



***“First Addendum to Notes on St. Augustine of Hippo’s
A TREATISE ON THE PREDESTINATION OF THE SAINTS”***

By

Rev. Roderick Andrew Lee Ford, J.D., Litt.D., LL.D.

August 31, 2025

Table of Contents

**First Addendum to “Notes on St. Augustine’s
A Treatise on the Predestination of the Saints ”**

Introduction	2
Chapter 1. “Earthly Dominion and the General Power to Judge”	4
Chapter 2. “The Church and the Earthly (or Civil) Dominion”	6
Chapter 3. “The Church and the Ecclesiastical (or Spiritual) Dominion”	12
Chapter 4. “The Pharisees, Predestination, and the Apostle Paul”	15
Conclusion.	18

Introduction

This work is an addendum to a previous treatise with the same title and dated May 19, 2024.¹ Like the first treatise, I am concerned here with the wasteful trivialities regarding one of the major theological disputes between the two broad wings of Protestantism or Puritanism; – namely, “Predestination.”

During my scholastic studies at Whitefield Theological Seminary, I wanted to address the dispute between Rev. George Whitefield (1714 - 1770) and the Rev. John Wesley (1703 – 1791). I concluded that Rev. Whitefield had correctly point out that Article 17 of the Church of England’s Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion had provided a valid definition of “Predestination” which the early Methodists were obliged to uphold, to wit:

XVII. OF PREDESTINATION AND ELECTION

PREDESTINATION to Life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (**before the foundations of the world were laid**) he hath constantly decreed **by his counsel secret to us**, to deliver from curse and damnation **those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation**, as vessels made to honour.

Wherefore, they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God be called **according to God's purpose by his Spirit working in due season**: they through Grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by adoption: they be made like the image of his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

As the godly consideration of Predestination, and our Election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal Salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God: So, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's Predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the Devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchlessness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scripture: and, in our doings, that Will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God.

¹ See **Exhibit A**, below.

I note that in pointing out this Article 17 of the Church of England’s Articles of Religion, Rev. Whitefield and the Methodist preachers were involved with defining and shaping the foundations of the early Methodist movement. But the fall-out between Whitefield and Wesley over the subject of predestination seemed superfluous and wasteful. In the end, there developed two broad camps of Methodists—those who followed the Calvinistic approach, which included primarily the Welsh Methodists, and those who continued to follow the Wesleyan approach, or the Arminian-leaning branch of the Methodist movement.

As a Puritan theologian, I have rejected the two extreme, opposing views—much to the chagrin of my academic advisor, Dr. Kenneth Talbot, who was a staunch Calvinist.

Instead, I explored the Protest and Puritan movements as they existed 100 years before the births of either Wesley or Whitefield. I especially enjoyed reading about the Puritans. For example, I especially enjoyed the writings of Richard Baxter (1615 – 1691), and found them to be very persuasive, and that they reflected a “middle way” between Arminianism and Calvinism.

Likewise, in Augustine of Hippo’s *Confessions*, which I have discussed below, there was yet another ancient reflection of that same “middle way” that I had discovered in Baxter’s writings.

But much to my chagrin, when with great excitement I brought the writings of both Richard Baxter and Aurelius Augustine to the attention of my academic mentor, Dr. Talbot, he seemed surprised that I had still not completely come to the side of the staunch Calvinists, and that I had still appeared to remain on the fence as a straddler.

This paper—which is a brief preview of some of Augustine’s theology that is contained within his *Confessions*—is actually made in support of my defense of the “middle way” position on the question of predestination. Hence, on the soteriological question of “Predestination,” I am a Puritan after the order of Richard Baxter, and an Augustinian after the order of Augustine of Hippo.

Chapter One:

“Earthly Dominion and the General Power to Judge”

This may seem redundant, but it is actually necessary to comprehend the mode and manner in which Augustine of Hippo’s theology addresses the theological question of “Predestination.” For Augustine, that question is so sublime that it falls far beyond the scope of human ability. Moreover, the answer to that question is not within the power or authority of mankind—whether it acts spiritually as an ecclesiastical judge or civilly or politically as a civil magistrate.

First defense: the theological question of Predestination falls outside of the scope of civil judges’ power to judge whether a Person has been Predestinated to do good or evil, or to receive eternal salvation

St. Augustine’s *Confessions* (Book XIII) reminds us that the Christian religion must be construed universally and broadly in its grand scope, because God has given all humanity “dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over all cattle and wild beasts, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth.”² Thus, by virtue of this general dominion on the earth, mankind “judges and approves what he finds right and disapproves what he finds amiss....”³

This universal earthly dominion implies, according to Augustine, the power to judge. “Now this phrase, ‘he judges all things,’” writes Augustine, “means that man has dominion....”⁴

Now this dominion and power to judge are not restricted to any particular nation or ethnic group, but is distributed evenly and broadly throughout the world.

² St. Augustine, *Confessions* (New York, N.Y.: Barnes and Nobles Classics, 2007), p. 249.

³ Ibid., p. 250.

⁴ Ibid., p. 249.

Yet, as I shall discuss in the next chapter, Augustine is interested in the “church” and its special dominion and power of judgment: here, he delineates the limitations of the church’s power to comprehend or to dispense the theological doctrine of predestination.

Chapter Two:

“The Church and the Earthly (or Civil) Dominion”

The natural tendency of hierarchical churches throughout the past two millennia has been to usurp the exclusive domain and authority of God over the question of “Predestination.” The Roman Catholic Church’s soteriological system was notorious for doing this; its system of indulgences and purgatory reflected a sort of theory on the “power of the keys” having been given to the church to render such judgments as to eternal salvation or eternal damnation. Surprisingly, one of the Catholic Church’s early fathers, Augustine of Hippo, explicitly disagreed with that theological system.

Second defense: the theological question of “Predestination” falls outside of the scope of ecclesiastical judges’ power to judge whether a Person has been Predestinated to do good or evil, or to receive eternal salvation

Significantly, given the universal dominion of mankind generally, Augustine’s *Confessions* held that the “church... by the grace [which God] have given us” has some “spiritual authority” over “those who are spiritually subject” to it.⁵

The ability to judge—and to understand or to make judgment—is a matter of “spiritual grace where, as far as sex is concerned, there is neither male nor female, just as there is neither Jew nor Greek, nor bond nor free.”⁶

This denotes a sort of egalitarian democracy within the church— an institution where “[s]piritual men... whether those who are in authority or those who are subject to authority, judge spiritually.”⁷

⁵ Ibid, p. 249.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

Significantly, Augustine sees in the natural order (i.e., the laws of nature) the very signs and symbols of the Christian sacraments, whereby the church, with spiritual grace may likewise better comprehend the meaning of the Sacred Scriptures, to wit:

Man, then... received dominion over the fish of the sea, and the fowls of the air; and over the cattle, and all the earth; and over all creeping things which creep on the earth. Indeed, he judges and approves what he finds right and disapproves what he finds amiss, whether in the celebration of those mysteries by which are initiated those whom your mercy has sought out in the midst of many waters; or in that sacrament in which is exhibited the fish itself which, being raised from the depths, the pious earth feeds upon; or, in the signs and symbols of words, which are subject to the authority of your book—such signs as burst forth and sound from the mouth, as if it were flying under the firmament, interpreting, expounding, discoursing, disputing, blessing, invoking you, so that the people may answer, ‘Amend.’⁸

Significantly, Augustine also sees divine order in the physical subordination of women (i.e., the wife) to men (i.e., the husband), where he writes:

And just as there is in his soul one element which controls by its power of reflection and another which has been made subject so that it should obey, so also, physically the woman was made for the man; for, although she had a like nature of rational intelligence in the mind, still in the sex of her body she should be similarly subject to the sex of her husband, as the appetite of action is subjected to the deliberation of the mind in order to conceive the rules of right action. These things we see, and each of them is good; and the whole is very good!⁹

⁸ Ibid., p. 250 (referencing 1 Corinthians 14:16).

⁹ Ibid., p. 258.

Perhaps this is because, in Augustine's theology, it is not permissible nor wise for the Church to question God's reasons for ordering nature (or the laws of nature) in the manner in which he has ordered them.¹⁰

First off, according to Augustine, the church, or "Spiritual men," must "not judge by the light of that spiritual knowledge which shines in the firmament, for it is inappropriate for them to judge by so sublime an authority."¹¹

"Man, then," writes Augustine, "even if he was made after your own image, did not receive the power of dominion over the lights of heaven, nor over the secret heaven, nor over the day and the night which you called forth before the creation of the heaven, nor over the gathering together of the waters which is the sea."¹²

Here, Augustine admonishes the church to not place itself in God's chair and attempt to reason and judge from so sublime a perspective as eternity or of divine purpose. For, similar to Article 17 within the Church of England's Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion ("Of Predestination and Election"), God's eternal perspective and eternal purpose are indeed "secret to us" and foreclosed from our understanding.¹³

Second, the church, or "Spiritual men," must not "judge concerning your book itself, although there are some things in it which are not clear.... [W]e submit... that what is hidden from our sight is still rightly and truly spoken."¹⁴ Here, Augustine reminds the Christian faithful that there are definite boundaries to

¹⁰ See, e.g., Romans 11: 25 – 33 ("His judgments are unsearchable, and His ways past finding out.")

¹¹ *Confessions*, supra, p. 249.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 250.

¹³ So, too, where some Calvinists insists that their conceptualization of predestination is so far superior to those of the Wesleyan-Arminian camp, that the latter group should be shunned or condemned, such Calvinistic judgements represent a sort of impiety, because it tends to judge fellow Christians with unauthorized "spiritual knowledge which shines in the firmament." Here, I have cautioned my Calvinistic brothers who tend to do this.

¹⁴ St. Augustine, *Confessions*, supra, p. 249.

questioning and criticizing the Sacred Scriptures. Instead, the Christian faithful “must be a doer of the law rather than its judge.”¹⁵

Third, the church, or “Spiritual men,” have no authority, no divine grace, and no sufficient spiritual or intellectual insight that allows them to ascertain who are members of the invisible church, or to ascertain and determine who will ultimately be redeemed and saved. On this very important point, Augustine writes:

Neither does the spiritual man judge concerning that division between spiritual and carnal men which is known to your eyes, God, and which may not, as yet, be made manifest to us by their external works, so that we may know them by their fruits; yet you, God, know them already and you have divided and called them secretly, before the firmament was made. Nor does a man, even though he is spiritual, judge the disordered state of society in this world. For what business of his is it to judge those who are without, since he cannot know which of them may later on come into the sweetness of your grace, and which of them may continue in the perpetual bitterness of their impiety?¹⁶

Here, as I have frequently argued, Augustine’s position is similar to that of Rev. John Wesley’s general “Arminian” approach to Gospel-preaching. Although, only God knows who will be saved, the church itself certainly does not know. And since the church does not know who will be saved, it must treat all persons as though they might be potentially called to salvation in accord with God’s eternal will that is “secret to us.”¹⁷

This “Reformed” and “Augustinian” doctrine was incorporated into Article 17 of the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion of the Church of England.

¹⁵ What those boundaries entail are beyond the scope of this small treatise, yet in Augustinian hermeneutics, all theological questions boil down to two major commandments: love of God and love of neighbor. This is explicitly set forth in Matthew 25: 34- 40.

¹⁶ St. Augustine, *Confessions*, supra, pp. 249-250.

¹⁷ See, e.g., Romans 11: 25 – 33 (“His judgments are unsearchable, and His ways past finding out.”) See, also, Article 17 of the Church of England’s Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion.

Therefore, I hold that there is really no room—as a pragmatic or practical matter—for the Calvinistic wing of the Puritan movement to keep up its vociferous objections to the Wesleyan-Arminian wing of the Puritan movement.

Perhaps this is why Rev. Whitefield eventually closed ranks with the Wesley brothers and continued to support the Methodist movement—regardless of the soteriological positions of the individual pastors or churches—even preaching under the auspices of Quakers, Baptists, Presbyterians, as well as Methodists.¹⁸

During my many discussions with Dr. Talbot of Whitefield Theological Seminary, I frequently pointed out this theological convergence between Whitefield and Wesley, and I assured him that my conception of “Oxford Methodism” was ultimately to bring harmony and peace to the two divergent camps of Calvinism and Arminianism within the Puritan-Protestant traditions.

I continued to make the case for the Reverend John Wesley. Rev. Wesley had held that, as a practical matter, the Gospel must be preached generally and universally to all human souls— without judgement upon any particular person or class of persons— because he believed that all persons could turn towards God and be saved. Furthermore, Rev. Wesley held generally that ecclesiastical regimen was good and even necessary because even the faithful Christian could turn back.

Of course, Rev. Whitefield and the Calvinistic Methodist disagreed with this latter portion of Wesley’s theological positions—because, as the Calvinistic doctrine holds, God’s salvation and grace are “irresistible,” as they have been decreed from eternity, and, assuming “election,” the Christian faithful does not, and cannot, turn back.

¹⁸ See, generally, Arnold Dallimore, *George Whitefield: The Life and Times of The Great Evangelist of the 18th Century Revival* (Peoria, IL: Versa Press, Inc., 2019), Vol. II., p. 257, stating:

During his ministry in England in the years immediately after the controversy of 1741-1744, he had devoted himself largely to his own movement. Now, however, having severed his particular ties with one branch of the Revival he was free to assist it in all its branches. In later pages we shall see him preaching under the auspices of Independents, Presbyterians, Baptists and sometimes Quakers, and above all helping Wesley, and this was the work he began to undertake from this time.... [A]nd he defined the basis of his collaboration, saying: ‘I truly love all that love the glorious Emmanuel, and though I cannot depart from the principles which I believe are clearly revealed in the book of God, yet I can cheerfully associate with those that differ from me, if I have reason to think they are united to our common Head.’

However, while relying upon Augustine's theology—as I have already outlined it above—I eventually came to the conclusion that the present conflict between the Calvinists and the Arminian Protestants may ultimately constitute *theological impiety*, because, as Augustine holds in *Confessions*, to make such judgments on predestination is to usurp the power and position of God himself, whose divine light upon the subject matter of predestination has not been revealed to mankind.

Significantly, for Augustine, Calvin,¹⁹ and Wesley alike, (1) the Gospel must be preached to all of humanity; (2) *only* God does the drawing and the saving; and (3) the persons whom God ultimately will save are “secret to us.”

With these three fundamental soteriological principles in mind, the differences between the Wesleyan-Arminian and the Calvinistic doctrines become trivial—at least among the rank-and-file Christian layperson who is neither a pastor or theologian, or for an Augustinian theologian such as the undersigned author.

For that reason, I cannot see how those differences should matter to practical, pragmatic preaching or pastoring the flock.²⁰

¹⁹ John Calvin (1509 – 1564).

²⁰ See, e.g., Don Thorsen, *Calvin vs. Wesley: Bringing Belief in Line with Practice* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2013).

Chapter Three:

“The Church and the Ecclesiastical (or Spiritual) Dominion”

In the previous two chapters, we have briefly observed that the power of dominion rests with mankind in general and with the church in particular; but, with respect to the church, that power of dominion in rendering judgments has *definite limitations* or hermeneutical *restrictions* which Augustine discusses in Book XIII of *Confessions*.

Third defense: the theological question of “Predestination” clearly falls outside of the “power of correction” of human judges, whether civil or ecclesiastical

In any event, in *Confessions*, Augustine accepts the authority of individual Christians to read and to judge the Sacred Scriptures for themselves, where he writes: “[t]he spiritual man also judges by approving what is right and reproving what he finds amiss in the works and morals of the faithful...”²¹ This is a core component of the Protestant Reformation— certainly of reformers such as Martin Luther and John Knox.

But Augustine also seems to accept the authority of church governors, rulers, elders, bishops and the like— as well as of individual Christians— to judge matters of Christian holiness and of faithful, righteous living, where he writes: “[t]he spiritual man... judges of the living soul, which is then made to live by the disciplining of its affections in chastity, in fasting, and in holy meditation.”²²

Yet, together with all just judges with authority to judge—whether civil or ecclesiastical—the individual Christian and the church as a corporate body have a duty and a right, according to Augustine, to judge “all those things which are

²¹ Ibid., p. 250.

²² Ibid.

perceived by the bodily senses. For it can be said that he should judge in *all matters* about which he also has *the power of correction*.”²³

Here, I contend, that both the civil polity and the church—as historically a part of tradition and custom in the West—ought to cooperate in judging, and in making just judgments in order to effectuate the correction of societal wrongs.

This Augustinian theology brings the church out of a state of seclusion—as some Protestant sects tend to embrace—into the public square of the “Greco-Roman” polis or city-state, where reasoned discourse and deliberation are held in high esteem.

For Augustine, the Christian must participate in the secular or worldly act of judging and in the making of just judgments.²⁴ Under Augustine’s theological scheme, the Calvinistic dichotomy between the “elect” and the “reprobate” only

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ I do not want to get ahead of myself—I plan to take up this question in a future paper or letter. But suffice it to say, Augustine’s comprehensive conceptualization of God lends itself to the support of Rev. John Wesley’s general approach to preaching or proclaiming the Gospel, social holiness, and ideas on general atonement. Both Wesley and Augustine would have the Christian to actively engage in repairing the world, through acts of community service. See, e.g., St. Augustine, *The City of God*, supra, p. 682, stating:

What shall I say of these judgments which men pronounce on men, and which are necessary in communities, whatever outward peace they enjoy? Melancholy and lamentable judgments they are, since the judges are men who cannot discern the consciences of those at their bar.... If such darkness shrouds social life, will a wise judge take his seat on the bench or no? Beyond question he will. For human society, which he thinks it a wickedness to abandon, constrains him and compels him to this duty.”

And see, also, *The City of God*, pp. 577-578, stating:

Now, he does judgment and justice who live aright. But he live aright who yields obedience to God when He commands. ‘The end of the commandment,’ that is, to which the commandment has reference, ‘is charity out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned.’ Moreover, this ‘charity,’ as the Apostle John testifies, ‘is of God.’ **Therefore to do justice and judgment is of God.** But what is ‘in the midst of the earth?’...Therefore, ‘in the midst of the earth,’ that is, while our soul is shut up in this earthly body, judgment and justice are to be done, which shall be profitable for us hereafter, when ‘every one shall receive according to that he hath done in the body, whether good or bad.’ In the same way we may suitably understand what we read in the psalm, ‘But God, our King before the worlds, hath wrought salvation in the midst of the earth;’ so that the Lord Jesus may be understood to be our God who is before the worlds, because by Him the worlds were made, working our salvation in the midst of the earth, for the Word was made flesh and dwelt in an earthly body.

muddies the waters and creates great confusion among the Christian faithful, in terms of how to respond to persons who might exemplify all the signs and symptoms of being “reprobates”; because, under both general ethical, moral, and legal codes, as well as basic Christian doctrine, the duty to provide even-handed, objective justice is paramount.²⁵

But mankind has no power whatsoever over who God has foreknown (i.e., “predestinated”) will receive eternal salvation or eternal damnation. That power being foreclosed to mankind, not even bishops or synods have the authority to render judgments over it—and to “judge sinners” is sheer speculation that is tantamount to spiritual impiety.

²⁵ See, e.g., Genesis 18: 18-19 (“... to do justice and judgment”).

Chapter Four:

“The Pharisees, Predestination, and the Apostle Paul”

Finally, I turn briefly to the Jewish theological tradition. Here, we may consider the biblical fact the Apostle Paul—who first introduced the words “predestinate” in the Sacred Scriptures—was a Jewish Pharisee, viz:

“For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren.” -- Romans 8: 29.

“Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will.” – Ephesian 1:5.

This leads us to the question: did Paul’s conception of predestination come from his Pharisee training and understanding of Jewish law and scripture? ²⁶ (I believe that it did).

If so, does Augustine’s, Calvin’s or Wesley’s soteriology align with that Jewish or Pauline conception of predestination? According to the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, the Jewish conception of predestination is described as follows:

The belief that the destiny of man is determined beforehand by God. ‘Predestination’ in this sense is not to be confounded with the term ‘preordination,’ applied to the moral agents as predetermining either election to eternal life or reprobation. **This latter view of predestination, held by Christian and Mohammedan theologians, is foreign to Judaism, which, professing the principle of Free Will, teaches that eternal life and reprobation are dependent solely upon man's good or evil actions.** It is in regard to the material life, as to whether man will experience good fortune or meet adversity, that Judaism recognizes a divine decision. According to Josephus, who desired to present the Jewish parties as so many philosophical schools,

²⁶ Kaufmann Kohler and Isaac Broyd , “Predestination,” *Jewish Encyclopedia*
<https://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/>

the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes were divided on this question. **The Pharisees held that not all things are divinely predestined, but that some are dependent on the will of man;** the Sadducees denied any interference of God in human affairs; while **the Essenes ascribed everything to divine predestination** ("B. J." ii. 8, § 14; "Ant." xiii. 5, § 9).

In this controversy the real point at issue was the question of divine providence. As followers of Epicurus, the Sadducees, according to Josephus, held that all the phenomena of this world are due to chance and they denied the existence of a divine providence. The Essenes attributed everything to the will of God, and, exaggerating the conception of divine providence, denied to man any initiative. **The Pharisees, fully aware that predestination precludes free-will, adopted a middle view, declaring that man is subject to predestination in his material life, but is completely free in his spiritual life.** This view is expressed in the teaching of R. Akiba (Abot iii. 15): **"All is foreseen, yet freedom is granted"**; and in the similar saying of R. Hanina, "All is in the power of God, except the fear of God" (Ber. 33b; Niddah 16b). Another saying of Hanina's is, **"A man does not hurt his finger in this world unless it has been decreed above"** (Hul. 7b). Similarly it is said, **"The plague may rage for seven years, and yet no man will die before the appointed hour"** (Sanh. 29a; Yeb. 114b).

The most striking example of predestinarian belief found in the Talmud is the legend concerning Eleazar ben Pedat. This amora, being in straitened circumstances, asked God how long he would suffer from his poverty. The answer, received in a dream, was, "My son, wouldst thou have Me overthrow the world?" (Ta'an. 25a); the meaning being that Eleazar's poverty could not be helped, he having been predestined to be poor.²⁷

The Pharisees' view that **"not all things are divinely predestined, but that some are dependent on the will of man"**²⁸ appears to be the same theological view expressed by Augustine in *The City of God* (426 or 427 A.D.) and *On Grace and*

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

Free Will (426 or 427 A.D.) That same middle-ground view of the Pharisees is embraced, too, in John Wesley's *Predestination Calmly Considered* (1752). Nevertheless, just a few years later, we find in Augustine's *A Treatise on the Predestination of the Saints* (429 A.D) a clearly definition of predestination that is closer in tone and content to that of the Jewish Essenes,²⁹ and to the later doctrine espoused by John Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (1536).

The same tensions between Calvinist and Arminian Christians regarding the theology and philosophy of predestination can be found within the Jewish theological and philosophical traditions as well. Within Judaism, the Pharisees' position on predestination is reflected the Wesleyan-Arminian position on the same topic; whereas the Essenes' position on predestination is reflected in the Calvinist position. Hence, this dichotomy of viewpoints on predestination appears to be natural or normal; nay, it reflects Paul's views in his Epistle to the Romans (Romans 11:33) and Augustine's views in *Confessions* that some aspects of God's eternal decrees are far beyond the domain of human dominion and judgment—hence, “unsearchable judgments” and “ways past finding out.”³⁰

²⁹ Ibid. (“... the Essenes ascribed everything to divine predestination”).

³⁰ Within the Jewish tradition, the attributes of Yahweh {G-d} include his awesome incomprehensibility. See, e.g., AI Overview, stating “[T]he Torah describes God as a mystical, unknowable entity, and Jewish tradition encourages trust in God's divine plan, even when it is beyond human understanding.”

Conclusion

John Calvin considered himself to be “Augustinian” and did not perceive that his theology deviated in any way from Augustine’s. For this reason, I have written this brief note with that historical and theological fact in mind. If Calvin held Augustine’s ideas in such high regard, then why should present-day theologians not interpret Calvin’s writings in light of Augustine’s writings on the same theological topics. Here, my critique of the Calvinists’ vociferous opposition to the Wesleyan-Arminian position on “Predestination” is based upon the following three objections, which are extrapolated from Augustine’s *Confessions*:

First defense: the theological question of “Predestination” falls outside of the scope of civil judges’ power to judge whether a Person has been Predestinated to do good or evil, or to receive eternal salvation

Second defense: the theological question of “Predestination” falls outside of the scope of ecclesiastical judges’ power to judge whether a Person has been Predestinated to do good or evil, or to receive eternal salvation

Third defense: the theological question of “Predestination” clearly falls outside of the “power of correction” of human judges, whether civil or ecclesiastical

Thus, it is clear that Augustine does not counsel the Christian faithful to haggle over theological questions of regarding the order of God’s divine decrees on salvation or predestination, because mankind was given no dominion to govern, or to judge, such eternal matters as election, predestination, and the foreknowledge of God. This is plain from the biblical language that certain theological questions—such as “Predestination”—fall into the category of God’s “unsearchable

judgments” that are “past finding out.”³¹ Hence, as a practical, pragmatic matter, Calvinistic and Wesleyan-Arminian modes and methods of preaching, teaching, and spreading the Gospel are uncannily similar despite the dichotomy of their viewpoints on “Predestination.”

THE END

³¹ Romans 11:33.

EXHIBIT A

“Notes on St. Augustine of Hippo’s

A TREATISE ON THE PREDESTINATION OF THE SAINTS”



**“Notes On St. Augustine of Hippo’s
A TREATISE ON THE PREDESTINATION OF THE SAINTS”**

By

Rev. Roderick Andrew Lee Ford, J.D., Litt.D., LL.D.

May 19, 2024

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
Part I. Augustine’s Assessment in <i>On Grace and Free Will</i> and in <i>The City of God</i>	4
Part II. Augustine’s Assessment in <i>On the Predestination of the Saints</i>	16
Conclusion	22
Appendix: St. Augustine, <i>A Treatise on the Predestination of the Saints</i>	23

Introduction

This paper is my recollection of several theological course papers on predestination which I researched and wrote during the period 2020 to 2022 at Whitefield Theological Seminary. Since that period, I have received and read Augustine of Hippo's work *A Treatise on the Predestination of the Saints*, and shared my thoughts orally with some of the brothers at Whitefield; but due to my busy schedule, I am just now finding the time to put my thoughts in writing. I have decided to do so now for a number of reasons. First, I think that it is now appropriate to set down in writing precisely what I mean by describing myself as an Augustinian theologian or a quasi-Calvinists or quasi-Calvinistic – which most Primitive Baptists claim to be. See, e.g., "Augustine's Influence on John Calvin."¹ In other words, I do not support "supralapsarian" double-predestination; and, thus, I am a "moderate" Calvinist. Secondly, I desire to state why, in the broad world of Methodism, I am more closer to theological position of Rev. George Whitefield than to Rev. John Wesley on the question of "grace," "predestination," and soteriology; while, simultaneously, I am in complete agreement with Rev. Wesley's views on "social holiness" and of broad-based "social justice" objectives. And, thirdly, I desire to make a contribution toward bringing together conservative Evangelicals who are either Arminian-leaning or Calvinistic-leaning – whether Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Independent, etc. – under one ecumenical camp, which I have called "Puritanism," "Oxford Methodism," or "Reformed Methodist Theology" – which is a theology, as I conceived it, that is fundamentally anchored in the theological doctrines of Augustine of Hippo.²

¹ "Augustine's influence on John Calvin"

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Augustine%27s_influence_on_John_Calvin#:~:text=Specialist%20of%20Augustine%2C%20Phillip%20Cary,whole%20body%20of%20the%20Reformers.%22

² Ibid.

Now according to Roman Catholic on-line source *New Advent*, Augustine's publication *On Grace and Free Will* was completed in 426 or 427 A.D. Coincidentally, Augustine's magnum opus, *The City of God*, was completed or published during the same period, in 426 A.D.³ Hence, I have sort of lumped these two works together for the objective on analyzing Augustine's views on predestination during the later stage of this ministry and life. In other words, *On Grace and Free Will* and *The City of God* present a clear, unified picture of what Augustine of Hippo's theological views were on the questions of "salvation," "grace," "free will," and "predestination" up to the year 428 AD. For in these two publications, we find a description of predestination and grace that is similar in content and analysis to those that are found in the Arminian and Wesleyan descriptions of those theological concepts. Here, we should note that if great theological mind of Augustine of Hippo himself evolved over several decades, then we Puritans of different persuasions – whether Arminian or Calvinistic – ought to be tolerant with one another.

The last publication which I shall discuss is Augustine of Hippo's *Treatise On the Predestination of the Saints*,⁴ which was published in 428 or 429, just a few years after the first two publications previously mentioned. In *Predestination of the Saints*, Augustine of Hippo's objective is to clear up any inconsistencies or unclear assertions on predestination and grace that were contained in his earlier writings. For in this last publication, completed in circa 429 AD, we find a much more conservative or

³ <https://www.britannica.com/topic/The-City-of-God> ("The City of God, philosophical treatise vindicating Christianity, written by the medieval philosopher St. Augustine as *De civitate Dei contra paganos* (Concerning the City of God Against the Pagans) about 413–426 CE. A masterpiece of Western culture, *The City of God* was written in response to pagan claims that the sack of Rome by barbarians in 410 was one of the consequences of the abolition of pagan worship by Christian emperors.")

⁴ The Full Text can be viewed here: <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/15121.htm>

“Calvinistic” doctrine on grace, free will, and predestination that is more closely affiliated with those of John Calvin and the Reformed theologians.

Hence, Augustine’s assessment of predestination supports the Protestant version of soteriology. The Wesleyan-Arminian claims and contentions are not wholly absent in Augustine’s final assessment of predestination in 428 or 429. However, Augustine’s final assessment tends to lean more in favor of the Calvinistic version of predestination, than of the Wesleyan-Arminian versions. But, clearly, Augustine rejects the theological doctrine of “double predestination,” because God does not create or cause sin. But Augustine repeatedly concludes in *Predestination of the Saints* that the reasons why God chose to save some, and not others, are nevertheless altogether just, while paraphrasing or quoting Romans 11:33, to wit:

Oh, the depth of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God!

How unsearchable his judgments,
and his paths beyond tracing out!

Ultimately, the ways, truth, and justice of God are unsearchable and beyond human capacity to fully comprehend.

I. Augustine’s Assessment of Grace and Predestination in *On Grace and Free Will* and in *The City of God*.

Now the seeds of the Protestant Reformation are richly contained in the theological writing of St. Augustine of Hippo, a doctor of the Roman Catholic Church.

In *On Grace and Free Will* (426 or 427 A.D.) Augustine sets forth a simple and cogent argument for the doctrine of “justification thorough faith alone, and not works.” This argument was embraced by Martin Luther and utilized in his famous *Ninety-Five Theses*, which launched the Protestant Reformation in Europe. Soon thereafter, two of the Protestant

Reformation's greatest leaders, Martin Luther and John Calvin, incorporated St. Augustine's theology on ecclesiology, law, and the doctrine of justification through faith alone into their polemics which they used as the basis for separation from the Roman Catholic Church.

In both *Grace and Free Will* (427 AD) and *Predestination of the Saints* (429 AD), Augustine relies heavily upon Paul's statement in Romans 12:1-3, to wit:

I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.

And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.

For I say, through **the grace given unto me**, to every man that is among you, **not to think of himself** more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, **according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith.**

From this passage, Augustine concludes that "grace" is a gift of God, and not of human merits, because, as this Scripture says, "God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith."

Augustine next reassures Christians "that whatever they have to fulfil in the law, they must ask for in the prayer. But this, of course, would be utterly empty if the human will were sufficient for the performance without the help of God."⁵ Hence, the "help of God" was an essential ingredient for salvation – not human merits or more righteous religious works. For Protestant Reformers such as Luther and Calvin, this was a very important theological fact, because it called into question and

⁵ Saint Augustine, *On Grace and Free Will* (Louisville, Kentucky: GLH Publishing, 2017), pp. 50-51.

undermined many Roman Catholic doctrines and principles such as penance, indulgences, and confession.

Within this theological system, Augustine concluded that there had to be some element of human “free will.” “There is, to begin with,” Augustine wrote, “the fact that God’s precepts themselves would be of no use to a man unless he had **free choice of will**, so that by performing them he might obtain the promised rewards.”⁶

And thus the fundamental question for each human being is whether he or she is willing to accept God’s free, prevenient grace. He thus writes: “When God says, ‘Turn ye unto me, and I will turn unto you,’ one of these clauses – that which invites our return to God – evidently belongs to our will; while the other, which promises His return to us, belongs to His grace.”⁷ And “[w]hat is the import of the fact that in so many passages God requires all His commandments to be kept and fulfilled? How does He make this requisition, if there is no free will? What means ‘the happy man,’ of whom the Psalmist says that ‘**his will has been the law of the Lord**?’”⁸

In other words, our ability to turn to God, and to “not sin,” is due to God’s grace, but we must first be “willing” to make that turn towards God. According to St. Augustine, the person who is unwilling is thereby unable to withstand Satan’s temptation. Some people have the desire to do “good,” but they have not yet the will to accept God’s grace. In this regards, their will is “good,” but still “weak.” This “good, weak will,” St. Augustine refers to as the “hard heart.”⁹ “We should remember,” he writes, “that He says, ‘Make you a new heart and a new spirit,’ who also promises,

⁶ Ibid., p. 5.

⁷ Ibid., p. 22.

⁸ Ibid., p. 9.

⁹ Ibid., p. 59.

‘I will give you a new heart, and a new spirit will I put within you.’¹⁰ This changed heart in essence is the good will that God gives freely through his grace. “By it also it comes to pass that the very good will, which has now begun to be, is enlarged, and made so great that it is able to fulfil the divine commandments which it shall wish, when it shall once firmly and perfectly wish.”¹¹

It is a cliché among Christian theologians that keeping the entire Law of Moses is impossible. However, according to St. Augustine, the reason that our frail, human will is not able to fulfill God’s commandments, is because we have not sought after God’s grace for divine aid and assistance. Through God’s grace, “the human will is not taken away, but changed from bad to good, and assisted when it is good.”¹² Thus, unless our wills have been changed from bad to good through God’s grace,¹³ it is not possible that any of us can fulfill the Mosaic law. At this point, whenever the frail, human will accepts God’s grace, it is “assisted when it is good.”¹⁴

This theological description of grace and free will are exactly what John Wesley advocated and proposed in his essay *Predestination Calmly Considered*. Rev. Wesley held that “choice” was a major component of the Christian soteriological system of salvation; and that, despite the Fall, God had supernaturally restored man’s ability to choose between Good and Evil.¹⁵

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 60.

¹² Ibid., p. 79.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ John Wesley, “Predestination Calmly Considered,” *The John Wesley Collection: 5 Classic Works* (Columbia, South Carolina [citation omitted]), Paragraph No. 45 (“But I do not carry free-will so far: (I mean, not in moral things:) Natural free-will, in the present state of mankind, I do not

Also, another key characteristic of the Wesleyan-evangelical doctrine on salvation through reformation the heart can also be traced to Augustine. In *On Grace and Free Will*, St. Augustine uses the symbolism of the “stony heart” to depict men and women who are unwilling to turn towards God’s grace for assistance with fulfilling the royal laws of God. St. Augustine describes the assistance of grace as a process of conversion – much similar to the sort of conversions which later depicted the primitive Methodist revivals of the 18th century-- whereby an individual person will receive a “new heart,”¹⁶ as is stated in the Book of Ezekiel, 36:22-27, where it is written: “[a] new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and the stony heart shall be taken away out of your flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and will cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them.”¹⁷ This became the Protestant evangelical expression of salvation – i.e., the “born again” experience.¹⁸

understand: I only assert, that there is a measure of free will supernaturally restored to every man, together with that supernatural light which ‘enlightens every man that cometh into the world.’”).

¹⁶ St. Augustine, *On Grace and Free Will*, supra, pp. 55-56; 73-74.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 57.

¹⁸ For example, in his autobiography *Life and Times*, Frederick Douglass recalled his own conversion experience as follows: “Previously to my contemplation of the anti-slavery movement and its probable results, my mind had been seriously awakened to the subject of religion. I was not more than thirteen years old, when, in my loneliness and destitution, I longed for someone to whom I could go, as to a father and protector. The preaching of a white Methodist minister, named Hanson, was the means of causing me to feel that in God I had such a friend. He thought that all men, great and small, bond and free, were sinners in the sight of God: that they were by nature rebels against his government; and that they must repent of their sins, and be reconciled to God through Christ. I cannot say that I had a very distinct notion of what was required of me, but one thing I did know well: that I was wretched and had no means of making myself otherwise. I consulted a good colored man named Charles Lawson, and in tones of holy affection he told me to pray, and to ‘cast all my care upon God.’ This I sought to do; and though for weeks I was a poor, broken-hearted mourner, traveling through doubts and fears, I finally found my burden lightened, and my heart relieved. I loved all mankind, slaveholders not excepted, though I abhorred slavery more than ever. I saw the world in a new

When we turn to Augustine's magnum opus, *The City of God* (426 or 427 A.D.), we find the same theological concepts regarding salvation and predestination as in *Grace and Free Will* (427 AD). In *The City of God*, Augustine argues that because God is omnipotent, this omnipotence does not mean that He is unable to create **voluntary wills** in human beings, while simultaneously maintaining His foreknowledge as to how human beings will exercise their voluntary wills. Augustine of Hippo says:

But it does not follow that, though there is for God a certain order of all causes, there must therefore be nothing depending on the free exercise of our own wills, for our wills themselves are included in that order of causes which is certain to God, and is embraced by His foreknowledge, for human wills are also causes of human actions; and He who foreknew all the cause of things would certainly among those causes not have been ignorant of our wills.¹⁹

Therefore, at least for Augustine of Hippo, these two ideals – God's omnipotence and Man's voluntary will – do not contradict each other. For, as Augustine of Hippo says, in *The City of God*, predestination is an immutable law of eternity, whereby a universal law of sin (reprobation), grace, and salvation reign unchangeable and supreme:

This race we have distributed into two parts, the one consisting of those who live according to man, the other of those who live according to God. And these we also mystically call the two cities, or the two communities of men, of which the one is predestined to reign eternally with God, and the other to suffer

light, and my great concern was to have everybody converted. My desire to learn increased, and especially did I want a thorough acquaintance with the contents of the Bible. I have gathered scattered pages of the Bible from the filthy street-gutters, and washed and dried them, that in moments of leisure I might get a word or two of wisdom from them." *Life and Times of Frederick Douglass* (New York, N.Y.: The Library of America, 1994), p. 538.

¹⁹ St. Augustine, *The City of God* (New York, N.Y.: The Modern Library, 1950), pp. 154-155.

eternal punishment with the devil. This, however, is their end, and of it we are to speak afterwards.... Of these two first parents of the human race, then, Cain was the first-born, and he belonged to the city of men; after him was born Abel, who belonged to the city of God. For as in the individual the truth of the apostle's statement is discerned, 'that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual,' whence it comes to pass that each man, being derived from a condemned stock, is first of all born of Adam evil and carnal, and becomes good and spiritual only afterwards, when he is grafted into Christ by regeneration: so was it in the human race as a whole. When these two cities began to run their course by a series of deaths and births, the citizen of this world was the first-born, and after him the stranger in this world, the citizen of the city of God, predestinated by grace, elected by grace, by grace a stranger below, and by grace a citizen above. By grace — for so far as regards himself he is sprung from the same mass, all of which is condemned in its origin; but God, like a potter (or this comparison is introduced by the apostle judiciously, and not without thought), of the same lump made one vessel to honour, another to dishonor. **But first the vessel to dishonor was made, and after it another to honour. For in each individual, as I have already said, there is first of all that which is reprobate, that *from which we must begin, but in which we need not necessarily remain; afterwards is that which is well-approved, to which we may abide.*** Not, indeed, that every wicked man shall be good, but that no one will be good who was not first of all wicked; but the sooner any one becomes a good man, the more speedily does he receive this title, and abolish the old name in the new. Accordingly, it is recorded of Cain that he built a city, but Abel, being a sojourner, built none. For the city of the saints is above,

although here below it begets citizens, in whom it sojourns till the time of its reign arrives, when it shall gather together all in the day of the resurrection; and then shall the promised kingdom be given to them, in which they shall reign with their Prince, the King of the ages, time without end.²⁰

Thus, Augustine's thesis on predestination in *The City of God* is that all men are born reprobate, "but...**we need not necessarily remain**" in this state of reprobation.²¹ There is in Augustine's theology, then, free choice and voluntary will – but not "free will." That is to say, there is no free human will that is independent of God's omnipotent will, as is espoused by secular humanism. But, according to Augustine, there is, instead, within each human being a voluntariness of will, or what we may call "voluntary will," whereby each human being "need not necessarily remain" in a state of reprobation.²² For in *The City of God*, Augustinian theology, there is before every human being the choice between Good and Evil, as Moses presented that choice to Church of Israel in the Old Testament. And this concept of salvation we find in the writings of the 17th-century "New Methodists" such as Mose Amyraldus, Peter Baro, Richard Baxter, and Daniel Williams;²³ and, later, in the writings of John Wesley, as stated in his *Predestination Calmly Considered*.²⁴

In *The City of God*, Augustine of Hippo expressly rejected "irresistible reprobation" and "irresistible election" – i.e., double predestination –

²⁰ Ibid., pp. 478 -479.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid., 154 – 155.

²³ Richard P. Heitzenrater, *Wesley and the People Called Methodists* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2013), pp. 18-19.

²⁴ John Wesley, "Predestination Calmly Considered," *The John Wesley Collection: 5 Classic Works*, supra.

because God did not “compel any one to sin.”²⁵ Rather, according to Augustine, mankind’s power of sin stems from “voluntary will” and “free choice,” which are neither beyond God’s omnipotence or foreknowledge. Indeed, mankind’s “voluntary will” and “free choice” can do nothing to thwart God’s sovereign will. In *The City of God*, Augustine of Hippo writes:

The sins of men and angels do nothing to impede the ‘great works of the Lord which accomplish His will.’ For He who by His providence and omnipotence distributes to every one his own portion, is able to make good use not only of the good, but also of the wicked. And thus making a good use of the wicked angel, who, in punishment of his first wicked volition, was doomed to an obduracy that prevents him now from willing any good, why should not God have permitted of his first wicked volition, was doomed to an obduracy that prevents him now from willing any good, why should not God have permitted him to tempt the first man, who had been created upright, that is to say, with a good will? For he had been so constituted, that if he looked to God for help, man’s goodness should defeat the angel’s wickedness; but if by proud self-pleasing he abandoned God, his Creator and Sustainer, he should be conquered. If his will remained upright, through leaning on God’s help, he should be rewarded; if it became wicked, by forsaking God, he should be punished. But even this trusting in God’s help could not itself be accomplished without God’s help, although man had it in his own power to relinquish the benefits of divine grace by pleasing himself. For as it is not in our power to live in the world without sustaining ourselves by food, while it is in our power to refuse this nourishment and cease to live, as those who kill themselves, so it was not in man’s power, even in Paradise, to live as he ought without

²⁵ St. Augustine, *The City of God*, supra, p. 476.

God's help; but it was in his power to live wickedly, though thus he should cut short his happiness, and incur very just punishment. Since, then, God was not ignorant that man would fall, why should He not have suffered him to be tempted by an angel who hated and envied him? It was not, indeed, that He was unaware that he should be conquered, but because He foresaw that the man's seed, aided by divine grace, this same devil himself should be conquered, to the greater glory of the saints. All was brought about in such a manner, that neither did any future even escape God's knowledge, nor did His foreknowledge compel any one to sin, and so as to demonstrate in the experience of the intelligent creation, human and angelic, how great a difference there is between the private presumption of the creature and the Creator's protection. For who will dare to believe or say that it was not in God's power to prevent both angels and men from sinning? But God preferred to leave this in their power, and thus to show both what evil could be wrought by their pride, and what good by His grace.²⁶

And men are punished by God for their sins often visibly, always secretly, either in this life or after death, although no man acts rightly save by divine aid; and no man or devil acts unrighteously save by the permission of the divine and most just judgment.²⁷

Thus, in my post-graduate course work at Whitefield Theological Seminary, in the year 2020, I wrote that:

²⁶ Ibid., 476 – 477.

²⁷ Ibid., 711.

Reformed Methodism thus embraces this Augustinian view of divine ‘omniscience,’ divine ‘omnipotence,’ divine ‘election,’ divine ‘grace,’ and ‘predestination’” Augustine says that God has not compelled ‘any one to sin.’²⁸ Hence, the Calvinists have misjudged God’s omnipotence and foreknowledge: God need not ‘control’ man’s choice – for mankind actually has ‘no free will’ but only a ‘free choice’ between good and evil; and mankind’s free choice of evil (i.e., sin) leads only to one inevitable result: death (e.g., suicide) and everlasting punishment. This Reformed-Methodist theological doctrine is not Pelagianism, Arminianism, semi-Augustinianism, or secular ‘free will.’ Like Martin Luther’s *On Bondage of the Will*, the human will is in bondage to sinful living and can do no other; but, with God’s help and grace, that same human will may choose to live righteously.²⁹

Augustine’s seeming conception of “universal atonement” and “resistible grace” is further embraced in *The City of God* with these words: “But even this trusting in God’s help could not itself be accomplished without God’s help, although man had it in his own power to relinquish the benefits of divine grace by pleasing himself.”³⁰ Now this “power to relinquish the benefits of divine grace” is a theological term of art which no Calvinist

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 476 - 477 (“nor did His foreknowledge compel any one to sin.... But God preferred to leave this in their power, and thus to show both what evil could be wrought by their pride, and what good by His grace.”).

²⁹ Roderick Ford’s “Predestination: An Essay Towards a Reformed Methodist Theology,” *The Whitefield Papers*

Click on the following link:

(<http://nebula.wsimg.com/95c5966e343c01abc6e2328fa1b5f6ea?AccessKeyId=CFD051C099636C9F5827&disposition=0&alloworigin=1>)

³⁰ St. Augustine, *The City of God*, p. 476.

would use, because in Calvinism “irresistible grace” and “perseverance of the saints” a chief tenets in its Reformed theology.

Similarly, in *The City of God*, Augustine makes a second point, where he compares “living without God’s help” to “living without food,” and he does this in such a way as to imply a sort of universal atonement, viz:

For as it is not in our power to live in this world without sustaining ourselves by food, while it is in our power to refuse this nourishment and cease to live, as those do who kill themselves, so it was not in man’s power, even in Paradise, to live as he ought without God’s help; but it was in his power to live wickedly, though thus he should cut short his happiness, and incur very just punishment.... For who will dare to believe or say that it was not in God’s power to prevent both angels and men from sinning? But God preferred to leave this in their power, and thus to show both what evil could be wrought by their pride, and what good by His grace....

Accordingly, two cities have been formed by two loves: the earthly by the love of self, even to the contempt of God; the heavenly by the love of God, even to the contempt of self.³¹

Therefore, I concluded my argument that Augustine’s “predestination” was somewhere in between that of Wesleyan-Arminianism and Calvinism. I felt the Wesleyan-Arminianism had failed to embrace Augustine’s conception of predestination, which I did embrace. Hence, I suggested that Augustine’s definitions of predestination, as set forth in *The City of God*, serve as a sort of “Reformed Methodist Theology” for present-day Methodism, because I did not think that John Wesley’s “Twenty Five Articles of Religion for the Methodist Churches” was an adequate

³¹ Ibid., pp. 476 – 477.

reflection of the “Protestant” faith since it failed to provide an article on Predestination.

Furthermore, since Calvinism widely acclaims Augustine of Hippo as a founding father of Reformed theology, I suggested that, while embracing Augustine’s theology in *On Grace and Free Will* and *The City of God*, that the Methodists find common ground with the Calvinists and work together as fellow Puritans. My subsequent communications with the brothers of Whitefield College and Theological Seminary reiterated these ideas and suggestions.

II. Augustine’s Assessment of Grace and Predestination in *Predestination of the Saints*.

It is unclear to me as to whether Augustine of Hippo wrote anything in *Predestination of the Saints* (427 or 428 A.D.) with the express purpose of refuting or changing any of his theological conclusions that were asserted in *On Grace and Free Will* and *The City of God*, because in *Predestination of the Saints*, Augustine makes it clear that, in his previous theological writings, he had omitted to discuss explicitly this following question: **Does the origin of man’s choice to accept God’s grace originate in man himself or in God?** Here, Augustine answers this question in the affirmative, stating the even “man’s choice” comes from God. Furthermore, Augustine concludes thus: **“if He had willed to teach even those to whom the word of the cross is foolishness to come to Christ beyond all doubt these also would have come.”**³² Now this last sentence comes close to admitting the Calvinistic doctrine of “irresistible grace” and “double predestination.” Was Augustine now changing his doctrine to

³² Bishop Aurelius Augustine, *Predestination of the Saints* (427 or 428 A.D.) [citation omitted].

state unequivocally that God created and predestined some souls for eternal damnation?

In *Predestination of the Saints*, Chapter 5, “To believe is to Think With Assent,” Augustine begins his discussion with a quote from the Apostle Paul, stating: “Not that we are sufficient to think anything as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God.”³³

Now, says Augustine, “thinking is prior to believing... no one believes anything unless he has first thought that it is to be believed. For however suddenly, however rapidly, some thoughts fly before the will to believe, and this presently follows in such wise as to attend them, as it were, in closest conjunction, it is yet necessary that everything which is believed should be believed after thought preceded....” From this, Augustine now attributes man’s “voluntary will” and “free choice” to the will of God. Whereas in *On Grace and Free Will* and in *The City of God*, Augustine had allowed for some leverage whereby human beings were given power to choose, we find in *Predestination of the Saints* a theological clarification thus indicating that it is God himself who does the choosing – not the individual person.

In *Predestination of the Saints*, Chapter 6, “Presumption and Arrogance to Be Avoided,” Augustine addressed the “beginning” of grace. He argues that if this “beginning” of grace is in God, then it is *not* “according to our merit,” because if it had anything to do with our own merit, then “grace is no more grace.”³⁴ When anyone takes credit, or responsibility for attaining this grace, Augustine argued, “he makes himself the first, and God the second!” This is what the Calvinists hold; but this is not so much what the Wesleyan-Arminians hold.

³³ Citing 2 Corinthians 3:5.

³⁴ Bishop Aurelius Augustine, *Predestination of the Saints* (427 or 428 A.D.) [citation omitted].

In Chapter 7 of *Predestination of the Saints*, Augustine confessed his former error regarding election and grace, stating, “And what I said a little after, ‘For it is ours to believe and to will, but it is His to give to those who believe and will, the power of doing good works through the Holy Spirit’” [was not wholly accurate]. Here, Augustine amended his theology, stating “**both are also God’s**, because **God prepares the will**; and both are ours too, because they are only brought about *with our good wills*.... Because **we are not able to Will unless we are called**; and when, after our calling, we would will, our willing is not sufficiently nor our running, unless God gives strength to us that run, and leads us whither He calls us....”³⁵ “It is plain, therefore, that it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy, that we do good works’ – this is absolutely most true.”³⁶

Augustine goes on to point out that God saves persons “for nothing,” thus making “free grace” truly grace and truly free. At the same time, God condemns and punishes those to whom no free grace had been given. Hence, what Augustine says God does here, Rev. Wesley vehemently criticizes and condemns in Reformed theology. In his *Predestination Calmly Considered*, Rev. Wesley asks, “Will God doom that man to the bottomless pit, because of that uncleanness which he could not save himself from, and which God could have saved him from, but would not? Verily, were an earthly King to execute such justice as this upon his helpless subjects, it might well be expected that the vengeance of the Lord would soon sweep him from the face of the earth.”³⁷ But Augustine defends his theological statement, making the following point:

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ John Wesley, “Predestination Calmly Considered,” *The John Wesley Collection: 5 Classic Works*, supra, Paragraph No.’s 30 & 33.

Here is mercy and judgment,- mercy towards the election which has obtained the righteousness of God, but judgment to the rest which have been blinded. And yet the former, because they willed, believed; the latter, because they did not will believed not. Therefore mercy and judgment were manifested in the very will themselves. Certainly such an election is of grace, not at all of merits.... Therefore the election obtained what it obtained gratuitously; there preceded none of those things which they might first give, and it should be given to them again. He saved them for nothing. But **to the rest who were blinded**, as is there plainly declared, **it was done in recompense.** 'All the paths of the Lord are mercy and truth.' But His ways are unsearchable. Therefore the mercy by which He freely delivers, and the truth by which He righteously judges, are equally unsearchable...."³⁸

"But why He delivers one rather than another,- 'His judgments are unsearchable, and His ways past finding out.' For it is better in this case for us to hear or to say, 'O man, who art thou that repliest against God?' than to dare to speak as if we could know what he has chosen to be kept secret. Since, moreover, **He could not will anything unrighteous.**"³⁹

With *On the Predestination of the Saints*, Augustine of Hippo clearly placed himself into the "Calvinistic" camp. I do not mean to imply that Augustine ever went so far as to imply that he adopted "double predestination," which holds the God foreordained from eternity some

³⁸ Bishop Aurelius Augustine, *Predestination of the Saints* (427 or 428 A.D.) [citation omitted], Chapter 7.

³⁹ Ibid., Chapter 16.

souls to eternal damnation. Augustine never makes such an utterance or even implicitly conveys such a message. In *On the Predestination of the Saints*, Augustine repeatedly insists that God “could not will anything unrighteous” and that his “judgments are unsearchable.” And in *On Grace and Free Will*, Augustine reiterated the same point, namely, that “the secret providence of God, whose judgments are unsearchable, and His ways past finding out.”⁴⁰ Therefore, even in an Augustinian theological system of predestination where God alone chooses to save some and not save others, the judgment of the wicked is certainly righteous and just, but God’s own “judgments are unsearchable, and His ways past finding out.”

For it is this last point, namely, that “God’s own judgments are unsearchable, and His ways past finding out” is a theological proposition this is missing in John Wesley’s polemic *Predestination Calmly Considered*. This may be true quite possibly because it is never mentioned in as a defense for predestination in any of the Reformed theologies that Rev. Wesley confronted – and, in *Predestination Calmly Considered*, Rev. Wesley addressed several Reformed theological sources, including the “Protestant Confession of Faith” (1559), The Dutch Divines Confession (1618), the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (1647), and John Calvin’s *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Wesley’s *Predestination Calmly Considered* countered these Reformed theological sources by arguing that a system of “unconditional election” and “unconditional reprobation” cannot reflect or represent the eternal divine attributes of a loving and just God. Rev. Wesley’s rendition of the themes of the Old and New Testaments, and several Scriptural examples and objections are likewise theologically persuasive, from the standpoint of human reasoning.⁴¹

⁴⁰ St. Augustine, *On Grace and Free Will*, supra. p. 88.

⁴¹ See, e.g., John Wesley, “Predestination Calmly Considered,” *The John Wesley Collection: 5 Classic Works*, supra, Paragraph No.’s 30 & 33.

But while Rev. Wesley addressed the Reformed authorities (all of them of Western European origin), he did not confront Augustine of Hippo's voluminous writings on predestination, upon which Calvinism was generally based. For, indeed, I have found Augustine's writings to be more persuasive than Calvin's or any of the other Reformed Confessions. For Augustine tacitly admits that "predestination" is problematic when one asks the following question: **why He delivers one rather than another?"** To that question, Augustine responded, **"His judgments are unsearchable, and His ways past finding out."** Notably, in all of Wesley's *Predestination Calmly Considered*, he did not once so far as imply this possibility that faith in God must include acceptance of things which we plainly cannot understand. In other words, the doctrine of predestination – as I have argued in my "Whitefield Papers" is a theological "mystery,"⁴² that falls into that category which both the Apostle Paul and Augustine of Hippo correctly placed it, namely, "His judgments are unsearchable, and His ways past finding out."⁴³

⁴² See, e.g., Romans 11: 25 ("For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this **mystery**, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come.").
in.

The expressed language within Article 17 of the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion says, "PREDESTINATION to Life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed by his counsel **secret to us....**"

As such, human beings do great dishonor to God by prying too much into it with the objective of reducing the doctrine to a simple formula, or set of definite formulas, such as the "doctrine of irresistible grace" and "unconditional election."

Predestination falls within that category of sacred eternal truths that are simply beyond the capacity of human beings to comprehend – as if to say, God has not yet revealed to us this information.

Theologians who inquire into the doctrine of predestination must guard against the impiety of questioning God's decision to establish the cosmic order in the manner in which he established it.

⁴³ Romans 11: 25-33.

Conclusion

This paper is thus an argument in favor of *broad-based Puritanism* that is anchored in the theology of Augustine of Hippo, and which includes both Calvinism and Arminianism as its two other major pillars. As I have argued in favor of a Reformed Methodist Theology, i.e., “Oxford Methodism” in honor of George Whitefield (“Calvinistic”) and John Wesley (“Arminian”), I believe that there are much more in common between the Calvinists and the Arminians – and this common ground is plainly revealed in Augustine of Hippo’s theological writings. It is for this reason that I do not accept labels such as “Calvinism” or “Arminianism,” or their differences over predestination, because I think that the typical arguments between Calvinists and Wesleyan-Arminians over their differences on the doctrine of predestination do a great injustice to the actual sovereignty, prerogative, omniscience, omnipotence, and will of God, – which are correctly summed up in the phrase, “His judgments are unsearchable, and His ways past finding out.”

--- The End ---

APPENDIX

St. Augustine, *A Treatise on the
Predestination of the Saints*

Aurelius Augustin, Bishop of Hippo

A TREATISE ON THE PREDESTINATION OF THE SAINTS

The First Book.

Addressed to Prosper and Hilary.

AD. 428 OR 429

WHEREIN THE TRUTH OF PREDESTINATION AND GRACE IS DEFENDED AGAINST THE SEMI-PELAGIANS,—THOSE PEOPLE TO WIT, WHO BY NO MEANS WITHDRAW ALTOGETHER FROM THE PELAGIAN HERESY, IN THAT THEY CONTEND THAT THE BEGINNING OF SALVATION AND OF FAITH IS OF OURSELVES; SO THAT IN VIRTUE, AS IT WERE, OF THIS PRECEDENT MERIT, THE OTHER GOOD GIFTS OF GOD ARE ATTAINED. AUGUSTIN SHOWS THAT NOT ONLY THE INCREASE, BUT THE VERY BEGINNING ALSO OF FAITH IS IN GOD'S GIFT. ON THIS MATTER HE DOES NOT DISAVOW THAT HE ONCE THOUGHT DIFFERENTLY, AND THAT IN SOME SMALL WORKS, WRITTEN BEFORE HIS EPISCOPATE, HE WAS IN ERROR, AS IN THAT EXPOSITION, WHICH THEY OBJECT TO HIM, OF PROPOSITIONS FROM THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. BUT HE POINTS OUT THAT HE WAS SUBSEQUENTLY CONVINCED CHIEFLY BY THIS TESTIMONY, "BUT WHAT HAST THOU THAT THOU HAST NOT RECEIVED?" WHICH HE PROVES IS TO BE TAKEN AS A TESTIMONY CONCERNING FAITH ITSELF ALSO. HE SAYS THAT FAITH IS TO BE COUNTED AMONG OTHER WORKS, WHICH THE APOSTLE DENIES TO ANTICIPATE GOD'S GRACE WHEN HE SAYS, "NOT OF WORKS" HE DECLARES THAT THE HARDNESS OF THE HEART IS TAKEN AWAY BY GRACE, AND THAT ALL COME TO CHRIST WHO ARE TAUGHT TO COME BY THE FATHER; BUT THAT THOSE WHOM HE TEACHES, HE TEACHES IN MERCY, WHILE THOSE WHOM HE TEACHES NOT, IN JUDGMENT HE TEACHES NOT. THAT THE PASSAGE FROM HIS HUNDRED AND SECOND EPISTLE, QUESTION 2, "CONCERNING THE TIME OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION" WHICH IS ALLEGED BY THE SEMI-PELAGIANS, MAY RIGHTLY BE EXPLAINED WITHOUT DETRIMENT TO THE DOCTRINE OF GRACE AND PREDESTINATION. HE TEACHES WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN GRACE AND PREDESTINATION. FURTHER, HE SAYS THAT GOD IN HIS PREDESTINATION FOREKNEW WHAT HE HAD PURPOSED TO DO. HE MARVELS GREATLY THAT THE ADVERSARIES OF PREDESTINATION, WHO ARE SAID TO BE UNWILLING TO BE DEPENDENT ON THE UNCERTAINTY OF GOD'S WILL, PREFER RATHER TO TRUST THEMSELVES TO THEIR OWN WEAKNESS THAN TO THE STRENGTH OF GOD'S PROMISE. HE CLEARLY POINTS OUT THAT THEY ABUSE THIS AUTHORITY, IF THOU BELIEVEST, THOU SHALT BE SAVED." THAT THE TRUTH OF GRACE AND PERSEVERANCE SHINES FORTH IN THE CASE OF INFANTS THAT ARE SAVED, WHO ARE DISTINGUISHED BY NO MERITS OF THEIR OWN FROM OTHERS WHO PERISH. FOR THAT THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THEM ARISING FROM THE FOREKNOWLEDGE OF MERITS WHICH THEY WOULD HAVE HAD IF THEY HAD LIVED LONGER. THAT TESTIMONY IS WRONGFULLY REJECTED BY THE ADVERSARIES AS BEING UNCANONICAL, WHICH HE ADDUCED FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS DISCUSSION, " HE WAS

TAKEN AWAY LEST WICKEDNESS,"ETC. THAT THE MOST ILLUSTRIOUS INSTANCE OF PREDESTINATION AND GRACE IS THE SAVIOUR HIMSELF, IN WHOM A MAN OBTAINED THE PRIVILEGE OF BEING THE SAVIOUR AND THE ONLY-BEGOTTEN SON OF GOD, THROUGH BEING ASSUMED INTO ONENESS OF PERSON BY THE WORD CO-ETERNAL WITH THE FATHER, ON ACCOUNT OF NO PRECEDENT MERITS, EITHER OF WORKS OR OF FAITH. THAT THE PREDESTINATED ARE CALLED BY SOME CERTAIN CALLING PECULIAR TO THE ELECT, AND THAT THEY HAVE BEEN ELECTED BEFORE THE FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD; NOT BECAUSE THEY WERE FOREKNOWN AS MEN WHO WOULD BELIEVE AND WOULD BE HOLY, BUT IN ORDER THAT BY MEANS OF THAT VERY ELECTION OF GRACE THEY MIGHT BE SUCH, ETC.

CHAP. 1 [I.]—INTRODUCTION.

WE know that in the Epistle to the Philippians the apostle said, "To write the same things to you to me indeed is not grievous but for you it is safe;" yet the same apostle writing to the Galatians when he saw that he had done enough among them of what he regarded as being needful for them, by the ministry of his preaching, said, "For the rest let no man cause me labour" or as it is read in many codices "Let no one be troublesome to me." But although I confess that it causes me trouble that the divine word in which the grace of God is preached (which is absolutely no grace if it is given according to our merits), great and manifest as it is, is not yielded to, nevertheless my dearest sons, Prosper and Hilary your zeal and brotherly affection—which makes you so reluctant to see any of the brethren in error, as to wish that, after so many books and letters of mine on this subject, I should write again from here—I love more than I can tell, although I do not dare to say that I love it as much as I ought. Wherefore, behold, I write to you again. And although not with you, yet through you I am still doing what I thought I had done sufficiently.

CHAP. 2.—TO WHAT EXTENT THE MASSILIANS WITHDRAW FROM THE PELAGIANS.

For on consideration of your letters, I seem to see that those brethren on whose behalf you exhibit a pious care that they may not hold the poetical opinion in which it is affirmed, "Every one is a hope for himself," and so fall under that condemnation which is, not poetically, but prophetically, declared, "Cursed is every man that hath hope in man," must be treated in that way wherein the apostle dealt with those to whom he said, "And if in anything ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you." For as yet they are in darkness on the question concerning the predestination of the saints, but they have that whence, "if in anything they are otherwise minded, God will reveal even this unto them," if they are walking in that to which they have attained. For which reason the apostle, when he had said, "If ye are in anything otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you," says, "Nevertheless whereunto we have attained, let us walk in the same." And those brethren of ours, on whose behalf your pious love is solicitous, have attained with Christ's Church to the belief that the human race is born obnoxious to the sin of the first man, and that none can be delivered from that evil save by the righteousness of the Second Man. Moreover, they have attained to the confession that men's wills are anticipated by God's grace; and to the agreement that no one can suffice to himself

either for beginning or for completing any good work. These things, therefore, unto which they have attained, being held fast, abundantly distinguish them from the error of the Pelagians. Further, if they walk in them, and beseech Him who giveth understanding, if in anything concerning predestination they are otherwise minded, He will reveal even this unto them. Yet let us also spend upon them the influence of our love, and the misery of our discourse, according to His gift, whom we have asked that in these letters we might say what should be suitable and profitable to them. For whence do we know whether by this our service, wherein we are serving them in the free love of Christ, our God may not perchance will to effect that purpose?

CHAP. 3 [II.]—EVEN THE BEGINNING OF FAITH IS OF GOD'S GIFT.

Therefore I ought first to show that the faith by which we are Christians is the gift of God if I can do that more thoroughly than I have already done in so many and so large volumes. But I see that I must now reply to those who say that the divine testimonies which I have adduced concerning this matter are of avail for this purpose, to assure us that we have faith itself of ourselves, but that its increase is of God; as if faith were not given to us by Him, but were only increased in us by Him, on the ground of the merit of its having begun from us. Thus there is here no departure from that opinion which Pelagius himself was constrained to condemn in the judgment of the bishops of Palestine, as is testified in the same Proceedings, "That the grace of God is given according to our merits," **if it is not of God's grace that we begin to believe**, but rather that on account of this beginning an addition is made to us of a more full and perfect belief; and so **we first give the beginning of our faith to God**, that **His supplement may also be given to us again**, and whatever else we faithfully ask.

CHAP. 4.—CONTINUATION OF THE PRECEDING.

But why do we not in opposition to this, rather hear the words, "Who hath first given to Him and it shall be recompensed to him again? since of Him, and through Him, and in Him, are all things " And from whom, then, is that very beginning of our faith if not from Him? For this is not excepted when other things are spoken of as of Him; but "of Him, and through Him, and in Him, are all things." But who can say that he who has already begun to believe deserves nothing from Him in whom he has believed? Whence it results that, to him who already deserves, other things are said to be added by a divine retribution, and thus that God's grace is given according to our merits. And this assertion when put before him, Pelagius himself condemned, that he might not be condemned. Whoever, then, wishes on every side to avoid this condemnable opinion, let him understand that what the apostle says is said with entire truthfulness, "Unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ not only to believe on Him, but also to suffer for His sake." He shows that both are the gifts of God, because he said that both were given. And he does not say, "to believe on Him more fully and perfectly," but, "to believe on Him." Neither does he say that he himself had obtained mercy to be more faithful, but "to be faithful" because he knew that he had not first given the beginning of his faith to God, and had its increase given back to him again by Him; but that he had been made faithful by God, who also had made him an apostle. For the beginnings of his faith are recorded, and they are very well known by being read in the church on an occasion calculated to distinguish them: how, being turned away from the faith which he was destroying, and being vehemently opposed to it, he was suddenly by a more powerful grace converted to it, by the conversion of Him, to whom as One who would do this very thing it was said by the prophet, "Thou wilt turn and quicken us;" so that not only from one who refused to believe he was made a willing believer, but, moreover, from being a persecutor,

he suffered persecution in defence of that faith which he persecuted. Because it was given him by Christ "not only to believe on Him, but also to suffer for His sake."

CHAP. 5.—TO BELIEVE IS TO THINK WITH ASSENT.

And, therefore, commending that grace which is not given according to any merits, but is the cause of all good merits, he says, "Not that we are sufficient to think anything as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God." Let them give attention to the, and well weigh these words, who think that the beginning of faith is of ourselves, and the supplement of faith is of God. For who cannot see that thinking is prior to believing? For no one believes anything unless he has first thought that it is to be believed. For however suddenly, however rapidly, some thoughts fly before the will to believe, and this presently follows in such wise as to attend them, as it were, in closest conjunction, it is yet necessary that everything which is believed should be believed after thought has preceded; although even belief itself is nothing else titan to think with assent. For it is not every one who thinks that believes, since many think in order that they may not believe; but everybody who believes, thinks,—both thinks in believing and believes in thinking. Therefore in what pertains to religion and piety (of which the apostle was speaking), if we are not capable of thinking anything as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God, we are certainly not capable of believing anything as of ourselves, since we cannot do this without thinking; but our sufficiency, by which we begin to believe, is of God. Wherefore, as no one is sufficient for himself, for the beginning or the completion of any good work whatever,—and this those brethren of yours, as what you have written intimates, already agree to be true, whence, as well in the beginning as in the carrying out of every good work, our sufficiency is of God,—so no one is sufficient for himself, either to begin or to perfect faith; but our sufficiency is of God. Because if faith is not a matter of thought, it is of no account; and we are not sufficient to think anything as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God.

CHAP. 6.—PRESUMPTION AND ARROGANCE TO BE AVOIDED.

Care must be taken, brethren, beloved of God, that a man do not lift himself up in opposition to God, when he says that he does what God has promised. Was not the faith of the nations promised to Abraham, "and he, giving glory to God, most fully believed that what He promised He is able also to perform"? He therefore makes the faith of the nations, who is able to do what He has promised. Further, if God works our faith, acting in a wonderful manner in our hearts so that we believe, is there any reason to fear that He cannot do the whole; and does man on that account arrogate to himself its first elements, that he may merit to receive its last from God? Consider if in such a way any other result be gained than that the grace of God is given in some way or other, according to our merit, and so grace is no more grace. For on this principle it is rendered as debt, it is not given gratuitously; for it is due to the believer that his faith itself should be increased by the Lord, and that the increased faith should be the wages of the faith begun; nor is it observed when this is said, that this wage is assigned to believers, not of grace, but of debt. And I do not at all see why the whole should not be attributed to man,—as he who could originate for himself what he had not previously, can himself increase what he had originated,—except that it is impossible to withstand the most manifest divine testimony by which faith, whence piety takes its beginning, is shown also to be the gift of God: such as is that testimony that "God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith;" and that one, "Peace be to the brethren, and love with faith, from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ," and other similar passages. Man, therefore, unwilling to resist such clear testimonies as these, and yet

desiring himself to have the merit of believing, compounds as it were with God to claim a portion of faith for himself, and to leave a portion for Him; and, what is still more arrogant, he takes the first portion for himself and gives the subsequent to Him; and so in that which he says belongs to both, **he makes himself the first, and God the second !**

CHAP. 7 [III.]—AUGUSTIN CONFESSES THAT HE HAD FORMERLY BEEN IN ERROR CONCERNING THE GRACE OF GOD.

It was not thus that pious and humble teacher thought—I speak of the most blessed Cyprian—when he said "that we must boast in nothing, since nothing is our own." And in order to show the, he appealed to the apostle as a witness, where he said, "For what hast thou that thou hast not received? And if thou hast received it, why boastest thou as if thou hadst not received it?" **And it was chiefly by this testimony that I myself also was convinced when I was in a similar error, thinking that faith whereby we believe on God is not God's gift, but that it is in us from ourselves, and that by it we obtain the gifts of God, whereby we may live temperately and righteously and piously in this world.** For I did not think that faith was preceded by God's grace, so that by its means would be given to us what we might profitably ask, except that we could not believe if the proclamation of the truth did not precede; but that we should consent when the gospel was preached to us I thought was our own doing, and came to us from ourselves. And this my error is sufficiently indicated in some small works of mine written before my episcopate. Among these is that which you have mentioned in your letters wherein is an exposition of certain propositions from the Epistle to the Romans. Eventually, when I was retracting all my small works, and was committing that retraction to writing, of which task I had already completed two books before I had taken up your more lengthy letters,—when in the first volume I had reached the retraction of this book, I then spoke thus:—**"Also discussing, I say, 'what God could have chosen in him who was as yet unborn, whom He said that the elder should serve; and what in the same elder, equally as yet unborn, He could have rejected; concerning whom, on this account, the prophetic testimony is recorded, although declared long subsequently, 'Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated,'"** I carried out my reasoning to the point of saying: **' God did not therefore choose the works of any one in foreknowledge of what He Himself would give them, but he chose the faith, in the foreknowledge that He would choose that very person whom He foreknew would believe on Him,—to whom He would give the Holy Spirit, so that by doing good works he might obtain eternal life also.'** I had not yet very carefully sought, nor had I as yet found, what is **the nature of the election of grace,** of which the apostle says, **' A remnant are saved according to the election of grace.'** Which assuredly is not grace if any merits precede it; lest what is now given, not according to grace, but according to debt, be rather paid to merits than freely given. And what I next subjoined: **' For the same apostle says, "The same God which worketh all in all;"** but it was never said, **God believeth all in all;** and then added, **' Therefore what we believe is our own, but what good thing we do is of Him who giveth the Holy Spirit to them that believe: '** I certainly could not have said, had I already known that **faith itself also is found among those gifts of God which are given by the same Spirit. Both, therefore, are ours on account of the choice of the will,** and yet both are given by the spirit of faith and love, For faith is not alone but as it is written, **' Love with faith, from God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ.'** And what I said a little after, **' For it is ours to believe and to will, but it is His to give to those who believe and will,** the **power of doing good works through the Holy Spirit,** by whom love is shed abroad in our hearts,—is true indeed; but by the same rule **both are also God's,** because **God prepares the will;** and **both are ours too,** because they are only brought about with our good wills. And thus what I subsequently said also: **' Because we are not able to Will unless we are called; and when, after our calling, we would will, our willing is not sufficiently nor our running,**

unless God gives strength to us that run, and leads us whither He calls us;' and thereupon added: 'It is plain, therefore, that it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy, that we do good works'—this is absolutely most true. But I discovered little concerning the calling itself, which is according to God's purpose; for not such is the calling of all that are called, but only of the elect. Therefore what I said a little afterwards: 'For as in those whom God elects it is not works but faith that begins the merit so as to do good works by the gift of God, so in those whom He condemns, unbelief and impiety begin the merit of punishment, so that even by way of punishment itself they do evil works'—I spoke most truly. But that even the merit itself of faith was God's gift, I neither thought of inquiring into, nor did I say. And in another place I say: 'For whom He has mercy upon, He makes to do good works, and whom He hardeneth He leaves to do evil works; but that mercy is bestowed upon the preceding merit of faith, and that hardening is applied to preceding iniquity.' And this indeed is true; but it should further have been asked, whether even the merit of faith does not come from God's mercy,—that is, whether that mercy is manifested in man only because he is a believer, or whether it is also manifested that he may be a believer? For we read in the apostles words: 'I obtained mercy to be a believer.' He does not say, 'Because I was a believer.' Therefore although it is given to the believer, yet it has been given also that he may be a believer. Therefore also, in another place in the same book I most truly said: 'Because, if it is of God's mercy, and not of works, that we are even called that we may believe and it is granted to us who believe to do good works, that mercy must not be grudged to the heathen;'—although I there discoursed less carefully about that calling which is given according to God's purpose."

CHAP. 8 [IV.]—WHAT AUGUSTIN WROTE TO SIMPLICIANUS, THE SUCCESSOR OF AMBROSE, BISHOP OF MILAN.

You see plainly what was at that time my opinion concerning faith and works, although I was labouring in commending God's grace; and in this opinion I see that those brethren of ours now are, because they have not been as careful to make progress with me in my writings as they were in reading them. For if they had been so careful, they would have found that question solved in accordance with the truth of the divine Scriptures in the first book of the two which I wrote in the very beginning of my episcopate to Simplicianus, of blessed memory, Bishop of the Church of Milan, and successor to St. Ambrose. Unless, perchance, they may not have known these books; in which case, take care that they do know them. Of this first of those two books, I first spoke in the second book of the Retractions; and what I said is as follows: "Of the books, I say, on which, as a bishop, I have laboured, the first two are addressed to Simplicianus, president of the Church of Milan, who succeeded the most blessed Ambrose, concerning divers questions, two of which I gathered into the first book from the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans. The former of them is about what is written: 'What shall we say, then? Is the law sin? By no means;' as far as the passage where he says, 'Who shall deliver me from the body of this death? The grace of God through Jesus Christ our Lord.' And therein I have expounded those words of the apostle: The law is spiritual; but I am carnal,' and others in which the flesh is declared to be in conflict against the Spirit in such a way as if a man were there described as still under law, and not yet established under grace. For, long afterwards, I perceived that those words might even be (and probably were) the utterance of a spiritual man. The latter question in this book is gathered from that passage where the apostle says, 'And not only this, but when Rebecca also had conceived by one act of intercourse, even by our father Isaac,' as far as that place where he says, 'Except the Lord of Sabaoth had left us a seed, we should be as Sodoma, and should have been like unto Gomorrah.' In the solution of this question I laboured indeed on behalf of the free choice of the human will, but God's grace overcame, and I could only reach that

point where the apostle is perceived to have said with the most evident truth, 'For who maketh thee to differ? and what hast thou that thou hast not received? Now, if thou hast received it, why dost thou glory as if thou receivedst it not?' And this the martyr Cyprian was also desirous of setting forth when he compressed the whole of it in that title: 'That we must boast in nothing, since nothing is our own.' " This is why I previously said that it was chiefly by this apostolic testimony that I myself had been convinced, when I thought otherwise concerning this matter; and this God revealed to me as I sought to solve this question when I was writing, as I said, to the Bishop Simplicianus. This testimony, therefore, of the apostle, when for the sake of repressing man's conceit he said, "For what hast thou which thou hast not received?" does not allow any believer to say, I have faith which I received not. All the arrogance of this answer is absolutely repressed by these apostolic words. Moreover, it cannot even be said, "Although I have not a perfected faith, yet I have its beginning, whereby I first of all believed in Christ" Because here also answered: "But what hast thou that thou hast not received? Now, if thou hast received it, why dost thou glory as if thou receivedst it, not?"

CHAP. 9 [V.]—THE PURPOSE OF THE APOSTLE IN THESE WORDS.

The notion, however, which they entertain, "that these words, 'What hast thou that thou hast not received?' cannot be said of this faith, because it has remained in the same nature, although corrupted, which at first was endowed with health and perfection," is perceived to have no force for the purpose that they desire if it be considered why the apostle said these words. For he was concerned that no one should glory in man, because dissensions had sprung up among the Corinthian Christians, so that every one was saying, "I, indeed, am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos, and another, I am of Cephas;" and thence he went on to say: "God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the strong things; and God hath chosen the ignoble things of the world, and contemptible things, and those things which are not, to make of no account things which are; that no flesh should glory before God." Here the intention of the apostle is of a certainty sufficiently plain against the pride of man, that no one should glory in man; and thus, no one should glory in himself. Finally, when he had said "that no flesh should glory before God," in order to show in what man ought to glory, he immediately added, "But it is of Him that ye are in Christ Jesus, who is made unto us wisdom from God, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: that according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." Thence that intention of his progressed, till afterwards rebuking them he says, "For ye are yet carnal; for whereas there are among you envying and contention, are ye not carnal, and walk according to man? For while one saith I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos, are ye not men? What, then, is Apollos, and what Paul? Ministers by whom you believed; and to every one as the Lord has given. I have planted, and Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. Therefore, neither is he that planteth anything, nor he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase." Do you not see that the sole purpose of the apostle is that man may be humbled, and God alone exalted? Since in all those things, indeed, which are planted and watered, he says that not even are the planter and the waterer anything, but God who giveth the increase: and the very fact, also, that one plants and another waters he attributes not to themselves, but to God, when he says, "To every one as the Lord hath given; I have planted, Apollos watered." Hence, therefore, persisting in the same intention he comes to the point of saying, "Therefore let no man glory in man," for he had already said, "He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." After these and some other matters which are associated therewith, that same intention of his is carried on in the words: "And these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself and to Apollos for your sakes, that ye might learn in us that no one of you should be puffed up for one against another

above that which is written. For who maketh thee to differ? And what hast thou which thou hast not received? Now, if thou hast received it, why dost thou glory as if thou receivedst it not?"

CHAP. 10.—IT IS GOD'S GRACE WHICH SPECIALLY DISTINGUISHES ONE MAN FROM ANOTHER.

In this the apostle's most evident intention, in which he speaks against human pride, so that none should glory in man but in God, it is too absurd, as I think, to suppose God's natural gifts, whether man's entire and perfected nature itself as it was bestowed on him in his flint state, or the remains, whatever they may be, of his degraded nature. **For is it by such gifts as these, which are common to all men, that men are distinguished from men?** But here he flint said, "For who maketh thee to differ?" and then added, "And what hast thou that thou hast not received?" Because **a man, puffed up against another, might say, "My faith makes me to differ,"** or **"My righteousness,"** or anything else of the kind. In reply to such notions, the good teacher says, **"But what hast thou that thou hast not received?"** And from whom but from Him who maketh thee to differ from another, on whom He bestowed not what He bestowed on thee? "Now if," says he, "thou hast received it, why dost thou glory as if thou receivedst it not?" Is he concerned, I ask, about anything else save that he who glorieth should glory in the Lord? **But nothing is so opposed to this feeling as for any one to glory concerning his own merits in such a way as if he himself had made them for himself, and not the grace of God,—a grace, however, which makes the good to differ from the wicked,** and is not common to the good and the wicked. Let the grace, therefore, whereby we are living and reasonable creatures, and are distinguished from cattle, be attributed to nature; let that grace also by which, among men themselves, the handsome are made to differ from the ill-formed, or the intelligent from the stupid, or anything of that kind, be ascribed to nature. But he whom the apostle was rebuking did not puff himself up as contrasted with cattle, nor as contrasted with any other man, in respect of any natural endowment which might be found even in the worst of men. **But he ascribed to himself, and not to God, some good gift which pertained to a holy life,** and was **puffed up** therewith when he deserved to hear the rebuke, "Who hath made thee to differ? and what hast thou that thou receivedst not?" For though the capacity to have faith is of nature, is it also of nature to have it? **"For all men have not faith," although all men have the capacity to have faith.** But the apostle does not say, "And what hast thou capacity to have, the capacity to have which thou receivedst not?" but he says, "And what hast thou which thou receivedst not?" Accordingly, **the capacity to have faith, as the capacity to have love, belongs to men's nature; but to have faith, even as to have love, belongs to the grace of believers.** That nature, therefore, in which is given to us the capacity of having faith, does not distinguish man from man, but faith itself makes the believer to differ from the unbeliever. And thus, when it is said, **"For who maketh thee to differ?"** and what hast thou that thou receivedst not?" if any one dare to say, "I have faith of mystic I did not, therefore, receive it," he directly contradicts this most manifest truth,—not because it is not in the choice of man's will to believe or not to believe, but because in **the elect the will is prepared by the Lord.** Thus, moreover, the passage, **"For who maketh thee to differ? and what hast thou that thou receivedst not?"** refers to that **very faith which is in the will of man.**

CHAP. 11 [VI.]—THAT SOME MEN ARE ELECTED IS OF GOD'S MERCY.

"Many hear the word of truth; but some believe, while others contradict. Therefore, the former will to believe; the latter do not will." Who does not know this? Who can deny this? But since **in some the will is prepared by the Lord,** in others it is not prepared, we must assuredly be

able to distinguish what comes from God's mercy, and what from His judgment. "What Israel sought for," says the apostle, "he hath not obtained, but the election hath obtained it; and the rest were blinded, as it is written, God gave to them the spirit of compunction,—eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear, even to this day. And David said, Let their table be made a snare, a retribution, and a stumblingblock to them; let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see; and bow down their back always." Here is mercy and judgment,—mercy towards the election which has obtained the righteousness of God, but judgment to the rest which have been blinded. And yet the former, because they willed, believed; the latter, because they did not will believed not. Therefore mercy and judgment were manifested in the very wills themselves. Certainly such an election is of grace, not at all of merits. For he had before said, "So, therefore, even at this present time, the remnant has been saved by the election of grace. And if by grace, now it is no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace." Therefore the election obtained what it obtained gratuitously; there preceded none of those things which they might first give, and it should be given to them again. He saved them for nothing. But to the rest who were blinded, as is there plainly declared, it was done in recompense. "All the paths of the Lord are mercy and truth." But His ways are unsearchable. Therefore the mercy by which He freely delivers, and the truth by which He righteously judges, are equally unsearchable.

CHAP. 12 [VII.]—WHY THE APOSTLE SAID THAT WE ARE JUSTIFIED BY FAITH AND NOT BY WORKS

But perhaps it may be said: "The apostle distinguishes faith from works; he says, indeed, that grace is not of works, but he does not say that it is not of faith." This, indeed, is true. But Jesus says that faith itself also is the work of God, and commands us to work it. For the Jews said to Him, "What shall we do that we may work the work of God? Jesus answered, and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent." The apostle, therefore, distinguishes faith from works, just as Judah is distinguished from Israel in the two kingdoms of the Hebrews, although Judah is Israel itself. And he says that a man is justified by faith and not by works, because faith itself is first given, from which may be obtained other things which are specially characterized as works, in which a man may live righteously. For he himself also says, "By grace ye are saved through faith; and this not of yourselves; but it is the gift of God," —that is to say, "And in saying 'through faith,' even faith itself is not of yourselves, but is God's gift." "Not of works," he says, "lest any man should be lifted up." For it is often said, "He deserved to believe, because he was a good man even before he believed." Which may be said of Cornelius since his alms were accepted and his prayers heard before he had believed on Christ; and yet without some faith he neither gave alms nor prayed. For how did he call on him on whom he had not believed? But if he could have been saved without the faith of Christ the Apostle Peter would not have been sent as an architect to build him up; although, "Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain who build it." And we are told, Faith is of ourselves; other things which pertain to works of righteousness are of the Lord; as if faith did not belong to the building,—as if, I say, the foundation did not belong to the building. But if this primarily and especially belongs to it, he labours in vain who seeks to build up the faith by preaching, unless the Lord in His mercy builds it up from within. Whatever, therefore, of good works Cornelius performed, as well before he believed in Christ as when he believed and after he had believed, are all to be ascribed to God, lest, perchance any man be lifted up.

CHAP. 13 [VIII.] —THE EFFECT OF DIVINE GRACE.

Accordingly, our only Master and Lord Himself, when He had said what I have above mentioned,—“This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent,”—says a little afterwards in that same discourse of His, “I said unto you that ye also have seen me and have not believed. All that the Father giveth me shall come to me.” What is the meaning of “shall come to me,” but, “shall believe in me”? But it is the Father’s gift that this may be the case. Moreover, a little after He says, “Murmur not among yourselves. No one can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all teachable of God. Every man that hath heard of the Father, and hath learned, cometh unto me.” What is the meaning of, “Every man that hath heard from the Father, and hath learned, cometh unto me,” except that there is none who hears from the Father, and learns, who cometh not to me? For if every one who has heard from the Father, and has learned, comes, certainly every one who does not come has not heard from the Father; for if he had heard and learned, he would come. For no one has heard and learned, and has not come; but every one, as the Truth declares, who has heard from the Father, and has learned, comes. Far removed from the senses of the flesh is this teaching in which the Father is heard, and teaches to come to the Son. Engaged herein is also the Son Himself, because He is His Word by which He thus teaches; and He does not do this through the ear of the flesh, but of the heart. Herein engaged, also, at the same time, is the Spirit of the Father and of the Son; and He, too, teaches, and does not teach separately, since we have learned that the workings of the Trinity are inseparable. And that is certainly the same Holy Spirit of whom the apostle says, “We, however, having the same Spirit of faith.” But this is especially attributed to the Father, for the reason that of Him is begotten the Only Begotten, and from Him proceeds the Holy Spirit, of which it would be tedious to argue more elaborately; and I think that my work in fifteen books on the Trinity which God is, has already reached you. Very far removed, I say, from the senses of the flesh is this instruction wherein God is heard and teaches. We see that many come to the Son because we see that many believe on Christ, but when and how they have heard this from the Father, and have learned, we see not. It is true that that grace is exceedingly secret, but who doubts that it is grace? This grace, therefore, which is hiddenly bestowed in human hearts by the Divine gift, is rejected by no hard heart, because it is given for the sake of first taking away the hardness of the heart. **When, therefore, the Father is heard within, and teaches, so that a man comes to the Son, He takes away the heart of stone and gives a heart of flesh, as in the declaration of the prophet He has promised.** Because He thus makes them children and vessels of mercy which He has prepared for glory.

CHAP. 14.—WHY THE FATHER DOES NOT TEACH ALL THAT THEY MAY COME TO CHRIST.

Why, then, does He not teach all that they may come to Christ, except because all whom He teaches, He teaches in mercy, **while those whom He teaches not, in judgment** He teaches not? Since, “On whom He will He has mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth.” But He has mercy when He gives good things. He hardens when He recompenses what is deserved. Or if, as some would prefer to distinguish them, those words also are his to whom the apostle says, “Thou sayest then unto me,” so that he may be regarded as having said, “Therefore hath He mercy on whom He will, and whom He will He hardeneth,” as well as those which follow,—to wit, “What is it that is still complained of? **for who resists His will?**” does the apostle answer, “O man, what thou hast said is false?” No; but he says, “O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Doth

the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay of the same lump? " and what follows, which you very well know. **And yet in a certain sense the Father teaches all men to come to His Son. For it was not in vain that it was written in the prophets, "And they shall all be teachable of God."** And when He too had premised this testimony, He added, "Every man, therefore, who has heard of the Father, and has learned, cometh to me." As, therefore, we speak justly when we say concerning any teacher of literature who is alone in a city, **He teaches literature here to everybody**,—not that all men learn, but that there is none who learns literature there who does not learn from him,—so we justly say, **God teaches all men to come to Christ, not because all come, but because none comes in any other way.** And why He does not teach all men the apostle explained, as far as he judged that it was to be explained, because, "willing to show His wrath, and to exhibit His power, He endured with much patience the vessels of wrath which were perfected for destruction; and that He might make known the riches of His glory on the vessels of mercy which He has prepared for glory." Hence it is that the **"word of the cross is foolishness to them that perish; but unto them that are saved it is the power of God."** God teaches all such to come to Christ, for He wills all such to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth. And if He had willed to teach even those to whom the word of the cross is foolishness to come to Christ beyond all doubt these also would have come. For He neither deceives nor is deceived when He says, "Every one that hath heard of the Father, and hath learned, cometh to me." Away, then, with the thought that any one cometh not, who has heard of the Father and has learned.

CHAP. 15.—IT IS BELIEVERS THAT ARE TAUGHT OF GOD.

"Why," say they, "does He not teach all men?" If we should say that they whom He does not teach are unwilling to learn, we shall be met with the answer: And what becomes of what is said to Him, "O God, Thou writ turn us again, and quicken us"? Or if God does not make men willing who were not willing, **on what principle does the Church pray**, according to the Lord's commandment, for her persecutors? For thus also the blessed Cyprian would have it to be understood that we say, "Thy will be done, as in heaven so in earth,"—that is, as in those who have already believed, and who are, as it were, heaven, so also in those who do not believe, and on this account are still the earth. What, then, do we pray for on behalf of those who are unwilling to believe, except that God would work in them to will also? Certainly the apostle says, "Brethren, my heart's good will, indeed, and my prayer to God for them, is for their salvation." **He prays for those who do not believe,— for what, except that they may believe?** For in no other way do they obtain salvation. If, then, the faith of the petitioners precede the grace of God, does the faith of them on whose behalf prayer is made that they may believe precede the grace of God?—since this is the very thing that is besought for them, that on them that believe not—that is, who have not faith—faith itself may be bestowed? **When, therefore, the gospel is preached, some believe, some believe not; but they who believe at the voice of the preacher from without, hear of the Father from within, and learn; while they who do not believe, hear outwardly, but inwardly do not hear nor learn;—that is to say, to the former it is given to believe; to the latter it is not given.** Because "no man," says He, "cometh to me, except the Father which sent me draw him." And this is more plainly said afterwards. **For after a little time, when He was speaking of eating his flesh and drinking His blood, and some even of His disciples said, "This is a hard saying, who can hear it? Jesus, knowing in Himself that His disciples murmured at this, said unto them, Doth this offend you?"** And a little after He said, "The words that I have spoken unto you are spirit and life; but **there are some among you which believe not.**" And immediately the evangelist says, "For Jesus knew from the beginning who were the believers, and who should betray Him; and He said, **Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me except it**

were given him of my Father." Therefore, to be drawn to Christ by the Father, and to hear and learn of the Father in order to come to Christ, is nothing else than to receive from the Father the gift by which to believe in Christ. For it was not the hearers of the gospel that were distinguished from those who did not hear, but the believers from those who did not believe, by Him who said, "No man cometh to me except it were given him of my Father."

CHAP. 16.—WHY THE GIFT OF FAITH IS NOT GIVEN TO ALL.

Faith, then, as well in its beginning as in its completion, is God's gift; and let no one have any doubt whatever, unless he desires to resist the plainest sacred writings, that this gift is given to some, while to some it is not given. But why it is not given to all ought not to disturb the believer, who believes that from one all have gone into a condemnation, which undoubtedly is most righteous; so that even if none were delivered therefrom, there would be no just cause for finding fault with God. Whence it is plain that it is a great grace for many to be delivered, and to acknowledge in those that are not delivered what would be due to themselves; so that he that glorieth may glory not in his own merits, which he sees to be equalled in those that are condemned, but in the Lord. But why He delivers one rather than another,— "His judgments are unsearchable, and His ways past finding out." For it is better in this case for us to hear or to say, "O man, who art thou that repliest against God?" than to dare to speak as if we could know what He has chosen to be kept secret. Since, moreover, He could not will anything unrighteous.

CHAP. 17 [IX.]—HIS ARGUMENT IN HIS LETTER AGAINST PORPHYRY, AS TO WHY THE GOSPEL CAME SO LATE INTO THE WORLD.

But that which you remember my saying in a certain small treatise of mine against Porphyry, under the title of The Time of the Christian Religion, I so said for the sake of escaping this more careful and elaborate argument about grace; although its meaning, which could be unfolded elsewhere or by others, was not wholly omitted, although I had been unwilling in that place to explain it. For, among other matters, I spoke thus in answer to the question proposed, why it was after so long a time that Christ came: "Accordingly, I say, since they do not object to Christ that all do not follow His teaching (for even they themselves feel that this could not be objected at all with any justice, either to the wisdom of the philosophers or even to the deity of their own gods), what will they reply, if—leaving out of the question that depth of God's wisdom and knowledge where perchance some other divine plan is far more secretly hidden, without prejudging also other causes, which cannot be traced out by the wise—we say to them only this, for the sake of brevity in the arguing of this question, that Christ willed to appear to men, and that His doctrine should be preached among them, at that time when He knew, and at that place where He knew, that there were some who would believe on Him. For at those times, and in those places, at which His gospel was not preached, He foreknew that all would be in His preaching such as, not indeed all, but many were in His bodily presence, who would not believe on Him, even when the dead were raised by Him; such as we see many now, who, although the declarations of the prophets concerning Him are fulfilled by such manifestations, are still unwilling to believe, and prefer to resist by human astuteness, rather than yield to divine authority so dear and perspicuous, and so lofty, and sublimely made known, so long as the human understanding is small and weak in its approach to divine truth. What wonder is it, then, if Christ knew the world in former ages to be so full of unbelievers, that He should reasonably refuse to appear, or to be preached to them, who, as He foreknew, would believe neither His words nor His miracles? For it is not incredible that all at that time were such as from His

coming even to the present time we marvel that so many have been and are. And yet from the beginning of the human race, sometimes more hiddenly, sometimes more evidently, even as to Divine Providence the times seemed to be fitting, there has neither been a failure of prophecy, nor were there wanting those who believed on Him; as well from Adam to Moses, as in the people of Israel itself which by a certain special mystery was a prophetic people; and in other nations before He had come in the flesh. For as some are mentioned in the sacred Hebrew books, as early as the time of Abraham,—neither of his fleshly race nor of the people of Israel nor of the foreign society among the people of Israel,—who were, nevertheless, sharers in their sacrament, why may we not believe that there were others elsewhere among other people, here and there, although we do not read any mention of them in the same authorities? **Thus the salvation of this religion, by which only true one true salvation is truly promised, never failed him who was worthy of it; and whoever it failed was not worthy of it. And from the very beginning of the propagation of man, even to the end, the gospel is preached,** to some for a reward, to some for judgment; and thus also those to whom the faith was not announced at all were foreknown as those who would not believe; and those to whom it was announced, although they were not such as would believe, are set forth as an example for the former; while those to whom it is announced who should believe, are prepared for the kingdom of heaven, and the company of the holy angels."

CHAP. 18.—THE PRECEDING ARGUMENT APPLIED TO THE PRESENT TIME.

Do you not see that my desire was, without any prejudgment of the hidden counsel of God, and of other reasons, to say what might seem sufficient about Christ's foreknowledge, to convince the unbelief of the pagans who had brought forward this question? For what is more true than that Christ foreknew who should believe on Him, and at what times and places they should believe? But whether by the preaching of Christ to themselves by themselves they were to have faith, or whether they would receive it by God's gift,—that is, whether God only foreknew them, or also predestinated them, I did not at that time think it necessary to inquire or to discuss. I Therefore what I said, "that Christ willed to appear to men at that time, and that His doctrine should be preached among them when He knew, and where He knew, that there were those who would believe on Him," may also thus be said, "That Christ willed to appear to men at that time, and that His gospel should be preached among those, whom He knew, and where He knew, that there were those who had been elected in Himself before the foundation of the world." But since, if it were so said, it would make the reader desirous of asking about those things which now by the warning of Pelagian errors must of necessity be discussed with greater copiousness and care, it seemed to me that what at that time was sufficient should be briefly said, leaving to one side, as I said, the depth of the wisdom and knowledge of God, and without prejudging other reasons, concerning which I thought that we might more fittingly argue, not then, but at some other time.

CHAP. 19 [X]—IN WHAT RESPECTS PREDESTINATION AND GRACE DIFFER.

Moreover, that which I said, **"That the salvation of this religion has never been lacking to him who was worthy of it, and that he to whom it was lacking was not worthy,"**—if it be discussed and it be asked whence any man can be worthy there are not wanting those who say—by human will. But we say, by **divine grace or predestination**. Further, between grace and predestination there is only this difference, that **predestination is the preparation for grace,** while **grace is the donation itself**. When, therefore the apostle says, "Not of works, lest any man

should boast. For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus in good works," it is grace; but what follows—"which God hath prepared that we should walk in them"—is predestination, which cannot exist without foreknowledge, although foreknowledge may exist without predestination; because God foreknew by predestination those things which He was about to do, whence it was said, "He made those things that shah be." Moreover, He is able to foreknow even those things which He does not Himself do,—as all sins whatever. Because, although there are some which are in such wise sins as that they are also the penalties of sins, whence it is said, "God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient," it is not in such a case the sin that is God's, but the judgment. Therefore God's predestination of good is, as I have said, the preparation of grace; which grace is the effect of that predestination. Therefore when God promised to Abraham in his seed the faith of the nations, saying, "I have established thee a father of many nations," whence the apostle says, "Therefore it is of faith, that the promise, according to grace, might be established to all the seed," He promised not from the power of our will but from His own predestination. For He promised what He Himself would do, not what men would do. Because, although men do those good things which pertain to God's worship, He Himself makes them to do what He has commanded; it is not they that cause Him to do what He has promised. Otherwise the fulfilment of God's promises would not be in the power of God, but in that of men; and thus what was promised by God to Abraham would be given to Abraham by men themselves. Abraham, however, did not believe thus, but "he believed, giving glory to God, that what He promised He is able also to do." He does not say, "to foretell"—he does not say, "to foreknow;" for He can foretell and foreknow the doings of strangers also; but he says, "He is able also to do;" and thus he is speaking not of the doings of others, but of His own.

CHAP. 20.—DID GOD PROMISE THE GOOD WORKS OF THE NATIONS AND NOT THEIR FAITH, TO ABRAHAM?

Did God, perchance, promise to Abraham in his seed the good works of the nations, so as to promise that which He Himself does, but did not promise the faith of the Gentiles, which men do for themselves; but so as to promise what He Himself does, did He foreknow that men would effect that faith? The apostle, indeed, does not speak thus, because God promised children to Abraham, who should follow the footsteps of his faith, as he very plainly says. But if He promised the works, and not the faith of the Gentiles certainly since they are not good works unless they are of faith (for "the righteous lives of faith," and, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin," and, "Without faith it is impossible to please"), it is nevertheless in man's power that God should fulfil what He has promised. For unless man should do what without the gift of God pertains to man, he will not cause God to give,—that is, unless man have faith of himself. God does not fulfil what He has promised, that works of righteousness should be given by God. And thus that God should be able to fulfil His promises is not in God's power, but man's. And if truth and piety do not forbid our believing this, let us believe with Abraham, that what He has promised He is able also to perform. But He promised children to Abraham; and this men cannot be unless they have faith, therefore He gives faith also.

CHAP. 21.—IT IS TO BE WONDERED AT THAT MEN SHOULD RATHER TRUST TO THEIR OWN WEAKNESS THAN TO GOD'S STRENGTH.

Certainly, when the apostle says, "Therefore it is of faith that the promise may be sure according to grace," I marvel that men would rather entrust themselves to their own weakness,

than to the strength of God's promise. But sayest thou, God's will concerning myself is to me uncertain? What then? Is thine own will concerning thyself certain to thee? and dost thou not fear,—“Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall”? Since, then, both are uncertain, why does not man commit his faith, hope, and love to the stronger will rather than to the weaker?

CHAP. 22.—GOD'S PROMISE IS SURE.

“But,” say they, “when it is said, ‘If thou believest, thou shalt be saved, one of these things is required; the other is offered. What is required is in man's power; what is offered is in God's.’” Why are not both in God's, as well what He commands as what He offers? For He is asked to give what He commands. Believers ask that their faith may be increased; they ask on behalf of those who do not believe, that faith may be given to them; therefore both in its increase and in its beginnings, faith is the gift of God. But it is said thus: “If thou believest, thou shalt be saved,” in the same way that it is said, “If by the Spirit ye shall mortify the deeds of the flesh, ye shall live.” For in this case also, of these two things one is required, the other is offered. It is said, “If by the Spirit ye shall mortify the deeds of the flesh, ye shall live.” Therefore, that we mortify the deeds of the flesh is required, but that we may live is offered. Is it, then, fitting for us to say, that to mortify the deeds of the flesh is not a gift of God, and not to confess it to be a gift of God, because we hear it required of us, with the offer of life as a reward if we shall do it? Away with this being approved by the partakers and champions of grace! This is the condemnable error of the Pelagians, whose mouths the apostle immediately stopped when he added, “For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God;” lest we should believe that we mortify the deeds of the flesh, not by God's Spirit, but by our own. And of this Spirit of God, moreover, he was speaking in that place where he says, “But all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing unto every man what is his own, as He will;” and among all these things, as you know, he also named faith. As, therefore, although it is the gift of God to mortify the deeds of the flesh, yet it is required of us, and life is set before us as a reward; so also faith is the gift of God, although when it is said, “If thou believest, thou shalt be saved,” faith is required of us, and salvation is proposed to us as a reward. For these things are both commanded us, and are shown to be God's gifts, in order that we may understand both that we do them, and that God makes us to do them, as He most plainly says by the prophet Ezekiel. For what is plainer than when He says, “I will cause you to do”? Give heed to that passage of Scripture, and you will see that God promises that He will make them to do those things which He commands to be done. He truly is not silent as to the merits but as to the evil deeds, of those to whom He shows that He is returning good for evil, by the very fact that He causeth them thenceforth to have good works, in causing them to do the divine commands.

CHAP. 23 [XII.] —REMARKABLE ILLUSTRATIONS OF GRACE AND PREDESTINATION IN INFANTS, AND IN CHRIST.

But all this reasoning, whereby we maintain that the grace of God through Jesus Christ our Lord is truly grace, that is, is not given according to our merits, although it is most manifestly asserted by the witness of the divine declarations, yet, among those who think that they are withheld from all zeal for piety unless they can attribute to themselves something, which they first give that it may be recompensed to them again, involves somewhat of a difficulty in respect of the condition of grown-up people, who are already exercising the choice of will. But when we come to the case of infants, and to the Mediator between God and man Himself, the

man Christ Jesus, there is wanting all assertion of human merits that precede the grace of God, because the former are not distinguished from others by any preceding good merits that they should belong to the Deliverer of men; any more than He Himself being Himself a man, was made the Deliverer of men by virtue of any precedent human merits.

CHAP. 24.—THAT NO ONE IS JUDGED ACCORDING TO WHAT HE WOULD HAVE DONE IF HE HAD LIVED LONGER.

For who can hear that infants, baptized in the condition of mere infancy, are said to depart from this life by reason of their future merits, and that others not baptized are said to die in the same age because their future merits are foreknown,—but as evil; so that God rewards or condemns in them not their good or evil life, but no life at all? The apostle, indeed, fixed a limit which man's incautious suspicion, to speak gently, ought not to transgress, for he says, "We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive according to the things which he has done by means of the body, whether it be good or evil." "Has done," he said; and he did not add, "or would have done." But I know not whence this thought should have entered the minds of such men, that infants' future merits (which shall not be) should be punished or honoured. But why is it said that a man is to be judged according to those things which he has done by means of the body, when many things are done by the mind alone, and not by the body, nor by any member of the body; and for the most part things of such importance, that a most righteous punishment would be due to such thought, such as,—to say nothing of others,—that "The fool hath said in his heart there is no God"? What, then, is the meaning of, "According to those things that he hath done by means of the body," except according to those things which he has done during that time in which he was in the body, so that we may understand "by means of the body" as meaning "throughout the season of bodily life"? But after the body, no one will be in the body except at the last resurrection,—not for the purpose of establishing any claims of merit, but for the sake of receiving recompenses for good merits, and enduring punishments for evil merits. But in this intermediate period between the putting off and the taking again of the body, the souls are either tormented or they are in repose, according to those things which they have done during the period of the bodily life. And to this period of the bodily life moreover pertains, what the Pelagians deny, but Christ's Church confesses, original sin; and according to whether this is by God's grace loosed, or by God's judgment not loosed, when infants die, they pass, on the one hand, by the merit of regeneration from evil to good, or on the other, by the merit of their origin from evil to evil. The catholic faith acknowledges this, and even some heretics, without any contradiction, agree to this. But in the height of wonder and astonishment I am unable to discover whence men, whose intelligence your letters show to be by no means contemptible, could entertain the opinion that any one should be judged not according to the merits that he had as long as he was in the body, but according to the merits which he would have had if he had lived longer in the body; and I should not dare to believe that there were such men, if I could venture to disbelieve you.

But I hope that God will interpose, so that when they are admonished they may at once perceive, that if those sins which, as is said, would have been, can rightly be punished by God's judgment in those who are not baptized, they may also be rightly remitted by God's grace in those who are baptized. For whoever says that future sins can only be punished by God's judgment, but cannot be pardoned by God's mercy, ought to consider how great a wrong he is doing to God and His grace; as if future sin could be foreknown, and could not be foregone. And if this is absurd, it is the greater reason that help should be afforded to those who would be sinners if they lived longer, when they die in early life, by means of that laver wherein sins are washed

away.

CHAP. 25 [XIII.]—POSSIBLY THE BAPTIZED INFANTS WOULD HAVE REPENTED IF THEY HAD LIVED, AND THE UNBAPTIZED NOT.

But if, perchance, they say that sins are re-remitted to penitents, and that those who die in infancy are not baptized because they are foreknown as not such as would repent if they should live, while God has foreknown that those who are baptized and die in infancy would have repented if they had lived, let them observe and see that if it be so it is not in this case original sins which are punished in infants that die without baptism, but what would have been the sins of each one had he lived; and also in baptized infants, that it is not original sins that are washed away, but their own future sins if they should live, since they could not sin except in more mature age; but that some were foreseen as such as would repent, and others as such as would not repent, therefore some were baptized, and others departed from this life without baptism. If the Pelagians should dare to say this, by their denial of original sin they would thus be relieved of the necessity of seeking, on behalf of infants outside of the kingdom of God, for some place of I know not what happiness of their own; especially since they are convinced that they cannot have eternal life because they have not eaten the flesh nor drank the blood of Christ; and because in them who have no sin at all, baptism, which is given for the remission of sins, is falsified. For they would go on to say that there is no original sin, but that those who as infants are released are either baptized or not baptized according to their future merits if they should live, and that according to their future merits they either receive or do not receive the body and blood of Christ, without which they absolutely cannot have life; and are baptized for the true remission of sins although they derived no sins from Adam, because the sins are remitted unto them concerning which God foreknew that they would repent. Thus with the greatest ease they would plead and would win their cause, in which they deny that there is any original sin, and contend that the grace of God is only given according to our merits. But that the future merits of men, which merits will never come into existence are beyond all doubt no merits at all, it is certainly most easy to see: for this reason even the Pelagians were not able to say this; and much rather these ought not to say it. For it cannot be said with what pain I find that they who with us on catholic authority condemn the error of those heretics, have not seen this, which the Pelagians themselves have seen to be most false and absurd.

CHAP. 26 [XIV]—REFERENCE TO CYPRIAN'S TREATISE "ON THE MORTALITY."

Cyprian wrote a work *On the Mortality*, known with approval to many and almost all who love ecclesiastical literature, wherein he says that death is not only not disadvantageous to believers, but that it is even found to be advantageous, because it withdraws men from the risks of sinning, and establishes them in a security of not sinning. But wherein is the advantage of this, if even future sins which have not been committed are punished? Yet he argues most copiously and well that the risks of sinning are not wanting in this life, and that they do not continue after this life is done; where also he adduces that testimony from the book of Wisdom: "He was taken away, lest wickedness should alter his understanding." And this was also adduced by me, though you said that those brethren of yours had rejected it on the ground of its not having been brought forward from a canonical book; as if, even setting aside the attestation of this book, the thing itself were not clear which I wished to be taught therefrom. For what Christian would dare to deny that the righteous man, if he should be prematurely laid hold of by death, will be in repose? Let who will, say this, and what man of sound faith will think that he

can withstand it? Moreover, if he should say that the righteous man, if he should depart from his righteousness in which he has long lived, and should die in that impiety after having lived in it, I say not a year, but one day, will go hence into the punishment due to the wicked, his righteousness having no power in the future to avail him,—will any believer contradict this evident truth? Further, if we are asked whether, if he had died then at the time that he was righteous, he would have incurred punishment or repose, shall we hesitate to answer, repose? This is the whole reason why it is said,—whoever says it,—" He was taken away lest wickedness should alter his understanding." For it was said in reference to the risks of this life, not with reference to the foreknowledge of God, who foreknew that which was to be, not that which was not to be—that is, that He would bestow on him an untimely death in order that he might be withdrawn from the uncertainty of temptations; not that he would sin, since he was not to remain in temptation. Because, concerning this life, we read in the book of Job, "Is not the life of man upon earth a temptation?" But why it should be granted to some to be taken away from the perils of this life while they are righteous, while others who are righteous until they fall from righteousness are kept in the same risks in a more lengthened life,—who has known the mind of the Lord? And yet it is permitted to be understood from this, that even those righteous people who maintain good and pious characters, even to the maturity of old age and to the last day of this life, must not glory in their own merits, but in the Lord. since He who took away the righteous man from the shortness of life, lest wickedness should alter his understanding, Himself guards the righteous man in any length of life, that wickedness may not alter his understanding. But why He should have kept the righteous man here to fall, when He might have withdrawn him before,—His judgments, although absolutely righteous, are yet unsearchable.

CHAP. 27.—THE BOOK OF WISDOM OBTAINS IN THE CHURCH THE AUTHORITY OF CANONICAL SCRIPTURE.

And since these things are so, the judgment of the book of Wisdom ought not to be repudiated, since for so long a course of years that book has deserved to be read in the Church of Christ from the station of the readers of the Church of Christ, and to be heard by all Christians, from bishops downwards, even to the lowest lay believers, penitents, and catechumens, with the veneration paid to divine authority. For assuredly, if, from those who have been before me in commenting on the divine Scriptures, I should bring forward a defence of this judgment, which we are now called upon to defend more carefully and copiously than usual against the new error of the Pelagians,—that is, that God's grace is not given according to our merits, and that it is given freely to whom it is given, because it is neither of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy; but that by righteous judgment it is not given to whom it is not given, because there is no unrighteousness with God;—if, therefore, I should put forth a defence of this opinion from catholic commentators on the divine oracles who have preceded us, assuredly these brethren for whose sake I am now discoursing would acquiesce, for this you have intimated in your letters. What need is there, then, for us to look into the writings of those who, before this heresy sprang up, had no necessity to be conversant in a question so difficult of solution as this, which beyond a doubt they would have done if they had been compelled to answer such things? Whence it arose that they touched upon what they thought of God's grace briefly in some passages of their writings, and cursorily; but on those matters which they argued against the enemies of the Church, and in exhortations to every virtue by which to serve the living and true God for the purpose of attaining eternal life and true happiness, they dwelt at length. But the grace of God, what it could do, shows itself artlessly by its frequent mention in prayers; for what God commands to be done would not be asked for from God, unless it could be

given by Him that it should be done.

CHAP. 28.—CYPRIAN'S TREATISE "ON THE MORTALITY."

But if any wish to be instructed in the opinions of those who have handled the subject, it behoves them to prefer to all commentators the book of Wisdom, where it is read, "He was taken away, that wickedness should not alter his understanding;" because illustrious commentators, even in the times nearest to the apostles, preferred it to themselves, seeing that when they made use of it for a testimony they believed that they were making use of nothing but a divine testimony; and certainly it appears that the most blessed Cyprian, in order to commend the advantage of an earlier death, contended that those who end this life, wherein sin is possible, are taken away from the risks of sins. In the same treatise, among other things, he says, "Why, when you are about to be with Christ, and are secure of the divine promise, do you not embrace being called to Christ, and rejoice that you are free from the devil?" And in another he says, "Why do we not hasten and run, that we may see our country, that we may hail our relatives? A great number of those who are dear to us are expecting us there,—a dense and abundant crowd of parents, brethren, sons, are longing for us; already secure of their own safety, but still anxious about our salvation." By these and such like sentiments, that teacher sufficiently and plainly testifies, in the clearest light of the catholic faith, that perils of sin and trials are to be feared even until the putting off of this body, but that afterwards no one shall suffer any such things. And even if he did not testify thus, when could any manner of Christian be in doubt on this matter? How, then, should it not have been of advantage to a man who has lapsed, and who finishes his life wretchedly in that same state of lapse, and passes into the punishment due to such as he,—how, I say, should it not have been of the greatest and highest advantage to such an one to be snatched by death from this sphere of temptations before his fall?

CHAP. 29.—GOD'S DEALING DOES NOT DEPEND UPON ANY CONTINGENT MERITS OF MEN.

And thus, unless we indulge in reckless disputation, the entire question is concluded concerning him who is taken away lest wickedness should alter his understanding. And the book of Wisdom, which for such a series of years has deserved to be read in Christ's Church, and in which this is read, ought not to suffer injustice because it withstands those who are mistaken on behalf of men's merit, so as to come in opposition to the most manifest grace of God: and **this grace chiefly appears in infants**, and while some of these baptized, and some not baptized, come to the end of this life, they sufficiently point to God's mercy and His judgment,—His mercy, indeed, gratuitous, His judgment, of debt. **For if men should be judged according to the merits of their life, which merits they have been prevented by death from actually having, but would have had if they had lived, it would be of no advantage to him who is taken away lest wickedness should alter his understanding; it would be of no advantage to those who die in a state of lapse if they should die before.** And this no Christian will venture to say. Wherefore our brethren, who with us on behalf of the catholic faith assail the pest of the Pelagian error, ought not to such an extent to favour the Pelagian opinion, wherein they conceive that God's grace is given according to our merits, as to endeavour (which they cannot dare) to invalidate a true sentiment, plainly and from ancient times Christian,—"He was taken away, lest wickedness should alter his understanding;" and to build up that which we should think, I do not say, no one would believe, but no one would dream,—to wit, that any deceased person would be judged according to those things which he would have done if he had lived for a more lengthened period. Surely thus what

we say manifests itself clearly to be incontestable,—that the grace of God is not given according to our merits; so that ingenious men who contradict this truth are constrained to say things which must be rejected from the ears and from the thoughts of all men.

CHAP. 30 [XV.]—THE MOST ILLUSTRIOUS INSTANCE OF PREDESTINATION IS CHRIST JESUS.

Moreover, the most illustrious Light of predestination and grace is the Saviour Himself,—the Mediator Himself between God and men, the man Christ Jesus. And, pray, by what preceding merits of its own, whether of works or of faith, did the human nature which is in Him procure for itself that it should be this? Let this have an answer, I beg. That man, whence did He deserve this—to be assumed by the Word co-eternal with the Father into unity of person, and be the only-begotten Son of God? Was it because any kind of goodness in Him preceded? What did He do before? What did He believe? What did He ask, that He should attain to this unspeakable excellence? Was it not by the act and the assumption of the Word that that man, from the time He began to be, began to be the only Son of God? Did not that woman, full of grace, conceive the only Son of God? Was He not born the only Son of God, of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary,—not of the lust of the flesh, but by God's peculiar gift? Was it to be feared that as age matured this man, He would sin of free will? Or was the will in Him not free on that account? and was it not so much the more free in proportion to the greater impossibility of His becoming the servant of sin? Certainly, in Him human nature—that is to say, our nature—specially received all those specially admirable gifts, and any others that may most truly be said to be peculiar to Him, by virtue of no preceding merits of its own. Let a man here answer to God if he dare, and say, Why was it not I also? And if he should heal "O than, who art thou that repliest against God?" let him not at this point restrain himself, but increase his impudence and say, "How is it that I heal Who art thou, O man? since I am what I hear,—that is, a than, and He of whom I speak is but the same? Why should not I also be what He is? For it is by grace that He is such and so great; why is grace different when nature is common? Assuredly, there is no respect of persons with God." I say, not what Christian man, but what madman will say this?

CHAP. 31.—CHRIST PREDESTINATED TO BE THE SON OF GOD.

Therefore in Him who is our Head let there appear to be the very fountain of grace, whence, according to the measure of every man, He diffuses Himself through all His members. It is by that grace that every man from the beginning of his faith becomes a Christian, by which grace that one man from His beginning became Christ. Of the same Spirit also the former is born again of which the latter was born. By the same Spirit is effected in us the remission of sins, by which Spirit it was effected that He should have no sin. God certainly foreknew that He would do these things. This, therefore, is that same predestination of the saints which most especially shone forth in the Saint of saints; and who is there of those who rightly understand the declarations of the truth that can deny this predestination? For we have learned that the Lord of glory Himself was predestinated in so far as the man was made the Son of God. The teacher of the Gentiles exclaims, in the beginning of his epistles, "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God (which He had promised afore by His prophets in the Holy Scriptures) concerning His Son, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was predestinated the Son of God in power, according to the Spirit of sanctification by the resurrection of the dead." Therefore Jesus was predestinated, so that He who was to be the Son of David according to the flesh should yet be in power the Son of God,

according to the Spirit of sanctification, because He was born of the Holy Spirit and of the Virgin Mary. This is that ineffably accomplished sole taking up of man by God the Word, so that He might truly and properly be called at the same time the Son of God and the Son of man,—Son of man on account of the man taken up, and the Son of God on account of the God only-begotten who took Him up, so that a Trinity and not a Quaternity might be believed in. Such a transporting of human nature was predestinated, so great, so lofty, and so sublime that there was no exalting it more highly,—just as on our behalf that divinity had no possibility of more humbly putting itself off, than by the assumption of man's nature with the weakness of the flesh, even to the death of the cross. As, therefore, that one man was predestinated to be our Head, so we being many are predestinated to be His members. Here let human merits which have perished through Adam keep silence, and let that grace of God reign which reigns through Jesus Christ our Lord, the only Son of God, the one Lord. Let whoever can find in our Head the merits which preceded that peculiar generation, seek in us His members for those merits which preceded our manifold regeneration. For that generation was not recompensed to Christ, but given; that He should be born, namely, of the Spirit and the Virgin, separate from all entanglement of sin. Thus also our being born again of water and the Spirit is not recompensed to us for any merit, but freely given; and if faith has brought us to the layer of regeneration, we ought not therefore to suppose that we have first given anything, so that the regeneration of salvation should be recompensed to us again; because He made us to believe in Christ, who made for us a Christ on whom we believe. He makes in men the beginning and the completion of the faith in Jesus who made the man Jesus the beginner and finisher of faith; for thus, as you know, He is called in the epistle which is addressed to the Hebrews.

CHAP. 32 [XVI.]—THE TWOFOLD CALLING.

God indeed calls many predestinated children of His, to make them members of His only predestinated Son,—not with that calling with which they were called who would not come to the marriage, since with that calling were called also the Jews, to whom Christ crucified is an offence, and the Gentiles, to whom Christ crucified is foolishness; but with that calling He calls the predestinated which the apostle distinguished when he said that he preached Christ, the wisdom of God and the power of God, to them that were called, Jews as well as Greeks. For thus he says "But unto them which are called," in order to show that there were some who were not called; knowing that there is a certain sure calling of those who are called according to God's purpose, **whom He has foreknown and predestinated before to be conformed to the image of His Son.** And it was this calling he meant when he said, **"Not of works, but of Him that calleth;** it was said unto her, That the elder shall serve the younger." Did he say, "Not of works, but of him that believeth"? Rather, he actually took this away from man, **that he might give the whole to God.** Therefore he said, "But of Him that calleth,"—not with any sort of calling whatever, but with that calling wherewith a man is made a believer.

CHAP. 33.—IT IS IN THE POWER OF EVIL MEN TO SIN; BUT TO DO THIS OR THAT BY MEANS

Moreover, it was this that he had in view when he said, "The gifts and calling of God are without repentance." And in that saying also consider for a little what was its purport. For when he had said, "For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, that ye may not be wise in yourselves, that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, and so all Israel should be saved; as it is written, There shall come out of

Sion one who shall deliver, and turn away impiety from Jacob: and this is the covenant to them from me, when I shall take away their sins;" he immediately added, what is to be very carefully understood, "As concerning the gospel, indeed, they are enemies for your sakes: but as concerning the election, they are beloved for their fathers' sake." What is the meaning of, "as concerning the gospel, indeed, they are enemies for your sake," but that their enmity wherewith they put Christ to death was, without doubt, as we see, an advantage to the gospel? And he shows that this came about by God's ordering, who knew how to make a good use even of evil things; not that the vessels of wrath might be of advantage to Him, but that by His own good use of them they might be of advantage to the vessels of mercy. For what could be said more plainly than what is actually said, "As concerning the gospel, indeed, they are enemies for your sakes"? It is, therefore, in the power of the wicked to sin; but that in sinning they should do this or that by that wickedness is not in their power, but in God's, who divides the darkness and regulates it; so that hence even what they do contrary to God's will is not fulfilled except it be God's will. We read in the Acts of the Apostles that when the apostles had been sent away by the Jews, and had come to their own friends, and shown them what great things the priests and elders said to them, they all with one consent lifted up their voices to the Lord and said, "Lord, thou art God, which hast made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein; who, by the mouth of our father David, thy holy servant, hast said, Why did the heathen rage, and the peoples imagine vain things? The kings of the earth stood up, and the princes were gathered together against the Lord, and against His Christ. For in truth, there have assembled together in this city against Thy holy child Jesus, whom Thou hast anointed, Herod and Pilate, and the people of Israel, to do whatever Thy hand and counsel predestinated to be done." See what is said: "As concerning the gospel, indeed, they are enemies for your sakes." Because God's hand and counsel predestinated such things to be done by the hostile Jews as were necessary for the gospel, for our sakes. But what is it that follows? "But as concerning the election, they are beloved for their fathers' sakes." For are those enemies who perished in their enmity and those of the same people who still perish in their opposition to Christ,—are those chosen and beloved? Away with the thought! Who is so utterly foolish as to say this? But both expressions, although contrary to one another—that is, "enemies" and "beloved"—are appropriate, though not to the same men, yet to the same Jewish people, and to the same carnal seed of Israel, of whom some belonged to the falling away, and some to the blessing of Israel himself. For the apostle previously explained this meaning more dearly when he said, "That which Israel wrought for, he hath not obtained; but the election hath obtained in and the rest were blinded? Yet in both cases it was the very same Israel. Where, therefore, we hear, "Israel hath not obtained," or, "The rest were blinded," there are to be understood the enemies for our sakes; but where we hear, "that the election hath obtained it," there are to be understood the beloved for their father's sakes, to which fathers those things were assuredly promised; because "the promises were made to Abraham and his seed," whence also in that olive-tree is grafted the wild olive-tree of the Gentiles. Now subsequently we certainly ought to fall in with the election, of which he says that it is according to grace, not according to debt, because "there was made a remnant by the election of grace" This election obtained it, the rest bring blinded. As concerning this election, the Israelites were beloved for the sake of their fathers. For they were not called with that calling of which it is said, "Many are called," but with that whereby the chosen are called. Whence also after he had said, "But as concerning the election, they are beloved for the fathers' sakes," he went on to add those words whence this discussion arose: "For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance,"—that is, they are firmly established without change. Those who belong to this calling are all teachable by God; nor can any of them say, "I believed in order to bring thus called," because the mercy of God anticipated him, because he was so called in order that he might believe. For all who are teachable of God come to the Son because they have heard and learned from the Father through the Son, who most clearly says, "Every one who has heard of

the Father, and has learned, cometh unto me." But of such as these none perishes, because "of all that the Father hath given Him, He will lose none." Whoever, therefore, is of these does not perish at all; nor was any who perishes ever of these. For which reason it is said, "They went out from among us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would certainly have continued with us."

CHAP. 34 [XVII.]—THE SPECIAL CALLING OF THE ELECT IS NOT BECAUSE THEY HAVE BELIEVED, BUT IN ORDER THAT THEY MAY BELIEVE.

Let us, then, understand the calling whereby they become elected,—not those who are elected because they have believed, but who are elected that they may believe. For the Lord Himself also sufficiently explains this calling when He says, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." For if they had been elected because they had believed, they themselves would certainly have first chosen Him by believing in Him, so that they should deserve to be elected. But He takes away this supposition altogether when He says "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." And yet they themselves, beyond a doubt, chose Him when they believed on Him. Whence it is not for any other reason that He says, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you," than because they did not choose Him that He should choose them, but **He chose them that they might choose Him; because His mercy preceded them according to grace,** not according to debt. Therefore He chose them out of the world while He was wearing flesh, but as those who were already chosen in Himself before the foundation of the world. This is the changeless truth concerning predestination and grace. For what is it that the apostle says, "**As He hath chosen us in Himself before the foundation of the world**"? And assuredly, if this were said because God foreknew that they would believe, not because He Himself would make them believers, the Son is speaking against such a foreknowledge as that when He says, "**Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you;**" when God should rather have foreknown this very thing, that they themselves would have chosen Him, so that they might deserve to be chosen by Him. Therefore they were elected before the foundation of the world with that predestination in which God foreknew what He Himself would do; but they were elected out of the world with that calling whereby God fulfilled that which He predestinated. **For whom He predestinated, them He also called, with that calling, to wit, which is according to the purpose.** Not others, therefore, but those whom He predestinated, them He also called; nor other, but those whom He so called, them He also justified; nor others, but those whom He predestinated, called, and justified, them He also glorified; assuredly to that end which has no end. Therefore **God elected believers;** but He chose them that they might be so, not because they were already so. The Apostle James says: "**Has not God chosen the poor in this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which God hath promised to them that love Him?**" By choosing them, makes them heirs of the kingdom; because He is rightly said to choose that in them, in order to make which in them He chose them. I ask, who can hear the Lord saying, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you," and can dare to say that men believe in order to be elected, when they are rather elected to believe; lest against the judgment of truth they be found to have first chosen Christ to whom Christ says, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen 'you'?"

CHAP. 35 [XVIII.]—ELECTION IS FOR THE PURPOSE OF HOLINESS.

Who can hear the apostle saying, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us in all spiritual blessing in the heavens in Christ; **as He has chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world,** that **we should be holy and without spot in His sight;**

in love predestinating us to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself according to the good pleasure of His will, wherein He hath shown us favour in His beloved Son; in whom we have redemption through His blood, the remission of sins according to the riches of His grace, which hath abounded to us in all wisdom and prudence; that He might show to us the mystery of His will according to His good pleasure, which He hath purposed in Himself, in the dispensation of the fulness of times, to restore all things in Christ, which are in heaven, and in the earth, in Him: in whom also we have obtained a share, being predestinated according to the purpose; who worketh all things according to the counsel of His will, that we should be to the praise of his glory;" —who, I say, can hear these words with attention and intelligence, and can venture to have any doubt concerning a truth so dear as this which we are defending? **God chose Christ's members in Him before the foundation of the world;** and how should He choose those who as yet did not exist, except by **predestinating them?** Therefore **He chose us by predestinating us.** Would he choose the unholy and the unclean? Now if the question be proposed, whether He would choose such, or rather the holy and unstained, who can ask which of these he may answer, and not give his opinion at once in favour of the holy and pure?

CHAP. 36.—GOD CHOSE THE RIGHTEOUS; NOT THOSE WHOM HE FORESAW AS BEING OF THEMSELVES, BUT THOSE WHOM HE PREDESTINATED FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING SO.

"Therefore," says the Pelagian, "He foreknew who would be holy and immaculate by the choice of free will, and on that account elected them before the foundation of the world in that same foreknowledge of His in which He foreknew that they would be such. Therefore He elected them," says he, "before they existed, predestinating them to be children whom He foreknew to be holy and immaculate. Certainly **He did not make them so; nor did He foresee that He would make them so, but that they would be so.**" Let us, then, look into the words of the apostle and see whether He chose us before the foundation of the world because we were going to be holy and immaculate, or in order that we might be so. "Blessed," says he, "be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us in all spiritual blessing in the heavens in Christ; even as He hath chosen us in Himself before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and unspotted." Not, then, because we were to be so, but that we might be so. Assuredly it is certain, —assuredly it is manifest. Certainly we were to be such for the reason that He has chosen us, predestinating us to be such by His grace. Therefore "He blessed us with spiritual blessing in the heavens in Christ Jesus, even as He chose us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and immaculate in His sight, order that we might not in so great a benefit of grace glory concerning the good pleasure of our will. "In which," says he, "He hath shown us favour in His beloved Son,"—in which, certainly, His own will, He hath shown us favour. Thus, it is said, He hath shown us grace by grace, even as it is said, He has made us righteous by righteous. "In whom," he says, "we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches is His grace, which has abounded to us in all was according to His own pleasure, should aid it to become so. But when he had said, "According to His good pleasure," he added, "which He purposed in Him," that is, in His beloved Son, "in the dispensation of the fulness of times to restore all things in Christ, which are in heaven, and which are in earth, in Him in whom also we too have obtained a lot, being predestinated according to His purpose who worketh all things according to the counsel of His will; that we should be to the praise of His glory."

CHAP. 37.—WE WERE ELECTED AND PREDESTINATED, NOT BECAUSE WE WERE GOING TO BE HOLY, BUT IN ORDER THAT WE MIGHT BE SO.

It would be too tedious to argue about the several points. But you see without doubt, you see with what evidence of apostolic declaration this grace is defended, in opposition to which human merits are set up, as if man should first give something for it to be recompensed to him again. **Therefore God chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world, predestinating us to the adoption of children, not because we were going to be of ourselves holy and immaculate, but He chose and predestinated us that we might be so.** Moreover, He did this according to the good pleasure of His will, so that nobody might glory concerning his own will, but about God's will towards himself. **He did this according to the riches of His grace, according to His good-will, which He purposed in His beloved Son; in whom we have obtained a share, being predestinated according to the purpose, not ours, but His, who worketh all things to such an extent as that He worketh in us to will also.** Moreover, He worketh according to the counsel of His will, that we may be to the praise of His glory. For this reason it is that we cry that no one should glory in man, and, thus, not in himself; but whoever glorieth let him glory in the Lord, that he may be for the praise of His glory. Because He Himself worketh according to His purpose that we may be to the praise of His glory, and, of course, holy and immaculate, for which purpose He called us, predestinating us before the foundation of the world. **Out of this, His purpose, is that special calling of the elect for whom He co-worketh with all things for good, because they are called according to His purpose, and "the gifts and calling of God are without repentance."**

CHAP. 38 [XIX]—WHAT IS THE VIEW OF THE PELAGIANS, AND WHAT OF THE SEMI-PELAGIANS, CONCERNING PREDESTINATION.

But these brethren of ours, about whom and on whose behalf we are now discoursing, say, perhaps, that the Pelagians are refuted by this apostolical testimony in which it is said that we are chosen in Christ and predestinated before the foundation of the world, in order that we should be holy and immaculate in His sight in love. For they think that "having received God's commands we are of ourselves by the choice of our free will made holy and immaculate in His sight in love; and since God foresaw that this would be the case," they say, "He therefore chose and predestinated us in Christ before the foundation of the world." Although the apostle says that it was not because He foreknew that we should be such, but in order that we might be such by the same election of His grace, by which He showed us favour in His beloved Son. When, therefore, He predestinated us, He foreknew His own work by which He makes us holy and immaculate. Whence the Pelagian error is rightly refuted by this testimony. "But we say," say they, "that God did not foreknow anything as ours except that faith by which we begin to believe, and that He chose and predestinated us before the foundation of the world, in order that we might be holy and immaculate by His grace and by His work." But let them also hear in this testimony the words where he says, "We have obtained a lot, being predestinated according to His purpose who worketh all things. He, therefore, worketh the beginning of our belief who worketh all things; because faith itself does not precede that calling of which it is said: "For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance;" and of which it is said: "Not of works, but of Him that calleth" (although He might have said, "of Him that believeth"); and the election which the Lord signified when He said: "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." For He chose us, not because we believed, but that we might believe, lest we should be said first to have chosen Him, and so His word be false (which be it far from us to think possible), "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." Neither are we called because we believed, but that we may

believe; and by that calling which is without repentance it is effected and carried through that we should believe. But all the many things which we have said concerning this matter need not to be repeated.

CHAP. 39—THE BEGINNING OF FAITH IS GOD'S GIFT.

Finally, also, in what follows this testimony, the apostle gives thanks to God on behalf of those who have believed;—**not, certainly, because the gospel has been declared to them, but because they have believed.** For he says, "In whom also after ye had heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the pledge of our inheritance, to the redemption of the purchased possession unto the praise of His glory. Wherefore I also, after I had heard of your faith in Christ Jesus and with reference to all the saints, cease not to give thanks to you."

Their faith was new and recent on the preaching of the gospel to them, which faith when he hears of, the apostle gives thanks to God on their behalf. If he were to give thanks to man for that which he might either think or know that man had not given, it would be called a flattery or a mockery, rather than a giving of thanks. "Do not err, for God is not mocked;" for His gift is also the beginning of faith, unless the apostolic giving of thanks be rightly judged to be either mistaken or fallacious. What then? Does that not appear as the beginning of the faith of the Thessalonians, for which, nevertheless, the same apostle gives thanks to God when he says, "For this cause also we thank God without ceasing, because when ye had received from us the word of the healing of God, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth the word of God, which effectually worketh in you and which ye believed"? What is that for which he here gives thanks to God? Assuredly it is a vain and idle thing if He to whom he gives thanks did not Himself do the thing. But, since this is not a vain and idle thing, certainly God, to whom he gave thanks concerning this work, Himself did it; that when they had received the word of the healing of God, they received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth the word of God. God, therefore, worketh in the hearts of men with that calling according to His purpose, of which we have spoken a great deal, that they should not hear the gospel in vain, but when they heard it, should be converted and believe, receiving it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth the word of God.

CHAP. 40[XX]—APOSTOLIC TESTIMONY TO THE BEGINNING OF FAITH BEING GOD'S GIFT.

Moreover, we are admonished that the beginning of men's faith is God's gift, since the apostle signifies this when, in the Epistle to the Colossians, he says, "Continue in prayer, and watch in the same in giving of thanks. Withal praying also for us that God would open unto us the door of His word, to speak the mystery of Christ, for which also I am bonds, that I may so to make it manifest as ought to speak." How is the door of His word opened, except when the sense of the hearer is opened so that he may believe, and, having made a beginning of faith, may admit those things which are declared and reasoned, for the purpose of building up wholesome doctrine, lest, by a heart closed through unbelief, he reject and repel those things which are spoken? Whence, also, he says to the Corinthians: "But I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost. For a great and evident door is opened unto me, and there are many adversaries." What else can be understood here, save that, when the gospel had been first of all preached there by him, many had believed, and there had appeared many adversaries of the same faith, in accordance with

that saying of the Lord, "No one cometh unto me, unless it were given him of my Father;" and, "To you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given"? Therefore, there is an open door in those to whom it is given, but there are many adversaries among those to whom it is not given.

CHAP. 41.—FURTHER APOSTOLIC TESTIMONIES.

And again, the same apostle says to the same people, in his second Epistle: "When I had come to Troas for the gospel of Christ, and a door had been opened unto me in the Lord, I had no rest in my spirit, because I found not Titus, my brother: but, making my farewell to them, I went away into Macedonia," To whom did he bid farewell but to those who had believed,—to wit, in whose hearts the door was opened for his preaching of the gospel? But attend to what he adds, saying, "Now thanks be unto God, who always causes us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savour of His knowledge by us in every place: because we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ in them who are saved, and in them who perish: to some, indeed, we are the savour of death unto death, but to some the savour of life unto life." See concerning what this most zealous soldier and invincible defender of grace gives thanks. See concerning what he gives thanks,—that the apostles are a sweet savour of Christ unto God, both in those who are saved by His grace, and in those who perish by His judgment. But in order that those who little understand these things may be less enraged, he himself gives a warning when he adds the words: "And who is sufficient for these things?" But let us return to the opening of the door by which the apostle signified the beginning of faith in his hearers. For what is the meaning of, "Withal praying also for us that God would open unto us a door of the word," unless it is a most manifest demonstration that even the very beginning of faith is the gift of God? For it would not be sought for from Him in prayer, unless it were believed to be given by Him. This gift of heavenly grace had descended to that seller of purple for whom, as Scripture says in the Acts of the Apostles, "The Lord opened her heart, and she gave heed unto the things which were said by Paul;" for she was so called that she might believe. Because God does what He will in the hearts of men, either by assistance or by judgment; so that, even through their means, may be fulfilled what His hand and counsel have predestinated to be done.

CHAP. 42.—OLD TESTAMENT TESTIMONIES.

Therefore also it is in vain that objectors have alleged, that what we have proved by Scripture testimony from the books of Kings and Chronicles is not pertinent to the subject of which we are discoursing: such, for instance, as that when God wills that to be done which ought only to be done by the willing men, their hearts are inclined to will this,—inclined, that is to say, by His power, who, in a marvellous and ineffable manner, worketh in us also to will. What else is this than to say nothing, and yet to contradict? Unless perchance, they have given some reason to you for the view that they have taken, which reason you have preferred to say nothing about in your letters. But what that reason can be I do not know. Whether, possibly, since we have shown that God has so acted on the hearts of men, and has induced the wills of those whom He pleased to this point, that Saul or David should be established as king,—do they not think that these instances are appropriate to this subject, because to reign in this world temporally is not the same thing as to reign eternally with God? And so do they suppose that God inclines the wills of those whom He pleases to the attainment of earthly kingdoms, but does not incline them to the attainment of a heavenly kingdom? But I think that it was in reference to the kingdom of heaven, and not to an earthly kingdom, that it was said, "Incline my heart unto Thy testimonies; or, "The

steps of a man are ordered by the Lord, and He will will His way;")or, "The will is prepared by the Lord;" or, "Let our Lord be with us as with our fathers; let Him not forsake us, nor turn Himself away from us; let Him incline our hearts unto Him, that we may walk in all His ways;" or, "I will give them a heart to know me, and earn that hear;" or, "I will give them another heart, and a new spirit will I give them." Let them also hear this, "I will give my Spirit within you, and I will cause you to walk in my righteousness; and ye shall observe my judgments,, and do them." Let them hear "Man's goings are directed by the Lord, and how can a man understand His ways?" Let them hear, "Every man seemeth right to himself, but the Lord directeth the hearts." Let them hear, "As many as were ordained to eternal life believed." Let them hear these passages, and whatever others of the kind I have not mentioned in which God is declared to prepare and to convert men's wills, even for the kingdom of heaven and for eternal life. And consider what sort of a thing it is to believe that God worketh men's wills for the foundation of earthly kingdoms, but that men work their own wills for the attainment of the kingdom of heaven.

CHAP. 43 [XXI.]—CONCLUSION.

I have said a great deal, and, perchance, I could long ago have persuaded you what I wished, and am still speaking this to such intelligent minds as if they were obtuse, to whom even what is too much is not enough. But let them pardon me, for a new question has compelled me to this. Because, although in my former little treatises I had proved by sufficiently appropriate proofs that faith also was the gift of God, there was found this ground of contradiction, viz., that those testimonies were good for this purpose, to show that the increase of faith was God's gift, but that **the beginning of faith, whereby a man first of all believes in Christ, is of the man himself, and is not the gift of God,**—but that God requires this, so that when it has of God; and that none of them is given freely, although in them God's grace is declared, which is not grace except as being gratuitous. And you see how absurd all this is. Wherefore I determined, as far as I could, to set forth that **this very beginning also is God's gift.** And if I have done this at a greater length than perhaps those on whose account I did it might wish, I am prepared to be reproached for it by them, so long as they nevertheless confess that, although at greater length than they wished, although with the disgust and weariness of those that understand, I have done what I have done: that is, **I have taught that even the beginning of faith, as continence, patience, righteousness, piety, and the rest, concerning which there is no dispute with them, is God's gift.** Let this, therefore, be the end of this treatise, lest too great length in this one may give offence.