
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

he becomes the life and nourishment of the soul. It was our Lord's intention that the people should ponder the meaning of these images, and have "great reasoning among themselves" concerning them. Thus all who were of an earnest and teachable spirit, would gradually come to the apprehension of the high truths which they covered, and only the careless and light-minded remain ignorant of their spiritual significance. The premature attempt to unfold their meaning in plain language to the multitude (aside from the fact that some of them pointed to events yet future, and could, therefore, have only a historic interpretation), would have had no other result than that of destroying the shell without feeding the soul with the kernel which it covered. The Divine wisdom of Jesus left to the people themselves the work of enucleating the kernel from the shell, and finding that it was, in very deed, spirit and not flesh. His example in this particular deserves the serious consideration of all religious teachers. In dealing with the ignorant they should be careful lest their laborious explanations, designed to bring everything spiritual within the apprehension of the finite human understanding, prove to be an *eliminating* rather than an *illuminating* process.

ARTICLE III.

ANSELM'S DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION AND ATONEMENT.

A TRANSLATION OF THE "CUR DEUS HOMO."

By James Gardiner Vose, Milton, Mass.

[In presenting a translation of this work, it may be proper to give a brief account of the career of its author, and of the manner in which he developed the monastic life and discipline.

Paul of Thebes and Anthony of Alexandria have each been called the father of monasticism. Yet neither the one in his lonely grotto, nor the other in the devout community gathered around him, could have foreseen the system which here had its

faint beginnings. Doubtless at this earlier period of monasticism, there was much in it that was irrational. The influence of eastern superstitions, habits of life and feeling, was doubtless far greater than we can easily trace. Yet there was also a basis for monachism in true Christianity. The corruptions of the church, so painfully manifest, called for a new consecration among its more devout members, which should divide them as naturally from formal religionists, as before they had been separated from the world. Monasticism was instituted to supply this profound want. It was, as it has been truly called: "The Church within the Church." From the first monks to Anselm of Canterbury, seven centuries had intervened, in which the system had been fully matured. The evils springing from its own weakness, and the still greater evils attaching themselves to it as a convenient instrument from without, had been abundantly revealed. They had been felt within the cloister, and already had Odo and Berno, with many more, equals in zeal if not in intellect, assayed the work of reformation. There was a return, as it were, to the spirit of the earlier ages, and if, among many of the older monks, the abuses of the system still remained, many more now sought its sacred order for the better hopes of holiness that it held out. "The Hildebrandian epoch of reform," says Neander, "was accompanied with the outpouring of a spirit of compunction and repentance on the western nations. It was the same spirit which, in different directions, promoted the crusades, monasticism and the spread of sects, which contended against the hierarchy."[1] Of all, who at that period sought the conventual life, none did it with simpler views than Anselm. Trained under the guidance of a mother, who plied him with every loving and pious motive, and wrought upon by that celestial influence, which alone is more powerful than this, it was not strange that he should early imbibe that devout enthusiasm which led him irresistibly to the monastic order. The dreams of his childhood foreshadow the course of his history. In visions he toiled up the steep ascent of the neighboring Alps to gain audience with God, and there beheld and feasted with the King of heaven — emblem of the effort and the victory of his whole life. Driven by paternal harshness from his youthful home, he wandered far in search of a congenial resting-place, till accident brought him to the convent of Bec; where, taking gladly the

[1] Torrey's Neander, Vol. III. p. 233.

solemn obligations of his order, he threw himself into the privacy of prayer and contemplation, doubtless hoping from such seclusion never to be withdrawn. And, though allowed for only three years to remain a simple monk, yet three and thirty years do we find him dwelling in that loved monastery, and devoting his highest energies to the cultivation of inward piety. Self-edification was the great primary idea in monasticism, and it absorbed the whole soul of Anselm. "Seek not so much," he would say, "a place of usefulness to others, as one in which you may be edified yourself." With such a rule, he gave the earlier years of his monastic life to prayer and devout study. Though imposing upon himself no useless penance, yet his conquest over bodily wants was truly remarkable. There seemed no need of mortifying the flesh, for the spirit had reached such a height as no longer to notice its encumbrance. Devoting his days to study, his nights were often spent in the vigils of prayer; or, upon his couch, sleep gave place to holy ecstasies, or profound meditation upon God. The monks, who opened the chapel for matins, not seldom found him there upon his knees, where the night had sped rapidly away in the fervor of his prolonged devotion. He fasted to an extent almost incredible, yet not in periods of long abstinence, as if for a show of piety, but in the uniform course of daily life. Nor let us think for a moment that in the rigor of monastic discipline he lost the glow of religious fervor. No studies, no routine of heavy duties, ever quenched the ardor of his early longing for the more inspiring views of God made manifest. From his lone cell, we hear the breathing of his ardent love for Christ, hallowing the stillness of the night, while he utters his glowing adoration: "What can be more delightful than to see the man, who is the creator of man! What more touching, than to behold in this Mediator between God and man, the Lord Jesus Christ, eternity as it were begin! loftiness become lowliness! He is conceived in a mother's womb, who sits evermore in the Father's bosom; born in time from a mother without father, who was begotten in eternity by a Father without mother. Folded in swaddling clothes lies he, who has decked the firmament with stars and the earth with flowers. A manger holds him whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain. He grows in wisdom, whose wisdom is without beginning and end; in age, whose years do not increase and do not diminish; in grace, who is the author of all grace. He is subject to

parents, before whom all creatures bow. He who is the bread, is an hungered. He who is the fountain, is thirsty. He who is the way, becomes weary. The Glory suffers itself to be put to shame; the Majesty to be humiliated; the Life to be slain."

The pious contemplations of Anselm were closely connected with his profoundest studies. His intellectual mould was that of the true monk. Study was his delight, and speculative study the most of all. Weariness and vacancy never tinged his solitude, and the public cares of later life only whetted his desire for the musing of the cell. Subjects the most vast and sublime, were his familiar food. The being and nature of God, he studied with remarkable intensity. And God revealed in flesh, stirring on one side the very ocean-depths of speculation, and on the other, touching the spirit's harp in the tenderest of human interests, was a subject which filled the mind of Anselm with the highest wonder and joy. To this he turned with childlike affection amid all the cares and dignity of official life. Follow him an exile from his country, where royal oppression had almost crushed the hopes of piety; and, while king and pope, prelates and nobles were agitating his claims, behold him in his lone dwelling in the German forests, returning with all the freshness of his early consecration, to the life of the recluse. There, as if there were no interest but the purifying of his own soul, and no pleasure but that of holy contemplation, he bends in profound thought over his immortal work, the "Cur Deus Homo." From such seclusion, had Anselm been less thoroughly imbued with the spirit of real Christianity, perhaps he might never have withdrawn. But the piety which made him a monk, was too deep and pure to leave him an anchorite. His own noble sentiment, that "a man's goodness belongs to and is an advantage to all holy beings," so modified his views of self-edification, that he could find no escape from the offices of public teacher, counsellor and guide. Accordingly, when called at an early age to the head of the convent, no reluctance could overcome the claims of Christian duty. How reads the history of his thirty years at Bec? He sits in the chair of abbot, guiding her temporal affairs with care and patience; giving judgment upon all church questions, whether of faith or practice; and freely laying aside his own employments to counsel and comfort his brethren. And what says the history of his later days? Ask of the hundreds and thousands who crowded about him when an exile on his

way to Rome. The cloistered monk had now become the itinerant missionary. He spends whole days in preaching, and administering the sacred rite of confirmation; days, as he himself expresses it, of most delightful feeling, in which was breathed no morbid sigh for solitude. Still later than this, we find Anselm in the height of his episcopal prosperity, at the dissolute court of Henry, aiming his shafts at every form of sin, and making the nobles tremble, and renounce their crimes. Behold him now the court preacher, led by duty to fields the furthest possible removed from the seclusion of his early choice. Retaining all his love of holy solitude, he was yet active in the most discordant scenes. All else that characterizes the monk, seemed lost in the course of his labors, except that piety which made him take the vow, and which constituted its only value. He was sixty years old when made archbishop of Canterbury, though urging every objection to an office, which was fairly thrust upon him by king and prelates. Yet witness the uncompromising fidelity with which he discharged its duties. He who was only forced to receive the crosier, cannot now be forced to abate one tittle of its dignity. He who learned so thoroughly and urged so warmly the monastic rule of obedience, shows now, in his position of authority, that he is well able to govern. We may not follow his long contests against royal oppression. In every one, with mildness, yet with unconquerable firmness, he sustains the rights of the church. Single-handed, he contends successfully against king and prelates, and even his own clergy; trying every art both to defend the honor of the church, and to cure the hideous wounds of priestly corruption. So heavy labors the human spirit could not long endure. Wasted with lingering sickness, though bearing the duties of his office to his latest days, he comes at length to the grave. His death-scene was a just expression of his life's history. He had one wish to live. It was that he might bring into clearer light an abstruse subject of Christian speculation, which pressed upon his mind. With his last effort of physical strength, he stretched out his hands in holy benediction upon the king, the clergy and the people, then dropped his head upon his breast in prayer. Never, from a monastic life, has been developed so perfect a character. The monk had grown into the apostle. Bearing from the cloister all its piety and discipline and industry, he infused new life into the church, and into his own character, by his manifold labors.

Prayer must sometimes give place to study; study to instruction; instruction to hospitality; and all of these to his more arduous official duties; so that each in turn made purer all the rest, and in their varied round, symmetry was given to the whole man. In piety, he was the revered example of the church; in knowledge, the expounder of her faith; in guidance, her wisest counsellor; and, in office, her valiant defender, her zealous reformer.

The circumstances under which the "Cur Deus Homo" was written, are interesting to notice. The difficulties of Anselm with the king, arising at his very consecration as archbishop, became in a short time so harassing, that he judged it necessary to lay his matters personally before the pope. And, though this were voluntary on his part, yet it was really an exile, for the king had no thought that he would ever return. In the midst, however, of all his public cares, he found time for study; and, at the earnest entreaty of others, as he tells us, though doubtless also at the instance of his own feelings, he began this work, even while discharging the earlier duties of his life at Canterbury. Nor did even his banishment interpose any serious interruption to the progress of this treatise. While at Rome, in the ensuing season, awaiting the mandates of the church, the heat became so extreme, that he determined to travel northward. Accordingly, he found a retreat in the German town of Telesi, but was afterwards induced to remove to Sclavia, a rural estate not far distant. He was entertained there by John, a monk formerly associated with him at Bec. "Here," said Anselm, "will I take breath;" which was but to say: "Here will I forget the world, and return to Divine contemplations." In this retirement he soon finished the "Cur Deus Homo," which is written, it will be perceived, in the form of a dialogue, thus giving a beautiful instance of the manner in which his healthful piety linked his solitary studies to the improvement of others. The person selected was no fictitious character, but a much-loved pupil, whose youth was happily fostered under the care of Anselm, and who became his successor at Bec, in the year 1124.

Of the work itself, it may be said, that it forms the most important epoch in the history of the doctrine of atonement. The views held for ten centuries, regarded the death of Christ as a sacrifice, to which was added also the idea of a conquest over the devil. By the victory of Christ, man was, as it were,

released from the power of the devil, to whom he rightfully belonged. Though traces of a more correct understanding of the doctrine may be formed at an earlier period, yet it was left for Anselm to bring out with clear and thorough reasoning the view, afterwards adopted by all branches of the orthodox church. To him belongs the praise of making the first distinct, formal exhibition of the atonement, as a satisfaction required by the justice of God. Says Baur: "The relation in which Anselm's theory of satisfaction stands to the notions which had generally obtained previous to his time, is chiefly expressed by his decided opposition to the principle on which those notions were founded in respect to the devil."[1] We cannot, therefore, well overrate the historic value of this treatise; nor will a careful study of it lessen our view of the merits of the work, though its scholastic nicety be sometimes distasteful. In addition to the common sources of information, it may be well to notice the somewhat recent work entitled: "Anselm von Canterbury," by Hasse. It is published in two volumes; the first is biographical, giving a full and interesting picture of his eventful life; the second presents the growth and character of his doctrinal system. With distinctness and simplicity, both the man and his works are set before the reader.—Tr.]

Anselm's Preface.

This work was undertaken for the sake of certain persons, who, without my knowledge, were engaged in transcribing the earlier parts of it, before it had been completed and revised. I have, therefore, been obliged to finish it, as best I could, more hurriedly than was convenient for me, and so within narrower limits than I could wish. For, had an undisturbed and adequate period been allowed me for publishing it, I should have introduced and subjoined many things, about which I have been silent. For it was while suffering under great anguish of heart (the origin and reason of which are known to God), that, at the entreaty of others, I began the book in England, and finished it when an exile in Capua. From the theme, on which it was published, I have called it: *Cur Deus Homo;* and have divided it into two short books. The first contains the objec-

[1] Baur, Versöhnungslehre, p. 155; quoted in Hagenbach's History of Doctrines, Vol. II. p. 34.

tions of infidels, who despise the Christian faith, because they deem it contrary to reason; and also the replies of believers; and, in fine, leaving Christ out of view (as if nothing had ever been known of him), it proves, by absolute reasons, the impossibility that any man should be saved without him. Again, in the second book, likewise, as if nothing were known of Christ, it is moreover shown by plain reasoning and fact, that human nature was ordained for this purpose, viz. that every man should enjoy a happy immortality, both in body and in soul; and that it was necessary, that this design for which man was made should be fulfilled; but that it could not be fulfilled, unless God became man, and unless all things were to take place, which we hold with regard to Christ. I request all, who may wish to copy this book, to prefix this brief preface, with the heads of the whole work, at its commencement; so that, into whosesoever hands it may fall, as he looks on the face of it, there may be nothing in the whole body of the work, which shall escape his notice.

Book First.

Chap. I. *The question on which the whole work rests.*

I have been often and most earnestly requested by many, both personally and by letter, that I would hand down, in writing, the proofs of a certain doctrine of our faith, which I am accustomed to give to inquirers; for they say that these proofs gratify them, and are considered sufficient. This they ask, not for the sake of attaining to faith by means of reason, but that they may be gladdened by understanding and meditating on those things which they believe; and that, as far as possible, they may be always ready to convince any one, who demands of them a reason of that hope which is in us. And this question, both infidels are accustomed to bring up against us, ridiculing Christian simplicity as absurd; and many believers ponder it in their hearts; for what cause or necessity, in sooth, God became man, and by his own death, as we believe and affirm, restored life to the world; when he might have done this, by means of some other being, angelic or human, or merely by his will. Not only the learned, but also many unlearned persons, interest themselves in this inquiry, and seek for its solution. Therefore, since many desire to consider this subject, and, though

it seem very difficult in the investigation, it is yet plain to all in the solution, and attractive for the value and beauty of the reasoning; although what ought to be sufficient has been said by the holy fathers and their successors, yet I will take pains to disclose to inquirers what God has seen fit to lay open to me. And since investigations which are carried on by question and answer, are thus made more plain to many, and especially to less quick minds, and on that account are more gratifying, I will take to argue with me one of those persons who agitate this subject; one, who among the rest impels me more earnestly to it, so that in this way Boso may question and Anselm reply.

CHAP. II. *How those things which are to be said should be received.*

Boso. As the right order requires us to believe the deep things of Christian faith, before we undertake to discuss them by reason; so to my mind it appears a neglect, if, after we are established in the faith, we do not seek to understand what we believe. Therefore, since I thus consider myself to hold the faith of our redemption, by the prevenient grace of God, so that, even were I unable in any way to understand what I believe, still nothing could shake my constancy; I desire that you should discover to me, what, as you know, many besides myself ask, for what necessity and cause God, who is omnipotent, should have assumed the littleness and weakness of human nature for the sake of its renewal? *Anselm.* You ask of me a thing which is above me, and therefore I tremble to take in hand subjects too lofty for me, lest, when some one may have thought or even seen that I do not satisfy him, he will rather believe that I am in error with regard to the substance of the truth, than that my intellect is not able to grasp it. *Boso.* You ought not so much to fear this, because you should call to mind, on the other hand, that it often happens, in the discussion of some question, that God opens what before lay concealed; and that you should hope for the grace of God, because if you liberally impart those things which you have freely received, you will be worthy to receive higher things, to which you have not yet attained. *Anselm.* There is also another thing, on account of which I think this subject can hardly, or not at all, be discussed between us comprehensively; since, for this purpose,

there is required a knowledge of Power and Necessity and Will and certain other subjects, which are so related to one another, that none of them can be fully examined without the rest; and so the discussion of these topics requires a separate labor, which, though not very easy, in my opinion, is by no means useless; for ignorance of these subjects makes certain things difficult, which by acquaintance with them become easy. *Boso.* You can speak so briefly with regard to these things, each in its place, that we may both have all that is requisite for the present object, and what remains to be said we can put off to another time. *Anselm.* This also much disinclines me from your request, not only that the subject is important, but as it is of a form fair above the sons of men, so is it of a wisdom fair above the intellect of men. On this account, I fear, lest, as I am wont to be incensed against sorry artists, when I see our Lord himself painted in an unseemly figure; so also it may fall out with me, if I should undertake to exhibit so rich a theme in rough and vulgar diction. *Boso.* Even this ought not to deter you, because, as you allow any one to talk better if he can, so you preclude none from writing more elegantly, if your language does not please him. But, to cut you off from all excuses, you are not to fulfil this request of mine for the learned but for me, and those asking the same thing with me. *Anselm.* Since I observe your earnestness and that of those who desire this thing with you, out of love and pious zeal, I will try, to the best of my ability (with the assistance of God and your prayers, which when making this request you have often promised me), not so much to make plain what you inquire about, as to inquire with you. But I wish all that I say to be received with this understanding, that, if I shall have said anything which higher authority does not corroborate, though I appear to demonstrate it by argument, yet it is not to be received with any further confidence, than as so appearing to me for the time, until God in some way make a clearer revelation to me. But if I am in any measure able to set your inquiry at rest, it should be concluded that a wiser than I will be able to do this more fully; nay, we must understand, that for all that a man can say or know, still deeper grounds of so great a truth lie concealed. *Boso.* Suffer me, therefore, to make use of the words of infidels; for it is proper for us, when we seek to investigate the reasonableness of our faith, to propose the objections of those

who are wholly unwilling to submit to the same faith, without the support of reason. For although they appeal to reason because they do not believe, but we, on the other hand, because we do believe; nevertheless the thing sought is one and the same. And if you bring up anything in reply, which sacred authority seems to oppose, let it be mine to urge this inconsistency until you disprove it. *Anselm.* Speak on according to your pleasure.

CHAP. III. *Objections of infidels and replies of believers.*

Boso. Infidels ridiculing our simplicity charge upon us that we do injustice and dishonor to God, when we affirm that he descended into the womb of a virgin, that he was born of woman, that he grew on the nourishment of milk and the food of men; and, passing over many other things which seem incompatible with Deity, that he endured fatigue, hunger, thirst, stripes and crucifixion among thieves. *Anselm.* We do no injustice or dishonor to God, but give him thanks with all the heart, praising and proclaiming the ineffable height of his compassion. For the more astonishing a thing it is and beyond expectation, that he has restored us from so great and deserved ills in which we were, to so great and unmerited blessings which we had forfeited; by so much the more has he shown his more exceeding love and tenderness towards us. For did they but carefully consider, how fitly in this way human redemption is secured, they would not ridicule our simplicity, but would rather join with us in praising the wise beneficence of God. For, as death came upon the human race by the disobedience of man, it was fitting that by man's obedience life should be restored. And, as sin, the cause of our condemnation, had its origin from a woman, so ought the author of our righteousness and salvation to be born of a woman. And so also was it proper that the devil, who, being man's tempter, had conquered him in eating of the tree, should be vanquished by man in the suffering of the tree which man bore. Many other things, also, if we carefully examine them, give a certain indescribable beauty to our redemption as thus procured.

CHAP. IV. *How these things appear not decisive to infidels, and merely like so many pictures.*

Boso. These things must be admitted to be beautiful, and like

so many pictures; but, if they have no solid foundation, they do not appear sufficient to infidels, as reasons why we ought to believe that God wished to suffer the things which we speak of. For when one wishes to make a picture, he selects something substantial to paint it upon, so that his picture may remain. For no one paints in water or in air, because no traces of the picture remain in them. Wherefore, when we hold up to infidels these harmonious proportions, which you speak of, as so many pictures of the real thing, since they do not think this belief of ours a reality, but only a fiction, they consider us as it were to be painting upon a cloud. Therefore the rational existence of the truth must first be shown, I mean, the necessity, which proves that God ought to or could have condescended to those things which we affirm. Afterwards, to make the body of the truth, so to speak, shine forth more clearly, these harmonious proportions, like pictures of the body, must be described. *Anselm.* Does not the reason why God ought to do the things we speak of, seem absolute enough, when we consider that the human race, that work of his so very precious, was wholly ruined, and that it was not seemly that the purpose which God had made concerning man should fall to the ground; and, moreover, that this purpose could not be carried into effect, unless the human race were delivered by their Creator himself.

Chap. V. *How the redemption of man could not be effected by any other being but God.*

Boso. If this deliverance were said to be effected somehow by any other being than God (whether it were an angelic or a human being), the mind of man would receive it far more patiently. For God could have made some man without sin, not of a sinful substance, and not a descendant of any man, but just as he made Adam, and by this man it should seem that the work we speak of could have been done. *Anselm.* Do you not perceive that, if any other being should rescue man from eternal death, man would rightly be adjudged as the servant of that being? Now if this be so, he would in no wise be restored to that dignity, which would have been his, had he never sinned. For he, who was to be through eternity only the servant of God and an equal with the holy angels, would now be the servant of a being who was not God, and whom the angels did not serve.

CHAP. VI. *How infidels find fault with us, for saying that God has redeemed us by his death, and thus has shown his love towards us, and that he came to overcome the devil for us.*

Boso. This they greatly wonder at, because we call this redemption a release. For, say they, in what custody or imprisonment, or under whose power were you held, that God could not free you from it, without purchasing your redemption by so many sufferings, and finally by his own blood? And when we tell them, that he freed us from our sins, and from his own wrath, and from hell, and from the power of the devil, whom he came to vanquish for us, because we were unable to do it, and that he purchased for us the kingdom of heaven; and that, by doing all these things, he manifested the greatness of his love towards us; they answer: If you say that God, who, as you believe, created the universe by a word, could not do all these things by a simple command, you contradict yourselves, for you make him powerless. Or, if you grant that he could have done these things in some other way, but did not wish to, how can you vindicate his wisdom, when you assert that he desired, without any reason, to suffer things so unbecoming? For these things which you bring up, are all regulated by his will; for the wrath of God is nothing but his desire to punish. If, then, he does not desire to punish the sins of men, man is free from his sins, and from the wrath of God, and from hell, and from the power of the devil, all which things are the sufferings of sin; and, what he had lost by reason of these sins, he now regains. For, in whose power is hell, or the devil? Or, whose is the kingdom of heaven, if it be not his who created all things? Whatever things, therefore, you dread or hope for, all lie subject to his will, whom nothing can oppose. If, then, God were unwilling to save the human race, in any other way than that you mention, when he could have done it by his simple will; observe, to say the least, how you disparage his wisdom. For, if a man without motive should do, by severe toil, a thing which he could have done in some easy way, no one would consider him a wise man. As to your statement, that God has shown in this way how much he loved you, there is no argument to support this, unless it be proved that he could not otherwise have saved man. For, if he could not have done it otherwise, then it was, indeed, necessary for him to manifest his love in this way. But now, when he could have saved man differently, why is it, that, for the sake of displaying his love, he

does and suffers the things which you enumerate? For does he not show good angels how much he loves them, though he suffer no such things as these for them? As to what you say of his coming to vanquish the devil for you, with what meaning dare you allege this? Is not the omnipotence of God everywhere enthroned? How is it, then, that God must needs come down from heaven to vanquish the devil? These are the objections with which infidels think they can withstand us.

CHAP. VII. *How the devil had no justice on his side against man; and why it was, that he seemed to have had it, and why God could have freed man in this way.*

Moreover, I do not see the force of that argument, which we are wont to make use of, that God, in order to save men, was bound, as it were, to try a contest with the devil in justice, before he did in strength, so that, when the devil should put to death that being in whom there was nothing worthy of death, and who was God, he should justly lose his power over sinners; and that, if it were not so, God would have used undue force against the devil, since the devil had a rightful ownership of man, for the devil had not seized man with violence, but man had freely surrendered to him. It is true that this might well enough be said, if the devil or man belonged to any other being than God, or were in the power of any but God. But since neither the devil nor man belong to any but God, and neither can exist without the exertion of Divine power, what cause ought God to try with his own creature (de suo, in suo), or what should he do but punish his servant, who had seduced his fellow-servant to desert their common Lord and come over to himself; who, a traitor, had taken to himself a fugitive; a thief, had taken to himself a fellow-thief, with what he had stolen from his Lord. For when one was stolen from his Lord by the persuasions of the other, both were thieves. For what could be more just than for God to do this? Or, should God, the judge of all, snatch man, thus held, out of the power of him who holds him so unrighteously, either for the purpose of punishing him in some other way, than by means of the devil, or of sparing him, what injustice would there be in this? For, though man deserved to be tormented by the devil, yet the devil tormented him unjustly. For man merited punishment, and there was no more suitable way for him to be punished, than by that being to whom he had

given his consent to sin. But the infliction of punishment was nothing meritorious in the devil; on the other hand, he was even more unrighteous in this, because he was not led to it by a love of justice, but urged on by a malicious impulse. For he did not do this at the command of God, but God's inconceivable wisdom, which happily controls even wickedness, permitted it. And, in my opinion, those who think that the devil has any right in holding man, are brought to this belief by seeing that man is justly exposed to the tormenting of the devil, and that God in justice permits this; and therefore they suppose that the devil rightly inflicts it. For the very same thing, from opposite points of view, is sometimes both just and unjust, and hence, by those who do not carefully inspect the matter, is deemed wholly just or wholly unjust. Suppose, for example, that one strikes an innocent person unjustly, and hence justly deserves to be beaten himself; if, however, the one who was beaten, though he ought not to avenge himself, yet does strike the person who beat him, then he does it unjustly. And hence this violence, on the part of the man who returns the blow, is unjust, because he ought not to avenge himself; but as far as he, who received the blow, is concerned, it is just, for since he gave a blow unjustly, he justly deserves to receive one in return. Therefore, from opposite views, the same action is both just and unjust, for it may chance that one person shall consider it only just, and another only unjust. So also the devil is said to torment men justly, because God in justice permits this, and man in justice suffers it. But when man is said to suffer justly, it is not meant that his just suffering is inflicted by the hand of justice itself, but that he is punished by the just judgment of God. But if that written decree is brought up, which the Apostle says was made against us, and cancelled by the death of Christ; and if any one thinks that it was intended by this decree, that the devil, as if under the writing of a sort of compact, should justly demand sin and the punishment of sin, of man, before Christ suffered, as a debt for the first sin to which he tempted man, so that in this way he seems to prove his right over man, I do not by any means think that it is to be so understood. For that writing is not of the devil, because it is called the writing of a decree of the devil, but of God. For by the just judgment of God it was decreed, and, as it were, confirmed by writing, that, since man had sinned, he should not henceforth of himself have the power to avoid sin

or the punishment of sin; for the spirit is out-going and not returning [est enim spiritus vadens et non rediens]; and he who sins, ought not to escape with impunity, unless pity spare the sinner, and deliver and restore him. Wherefore we ought not to believe that, on account of this writing, there can be found any justice on the part of the devil, in his tormenting man. In fine, as there is never any injustice in a good angel, so in an evil angel there can be no justice at all. There was no reason, therefore, as respects the devil, why God should not make use of his own power against him, for the liberation of man.

Chap. VIII. *How, although the acts of Christ's condescension which we speak of, do not belong to his divinity, it yet seems improper to infidels, that these things should be said of him even as a man; and why it appears to them, that this man did not suffer death of his own will.*

Anselm. The will of God ought to be a sufficient reason for us, when he does anything, though we cannot see why he does it. For the will of God is never irrational. *Boso.* That is very true, if it be granted that God does wish the thing in question; but many will never allow that God does wish anything, if it be inconsistent with reason. *Anselm.* What do you find inconsistent with reason, in our confessing that God desired those things, which make up our belief with regard to his incarnation? *Boso.* This, in brief: that the Most High should stoop to things so lowly, that the Almighty should do a thing with such toil. *Anselm.* They who speak thus, do not understand our belief. For we affirm that the Divine nature is beyond doubt impassible, and that God cannot at all be brought down from his exaltation, nor *toil* in anything, which he wishes to effect. But we say that the Lord Jesus Christ is very God and very man, one person in two natures, and two natures in one person. When, therefore, we speak of God as enduring any humiliation or infirmity, we do not refer to the majesty of that nature, which cannot suffer; but to the feebleness of the human constitution, which He assumed. And so there remains no ground of objection against our faith. For in this way, we intend no debasement of the Divine nature, but we teach that one person is both Divine and human. In the incarnation of God, there is no lowering of the Deity; but the nature of man we believe to be exalted. *Boso.* Be it so; let nothing be referred to the Divine nature, which is

spoken of Christ after the manner of human weakness; but how will it ever be made out a just or reasonable thing that God should treat, or suffer to be treated in such a manner, that man whom the Father called his beloved Son in whom he was well pleased, and whom the Son made himself? For what justice is there in *his* suffering death for the sinner, who was the most just of all men? What man, if he condemned the innocent to free the guilty, would not himself be judged worthy of condemnation? And so the matter seems to return to the same incongruity, which is mentioned above. For if he could not save sinners in any other way than by condemning the just, where is his omnipotence? If, however, he could, but did not wish to, how shall we sustain his wisdom and justice? *Anselm.* God the Father did not treat that man as you seem to suppose, nor put to death the innocent for the guilty. For the Father did not compel him to suffer death, or even allow him to be slain, against his will, but of his own accord he endured death for the salvation of men. *Boso.* Though it were not against his will, since he agreed to the will of the Father; yet the Father seems to have bound him, as it were, by his injunction. For it is said, that Christ "humbled himself, being made obedient to the Father even unto death, and that the death of the cross. For which cause God also hath highly exalted him;" and that "he learned obedience from the things which he suffered;" and that "God spared not his own Son, but gave him up for us all." And likewise the Son says: "I came not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." And when about to suffer, he says: "As the Father hath given me commandment, so I do." Again: "The cup which the Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?" And, at another time: "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt." And again: "Father, if this cup may not pass from me, except I drink it, thy will be done." In all these passages, it would rather appear, that Christ endured death by the constraint of obedience, than by the inclination of his own free will.

Chap. IX. *How it was of his own accord that he died, and what this means: "he was made obedient even unto death;" and: "for which cause God hath highly exalted him;" and: "I came not to do mine own will;" and: "he spared not his own Son;" and: "not as I will, but as thou wilt."*

Anselm. It seems to me that you do not rightly understand the difference between what he did at the demand of obedience, and what he suffered, not demanded by obedience, but inflicted on him, because he kept his obedience perfect. *Boso.* I need to have you explain it more clearly. *Anselm.* Why did the Jews persecute him even unto death? *Boso.* For nothing else, but that, in word and in life, he invariably maintained truth and justice. *Anselm.* I believe that God demands this of every rational being, and every being owes this in obedience to God. *Boso.* We ought to acknowledge this. *Anselm.* That man, therefore, owed this obedience to God the Father, humanity to Deity; and the Father claimed it from him. *Boso.* There is no doubt of this *Anselm.* Now you see what he did, under the demand of obedience. *Boso.* Very true, and I see also what infliction he endured, because he stood firm in obedience. For death was inflicted on him for his perseverance in obedience, and he endured it; but I do not understand how it is that obedience did not demand this. *Anselm.* Ought man to suffer death, if he had never sinned, or should God demand this of him? *Boso.* It is on this account, that we believe that man would not have been subject to death, and that God would not have exacted this of him; but I should like to hear the reason of the thing from you. *Anselm.* You acknowledge that the intelligent creature was made holy, and for this purpose, viz. to be happy in the enjoyment of God. *Boso.* Yes. *Anselm.* You surely will not think it proper for God to make his creature miserable without fault, when he had created him holy that he might enjoy a state of blessedness. For it would be a miserable thing for man to die against his will. *Boso.* It is plain that, if man had not sinned, God ought not to compel him to die. *Anselm.* God did not, therefore, compel Christ to die; but he suffered death of his own will, not yielding up his life as an act of obedience, but on account of his obedience in maintaining holiness; for he held out so firmly in this obedience, that he met death on account of it. It may, indeed, be said, that the Father commanded him to die, when he enjoined that upon him,

on account of which he met death. It was in this sense, then, that "as the Father gave him the commandment, so he did, and the cup which He gave to him, he drank; and he was made obedient to the Father, even unto death;" and thus "he learned obedience from the things which he suffered," that is, how far obedience should be maintained. Now the word "didicit," which is used, can be understood in two ways. For either "didicit" is written for this: he caused others to learn; or it is used, because he did learn by experience what he had an understanding of before. Again, when the Apostle had said: "he humbled himself, being made obedient even unto death, and that the death of the cross," he added: "wherefore God also hath exalted him and given him a name, which is above every name." And this is similar to what David said: "he drank of the brook in the way, therefore did he lift up the head." For it is not meant that he could not have attained his exaltation in any other way, but by obedience unto death; nor is it meant, that his exaltation was conferred on him, only as a reward of his obedience (for he himself said before he suffered, that all things had been committed to him by the Father, and that all things belonging to the Father were his); but the expression is used because he had agreed with the Father and the Holy Spirit, that there was no other way to reveal to the world the height of his omnipotence, than by his death. For if a thing do not take place, except on condition of something else, it is not improperly said to occur by reason of that thing. For if we intend to do a thing, but mean to do something else first, by means of which it may be done; when the first thing which we wish to do is done, if the result is such as we intended, it is properly said to be on account of the other; since that is now done, which caused the delay; for it had been determined that the first thing should not be done, without the other. If, for instance, I propose to cross a river, only in a boat, though I can cross it in a boat or on horseback, and suppose that I delay crossing, because the boat is gone; but if afterwards I cross, when the boat has returned, it may be properly said of me: the boat was ready, and therefore he crossed. And we not only use this form of expression, when it is by means of a thing, which we desire should take place first, but also when we intend to do something else, not by means of that thing, but only after it. For if one delays taking food, because he has

not to-day attended the celebration of mass; when that has been done which he wished to do first, it is not improper to say to him: now take food, for you have now done that, for which you delayed taking food. Far less, therefore, is the language strange, when Christ is said to be exalted on this account, because he endured death; for it was through this, and after this, that he determined to accomplish his exaltation. This may be understood also in the same way, as that passage, in which it is said that our Lord increased in wisdom, and in favor with God; not that this was really the case, but that he deported himself, as if it were so. For he was exalted after his death, as if it were really on account of that. Moreover, that saying of his: "I came not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me," is precisely like that other saying: "My doctrine is not mine;" for what one does not have of himself, but of God, he ought not to call his own, but God's. Now no one has the truth which he teaches, or a holy will, of himself, but of God. Christ, therefore, came not to do his own will, but that of the Father; for his holy will was not derived from his humanity, but from his divinity. For that sentence: "God spared not his own Son, but gave him up for us all," means nothing more, than that He did not rescue him. For there are found in the Bible many things like this. Again, when he says: "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt;" and "If this cup may not pass from me, except I drink it, thy will be done;" he signifies, by his own will, the natural desire of safety, in accordance with which human nature shrank from the anguish of death. But he speaks of the will of the Father, not because the Father preferred the death of the Son to his life; but because the Father was not willing to rescue the human race, unless man were to do even as great a thing as was signified in the death of Christ. Since reason did not demand of another what he could not do, therefore, the Son says that he desires his own death. For he preferred to suffer, rather than that the human race should be lost; as if he were to say to the Father: "Since thou dost not desire the reconciliation of the world to take place in any other way, in this respect, I see that thou desirest my death; let thy will, therefore, be done, that is, let my death take place, so that the world may be reconciled to thee." For we often say that one desires a thing, because he

does not choose something else, the choice of which would preclude the existence of that which he is said to desire; for instance, when we say that he, who does not choose to close the window, through which the draft is admitted, which puts out the light, wishes the light to be extinguished. So the Father desired the death of the Son, because he was not willing that the world should be saved in any other way, except by man's doing so great a thing, as that which I have mentioned. And this, since none other could accomplish it, availed as much with the Son, who so earnestly desired the salvation of man, as if the Father had commanded him to die; and, therefore, "as the Father gave him commandment, so he did, and the cup which the Father gave to him, he drank, being obedient even unto death."

CHAP. X. *Likewise on the same topics; and how otherwise they can be correctly explained.*

It is also a fair interpretation, that it was by that same holy will, by which the Son wished to die for the salvation of the world, that the Father gave him commandment (yet not by compulsion), and the cup of suffering, and spared him not, but gave him up for us, and desired his death; and that the Son himself was obedient even unto death, and learned obedience from the things which he suffered. For as with regard to that will, which led him to a holy life, he did not have it as a human being of himself, but of the Father; so also that will, by which he desired to die for the accomplishment of so great good, he could not have had, but from the Father of lights, from whom is every good and perfect gift. And as the Father is said to draw by imparting an inclination, so there is nothing improper in asserting that he moves man. For as the Son says of the Father: "No man cometh to me except the Father draw him," he might as well have said, except he move him. In like manner, also, could he have declared: "No man layeth down his life for my sake, except the Father move or draw him." For since a man is drawn or moved, by his will, to that which he invariably chooses, it is not improper to say, that God draws or moves him, when he gives him this will. And in this drawing or impelling, it is not to be understood, that there is any constraint, but a free and grateful clinging to the holy will, which has been given. If then it cannot be denied, that the Father

drew or moved the Son to death, by giving him that will; who does not see, that, in the same manner, he gave him commandment, to endure death of his own accord, and to take the cup, which he freely drank. And if it is right to say, that the Son spared not himself, but gave himself for us, of his own will, who will deny, that it is right to say that the Father, of whom he had this will, did not spare him, but gave him up for us, and desired his death? In this way, also, by following the will received from the Father invariably, and of his own accord, the Son became obedient to Him, even unto death; and learned obedience from the things which he suffered; that is, he learned how great was the work to be accomplished by obedience. For this is real and sincere obedience, when a rational being, not of compulsion, but freely, follows the will received from God. In other ways, also, we can properly explain the Father's desire that the Son should die, though these would appear sufficient. For as we say that he desires a thing who causes another to desire it; so, also, we say that he desires a thing, who approves of the desire of another, though he does not cause that desire. Thus when we see a man, who desires to endure pain with fortitude, for the accomplishment of some good design; though we acknowledge, that we wish to have him endure that pain, yet we do not choose, nor take pleasure in, his suffering, but in his choice. We are, also, accustomed to say that he, who can prevent a thing, but does not, desires the thing, which he does not prevent. Since, therefore, the will of the Son pleased the Father, and he did not prevent him from choosing, or from fulfilling his choice; it is proper to say, that he wished the Son to endure death so piously and for so great an object, though he was not pleased with his suffering. Moreover, he said, that the cup must not pass from him, except he drank it, not because he could not have escaped death, had he chosen to; but because, as has been said, the world could not otherwise be saved; and it was his fixed choice to suffer death, rather than that the world should not be saved. It was for *this* reason, also, that he used those words, viz. to teach the human race that there was no other salvation for them, but by his death; and not to show that he had no power at all to avoid death. For whatsoever things are said of him, similar to these which have been mentioned, they are all to be explained in accordance with the belief that he died, not by compulsion, but of free choice. For he was

omnipotent, and it is said of him, when he was offered up, that he desired it. And he says himself: "I lay down my life, that I may take it again; no man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself; I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." A man cannot, therefore, be properly said to have been driven to a thing, which he does of his own power and will. *Boso.* But this simple fact, that God allows him to be so treated, even if he were willing, does not seem becoming for such a Father, in respect to such a Son. *Anselm.* Yes, it is of all things most proper that such a Father should acquiesce with such a Son in his desire, if it be praiseworthy as relates to the honor of God, and useful for man's salvation, which would not otherwise be effected. *Boso.* The question which still troubles us, is, how the death of the Son can be proved reasonable and necessary. For otherwise, it does not seem that the Son ought to desire it, or the Father compel or permit it. For the question is, why God could not save man in some other way, and if so, why he wished to do it in this way? For it both seems unbecoming for God to have saved man in this way; and it is not clear, how the death of the Son avails for the salvation of man. For it is a strange thing if God so delights in, or requires the blood of the innocent, that he neither chooses, nor is able, to spare the guilty, without the sacrifice of the innocent. *Anselm.* Since, in this inquiry, you take the place of those who are unwilling to believe anything, not previously proved by reason, I wish to have it understood between us, that we do not admit anything in the least unbecoming to be ascribed to the Deity, and that we do not reject the *smallest* reason if it be not opposed by a greater. For as it is impossible to attribute anything in the least unbecoming to God; so any reason, however small, if not overbalanced by a greater, has the force of necessity. *Boso.* In this matter, I accept nothing more willingly, than that this agreement should be preserved between us in common. *Anselm.* The question concerns only the incarnation of God, and those things which we believe with regard to his taking human nature. *Boso.* It is so. *Anselm.* Let us suppose, then, that the incarnation of God, and the things that we affirm of him as man, had never taken place; and be it agreed between us, that man was made for happiness, which cannot be attained in this life, and that no being can ever arrive at happiness, save by freedom from sin, and that no man passes this life with-

out sin. Let us take for granted, also, the other things the belief of which is necessary for eternal salvation. *Boso.* I grant it; for in these there is nothing which seems unbecoming or impossible for God. *Anselm.* Therefore, in order that man may attain happiness, remission of sin is necessary. *Boso.* We all hold this.

CHAP. XI. *What it is to sin, and to make satisfaction for sin.*

Anselm. We must needs inquire, therefore, in what manner God puts away men's sins; and, in order to do this more plainly, let us first consider what it is to sin, and what it is to make satisfaction for sin. *Boso.* It is yours to explain, and mine to listen. *Anselm.* If man or angel always rendered to God his due, he would never sin. *Boso.* I cannot deny that. *Anselm.* Therefore to sin is nothing else, than not to render to God his due. *Boso.* What is the debt, which we owe to God? *Anselm.* Every wish of a rational creature should be subject to the will of God. *Boso.* Nothing is more true. *Anselm.* This is the debt which man and angel owe to God, and no one who pays this debt commits sin; but every one who does not pay it sins. This is justice, or uprightness of will, which makes a being just or upright in heart, that is, in will; and this is the sole and complete debt of honor, which we owe to God, and which God requires of us. For it is such a will only, when it can be exercised, that does works pleasing to God; and when this will cannot be exercised, it is pleasing of itself alone, since without it no work is acceptable. He who does not render this honor which is due to God, robs God of his own, and dishonors him; and this is sin. Moreover, so long as he does not restore what he has taken away, he remains in fault; and it will not suffice merely to restore what has been taken away, but, considering the contempt offered, he ought to restore more than he took away. For as one who imperils another's safety, does not enough by merely restoring his safety, without making some compensation for the anguish incurred; so he who violates another's honor, does not enough by merely rendering honor again, but must, according to the extent of the injuiry done, make restoration in some way satisfactory to the person whom he has dishonored. We must also observe, that when any one pays what he has unjustly taken away, he ought to give something, which could not have been demanded of him, had he

not stolen what belonged to another. So then, every one who sins, ought to pay back the honor of which he has robbed God; and this is the satisfaction which every sinner owes to God. *Boso.* Since we have determined to follow reason in all these things, I am unable to bring any objection against them, although you somewhat startle me.

CHAP. XII. *Whether it were proper for God to put away sins by compassion alone, without any payment of the debt.*

Anselm. Let us return and consider, whether it were proper for God to put away sins, by compassion alone, without any payment of the honor taken from him. *Boso.* I do not see why it is not proper. *Anselm.* To remit sin in this manner is nothing else, than not to punish; and since it is not right to cancel sin, without compensation or punishment; if it be not punished, then is it passed by undischarged. *Boso.* What you say is reasonable. *Anselm.* It is not fitting for God to pass over anything in his kingdom undischarged. *Boso.* If I wish to oppose this, I fear to sin. *Anselm.* It is, therefore, not proper for God thus to pass over sin unpunished. *Boso.* Thus it follows. *Anselm.* There is also another thing which follows, if sin be passed by unpunished, viz. that with God there will be no difference between the guilty and the not guilty; and this is unbecoming to God. *Boso.* I cannot deny it. *Anselm.* Observe this also. Every one knows that justice to man is regulated by law, so that, according to the requirements of law, the measure of award is bestowed by God. *Boso.* This is our belief. *Anselm.* But if sin is neither paid for nor punished, it is subject to no law. *Boso.* I cannot conceive it to be otherwise. *Anselm.* Injustice, therefore, if it is cancelled by compassion alone, is more free than justice; which seems very inconsistent. And to these is also added a further incongruity, viz. that it makes injustice like God. For as God is subject to no law, so neither is injustice. *Boso.* I cannot withstand your reasoning. But when God commands us in every case to forgive those who trespass against us, it seems inconsistent to enjoin a thing upon us, which it is not proper for him to do himself. *Anselm.* There is no inconsistency in God's commanding us, not to take upon ourselves, what belongs to Him alone. For to execute vengeance belongs to none but Him, who is Lord of all; for when the powers of the world rightly accomplish this end, God himself

does it, who appointed them for the purpose. *Boso.* You have obviated the difficulty, which I thought to exist; but there is another, to which I would like to have your answer. For since God is so free as to be subject to no law, and to the judgment of no one, and is so merciful, as that nothing more merciful can be conceived; and nothing is right or fit save as he wills; it seems a strange thing for us to say, that he is wholly unwilling or unable to put away an injury done to himself, when we are wont to apply to him for indulgence, with regard to those offences which we commit against others. *Anselm.* What you say of God's liberty and choice and compassion, is true; but we ought so to interpret these things, as that they may not seem to interfere with His dignity. For there is no liberty, except as regards what is best or fitting; nor should that be called mercy, which does anything improper for the Divine character. Moreover, when it is said that what God wishes is just, and that what He does not wish is unjust, we must not understand that, if God wished anything improper, it would be just, simply because he wished it. For if God wishes to lie, we must not conclude that it is right to lie, but rather that he is not God. For no will can ever wish to lie, unless truth in it is impaired, nay, unless the will itself be impaired by forsaking truth. When, then, it is said: "If God wishes to lie;" the meaning is simply this: "If the nature of God is such, as that he wishes to lie;" and, therefore, it does not follow that falsehood is right, except it be understood in the same manner, as when we speak of two impossible things: "If this be true, then that follows; because neither *this* nor *that* is true;" as if a man should say: "Supposing water to be dry, and fire to be moist;" for neither is the case. Therefore, with regard to these things, to speak the whole truth: If God desires a thing, it is right that he should desire that which involves no unfitness. For if God chooses that it should rain, it is right that it should rain; and if he desires that any man should die, then is it right that he should die. Wherefore, if it be not fitting for God to do anything unjustly, or out of course, it does not belong to his liberty or compassion or will, to let the sinner go unpunished, who makes no return to God of what the sinner has defrauded him. *Boso.* You remove from me every possible objection, which I had thought of bringing against you. *Anselm.* Yet observe, why it is not fitting for God to do this. *Boso.* I listen readily to whatever you say.

CHAP. XIII. *How nothing less was to be endured, in the order of things, than that the creature should take away the honor due the Creator, and not restore what he takes away.*

Anselm. In the order of things, there is nothing less to be endured, than that the creature should take away the honor due the Creator, and not restore what he has taken away. *Boso.* Nothing is more plain than this. *Anselm.* But there is no greater injustice suffered, than that by which so great an evil must be endured. *Boso.* This, also, is plain. *Anselm.* I think, therefore, that you will not say, that God ought to endure a thing, than which no greater injustice is suffered, viz. that the creature should not restore to God what he has taken away. *Boso.* No; I think it should be wholly denied. *Anselm.* Again, if there is nothing greater or better than God; there is nothing more just, than supreme justice, which maintains God's honor in the arrangement of things, and which is nothing else but God himself. *Boso.* There is nothing clearer than this. *Anselm.* Therefore God maintains nothing with more justice, than the honor of his own dignity. *Boso.* I must agree with you. *Anselm.* Does it seem to you, that he wholly preserves it, if he allows himself to be so defrauded of it, as that he should neither receive satisfaction, nor punish the one defrauding him. *Boso.* I dare not say so. *Anselm.* Therefore the honor taken away must be repaid, or punishment must follow; otherwise, either God will not be just to himself, or he will be weak in respect to both parties; and this it is impious even to think of. *Boso.* I think that nothing more reasonable can be said.

CHAP. XIV. *How the honor of God exists in the punishment of the wicked.*

Boso. But I wish to hear from you, whether the punishment of the sinner is an honor to God, or how it is an honor. For if the punishment of the sinner is not for God's honor, when the sinner does not pay what he took away, but is punished, God loses his honor so that he cannot recover it. And this seems in contradiction to the things which have been said. *Anselm.* It is impossible for God to lose his honor; for either the sinner pays his debt of his own accord, or, if he refuse, God takes it from him. For either man renders due submission to God, of his own will, by avoiding sin or making payment, or else God subjects him to himself by torments, even against man's will, and thus shows that

he is the Lord of man, though man refuses to acknowledge it of his own accord. And here, we must observe, that as man in sinning takes away what belongs to God, so God in punishing gets in return what pertains to man. For not only does that belong to a man, which he has in present possession, but also that which it is in his power to have. Therefore, since man was so made, as to be able to attain happiness by avoiding sin; if, on account of his sin, he is deprived of happiness and every good, he repays, from his own inheritance, what he has stolen, though he repay it against his will. For although God does not apply what he takes away to any object of his own, as man transfers the money which he has taken from another to his own use; yet what he takes away, serves the purpose of his own honor, for this very reason, that it is taken away. For by this act he shows that the sinner, and all that pertains to him, are under his subjection.

Chap. XV. *Whether God suffers his honor to be violated even in the least degree.*

Boso. What you say satisfies me. But there is still another point which I should like to have you answer. For if, as you make out, God ought to sustain his own honor, why does he allow it to be violated, even in the least degree? For what is in any way made liable to injury, is not entirely and perfectly preserved. *Anselm.* Nothing can be added to or taken from the honor of God. For this honor which belongs to him, is in no way subject to injury or change. But as the individual creature preserves, naturally or by reason, the condition belonging, and, as it were, allotted to him, he is said to obey and honor God; and to this, rational nature, which possesses intelligence, is especially bound. And when the being chooses what he ought, he honors God; not by bestowing anything upon him, but because he brings himself freely under God's will and disposal, and maintains his own condition in the universe, and the beauty of the universe itself, as far as in him lies. But when he does not choose what he ought, he dishonors God, as far as the being himself is concerned, because he does not submit himself freely to God's disposal. And he disturbs the order and beauty of the universe, as relates to himself, although he cannot injure nor tarnish the power and majesty of God. For if those things which are held together in the circuit of the heavens, desire to be elsewhere than under the heavens, or to be further removed from the heav-

ens, there is no place where they can be, but under the heavens, nor can they fly from the heavens without also approaching them. For both whence and whither and in what way they go, they are still under the heavens; and if they are at a greater distance from one part of them, they are only so much nearer to the opposite part. And so, though man or evil angel refuse to submit to the Divine will and appointment, yet he cannot escape it; for if he wishes to fly from a will that commands, he falls into the power of a will that punishes. And if you ask whither he goes, it is only under the permission of that will; and even this wayward choice or action of his becomes subservient, under infinite wisdom, to the order and beauty of the universe before spoken of. For when it is understood, that God brings good out of many forms of evil, then the satisfaction for sin freely given, or if this be not given, the exaction of punishment, hold their own place and orderly beauty in the same universe. For if Divine wisdom were not to insist upon these things, when wickedness tries to disturb the right appointment, there would be, in the very universe which God ought to control, an unseemliness, springing from the violation of the beauty of arrangement, and God would appear to be deficient in his management. And these two things are not only unfitting, but consequently impossible; so that satisfaction or punishment must needs follow every sin. *Boso.* You have relieved my objection. *Anselm.* It is then plain, that no one can honor or dishonor God, as he is in himself; but the creature, as far as he is concerned, appears to do this, when he submits or opposes his will to the will of God. *Boso.* I know of nothing which can be said against this. *Anselm.* Let me add something to it. *Boso.* Go on, until I am weary of listening.

CHAP. XVI. *The reason why the number of angels who fell, must be made up from men.*

Anselm. It was proper that God should design to make up for the number of angels that fell, from human nature which he created without sin. *Boso.* This is a part of our belief, but still I should like to have some reason for it. *Anselm.* You mistake me, for we intended to discuss only the incarnation of the Deity, and here you are bringing in other questions. *Boso.* Be not angry with me; "for the Lord loveth a cheerful giver;" and no one shows better how cheerfully he gives what he promises,

than he who gives more than he promises; therefore, tell me freely what I ask. *Anselm.* There is no question that intelligent nature, which finds its happiness, both now and forever, in the contemplation of God, was foreseen by him in a certain reasonable and complete number, so that there would be an unfitness in its being either less or greater. For either God did not know in what number it was best to create rational beings, which is false; or, if he did know, then he appointed such a number as he perceived was most fitting. Wherefore, either the angels who fell, were made so as to be within that number; or, since they were out of that number, they could not continue to exist, and so fell of necessity. But this last is an absurd idea. *Boso.* The truth which you set forth is plain. *Anselm.* Therefore, since they ought to be of that number, either their number should of necessity be made up, or else rational nature, which was foreseen as perfect in number, will remain incomplete. But this cannot be. *Boso.* Doubtless, then, the number must be restored. *Anselm.* But this restoration can only be made from human beings, since there is no other source.

CHAP. XVII. *How other angels cannot take the place of those who fell.*

Boso. Why could not they themselves be restored, or other angels substituted for them? *Anselm.* When you shall see the difficulty of our restoration, you will understand the impossibility of theirs. But other angels cannot be substituted for them on this account (to pass over its apparent inconsistency with the completeness of the first creation), because they ought to be such as the former angels would have been, had they never sinned. But the first angels, in that case, would have persevered without ever witnessing the punishment of sin; which, in respect to the others, who were substituted for them after their fall, was impossible. For two beings, who stand firm in truth, are not equally deserving of praise, if one has never seen the punishment of sin, and the other forever witnesses its eternal reward. For it must not for a moment be supposed that good angels are upheld by the fall of evil angels, but by their own virtue. For, as they would have been condemned together, had the good sinned with the bad, so, had the unholy stood firm with the holy, they would have been likewise upheld. For if, without the fall of a part, the rest could not be upheld; it would follow, either

that none could ever be upheld, or else that it was necessary for some one to fall, in order by his punishment to uphold the rest; but either of these suppositions is absurd. Therefore, had all stood, all would have been upheld in the same manner as those who stood; and this manner I explained, as well as I could, when treating of the reason why God did not bestow perseverance upon the devil. *Boso.* You have proved that the evil angels must be restored from the human race; and from this reasoning it appears, that the number of men chosen will not be less than that of fallen angels. But show, if you can, whether it will be greater.

CHAP. XVIII. *Whether there will be more holy men than evil angels.*

Anselm. If the angels, before any of them fell, existed in that perfect number of which we have spoken, then men were only made to supply the place of the lost angels; and, it is plain, that their number will not be greater. But if that number were not found in all the angels together, then both the loss and the original deficiency must be made up from men, and more men will be chosen than there were fallen angels. And so we shall say, that men were made not only to restore the diminished number, but also to complete the imperfect number. *Boso.* Which is the better theory, that angels were originally made perfect in number, or that they were not? *Anselm.* I will state my views. *Boso.* I cannot ask more of you. *Anselm.* If man was created after the fall of evil angels, as some understand the account in Genesis, I do not think that I can prove from this either of these suppositions positively. For it is possible, I think, that the angels should have been created perfect in number, and that afterwards man was created to complete their number, when it had been lessened; and it is also possible, that they were not perfect in number, because God deferred completing the number, as he does even now, determining in his own time to create man. Wherefore, either God would only complete that which was not yet perfect, or, if it were also diminished, He would restore it. But if the whole creation took place at once, and those days in which Moses appears to describe a successive creation, are not to be understood like such days as ours; I cannot see how angels could have been created perfect in number. Since, if it were so, it seems to me that some, either men or angels, would fall imme-

diately, else in heaven's empire there would be more than the complete number required. If, therefore, all things were created at one and the same time, it should seem that angels, and the first two human beings, formed an incomplete number, so that, if no angel fell, the deficiency alone should be made up, but if any fell, the lost part should be restored; and that human nature, which had stood firm, though weaker than that of angels, might, as it were, justify God, and put the devil to silence, if he were to attribute his fall to weakness. And in case human nature fell, much more would it justify God against the devil, and even against itself, because, though made far weaker and of a mortal race, yet, in the elect, it would rise from its weakness to an estate exalted above that from which the devil was fallen, as far as good angels, to whom it should be equal, were advanced after the overthrow of the evil, because they persevered. From these reasons, I am rather inclined to the belief, that there was not, originally, that complete number of angels necessary to perfect the celestial state; since, supposing that man and angels were not created at the same time, this is possible; and it would follow of necessity, if they were created at the same time, which is the opinion of the majority, because we read: "He, who liveth forever, created all things at once." But if the perfection of the created universe is to be understood as consisting, not so much in the number of beings, as in the number of natures; it follows, that human nature was either made to consummate this perfection, or that it was superfluous, which we should not dare affirm of the nature of the smallest reptile. Wherefore, then, it was made for itself, and not merely to restore the number of beings possessing another nature. From which it is plain, that, even had no angel fallen, men would yet have had their place in the celestial kingdom. And hence it follows, that there was not a perfect number of angels, even before a part fell; otherwise, of necessity some men or angels must fall, because it would be impossible that any should continue beyond the perfect number. *Boso.* You have not labored in vain. *Anselm.* There is, also, as I think, another reason, which supports, in no small degree, the opinion that angels were not created perfect in number. *Boso.* Let us hear it. *Anselm.* Had a perfect number of angels been created, and had man been made only to fill the place of the lost angels, it is plain that, had not some angels fallen from their happiness, man would never have

been exalted to it. *Boso.* We are agreed. *Anselm.* But if any one shall ask: "Since the elect rejoice as much over the fall of angels, as over their own exaltation, because the one can never take place without the other; how can they be justified in this unholy joy, or how shall we say that angels are restored by the substitution of men, if they (the angels) would have remained free from this fault, had they not fallen, viz. from rejoicing over the fall of others?" We reply: Cannot men be made free from this fault? nay, how ought they to be happy with this fault? With what temerity then, do we say, that God neither wishes, nor is able to make this substitution without this fault! *Boso.* Is not the case similar to that of the Gentiles, who were called unto faith, because the Jews rejected it? *Anselm.* No; for had the Jews all believed, yet the Gentiles would have been called; for "in every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him." But, since the Jews despised the apostles, this was the immediate occasion of their turning to the Gentiles. *Boso.* I see no way of opposing you. *Anselm.* Whence does that joy, which one has over another's fall, seem to arise? *Boso.* Whence, to be sure, but from the fact, that each individual will be certain, that, had not another fallen, he would never have attained the place where he now is? *Anselm.* If, then, no one had this certainty, there would be no cause for one to rejoice over the doom of another. *Boso.* So it appears. *Anselm.* Think you, that any one of them can have this certainty, if their number shall far exceed that of those who fell? *Boso.* I certainly cannot think that any one would or ought to have it. For how can any one know, whether he were created to restore the part diminished, or to make up that which was not yet complete in the number necessary to constitute the state? But all are sure, that they were made with a view to the perfection of that kingdom. *Anselm.* If, then, there shall be a larger number than that of the fallen angels, no one can or ought to know that he would not have attained this height but for another's fall. *Boso.* That is true. *Anselm.* No one, therefore, will have cause to rejoice over the perdition of another. *Boso.* So it appears. *Anselm.* Since, then, we see, that, if there are more men elected than the number of fallen angels, the incongruity will not follow, which must follow, if there are not more men elected; and since it is impossible that there should be anything incongruous in that celestial state, it becomes a necessary fact, that angels were not

made perfect in number, and that there will be more happy men than doomed angels. *Boso.* I see not how this can be denied. *Anselm.* I think that another reason can be brought to support this opinion. *Boso.* You ought then to present it. *Anselm.* We believe that the material substance of the world must be renewed, and that this will not take place until the number of the elect is accomplished, and that happy kingdom made perfect, and that after its completion there will be no change. Whence it may be reasoned, that God planned to perfect both at the same time; in order that the inferior nature, which knew not God, might not be perfected before the superior nature, which ought to enjoy God; and that the inferior, being renewed at the same time with the superior, might, as it were, rejoice in its own way; yes, that every creature, having so glorious and excellent a consummation, might delight in its Creator and in itself, in turn, rejoicing always after its own manner, so that what the will effects in the rational nature of its own accord, this also the irrational creature naturally shows by the arrangement of God. For we are wont to rejoice in the fame of our ancestors, as when on the birthdays of the saints, we delight with festive triumph, rejoicing in their honor. And this opinion derives support from the fact, that, had not Adam sinned, God might yet put off the completion of that state until the number of men, which he designed, should be made out, and men themselves be transferred, so to speak, to an immortal state of bodily existence. For they had in paradise a kind of immortality, that is, a power not to die, but since it was possible for them to die, this power was not immortal, as if, indeed, they had not been capable of death. But if God determined to bring to perfection, at one and the same time, that intelligent and happy state and this earthly and irrational nature; it follows, that either that state was not complete in the number of angels, before the destruction of the wicked, but God was waiting to complete it by men, when he should renovate the material nature of the world; or that, if that kingdom were perfect in number, it was not in confirmation, and its confirmation must be deferred, even had no one sinned, until that renewal of the world, to which we look forward; or that, if that confirmation could not be deferred so long, the renewal of the world must be hastened, that both events might take place at the same time. But that God should determine to renew the world, immediately after it was made, and to destroy in the very beginning those

things which after this renewal would not exist, before any reason appeared for their creation, is simply absurd. It therefore follows, that, since angels were not complete in number, their confirmation will not be long deferred on this account, because the renewal of a world just created ought soon to take place; for this is not fitting. But that God should wish to put off their confirmation to the future renewing of the world, seems improper, since he so quickly accomplished it in some, and since we know, that, in regard to our first parents, if they had not sinned as they did, he would have confirmed them, as well as the angels who persevered. For, although not yet advanced to that equality with angels to which men were to attain, when the number taken from among them was complete; yet, had they preserved their original holiness, so as not to have sinned, though tempted, they would have been confirmed, with all their offspring, so as never more to sin; just as when they were conquered by sin, they were so weakened as to be unable, in themselves, to live afterwards without sinning. For who dares affirm, that wickedness is more powerful to bind a man in servitude, after he has yielded to it at the first persuasion, than holiness to confirm him in liberty, when he has adhered to it in the original trial? For as human nature, being included in the person of our first parents, was in them wholly won over to sin (with the single exception of that man whom God being able to create from a virgin, was equally able to save from the sin of Adam), so had they not sinned, human nature would have wholly conquered. It therefore remains, that the celestial state was not complete in its original number, but must be completed from among men. *Boso.* What you say seems very reasonable to me. But what shall we think of that which is said respecting God: "He hath appointed the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel;" which some, because for the expression "children of Israel," is found sometimes "angels of God," explain in this way, that the number of elect men taken, should be understood as equal to that of good angels? *Anselm.* This is not discordant with the previous opinion, if it be not certain that the number of angels who fell, is the same as that of those who stood. For if there be more elect than evil angels, and elect men must needs be substituted for the evil angels, and it is possible for them to equal the number of the good angels, in that case there will be more holy men than evil angels. But remember with

what condition I undertook to answer your inquiry, viz. that if I say anything not upheld by greater authority, though I appear to demonstrate it, yet it should be received with no further certainty, than as my opinion for the present, until God makes some clearer revelation to me. For I am sure that, if I say anything which plainly opposes the Holy Scriptures, it is false; and if I am aware of it, I will no longer hold it. But if, with regard to subjects, in which opposite opinions may be held without hazard, as that, for instance, which we now discuss; for if we know not whether there are to be more men elected, than the number of the lost angels, and incline to either of these opinions rather than the other; I think the soul is not in danger; if, I say, in questions like this, we explain the Divine words, so as to make them favor different sides, and there is nowhere found anything to decide, beyond doubt, the opinion that should be held; I think there is no censure to be given. As to the passage which you spoke of: "He hath determined the bounds of the people (or tribes) according to the number of the angels of God;" or as another translation has it: "according to the number of the children of Israel;" since both translations either mean the same thing, or are different, without contradicting each other, we may understand that good angels only are intended by both expressions, "angels of God," and "children of Israel," or that elect men only are meant, or that both angels and elect men are included, even the whole celestial kingdom. Or by angels of God, may be understood holy angels only, and, by children of Israel, holy men only; or, by children of Israel, angels only, and by angels of God, holy men. If good angels are intended in both expressions, it is the same as if only "angels of God" had been used; but if the whole heavenly kingdom were included, the meaning is, that a people, that is, the throng of elect men is to be taken, or that there will be a people in this stage of existence, until the appointed number of that kingdom, not yet completed, shall be made up from among men. But I do not now see why angels only, or even angels and holy men together, are meant by the expression "children of Israel;" for it is not improper to call holy men "children of Israel," as they are called "sons of Abraham." And they can also properly be called "angels of God," because they imitate the life of angels, and they are promised in heaven a likeness to and equality with angels, and all who live holy lives are angels of God. Therefore the confessors

or martyrs are so called; for he who declares and bears witness to the truth, he is a messenger of God, that is, his angel. And if a wicked man is called a devil, as our Lord says of Judas, because they are alike in malice; why should not a good man be called an angel, because he follows holiness? Wherefore I think we may say that God hath appointed the bounds of the people according to the number of elect men, because men will exist and there will be a natural increase among them, until the number of elect men is accomplished; and when that occurs, the birth of men, which takes place in this life, will cease. But if by "angels of God" we only understand holy angels, and by "children of Israel" only holy men; it may be explained in two ways: that "God hath appointed the bounds of the people according to the number of the angels of God," viz. either, that so great a people, that is, so many men will be taken as there are holy angels of God, or that a people will continue to exist upon earth, until the number of angels is completed from among men. And I think there is no other possible method of explanation: "he hath appointed the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel," that is, that there will continue to be a people in this stage of existence, as I said above, until the number of holy men is completed. And we infer from either translation that as many men will be taken, as there were angels who remained steadfast. Yet, although lost angels must have their ranks filled by men, it does not follow, that the number of lost angels was equal to that of those who persevered. But if any one affirms this, he will have to find means of invalidating the reasons given above, which prove, I think, that there was not among angels, before the fall, that perfect number before mentioned, and that there are more men to be saved, than the number of evil angels. *Boso.* I by no means regret that I urged you to these remarks about the angels, for it has not been for nought. Now let us return from our digression.

CHAP. XIX. *How man cannot be saved without satisfaction for sin.*

Anselm. It was fitting for God to fill the places of the fallen angels from among men. *Boso.* That is certain. *Anselm.* Therefore there ought to be in the heavenly empire as many men taken as substitutes for the angels as would correspond with the number whose place they shall take, that is, as many

as there are good angels now; otherwise they who fell will not be restored, and it will follow that God either could not accomplish the good which he begun, or he will repent of having undertaken it; either of which is absurd. *Boso.* Truly it is fitting that men should be equal with good angels. *Anselm.* Have good angels ever sinned? *Boso*, No. *Anselm.* Can you think that man, who has sinned, and never made satisfaction to God for his sin, but only been suffered to go unpunished, may become the equal of an angel who has never sinned? *Boso.* These words I can both think of and utter, but can no more perceive their meaning than I can make truth out of falsehood. *Anselm.* Therefore it is not fitting, that God should take sinful man without an atonement, in substitution for lost angels; for truth will not suffer man thus to be raised to an equality with holy beings. *Boso.* Reason shows this. *Anselm.* Consider, also, leaving out the question of equality with the angels, whether God ought, under such circumstances, to raise man to the same or a similar kind of happiness, as that which he had before he sinned. *Boso.* Tell your opinion, and I will attend to it as well as I can. *Anselm.* Suppose a rich man possessed a choice pearl, which had never been defiled, and which could not be taken from his hands without his permission; and that he determined to commit it to the treasury of his dearest and most valuable possessions. *Boso.* I accept your supposition. *Anselm.* What, if he should allow some envious person to take it from him when at supper, though he might have prevented it; and afterwards taking it from supper all soiled and unwashed, should commit it again to his beautiful and loved casket; will you consider him a wise man? *Boso.* How can I? for would it not be far better to keep and preserve his pearl pure, than to have it polluted? *Anselm.* Would not God be acting like this, who held man in paradise, as it were in his own hand, without sin, and destined to the society of angels, and allowed the devil, inflamed with envy, to cast him into the mire of sin, though truly with man's consent? For, had God chosen to restrain the devil, the devil could not have tempted man. Now I say, would not God be acting like this, should he restore man, stained with the defilement of sin, unwashed, that is, without any satisfaction, and always to remain so; should He restore him at once to paradise, from which he had been thrust out? *Boso.* I dare not deny the aptness of your comparison, were God to do this, and therefore do not admit that

he can do this. For it should seem either that he could not accomplish what he designed, or else that he repented of his good intent, neither of which things is possible with God. *Anselm.* Therefore, consider it settled, that, without satisfaction, that is, without voluntary payment of the debt, God can neither pass by the sin unpunished, nor can the sinner attain that happiness, or happiness like that, which he had before he sinned; for man cannot in this way be restored, or become such as he was before he sinned. *Boso.* I am wholly unable to refute your reasoning. But what say you to this: that we pray God, "put away our sins from us," and every nation prays the God of its faith, to put away its sins. For, if we pay our debt, why do we pray God to put it away? Is not God unjust to demand what has already been paid? But if we do not make payment, why do we supplicate in vain that he will do what he cannot do, because it is unbecoming? *Anselm.* He, who does not pay, says in vain: "pardon;" but he who pays, makes supplication, because prayer is properly connected with the payment; for God owes no man anything, but every creature owes God; and, therefore, it does not become man to treat with God as with an equal. But of this it is not now needful for me to answer you. For when you know why Christ died, I think you will see yourself the answer to your question. *Boso.* Your reply with regard to this matter suffices me for the present. And, moreover, you have so clearly shown that no man can attain happiness in sin, or be freed from sin without satisfaction for the trespass, that, even were I so disposed, I could not doubt it.

CHAP. XX. *That satisfaction ought to be proportionate to guilt; and that man is of himself unable to accomplish this.*

Anselm. Neither, I think, will you doubt this, that satisfaction should be proportionate to guilt. *Boso.* Otherwise sin would remain in a manner exempt from control (inordinatum), which cannot be, for God leaves nothing uncontrolled in his kingdom. But this is determined, that even the smallest unfitness is impossible with God. *Anselm.* Tell me, then, what payment you make God forr you sin? *Boso.* Repentance, a broken and contrite heart, self-denial, various bodily sufferings, pity in giving and forgiving, and obedience. *Anselm.* What do you give to God in all these? *Boso.* Do I not honor God, when, for his love and fear, in heartfelt contrition I give up worldly joy, and despise,

amid abstinence and toils, the delights and ease of this life, and submit obediently to him, freely bestowing my possessions in giving to and releasing others? *Anselm.* When you render anything to God, which you owe him, irrespective of your past sin, you should not reckon this as the debt which you owe for sin. But you owe God every one of those things you have mentioned. For, in this mortal state, there should be such love and such desire of attaining the true end of your being, which is the meaning of prayer, and such grief that you have not yet reached this object, and such fear lest you fail of it, that you should find joy in nothing, which does not help you or give encouragement of your success. For you do not deserve to have a thing which you do not love and desire for its own sake, and the want of which at present, together with the great danger of never getting it, causes you no grief. This also requires one to avoid ease and worldly pleasures, such as seduce the mind from real rest and pleasure, except so far as you think suffices for the accomplishment of that object. But you ought to view the gifts which you bestow as a part of your debt, since you know that what you give comes not from yourself, but from him whose servant both you are and he also to whom you give. And nature herself teaches you to do to your fellow servant, man to man, as you would be done by; and that he, who will not bestow what he has, ought not to receive what he has not. Of forgiveness, indeed, I speak briefly, for, as we said above, vengeance in no sense belongs to you, since you are not your own, nor is he who injures you yours or his, but you are both the servants of one Lord, made by him out of nothing. And if you avenge yourself upon your fellow servant, you proudly assume judgment over him, when it is the peculiar right of God, the judge of all. But what do you give to God by your obedience, which is not owed him already, since he demands from you all that you are and have and can become? *Boso.* Truly I dare not say that in all these things I pay any portion of my debt to God. *Anselm.* How then do you pay God for your transgression? *Boso.* If in justice I owe God myself and all my powers, even when I do not sin, I have nothing left to render to him for my sin. *Anselm.* What will become of you then? How will you be saved? *Boso.* Merely looking at your arguments, I see no way of escape. But, turning to my belief, I hope through Christian faith, "which works by love," that I may be saved, and the more, since we

read, that if the sinner turns from his iniquity and does what is right, all his transgressions shall be forgotten. *Anselm.* This is only said of those who either looked for Christ, before his coming, or who believe in him, since he has appeared. But we set aside Christ and his religion, as if they did not exist, when we proposed to inquire whether his coming were necessary to man's salvation. *Boso.* We did so. *Anselm.* Let us, then, proceed by reason simply. *Boso.* Though you bring me into straits, yet I very much wish you to proceed as you have begun.

CHAP. XXI. *How great a burden sin is.*

Anselm. Suppose that you did not owe any of those things, which you have brought up as possible payment for your sin, let us inquire whether they can satisfy for a sin so small as one *look* contrary to the will of God. *Boso.* Did I not hear you question the thing, I should suppose that a single repentant feeling on my part would blot out this sin. *Anselm.* You have not as yet estimated the great burden of sin. *Boso.* Show it me then. *Anselm.* If you should find yourself in the sight of God, and one said to you: "look thither;" and God, on the other hand, should say: "It is not my will that you should look;" ask your own heart, what there is in all existing things, which would make it right for you to give that *look* contrary to the will of God. *Boso.* I can find no motive, which would make it right; unless, indeed, I am so situated as to make it necessary for me either to do this or some greater sin. *Anselm.* Put away all such necessity; and ask with regard to this sin only, whether you can do it even for your own salvation. *Boso.* I see plainly that I cannot. *Anselm.* Not to detain you too long; what if it were necessary either that the whole universe, except God himself, should perish and fall back into nothing, or else that you should do so small a thing, against the will of God? *Boso.* When I consider the action itself, it appears very slight; but when I view it as contrary to the will of God, I know of nothing so grievous, and of no loss that will compare with it; but sometimes we oppose another's will without blame in order to preserve his property, so that afterwards he is glad that we opposed him. *Anselm.* This is in the case of man, who often does not know what is useful for him, or cannot make up his loss; but God is in want of nothing, and, should all things perish, can restore them as easily as he created them. *Boso.* I must confess that I ought not to oppose

the will of God even to preserve the whole creation. *Anselm.* What if there were more worlds as full of beings as this? *Boso.* Were they increased to an infinite extent, and held before me in like manner, my reply would be the same. *Anselm.* You cannot answer more correctly, but consider, also, should it happen, that you gave the look contrary to God's will, what payment you can make for this sin? *Boso.* I can only repeat what I said before. *Anselm.* So heinous is our sin, whenever we knowingly oppose the will of God even in the slightest thing; since we are always in his sight, and he always enjoins it upon us not to sin. *Boso.* I cannot deny it. *Anselm.* Therefore you make no satisfaction, unless you restore something greater than the amount of that obligation, which should restrain you from committing the sin. *Boso.* Reason seems to demand this, and to make the contrary wholly impossible. *Anselm.* Even God cannot raise to happiness any being bound at all by the debt of sin, because He ought not to. *Boso.* This decision is most weighty. *Anselm.* Listen to an additional reason, which makes it no less difficult for man to be reconciled to God. *Boso.* This alone would drive me to despair, were it not for the consolation of faith. *Anselm.* But listen. *Boso.* Say on.

CHAP. XXII. *What contempt man brought upon God, when he allowed himself to be conquered by the devil; for which he can make no satisfaction.*

Anselm. Man being made holy was placed in paradise, as it were in the place of God, between God and the devil, to conquer the devil by not yielding to his temptation, and so to vindicate the honor of God, and put the devil to shame, because that man, though weaker and dwelling upon earth, should not sin though tempted by the devil, while the devil, though stronger and in heaven, sinned without any to tempt him. And when man could have easily effected this, he, without compulsion and of his own accord, allowed himself to be brought over to the will of the devil, contrary to the will and honor of God. *Boso.* To what would you bring me? *Anselm.* Decide for yourself, if it be not contrary to the honor of God, for man to be reconciled to Him, with this calumnious reproach still heaped upon God; unless man first shall have honored God by overcoming the devil, as he dishonored him in yielding to the devil. Now the victory ought to be of this kind, that, as in his strength and immortal

vigor, he freely yielded to the devil to sin, and on this account justly incurred the penalty of death; so, in his weakness and mortality, which he had brought upon himself, he should conquer the devil by the pain of death, while wholly avoiding sin. But this cannot be done, so long as from the deadly effect of the first transgression, man is conceived and born in sin. *Boso.* Again I say that the thing is impossible, and reason approves what you say. *Anselm.* Let me mention one thing more, without which man's reconciliation cannot be justly effected, and the impossibility is the same. *Boso.* You have already presented so many obligations which we ought to fulfil, that nothing which you can add will alarm me more. *Anselm.* Yet listen. *Boso.* I will.

CHAP. XXIII. *What man took from God by his sin, which he has no power to repay.*

Anselm. What did man take from God, when he allowed himself to be overcome by the devil? *Boso.* Go on to mention, as you have begun, the evil things which can be added to those already shown, for I am ignorant of them. *Anselm.* Did not man take from God whatever He had purposed to do for human nature? *Boso.* There is no denying that. *Anselm.* Listen to the voice of strict justice; and judge according to that whether man makes to God a real satisfaction for his sin, unless, by overcoming the devil, man restore to God what he took from God in allowing himself to be conquered by the devil; so that, as, by this conquest over man, the devil took what belonged to God, and God was the loser, so in man's victory the devil may be despoiled, and God recover his right. *Boso.* Surely nothing can be more exactly, or justly conceived. *Anselm.* Think you that supreme justice can violate *this* justice? *Boso.* I dare not think it. *Anselm.* Therefore man cannot and ought not by any means to receive from God, what God designed to give him, unless he return to God everything which he took from him; so that, as by man God suffered loss, by man, also, He might recover His loss. But this cannot be effected except in this way: that, as in the fall of man, all human nature was corrupted, and, as it were, tainted with sin, and God will not choose one of such a race to fill up the number in his heavenly kingdom; so, by man's victory, as many men may be justified from sin as are needed to complete the number which man was made to fill. But a sinful man can by no means do this, for a sinner cannot justify a sinner.

Boso. There is nothing more just or necessary; but, from all these things, the compassion of God and the hope of man seems to fail, as far as regards that happiness for which man was made. *Anselm.* Yet wait a little. *Boso.* Have you anything further?

Chap. XXIV. *How, as long as man does not restore what he owes God, he cannot be happy, nor is he excused by want of power.*

Anselm. If a man is called unjust, who does not pay his fellow man a debt, much more is he unjust who does not restore what he owes God. *Boso.* If he can pay and yet does not, he is certainly unjust. But if he be not able, wherein is he unjust? *Anselm.* Indeed, if the origin of his inability were not in himself, there might be some excuse for him. But if in this very impotence lies the fault, as it does not lessen the sin, neither does it excuse him from paying what is due. Suppose one should assign his slave a certain piece of work, and should command him not to throw himself into a ditch, which he points out to him, and from which he could not extricate himself; and suppose that the slave, despising his master's command and warning, throws himself into the ditch before pointed out, so as to be utterly unable to accomplish the work assigned; think you that his inability will at all excuse him for not doing his appointed work? *Boso.* By no means, but will rather increase his crime, since he brought his inability upon himself. For doubly hath he sinned, in not doing what he was commanded to do, and in doing what he was forewarned not to do. *Anselm.* Just so inexcusable is man, who has voluntarily brought upon himself a debt which he cannot pay, and by his own fault disabled himself, so that he can neither escape his previous obligation not to sin, nor pay the debt which he has incurred by sin. For his very inability is guilt, because he ought not to have it; nay, he ought to be free from it; for as it is a crime not to have what he ought, it is also a crime to have what he ought not. Therefore, as it is a crime in man not to have that power which he received to avoid sin, it is also a crime to have that inability by which he can neither do right and avoid sin, nor restore the debt which he owes on account of his sin. For it is by his own free action that he loses that power, and falls into this inability. For not to have the power which one ought to have, is the same thing as to have the inability which one ought not to have. Therefore man's inability to restore what he owes to God, an inability brough

upon himself for that very purpose, does not excuse man from paying; for the result of sin cannot excuse the sin itself. *Boso.* This argument is exceedingly weighty, and must be true. *Anselm.* Man, then, is unjust in not paying what he owes to God. *Boso.* This is very true; for he is unjust both in not paying, and in not being able to pay. *Anselm.* But no unjust person shall be admitted to happiness; for, as that happiness is complete in which there is nothing wanting, so it can belong to no one who is not so pure as to have no injustice found in him. *Boso.* I dare not think otherwise. *Anselm.* He, then, who does not pay God what he owes, can never be happy. *Boso.* I cannot deny that this is so. *Anselm.* But if you choose to say that a merciful God remits to the suppliant his debt, because he cannot pay; God must be said to dispense with one of two things, viz. either this, which man ought voluntarily to render, but cannot, that is, an equivalent for his sin, a thing which ought not to be given up even to save the whole universe besides God; or else this, which, as I have before said, God was about to take away from man by punishment, even against man's will, viz. happiness. But, if God gives up what man ought freely to render, for the reason that man cannot repay it, what is this but saying that God gives up what he is unable to obtain? But it is mockery to ascribe such compassion to God. But if God gives up what he was about to take from unwilling man, because man is unable to restore what he ought to restore freely, He abates the punishment, and makes man happy on account of his sin, because he has what he ought not to have. For he ought not to have this inability, and therefore as long as he has it without atonement, it is his sin. And truly such compassion on the part of God is wholly contrary to the Divine justice, which allows nothing but punishment as the recompense of sin. Therefore, as God cannot be inconsistent with himself, his compassion cannot be of this nature. *Boso.* I think, then, we must look for another mercy than this. *Anselm.* But suppose it were true that God pardons the man who does not pay his debt, because he cannot. *Boso.* I could wish it were so. *Anselm.* But while man does not make payment, he either wishes to restore, or else he does not wish to. Now if he wishes to do what he cannot, he will be needy, and if he does not wish to, he will be unjust. *Boso* Nothing can be plainer. *Anselm.* But whether needy or unjust, he will not be happy. *Boso.* This also is plain. *Anselm.* So long, then, as he

does not restore, he will not be happy. *Boso.* If God follows the method of justice, there is no escape for the miserable wretch, and God's compassion seems to fail. *Anselm.* You have demanded an explanation; now hear it. I do not deny that God is merciful, who preserveth man and beast, according to the multitude of his mercies. But we are speaking of that exceeding pity, by which he makes man happy after this life. And I think that I have amply proved, by the reasons given above, that happiness ought not to be bestowed upon any one whose sins have not been wholly put away; and that this remission ought not to take place, save by the payment of the debt incurred by sin, according to the extent of sin. And if you think that any objections can be brought against these proofs, you ought to mention them. *Boso.* I see not how your reasons can be at all invalidated. *Anselm.* Nor do I, if rightly understood. But even if one of the whole number be confirmed by impregnable truth, that should be sufficient. For truth is equally secured against all doubt, if it be demonstrably proved by one argument, as by many. *Boso.* Surely this is so. But how, then, shall man be saved, if he neither pays what he owes, and ought not to be saved, without paying? Or, with what face shall we declare that God, who is rich in mercy above human conception, cannot exercise this compassion? *Anselm.* This is the question which you ought to ask of those, in whose behalf you are speaking, who have no faith in the need of Christ for man's salvation, and you should also request them to tell how man can be saved without Christ. But, if they are utterly unable to do it, let them cease from mocking us, and let them hasten to unite themselves with us, who do not doubt that man can be saved through Christ; else let them despair of being saved at all. And if this terrifies them, let them believe in Christ as we do, that they may be saved. *Boso.* Let me ask you, as I have begun, to show me how a man is saved by Christ.

Chap. XXV. *How man's salvation by Christ is necessarily possible.*

Anselm. Is it not sufficiently proved that man can be saved by Christ, when even infidels do not deny that man can be happy somehow, and it has been sufficiently shown, that, leaving Christ out of view, no salvation can be found for man? For, either by Christ, or by some one else, can man be saved, or else

not at all. If, then, it is false that man cannot be saved at all, or that he can be saved in any other way, his salvation must necessarily be by Christ. *Boso.* But what reply will you make to a person who perceives that man cannot be saved in any other way, and yet, not understanding how he can be saved by Christ, sees fit to declare that there cannot be any salvation either by Christ or in any other way? *Anselm.* What reply ought to be made to one who ascribes impossibility to a necessary truth, because he does not understand how it can be? *Boso.* That he is a fool. *Anselm.* Then what he says must be despised. *Boso.* Very true; but we ought to show him in what way the thing is true, which he holds to be impossible. *Anselm.* Do you not perceive, from what we have said above, that it is necessary for some men to attain to felicity? For, if it is unfitting for God to elevate man with any stain upon him, to that for which he made him free from all stain, lest it should seem that God had repented of his good intent, or was unable to accomplish his designs; far more is it impossible, on account of the same unfitness, that no man should be exalted to that state for which he was made. Therefore, a satisfaction, such as we have above proved necessary, for sin, must be found apart from the Christian faith, which no reason can show; or else we must accept the Christian doctrine. For what is clearly made out by absolute reasoning, ought by no means to be questioned, even though the method of it be not understood. *Boso.* What you say is true. *Anselm.* Why, then, do you question further? *Boso.* I come not for this purpose, to have you remove doubts from my faith, but to have you show me the reason of my confidence. Therefore, as you have brought me thus far by your reasoning, so that I perceive that man as a sinner owes God for his sin, what he is unable to pay, and cannot be saved without paying; I wish you would go further with me, and enable me to understand, by force of reasoning, the fitness of all those things which the Catholic faith enjoins upon us with regard to Christ, if we hope to be saved; and how they avail for the salvation of man, and how God saves man by compassion; when he never remits his sin, unless man shall have rendered what was due on account of his sin. And, to make your reasoning the clearer, begin at the beginning, so as to rest it upon a strong foundation. *Anselm.* Now God help me, for you do not spare me in the least, nor consider the weakness of my skill, when you enjoin so great a work upon me.

Yet I will attempt it, as I have begun, not trusting in myself but in God, and will do what I can with his help. But let us separate the things which remain to be said from those which have been said, by a new introduction, lest by their unbroken length, these things become tedious to one who wishes to read them.

[End of Book First. To be concluded.]

ARTICLE IV.

SPECIAL DIVINE INTERPOSITIONS IN NATURE.[1]

By Edward Hitchcock, D. D., LL. D., Amherst College.

No subject of theology has in it more true moral sublimity than the government of God over this world. Yet it is eminently a practical subject. Our views of it afford a test of our piety and a type of its character. Nay, there is one feature of this government, that has been regarded as the chief distinction between revealed and natural religion. We refer to Special Divine Interpositions. These have been supposed to be peculiar to revelation; while nature moves on by uniform, unchanging and unchangeable laws; nor does the whole history of those laws, as given by natural science, show a single example of interference or modification on the part of the Deity.

We venture to call in question the correctness of these views. If we have read nature aright, it teaches a different lesson. That lesson may be worth learning. We choose for our subject, therefore, SPECIAL DIVINE INTERPOSITIONS IN NATURE, *as made known by science.*

Let us, in the first place, endeavor to affix a definite meaning to the phrase: *Special Divine Interpositions.*

But here, perhaps, it may be necessary to interpose a remark, to prevent misunderstanding. We assume, as the basis of much

[1] This paper, essentially as here given, was delivered at the Anniversaries of the Newton and Bangor Theological Seminaries.