

Pánfilo de Cesarea

APOLOGÍA DE ORÍGENES

What you have experienced does not seem to me in the least surprising, brothers: the understanding of Origen has so eluded your grasp that you too share the opinions about him that many others hold as well.²² These, either through their own inexperience (because of which they cannot behold the depth of his thought) or through the perversity of their mind (by which they expend effort, not only to accuse his statements but even to take up hostilities against those who read them), suppose that to them alone, obviously, should be granted the experience needed to judge a discourse. Indeed, they act with such obstinacy that they think that [readers of Origen] are worthy of no indulgence whatsoever, not even that which is usually accorded, for instance, to those who, in their zeal for thorough investigation and learning, work through the books of pagan Greeks, or sometimes even of the heretics. For instance, if they know that they should retain anything good that someone says, they would know that they should stay away from every form of evil.²³ But they imagine that those who read the books of Origen are completely ignoring that mandate by which money-changers are asked to become worthy of approval, knowing how to keep the good [coins] while staying away from the bad.²⁴ But <anyone> who merely seems to be reading [Origen's] books is immediately

drenched by them with the slanderous reputation of being heretics.

In short, for one reason alone they harbor hostility against many men of humble life and religious purpose, in whom they find no fault whatsoever: if they have perceived in these people a somewhat too eager zeal for the books of the man in question. Even more maliciously they fabricate the following charge: that these men rank both Origen himself and his words at the same level as the holy apostles and prophets.²⁵

2. But on this point I am not sure whether they utter these things with the sole intention of stirring up calumny, or whether possibly at some time they have actually heard something like this from some of the simpler brothers who are devoted to Origen with excessive affection.

3. We, however, have frequently observed that Origen speaks with a great fear of God and in all humility. This is noticeable when he begs pardon for those things that come to the mind of the investigator in the course of extended discussion and lengthy scrutiny of Scripture. In the process of explaining these things, his frequent custom is to add an admission that he is not declaring these things by a definitive pronouncement, nor is he defining them as secure dogma, but he is investigating to the best of his ability and discussing the meaning of the Scriptures. Yet he does not profess that he has completely and perfectly comprehended these things. Rather, he says that he is offering conjectures on as many subjects as possible and that he is not certain that he has attained a perfect and complete interpretation in everything. Moreover, sometimes we find that he admits that he is at a loss in many subjects on which he raises those very points that come into question; and yet he does not

add solutions to these problems, but in all humility and truthfulness he is not ashamed to confess that these things are not clear to him.

We have also heard that he often inserted what today not even the most inexperienced of all his detractors scorn²⁶ to say, namely, that if anyone has spoken about or explained in a better way the passages he has discussed, that person who has spoken more correctly deserves to be listened to, rather than himself.²⁷

Moreover, we notice that he sometimes offers diverse explanations of the same text; and he does this quite reverently, as one who knows that he is speaking about the sacred Scriptures. When he sets forth the many things that have occurred to him, he instructs those who read to test the details of what he has said and to retain what the prudent reader has judged to be spoken more correctly. For he was not unaware that not everything that he had touched on or discussed deserved to be treated as finally settled because the Holy Scriptures are thought to contain many mystical and arcane things.²⁸

4. Finally, if we pay very careful attention to his irreproachably Catholic declaration about all his discussions in the preface to the books that he wrote on Genesis, from this we easily become familiar with his entire way of thinking.

5. ORIGEN If our sluggishness and complete laziness did not prevent us from even approaching to ask, since our Lord and Savior challenges us to do this,³⁰ we would actually turn back, considering how distant we are from the greatness of the spiritual interpretation by which the meaning of such great realities ought to be investigated.

6. PAMPHILUS. And a little bit after this he says:

7. ORIGEN But if anything profound occurs to someone in the course of the discussion, he must talk about it, to be sure, but not with complete assurance. For complete assurance is either the mark of a rash person and of one who has lost all sense of human weakness and has forgotten who he is; or, indeed, it is the mark of those who are perfect and of those who confidently know that their teaching is that of the Lord Jesus himself,³² that is, of the Word of truth, and who have learned from Wisdom itself, through which all things have been made;³³ or it is the mark of those who have received from heaven the divine responses, having entered the storm and the gloomy darkness where God himself is,³⁴ into which when Moses himself entered he was scarcely able either to understand such things or to utter them.³⁵

But we, in proportion to our modest gift, have nevertheless come to believe in our Lord Jesus, and we glory in being his disciples, yet we do not have the audacity to say that the understanding he has given us of those things that are related in the divine books is something we have received face to face;³⁶ things of which, indeed, I am certain that not even the world itself could contain the meanings because of the power and majesty of the ideas they signify.³⁷ For that reason we dare not utter as pronouncements the things about which we speak, as the apostles were able to do; but we give thanks for the fact that we are not unaware of our ignorance of the great realities and of those things that are beyond us.³⁸ This we do in contrast to the many who are unaware of their own ignorance, and of the fact that their own inspirations are confused and disordered, [inspirations] which are not infrequently both ridiculous and fantastic as well, with (in their view) the gravest sense of purpose, as if they were declaring absolute truth with confidence.

8. PAMPHILUS. Since, therefore, we hear him speaking about himself in this way, and presenting his own discourse with this kind of mind and intention, we are amazed that some

have advanced in rashness to the point of imagining that when he judges himself with such great humility, others regard his statements or books as equal to the discourse of the apostles, or that another likens him to either the prophets or the apostles.

9. And indeed, no one hesitates to affirm that the office of priesthood in the Church was conferred on Origen and that he led a “philosophical” manner of life, that he practiced extreme self-denial, and that he observed the pure discipline of [our] religion, and exerted himself beyond others in his devotion to the Word of God and to teaching. This is obvious even from those things that stand out to us as the most certain indications of his labor and zeal, but above all from those extemporaneous discussions that he held almost daily in the Church,³⁹ which the secretaries who transcribed them have handed down as a monument to posterity. It was consistent for us, therefore, basing ourselves on all the evidence that exists for his labors and studies, to embrace such a man, neither granting to him, in our eagerness to defend him, more [dignity] than the measure of his merits demands, nor, on the other hand, readily condemning him through the vice of fault-finding, and rashly declaring that he is estranged from the Church’s teaching. For the Word of God in its foresight forbids us from approaching either of these two precipices when it says: “Let there not be a greater measure with you nor a smaller measure. For both are abominable in the sight of the Lord.”⁴⁰ For it is the duty of justice to grant to each according to his merit; for this reason “both a whole measure and an equal weight are acceptable with the Lord.”⁴¹ We are not to use a measure that falsifies the truth, according to which one gives either more than merit demands, or that subtracts from the merit that is owed.

10. How much more properly, if, without any prejudice, but “with all respect for the truth,”⁴² which, along with love, we are commanded to show to all our neighbors, they would see him also as one of their neighbors whom, by commandment, we are

obligated to love;⁴³ and if they would take up and read his books with that indulgence that he asks for in his prefatory remarks, whenever they find passages that require indulgence.

11. But now, to the contrary, you see them not even withholding from him curses and reproaches, while they deter from reading his books those who are eager to understand the Scriptures according to the commandment of our Lord and Savior,⁴⁴ and insist that they read other books—any at all, even useless ones, even books that bring no benefit—rather than read the commentaries of Origen.

12. In this connection, [his detractors] are often used to experiencing something that is laughable. For in order that their contentious presumption, or, to speak more truly, their insane prejudice, may be more easily made known, it usually happens, whether by accident or, sometimes, on purpose, that something of Origen's is read in the hearing of his detractors as if it were from another commentator (when Origen's name is not found in the heading of the manuscript). The reading pleases the audience and is praised and is held in all admiration for as long a time as the name of the author remains unknown. But when it becomes known that what was pleasing was from Origen, all at once it becomes displeasing, all at once the reading is said to be heretical, and the things that a little while before were being extolled to heaven, by the same voices and by the same tongue are plunged into hell.

13. Moreover, we have also encountered the following situation. Sometimes his accusers are those who do not know Greek: some are utterly ignorant of it; others, though they seem to have some competence in it, are nevertheless insufficiently qualified to undertake the task of reading his works; or, if it happens that they do indeed read them, they do not do so straight through and with sufficient learning to be able to follow the depths of his meaning. Thus they are unable to follow his pattern of discussing things from different points of view, owing to the contexts and occasions of the discussion. One can find many who, if you ask them in which books or in which passages Origen said

the things [of] which they are accusing [him], will admit that they do not even know. The things about which they are making their assertions are things they have never read, but they have heard others talking about them. For this reason their verdict [about Origen] will appear completely ridiculous to anyone, since they are passing judgments about these things and they are condemning ideas that they have not even succeeded in first learning or becoming acquainted with.

14. Now in others a disease of unusual fury and an insanity of unprecedented disgrace rage without ceasing. [Origen wrote] very many books that are deemed to be entirely packed with things that are beneficial and instructive. Very rarely and infrequently do we find passages by which perhaps those with less knowledge, or, to speak more truly, the malicious, are able to see themselves offended. Yet some destroy and disdain everything Origen has written, even the things that they themselves confess to be Catholic and fit for the edification of souls and for instruction in knowledge. They are unwilling to make any progress even from those things from which they are able and ought <to make progress>.⁴⁵ Instead, those things alone that lead to calumny are the things they learn with utmost zeal. And as those who have perhaps never learned anything good, they recommend these things that they say are not good as things that must be retained in the memory as a matter of first importance. The reason they do this is, to be precise, to be able more readily to concoct more effective calumnies by setting these things forth.

15. There is also another race of men, truly repulsive and disgraceful, as far as the moral quality of their character is concerned; but in terms of their gift for exceedingly violent calumny and for extremely repulsive accusations, they are what the Greeks call φαγολοιδόρους [revilers of those who are eating]. They exhibit the utmost zeal [in studying Origen's works], and they pay out sufficiently attentive effort to them. For they want to take advantage of this teacher in every way and parade themselves as his special disciples. But an opportunity comes

when they now prefer to name themselves “teachers” rather than “disciples,” a time when the audience’s applause begins to follow. Then, if perchance someone in the audience whispers that these things that are being praised come from Origen, lest they either yield this praise to the teacher or risk being judged as blameworthy, they protest at once that Origen is estranged [from the Church]. They claim that there is no common ground between Origen’s teaching and their own; nor do they hesitate even reproachfully to declare him accursed, and they do not refrain from speaking malicious things about him. These people have no respect for the Apostle’s words that make clear that “malicious gossips will not inherit the kingdom of God.”⁴⁶

16. But the malice of these men of whom we have spoken above has progressed to such an extent that some of them have even dared to write against him.⁴⁷ By means of published books they belittle Origen, who was a teacher of the Church for so many years, who grew old in the Catholic⁴⁸ Church, who fought so steadfastly and boldly against those heresies that were assailing the Church at that time that he undermined all the foundations of their devilish schemes. They overlook the effort he put into his studies, his self-discipline, his education, his humility—which beyond all his other virtues is his greatest gift. Least of all do they consider the fact that he was dignified in the Church with the office of priesthood.

17. If all this cannot suffice to recall their tongue and to restrain their speech, they should have at least considered how much material for ridicule they were supplying to the pagans and the heretics, when they [the pagans and the heretics] see that those who they thought were the champions and defend-

ers of Christian doctrine are now being silenced and refuted by their own people. Just as in a civil war, they rejoice that Origen has been attacked, a man whom they themselves were not able to attack with their own hostility.

18. Since, therefore, very many of the simpler brothers whom we mentioned above are being injured not only by those who think badly of him, but also by those who, in their zeal to know and understand the Scriptures, examine among the other books Origen's writings as well—to the point that you yourselves are wondering whether to put faith in either the multitude or the authority of the calumniators, with respect to the things that are being spread abroad everywhere without the least regard—it seemed good to us, in the first place, to attend to your suspicion; then, at the same time, too, by the opportunity you have given, to refute the charges of all who are disparaging him.

19. In pursuing this goal it seemed more proper to us to prepare a defense not in our own words or assertions, but from Origen's own utterances, where he himself testifies in his own words that he is a stranger to those things that his detractors raise as objections, that is to say, to everything that is preached contrary to the Catholic faith. For it could possibly seem suspicious if we intend to assert these things in our own words, since out of love for him we may have concealed passages where his thinking was corrupt. But when we use the utterances of the very man who is being accused and defend him against all the objections of his accusers by his own words, not by our assertions, what pretext for incrimination can further remain, at least with those who are always agitated not from a passion to know the truth, but, as it were, by some sort of lust for finding fault? And since the present words concern one who, at least among men, has died, what could have greater reliability and force among human judges on behalf of one who has died than the literature and written works of the deceased?

20. Beginning, then, with the evidence drawn from his own writings, to show what he thought about each point, we will assemble testimonies chiefly from those <books> from which his accusers mainly raise their charges, that is, those that he wrote

privately at leisure and over a period of time—for these are the ones that they claim in particular to be in conflict with the Church's preaching. The majority of the objections raised by his accusers are chiefly based on the books that he entitled *Peri archon*.

21. So then, we will make known how he explained in those very books the fundamental elements of the faith; then, from those thoughts of his that are scattered here and there, whether in these books or his other ones, we will attest that he held to the apostolic proclamation.

22. Here, then, as promised, is a passage from the first book of the *Peri archon*.

23. ORIGEN For although there were many among the Greeks and barbarians who promised truth, after we came to believe that Christ is the Son of God and became convinced that we must learn [the truth] from himself, we were not accustomed to look for it among any who asserted it by means of false opinions. Likewise, although there are many who think they have the mind of Christ,⁵⁰ and yet some of these think differently from their predecessors, yet the Church's proclamation must be preserved as it has been transmitted in orderly succession from the apostles and remains in the churches unto the present day. That alone should be believed as truth, which is not discordant in any way with the ecclesiastical tradition.

Now one ought to know the following: that the holy apostles, while preaching the faith of Christ, passed down very clear traditions on certain points that they believed to be necessary to all believers, even to those who seemed rather sluggish in the investigation of divine knowledge; yet they left the task of giving a rational account of their assertions to be investigated by those who through the Holy Spirit himself were worthy to receive the excellent gifts of the Spirit, and especially the gifts of words of wisdom and of knowledge.⁵¹ But on other subjects they indeed said that these things were so, but they were silent as to the manner or origin of their existence. Surely the reason for this was that the more zealous lovers of wisdom⁵² among their

successors—namely, those who have prepared themselves to be worthy of and capable of receiving wisdom—might be able to have an opportunity to train themselves and thus be able to display the fruit of their intellectual talents.

Now the particular points that are clearly handed down through the apostolic proclamation are these:

First, that there is one God, who created and arranged all things, and who brought the universe into existence out of nothing.⁵³ He is the God of all just men from the first creation and foundation of the world, the God of Adam, Abel, Seth, Enosh, Enoch, Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the twelve patriarchs, Moses, and the prophets. This God, in the last days, as he had promised beforehand by his prophets,⁵⁴ sent the Lord Jesus Christ, in the first place to call Israel,⁵⁵ and secondly the gentiles as well, after the unfaithfulness of the people of Israel. This God is just and good, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. He himself gave the law and the prophets and the Gospels, who is the God both of the apostles and of the Old and New Testaments.

Next, [the apostles handed down] that Christ Jesus himself, he who has come, was born (*natus*) of the Father before any creature. Though he had served the Father in the creation of all things—for “by him all things were made”⁵⁶—he, in the last times, “emptied himself”⁵⁷ and became man. Although he was God, he was incarnated,⁵⁸ and having been made man, he remained the God that he was.⁵⁹ He assumed a body like our body, differing in this respect only: that it was born of a virgin and of the Holy Spirit.⁶⁰ And that this Jesus Christ, who was born, also suffered, truly, and not by a fictitious representation, having truly died this common death—for he also truly rose again from the dead—and after his resurrection, after he had conversed with his disciples, he was taken up.⁶¹

Next, they handed down that the Holy Spirit is associated in honor and dignity with the Father and the Son; but in his case it is not clearly defined whether he was born or unborn. . . .

24. PAMPHILUS. Doubtless the one who asks whether he was born or unborn does not hold the view that he was a creature; otherwise, he would have brought this up in his investigation.⁶²

25. ORIGEN . . . or if he himself should also be considered to be a Son of God or not. But these are points that we need to examine to the best of our ability with reference to Holy Scripture and investigate by means of a wise and careful inquiry; and, of course, that this Holy Spirit inspired each one of the saints, both the prophets and the apostles; and that there was not one Spirit among the men of antiquity, and another among those who were inspired at the advent of Christ. These points are most clearly preached in the churches.

Now after these points [the apostles have handed down] that the soul has its own substance and life. After its departure from this world, it will be paid back according to its merits. Either it will obtain an inheritance of eternal life and blessedness,⁶⁴ if its actions have procured this for it,⁶⁵ or it will be delivered up to eternal fire and punishments,⁶⁶ if the guilt of its crimes shall have diverted it there.

And also that there will be a time of resurrection of the dead, when this body, which is <now> “sown in corruption shall rise in incorruption,”⁶⁷ and that which “is sown in dishonor will rise in glory.”⁶⁸

The following point has also been defined in the Church’s proclamation: that every soul is rational and has freedom of choice and of will; also, that it must struggle against the devil and his angels and opposing powers,⁶⁹ because they strive to

burden it down with sins, but if we are to live rightly and resolutely, we must try to rid ourselves of such a downfall. What logically follows from this is that we do not understand ourselves to be subject to necessity, as if we were compelled by all means, even against our will, to do either good or evil. For if we have a choice, then although certain powers perhaps can attack us with respect to sin, and others can help us attain salvation, yet we are not forced by necessity to act either rightly or wrongly. This is what they think happens who say that the course and movements of the stars are the cause of human actions, not of those actions that take place beyond the influence of the freedom of choice, but of those which are placed within our own power.⁷⁰

But concerning the soul, the [Church's] proclamation does not adequately or explicitly define whether it derives from the transmission of seed, so that its nature⁷¹ or substance may be considered to have been inserted into the bodily seed, or whether it has some other origin; and whether this origin itself is born or not born; or whether it is implanted into the body from without or not.

Concerning the devil and his angels and the opposing powers, the Church's proclamation has taught that they indeed exist; but what they are or how they exist, it has not explained with sufficient clarity. The majority, however, hold to the opinion that the devil was an angel, and when he became an apostate, he persuaded as many of the angels as possible to fall away with himself, who are even now called "his angels."⁷²

This also is a part of the Church's proclamation: that the world was itself made and began at a certain time, and it is going to be destroyed on account of its own corruption.⁷³ But what existed before this world, or what will exist after the world, has not yet been explicitly defined for the multitude; for clear statements about these matters are not expressed in the Church's proclamation.

Next, [the apostles have handed down] that the Scriptures were written by the Spirit of God and have a meaning, not merely that which is manifest, but also another meaning, which escapes the notice of most. For the things that are written are the forms of certain mysteries and the images of divine things. Throughout the whole Church there is a single understanding about this matter: that the whole law is indeed spiritual,⁷⁴ but that the things that the law intends⁷⁵ are not known to all, but only to those on whom the grace of the Holy Spirit is bestowed in the word of wisdom and knowledge.⁷⁶

26. PAMPHILUS. And after a few things he says:

27. ORIGEN This also is a part of the proclamation of the Church: that there are certain angels of God and good powers who serve him in accomplishing the salvation of men;⁷⁸ but the question of when they were created, or what their nature is, or how they exist, is not explicitly defined. But the tradition is not explicit on the question of the sun, moon, and stars, whether they are living beings or lifeless.

It is necessary, therefore, to make use of these ABC's, as it were, and fundamentals of this sort according to the command that says: "Enlighten yourselves with the light of knowledge."⁷⁹ This is addressed to the one who desires to perfect a kind of ordered body [of doctrine] based upon the rational explanation of all these things, so that by explicit and necessary statements about each of these matters, one may form an outline of what is the truth about them, and create, as we have said, a single body, by means of examples and statements, either from those

things that one has discovered in Holy Scripture, or from those that one has deduced by careful investigation and by correct method.

28. PAMPHILUS. Now these are the things Origen has discussed among the principal matters of the first book of *Peri archon*, in order to show what are the things that have been explicitly handed down in the Church's proclamation, and what are the things that are not openly defined. In scattered locations throughout the remaining chapters of those books, he discusses these points according to the classification that he revealed above: On the one hand, there are the matters that he showed above to be definitively proclaimed by the Church. He asserts these things explicitly and firmly by means of all the proofs that are exhibited from Holy Scripture. But with regard to those matters that he has shown to be not explicitly and definitively proclaimed in the Church, he prefers to make use of opinions and of the thoughts that happened to occur to him as one who was discussing and investigating such things, rather than to make use of certain and definitive assertions. That is to say, he investigates and discusses these things rather than making assertions about them. But in everything he remembers his own words that we have set forth above, when he says that that alone must be received and believed as truth which in no way is opposed to apostolic doctrines of the Church. And not only in these books that we have mentioned above, but also in all his works where he explains the Scripture, he is accustomed to make use of this statement. This is especially true in passages where he sets forth multiple interpretations of a single text. He asserts that he has indeed set forth multiple and divergent interpretations in as much as it was possible to do this, lest he should omit anything that could be said, but he claims also that one must hold fast to that which a reader who is faithful to the Church and to the apostles would approve.

29. He does this same thing as well when he discusses the schools of the heretics. After he silences and conquers all of them, he adheres to the single and unique judgment of Catholic truth that he set forth above. It would take us too long, and it would be both burdensome for us who are writing and tedious

for those who are reading, to assemble together intentionally all his judgments concerning each heresy, in order to show how he responded to the heretics, and in what manner he always affirmed the apostolic faith, as he obliterated all the heretical doctrines. But it is sufficient to bring forth a few things by which it will be quite easy to discern the evidence for all these things. For one must not render a judgment that is contrary to the Lord's judgment: that "he who is found faithful with few things" is not also to be considered and believed to be "faithful with much."⁸⁰

30. Therefore, the first excerpt from his books we shall offer that agrees with the foregoing is from the book that he wrote on the Apostle Paul's Epistle to Titus, from the section where the Apostle says: "Avoid the heretical man after the first rebuke, knowing that he is perverted and is sinning. He is self-condemned."⁸¹ There Origen speaks about what a heretic is and what a Catholic and a churchman is.

31. ORIGEN The term "heresy," as far as I have been able to discover, is also defined in the Epistle to the Corinthians in this manner: "For it is necessary that there be heresies, in order that those who are approved might become known among you."⁸³ And again the term "heresy" is also described among the works of the flesh in [Paul's] Epistle to the Galatians, where he says: "Now the works of the flesh are plain: fornication, uncleanness, immodesty, idolatry, sorcery, hostilities, contentions, jealousies, outbursts of anger, quarrels, discords, heresies, drunkenness, orgies, and similar things, which I proclaim to you, as I have proclaimed, that those who do such things will not possess the kingdom of God."⁸⁴

From this passage we recognize that just as those who have been defiled by acts of fornication, uncleanness, immodesty,

and the worship of idols will not possess the kingdom of God, the same applies to those who have turned aside into heresy. For one must not think that such an absolute pronouncement by such a great apostle could be untrustworthy in any way. For he is the apostle of all the churches of Christ,⁸⁵ chosen “not by man nor through a man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father.”⁸⁶ So for that reason, according to the authority of his pronouncement, we too must avoid the name of “heresy,”⁸⁷ just as we avoid the other evils that he has enumerated; nor should we engage in the communion of prayer with such persons.⁸⁸

32. PAMPHILUS. And after this, having inserted a few things in between, he adds:

33. ORIGEN Let us now explain to the best of our ability what is meant by a heretic, in accordance with our intellectual capabilities. Everyone who professes to believe in Christ, and yet says that there is one God of the law and the prophets, and another God of the Gospels, and who says that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is not he who is proclaimed by the law and the prophets, but is some other, whom no one knows and no one has heard of, men of this type we designate as heretics, however various, however different, however fantastic be the fictions they concoct. There are, for example, <the sects> of Marcion,⁹⁰ and Valentinus,⁹¹ and Basilides⁹² and those who call

themselves the Sethians.⁹³ Moreover, there is Apelles.⁹⁴ Though he does not wholly deny that the law and the prophets are of God, yet he himself is designated as a heretic, since he declares that the God who created this world constructed it for the glory of another unbegotten and good God, and that this unbegotten God at the consummation of the age sent Jesus Christ to amend the world. The unbegotten God had been asked by the God who had made the world to send his own Son for the correction of his own world.

Now if it were only the man whose understanding of God the Father is at variance with the demands of the rule of piety who must be accounted a heretic, surely what has been said above would be sufficient. But in reality one must have exactly the same belief regarding the man who has an erroneous understanding of our Lord Jesus Christ, whether this is in accordance with those who say he was born of Joseph and Mary, as do the Ebionites⁹⁵ and the Valentinians; or according to those who deny that he is the “firstborn,”⁹⁶ the God “of all creation” and “the Word”⁹⁷ and “the Wisdom,”⁹⁸ which is “the beginning of the ways of God,” which “came into being before anything else,”⁹⁹ “found-

ed before the ages”¹⁰⁰ and “generated before all the hills,”¹⁰¹ and who say instead that he was a mere man.¹⁰² Or a heretic may agree with those who indeed confess that he is God, but not that he assumed humanity, that is, a soul and earthly body. These heretics, under the pretext of ascribing greater glory to Jesus the Lord, claim that all his actions seemed to have been done rather than were truly done.¹⁰³ Moreover, they do not acknowledge that he was born of a virgin, but say that he appeared in Judea as a thirty-year-old man.¹⁰⁴ On the other hand, others believe that he was indeed brought forth from a virgin, but claim that the virgin only imagined that she had given him birth, when in fact she had not truly given him birth. For they say that the mystery of the putative birth was hidden even from the virgin. How is it conceivable that such people should not be placed far away from the Church, since they suffer from the disease of *philarchia* [having a lust for power]¹⁰⁵ and have established doctrines by means of which they have turned disciples aside to [the sect that bears] their own name?

Moreover, not without danger may those be associated with the Church’s membership who say that the Lord Jesus was a man, foreknown and predestined, who before his coming in

the flesh had no substantial and proper existence, but that, because he was born human, he possessed only the deity of the Father within him.¹⁰⁶ The same applies to those who with more superstition than religion, wishing to avoid the appearance of saying that there are two Gods, and yet having no intention of denying the deity of the Savior, claim that the Father and the Son have one and the same substance.¹⁰⁷ That is to say, they indeed say that the deity receives two names according to the diversity of causes, yet there exists a single ὑπόστασις, that is, one underlying person with two names. In Latin they are called Patripassians.¹⁰⁸

Moreover, <there are those> who say that there is one Holy Spirit who was in the prophets, but another who was in the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ.¹⁰⁹ These are guilty of exactly the same impious offense as those who, to the extent that they have it in them, sever the nature of the deity and divide the one God of the Law and of the Gospels.¹¹⁰

Moreover, there are those who say that human souls are not all of one and the same substance, but that there are different natures of souls.¹¹¹ These must be classed among those heresies that utter wickedness against the Most High¹¹² and accuse him of injustice and inequity.¹¹³

And surely also those who endeavor to take away from souls the power of free choice must be judged as bringing a plague, as it were, upon our common human life and upon the virtue of self-control by their destructive doctrine. They tell us that nothing good can be attributed to human intentions, whether action, speech, or thought. This doctrine will lead to the formation of a human mind that despises and neglects the divine judgment.

But as a part of the Church's rule there must also be assurance regarding the punishments that are due to sinners at God's just judgment, and in regard to those who will receive rewards for their good conduct and life in the Lord's kingdom.

If then anyone attempts to alter or subvert any of these things that we have above described, "<he is a heretic and is sinning> like a perverse man and is self-condemned,"¹¹⁴ according to the pronouncement of the Apostle. He must also be regarded as such by us as well, who obey the [Apostle's] precept.

But in addition to everything we have explained above, let a churchman be defined by his assurance of the resurrection of the dead, concerning which the holy Apostle Paul thus declares that one who denies the resurrection of the dead denies consequently the Resurrection of Christ.¹¹⁵

No less to be reckoned with in the Church's rule are the devil and all his army, that they incite certain contests and struggles against all men, but especially against those who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and that, although they do not have the power through such contests and struggles to lay upon us any compulsion to sin, yet they can persuade and deceive to their ruin those who do not guard their hearts with all watchfulness.¹¹⁶

And among the precepts of the Church we must maintain that no man is handed over to destruction by God, but each of those who perish perishes by his own fault and negligence. Since each has the freedom of choice, each was both able and obligated to choose what is good.¹¹⁷ We must likewise hold this view of the devil himself, who is recorded to have offered resis-

tance in the presence of the Lord Almighty¹¹⁸ and to have abandoned his proper position,¹¹⁹ in which he had been without stain,¹²⁰ he who assuredly could have “persevered to the end”¹²¹ in that position in which he had been from the beginning,¹²² if he had wanted.

I think we have defined and described to the best of our ability the nature and character of a heretic, the doctrines and false opinions that they maintain, and also the purity of the Church’s doctrinal observance.

34. PAMPHILUS. And after a few things he adds this:

35. ORIGEN Now some have asked whether those who are called the κατὰ Φρύγας [Kataphrygians] ought to be identified as a heresy or schism.¹²⁴ They follow after false prophets and say: “Do not approach me, because I am clean;¹²⁵ for I do not take a wife nor is my throat an open grave,¹²⁶ but I am a Nazarene¹²⁷ of God and drink no wine¹²⁸ as they do.”¹²⁹

36. PAMPHILUS. These are the words of a man who is being accused as a heretic, as the corruption and ruination of souls, by those who have by no means learned from the prophet to place a door over their mouth and a bolt over their lips.¹³⁰ Origen did not even say these things in public, that is, in the general audience hall of the Church—lest anyone should think that he prepared flattering words for the sake of an audience—but

we have brought these things forth from those books that he dictated privately, while he was alone and had no arbiter intervening.¹³¹

37. On this subject I want you to consider more carefully what he has said: that “if anyone alters any of these points, ‘he is a heretic and he is sinning, he is subversive and self-condemned’¹³² in accordance with the pronouncement of the Apostle, with whose authority we too should comply and with whom we should ‘think the same things.’”¹³³ Since, therefore, these things are so, I think it is logical to ask his very accusers if they think otherwise than has been defined in his words, either about a heretic or about a Catholic. Let them declare what other ecclesiastical doctrines exist, besides these which [Origen] has summarized above.

38. Now he said the above things in a general fashion concerning all the Church’s doctrines. But let us move on to his particular understanding of each subject and especially of the fundamental matters, concerning the holy and blessed Trinity, that is, concerning the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. We will indicate and set before the public what he has specified and included in various sections of his work, both so that his opinion concerning the greatest divine matters that exist may be revealed, and so that “every word” of his defense may “stand by two or three testimonies”¹³⁴ from his own mouth.

39. Well then, he indicates his thoughts about God the Father in the same books that are especially discussed by his accusers, that is, *Peri archon*. He writes the following:

40. ORIGEN We have refuted, then, to the best of our ability, every notion that might suggest that God is to be understood in any sense as corporeal. Now we are saying in accordance with the truth that God is incapable of being comprehended and conceived. For if there is anything that we are able to perceive or understand about God, it is necessary to believe

that he is far better in many ways than what we have perceived. For example, consider the person who is barely able to look at a spark of light, or the light of a tiny lamp. If we want to acquaint this person, whose vision is not strong enough to admit more light than what we have stated above, with the brightness and splendor of the sun, would it not be necessary for us to tell him: "The splendor of the sun is unspeakably and inconceivably better and more glorious than all this light that you see"? It is in this way that our mind, since it is locked within the walls of flesh and blood, is also rendered rather dull and obtuse on account of its participation in such material, although, in comparison with our bodily nature, it is considered to be far superior. Nevertheless, when it strives for what is incorporeal and searches for an intuition of these things, at that time it scarcely holds the place of a spark <or> lamp.

But among all intellectual realities, that is to say, among things that are incorporeal, what is as superior to all others, what is as unspeakably and inconceivably superior, as God is? Surely his nature cannot be viewed or seen by any mental vision of human beings. Not even the purest and most lucid mind would be capable of that.

But it does not seem absurd if we use another comparison as well to make the matter clearer. Sometimes our eyes cannot look upon the very nature of light, that is, upon the substance of the sun, but when we view its splendor or its rays pouring in through a window, perhaps, or through some small openings that let in light, we can reflect <from these> upon how great is the fire itself and the source of the corporeal light. So, in like manner, the works of divine Providence and the design of this universe are like sun rays, as it were, of the nature of God, in comparison with <his very> substance and nature. Since, therefore, our mind is unable of itself to view God himself, as he is in himself, it understands the Father of the universe from the beauty of his works and from the comeliness of his creatures.¹³⁶

God, therefore, must not be thought of as some kind of body or as existing in a body, but he is an intellectual nature, simple,

admitting within himself no addition of any kind, so that one should not believe that he has anything greater and lesser in himself, but that he is in all parts a μὴνός¹³⁷ and, so to speak, a ἐνός. He is both the mind and the source from which the beginning of all intellectual nature, or of mind, exists. But mind, in order to move or operate, does not need a physical¹³⁸ location, nor measurable size,¹³⁹ nor bodily shape or color, nor does it require any other of those things at all that are proper to a body or to matter. For that reason, that simple nature and total mind cannot have any extension or slowness in its movements or operations, lest the simplicity of the divine nature should seem to be circumscribed by an addition of this sort, or inhibited in some degree. Otherwise, that which is the beginning of all things would be found composite and diverse, and there would be multiplicity, not the oneness that befits the existence of the one who is estranged from mixing with all corporeity, in his, so to speak, single and unique species of deity.

41. PAMPHILUS. These are the things he writes about the divine nature in the first book of *Peri archon*. Now in the second book, he relates in this manner that the God of the Old and New Testaments is the same:

42. ORIGEN Now that we have briefly arranged these points in order, as we were able, it follows that, in accordance with our initial intention, we refute those who think that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is a different God from him who gave the oracles of the law of Moses, or sent the prophets, who is the God of the fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. For we must be firmly grounded in this rule of faith as a matter of first importance. One should consider, then, that expression that is frequently used in the Gospels and is attached to all the actions of our Lord and Savior: such-and-such happened “that what was spoken by the prophet might be fulfilled.”¹⁴¹ For it is obvious

<that> the prophets belong to that God who made the world. The inference that is drawn from this, then, is that he who sent the prophets himself made predictions concerning Christ as to what would be accomplished. And doubtless it was the Father of [Christ] himself, and not any other besides him, who predicted these things. Moreover, the fact that the Savior or his apostles frequently produce illustrations from the Old Testament indicates nothing else but that the Savior and his disciples attribute authority to the ancients. Furthermore, the fact that the Savior, when he challenges his disciples to show kindness, says: "Be perfect, just as your heavenly Father is perfect,"¹⁴² who "commands his sun to rise upon the good and the evil, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust,"¹⁴³ suggests most clearly the interpretation, even to a man of scanty intelligence, that he is proposing that his disciples become imitators of no other God but the Maker of the sun and the Dispenser of rain.

43. PAMPHILUS. After these things, he shows in what follows, by asserting many proofs and illustrations from the Scriptures, that one and the same God is the God of the law and of the Gospels, of the prophets and the apostles, who is just and good, the Lord of what is seen and unseen and of the whole universe.

So then, we have clarified Origen's conception of God the Father by means of the written texts that we have set forth above.

44. Now then, let us see how he speaks of the Son of God.

45. ORIGEN To the best of our very scanty abilities, then, we have considered the divine nature through the contemplation of his works rather than from our own thoughts. And we have also viewed no less his visible creation and by faith have contemplated the invisible creation as well. For human frailty is not capable of seeing all things with the eyes, nor can it embrace them by reason, because we humans are weaker and frailer living creatures than all other rational beings. For those that are in heaven or above the heavens are considered more eminent. It remains for us to investigate [the being who is] intermediate between all these creatures and God, that is,

the Mediator,¹⁴⁵ whom the Apostle Paul declares to be the “first-born of all creation.”¹⁴⁶ For we see those things that are said in Holy Scripture concerning his majesty and observe that he is called “the image of the invisible God,”¹⁴⁷ and the “firstborn of all creation,”¹⁴⁸ and that “in him were all things created, whether things in heaven or things that are on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers, all things were created through him and in him, and he is before all, and by him all things consist,”¹⁴⁹ who is the head of all things,¹⁵⁰ alone having God the Father as his head; just as it is written: “But the head of Christ is God.”¹⁵¹ We also see clearly that it is written: “No one knows the Father except the Son, nor does anyone know the Son except the Father.”¹⁵² For who can know what Wisdom is, except the one who generated it? Or who knows clearly what truth is except the Father of truth? Who indeed is capable of investigating the whole nature of his Word and of that God who is from God, except God alone, with whom the Word was?¹⁵³ This is why we ought to regard it as certain that this Word, or reason, if that is the name to be given to it, this wisdom, this truth is known to no other than the Father <alone>. Of him, as it is written, “I do not think that even the world itself could contain the books that might be written,”¹⁵⁴ namely, regarding the glory and majesty of the Son of God. For it is impossible to commit to writing what pertains to the glory of the Savior.

46. PAMPHILUS. We have brought forth this single testimony concerning the deity of the Son of God from those books that his accusers especially rebuke. But doubtless in his other books as well he understands things in the same sense, nor does he contradict himself.¹⁵⁵

47. Concerning the fact that the Father is not prior to the Son, but the Son is co-eternal with the Father, he says the following in the first book of his *Commentary on Genesis*:

48. ORIGEN For God did not begin to be the Father later, as though he were not the Father previously, as if he were impeded for certain reasons by which mortal men are usually impeded, so that they cannot immediately also be fathers from the time when they exist. For if God is always perfect, he does not lack the power by which he is a Father, and if it is good that he is the Father of such a Son, why does it matter or why would he deprive himself of this good and not become the Father immediately, if one can say it this way, from when he is able to be the Father? The same thing should likewise be said about the Holy Spirit.

49. PAMPHILUS. There is another testimony on the same subject in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*:

50. ORIGEN How else should one understand the “eternal light”¹⁵⁸ except as referring to God the Father? But he, inasmuch as he is the light, never existed at a time when his radiance¹⁵⁹ was not present with him—for a light without its radiance could never be conceived, which, if it is true, then there never was a time when the Son did not exist.¹⁶⁰ But he was not unborn, as we have said of the eternal light. Otherwise, we would appear to be implying two principles of light. But, as the radiance of the unborn light, he was born of that light, having that same light as origin and source; yet there was not [a time] when he did not exist.

51. PAMPHILUS. There is another testimony on the same subject in the *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*:

52. ORIGEN “Which he promised,” he says, “through his prophets in the Holy Scriptures concerning his Son, who was made according to the flesh from the seed of David”: that which previously did not exist “was made”; for it is clear that, according to the flesh, he did not previously exist; but according to the Spirit he existed previously, and there was never [a time] when he did not exist.

53. PAMPHILUS. The same thing is found in the first book of *Peri archon*, that the generation of the Son of God transcends any commencement:

54. ORIGEN If, then, it is once rightly understood that the only-begotten Son of God is his wisdom who exists substantially, I do not know if our thoughts should still venture beyond this to conjecture whether perhaps his very substance <that is, his ὑπόστασις> contains anything corporeal, since everything that is corporeal is defined either by form or color or size. And who in his sound mind ever sought for form or color or measurement of size in wisdom, in respect of its being wisdom?

And who that knows how to understand or perceive anything pious of God can perceive or believe that God the Father ever existed, even for a moment of time, without the generation of this Wisdom? For either he will say that God was unable to generate wisdom before he generated it, so that he afterwards begot that which <formerly> did not exist, so that it would exist; or he will say that he indeed possessed the power, but—what it is not even possible to be said of God—was unwilling to generate it. It is obvious to everyone that these two options are both absurd and impious: that is, either that God advanced from a condition of inability to one of ability, or that, although he was able, he dissimulated and delayed the generation of Wisdom. Therefore, we, for our part, recognize that God has always been the Father of his only-begotten Son, who, to be sure, was born of him and derives what he is from him, but without any beginning, not only without that beginning which can be defined by any intervals of time, but also not even with that be-

ginning which the mind alone is accustomed to observe within itself, and to look at with the naked intellect and spirit, so to speak. Therefore, one must believe that Wisdom was generated apart from any beginning that can be either spoken or comprehended.

55. PAMPHILUS. Here is another testimony on the same subject:

56. ORIGEN But the one who grants a beginning to the Word of God, or Wisdom of God, should see to it that he does not hurl his own impiety instead against the unbegotten Father himself, by denying that he was always a Father and had generated the Word, and had possessed Wisdom <in all> preceding periods or times or ages, or whatever it is that that can be named.

57. PAMPHILUS. Here is another testimony on the same subject.

58. ORIGEN So then, another power is produced, which exists in its own proper being—as the words of Scripture say: a kind of “breath” of the primal and unbegotten “power of God”¹⁶⁵—from which it indeed derives what it is, but there was never [a time] when it did not exist.

For if any one wants to say that it did not formerly exist, but came afterwards into existence, let him tell the reason why the Father, who brought it into being, did not do this earlier. And if he shall grant that there was once a beginning, when that breath proceeded from the power of God, we shall ask him again why it did not happen even before that which he has called the beginning. And in this way, by continuously inquiring about what was earlier and by ascending with our word of inquiry, we shall arrive at that understanding that, since God was always able and willing, it was never befitting, nor could it be the case for any reason, that he would not have always possessed that good that he <was able> and willing to have. From this it is shown that this “breath of the power of God”¹⁶⁶ always existed, having no beginning but God himself. Nor was it fitting that it have any other beginning but God himself, from

whom it both exists and is born. In fact, according to the Apostle, who says that Christ is the “power of God,”¹⁶⁷ it ought now be called not only the “breath of the power of God,”¹⁶⁸ but the power from the power.

59. PAMPHILUS. Here is another testimony on the same subject.

60. ORIGEN That is properly called “everlasting” or “eternal” which neither had a beginning of existence, nor can ever cease to be what it is. And this is what John is defining when he says that “God is light.”¹⁷⁰ Now the “radiance of his light”¹⁷¹ is his Wisdom, not only in accordance with the fact that it is light, <but also in accordance with the fact that it is everlasting light>, so that his wisdom is the <eternal> radiance <and> of eternity. And if this is fully understood, it clearly shows that the existence of the Son is derived from the Father himself, but not in time, nor from any other beginning, except, as we have said, from God himself.

61. PAMPHILUS. There is still another testimony in the first book about the co-eternity of the Son of God and his inseparability from the Father:

62. ORIGEN But it is shocking and illicit to compare God the Father in the generation and existence of his only-begotten Son to someone generating a human being or other living thing. But it is necessary that there is something exceptional and worthy of God, which does not admit of any comparison at all, not merely to things, but that cannot even be discovered by thought or understanding. Thus human thought is unable to apprehend how the unbegotten God becomes the Father of the only-begotten Son. For his generation is eternal and everlasting in the way that radiance is generated from light. For it is not through the adoption of the Spirit¹⁷³ that he becomes the Son, by an outward act, but he is Son by nature.

63. PAMPHILUS. Likewise, here is another testimony concerning the same subject:

64. ORIGEN Let us see, then, who is our Savior. He is called the “radiance of glory,”¹⁷⁵ that is, the “radiance of eternal light;”¹⁷⁶ and it is certain that the radiance is begotten inseparably from light, and so long as the light continues, the radiance also always continues. Therefore, our Savior, who is Wisdom¹⁷⁷—and the Wisdom of God is itself “the radiance of everlasting light”¹⁷⁸—inseparably and unceasingly is begotten from the Father. For thus Wisdom itself says concerning itself through Solomon: “Before all the hills he begets me”;¹⁷⁹ for he did not say, “Before all the hills he has begotten me,” but “begets me,” whereby the meaning is that of everlastingness.

65. PAMPHILUS * * * in the second book:

66. ORIGEN It is now time for us briefly to discuss the Holy Spirit to the best of our ability. Our Lord and Savior in the Gospel according to John called him the “Paraclete.”¹⁸¹ For just as God himself is the same, and Christ himself is the same, so also the Holy Spirit himself is the same, who was in the prophets and apostles, that is, both in those who believed in God before the advent of Christ, and in those who took refuge in him through Christ. Now we have heard that heretics have dared to say that there are two Gods and two Christs, but we have never heard it preached by anyone that there are two Holy Spirits.

67. PAMPHILUS. He shows in the first book of *Peri archon* that the inconvertibility¹⁸² of the Holy Spirit is the same as that of the Father and the Son:

68. ORIGEN There is, then, no nature, in our judg-

ment, which is incapable of receiving evil; <but it does not immediately follow that, because we say that there is no nature that is incapable of receiving evil,> therefore we are asserting that every nature has received evil, that is, has become wicked. On the contrary, it is like saying that the nature of every man admits of his being a sailor, but it does not follow from this that every man has become a sailor. Likewise, it is possible for every human being to learn grammar or medicine, but it is not therefore demonstrated that every man is either a physician or a grammarian. So if we say that there is no nature that is incapable of receiving evil, it is not immediately indicated that it likewise has received evil. And conversely, there is no nature which may not receive good, but it will not on that account be proven that every nature has received what is good.

69. PAMPHILUS. And after a few things he adds:

70. ORIGEN There is no nature then, which may not receive good or evil, except the nature of God, which is the font of all <good> things, and of Christ: <for> it is Wisdom;¹⁸⁵ and wisdom assuredly cannot receive folly; and it is Justice,¹⁸⁶ and justice will never indeed have room for injustice; and it is the Word,¹⁸⁷ or reason, which certainly cannot become irrational; moreover, it is Light,¹⁸⁸ and it is certain that the darkness does not comprehend the light.¹⁸⁹ And in a similar way, also, the nature of the Holy Spirit, which is holy, does not receive pollution; for it is holy naturally, or substantially.

But if any other nature is holy, it has this sanctification by the reception or inspiration of the Holy Spirit. It does not possess this by its own nature, but as something accidental <to itself>, for which reason that which is accidental can disappear. So also one can have an accidental justice, which is also why it is possible for it to disappear. Moreover, someone has wisdom that is no less accidental, although it lay within our power to become wise, if we strive after wisdom by our zeal and by the merit of our life; and if we always bear this zeal for it, we may always participate in wisdom, and it would fall to us as an accidental

quality, either in a greater or lesser degree, according to the merit of our life or the amount of our zeal.

71. PAMPHILUS. That the Trinity is equal to itself and that the Holy Spirit is not a creature are found in the first book of *Peri archon*:

72. ORIGEN Now concerning the Holy Spirit, that he exists, many Scriptures have shown us, as David says in the fiftieth Psalm: "And take not your Holy Spirit from me",¹⁹¹ and it is said in Daniel: "The Holy Spirit who is in you."¹⁹² Indeed, in the New Testament we are instructed by abundant testimonies, when the Holy Spirit is described as having descended upon Christ,¹⁹³ and when the Lord himself breathed upon the apostles after the Resurrection, saying: "Receive the Holy Spirit",¹⁹⁴ and it is said by the angel to Mary: "The Holy Spirit will come upon you."¹⁹⁵ Paul, in fact, teaches that "no one can call Jesus Lord except in the Holy Spirit."¹⁹⁶ And in the Acts of the Apostles, the Holy Spirit was given by the imposition of the apostles' hands in baptism.¹⁹⁷ From all of these texts we learn that the substance of the Holy Spirit is of such great authority and dignity that saving baptism is not otherwise complete except by the authority of the Trinity, the most excellent of all, that is, by the naming of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit; and that the name of the Holy Spirit must also be linked to the unborn God the Father and to his only-begotten Son. Who, then, is not amazed by the greatness of the majesty of the Holy Spirit, when he hears that "he who speaks a word against the Son of Man can hope for pardon, but he who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit cannot have pardon, either in the present age or in the future?"¹⁹⁸

73. PAMPHILUS. And after a few things he adds:

74. ORIGEN But up to the present we have been able to find no statement in the Holy Scriptures in which the Holy Spirit is said to have been made or created.

75. PAMPHILUS. And after citing numerous testimonies to the power of the Holy Spirit, after some things he adds this as well:

76. ORIGEN If the Holy Spirit knows the Father when the Son reveals him,²⁰¹ then he goes from ignorance to knowledge, which assuredly is as impious as it is foolish, that is, to confess him to be the Holy Spirit and yet to ascribe ignorance to him. For it is not possible, in fact, that having been something else before he became the Holy Spirit, by progressive advancement he came to be the Holy Spirit; as if someone would dare to say that at the time when he was not yet the Holy Spirit, he was ignorant of the Father, but after he had received the knowledge, he likewise became the Holy Spirit. For if that were the case, assuredly the Holy Spirit himself would never have been reckoned in the unity of the Trinity, that is, in the unity of the inconvertible Father and of his Son, unless he himself had always been the Holy Spirit.

77. PAMPHILUS. And after a few things he adds:

78. ORIGEN It seems correct, however, to inquire into the reason why he who is regenerated by God unto salvation²⁰³ needs both the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and will not obtain salvation unless the whole Trinity is involved; nor is it possible to become a sharer of the Father and the Son without the Holy Spirit. And in discussing these subjects, doubtless it will be necessary for us to describe the specific activity of the Holy Spirit <and> the specific activity of the Father and of the Son.

I am of the opinion, then, that the activity of the Father and of the Son takes place both in saints as well as in sinners, in rational men and in speechless animals; moreover, even in those things that are without life, and in all things universally that exist. But the activity of the Holy Spirit does not take place at all in those things that are without life, or in those that, although they are living, are yet speechless. Moreover, it is not even found in those who indeed are rational, but who lie in evil²⁰⁴ and have

not at all been converted to better things. But in my opinion, there is need for the Holy Spirit in those alone who are already turning themselves to better things and who are walking along the ways of Christ Jesus,²⁰⁵ that is, who are doing good deeds²⁰⁶ and who are abiding in God.²⁰⁷

But that the activity of the Father and the Son is both in saints and in sinners is manifested from the fact that all who are rational are partakers of the Word of God, that is, of reason; and by this means they bear certain seeds, as it were, that have been implanted within them, of wisdom and justice, which is Christ.²⁰⁸ Moreover, the very fact that every creature exists and continues is the activity of God the Father, who said: "I am who I am."²⁰⁹ This extends to all: for it is he himself "who commands his sun to rise upon the good and the evil and who rains upon the just and the unjust."²¹⁰

79. PAMPHILUS. And after many things about the Father and the Son by means of scriptural citations, he adds this statement:

80. ORIGEN But we have found that it is only the saints who have a participation in the Holy Spirit. This is why it is said: "No one can say 'Jesus is Lord' except in the Holy Spirit."²¹² And on one occasion scarcely even the apostles themselves are deemed worthy to hear: "You will receive power when the Holy Spirit comes upon you."²¹³ For this reason as well I think it is consistent that he who has <indeed> committed a sin against the Son of Man is deserving of pardon,²¹⁴ in light of the fact that, if he who is a sharer in the Word or reason of God ceases to live according to reason, he seems to have fallen into ignorance or folly, and therefore seems to deserve pardon; but the one who has already been deemed worthy of participation in the Holy Spirit and turns back, by the very fact and action [of turning back], is said to have blasphemed against the Holy Spirit.²¹⁵

81. PAMPHILUS. In the fourth book of *Peri archon*, we find Origen's testimony that just as the Father knows what are the beginnings and the ends of all things, so also the Son knows this, and so also the Holy Spirit knows this, and that it is impossible for any creature to know this.

82. ORIGEN The Apostle Paul through the Holy Spirit, who "searches even the deep things of God,"²¹⁷ seeks to fathom "the depth of the divine wisdom and of the knowledge <of God>,"²¹⁸ and yet he is unable to reach the end and, so to speak, to come to an intimate knowledge. Then in despair and amazement he exclaims and says: "O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God!"²¹⁹ And to prove that it was from despair of attaining a perfect understanding that he uttered this exclamation, listen to him speaking: "How unsearchable are God's judgments and how beyond investigation are his ways!"²²⁰ For he did not say that one can fathom God's judgments with difficulty, but that one cannot fathom them at all. And he did not say that his ways can be investigated with difficulty, but that they cannot be investigated. For however far someone advances in his search and makes progress by means of very diligent study, assisted, too, by the grace of God, and enlightened in his mind,²²¹ he will not be able to reach the perfect end of those things that are sought for. Nor can any created mind in any way hold out the possibility of comprehending; but when it has discovered a small portion of the things that are being sought, it sees yet others that need to be sought out. And even if it reaches those things, it will see yet many others that arise from these that should be researched.

This is why the very wise Solomon, beholding the nature of things by his wisdom, says: "I said, 'I will become wise'; and wisdom herself went far from me, further than it had been by far, and who shall find its profound depth?"²²² Moreover, Isaiah knows that the beginnings of things cannot be found by a mortal nature nor even by those natures that, although they

are more divine than the human nature is, were nevertheless themselves made, or created. Knowing, therefore, that neither the beginning nor the end can be found by any of these natures, he says: "Tell the former things that have been, and we will know that you are gods; or announce the last things that exist, and then we shall see that you are gods."²²³ For even my Hebrew teacher²²⁴ used to say that because the beginnings or the end of all things could not be comprehended by any one, but only by the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Holy Spirit, for that reason through the form of a vision Isaiah spoke of two seraphim alone, who with two wings cover the face of God, and with two [wings cover] his feet, and with two they fly. They call to each other alternately²²⁵ and say: "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord Sabaoth; the whole earth is full of your glory."²²⁶ So, since only the two seraphim have their wings over the face of God and over his feet, one should be bold enough to declare that neither the army of holy angels²²⁷ nor the holy thrones²²⁸ nor the dominions nor the principalities nor the powers²²⁹ can fully know the beginning of all things and the end of the universe. But one should understand that those holy beings whom we have listed, the spirits and powers, are indeed near to those beginnings, and they attain a very great measure that the rest are incapable of reaching. And yet, whatever that is that these powers have learned through revelation from the Son of God²³⁰ and from the Holy Spirit, and they were certainly capable of apprehending a very large number of things, far more in the case of the former beings than for the lower ones, nevertheless it is impossible for them to comprehend all things. For it is written: "Most of God's works are in secret."²³¹

This is why it is desirable that everyone according to his

strength should always “stretch out to those things that are before, forgetting the things that are behind,”²³² both to better works and also to a clearer thinking and understanding, “through Jesus Christ” our Savior “to whom be glory in the ages of ages.”²³³

83. PAMPHILUS . * * *

84. ORIGEN In the whole world, in all Greece, and in <all> foreign countries, there is an incalculably enormous number of people who have abandoned the laws of their fathers and those whom they had believed were gods, and who have entrusted themselves to the observance of the law of Moses and to the discipleship and worship of Christ. And they have done this not without <exciting against themselves> the intense hatred²³⁵ of those who worship images. The result of this is that frequently they are exposed to cruel tortures by them; sometimes they are even put to death. Yet they embrace and keep the words of Christ’s teaching with all affection.

And one can see how that same religion increased in a short time, advancing by means of the punishment and deaths of its worshipers, and also by the plundering of their goods and by every kind of affliction that they endured from them. And this result is all the more surprising since the teachers themselves were neither very competent²³⁶ nor many in number. And yet these words “are preached throughout the whole world,”²³⁷ so that “Greeks and barbarians, wise and foolish,”²³⁸ receive the religion of Christian teaching.

What doubtless follows from this is that this is not being done by human power or resources, as the words of Jesus Christ prevail with all power and conviction over the minds and souls of all. For that this was both predicted by him and confirmed by him by divine oracles is obvious when he says that: “You will

be brought before governors and judges for my sake as a testimony to them and to the gentiles.”²³⁹ <And again: “This Gospel will be preached among all nations.”>²⁴⁰ And again: “Many shall say to me on that day: ‘Lord, Lord, did we not eat and drink in your name²⁴¹ and in your name cast out devils?’ And I will say to them: ‘Depart from me, you workers of iniquity; I never knew you.’”²⁴² Now if these things had been spoken like this by him, and yet the outcome of these predictions had not been attained, perhaps they would have appeared to be untrue and not to possess any authority. But now, since the things that he had predicted are being effectively realized, since they were predicted with such power and authority, it is most clearly shown that it was truly God who, having been made man, delivered to men the precepts of salvation.

What then should one say of that which the prophets had predicted beforehand of him, that “princes would not cease from Judah, nor leaders from his thighs, until he comes for whom it has been reserved”—namely, the kingdom—“and until the expectation of the gentiles comes”?²⁴³ For it is most distinctly evident from history itself and from what is clearly seen today that from the time of Christ there have arisen no more kings among the Jews. Moreover, all those Judaic ambitions that they vaunted so much and in which they gloried, whether concerning the beauty of the temple or the outer trappings of the altar and all those sacerdotal fillets and robes of the high priests, all these things were simultaneously destroyed. For the prophecy was fulfilled that said: “For the sons of Israel shall abide many days without a king, without a prince; there will be no sacrifice nor altar nor priesthood nor oracles.”²⁴⁴

We are using these testimonies then against those who seem to assert that what is spoken about these things in Genesis by Jacob refers to Judah, and who say that there <still> remains a prince of the race of Judah—he, namely, who is the prince of their nation, the one whom they call their patriarch. They also say that those cannot fail who descend from his seed and

remain until the advent of that Christ whom they describe to themselves. But if what the prophet says is true, that “the sons of Israel shall abide many days without a king, without a prince, nor is there a sacrifice or altar or priesthood”;²⁴⁵ and seeing that the Temple has assuredly been overthrown, that victims are not offered, that the altar does not stand, that the priesthood does not exist; then it is absolutely certain that “princes have failed from Judah,” just as it was written, as has the “leader from his thighs until he comes for whom it has been promised.”²⁴⁶ It is established, then, that “he has come for whom it has been reserved,”²⁴⁷ <and in whom is the “expectation of the gentiles.”> And this manifestly seems to be fulfilled in the multitude of those who through Christ have believed in God from the different nations.

Moreover, in the song of Deuteronomy it is prophetically indicated that on account of the sins of the former people there would be an election of a “foolish nation,” none other, certainly, than that which came into existence through Christ. For this is what it says: “They have excited me to anger by their images, and I will stir them up to jealousy, <I will arouse them by a foolish nation.>”²⁴⁸ One can therefore very clearly recognize in what manner the Hebrews, who are said to have “excited” God’s “anger” “by means of those who are not gods” and “to have aroused him by their images, were themselves also aroused to jealousy by a foolish nation,” which God chose²⁴⁹ through the advent of Christ Jesus and through his disciples. For thus the Apostle says: “For you see your calling, brothers, that not many among you were wise according to the flesh, not many were influential, not many were noble; but God chose the things that are foolish of the world and the things that are not, to destroy the things that previously existed.”²⁵⁰ Therefore, let not carnal Israel²⁵¹

glory—for such is the term used by the Apostle: “Let no flesh,” I say, “glory in the presence of God.”²⁵²

Moreover, what should one say concerning those things that are prophesied of Christ in the Psalms? Especially the one with the superscription: “A song for the Beloved,” where it is stated that “his tongue is the pen of a scribe writing swiftly; fairer in appearance than the sons of men,” for “grace has been poured out on his lips”?²⁵³ <Now an indication that “grace has been poured out on his lips”> is this: that after only a short period of instruction had elapsed—for he taught for a year and some months—the whole world was filled with his proclamation and with faith in his religion. There arose, then, “justice in his days and an abundance of peace,”²⁵⁴ continuing all the way to the end. This end is called the “removal of the moon,”²⁵⁵ “and “he has dominion from sea to sea and from the river to the ends of the earth.”²⁵⁶

But a sign was also given to the house of David.²⁵⁷ For “the virgin conceived in her womb and gave birth to Emanuel,” which is interpreted, “God with us.”²⁵⁸ And what the same prophet said was fulfilled: “God is with us; know this, O nations, and be conquered.”²⁵⁹ For we have been conquered and overcome, we <who are> from the gentiles, and who remain as <a kind of> spoils <of his victory,>²⁶⁰ we who have subjected our necks to his grace. Moreover, the place of his birth was predicted in the prophet Micah, who says: “And you, Bethlehem, land of Judah, are by no means small among the leaders of Judah; for from you shall come forth a leader who shall rule my people Israel.”²⁶¹ Moreover, the “weeks of years”²⁶² until the leader Christ have been fulfilled, which the prophet Daniel had predicted. He is no less at hand who through Job was predicted to consume an enormous beast,²⁶³ who also gave power to his closest disciples to trample upon serpents and scorpions and upon

all the power of the enemy, disciples who are not going to be harmed by that enemy.²⁶⁴

85. PAMPHILUS. This is Origen's faith concerning the highest realities, that is, concerning the Holy Trinity. From a very small number of citations that have been taken from his many books, we have shown the faith that he had adopted. What could be so correct, so true, and so Catholic? What indeed could be more useful for instructing everyone, even among those very persons who rage furiously against him with a hostile mind? What could be less deserving of reproach?

86. And indeed, it would have sufficed to have recorded in summary fashion these things concerning the documentation and proof of his faith, if it did not seem necessary to respond to the remaining points in answer to those who raise charges against him.

87. So let us consider those very charges that are leveled by his malevolent accusers:

The first is that they claim that he says the Son of God was not born.

The second is that they claim that he says, in agreement with the fictitious ideas of Valentinus, that the Son of God came into existence as an emission.

The third, which completely contradicts all of the above, is that they claim that he says, in agreement with Artemas²⁶⁵ and Paul of Samosata,²⁶⁶ that Christ the Son of God is a mere man, that is, that he is not also God.

After this comes the charge that is opposed to all the preceding—for malice is blind—that they claim that he says that all the Savior's actions were done δοκῆσει, that is, only in appearance, and by allegory, but not also in accordance with the things that are reported in the historical narratives.

There is another charge too, according to which they assert that he proclaims two Christs.

They add this one too: that he completely denies the literal historical narratives²⁶⁷ that are reported throughout all of Holy Scripture concerning the deeds of the saints.

Moreover, with respect to the resurrection of the dead and the punishments of the ungodly, they impugn him with no trivial calumny, [that is,] that he denies that penalties will be inflicted upon sinners.

Moreover, some find fault with his discussions and opinions in which he treated the condition and divine management of the soul.

The final charge against him is the one that is spread abroad with complete shamelessness, namely, [the doctrine] of μετενσωματώσις, that is, that Origen asserts that human souls after death transmigrate into speechless animals, for example, into snakes and cattle, and that even the very souls of speechless animals are rational. The reason we have recorded this accusation last is so that by heaping up a large number of sample texts from his books, its falsity may be recognized all the more clearly.

88. So then, keeping in mind the list of charges recorded above, let us begin with the first.

From the first book of the *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*:

89. ORIGEN Perhaps someone may ask if the Son is love, especially because John has applied this word to God the Father, saying that “God is love.”²⁶⁹ But, on the other hand, we shall cite what he says in the same epistle of his: “Beloved, let us love one another because love is from God.”²⁷⁰ So then, he who said that “God is love,” also teaches that “love is from God.” I believe that this love is none other than his only-begotten Son; just as God is procreated from God, so love is procreated from love.

90. PAMPHILUS. He speaks about the same things in the fifth book of his *Commentary on the Gospel according to John*:

91. ORIGEN The only-begotten Son, our Savior, who alone was born from the Father, alone is Son by nature, not by adoption.

92. PAMPHILUS. The same thought occurs in the same book:

93. ORIGEN So the true God is one,²⁷³ who “alone has immortality”; he “dwells in unapproachable light.”²⁷⁴ He says “one true God” to prevent us from believing that the name of the true God applies to many. So then, even those who receive “the spirit of adoption of sons” by which they cry: “Abba, Father”²⁷⁵ are sons of God, but not like the only-begotten Son. For the only-begotten is Son by nature and is always and inseparably the Son, but the others, in view of the fact that they have received the Son of God within themselves “have received authority to become sons of God.”²⁷⁶ Although “they have been born not from blood nor from the will of the flesh nor from the will of man, but from God,”²⁷⁷ nevertheless they have not been born by that birth by which the only-begotten Son was born. For that reason the true God is as different from those to whom it is said: “I said: ‘You are gods,’” as the true Son is different from those who hear: “You are all sons of the Most High.”²⁷⁸

94. PAMPHILUS. From the *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, he says that the Son is ὁμοούσιος with the Father, that is, of one substance with the Father, but foreign from the substances of a creature.²⁷⁹

95. ORIGEN Therefore, we are asking those who are reluctant to confess that the Son of God is God how a mere human nature, having nothing exceptional in itself nor anything of the divine substance, could receive as an inheritance²⁸¹ all principality and all authority and power,²⁸² and could be preferred to all these things and placed ahead of them all by the Father.²⁸³ For this reason it seems correct that he who receives the inheritance ought to be more eminent, both in kind, assuredly, and in species, substance, existence, or nature, and in all ways whatsoever in which he ought to be more eminent.

96. PAMPHILUS. And after a few things in the same book he says:

97. ORIGEN Now when one examines what has been said about the Son of God, that he is the “radiance of glory,”²⁸⁵ it seems necessary at the same time to treat what is also said, not only that he is the “radiance of eternal light,”²⁸⁶ but also what is said, similar to this, in the Wisdom of Solomon, where wisdom describes herself in these words: “For she is a breath of the power of God and the purest ἀπόρροια [emanation] of the glory of the Almighty.”²⁸⁷

98. PAMPHILUS. And after a few things he says:

99. ORIGEN We need to realize that Holy Scripture, as it makes its way somehow through certain ineffable, secret, and hidden matters, tries to indicate to men and to suggest an understanding by introducing the subtle term “breath.”²⁸⁹ It has taken this term from the physical realm in order that we might be able to understand it in part, since it is Christ who is Wisdom.²⁹⁰ Therefore, like the breath that proceeds from some physical²⁹¹ substance, so likewise he himself comes into being

as some “breath of the very power of God.”²⁹² So also the Wisdom that proceeds from it is generated from the very substance of God; so also, no less according to the likeness of a physical²⁹³ ἀπόρροια [emanation], it is said to be a certain and simple “pure ἀπόρροια of the glory of the Almighty.”²⁹⁴ Both of these comparisons show very clearly that there is a sharing of substance between the Father and the Son; for an ἀπόρροια [emanation] is clearly ὁμοούσιος [consubstantial], that is, of one substance, with that body from which it is either an ἀπόρροια [emanation] or breath.²⁹⁵

100. PAMPHILUS. It has been shown with sufficient clarity, in my judgment, and it is very evident, that [Origen] has declared that the Son of God was born from the very substance of God, that is, he is ὁμοούσιος, of the same substance with the Father, and that he is not a creature nor was it through adoption, but by nature, that he was generated as a true Son from the Father himself.²⁹⁶

101. It remains also that Origen himself be allowed to answer the second charge leveled against him by his accusers, by means of excerpts published by us, to be sure, but in his very own words. I will cite two or three testimonies by which fair-

ness demands according to our law that every word be established.²⁹⁷

102. ORIGEN I think that the will of the Father should be sufficient for the existence of that which the Father wills; for when he wills, he uses no other way than what is brought forth by the counsel of his will.

So then, the existence of the Son is also generated by him; for it is necessary for this point to be received as a matter of first importance by those who confess that nothing is not generated, that is, unborn, except God the Father alone. For one should be careful that no one fall into those absurd fictitious ideas of those who picture to themselves certain emanations, which result in cutting the divine nature into parts and dividing God the Father, as far as they can. For even to entertain the remotest suspicion of such a thing concerning an incorporeal nature is not only the height of impiety, but a mark of supreme folly, nor is it in any way consistent with intelligence that one could conceive a division of substance in an incorporeal nature.

Instead, it is the case, then, that, just as the will proceeds from the mind and neither cuts off any part of the mind nor is separated or divided from it, so in some such fashion is the Father to be supposed to have begotten the Son, namely, his own image, so that, just as he himself is invisible by nature, so also he generated an invisible image.²⁹⁹ For the Son is the Word,³⁰⁰ and therefore one should not understand anything in him that is subject to the senses. He is wisdom,³⁰¹ and in wisdom nothing physical³⁰² should be imagined. He is "the true light that enlightens every man coming into this world,"³⁰³ but he has nothing in common with the light of this sun.

103. PAMPHILUS. He speaks of these same matters in the fourth book of *Peri archon*:

104. ORIGEN Since the matters that we have discussed concerning the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit

have been treated, it is time to recapitulate a few matters that we have left on the side. Since God the Father is both indivisible and inseparable from the Son, <the Son> was not generated from him by emission, as some suppose; for if the Son is an emission of the Father, and the term “emission” signifies the kind of generation that is customary for the progeny of animals or human beings, then of necessity both he who emitted and he who was emitted are body.

105. PAMPHILUS. Then in what follows he inveighs quite vehemently against the heresy of Valentinus, which sets forth such ideas. Origen has professed his own opinion in accordance with the truth of the Catholic faith, an opinion that is diametrically opposed to such views. In the fifth book of his *Commentary on the Gospel according to John*, he speaks about these matters:

106. ORIGEN The “only-begotten God,”³⁰⁶ then, our Savior, alone generated from the Father, is Son by nature and not by adoption. And he was born from the very mind of the Father, as the will is born from the mind. For the divine nature, that is, the nature of the unbegotten Father, is not divisible, as if we should think that the Son was procreated either by division or subtraction from his substance. On the contrary, one should speak of him as the mind or heart or thought of God, who, abiding unchangeable,³⁰⁷ producing an offspring of its will, became the Father of the Word.³⁰⁸ This Word, reposing in the bosom of the Father, announces the God whom no one has ever seen,³⁰⁹ and to those whom the heavenly Father drew to him³¹⁰ he reveals the Father whom no one knows except himself alone.³¹¹

107. PAMPHILUS. Let these things suffice as a response to the second charge.

108. Now in what follows we will respond as well to those who assert that Origen claims that Christ is a mere man, that is, without his being God.

From the first book of the *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*:

109. ORIGEN From what the Apostle has said: "Paul, an apostle not from men nor through a man but through Jesus Christ,"³¹³ it is given to be understood clearly that Jesus Christ was not a man but was a divine nature. For if he were a man, Paul would not have said what he says: "Paul, an apostle not from men nor through a man." For if Jesus had been a man, and Paul was received into the apostolate through him, surely he would have become an apostle through a man; and if he had been an apostle through a man, he would have never said: "nor through a man." But by these words Paul clearly separates Jesus from human nature; for it is not sufficient for him to have said "nor through a man," but he goes on to say: "but through Jesus Christ." For surely he knew that he was of a more eminent nature, and for that reason he said that he himself had not been chosen "through a man."

110. PAMPHILUS. Saying these things at the beginning of the epistle, in subsequent passages of the same commentary he adds similar things, explaining that section in which it is written: "But I make known to you, brothers, the Gospel that I preached to you, that it is not according to man; for I did not receive it from a man but through a revelation of Jesus Christ."³¹⁴

111. ORIGEN Pay attention to what he writes. For the one who adds these things to the former things is able adequately to show those who deny the deity of Jesus Christ, and who declare him to be a mere man, that Jesus Christ the Son of God is not a man but God. For if the Apostle says that "the Gospel that I preached to you is not according to man,"³¹⁶ but

according to Jesus Christ, he shows plainly that Christ Jesus is not a man; and if he is not a man, doubtless he is God <or rather, he will be nothing other than man and God>. And again if what Paul says is true, that "I have not received the Gospel from a man but through a revelation of Jesus Christ,"³¹⁷ it is certain that Jesus Christ, who revealed it, is not a man; for it is foreign to human nature to reveal things that are secret and covered up. Even if this does sometimes take place through a man, yet it does not come about from the man, but from him who speaks in the man, Christ.³¹⁸

112. PAMPHILUS. Since these things have been demonstrated so clearly, it is time for us to turn to a defense against the next charge. In view of our eagerness to be brief, we will content ourselves with proving [Origen's position] with a few citations.

113. ORIGEN One must add the following as well to the things that we said above, that the body of Christ was not estranged from earthly substance. This accords with the fact that he is a son of David and a son of Abraham, as Matthew writes: "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, son of David, son of Abraham,"³²⁰ and as Paul says that Christ was from the seed of Abraham³²¹ and from the seed of David according to the flesh.³²²

The fact then that it is said that "when the forty days and forty nights of his fast were completed, afterward he was hungry,"³²³ doubtless indicates that his body was also capable of being emaciated and of being filled up, exactly as our bodies are accustomed to be. In fact, if someone uses as an objection against us the account of that miracle of the forty-day fast, the objection can easily be resolved by pointing to the examples of Moses and Elijah, who likewise are said to have endured a fast.³²⁴

Moreover, what else is indicated by his fatigue from the exertion of the journey and the heat, his sitting down at the well

and resting, and his growing thirsty,³²⁵ if not his muscular fatigue and his consumption of the element of physical liquid due to the sun's excessive heat? And the fact that he postponed drinking what he wanted to drink, when he was preoccupied with better matters and did not drink, should not lead one to conclude, therefore, that he did not experience thirst.³²⁶

Moreover, there is the fact that he is frequently invited to dinners and eats and drinks in the sight of everyone. He does this not by deception nor by tricking the eyes of those who are looking on, nor does he do this in appearance, as some think, especially since he consumed the food and drink in such a way that he was even accused by some for excessive presumption, as one whose appetite for food and drink was too extreme. And if anyone wants to assert audaciously that the reason these things were said is that he was eating as a ghost and that they did not know how it was happening, let the response to these things be based on what the Lord himself said: "John the Baptist came neither eating nor drinking, and they say: 'He has a demon.' The Son of Man comes eating and drinking, and they say: 'Behold a gluttonous man and a wine-drinker.'"³²⁷ For since the Savior himself says: "The Son of Man comes eating and drinking," how can anyone dare to say that he neither ate nor drank? Surely this is flagrantly to disbelieve his teaching. But if he ate and drank, and if the substance of wine and food entered his flesh, doubtless it was diffused through all the joints of his body and the intricate passages of his limbs. For it is impossible for a spiritual nature—as some conceive his body to be, which they do very ignorantly and absurdly—to receive the substance of wine and food. But if anyone, in the course of the investigation of this matter, cites unworthy and obscene matters, and asks whether there were likewise digestive processes in his body, it hardly seems absurd to admit this "as a consequence of bodily nature."³²⁸ But if they likewise demand that we confirm this by

means of examples, one should point out that they are conducting this inquiry into these things with excessive folly. For where are such things reported to have been done by the apostles or the other saints or even by the ungodly and sinners?

But not even the account of his circumcision³²⁹ will embarrass us. For we say that as a logical consequence of his having a human body, he was circumcised, and his foreskin was committed to the earth, perhaps until the end of time (or if it is otherwise, it should be investigated in another discussion.) This circumcision of his, however, will considerably embarrass those who are on the opposing side. For how could a spiritual body be circumcised with an earthly blade? For that reason some of them did not blush to publish books even concerning the foreskin of his circumcision in which they tried to show that his foreskin had transformed into a spiritual substance. And those who claim that the body of Christ was psychic³³⁰ body will likewise be no less embarrassed.

Moreover, the same interpretation should be given to the episode concerning his blood and water that flowed from his side when the soldier's spear had pierced it.³³¹ And to those who know how to understand this, it is openly made known that his flesh was earthly, that is, of a human nature, through the fact that it is said that the imprints of the nails were on his body.³³² Surely his flesh was not a sort that was incapable of receiving wounds.

But if in his very death he did not feel many things [that arise] from human weakness, why was his soul "troubled"?³³³ Why is he "grieved to the point of death"³³⁴ because of this weakness? All these things clearly show that it was not illusory, but as a man, that he said: "The spirit indeed is ready, but the flesh is weak."³³⁵

No less does the account of his sleep show the very same

thing, when it is said that “he was sleeping in the stern on a pillow,” as Mark reports, and is roused from his sleep by someone.³³⁶ For although these things may contain a spiritual understanding, yet the spiritual meaning ought to be received as well, while the prior truth of the historical narrative abides.

For just as he is always curing those who are blind according to the spiritual understanding, by illuminating minds that are blinded by ignorance, yet he also physically³³⁷ healed the blind man at that time.³³⁸ And he is constantly raising the dead, yet at that time he also did miracles of this sort, as, for example, the daughter of the synagogue ruler,³³⁹ the widow’s son,³⁴⁰ and Lazarus.³⁴¹ And although he is always bringing under control the storms and tempests of the Church, when he is roused by his disciples,³⁴² nevertheless it is certain that at that time as well the things that are related in the historical narratives were carried out. <This then is the sound manner of interpreting the meaning of Scripture.>

It is not necessary to give a hearing to those who say that he was born *through* Mary but not *of* Mary, since the Apostle in his foreknowledge said ahead of time: “But when the fullness of time came, God sent his Son, born (*factum*) *of* a woman, born (*factum*) under the law, that he might redeem those who were under the law.”³⁴³ You see that he did not say: “born *through* a woman,” but “born *of* a woman.”

114. PAMPHILUS. What is there that [one could assert] so clearly or irreproachably as that which proceeds from all these things that he has written, in which he affirms the truth of the Lord’s deeds and the reliability of the historical narrative in the Scriptures?

115. But let us consequently pursue the remaining things as well in which the charge is raised that he seems to speak of two Christs, one who is God the Word, and another who is Jesus Christ, who was born of Mary.

From the first book of his *Commentary on Isaiah*:

116. ORIGEN For though the Holy Spirit is one, yet there are many who are individually called holy spirits, namely, those who have the Holy Spirit within them; in the same way one may also say of Christ that from the one Christ, many become christs. Of them the Scripture says: "Do not touch my christs and do not do harm to my prophets."³⁴⁵ So also, from the one God, many are called gods, namely, all those in whom God dwells,³⁴⁶ but "for us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things."³⁴⁷

So then, there is "one true God,"³⁴⁸ who is, so to speak, the provider of deity, and there is one Christ, who is the maker of christs, and there is one Holy Spirit who makes a holy spirit in the individual souls of the saints. In fact, just as Christ, through the fact that he is Christ, makes christs,³⁴⁹ so also, through the fact that he is Son of God, and the unique only-begotten Son, he makes into sons of God all those who receive from him the spirit of adoption.³⁵⁰

117. PAMPHILUS. Here is one testimony that there is but one true Christ, who by sharing of himself makes many christs. But let us exhibit another as well from the first book of his *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, where he speaks in the following manner:

118. ORIGEN Christ Jesus, "though he was in the form of God, did not consider it robbery that he was equal to God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a slave; and having been born [*factus*] in the likeness of men, he was found in form as a man; humbling himself he became obedient to death, even the death of a cross."³⁵² If this is so, then there is no doubt that his birth was not of the sort that one who did not previously exist began to be. This is the way we think of the birth of men. But in his case, one who previously existed and "was

in the form of God” came in order likewise to take “the form of a slave.” After all, “that which is born of flesh is flesh,”³⁵³ he says. The meaning is: “that which is born” from her who said: “Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it done to me according to your word.”³⁵⁴ This is the “form of a slave” that assuredly is “flesh.”

119. PAMPHILUS. And in the third book of the *Commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians*, he writes the following concerning these same matters:

120. ORIGEN Now the law of Moses was given through angels by the hand and power of the Mediator,³⁵⁵ namely, Christ,³⁵⁶ who, though he was the “Word of God in the beginning and was with God, and the Word was God,”³⁵⁷ yet served the Father in all things. For “through him all things were made,”³⁵⁸ that is, not only creatures but the law and the prophets; and the Word himself is “the Mediator of God and men.”³⁵⁹ This Word, at the end indeed of the ages, became man, Jesus Christ; but before this coming was manifest in the flesh,³⁶⁰ he was indeed Mediator of all things, but he was not yet man. Yet he was even then “Mediator of God and men.”³⁶¹ This is why the law that was given through angels is said to have been given through the hands³⁶² of the Mediator himself, so that “the law was holy and the command holy and just and good,”³⁶³ and all these things were sanctified by Christ.

121. PAMPHILUS. I think that it is sufficient that the calumny about this point as well has been refuted on the basis of three witnesses.³⁶⁴ Now if anyone is offended that Origen has said that the Savior as well received a soul, nothing more need be said about this, I think, than that Origen is not the source of this opinion, but the Holy Scripture itself testifies to this when the Lord and Savior himself says: “No one will take my soul

from me,"³⁶⁵ and: "My soul is grieved unto death,"³⁶⁶ and: "Now is my soul troubled."³⁶⁷ And you will find many things similar to these in the Holy Scriptures.

122. It remains to respond to the slanderous accusation that Origen transforms all Scripture into allegory. We will show from those very books on which his detractors especially base their charges against him, that is, from the fourth book of *Peri archon*, that Origen does not deny the things that are reported in the Scriptures as having also been accomplished literally.

123. ORIGEN Let no one suspect us of saying that we think that no historical narrative in Scripture happened, because we have conjectured that some of them did not happen; or that we think that no precepts of the law are valid according to the letter, because we say that some of them cannot be observed literally, in which either the rationale or possibility of the thing does not permit it; or that we do not think that the things that have been written about the Savior were fulfilled in a manner palpable to the senses; or that his commandments should not be kept according to the letter. Therefore, in response to this we must openly declare that we discern that the truth of the historical narrative should be <and can be> preserved in the majority of instances.

For who can deny that Abraham was buried in the double cave at Hebron,³⁶⁹ along with Isaac and Jacob and each of their wives?³⁷⁰ Or who doubts that Shechem was given as a portion to Joseph?³⁷¹ Or that Jerusalem is the metropolis of Judea,³⁷² in which the Temple of God was built by Solomon?³⁷³ And countless other statements? For there are far more things that are true according to the historical narrative than there are things that contain merely a spiritual meaning.

So then, who would not insist that the command that pre-

scribes: "Honor your father and mother, that it may be well with you"³⁷⁴ is sufficient without any spiritual interpretation, and that it is necessary for those who observe it, especially since Paul also has confirmed that command by repeating it in the same words;³⁷⁵ And what need is there to mention what is said: "You shall not commit adultery, you shall not kill, you shall not steal, you shall not speak false testimony,"³⁷⁶ and others of the same kind? Now, in fact, with respect to the things that are commanded in the Gospel, it is not even possible to doubt that these things are to be literally observed, as, for instance, when it says: "But I say to you not to swear at all,"³⁷⁷ and when it says: "But whoever looks upon a woman to lust after her has already committed adultery with her in his heart."³⁷⁸ This also applies to the things that are commanded in the writings of the Apostle Paul: "Warn the undisciplined, console the faint-hearted, support the weak, be patient towards all,"³⁷⁹ and very many other things.

124. PAMPHILUS. He says in his *Commentary on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to Philemon*:

125. ORIGEN Moreover, concerning each of the saints who are written about in Holy Scripture and whom Scripture attests to be just and chosen by God, those who desire to be saved ought to have a certain kind of faith; for faith in God cannot be perfected unless one has even that faith by which it is believed with respect to the saints that they are saints.

Now what we are saying is this. He who believes in God and accepts that his teachings are true also believes that Adam was formed as the first man.³⁸¹ He believes that God fashioned Eve to be Adam's wife by taking one of his ribs.³⁸² He also believes

that Enosh truly “hoped to call upon the name of the Lord God”,³⁸³ and that Enoch was translated, because he had pleased God for two hundred years after he became the father of Methusaleh.³⁸⁴ He believes that Noah received an oracle to build an ark and that he alone, together with only those who had entered with him into the ark, was saved from the flood.³⁸⁵ Likewise, he believes that Abraham merited God’s approval and showed hospitality to three men, one of whom was the Lord, when he was under the oak of Mamre.³⁸⁶ He also believes the things concerning Isaac, both the manner of his birth,³⁸⁷ that he was offered by his father,³⁸⁸ and that he merited to hear oracles from God.³⁸⁹ Moreover, he believes that when Jacob’s name was changed he received from God the name Israel.³⁹⁰ Concerning Moses he believes that he served God through signs and miracles.³⁹¹ And he believes that Jesus son of Nun, having been heard by God, made the sun stand still over Gibeon and the moon over the valley of Helon.³⁹²

And what should be said concerning the faithful judges and about those things that are related as having been carried out by them?³⁹³ And in the books of the Kingdoms concerning Samuel, that he demanded rain from God at the harvest time and received it?³⁹⁴ And of David, whom the Lord took from the sheep to rule over Jacob, his son, and over Israel, his inheritance?³⁹⁵ And of Nathan, that he prophesied,³⁹⁶ and Gad as well?³⁹⁷ Moreover, what about Solomon, that the Lord appeared to him in a vision?³⁹⁸ And of Elijah, that he was assumed into heaven in an ascension³⁹⁹ after performing all those signs and wonders that are recorded?⁴⁰⁰ Moreover, what should be said of Elisha: that he raised not only the son of the Shunamite woman,⁴⁰¹ but also

the dead man who was thrown on his bones?⁴⁰² <It is necessary, then, that all faithful believe in all that is written>; also, concerning Hezekiah, that in his time the shadow of the sun traveled backwards.⁴⁰³

Our faith, then, is first of all in our Lord Jesus Christ, but also, by way of consequence, in all the holy patriarchs and prophets and apostles of Christ, according to the rule that we have spoken about above.

126. PAMPHILUS. The things that have been said are adequate to prove that Origen's faith was Catholic, and they suffice to show the nature of his views regarding the historical veracity of the Scriptures.

127. Now among the other charges that they level against Origen, they record as the greatest of all that he denies the future resurrection of the dead. Yet the resurrection is assuredly proclaimed openly in the churches as a future event. It is consistent, then, that on this point as well we show by means of Origen's own statements that his detractors, who have not refrained even from publishing writings against him on this subject, are manifest liars.⁴⁰⁴ Therefore, both from the books that he wrote *On the Resurrection*, and from other diverse works of his, we shall prove that his views were Catholic on this topic also.

From the first book of *On the Resurrection*:

128. ORIGEN For how will it not seem absurd that this body that bore scars for Christ's sake and that equally with its soul endured the cruel tortures of persecutions, that even suffered the penalties of imprisonment, chains, and beatings, that was even tortured by fire and was cut with the sword, beyond that, that even experienced being devoured by cruel beasts and [being exposed to] the gibbet of the cross, along with various other kinds of punishments, should be deprived of the [corresponding] rewards for such great contests? For if

the soul alone, which did not struggle alone, is crowned, and the vessel of its body, which served it with very great exertion, should attain no rewards for the struggle and victory, how does it not seem contrary to all reason that the flesh, by resisting the vices of nature and inborn lust for the sake of Christ and by maintaining virginity with enormous effort—which effort for continence is assuredly either greater for the body, or at least equal for both soul and body—that at the time of recompense, the one should be brushed aside as unworthy, while the other is crowned? Doubtless such an outcome makes God guilty either of some injustice or of an inability.

129. PAMPHILUS. Beginning with these statements that pertain to the resurrection of the dead, Origen makes use of the clearest proofs for this doctrine throughout the whole volume. In fact, in the second chapter of his book on this same subject, after he had first said that he was speaking as it were to pagans, he then declares his own opinion as follows:

130. ORIGEN We, for our part, say that after the corruption of the world men are going to be exactly the same, though not in the same state or in possession of the same passions—for they will not again be the issue of the union of husband and wife; but, for instance, the same principle⁴⁰⁷ that maintains the substance of Paul—now I mean Paul’s physical substance—remains intact, and when God wills, according to the things that have been said, through the mystery of the trumpets it comes about that “at the last trumpet the dead rise.”⁴⁰⁸ With the same substantial principle that remains intact, from the dust of the earth they are raised from the dead out of all locations, namely, those in whom that principle of the bodily substance was preserved in their same bodies. Those bodies that had gone into the ground are raised again by the will of God.

And I think that this is what the Apostle wanted to state when, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, after asserting the resurrection of the dead, after setting forth those things that could have been objected to himself by others concerning the

resurrection of the dead, he says the following: "But someone will say: 'How do the dead rise? And with what body do they come?' Fool! What you sow does not come to life unless it first dies, and what you sow is not the body that will be, but you sow the bare seed, for example, of wheat or of something else, but God gives to it a body as he has willed."⁴⁰⁹

For since he had plainly shown that the dead rise, and since it was certain that our Savior rose with that very body that he had received from Mary, but it was not sufficiently clear how the others would be resurrected and what sort of body they would dwell in, he compares the resurrection to seeds that are sown in the ground, for example, the seed of grain that, when it falls into the ground, is corrupted; but the power of that principle,⁴¹⁰ which is lodged in its inner marrow, the real power of the principle, taking the earth that lies near it and the moisture of water, receiving as well the surrounding environment of the air and adequate tinder from the heat, by divine power rises into the body of hay or an ear of grain. And this is what he says: "What you sow does not come to life unless it first dies, and what you sow is not the body that will be."⁴¹¹ Therefore, that which falls into [the common earth] as a seed, our body, has been compared with the grain of corn.

131. PAMPHILUS. And having stated these things, after a few things, he adds the following as well as an inference:

132. ORIGEN Now the Holy Scriptures show in many ways that this entire promise of a resurrection of the dead concerns this body that is left dead. It is clarified by the very resurrection of our Lord, who is called "firstborn from the dead."⁴¹³

133. PAMPHILUS. After this, when he had disputed certain matters quite extensively in between, he adds this as well:

134. ORIGEN For just as every rational soul has more than those beings have that are said to exhibit solely the functions of growing, nourishing themselves, and moving, so the very principle that is in the human body has much more than

what is in the other bodies. The reason for this is that, when the human body decomposes, it can exist again, having been preserved by the power of God and guarded until the time of its resurrection.

Now John says in his Revelation that it may be restored from anywhere, that is, from every place wheresoever it lies: "And the sea gave up the dead that it had within it, and death and the underworld gave up their dead which were in them."⁴¹⁵ For possibly, in my judgment, the sea here has been named for every liquid element, and the underworld for the air, and death for the earth. For since these things have a kind of mutual affinity between them, Scripture calls our body "the dust of death"⁴¹⁶ or "earth"⁴¹⁷ or "body of death."⁴¹⁸

Surely each one's resurrection will correspond with the preparation he has made in this life: One who lived here very blessedly will shine with a more divine radiance in the resurrection, and he will be given a mansion that has been prepared for blessed habitations.⁴¹⁹ But to the one who wasted the time granted to him for the present life by doing evil will be given a kind of body that is capable only of suffering and enduring penalties. And I think that the Apostle Paul wanted to make this distinction clear when he said: "There is one flesh of animals, another flesh of birds, another of fish,"⁴²⁰ and the others that the Apostle enumerates.

But just as one should not think that a sinner would receive a body of an animal or of a bird or of a fish, so it should not be expected that those who will rise in glory⁴²¹ will receive a body of the sun or the moon or the stars.⁴²² On the contrary, one should understand that these things have been said by the Apostle as examples, in order to clarify through these things that some will be of higher dignity and brightness because of their merits. They will be allotted more blessed habitations, too, but, among the others, to the one who is least worthy and most base because of the wickedness of his actions, there will be al-

lotted a state that deserves to be compared even with dumb animals.⁴²³

135. PAMPHILUS. We have cited these few things as testimony from the many countless testimonies that Origen set forth on the meaning of this precise topic in the books that he has written *On the Resurrection*.

136. Now it does not seem absurd to provide a stronger vindication [of Origen] by citing a few of his opinions from his remaining works, [opinions] that are in agreement with those cited above. So, then, in the twenty-eighth book of his *Commentary on the Prophet Isaiah*, while commenting on the section where it is said: "The dead will be resuscitated, and those who are in the tombs will rise,"⁴²⁴ he says the following:

137. ORIGEN It is better to say, then, that we shall all rise again.⁴²⁶ For the impious, too, will come to that place where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth⁴²⁷ and where the just shall receive [a reward], "each in his order,"⁴²⁸ according to the merit of their good deeds.⁴²⁹ At that time the body of their humiliation shall be transformed so as to become conformed to the body of the glory of Christ:⁴³⁰ "What is sown in corruption will rise in incorruption; what is sown in dishonor will rise in glory; what is sown in weakness will rise in power," <namely, at the time of the resurrection,> "and what is sown a physical body will rise a spiritual body."⁴³¹

So then, although all rise again, and "each" rises "in his own order,"⁴³² one should nevertheless consider, in view of John's words spoken in his Revelation: "Blessed is he who has a share in the first resurrection; over him the second death has no power,"⁴³³ whether perhaps the whole scheme of the resurrection can be divided into two parts, that is, of those who will be saved, the just; and of those who will be punished, the sinners. Thus one part, which is called the first, will be the resurrection

of the good; and the other, which is called the second, is the resurrection of the wretched. The one is in all respects pure, joyous, and full of all gladness, but the other is altogether sad, completely full of grief, and corresponds to the deeds and life of those who in the present life have despised God's commandments, put aside all fear of his judgment, and given themselves over to the doing of all uncleanness and covetousness.⁴³⁴ Nor did they attempt to prepare themselves to be able to resist the adversary⁴³⁵ and to oppose the powers that are adverse and hostile to the human race.

Now in this passage the "tombs"⁴³⁶ of the dead, as in many other passages, must be understood according to the well-assured meaning of Scripture. It refers not only to those tombs that seem to have been built or cut in rock or dug in the earth, as receptacles of human bodies, but to every place in which either an entire human body or any part of one lies. Even if it may happen that one body is dispersed in several places, it will not be absurd that all those places in which any part of the body lies are called the "tombs" of that body. For if we fail to understand that the dead rise in this way from their tombs by divine power,⁴³⁷ [including the dead] who have never been committed to burial or laid in tombs, but who have somewhere or other perished, whether by shipwrecks or in the deserts, so that they were not able to be committed to burial, then these persons will not seem to be included among those who are said to be about to "rise" from their "tombs,"⁴³⁸ which is surely quite absurd.

138. PAMPHILUS. Similarly, after some intervening matters, Origen says the following in that same book:

139. ORIGEN So then, when Paul writes that: "as star differs from star in glory, so shall be also the resurrection of the dead,"⁴⁴⁰ and when he says that: "it is sown in corruption, it will rise in incorruption,"⁴⁴¹ and the other things like this, clearly he is writing this of the body alone. For the soul is not sown in cor-

the first to “rest in hope,” is saying these things. For he was crucified and became “firstborn from the dead”;⁴⁴⁸ and after the resurrection he was assumed into heaven⁴⁴⁹ and took his earthly body with him, so that the heavenly powers were terrified and stunned when they saw flesh ascending into heaven. For it is written of Elijah that he was, as it were, *assumed* into heaven,⁴⁵⁰ and of Enoch, that he was *translated*,⁴⁵¹ but it is not said that he *ascended* into heaven.⁴⁵² The one who wants may take offense at our words, but I shall nevertheless assert with all confidence that, just as Christ is “firstborn from the dead,”⁴⁵³ so he was the first to bring flesh to heaven. After all, the heavenly powers are quite terrified at the very novelty [of the thing], since they were now seeing what they had never seen before: flesh ascending into heaven. And that is why they say: “Who is he who comes from Edom?”—that is, from the earth, and, “The red of his vestments is from Bosor”;⁴⁵⁴ for they saw in his body the marks of the wounds from Bosor,⁴⁵⁵ that is, the marks that he had received in the flesh.

144. PAMPHILUS. And after a few things:

145. ORIGEN These explanations concern the words “my flesh will rest in hope.”⁴⁵⁷ In which hope? Not merely in that hope according to which the flesh rose from the dead—for that is trivial—but it rests in that hope according to which it was assumed into heaven.

146. PAMPHILUS. What could anyone say more plainly and clearly concerning the resurrection of the flesh? Origen has affirmed not only that the flesh will rise from the dead, but also that it will be assumed into heaven, but only if it has merited that by following the one who became the “firstborn from the dead”⁴⁵⁸ as the first to bring the nature of his flesh into heaven.

147. But let us hear his views that are expressed in his *Com-*

mentary on the Eighteenth Psalm, as he explains the little verse: "He has set his tabernacle in the sun".⁴⁵⁹

148. ORIGEN What does he mean by: "He has set his tabernacle in the sun"?⁴⁶¹ Some said that our Savior, when he ascended and took his body from earth to heaven, reached that sphere that is called the belt of the sun, and there, they say, he set the tent of his body.⁴⁶² For it was not possible for his body to advance further than that. But the reason they interpret these things in this way is that they are unwilling to receive allegory in the divine Scripture. Therefore, as slaves to the mere historical narrative, they compose fables and fictions of this sort. But we call upon the omnipotence of God, that he may deem us worthy to hear and may think it fitting to open up to us the secrets of the spiritual understanding. Therefore, in this passage we understand the following: "He has set his tabernacle in the sun": What, I ask, is the "tabernacle of Christ," and what is the dwelling-place in which Christ's tabernacle is located? The dwelling-place of Christ's tabernacle is said to be the sun, but I understand Christ's tabernacle to be the Church. Now what other sun should I understand but that "true light that enlightens every man coming into this world"?⁴⁶³ I see that sun of which it is said that "the sun of justice will rise for those who fear the name of the Lord, and there is healing in his wings."⁴⁶⁴ Therefore, "in the sun" he "set his tabernacle"; that is, in the sun of justice he placed his Church; for in that sun, which makes eternal day, his Church is located, as it is said: "The Lord will be eternal light to you, and God will be your glory."⁴⁶⁵

149. PAMPHILUS. Those too should be ashamed who have not hesitated to concoct the fiction on this topic in which they say that Origen claims that Christ's body or flesh was carried off to the sun and was left there; for he is refuting this as a statement incorrectly spoken by others. But his detractors have shown themselves incapable even of understanding what are

the opinions that Origen exposes as things that have been spoken incorrectly by others, and what are the things that he himself asserts.

Then there are those who blunt their own impudence by saying that Origen admits that the *body* will rise again, but he denies that the *flesh* will rise. Let them cease from evil-speaking by observing that he puts the flesh of the Word of God with the very God <the Word> in heaven where the Word of God ascends.

150. To these things he adds some words about the punishments of sinners, which we also will add in a coherent manner to the things that have been said above. For in the series of accusations, this was the order followed.

151. ORIGEN I think that the soul is like the body in the sense that in the body an excess of nourishment and a detrimental kind and amount of food give rise to fevers, and the fevers too are of different sorts and duration, according to the proportion in which the accumulated intemperateness supplies material and fuel for the fevers. The nature of this material, which is determined by the different degrees of intemperateness, is the cause of either a more acute or a lingering disease. Thus when the soul has gathered together a multitude of evil works and an excess of sins within itself, at a suitable time the entire assembly of evils is stirred up to pay a penalty and is inflamed to punishments. This happens when the mind itself, or conscience, by divine power receives into its memory all those firm impressions and forms that had been stamped on itself when it was sinning. It will see, exposed before its eyes, a kind of history, as it were, of all its deeds that it had done foully and shamefully, or had even committed impiously. At that time the conscience is itself agitated and pierced by its own goads, and it becomes its own accuser and witness. And this, I think, is what the Apostle Paul meant when he says: "While their thoughts either mutually accuse or even defend them on the day when God will judge the secrets of men according to my Gospel through Jesus Christ."⁴⁶⁷

152. PAMPHILUS. Moreover, in the sections that follow he writes more about the punishments of sins in this manner:

153. ORIGEN Now there are many things that are hidden from us, which are known to him alone who is the Physician of our souls. Sometimes, on account of those disorders that we have brought upon ourselves through food and drink, we ourselves deem it necessary for the health of the body to make use of quite severe and bitter medicine. Indeed, at times, if the nature of the disease demands it, we require the rigor of the knife and the severity of amputation. And if the gravity of the disease outstrips even these measures, as a last resort the evil is burned out by fire. If this is so, how much more should one understand that God our Physician, who wants to remove the disorders of our souls that they had contracted from their different sins and wicked deeds, employs penal cures of this sort and, what is more, he applies the penalty of fire to those who have lost the health of their soul!

154. PAMPHILUS. After a few things, he adds this as well:

155. ORIGEN Now Isaiah teaches that the punishment that is said to be applied by fire is very necessary. For he says the following concerning Israel: "The Lord will wash away the filth of the sons and daughters of Zion, and he will purge away the blood from their midst by a spirit of judgment and by a spirit of burning."⁴⁷⁰ But of the Chaldeans he says this: "You have the coals of fire; you will sit upon them: they will be a help to you."⁴⁷¹ And in other passages he says: "The Lord will sanctify them in a burning fire."⁴⁷² And in the prophet Malachi he says this: "The Lord sits and will kindle his people like gold and silver; he will kindle and purify them, and he will smelt the purified sons of Judah."⁴⁷³

156. PAMPHILUS. Now these things are from the books *Peri archon*. But there are innumerable testimonies scattered about in all his books where he asserts things of this sort. We omit them for the sake of brevity. We will mention only one passage where he speaks of these things, namely, his discussion con-

cerning this same kind of punishment in his *Commentary on the Sixth Psalm*.

157. ORIGEN it is possible to consider especially from these sufferings which we feel while placed in this body, which, however great they may be, are surely of brief duration since, if they were even a little stronger, they would at once bring a swift end even to life. After all, many, if the situation demands it, render their soul to these torments for the sake of the confession of religion, but some who are now <set before (*propositi*)> the doorway to the crown deny the faith that they had pledged (*proposuerant*) to confess unto death. And by a complete failure of purpose (*propositi*), they do not endure this, but are overcome by the excessive and intolerable violence of the suffering.

If, then, in this present life the sufferings of punishments are so intolerable, what should one think the situation will be at that time, when the soul no longer makes use of heavier covering,⁴⁷⁵ but when the soul will receive that spiritual covering as a result of the resurrection, and will assuredly feel the force of the suffering more strongly, since its covering has become thinner? For I think that to the extent that there is a great difference in the present world when a naked man is beaten versus one who is clothed, in terms of feeling the torture, because the blows will torture a naked body more than a clothed one, to that extent, I believe, there will be a difference in suffering in the future, when the human body with the covering of its heaviness⁴⁷⁶ laid aside, begins to endure the tortures in its nakedness.

158. PAMPHILUS. I think that even these few testimonies brought forth from his books are sufficient to refute the malicious charge of this accusation. It is obvious that such testimonies are countless and are scattered far and wide in his books.

159. Now we will respond in our own words to those objections they also raise concerning Origen's doctrine of the soul, namely, that he says that the soul was made to exist before the body.

160. Now Origen was aware that this doctrine concerning the soul is not held openly nor manifestly in the ecclesiastical proclamation.⁴⁷⁷ Therefore, if the words of Scripture anywhere suggested to him an occasion, or rather a pretext, for discussing it, he explored and investigated the things that occurred to his mind and he set these things before his readers for consideration and for testing.⁴⁷⁸ He did not openly define these things by way of dogmatic decree or rashly by the authority of his own opinion. Indeed, frequently he even adds these words: “if, however, the words that we have given in explanation concerning the soul seem to have some coherence or find approval.”⁴⁷⁹

161. After all, in so many books of his that cover such diverse topics, on absolutely no occasion do we find a book written by him that is devoted specifically to the soul, in the way that he has a book on martyrdom, on prayer, and on the resurrection. Yet he never published a book that was written specifically on the soul. Instead, in various passages, as we have said above, he discussed the ideas that came to him based on the scriptural contexts. Now this should be seen as an indication of his very great reverence and fear in respect to divine doctrinal matters. For this man, who possessed such great intelligence and such great prudence, indeed who was a teacher of the Church, who spoke of such great matters, did not dare to presume to himself the authority to publish a book written specifically on the soul. It is scarcely to be doubted that this practice of his indicates that he was not bold enough to affirm anything by way of manifest dogma concerning this matter.

162. Finally, in that book that he has written *On the Apostle's Epistle to Titus*, when he describes a heretic and mentions the soul, he says this:

163. ORIGEN But there are also certain other dogmas that are not included in the apostolic traditions. You may be asking whether it is necessary to consider as heretics those who hold various opinions on these matters, or who investigate them in various ways. Consider for instance—and I mean this

as an example—whether one should be considered a heretic who investigates the question of the human soul, since concerning it the Church’s rule has handed down neither that it is derived from the propagation of seed, nor that it is more honorable and more ancient than the structure of bodies.⁴⁸¹ For that reason many have been unable to comprehend what their opinion should be concerning the question of the soul. Moreover, those who have seemed to hold some opinion or to discuss anything are held in suspicion by some, as men who are introducing novelties.

164. PAMPHILUS. Then after a few things he says:

165. ORIGEN Moreover, when you yourself reflect on these matters, consider whether it is necessary rashly to define as a heretic or a churchman the one who thinks in some way, whatever it may be, about these things, or whether it is not dangerous to pronounce about him that “he is perverse and is sinning and is self-condemned”⁴⁸³—this is spoken of heretics—if perchance, on the subjects that we mentioned above, he seems to introduce an opinion, whatever it may be, that sometimes sounds strange to many.

166. PAMPHILUS. Origen himself writes these things in that book that we mentioned above. But to these things we add on our own the following [reflections] that fairness itself seems to demand. If the Church manifestly handed down or proclaimed things that were contrary to Origen’s views, doubtless he would be deservedly censured as one who contradicted and resisted the Church’s decrees. But now, since there is diversity of opinion among all the men of the Church, and seeing that some hold one thing about the soul and others hold something else, and everyone holds different opinions, how is it that Origen should be accused rather than the others, especially since the things that are asserted by the others seem much more absurd, and these things are themselves contradictory?

167. For some are of the opinion that it is only after the bodies have already been prepared and formed in the wombs of

the women that the souls each time are created and inserted into the newly formed body. But those who hold these opinions are unable to go on and exhibit clear proofs from the Holy Scriptures. Moreover, in a certain respect they are accusing the Creator of injustice, because he does not bestow on everyone equally, that is, he does not give equal courses of life to all. For immediately when a soul has been created, when it has as yet committed absolutely no wrong within itself, it is inserted, as it so happens, sometimes into the body of a blind man, at other times into a debilitated body, at other times into healthy and stronger bodies. And to some souls a long life is granted, but to others a very brief life, so that sometimes, as soon as the souls are born, they are expelled from the body. And some souls are even directed to a kind of savage and barbaric manner of life, where nothing humane and decent exists, and, beyond all that, where irreligious native superstitions predominate. Yet other souls are directed to decent men who are sober and humane, where the observance of human laws obtains. Sometimes they are even directed to religious parents, where they receive a noble and honest upbringing, and where they likewise receive an education that is founded on reason. How then can those who defend such opinions assign to divine Providence rectitude and impartiality in dispensing and governing all things, as befits a good and just God?

168. Now consider those who assert that souls come from propagation and are sown immediately together with the bodily seed.⁴⁸⁴ Indeed, some of these are accustomed to claim that the soul is nothing but the in-breathing of the Spirit of God, namely, that which at the beginning of the creation of the world God is said to have breathed into Adam.⁴⁸⁵ Essentially they are professing that the soul is from the same substance of God. If this is true, how will these persons as well not seem in some way to be making assertions that go beyond the rule of Scripture and the definitions of religion? For if the soul is from the substance of God, then the substance of God sins when the soul

sins. Moreover, the substance of God would have to be handed over to punishments because of sin. Furthermore, this theory runs into the problem—and this is extremely absurd—of failing to see that according to this view the soul necessarily dies together with the body and is mortal, if indeed it has been sown, formed, and born together with the body.

169. Next, there are those who claim that a single unique soul was made by God from no existing substances, namely, that soul that was first made in Adam, and from that one the souls of all men now exist and also that the propagation of souls doubtless occurs by bodily descent. What else are these people as well teaching except that souls are mortal? For if they come to exist solely from the seed, like the rest of the living creatures, then we should think the same thing of men, that is, that together with the body the soul too is diffused in the same seed. What, then, do we say about those who are still imperfectly formed and are aborted from the womb? What do we say about the fact that sometimes the seeds perish even before they have been received into the receptacles of natural vessels? In such cases doubtless it will be found that those souls as well that had been inserted into the seeds by a natural method were at the same time equally extinguished and destroyed.

170. Whether, therefore, souls are from the in-breathing of God, or from that single soul that was made first, necessarily they will be destroyed together with the bodies, if they likewise derive their origin with the bodies in accordance with the definition of these people. [For there are two possibilities:] either absolutely nothing of the rational and immortal soul will share in that which has just been destroyed in the womb, and that definition is rejected that affirms that the soul is sown by propagation in the seed with bodies; or, if it does share in what is destroyed, then inevitably one will be forced to confess that the soul is mortal, which our faith assuredly does not accept.

171. Now exactly what are we aiming to prove by all these things? Namely, the following: that just as one would be wrong to call heretics those who hold as true either one of these opinions that we have set forth above, because nothing of certainty seems to have been manifestly spoken in the divine Scrip-

tures about these matters, nor is it contained in the Church's proclamation, so it is unjust to blame Origen when he discusses what seemed right to him [concerning these matters]. This is especially the case [when we consider] that in every way he preserved what chiefly had to be preserved in the Church concerning the confession of the soul: namely, he denied that there are different natures of souls; more than that, he even rebuked those who said this and defeated them with powerful arguments. But he himself confesses that all souls are of one substance and are rational and immortal, free to choose and to will, and that they will also be judged for what they have done in this life; further, he holds that they were made by God, who created and established the universe; but as to when they were made, whether together and all at once, or in an ongoing manner at each birth, what is the danger in holding to one or the other of these two opinions?

172. But it is possible to respond in another way so that absolutely every opportunity for finding fault is excluded. For just as concerning the stars of heaven, those who are in the Church each think differently—some indeed hold the view that they are living beings and of [the class of] rational living beings, but others think that they are irrational, nay rather, that they not only lack a soul and all sensibility but are mere bodies without spirit and sensibility. Yet no one would justly call someone a heretic who holds to one or another of these diverse opinions. Therefore, since there are no clear traditions in the apostolic proclamation concerning these matters, it is also not right to pronounce as heretics those who are in doubt and hold different views concerning the human soul and its origination and origin, especially since in the remaining standards of ecclesiastical doctrine they hold to what is correct and Catholic.⁴⁸⁶

173. Finally, there is the charge of μετενσωμάτωσις, that is, the transmigration of souls. As we have done with the other accusations, we will respond to this charge by citing the words of the accused himself. But first, we will give the following warn-

ing as a necessary preliminary matter. Origen's accusers do not understand the way Origen deals with this problem and how his method of disputation implies that what is being said is not always being declared under his own persona. On the contrary, sometimes Origen discusses things that could be said from the opposite point of view. Failing to pay attention to the fact that this is his way of carrying on his discussions, his accusers object to him regarding this doctrine as if Origen himself believed the things that he had discussed under the persona of his adversary.

174. In short, Origen himself makes clear in the things that he adds after the discussion of the matter itself that he was speaking for the sake of discussing, not asserting, these things. He says the following:

175. ORIGEN But these things, insofar as they concern us, should not be dogmatic decrees, but would have been said for the sake of discussion, and they may be rejected. They have only been said lest it seem that a question that had been raised has gone undiscussed.

176. PAMPHILUS. Now he said this in a passage in which he was investigating the souls of living beings, not the transmigration of souls.

177. He writes about the transmigration of souls in the seventh book of his *Commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew* and says the following:

178. ORIGEN In view of what is said, "He is the Elijah who is to come,"⁴⁸⁹ some are of the opinion that the soul of Elijah was the same as that of John—for they thought that what he said: "He is Elijah" must refer to nothing else but the soul—and from these practically solitary words they have introduced the doctrine of *metempsychosis*, that is, the transmigration of souls, as if Jesus himself were affirming this point. But they should have considered that, if this were true, then something similar should be found in numerous texts of the prophets and the Gospels. Furthermore, even the words that are joined to

these show that a rather concealed and hidden meaning should be sought in the things that have been said rather than what they have understood in accordance with the sense of the letter alone. For he says: "He who has ears to hear, let him hear."⁴⁹⁰

And the following point should be added as well: If, as these people think, there is a transmigration of souls for sins, for what sins was Elijah's soul transmigrated into John, whose coming birth is announced by the very same angel that announced the birth of our Savior Jesus?⁴⁹¹ So then, how is it not most obviously false that he [Elijah] who was so perfect that he did not even experience⁴⁹² that common death⁴⁹³ came to a transmigration of his soul, which according to their assertion, cannot happen except because of sins? Next, how do they explain what is said to John: "Are you Elijah?" and he says: "I am not."⁴⁹⁴ Now, that this too may be shown to agree with the words that the Lord spoke: "If you want to accept it, he is the Elijah who is to come,"⁴⁹⁵ his words: "He is the Elijah" must be referred to the spirit and power of Elijah.⁴⁹⁶ For John "went forth in the spirit and power of Elijah to turn the hearts of the fathers to their sons."⁴⁹⁷

179. PAMPHILUS. He speaks of the same subject in the eleventh book of the *Commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew*:

180. ORIGEN Now, those who are estranged from the Catholic faith⁴⁹⁹ think that souls are transferred from human bodies into the bodies of animals⁵⁰⁰ according to the different kinds of their sins. But we who have never found this provision in the divine Scripture say that when the human intelligence, by means of great negligence in life, becomes wild and abandoned, it becomes like an irrational beast—by ignorance and

negligence, not by nature. And in a similar manner, those who have become this way have been made this way by the negligence of their own intentions in that they have neglected to receive instruction. Now if, [on the other hand,] they hand themselves over to instruction and rational training, they become rational and intelligent, just as it is written in the Gospels about those dogs who ate “from the crumbs that fall from their masters’ table.”⁵⁰¹ The Canaanite woman had been one of them, but when she was converted, she became a daughter of God in accordance with what the Savior says to her: “O daughter, great is your faith.”⁵⁰² For just as the mind’s virtue confers to each one [the power] to become a son of God,⁵⁰³ so the mind’s evil and the madness and stupidity of one’s words cause some people to be called dogs, according to the authority of Scripture. And it is in a similar way that one should also understand the names of the other speechless animals.

181. PAMPHILUS. He speaks of the same topic in the thirteenth book of his *Commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew*:

182. ORIGEN In this passage,⁵⁰⁵ it appears to me that it is Elijah who is spoken of, not the soul of Elijah. Otherwise, we would fall into a doctrine that is estranged from the Church of God, namely, the transmigration of souls, which has not been handed down from the apostles nor has provision ever been made for it in the Scriptures. For it is contrary to those things that are spoken by the Apostle, that “the things that are seen are temporal.”⁵⁰⁶ Moreover, when would be the event that all Scripture affirms is to take place, that the present age must end?⁵⁰⁷ Further, that statement could not stand firm: “Heaven and earth will pass away,”⁵⁰⁸ nor that which the Apostle says: “For the form of this world will pass away,”⁵⁰⁹ and the following: “The heavens will perish,”⁵¹⁰ and the things that follow.

For if, as the originators of this dogma say, no one can be restored to that initial state that existed, from the beginning of the world until the end, what need is there for the soul to be changed and transferred a second or third time, or multiple times? For it is in this manner, they say, that each one's transgressions are paid for, as one submits oneself to punishments, that is to say, when souls are repeatedly transmigrated into different bodies. But this will assuredly be in vain if there will be no end of the correction and no time when the soul is not transferred. And if the souls, because of their transgressions, always have to return to different bodies, what end will ever be given to the world that would bring fulfillment to the statement: "Heaven and earth will pass away"?⁵¹¹

And if it be conceded, for instance, that there is someone without sin for whom it is no longer necessary for him to return to a body, through how many ages shall we think perhaps scarcely one soul would be found which is absolutely pure and does not require a transfer of body? And if that too is conceded, it again becomes contrary to its own dogma: for if we grant that there are a few souls that can be individually restored to perfection, so that they no longer need to enter into bodies, it is necessary for each of the souls that have been restored to perfection, granting that it is through infinite ages and immense amounts of time [that this takes place], to cease making further use of the body. And by this means it is necessary that the world come to an end and be dissolved. Yet this is not the way things appear in the Holy Scripture, which says that a multitude of sinners will remain at the end of the age. This is very clearly indicated in the Gospel where it is written: "But do you think that the Son of Man, when he comes, will he find faith on the earth?"⁵¹² "For just as in the days of Noah, so shall be also the coming of the Son of Man."⁵¹³

183. PAMPHILUS. And after discussing many things from the Scriptures, Origen then declares his own opinion [about this matter] as follows:

184. ORIGEN Now there will be vengeance at that time for them, but not by the transmigration of their souls; for there will no longer be the opportunity for sinning. Instead, the punishments will be of another sort. For the transference of bodies will not be the punishment for sinners, as if no external penalties should be thought to be inflicted. Rather, there is a manner of punishments for sinners, that is, in order that they may receive the punishment of their transgressions for those things that they have done in this world.

Yet it is obvious to those who are able to draw accurate conclusions that each of these reasons contradicts the teaching that says that souls transmigrate. But if pagan authors who have reached this opinion as a conclusion based upon their own principles want to follow this doctrine and say that there is no doubt that this world can never end, since these things happen, then it follows that those who want this teaching do not believe in our Scripture, which very openly declares that there will be an end of the world. And they <should> not seek, in these same Scriptures, expositions or ridiculous and worthless assertions from which it is impossible to prove that according to our Scriptures there is never going to be an end of the world.

185. PAMPHILUS. He speaks on the same subject in his book *On the Proverbs of Solomon*:

186. ORIGEN Now it seems to me that that assertion according to which it is claimed that souls are transferred from body to body has even reached some who seem to believe in Christ and who [derive that assertion] from certain texts in the Holy Scripture. These people do not understand how the things that are written ought to be interpreted. For they do not pay heed to how a man becomes either a chicken or a horse or a mule. They thought that the human soul is transmigrated into the bodies of cattle, so that they reckon that at some time it receives the body of a serpent or of a viper, at another time of a horse or of the other animals. It is logical, then, that they should also say that the devil, who is called a lion in the

Scripture,⁵¹⁶ uses the body of a lion, or the flesh of a dragon, since he is named a dragon.⁵¹⁷ So shall it be that, according to them, this transmigration of souls reaches even into the nature of demons, so that there could sometimes be a lion or a dragon that has the devil for its soul.

187. PAMPHILUS. And shortly after this he says:

188. ORIGEN But all these additional fabrications are in vain. For it is obvious that the Lord has determined in advance a single punishment for sins, both for the nature of demons as well as for the human race. The Lord himself has indicated this by his own judgment when he says: "Go into the eternal fire which God has prepared for the devil and his angels."⁵¹⁹ In that passage he shows that the same kind of punishments has been prepared for human sinners and for the devil and his angels, though in that punishment the measure of punishment may be different. For some are tormented more strongly and gravely owing to the magnitude of their sins, but others are punished more lightly, namely, those whose sins were less grave and less severe.