, 17 et 18). Ergo cum legit peccator has Scripturas divinas, audit vocem Dei quasi ambulantis ad vesperam. Quid est ad vesperam, nisi quia culpam suam sero cognoscit, et sero venit quaedam erroris praeteriti verecundia, quae errorem praevenire debuerat? Nam dum culpa fervet in corpore, et anima exagitur corporis passionibus, non cogitat Deum sensus errantis, hoc est, non audit Deum ambulantes in Scripturis divinis, ambulantes in mentibus singulorum. Dicit enim Deus, Quoniam inhabitabo in illis, et inter eos ambulabo, et ero illorum Deus (Levit. XXVI, 12). Ergo cum in animae sensum redierit potestatis formido divinae, tum erubescimus, tunc nos gestimus abscondere, tunc in peccatorum nostrorum positi cogitationibus, in medio ligni paradisi ubi peccavimus, deprehendimur, latere cupientes, et arbitantes quod Deus non requirat occulta. Sed scrutator animorum et cogitationum usque ad divisionem animae penetrans dicit: Adam, ubi es (Gen. III, 9)?

CHAPTER XIV.

Concerning the voice of the Lord walking in the afternoon, and the rebuke of Adam, "Where are you?" Why, moreover, Adam is rebuked first, although the woman tasted first; and concerning the woman's excuse, and the mysteries designated through those things.

68. "And they heard," it says, "the voice of the Lord God walking in paradise in the afternoon" (Gen. 3:8). What is this walking of God, who is always everywhere? But I think this is a certain walking of God through the series of the divine Scriptures, in which a certain presence of God is involved; when we hear that He Himself beholds all things, and that the eyes of the Lord are upon the just; when we read that Jesus knew their thoughts (Luke 6:8); when we read: "Why do you think evil in your hearts?" (Matth. 9:4). Therefore, while we review these things, we recognize God as it were walking. Therefore the sinner had fled, not to where he could lie hidden from the sight of God, but he desired to lie hidden within his own conscience; he did not wish his works to shine. For it belongs to the just man to see face to face (*facie ad faciem*); because the mind of the just is not only present to God, but also disputes with God, as it is written: "Judge for the fatherless, and justify the widow, and come, let us dispute, says the Lord" (Is. 1:17 and 18). Therefore, when the sinner reads these divine Scriptures, he hears the voice of God as if walking in the afternoon. What is "in the afternoon" (*ad vespem*), unless because he recognizes his fault late, and there comes late a certain shame for past error, which ought to have preceded the error? For while the fault is fervent in the body, and the soul is agitated by the passions of the body, the sense of the erring one does not think of God—that is, he does not hear God walking in the divine Scriptures, walking in the minds of individuals. For God says: "Because I will dwell in them, and will walk among them, and will be their God" (Lev. 26:12). Therefore, when the fear of divine power has returned into the sense of the soul, then we blush, then we desire to hide ourselves; then placed in the thoughts of our sins, in the midst of the tree of paradise where we sinned, we are caught, desiring to lie hidden, and thinking that God does not require hidden things. But the searcher of souls (*scrutator animorum*) and thoughts, penetrating even to the division of the soul, says: "Adam, where are you?" (Gen. 3:9).

69. Quomodo loquitur Deus? Numquid voce corporea? Non utique, sed virtute quadam praestantiore, quam vox corporis potest esse, fundit oracula. Hanc vocem ejus prophetae audierunt; hanc vocem fideles audiunt, impii non intelligunt. Denique in Evangelio habes, quia audivit evangelista dicentem Patrem: Et clarificavi, et iterum clarificabo (Joan. XII, 28); sed Judaei non audierunt. Dicebant enim: Tonitruum factum est (Ibid., 29). Illic ergo, sicut supra habes, quia sentiebatur deambulans Deus qui non deambulabat: sic audiebatur loquens Deus, qui non loquebatur.

70. Sed quid loquatur, consideremus: Adam, ubi es? Adhuc in his remedium sanitatis est, qui audiunt Dei verbum. Denique Judaei qui sibi clausurunt aures ne audirent, hodieque non merentur audire. Deinde habent remedium qui se absconderunt. Nam qui absconditur, erubescit: qui erubescit, convertitur; sicut scriptum est: Confundantur, et convertantur omnes valde velociter (Ps. VI, 11). Deinde hoc ipsum quod vocat, indicium sanaturi est, quia Dominus quos miseratur, et vocat. Dicendo autem, Ubi es? non locum quaerit qui novit arcanum; neque enim Deus clausos habebat oculos, ut non videret latentem. Denique ideo dixit: Factus est Adam tamquam unus ex nobis (Gen. III, 22); quia aperuit oculos. Et hic quidem aperuit oculos, ut culpam suam videret, quam vitare non potuit. Magis enim postquam peccavimus, nescio quomodo nostra delicta cognoscimus: et tunc peccatum esse intelligimus, quod antequam peccaremus, non putabamus esse peccatum. Certe non quasi peccatum putabamus esse damnandum; nam si damnaveremus, non admitteremus. Deus autem omnium videt culpas, et omnium delicta cognoscit: super omnem animam, super omnium occulta oculos habet. Quid est ergo: Adam, ubi es? Id est, non in quo, sed in quibus es. Non ergo interrogatio est, sed increpatio. De quibus, inquit, bonis, de qua beatitudine, de qua gratia in quam miseriam recidisti? Dereliquisti vitam aeternam, et attumulatus es morti, consepultus errori. Ubi est illa tua bene sibi conscia confidentia? Timor iste culpam fatetur, latebra praevaricationem. Ubi ergo es? Hoc est, non in quo loco quaero, sed in quo statu. Quo te perduxerunt peccata tua, ut fugias Deum tuum quem ante quaerebas? Fortasse moveat cur ante increpatur Adam, cum mulier ante gustaverit? Sed a praevaricatione sexus infirmior coeperit, a verecundia et excusatione fortior; ut femina erroris causa fuerit, vir pudoris.

71. Et dixit mulier: Serpens decepit me, et manducavi (Gen. III, 13; De Poenit. dist I, c. Serpens). Veniabilis culpa quam sequitur confessio delictorum. Ideo non desperata mulier quae non reticuit Deo, sed magis confessa peccatum est, quam medicabilis secuta sententia est. Bonum est condemnari in peccato, et flagellari in delicto, ut cum hominibus flagellemur.

69. How does God speak? Is it with a corporal voice? Not indeed, but with a certain power more excellent than a voice of the body can be, He pours forth oracles (oracula). This voice of His the prophets heard; this voice the faithful hear, the impious do not understand. Finally, you have in the Gospel that the evangelist heard the Father saying: "And I have glorified, and I will glorify again" (John 12:28); but the Jews did not hear. For they said: "Thunder has happened" (Ibid., 29). There, therefore, as you have above, that God was felt as walking who did not walk; so God was heard as speaking who did not speak.

70. But let us consider what He says: Adam, where are you? There is still a remedy of health in those who hear the word of God. Finally, the Jews, who closed their ears to themselves so as not to hear, today also do not deserve to hear. Then those who hid themselves have a remedy. For he who is hidden, blushes; he who blushes, is converted; as it is written: "Let all be confounded and turned back very speedily" (Ps. 6:11). Then this very fact that He calls is an indication of one about to heal, because the Lord also calls those whom He pities. But by saying, Where are you?, He does not seek a place, who knows what is secret; for God did not have His eyes closed, so that He would not see the one lying hidden. Finally, He said therefore: "Adam has become as one of us" (Gen. 3:22); because he opened his eyes. And here indeed he opened his eyes, so that he might see his fault, which he could not avoid. For more after we have sinned, in some way we recognize our offenses; and then we understand that it is sin, which before we sinned, we did not think was sin. Certainly we did not think it was to be condemned as sin; for if we condemned it, we would not admit it. But God sees the faults of all, and recognizes the offenses of all; over every soul, over the hidden things of all, He has eyes. What is it therefore: Adam, where are you? That is, not in what place, but in what condition are you. Therefore it is not an interrogation, but a rebuke. From what goods, He says, from what blessedness, from what grace have you fallen back into what misery? You have abandoned eternal life, and are entombed in death, buried together in error. Where is that confidence of yours, well conscious of itself? This fear confesses the fault, the hiding place the transgression (*praevaricatio*). Where therefore are you? That is, I do not seek in what place, but in what state. To where have your sins led you, that you flee your God whom you sought before? Perhaps it may move one why Adam is rebuked first, since the woman tasted first? But from transgression the weaker sex began, from shame and excuse the stronger; so that the woman was the cause of error, the man of modesty.

71. And the woman said: "The serpent deceived me, and I ate" (Gen. 3:13). A venial fault is that which a profession of offenses follows. Therefore the woman was not despaired of, who did not keep silent to God, but rather confessed the sin, for which a curable sentence followed. It is good to be condemned in sin, and to be scourged in offense, so that we may be scourged with men.

Denique Cain quia voluit crimen negare indignus judicatus est, qui puniretur in peccato: sed remissus est sine praescripto poenae, fortasse non tam majori crimine parricidii (illud enim commisit in fratrem) quam sacrilegii, quod Deo credidit mentiendum dicens: Nescio: numquid ego custos fratris mei sum (Gen. IV, 9)? Et ideo accusatori diabolo ejus accusatio reservata est; ut cum ejus angelis flagelletur, qui cum hominibus noluit flagellari. Denique de talibus dictum est: Non est declinatio mortis eorum . . . et cum hominibus non flagellabuntur (Ps. LXXII, 4 et 5). Alia ergo ratio mulieris, quae licet in culpam praevaricationis inciderat, tamen de paradisi lignis habebat adhuc virtutis escam; et ideo dixit peccatum suum, et reputatum est ei ad veniam. Justus enim accusator est sui in principio sermonis. Neque enim potest quisquam justificari a peccato (De Poenit. dist. 1, c. Non potest), nisi fuerit peccatum ante confessus. Unde Dominus ait: Dic iniquitates tuas, ut justificeris (Esai. XLIII, 26).

72. Ergo quia Eva ipsa confessa delictum est, misequitur et profutura sententia, quae condemnaret errorem, et veniam non negaret, ut ad virum suum conversa serviret. Primum ne eam facile delectaret errare: deinde ut sub fortiori vase locata non traduceret virum, sed magis viri consilio et ipsa regeretur. In quo quidem mysterium Christi et Ecclesiae evidenter agnosco. Designatur enim Ecclesiae ad Christum futura conversio, et religiosa servitus subdita Dei Verbo, quae multo sit melior, quam saeculi hujus libertas. Denique scriptum est: Dominum Deum tuum adorabis, et ipsi soli serves (Deut. VI, 13). Haec igitur servitus Dei donum est. Denique inter benedictiones numeratur hujus servitutis obsequium; nam et Isaac in loco benedictionis eam dedit Esau filio suo, ut serviret fratri suo. Denique benedictionem ille poscebat; etsi unam sibi cognovisset esse praereptam, tamen aliam postulabat dicens: Numquid una benedictio tibi est, Pater (Gen. XXVII, 38)? Per hanc igitur servitutem ille qui per gulam primitias suas ante vendiderat, et studio venationis agrestis gratiam benedictionis amiserat, credidit se ipso futurum esse meliorem, si typum Christi veneretur in fratre. Hac enim servitute pollet populus Christianus, sicut et Dominus ad discipulos suos ait: Qui vult inter vos primus esse, sit omnium servus (Matth. XX, 27). Denique hanc servitutem operatur charitas, quae et spe major et fide est. Unde scriptum est: Per charitatem servite invicem vobis (Galat. V, 13). Hoc est ergo mysterium quod ait Apostolus esse in Christo et in Ecclesia (Ephes. V, 32). Haec enim vere in praevaricatione ante fuit, sed salva erit per filiorum generationem in fide, et charitate, et sanctificatione, cum castitate. Praevaricata utique in patribus generatio hominum salvatur per filios; ut quod in Judaeis offenderat, in Christiana posteritate corrigeret.

Finally Cain, because he wished to deny the crime, was judged unworthy to be punished in sin; but he was dismissed without a prescription of punishment, perhaps not so much for the greater crime of parricide (for that he committed against his brother) as for sacrilege, because he believed he should lie to God, saying: "I do not know; am I my brother's keeper?" (Gen. 4:9). And therefore his accusation is reserved for the accuser devil; so that he may be scourged with his angels, who refused to be scourged with men. Finally, concerning such it is said: "There is no avoidance of their death... and they shall not be scourged with men" (Ps. 72:4 and 5). Therefore, another is the reason of the woman, who although she had fallen into the fault of transgression, nevertheless still had the food of virtue from the trees of paradise; and therefore she told her sin, and it was reckoned to her for pardon. For the just man is the accuser of himself in the beginning of his speech. Nor can anyone be justified from sin, unless he has first confessed the sin. Wherefore the Lord says: "Tell your iniquities, that you may be justified" (Is. 43:26).

72. Therefore, because Eve herself confessed her offense, there follows also a profitable sentence, which would condemn the error and not deny pardon, so that she might serve being converted to her husband. First, lest it should easily please her to err; then, so that being placed under a stronger vessel she might not lead her husband astray, but rather might herself be ruled by her husband's counsel. In which indeed I evidently recognize the mystery of Christ and the Church. For there is designated the future conversion of the Church to Christ, and the religious servitude subject to the Word of God, which is much better than the liberty of this world. Finally, it is written: "The Lord your God shall you adore, and Him only shall you serve" (Deut. 6:13). This servitude, therefore, is a gift of God. Finally, the obedience of this servitude is numbered among the blessings; for Isaac also gave it in the place of blessing to his son Esau, that he should serve his brother. Finally, he was asking for a blessing; even if he had known one had been snatched away from him, nevertheless he was asking for another, saying: "Is there not one blessing for you, Father?" (Gen. 27:38). Through this servitude, therefore, he who through gluttony had before sold his birthright, and through the study of field hunting had lost the grace of blessing, believed that he himself would be better, if he would venerate the type of Christ in his brother. For in this servitude the Christian people prevail, just as the Lord also said to His disciples: "He who wishes to be first among you, let him be the servant of all" (Matth. 20:27). Finally, charity works this servitude, which is greater than both hope and faith. Wherefore it is written: "Through charity serve one another" (Galat. 5:13). This is therefore the mystery which the Apostle says is in Christ and in the Church (Ephes. 5:32). For she truly was in transgression before, but she shall be saved through the generation of children in faith, and charity, and sanctification, with chastity. Certainly the generation of men, having transgressed in the fathers, is saved through the sons; so that what had offended in the Jews, it might correct in the Christian posterity.

CAPUT XV.

Peccatum mulieris quare venia dignum; quidve per serpentem, feminam, ac virum significetur. Qualis serpentis condemnatio; et in quibus ab Adami condemnatione distinguatur.

73. Serpens, inquit, me persuasit: et hoc veniabile Deo visum est; eo quod nosset multas ad decipiendum vias esse serpentis (quia transfiguratur in angelum lucis, et ministri ejus sicut ministri justitiae sunt) falsa imponentis rebus singulis nomina, ut temeritatem dicat esse virtutem, et avaritiae nomen imponat industriae. Serpens enim mulierem decepit, virum mulier ad praevaricationem de veritate deduxit. Serpentis typum accepit delectatio corporalis: mulier symbolum sensus est nostri, vir mentis. Delectatio itaque sensum movet, sensus menti transfundit quam acceperit passionem. Delectatio igitur prima est origo peccati, ideoque non mireris, cur ante serpens damnetur judicio Dei, secundo mulier, tertio vir. Secundum erroris ordinem, damnationis quoque ordo servatus est. Delectatio enim sensum, sensus autem mentem captivam facere consuevit. Ut scias autem quia serpens typus est delectationis, damnationem ejus adverte.

74. Supra pectus, inquit, tuum et in utero tuo ambulabis (Gen. III, 14). Qui sunt qui in utero suo ambulabant, nisi qui ventri et gulae vivunt, quorum deus venter est, et gloria in pudendis eorum, qui terrena sapiunt, et cibo onerati ad terrena curvantur? Bene ergo delectationi ait, quae cibus intenta terram videtur manducare: Supra pectus tuum, et in utero tuo ambulabis, et terram manducabis omnibus diebus vitae tuae. Tollenda est omnis excusatio diaboli; ne forte malitiae suae aliquid possit obtendere, ut dicat iniquitatem suam ex condemnatione venisse; et ideo ad nocendum hominibus pertinaciter obniti, quia ideo damnatus est ut noceret: quod videtur esse proximum opinioni, si tamquam damnationis accipimus istam sententiam. Non enim Deus ad hoc serpentem damnavit, ut noceat: sed quid futurus esset, ostendit. Et quidem tentatio illa quod amplius hominibus prosit, superius demonstravimus (c. 2, n. 9): sed tamen cum legerimus quod scriptum est, dicente Deo: Honorificantes me honorificabo, et contemptor mei honore privabitur (I Reg. II, 30), licet nobis ex his verbis aliquid aestimare. Deus enim operatur quod bonum est, non quod malum. Ergo doceant te verba divina, quia operatur gloriam, poenam relinquit. Honorificantes me, inquit, honorificabo, honorem bonorum operationis suae esse declarans.

CHAPTER XV.

Why the sin of the woman is worthy of pardon; and what is signified through the serpent, the woman, and the man. What kind is the condemnation of the serpent; and in what things it is distinguished from the condemnation of Adam.

73. "The serpent," she says, "persuaded me": and this seemed venial to God; because He knew there are many ways of the serpent for deceiving (since he is transfigured into an angel of light, and his ministers are as ministers of justice) imposing false names on individual things, so that he may call temerity a virtue, and impose the name of industry on avarice. For the serpent deceived the woman, the woman led the man from the truth to transgression. Bodily pleasure (*delectatio corporalis*) took the type of the serpent; the woman is the symbol of our sense (*sensus*), the man of the mind (*mens*). Pleasure, therefore, moves the sense; the sense transfers to the mind the passion which it has received. Pleasure, therefore, is the first origin of sin, and for that reason do not wonder why the serpent is condemned first by the judgment of God, second the woman, third the man. According to the order of error, the order of condemnation was also preserved. For pleasure is accustomed to make the sense captive, and the sense the mind. But that you may know that the serpent is the type of pleasure, observe its condemnation.

74. "Upon your breast," He says, "and on your belly shall you walk" (Gen. 3:14). Who are they who were walking on their belly, unless those who live for the belly and gluttony, whose god is the belly, and glory in their shame, who savor earthly things, and burdened with food are curved toward earthly things? Well, therefore, He says to pleasure, which intent on food seems to eat earth: "Upon your breast, and on your belly shall you walk, and earth shall you eat all the days of your life." All excuse of the devil is to be removed; lest perhaps he might be able to pretend something of his malice, so as to say that his iniquity came from condemnation; and therefore to resist persistently in harming men, because he was condemned for this, that he might harm: which seems to be close to opinion, if we receive that sentence as if of condemnation. For God did not condemn the serpent to this, that he might harm; but He showed what he would be. And indeed that temptation, that it profits men more, we have demonstrated above (ch. 2, n. 9); but nevertheless when we shall have read what is written, God saying: "Those honoring me I will honor, and the contemner of me shall be deprived of honor" (1 Kings 2:30), it is permitted for us to estimate something from these words. For God works that which is good, not that which is evil. Therefore let the divine words teach you, because He works glory, He leaves punishment. "Those honoring me," He says, "I will honor," declaring honor to be of the operation of His good ones.

Et contemptores, inquit, mei, non dixit honore privabo; sed, honore privabuntur; non suae operationi deputans eorum injuriam, sed quid futurum esset, ostendens. Ergo hic non dixit: Facio te supra pectus tuum, et in utero tuo ambulare, et terram manducare omnes dies vitae tuae: sed: Ambulabis, inquit, et manducabis; ut praedixisse magis de serpente quae futura sunt, videretur, quam praescripsisse quid faceret. Terra enim, inquit, tibi cibus erit, non anima: nam et hoc peccatoribus prodest. Unde et Apostolus tradidit hujusmodi in interitum carnis, ut spiritus salvus sit in die Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Pectore autem et ventre ait reptare serpentem, non tam propter corporis figuram, quam quod propter terrenas cogitationes de illa coelesti beatitudine sit lapsus. Pectus enim frequenter recessus quidam accipitur sapientiae. Et ideo Apostolus supra pectus Christi reclinat caput, non in terram dejicit. Ergo si sapientia diaboli feris immanissimis comparatur, quibus intra pedes pectus sit: et etiam homines qui terrena sapiunt, nec interiore affectu eriguntur ad coelum, utero videntur reptare per terram; utique ventrem animae nostrae non corruptibilibus saeculi hujus implere, sed magis Dei verbo satiare debemus. Bene igitur David personam suscipiens Adae dicit: Humiliata est in pulvere anima mea, adhaesit in terra venter meus (Ps. XLIII, 25). Adhaesit enim dum configuratur serpenti, qui pascitur in iniquitate terrena. Ideoque nos Apostolus configurari dicit oportere Christo (Rom. VI, 5), ut virtus Christi prae- tendat in nobis. Quae sententia non putatur in serpentem gravis, cum etiam Adam, qui levius peccavit, tali condemnatur sententia.

75. Scriptum est enim: Maledicta terra in operibus tuis: in tristitia manducabis eam omnes dies vitae tuae (Gen. III, 17). Videtur certe similitudo quaedam esse sententiae: sed tamen in ipsa similitudine magna discretio. Interest enim utrum manducet aliquis terram, sicut serpenti dictum est, quia terram manducabit: an vero sicut homini dictum est, in tristitia manducabis. Adjectio enim ista: In tristitia, discretionem facit. Discretio quam vim habeat, considera. Bonum est mihi in tristitia magis terram manducare, quam in delectatione, hoc est, ut in actu quodam et sensu corporis contristari videar, quam delectari in peccato. Multi enim propter nimias iniquitates non suscipiunt peccati conscientiam. At vero ille qui ait: Castigo corpus meum, et servituti redigo (I Cor. IX, 27), contristatur in nostrorum poenitentia peccatorum; quia sua tanta delicta non habuit, ut in his contristari deberet. Denique et nobis suadet utilem istam esse tristitiam, quae secundum Deum, non secundum saeculum est.

And “contemners,” He says, “of me,” He did not say “I will deprive of honor”; but, “they shall be deprived of honor”; not deputing their injury to His operation, but showing what would be. Therefore here He did not say: I make you walk upon your breast, and on your belly, and eat earth all the days of your life; but: “You shall walk,” He says, “and you shall eat”; so that He would seem rather to have predicted about the serpent what things are to come, than to have prescribed what he should do. “Earth,” He says, “shall be food for you, not the soul”: for this also profits sinners. Whence also the Apostle delivered such a one unto the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ. But with breast and belly He says the serpent crawls, not so much because of the figure of the body, as that because of earthly thoughts he has fallen from that heavenly beatitude. For the breast is frequently received as a certain retreat of wisdom. And therefore the Apostle reclines his head upon the breast of Christ, he does not cast it down on the earth. Therefore if the wisdom of the devil is compared to the most immense wild beasts, to which the breast is within the feet; and also men who savor earthly things, nor are they raised by interior affection to heaven, seem to crawl with the belly through the earth; certainly we ought not to fill the belly of our soul with the corruptible things of this world, but rather to satisfy it with the word of God. Well, therefore, David taking up the person of Adam says: “My soul is humbled in the dust, my belly has cleaved to the earth” (Ps. 43:25). For it cleaved while it is configured to the serpent, who feeds on earthly iniquity. And therefore the Apostle says it is necessary to be configured to Christ (Rom. 6:5), so that the virtue of Christ may extend in us. Which sentence is not thought heavy against the serpent, since even Adam, who sinned more lightly, is condemned with such a sentence.

75. For it is written: “Cursed is the earth in your works: in sadness shall you eat it all the days of your life” (Gen. 3:17). Certainly a certain likeness of sentence seems to be: but nevertheless in that very likeness a great discretion. For it matters whether someone eats earth, as it was said to the serpent, that he shall eat earth: or truly as it was said to man, “in sadness shall you eat.” For that addition, “In sadness,” makes a discretion. Consider what force the discretion has. It is better for me to eat earth rather in sadness than in pleasure, that is, so that I may seem to be saddened in a certain act and sense of the body, than to be delighted in sin. For many because of excessive iniquities do not receive the consciousness of sin. But truly he who says: “I chastise my body, and bring it into servitude” (1 Cor. 9:27), is saddened in the repentance of our sins; because he did not have such great offenses of his own, that he ought to be saddened in them. Finally, he also persuades us that this sadness is useful, which is according to God, not according to the world.

Oportet, inquit, vos contristari in poenitentiam secundum Deum (II Cor. VII, 9 et 10); nam secundum Deum tristitia salutem operatur, saeculi autem tristitia mortem operatur. Sed et de veteri Testamento accipe illos ad gratiam pervenisse, qui contristabantur in operibus corporalibus; illos vero in supplicio remansisse, qui delectabantur hujus mundi operibus. Denique Hebraei qui ingemiscebant in laboribus Aegypti, justorum gratiam consecuti sunt (Exod. II, 24). Et quia panem in tristitia manduca-verunt, esca donati sunt spiritali (Exod. XVI, 13 et seq.): Aegyptii vero qui talia opera cum exultatione celebrabant, regi detestabili servientes, nullam veniam sunt adepti.

76. Sed est et illa distinctio, quod serpenti dicitur quia terram manducabit; Adae autem: In tristitia, inquit, manducabis, et cum sudore manducabis, et manducabis fenum agri (Gen. III, 18 et 19); ut quemdam intelligamus in his esse processum et quando terram manducamus, in quadam malitia esse videamur: quando fenum, in quodam processu: quando vero panem, cum consummata fuerit fortitudo. Ergo et nos habeamus processum vitae hujus, sicut habuit et Paulus qui dicit: Vivo autem jam non ego (Galat. II, 20), hoc est, non ego qui terram ante manducabam: non ego qui fenum, quia omnis caro fenum: Sed vivit in me Christus, hoc est, vivit panis ille vivus qui venit e coelo, vivit sapientia, vivit gratia, vivit justitia, vivit resurrectio.

77. Deinde considera quia non est maledictus homo, sed maledictus est serpens: nec terra in se maledicta est; sed Maledicta, inquit, in operibus tuis, quod ad Adam dictum est. Tunc terra maledicta est, si habeas opera terrena, id est opera saecularia. Et maledicta non in universum; sed ut spinas et tribulos generet, nisi fuerit humanae studio operationis exercitata. Quod si eam exercuerimus, in labore quidem et sudore, sed tamen panem manducabimus. Repugnat enim lex carnis legi mentis. Et laborandum nobis est ac desudandum, ut castigemus corpus, et servituti redigamus, et quae sunt spiritalia seminemus. Si enim carnalia seminauerimus, quae carnalia sunt metemus: si vero spiritalia seminauerimus, metemus ea quae sunt spiritalia. (S. Aug., l. II cont. Jul. Pelag., c. 5).

It is necessary, he says, for you to be saddened unto repentance according to God (2 Cor. 7:9 and 10); for sadness according to God works salvation, but the sadness of the world works death. But also from the Old Testament receive that they reached grace, who were saddened in bodily works; but those truly remained in punishment, who were delighted in the works of this world. Finally, the Hebrews who groaned in the labors of Egypt, obtained the grace of the just (Exod. 2:24). And because they ate bread in sadness, they were gifted with spiritual food (Exod. 16:13 et seq.): but the Egyptians who celebrated such works with exultation, serving a detestable king, obtained no pardon.

76. But there is also that distinction, that it is said to the serpent that he shall eat earth; but to Adam: "In sadness," He says, "shall you eat, and with sweat shall you eat, and you shall eat the hay of the field" (Gen. 3:18 and 19); so that we may understand there is a certain progress in these: and when we eat earth, we seem to be in a certain malice: when hay, in a certain progress: when truly bread, when fortitude shall have been consummated. Therefore let us also have a progress of this life, just as Paul had who says: "But I live, now not I" (Galat. 2:20), that is, not I who before was eating earth: not I who hay, because all flesh is hay: "But Christ lives in me," that is, there lives that living bread which came from heaven, there lives wisdom, there lives grace, there lives justice, there lives resurrection.

77. Then consider because the man is not cursed, but the serpent is cursed: nor is the earth in itself cursed; but "Cursed," He says, "in your works," which was said to Adam. Then the earth is cursed, if you have earthly works, that is, secular works. And it is not cursed in general; but so that it may generate thorns and thistles, unless it shall have been exercised by the study of human operation. Which if we shall have exercised it, in labor indeed and sweat, but nevertheless we shall eat bread. For the law of the flesh resists the law of the mind. And we must labor and sweat, so that we may chastise the body, and bring it into servitude, and sow those things which are spiritual. For if we shall have sown carnal things, those things which are carnal we shall reap: if truly we shall have sown spiritual things, we shall reap those things which are spiritual.