

ARTICLE III.

ANSELM'S DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION AND ATONEMENT.

A TRANSLATION OF THE "CUR DEUS HOMO."

By James Gardiner Vose, Milton, Mass. [Concluded from Vol. XI. p. 776.]

BOOK SECOND.

CHAP. I. *How man was made holy by God, so as to be happy in the enjoyment of God.*

Anselm. It ought not to be disputed, that rational nature was made holy by God, in order to be happy in enjoying Him. For to this end is it rational, in order to discern justice and injustice, good and evil, and between the greater and the lesser good. Otherwise it was made rational in vain. But God made it not rational in vain. Wherefore, doubtless, it was made rational for this end. In like manner is it proved that the intelligent creature received the power of discernment for this purpose, that he might hate and shun evil, and love and choose good, and especially the greater good. For else in vain would God have given him that power of discernment, since man's discretion would be useless, unless he loved and avoided according to it. But it does not befit God to give such power in vain. It is, therefore, established, that rational nature was created for this end, viz. to love and choose the highest good supremely, for its own sake and nothing else; for if the highest good were chosen for any other reason, then something else and not itself would be the thing loved. But intelligent nature cannot fulfil this purpose without being holy. Therefore that it might not in vain be made rational, it was made, in order to fulfil this purpose, both rational and holy. Now, if it was made holy in order to choose and love the highest good, then it was made such in order to follow sometimes what it loved and chose, or else it was not. But if it were not made holy for this end, that it might follow what it loves and chooses, then in vain was it made to love and choose holiness; and there can be no reason why it should be ever bound to follow holiness. Therefore, as long as it will be holy in loving and choosing the supreme good, for which it was made, it will be miserable;

because it will be impotent despite of its will, inasmuch as it does not have what it desires. But this is utterly absurd. Wherefore rational nature was made holy, in order to be happy in enjoying the supreme good, which is God. Therefore man, whose nature is rational, was made holy for this end, that he might be happy in enjoying God.

CHAP. II. *How man would never have died, unless he had sinned.*

Anselm. Moreover, it is easily proved, that man was so made as not to be necessarily subject to death; for, as we have already said, it is inconsistent with God's wisdom and justice to compel man to suffer death without fault, when He made him holy to enjoy eternal blessedness. It therefore follows, that had man never sinned, he never would have died.

CHAP. III. *How man will rise with the same body which he has in this world.*

Anselm. From this the future resurrection of the dead is clearly proved. For if man is to be perfectly restored, the restoration should make him such as he would have been, had he never sinned. *Boso.* It must be so. *Anselm.* Therefore, as man, had he not sinned, was to have been transferred with the same body to an immortal state, so when he shall be restored, it must properly be, with his own body as he lived in this world. *Boso.* But what shall we say to one who tells us that this is right enough with regard to those in whom humanity shall be perfectly restored, but is not necessary as respects the reprobate? *Anselm.* We know of nothing more just or proper than this, that as man, had he continued in holiness, would have been perfectly happy for eternity, both in body and in soul; so, if he persevere in wickedness, shall be likewise completely miserable forever. *Boso.* You have promptly satisfied me in these matters.

CHAP. IV. *How God will complete, in respect to human nature, what he has begun.*

Anselm. From these things, we can easily see, that God will either complete what he has begun with regard to human nature, or else he has made to no end so lofty a nature, capable of so great good. Now if it be understood, that God has made nothing more valuable than rational existence capable of enjoying

Him; it is altogether foreign from his character to suppose that he will suffer that rational existence utterly to perish. *Boso.* No reasonable being can think otherwise. *Anselm.* Therefore is it necessary for him to perfect in human nature what he has begun. But this, as we have already said, cannot be accomplished save by a complete expiation of sin, which no sinner can effect for himself. *Boso.* I now understand it to be necessary for God to complete what he has begun, lest there be an unseemly falling off from his design.

CHAP. V. *How, although the thing may be necessary, God may not do it by a compulsory necessity; and what is the nature of that necessity which removes or lessens gratitude, and what necessity increases it.*

Boso. But if it be so, then God seems, as it were, compelled, for the sake of avoiding what is unbecoming, to secure the salvation of man. How, then, can it be denied that he does it more on his own account than on ours? But if it be so, what thanks do we owe him for what he does for himself? How shall we attribute our salvation to his grace, if he saves us from necessity? *Anselm.* There is a necessity which takes away or lessens our gratitude to a benefactor, and there is also a necessity by which the favor deserves still greater thanks. For when one does a benefit from a necessity to which he is unwillingly subjected, less thanks are due him, or none at all. But when he freely places himself under the necessity of benefiting another, and sustains that necessity without reluctance, then he certainly deserves greater thanks for the favor. For this should not be called necessity but grace, inasmuch as he undertook or maintains it, not with any constraint, but freely. For if what you promise to-day, of your own accord, that you will give to-morrow, you give to-morrow with the same willingness; though it be necessary for you, if possible, to redeem your promise, or make yourself a liar; notwithstanding, the recipient of your favor is as much indebted for your precious gift, as if you had not promised it; for you were not obliged to make yourself his debtor, before the time of giving it. Just so is it, when one undertakes, by a vow, a design of holy living. For though after his vow he ought necessarily to perform, lest he suffer the judgment of an apostate, and, although he may be compelled to keep it even unwillingly, yet, if he keep his vow cheerfully, he is not less but more pleas-

ing to God than if he had not vowed. For he has not only given up the life of the world, but also his personal liberty for the sake of God; and he cannot be said to live a holy life of necessity, but with the same freedom with which he took the vow. Much more, therefore, do we owe all thanks to God for completing his intended favor to man, though, indeed, it would not be proper for him to fail in his good design, because wanting nothing in himself, he begun it for our sake and not his own. For what man was about to do was not hidden from God at his creation, and yet by freely creating man, God, as it were, bound himself to complete the good which he had begun. In fine, God does nothing by necessity, since he is not compelled or restrained in anything. And when we say that God does anything to avoid dishonor, which he certainly does not fear, we must mean that God does this from the necessity of maintaining his honor; which necessity is after all no more than this, viz. the immutability of his honor, which belongs to Him in himself, and is not derived from another; and therefore it is not properly called necessity. Yet we may say, although the whole work which God does for man is of grace, that it is necessary for God, on account of his unchangeable goodness, to complete the work which he has begun. *Boso.* I grant it.

CHAP. VI. *How no being, except the God-man, can make the atonement by which man is saved.*

Anselm. But this cannot be effected, except the price paid to God for the sin of man be something greater than all the universe besides God. *Boso.* So it appears. *Anselm.* Moreover, it is necessary that he who can give God anything of his own, which is more valuable than all things in the possession of God, must be greater than all else but God himself. *Boso.* I cannot deny it. *Anselm.* Therefore none but God can make this satisfaction. *Boso.* So it appears. *Anselm.* But none but a man ought to do this, otherwise man does not make the satisfaction. *Boso.* Nothing seems more just. *Anselm.* If it be necessary, therefore, as it appears, that the heavenly kingdom be made up of men, and this cannot be effected unless the aforesaid satisfaction be made, which none but God can make and none but man ought to make, it is necessary for the God-man to make it. *Boso.* Now blessed be God! we have made a great discovery with regard to our question. Go on, therefore, as you have

begun. For I hope that God will assist us. *Anselm.* Now must we inquire, how God can become man.

CHAP. VII. *How necessary it is for the same being to be perfect God and perfect man.*

Anselm. The Divine and human natures cannot alternate, so that the Divine should become human, or the human Divine; nor can they be so commingled as that a third should be produced from the two, which is neither wholly Divine, nor wholly human. For, granting that it were possible for either to be changed into the other, it would in that case be only God and not man, or man only and not God. Or, if they were so commingled, that a third nature sprung from the combination of the two (as from two animals, a male and a female, of different species, a third is produced, which does not preserve entire the species of either parent, but has a mixed nature derived from both), it would neither be God nor man. Therefore the God-man, whom we require to be of a nature both human and Divine, cannot be produced by a change from one into the other, nor by an imperfect commingling of both in a third; since these things cannot be, or, if they could be, would avail nothing to our purpose. Moreover, if these two complete natures are said to be joined somehow, in such a way that one may be Divine while the other is human, and yet that which is God not be the same with that which is man, it is impossible for both to do the work necessary to be accomplished. For God will not do it, because He has no debt to pay; and man will not do it, because he cannot. Therefore, in order that the God-man may perform this, it is necessary that the same being should be perfect God and perfect man, in order to make this atonement. For he cannot and ought not to do it, unless he be very God and very man. Since, then, it is necessary that the God-man preserve the completeness of each nature, it is no less necessary that these two natures be united entire in one person, just as a body and a reasonable soul exist together in every human being; for otherwise it is impossible that the same being should be very God and very man. *Boso.* All that you say is satisfactory to me.

CHAP. VIII. *How it behoved God to take a man of the race of Adam, and born of a woman.*

Anselm. It now remains to inquire whence and how God shall

assume human nature. For he will either take it from Adam, or else he will make a new man, as he made Adam originally. But, if he makes a new man, not of Adam's race, then this man will not belong to the human family, which descended from Adam, and therefore ought not to make atonement for it, because he never belonged to it. For, as it is right for man to make atonement for the sin of man, it is also necessary that he who makes the atonement should be the very being who has sinned, or else one of the same race. Otherwise, neither Adam nor his race would make satisfaction for themselves. Therefore, as through Adam and Eve sin was propagated among all men, so none but themselves, or one born of them, ought to make atonement for the sin of men. And, since they cannot, one born of them must fulfil this work. Moreover, as Adam and his whole race, had he not sinned, would have stood firm, without the support of any other being, so, after the fall, the same race must rise and be exalted by means of itself. For, whoever restores the race to its place, it will certainly stand by that being who has made this restoration. Also, when God created human nature in Adam alone, and would only make woman out of man, that by the union of both sexes there might be increase, in this he showed plainly, that he wished to produce all that he intended with regard to human nature from man alone. Wherefore, if the race of Adam be reinstated by any being not of the same race, it will not be restored to that dignity which it would have had, had not Adam sinned, and so will not be completely restored; and, besides, God will seem to have failed of his purpose, both which suppositions are incongruous. It is, therefore, necessary that the man by whom Adam's race shall be restored, be taken from Adam. *Boso.* If we follow reason, as we proposed to do, this is the necessary result. *Anselm.* Let us now examine the question, whether the human nature taken by God, must be produced from a father and mother, as other men are, or from man alone, or from woman alone. For, in whichever of these three modes it be, it will be produced from Adam and Eve, for from these two is every person of either sex descended. And of these three modes, no one is easier for God than another, that it should be selected on this account. *Boso.* So far, it is well. *Anselm.* It is no great toil to show that that man will be brought into existence in a nobler and purer manner, if produced from man alone, or woman alone, than if springing from the union of both,

as do all other men. *Boso.* I agree with you. *Anselm.* Therefore must he be taken either from man alone, or woman alone.

Boso. There is no other source. *Anselm.* In four ways can God create man, viz. either of man and woman, in the common way; or neither of man nor woman, as he created Adam; or of man without woman, as he made Eve; or of woman without man, which thus far he has never done. Wherefore, in order to show that this last mode is also under his power, and was reserved for this very purpose, what more fitting than that he should take that man, whose origin we are seeking, from a woman without man? Now whether it be more worthy that he be born of a virgin, or one not a virgin, we need not discuss, but must affirm, beyond all doubt, that the God-man should be born of a virgin.

Boso. Your speech gratifies my heart. *Anselm.* Does what we have said appear sound, or is it unsubstantial as a cloud, as you have said infidels declare? *Boso.* Nothing can be more sound.

Anselm. Paint not, therefore, upon baseless emptiness, but upon solid truth, and tell how clearly fitting it is that, as man's sin and the cause of our condemnation sprung from a woman, so the cure of sin and the source of our salvation should also be found in a woman. And that women may not despair of attaining the inheritance of the blessed, because that so dire an evil arose from woman, it is proper that from woman also so great a blessing should arise, that their hopes may be revived. Take also this view. If it was a virgin which brought all evil upon the human race, it is much more appropriate that a virgin should be the occasion of all good. And this also. If woman, whom God made from man alone, was made of a virgin (*de virgine*), it is peculiarly fitting for that man also, who shall spring from a woman, to be born of a woman without man. Of the pictures which can be superadded to this, showing that the God-man ought to be born of a virgin, we will say nothing. These are sufficient. *Boso.* They are certainly very beautiful and reasonable.

CHAP. IX. *How of necessity the Word only can unite in one person with man.*

Anselm. Now must we inquire further, in what person, God, who exists in three persons, shall take upon himself the nature of man. For a plurality of persons cannot take one and the same man into a unity of person. Wherefore in one person

only can this be done. But, as respects this personal unity of God and man, and in which of the Divine persons this ought to be effected, I have expressed myself, as far as I think needful for the present inquiry, in a letter on the Incarnation of the Word, addressed to my lord, the pope Urban. *Boso.* Yet briefly glance at this matter, why the person of the Son should be incarnated, rather than that of the Father or the Holy Spirit. *Anselm.* If one of the other persons be incarnated, there will be two sons in the Trinity, viz. the Son of God, who is the Son before the incarnation, and he also, who, by the incarnation, will be the son of the virgin; and among the persons, which ought always to be equal, there will be an inequality as respects the dignity of birth. For the one born of God will have a nobler birth than he who is born of the virgin. Likewise, if the Father become incarnate, there will be two grandsons in the Trinity; for the Father, by assuming humanity, will be the grandson of the parents of the virgin, and the Word, though having nothing to do with man, will yet be the grandson of the virgin, since he will be the son of her son. But all these things are incongruous and do not pertain to the incarnation of the Word. And there is yet another reason which renders it more fitting for the Son to become incarnate than the other persons. It is, that for the Son to pray to the Father is more proper than for any other person of the Trinity to supplicate his fellow. Moreover, man, for whom he was to pray, and the devil, whom he was to vanquish, have both put on a false likeness to God, by their own will. Wherefore they have sinned, as it were, especially against the person of the Son, who is believed to be the very image of God. Wherefore the punishment or pardon of guilt is with peculiar propriety ascribed to him, upon whom chiefly the injury was inflicted. Since, therefore, infallible reason has brought us to this necessary conclusion, that the Divine and human natures must unite in one person, and that this is evidently more fitting in respect to the person of the Word than the other persons, we determine that God the Word must unite with man, in one person. *Boso.* The way by which you lead me is so guarded by reason, that I cannot deviate from it to the right or left. *Anselm.* It is not I who lead you, but he of whom we are speaking, without whose guidance we have no power to keep the way of truth.

CHAP. X. *How this man dies not of debt; and in what sense he can or cannot sin; and how neither he nor an angel deserves praise for their holiness, if it is impossible for them to sin.*

Anselm. We ought not to question whether this man was about to die as a debt, as all other men do. For, if Adam would not have died, had he not committed sin, much less should this man suffer death, in whom there can be no sin, for he is God.

Boso. Let me delay you a little on this point. For in either case it is no slight question with me whether it be said that he can sin or that he cannot. For if it be said that he cannot sin, it should seem hard to be believed. For to say a word concerning him, not as of one who never existed, in the manner we have spoken hitherto, but as of one whom we know, and whose deeds we know; who, I say, will deny that he could have done many things which we call sinful? For, to say nothing of other things, how shall we say that it was not possible for him to commit the sin of lying? For, when he says to the Jews, of his Father: "If I say that I know him not, I shall be a liar, like unto you," and, in this sentence, makes use of the words: "I know him not," who says that he could not have uttered these same three words, or expressing the same thing differently, have declared, "I know him not?" Now had he done so, he would have been a liar, as he himself says, and therefore a sinner. Therefore, since he could do this, he could sin.

Anselm. It is true that he could say this, and also that he could not sin.

Boso. How is that? *Anselm.* All power follows the will. For, when I say that I can speak or walk, it is understood, if I choose. For, if the will be not implied as acting, there is no power but only necessity. For, when I say that I can be dragged or bound unwillingly, this is not my power, but necessity and the power of another; since I am able to be dragged or bound in no other sense than this, that another can drag or bind me. So we can say of Christ, that he could lie, so long as we understand, if he chose to do so. And, since he could not lie unwillingly and could not wish to lie, none the less can it be said that he could not lie. So in this way it is both true that he could and could not lie.

Boso. Now let us return to our original inquiry with regard to that man, as if nothing were known of him. I say, then, if he were unable to sin, because, according to you, he could not wish to sin, he maintains holiness of necessity, and therefore he will not be holy from freewill. What thanks, then,

will he deserve for his holiness? For we are accustomed to say that God made man and angel capable of sinning on this account, that, when of their own free-will they maintained holiness, though they might have abandoned it, they might deserve commendation and reward, which they would not have done, had they been necessarily holy. *Anselm.* Are not the angels worthy of praise, though unable to commit sin? *Boso.* Doubtless they are, because they deserved this present inability to sin from the fact that when they could sin they refused to do so. *Anselm.* What say you with respect to God, who cannot sin, and yet has not deserved this, by refusing to sin when he had the power? Must not He be praised for his holiness? *Boso.* I should like to have you answer that question for me; for if I say that He deserves no praise, I know that I speak falsely. If, on the other hand, I say that He does deserve praise, I am afraid of invalidating my reasoning with respect to the angels. *Anselm.* The angels are not to be praised for their holiness, because they could sin, but because it is owing to themselves, in a certain sense, that now they cannot sin. And in this respect are they in a measure like God, who has, from himself, whatever he possesses. For a person is said to give a thing, who does not take it away when he can; and to do a thing is but the same as not to prevent it, when that is in one's power. When, therefore, the angel could depart from holiness and yet did not, and could make himself unholy yet did not, we say with propriety, that he conferred virtue upon himself, and made himself holy. In this sense, therefore, has he holiness of himself (for the creature cannot have it of himself in any other way), and, therefore, should be praised for his holiness, because he is not holy of necessity but freely; for that is improperly called necessity, which involves neither compulsion nor restraint. Wherefore, since whatever God has, he has perfectly of himself; he is most of all to be praised for the good things which he possesses and maintains not by any necessity, but, as before said, by his own infinite unchangeableness. Therefore, likewise, that man, who will be also God, since every good thing which he possesses comes from himself, will be holy, not of necessity but voluntarily, and, therefore, will deserve praise. For, though human nature will have what it has from the Divine nature, yet it will likewise have it from itself, since the two natures will be united in one person. *Boso.* You have satisfied me on this point; and I see clearly that it is both

true that he could not sin, and yet that he deserves praise for his holiness. But now I think the question arises, since God could make such a man, why he did not create angels and our first parents so as to be incapable of sin, and yet praiseworthy for their holiness? *Anselm.* Do you know what you are saying? *Boso.* I think I understand, and it is therefore I ask, why he did not make them so. *Anselm.* Because it was neither possible nor right for any one of them to be the same with God, as we say *that man was*. And if you ask, why he did not bring the three persons, or at least the Word, into unity with men, at that time, I answer: Because reason did not at all demand any such thing then, but wholly forbade it, for God does nothing without reason. *Boso.* I blush to have asked the question. Go on with what you have to say. *Anselm.* We must conclude, then, that he should not be subject to death, inasmuch as he will not be a sinner. *Boso.* I must agree with you.

CHAP. XI. *How Christ dies of his own power, and how mortality does not inhere in the essential nature of man.*

Anselm. Now, also, it remains to inquire whether, as man's nature is, it is possible for that man to die? *Boso.* We need hardly dispute with regard to this, since he will be really man, and every man is by nature mortal. *Anselm.* I do not think mortality inheres in the essential nature of man, but only as corrupted. Since, had man never sinned, and had his immortality been unchangeably confirmed, he would have been as really man; and, when the dying rise again, incorruptible, they will no less be really men. For, if mortality was an essential attribute of human nature, then he who was immortal could not be man. Wherefore, neither corruption nor incorruption belong essentially to human nature, for neither makes nor destroys a man; but happiness accrues to him from the one, and misery from the other. But since all men die, mortality is included in the definition of man, as given by philosophers, for they have never even believed in the possibility of man's being immortal in all respects. And so it is not enough to prove that that man ought to be subject to death, for us to say that he will be in all respects a man. *Boso.* Seek then for some other reason, since I know of none, if you do not, by which we may prove that he can die. *Anselm.* We may not doubt, that, as he will be God, he will possess omnipotence. *Boso.* Certainly. *Anselm.* He

can then, if he chooses, lay down his life and take it again. *Boso.* If not, he would scarcely seem to be omnipotent. *Anselm.* Therefore is he able to avoid death, if he chooses, and also to die and rise again. Moreover, whether he lays down his life by the intervention of no other person, or another causes this, so that he lays it down by permitting it to be taken, it makes no difference, as far as regards his power. *Boso.* There is no doubt about it. *Anselm.* If, then, he chooses to allow it, he could be slain; and if he were unwilling to allow it, he could not be slain. *Boso.* To this we are unavoidably brought by reason. *Anselm.* Reason has also taught us, that the gift which he presents to God, not of debt but freely, ought to be something greater than anything in the possession of God. *Boso.* Yes. *Anselm.* Now this can neither be found beneath him, nor above him. *Boso.* Very true. *Anselm.* In himself, therefore, must it be found. *Boso.* So it appears. *Anselm.* Therefore will he give himself, or something pertaining to himself. *Boso.* I cannot see how it should be otherwise. *Anselm.* Now must we inquire, what sort of a gift this should be? For he may not give himself to God, or anything of his, as if God did not have what was his own. For every creature belongs to God. *Boso.* This is so. *Anselm.* Therefore must this gift be understood in this way, that he somehow gives up himself, or something of his, to the honor of God, which he did not owe as a debtor. *Boso.* So it seems, from what has been already said. *Anselm.* If we say that he will give himself to God by obedience, so as, by steadily maintaining holiness, to render himself subject to his will, this will not be giving a thing not demanded of him by God as his due. For every reasonable being owes this obedience to God. *Boso.* This cannot be denied. *Anselm.* Therefore must it be in some other way, that he gives himself, or something belonging to him, to God. *Boso.* Reason urges us to this conclusion. *Anselm.* Let us see whether, perchance, this may be to give up his life or to lay down his life, or to deliver himself up to death for God's honor. For God will not demand this of him as a debt; for, as no sin will be found, he ought not to die, as we have already said. *Boso.* Else, I cannot understand it. *Anselm.* But let us further observe, whether this is according to reason. *Boso.* Speak you, and I will listen with pleasure. *Anselm.* If man sinned with ease, is it not fitting for him to atone with difficulty? And if he was overcome by the devil in the easiest manner possible, so

as to dishonor God by sinning against him, is it not right that man, in making satisfaction for his sin, should honor God by conquering the devil, with the greatest possible difficulty? Is it not proper that, since man has departed from God as far as possible in his sin, he should make to God the greatest possible satisfaction? *Boso.* Surely there is nothing more reasonable. *Anselm.* Now nothing can be more severe or difficult for man to do for God's honor, than to suffer death voluntarily, when not bound by obligation; and man cannot give himself to God in any way more truly, than by surrendering himself to death for God's honor. *Boso.* All these things are true. *Anselm.* Therefore he, who wishes to make atonement for man's sin, should be one who can die if he chooses. *Boso.* I think it is plain that the man whom we seek for should not only be one who is not necessarily subject to death on account of his omnipotence, and one who does not deserve death on account of his sin, but also one who can die of his own free-will, for this will be necessary. *Anselm.* There are also many other reasons why it is peculiarly fitting for that man to enter into the common intercourse of men, and maintain a likeness to them, only without sin. And these things are more easily and clearly manifest in his life and actions, than they can possibly be shown to be by mere reason, without experience. For who can say how necessary and wise a thing it was for him, who was to redeem mankind, and lead them back, by his teaching, from the way of death and destruction into the path of life and eternal happiness, when he conversed with men, and when he taught them by personal intercourse, to set them an example himself of the way in which they ought to live? But how could he have given this example to weak and dying men, that they should not deviate from holiness, because of injuries, or scorn, or tortures, or even death, had they not been able to recognize all these virtues in himself?

CHAP. XII *How, though he share in our weaknesses, he is not therefore miserable.*

Boso. All these things plainly show that he ought to be mortal and to partake of our weaknesses. But all these things are our miseries. Will he then be miserable? *Anselm.* No, indeed! for as no advantage, which one has apart from his choice, constitutes happiness, so there is no misery in choosing

to bear a loss, when the choice is a wise one, and made without compulsion. *Boso.* Certainly, this must be allowed.

CHAP. XIII. *How, along with our other weaknesses, he does not partake of our ignorance.*

Boso. But tell me, whether in this likeness to men which he ought to have, he will inherit also our ignorance, as he does our other infirmities? *Anselm.* Do you doubt the omnipotence of God? *Boso.* No! but, although this man be immortal in respect to his Divine nature, yet will he be mortal in his human nature. For why will he not be like them in their ignorance, as he is in their mortality? *Anselm.* That union of humanity with the Divine person will not be effected except in accordance with the highest wisdom; and, therefore, God will not take anything belonging to man which is only useless, but even a hindrance to the work which that man must accomplish. For ignorance is in no respect useful, but very prejudicial. How can he perform works, so many and so great, without the highest wisdom? Or, how will men believe him if they find him ignorant? And if he be ignorant, what will it avail him? If nothing is loved except as it is known, and there be no good thing which he does not love, then there can be no good thing of which he is ignorant. But no one perfectly understands good, save he who can distinguish it from evil; and no one can make this distinction who does not know what evil is. Therefore, as he of whom we are speaking, perfectly comprehends what is good, so there can be no evil with which he is unacquainted. Therefore must he have all knowledge, though he do not openly show it in his intercourse with men. *Boso.* In his more mature years, this should seem to be as you say; but, in infancy, as it will not be a fit time to discover wisdom, so there will be no need, and therefore no propriety, in his having it. *Anselm.* Did not I say that the incarnation will be made in wisdom? But God will in wisdom assume that mortality, which he makes use of so wisely, because for so great an object. But he could not wisely assume ignorance, for this is never useful, but always injurious, except when an evil will is deterred from acting, on account of it. But, in him, an evil desire never existed. For if ignorance did no harm in any other respect, yet does it in this, that it takes away the good of knowing. And to answer your question in a word, *that man*, from the essential nature of his being, will

be always full of God ; and, therefore, will never want the power, the firmness or the wisdom of God ? *Boso.* Though wholly unable to doubt the truth of this with respect to Christ, yet, on this very account, have I asked for the reason of it. For we are often certain about a thing, and yet cannot prove it by reason.

CHAP. XIV. *How his death outweighs the number and greatness of our sins.*

Boso. Now I ask you to tell me how his death can outweigh the number and magnitude of our sins, when the least sin we can think of, you have shown to be so monstrous, that, were there an infinite number of worlds as full of created existence as this, they could not stand, but would fall back into nothing, sooner than one look should be made contrary to the just will of God. *Anselm.* Were that man here before you, and you knew who he was, and it were told you that, if you did not kill him, the whole universe, except God, would perish, would you do it, to preserve the rest of creation ? *Boso.* No ! not even were an infinite number of worlds displayed before me. *Anselm.* But suppose you were told : " If you do not kill him, all the sins of the world will be heaped upon you." *Boso.* I should answer, that I would far rather bear all other sins, not only those of this world, past and future, but also all others that can be conceived of, than this alone. And I think I ought to say this, not only with regard to killing him, but even as to the slightest injury which could be inflicted on him. *Anselm.* You judge correctly ; but tell me why it is that your heart recoils from one injury inflicted upon him as more heinous than all other sins that can be thought of, inasmuch as all sins whatsoever are committed against him ? *Boso.* A sin committed upon his person, exceeds beyond comparison all the sins which can be thought of, that do not affect his person. *Anselm.* What say you to this, that one often suffers freely certain evils in his person, in order not to suffer greater ones in his property ? *Boso.* God has no need of such patience, for all things lie in subjection to his power, as you answered a certain question of mine above. *Anselm.* You say well ; and hence we see that no enormity or multitude of sins, apart from the Divine person, can for a moment be compared with a bodily injury inflicted upon that man. *Boso.* This is most plain. *Anselm.* How great does this good seem to you, if the destruction of it is such an evil ? *Boso.* If its existence is

as great a good as its destruction is an evil, then is it far more a good than those sins are evils, which its destruction so far surpasses. *Anselm.* Very true. Consider, also, that sins are as hateful as they are evil, and that life is only amiable in proportion as it is good. And, therefore, it follows that that life is more lovely than sins are odious. *Boso.* I cannot help seeing this. *Anselm.* And do you not think that so great a good, in itself so lovely, can avail to pay what is due for the sins of the whole world? *Boso.* Yes! it has even infinite value. *Anselm.* Do you see, then, how this life conquers all sins, if it be given for them? *Boso.* Plainly. *Anselm.* If, then, to lay down life is the same as to suffer death, as the gift of his life surpasses all the sins of men, so will also the suffering of death.

CHAP. XV. *How this death removes even the sins of his murderers.*

Boso. This is properly so with regard to all sins not affecting the person of the Deity. But let me ask you one thing more. If it be as great an evil to slay him as his life is a good, how can his death overcome and destroy the sins of those who slew him? Or, if it destroys the sin of any one of them, how can it not also destroy any sin committed by other men? For we believe that many men will be saved, and a vast many will not be saved. *Anselm.* The Apostle answers this question when he says: "Had they known it, they would never have crucified the Lord of glory." For a sin knowingly committed and a sin done ignorantly are so different, that an evil which they could never do, were its full extent known, may be pardonable, when done in ignorance. For no man could ever, knowingly, at least, slay the Lord; and, therefore, those who did it in ignorance, did not rush into that transcendent crime with which none others can be compared. For this crime, the magnitude of which we have been considering as equal to the worth of his life, we have not looked at as having been ignorantly done, but knowingly; a thing which no man ever did or could do. *Boso.* You have reasonably shown that the murderers of Christ can obtain pardon for their sin. *Anselm.* What more do you ask? For now you see how reason of necessity shows that the celestial state must be made up from men, and that this can only be by the forgiveness of sins, which man can never have but by man, who must be at the same time Divine, and reconcile sinners to God by his own death. There-

fore have we clearly found that Christ, whom we confess to be both God and man, died for us; and, when this is known beyond all doubt, all things which he says of himself must be acknowledged as true, for God cannot lie, and all he does must be received as wisely done, though we do not understand the reason of it. *Boso.* What you say is true; and I do not for a moment doubt that his words are true, and all that he does reasonable. But I ask this in order that you may disclose to me, in their true rationality, those things in Christian faith which seem to infidels improper or impossible; and this, not to strengthen me in the faith, but to gratify one already confirmed by the knowledge of the truth itself.

CHAP. XVI. *How God took that man from a sinful substance, and yet without sin; and of the salvation of Adam and Eve.*

Boso. As, therefore, you have disclosed the reason of those things mentioned above, I beg you will also explain what I am now about to ask. First, then, how does God, from a sinful substance, that is, of human species, which was wholly tainted by sin, take a man without sin, as an unleavened lump from that which is leavened? For, though the conception of this man be pure, and free from the sin of fleshly gratification, yet the virgin herself, from whom he sprang, was conceived in iniquity, and in sin 'did her mother bear her, since she herself sinned in Adam, in whom all men sinned. *Anselm.* Since it is fitting for that man to be God, and also the restorer of sinners, we doubt not that he is wholly without sin; yet will this avail nothing, unless he be taken without sin, and yet of a sinful substance. But, if we cannot comprehend in what manner the wisdom of God effects this, we should be surprised, but with reverence should allow of a thing of so great magnitude to remain hidden from us. For the restoring of human nature by God, is more wonderful than its creation; for either was equally easy for God; but before man was made, he had not sinned, so that he ought not to be denied existence. But after man was made he deserved, by his sin, to lose his existence together with its design; though he never has wholly lost this, viz. that he should be one capable of being punished, or of receiving God's compassion. For neither of these things could take effect if he were annihilated. Therefore God's restoring man is more wonderful than his creating man, inasmuch as it is done for the

sinner contrary to his deserts; while the act of creation was not for the sinner, and was not in opposition to man's deserts. How great a thing it is, also, for God and man to unite in one person, that, while the perfection of each nature is preserved, the same being may be both God and man! Who, then, will dare to think that the human mind can discover how wisely, how wonderfully, so incomprehensible a work has been accomplished? *Boso.* I allow that no man can wholly discover so great a mystery in this life, and I do not desire you to do what no man can do, but only to explain it according to your ability. For you will sooner convince me that deeper reasons lie concealed in this matter, by showing some one that you know of, than if, by saying nothing, you make it appear that you do not understand any reason.

Anselm. I see that I cannot escape your importunity; but, if I have any power to explain what you wish, let us thank God for it. But if not, let the things above said suffice. For, since it is agreed that God ought to become man, no doubt He will not lack the wisdom or the power to effect this without sin. *Boso.* This I readily allow. *Anselm.* It was certainly proper that that atonement which Christ made, should benefit not only those who lived at that time but also others. For, suppose there were a king, against whom all the people of his provinces had rebelled, with but a single exception of those belonging to their race, and that all the rest were irretrievably under condemnation. And suppose that he, who alone is blameless, had so great favor with the king, and so deep love for us, as to be both able and willing to save all those who trusted in his guidance; and this because of a certain very pleasing service which he was about to do for the king, according to his desire; and, inasmuch as those who are to be pardoned cannot all assemble upon that day, the king grants, on account of the greatness of the service performed, that whoever, either before or after the day appointed, acknowledged that he wished to obtain pardon by the work that day accomplished, and to subscribe to the condition there laid down, should be freed from all past guilt; and, if they sinned after this pardon, and yet wished to render atonement, and to be set right again, by the efficacy of this plan, they should again be pardoned, only provided that no one enter his mansion until this thing be accomplished, by which his sins are removed. In like manner, since all who are to be saved, cannot be present at the sacrifice of Christ, yet, such virtue is there in his death, that its power is

extended even to those far remote in place or time. But that it ought to benefit not merely those present is plainly evident, because there could not be so many living at the time of his death as are necessary to complete the heavenly state, even if all who were upon the earth at that time, were admitted to the benefits of redemption. For the number of evil angels, which must be made up from men, is greater than the number of men at that time living. Nor may we believe that, since man was created, there was ever a time when the world, with the creatures made for the use of man, was so unprofitable as to contain no human being who had gained the object for which he was made. For it seems unfitting that God should even for a moment allow the human race, made to complete the heavenly state, and those creatures which he made for their use, to exist in vain. *Boso.* You show by correct reasoning, such as nothing can oppose, that there never was a time since man was created, when there has not been some one who was gaining that reconciliation without which every man was made in vain. So that we rest upon this as not only proper, but also necessary. For if this is more, fit and reasonable than that at any time there should be no one found fulfilling the design for which God made man, and there is no further objection that can be made to this view, then it is necessary that there always be some person partaking of this promised pardon. And, therefore, we must not doubt that Adam and Eve obtained part in that forgiveness, though Divine authority makes no mention of this. *Anselm.* It is also incredible that God created them, and unchangeably determined to make all men from them, as many as were needed for the celestial state, and yet should exclude these two from this design. *Boso.* Nay, undoubtedly we ought to believe that God made them for this purpose, viz. to belong to the number of those for whose sake they were created. *Anselm.* You understand it well. But no soul, before the death of Christ, could enter the heavenly kingdom, as I said above, with regard to the palace of the king. *Boso.* So we believe. *Anselm.* Moreover, the virgin, from whom that man was taken of whom we are speaking, was of the number of those who were cleansed from their sins, before his birth, and he was born of her in her purity. *Boso.* What you say would satisfy me, were it not that he ought to be pure of himself, whereas he appears to have his purity from his mother and not from himself. *Anselm.* Not so. But as the mother's purity,

which he partakes, was only derived from him, he also was pure by and of himself.

CHAP. XVII. *How he did not die of necessity, though he could not be born, except as destined to suffer death.*

Boso. Thus far it is well. But there is yet another matter that needs to be looked into. For we have said before, that his death was not to be a matter of necessity; yet now we see that his mother was purified by the power of his death, when without this he could not have been born of her. How, then, was not his death necessary, when he could not have been, except in view of future death? For if he were not to die, the virgin of whom he was born could not be pure, since this could only be effected by true faith in his death, and, if she were not pure, he could not be born of her. If, therefore, his death be not a necessary consequence of his being born of the virgin, he never could have been born of her at all; but this is an absurdity.

Anselm. If you had carefully noted the remarks made above, you would easily have discovered in them, I think, the answer to your question. *Boso.* I see not how. *Anselm.* Did we not find, when considering the question whether he would lie, that there were two senses of the word *power* in regard to it, the one referring to his disposition, the other to the act itself; and that, though having the power to lie, he was so constituted by nature as not to wish to lie, and, therefore, deserved praise for his holiness in maintaining the truth? *Boso.* It is so. *Anselm.* In like manner, with regard to the preservation of his life, there is the power of preserving, and the power of wishing to preserve it. And, when the question is asked, whether the same God-man could preserve his life, so as never to die, we must not doubt that he always had the power to preserve his life, though he could not wish to do so for the purpose of escaping death. And since this disposition, which forever prevents him from wishing this, arises from himself, he lays down his life not of necessity, but of free authority. *Boso.* But those powers were not in all respects similar, the power to lie and the power to preserve his life. For, if he wished to lie, he would of course be able to; but, if he wished to avoid the other, he could no more do it than he could avoid being what he is. For he became man for this purpose, and it was on the faith of his coming death, that he could receive birth from a virgin, as you said above. *Anselm.*

As you think that he could not lie, or that his death was necessary, because he could not avoid being what he was, so you can assert that he could not wish to avoid death, or that he wished to die of necessity, because he could not change the constitution of his being; for he did not become man, in order that he should die, any more than for this purpose, that he should wish to die. Wherefore, as you ought not to say that he could not help wishing to die, or that it was of necessity that he wished to die, it is equally improper to say that he could not avoid death, or that he died of necessity. *Boso.* Yes, since dying and wishing to die are included in the same mode of reasoning, both would seem to fall under a like necessity. *Anselm.* Who freely wished to become man, that by the same unchanging desire he should suffer death, and that the virgin from whom that man should be born, might be pure, through confidence in the certainty of this? *Boso.* God, the Son of God. *Anselm.* Was it not above shown, that no desire of God is at all constrained; but that it freely maintains itself in his own unchangeableness, as often as it is said that he does anything necessarily? *Boso.* It has been clearly shown. But we see, on the other hand, that what God unchangeably wishes, cannot avoid being so, but takes place of necessity. Wherefore, if God wished that man to die, he could but die. Because the Son of God took the nature of man with this desire, viz. that he should suffer death, you prove it necessary that this man should not be able to avoid death. *Boso.* So I perceive. *Anselm.* Has it not in like manner appeared from the things which have been spoken, that the Son of God and the man whose person, he took were so united that the same being should be both God and man, the Son of God and the son of the virgin? *Boso.* It is so. *Anselm.* Therefore the same man could possibly both die and avoid death. *Boso.* I cannot deny it. *Anselm.* Since, then, the will of God does nothing by any necessity, but of his own power, and the will of that man was the same as the will of God, he died not necessarily, but only of his own power. *Boso.* To your arguments I cannot object; for neither your propositions nor your inferences can I invalidate in the least. But yet this thing, which I have mentioned, always recurs to my mind: that, if he wished to avoid death, he could no more do it than he could escape existence. For it must have been fixed that he was to die, for had it not been true that he was about to die, faith in his coming death would not have existed,

by which the virgin, who gave him birth, and many others also, were cleansed from their sin. Wherefore, if he could avoid death, he could make untrue what was true. *Anselm.* Why was it true, before he died, that he was certainly to die? *Boso.* Because this was his free and unchangeable desire. *Anselm.* If, then, as you say, he could not avoid death because he was certainly to die, and was, on this account, certainly to die, because it was his free and unchangeable desire, it is clear that his inability to avoid death is nothing else but his fixed choice to die. *Boso.* This is so; but, whatever be the reason, it still remains certain that he could not avoid death, but that it was a necessary thing for him to die. *Anselm.* You make a great ado about nothing, or, as the saying is, you stumble at a straw. *Boso.* Are you not forgetting my reply to the excuses you made at the beginning of our discussion, viz. that you should explain the subject, not as to learned men, but to me and my fellow inquirers? Suffer me, then, to question you as my slowness and dullness require, so that, as you have begun thus far, you may go on to settle all our childish doubts.

CHAP. XVIII. a. *How, with God, there is neither necessity nor impossibility, and what is a coercive necessity, and what one that is not so.*

Anselm. We have already said that it is improper to affirm of God, that he does anything, or that he cannot do it, of necessity. For all necessity and impossibility is under his control. But his choice is subject to no necessity nor impossibility. For nothing is necessary or impossible save as He wishes it. Nay, the very choosing or refusing anything, as a necessity or an impossibility, is contrary to truth. Since, then, he does what he chooses and nothing else, as no necessity or impossibility exists before his choice or refusal, so neither do they interfere with his acting or not acting, though it be true that his choice and action are immutable. And as, when God does a thing, since it has been done, it cannot be undone, but must remain an actual fact; still, we are not correct in saying that it is impossible for God to prevent a past action from being what it is. For there is no necessity or impossibility in the case whatever, but the simple will of God, which chooses that truth should be eternally the same, for he himself is truth. Also, if he has a fixed determination to do anything, though his design must be destined to an accomplishment before

it comes to pass, yet there is no coercion as far as he is concerned, either to do it or not to do it, for his will is the sole agent in the case. For when we say that God cannot do a thing, we do not deny his power; on the contrary, we imply that He has invincible authority and strength. For we mean simply this, that nothing can compel God to do the thing which is said to be impossible for Him. We often use an expression of this kind, that a thing can be when the power is not in itself, but in something else; and that it cannot be, when the weakness does not pertain to the thing itself, but to something else. Thus we say: "Such a man can be bound," instead of saying "Somebody can bind him;" and: "He cannot be bound," instead of "Nobody can bind him." For to be able to be overcome is not power but weakness, and not to be able to be overcome is not weakness but power. Nor do we say that God does anything by necessity, because there is any such thing pertaining to him, but because it exists in something else, precisely as I said with regard to the affirmation that he cannot do anything. For necessity is always either compulsion or restraint; and these two kinds of necessity operate variously by turn, so that the same thing is both necessary and impossible. For whatever is obliged to exist, is also prevented from non-existence; and that which is compelled not to exist, is prevented from existence. So that whatever exists from necessity, cannot avoid existence, and it is impossible for a thing to exist which is under a necessity of non-existence, and *vice versa*. But when we say with regard to God, that anything is necessary or not necessary, we do not mean that, as far as he is concerned, there is any necessity either coercive or prohibitory, but we mean that there is a necessity in everything else, restraining or driving them in a particular way. Whereas we say the very opposite of God. For, when we affirm that it is necessary for God to utter truth, and never to lie, we only mean that such is his unwavering disposition to maintain the truth, that of necessity nothing can avail to make him deviate from the truth, or utter a lie. When, then, we say that that man (who, by the union of persons, is also God, the Son of God) could not avoid death, or the choice of death, after he was born of the virgin, we do not imply that there was in him any weakness with regard to preserving, or choosing to preserve, his life, but we refer to the unchangeableness of his purpose, by which he freely became man for this design, viz. that, by persevering in his wish, he

should suffer death. And this desire nothing could shake. For it would be rather weakness than power, if he could wish to lie, or deceive, or change his disposition, when before he had chosen that it should remain unchanged. And, as I said before, when one has freely determined to do some good action, and afterwards goes on to complete it, though, if unwilling to pay his vow, he could be compelled to do so, yet we must not say that he does it of necessity, but with the same freedom with which he made the resolution. For we ought not to say that anything is done, or not done, by necessity or weakness, when free choice is the only agent in the case. And, if this is so with regard to man, much less can we speak of necessity or weakness in reference to God; for He does nothing except according to his choice, and his will no force can drive or restrain. For this end was accomplished by the united natures of Christ, viz. that the Divine nature should perform that part of the work needful for man's restoration, which the human nature could not do; and that in the human should be manifested what was inappropriate to the Divine. Finally, the virgin herself, who was made pure by faith in him, so that he might be born of her, even she, I say, never believed that he was to die, save of his own choice. For she knew the words of the prophet, who said of him: "He was offered of his own will." Therefore, since her faith was well founded, it must necessarily turn out as she believed. And, if it perplexes you to have me say that it is necessary, remember, that the reality of the virgin's faith was not the cause of his dying by his own freewill; but, because this was destined to take place, therefore, her faith was real. If, then, it be said that it was necessary for him to die of his single choice, because the antecedent faith and prophecy were true, this is no more than saying that it must be because it was to be. But such a necessity as this does not compel a thing to be, but only implies a necessity of its existence. There is an antecedent necessity, which is the cause of a thing, and there is also a subsequent necessity, arising from the thing itself. Thus, when the heavens are said to revolve, it is an antecedent and efficient necessity, for they must revolve. But when I say that you speak of necessity, because you are speaking, this is nothing but a subsequent and inoperative necessity. For I only mean, that it is impossible for you to speak and not to speak at the same time, and not that some one compels you to speak. For the force of its own nature makes

the heaven revolve; but no necessity obliges you to speak. But wherever there is an antecedent necessity, there is also a subsequent one; but not *vice versa*. For we can say that the heaven revolves of necessity, because it revolves; but it is not likewise true that, because you speak, you do it of necessity. This subsequent necessity pertains to everything, so that we say: Whatever has been, necessarily has been. Whatever is, must be. Whatever is to be, of necessity will be. This is that necessity which Aristotle treats of ("de propositionibus singularibus et futuris"), and which seems to destroy any alternative, and to ascribe a necessity to all things. By this subsequent and imperative necessity, was it necessary (since the belief and prophecy concerning Christ were true, that he would die of his own freewill), that it should be so. For this he became man; for this he did and suffered all things undertaken by him; for this he chose as he did. For therefore were they necessary, because they were to be, and they were to be because they were, and they were because they were; and, if you wish to know the real necessity of all things which he did and suffered, know that they were of necessity, because he wished them to be. But no necessity preceded his will. Wherefore if they were not, save by his will, then, had he not willed, they would not have existed. So then, no one took his life from him, but he laid it down of himself, and took it again; for he had power to lay it down and to take it again, as he himself said. *Boso*. You have satisfied me that it cannot be proved that he was subjected to death by any necessity; and I cannot regret my importunity in urging you to make this explanation. *Anselm*. I think we have shown with sufficient clearness, how it was that God took a man without sin from a sinful substance; but I would on no account deny that there is no other explanation than this which we have given, for God can certainly do what human reason cannot grasp. But since this appears adequate, and since in search of other arguments we should involve ourselves in such questions as that of original sin, and how it was transmitted by our first parents to all mankind, except this man of whom we are speaking; and since, also, we should be drawn into various other questions, each demanding its own separate consideration; let us be satisfied with this account of the matter, and go on to complete our intended work. *Boso*. As you choose; but with this condition, that, by the help of God, you will sometime give this other expla-

nation, which you owe me, as it were, but which now you avoid discussing. *Anselm.* Inasmuch as I entertain this desire myself, I will not refuse you; but because of the uncertainty of future events, I dare not promise you, but commend it to the will of God. But say now, what remains to be unravelled with regard to the question which you proposed in the first place, and which involves many others with it? *Boso.* The substance of the inquiry was this, why God became man, for the purpose of saving men by his death, when He could have done it in some other way. And you, by numerous and positive reasons, have shown, that the restoring of mankind ought not to take place, and could not, without man paid the debt which he owed God for his sin. And this debt was so great, that, while none but man must solve the debt, none but God was able to do it; so that he who does it, must be both God and man. And hence arises a necessity that God should take man into unity with his own person; so that he who in his own nature was bound to pay the debt, but could not, might be able to do it in the person of God. In fine, you have shown that that man, who was also God, must be formed from the virgin, and from the person of the Son of God, and that he could be taken without sin, though from a sinful substance. Moreover, you have clearly shown the life of this man to have been so excellent and so glorious as to make ample satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, and even infinitely more. It now, therefore, remains to be shown, how that payment is made to God for the sins of men.

CHAP. XVIII. b. *How Christ's life is paid to God for the sins of men, and in what sense Christ ought, and in what sense he ought not, or was not bound, to suffer.*

Anselm. If he allowed himself to be slain for the sake of justice, did he not give his life for the honor of God? *Boso.* It should seem so, but I cannot understand, although I do not doubt it, how he could do this reasonably. If I saw how he could be perfectly holy, and yet forever preserve his life, I would acknowledge that he freely gave, for the honor of God, such a gift as surpasses all things else but God himself, and is able to atone for all the sins of men. *Anselm.* Do you not perceive, that when he bore with gentle patience the insults put upon him, violence and even crucifixion among thieves that he might maintain strict holiness; by this he set men an example that

they should never turn aside from the holiness due to God on account of personal sacrifice? But how could he have done this, had he, as he might have done, avoided the death brought upon him for such a reason? *Boso.* But surely there was no need of this, for many persons before his coming, and John the Baptist after his coming but before his death, had sufficiently enforced this example, by nobly dying for the sake of the truth.

Anselm. No man, except this one, ever gave to God what he was not obliged to lose, or paid a debt he did not owe. But he freely offered to the Father what there was no need of his ever losing, and paid for sinners what he owed not for himself. Therefore he set a much nobler example, that each one should not hesitate to give to God, for himself, what he must at any rate lose before long, since it was the voice of reason; for he, when not in want of anything for himself, and not compelled by others, who deserved nothing of him but punishment, gave so precious a life, even the life of so illustrious a personage, with such willingness. *Boso.* You very nearly meet my wishes; but suffer me to make one inquiry, which you may think foolish, but which, nevertheless, I find no easy thing to answer. You say that when he died, he gave what he did not owe. But no one will deny that it was better for him, or that so doing he pleased God more, than if he had not done it. Nor will any one say that he was not bound to do what was best to be done, and what he knew would be more pleasing to God. How then can we affirm that he did not owe God the thing which he did, that is, the thing which he knew to be best and most pleasing to God, and, especially, since every creature owes God all that he is and all that he knows, and all that he is capable of? *Anselm.* Though the creature has nothing of himself, yet when God grants him the liberty of doing or not doing a thing, he leaves the alternative with him, so that, though one is better than the other, yet neither is positively freed. And, whichever he does, it may be said that he ought to do it; and if he takes the better choice, he deserves a reward; because he renders freely what is his own. For, though celibacy be better than marriage, yet neither is absolutely enjoined upon man; so that both he who chooses marriage and he who prefers celibacy, may be said to do as they ought. For no one says that either celibacy or marriage ought not to be chosen; but we say, that what a man esteems best, before taking action upon any of these things, this he ought to

do. And if a man preserves his celibacy, as a free gift offered to God, he looks for a reward. When you say that the creature owes God what he knows to be the better choice, and what he is able to do, if you mean that he owes it as a debt, without implying any command on the part of God, it is not always true. Thus, as I have already said, a man is not bound to celibacy as a debt, but ought to try matrimony if he prefers it. And if you are unable to understand the use of this word "*debere*," when no debt is implied, let me inform you, that we use the word "*debere*" precisely as we sometimes do the words "*posse*," and "*non posse*," and also "*necessitas*," when the ability, etc., is not in the things themselves, but in something else. When, for instance, we say that the poor ought to receive alms from the rich, we mean that the rich ought to bestow alms upon the poor. For this is a debt not owed by the poor but by the rich. We also say that God ought to be exalted over all, not because there is any obligation resting upon him, but because all things ought to be subject to him. And he wishes that all creatures should be what they ought; for what God wishes to be, He ought to be. And, in like manner, when any creature wishes to do a thing that is left entirely at his own disposal, we say that he ought to do it, for he ought to be what he wishes to be. So our Lord Jesus, when he wished, as we have said, to suffer death, ought to have done precisely what he did; because he ought to be what he wished, and was not bound to do anything as a debt. As he is both God and man, in connection with his human nature, which made him a man, he must also have received from the Divine nature that control over himself, which freed him from all obligation, except to do as he chose. In like manner, as one person of the Trinity, he must have had whatever he possessed of his own right, so as to be complete in himself, and could not have been under obligations to another, nor have need of giving anything in order to be repaid himself.

Boso. Now I see clearly, that he did not give himself up to die, for the honor of God, as a debt; for this my own reason proves, and yet he ought to have done what he did.

Anselm. That honor certainly belongs to the whole Trinity; and, since he is very God, the Son of God, he offered himself for his own honor, as well as for that of the Father and the Holy Spirit; that is, he gave his humanity to his Divinity, which is one person of the Triune God. But, though we express our idea more defi-

nately by clinging to the precise truth, yet we may say, according to our custom, that the Son freely gave himself to the Father. For thus, we plainly affirm, that in speaking of one person we understand the whole Deity, to whom as man he offered himself. And, by the names of Father and Son, a wondrous depth of devotion is excited in the hearts of the hearers, when it is said that the Son supplicates the Father on our behalf. *Boso.* This I readily acknowledge.

CHAP. XIX. *How human salvation follows upon his death.*

Anselm. Let us now observe, if we can, how the salvation of men rests on this. *Boso.* This is the very wish of my heart. For, although I think I understand you, yet I wish to get from you the close chain of argument. *Anselm.* There is no need of explaining how precious was the gift, which the Son freely gave. *Boso.* That is clear enough already. *Anselm.* But you surely will not think that he deserves no reward, who freely gave so great a gift to God. *Boso.* I see that it is necessary for the Father to reward the Son; else he is either unjust in not wishing to do it, or weak in not being able to do it; but neither of these things can be attributed to God. *Anselm.* He who rewards another, either gives him something which he does not have, or else remits some rightful claim upon him. But anterior to the great offering of the Son, all things belonging to the Father were his, nor did he ever owe anything, which could be forgiven him. How then can a reward be bestowed on one who needs nothing, and to whom no gift or release can be made? *Boso.* I see, on the one hand, a necessity for a reward, and on the other, it appears impossible; for God must necessarily render payment for what He owes, and yet there is no one to receive it. *Anselm.* But if a reward so large and so deserved is not given to him or any one else, then it will almost appear as if the Son had done this great work in vain. *Boso.* Such a supposition is impious. *Anselm.* The reward then must be bestowed upon some one else, for it cannot be upon him. *Boso.* This is necessarily so. *Anselm.* Had the Son wished to give some one else what was due to him, could the Father rightfully prevent it, or refuse to give it to the other person? *Boso.* No! but I think it would be both just and necessary that the gift should be given by the Father to whomsoever the Son wished; because the Son should be allowed to give away what

is his own, and the Father cannot bestow it at all except upon some other person. *Anselm.* Upon whom would he more properly bestow the reward accruing from his death, than upon those for whose salvation, as right reason teaches, he became man; and for whose sake, as we have already said, he left an example of suffering death, to preserve holiness? For surely in vain will men imitate him, if they be not also partakers of his reward. Or whom could he more justly make heirs of the inheritance, which he does not need, and of the superfluity of his possessions, than his parents and brethren? What more proper, than that, when he beholds so many of them weighed down by so heavy a debt, and wasting through poverty, in the depth of their miseries, he should remit the debt incurred by their sins, and give them what their transgressions had forfeited? *Boso.* The universe can hear of nothing more reasonable, more sweet, more desirable. And I receive such confidence from this, that I cannot describe the joy, with which my heart exults. For it seems to me, that God can reject none, who come to him in this name. *Anselm.* Certainly not, if he come aright. And the Scriptures, which rest on solid truth, as on a firm foundation, and which, by the help of God, we have somewhat examined,—the Scriptures, I say, show us how to approach in order to share such favor, and how we ought to live under it. *Boso.* And whatever is built on this foundation, is founded on an immovable rock. *Anselm.* I think I have nearly enough answered your inquiry, though I might do it still more fully, and there are doubtless many reasons, which are beyond me, and which mortal ken does not reach. It is also plain that God had no need of doing the thing spoken of; but eternal truth demanded it. For though God is said to have done what that man did, on account of the personal union made; yet God was in no need of descending from heaven to conquer the devil, nor of contending against him in holiness to free mankind. But God demanded that man should conquer the devil, so that he who had offended by sin, should atone by holiness. As God owed nothing to the devil but punishment, so man must only make amends by conquering the devil, as man had already been conquered by him. But whatever was demanded of man, he owed to God and not to the devil.

CHAP. XX. *How great and how just is God's compassion.*

Now we have found the compassion of God, which appeared lost to you, when we were considering God's holiness and man's sin; we have found it, I say, so great, and so consistent with his holiness, as to be incomparably above anything that can be conceived. For what compassion can excel these words of the Father, addressed to the sinner doomed to eternal torments, and having no way of escape: "Take my only begotten Son, and make him an offering for yourself;" or these words of the Son: "Take me, and ransom your souls." For these are the voices they utter, when inviting and leading us to faith in the Gospel. Or, can anything be more just, than for Him to remit all debt, since he has earned a reward greater than all debt, if given with the love which he deserves.

CHAP. XXI. *How it is impossible for the devil to be reconciled.*

If you carefully consider the scheme of human salvation, you will perceive the reconciliation of the devil, of which you made inquiry, to be impossible. For, as man could not be reconciled but by the death of the God-man, by whose holiness the loss occasioned by man's sin should be made up; so fallen angels cannot be saved but by the death of a God-angel, who by his holiness may repair the evil occasioned by the sins of his companions. And as man must not be restored by a man of a different race, though of the same nature, so no angel ought to be saved by any other angel, though all were of the same nature, for they are not like men, all of the same race. For all angels were not sprung from one, as all men were. And there is another objection to their restoration, viz. that, as they fell with none to plot their fall, so they must rise with none to aid them; but this is impossible. But otherwise they cannot be restored to their original dignity. For, had they not sinned, they would have been confirmed in virtue without any foreign aid, simply by the power given to them from the first. And, therefore, if any one thinks that the redemption of our Lord ought to be extended even to the fallen angels, he is convinced by reason, for by reason he has been deceived. And I do not say this, as if to deny that the virtue of his death far exceeds all the sins of men and angels, but because infallible reason rejects the reconciliation of the fallen angels.

CHAP. XXII. *How the truth of the Old and New Testament is shown in the things which have been said.*

Boso. All things which you have said seem to me reasonable and incontrovertible. And by the solution of the single question proposed, do I see the truth of all that is contained in the Old and New Testament. For, in proving that God became man by necessity, leaving out what was taken from the Bible, viz. the remarks on the persons of the Trinity, and on Adam, you convince both Jews and Pagans, by the mere force of reason. And the God-man himself originates the New Testament, and approves the Old. And, as we must acknowledge him to be true, so no one can dissent from anything contained in these books. *Anselm.* If we have said anything that needs correction, I am willing to make the correction, if it be a reasonable one. But, if the conclusions which we have arrived at by reason, seem confirmed by the testimony of the truth, then ought we to attribute it, not to ourselves, but to God, who is blessed forever. Amen.

ARTICLE IV.

THE NARRATIVE OF THE CREATION IN GENESIS.

By Rev. John O. Means, East Medway, Mass.

It is proposed to give an exposition of the first chapter of Genesis, with the first three verses of the second chapter, which complete the narrative of the creation.

The object is, to learn what God teaches in this portion of Scripture. It is important to bear this in mind. We receive the Bible as written by Divine inspiration. This passage, especially, must be regarded as purely matter of revelation. These facts could not be known in any other way. No human being was present to observe these scenes. This is, in the absolute sense, a Divine communication. Our object, then, is to learn what God designs to communicate.