

**COMPLETE PHILOSOPHICAL AND  
THEOLOGICAL TREATISES  
of  
ANSELM of CANTERBURY**

Translated  
by  
**JASPER HOPKINS**  
and  
**HERBERT RICHARDSON**

**The Arthur J. Banning Press  
Minneapolis**

In the notes to the translations the numbering of the Psalms accords with the Douay version and, in parentheses, with the King James (Authorized) version. A reference such as "S II, 264:18" indicates "F. S. Schmitt's edition of the Latin texts, Vol. II, p. 264, line 18."

Library of Congress Control Number: 00-133229

ISBN 0-938060-37-6

Printed in the United States of America

Copyright © 2000 by The Arthur J. Banning Press, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402. All rights reserved.

**THE HARMONY OF THE FOREKNOWLEDGE,  
THE PREDESTINATION, AND THE GRACE  
OF GOD WITH FREE CHOICE.<sup>1</sup>**  
*(De Concordia Praescientiae et Praedestinationis  
et Gratiae Dei cum Libero Arbitrio)*

With the help of God I shall try to set forth in writing what He will deign to reveal to me concerning these three controversies in which free choice seems to be incompatible with (1) the foreknowledge, (2) the predestination, and (3) the grace of God.

[First Controversy:] Foreknowledge and Free Choice

I

Admittedly, free choice and the foreknowledge of God seem incompatible; for it is necessary that the things foreknown by God be going to occur, whereas the things done by free choice occur without any necessity. Now, if these two are incompatible, then it is impossible that God's all-foreseeing foreknowledge should co-exist with something's being done by freedom of choice. In turn, if this impossibility is regarded as not obtaining, then the incompatibility which seems to be present is completely eliminated.

Therefore, let us posit as existing together both God's foreknowledge (from which the necessity of future things seems to follow) and freedom of choice (by which many actions are believed to be done without any necessity); and let us see whether it is impossible for these two to co-exist. If this co-existence is impossible, then some other impossibility arises from it. For, indeed, an impossible thing is one from which, when posited, some other impossible thing follows.

Now, if something is going to occur without necessity, God foreknows this, since he foreknows all future events. And that which is foreknown by God is, necessarily, going to occur, as is foreknown. Therefore, it is necessary that something be going to occur without necessity. Hence, the foreknowledge from which necessity follows and the freedom of choice from which necessity is absent are here seen (for one who rightly understands it) to be not

---

<sup>1</sup>Completed in Canterbury around 1107-1108.

at all incompatible. For, on the one hand, it is necessary that what is foreknown by God be going to occur; and, on the other hand, God foreknows that something is going to occur without any necessity.

But you will say to me: “You still do not remove from me the necessity of sinning or the necessity of not sinning. For God foreknows that I am going to sin or foreknows that I am not going to sin. And so, if I sin, it is necessary that I sin; or if I do not sin, it is necessary that I do not sin.” To this claim I reply: You ought to say not merely “God foreknows that I am going to sin” or “God foreknows that I am not going to sin” but “God foreknows that it is without necessity that I am going to sin” or “God foreknows that it is without necessity that I am not going to sin.” And thus it follows that whether you sin or do not sin, in either case it will be without necessity; for God foreknows that what will occur will occur without necessity. Do you see, then, that it is not impossible for God's foreknowledge (according to which future things, which God foreknows, are said to occur of necessity) to co-exist with freedom of choice (by which many actions are performed without necessity)? For if this co-existence were impossible, then something impossible would follow. But no impossibility arises from this co-existence.

Perhaps you will claim: “You still do not remove the constraint of necessity from my heart when you say that, because of God's foreknowledge, it is necessary for me to be going to sin without necessity or it is necessary for me to be not going to sin without necessity. For *necessity* seems to imply coercion or restraint. Therefore, if it is necessary that I sin willingly, I interpret this as indicating that I am compelled by some hidden power to will to sin; and if I do not sin, [I interpret this as indicating that] I am restrained from willing to sin. Therefore, it seems to me that (1) if I sin, I sin by necessity and (2) if I do not sin, by necessity I do not sin.”

## 2

And I [reply]: We must realize that we often say “necessary to be” of what is not compelled-to-be by any force, and “necessary not to be” of what is not excluded by any preventing factor. For example, we say “It is necessary for God to be immortal” and “It is

necessary for God not to be unjust.” [We say this] not because some force compels Him to be immortal or prohibits Him from being unjust, but because nothing can cause Him not to be immortal or can cause Him to be unjust. Similarly, then, I might say: “It is necessary that you are going to sin voluntarily” or “It is necessary that, voluntarily, you are not going to sin”—just as God foreknows. But these statements must not be construed to mean that something prevents the act of will which shall not occur or compels to occur that act of will which shall occur. For God, who foresees that some action is going to occur voluntarily, foreknows the very fact that the will is neither compelled nor prevented by anything. Hence, what is done voluntarily is done freely. Therefore, if these matters are carefully pondered, I think that no inconsistency prevents freedom of choice and God's foreknowledge from co-existing.

Indeed, (if someone properly considers the meaning of the word), by the very fact that something is said to be *foreknown*, it is declared to be going to occur. For only what is going to occur is foreknown, since knowledge is only of the truth. Therefore, when I say “If God foreknows something, it is necessary that this thing be going to occur,” it is as if I were to say: “If this thing will occur, of necessity it will occur.” But this necessity neither compels nor prevents a thing's existence or non-existence. For because the thing is presumed to exist, it is said to exist of necessity; or because it is presumed not to exist, it is said to not-exist of necessity. [But our reason for saying these things is] not that necessity compels or prevents the thing's existence or non-existence. For when I say “If it will occur, of necessity it will occur,” here the necessity follows, rather than precedes, the presumed existence of the thing. The sense is the same if we say “What will be, of necessity will be.” For this necessity signifies nothing other than that what will occur will not be able not to occur at the same time.

Likewise, the following statements are both true: (1) that some thing did exist and does exist and will exist, but not out of necessity, and (2) that all that was, necessarily was, all that is, necessarily is, and all that will be, necessarily will be. Indeed, for a thing to be past is not the same as for a past thing to be past; and for a thing to be present is not the same as for a present thing to be present; and for a thing to be future is not the same as for a

future thing to be future. By comparison, for a thing to be white is not the same as for a white thing to be white. For example, a staff is not always necessarily white, because at some time before it became white it was able not to become white; and after it has become white, it is able to become not-white. But it is necessary that a white staff always be white. For neither before a white thing was white nor after it has become white can it happen that a white thing is not-white at the same time. Similarly, it is not by necessity that a thing is temporally present. For before the thing was present, it was able to happen that it would not be present; and after it has become present, it can happen that it not remain present. But it is necessary that a present thing always be present, because neither before it is present nor after it has become present is a present thing able to be not-present at the same time. In the same way, some event—e.g., an action—is going to occur without necessity, because before the action occurs, it can happen that it not be going to occur. On the other hand, it is necessary that a future event be future, because what is future is not able at the same time to be not-future.

Of the past it is similarly true (1) that some event is not necessarily past, because before it occurred, there was the possibility of its not occurring, and (2) that, necessarily, what is past is always past, since it is not able at the same time not to be past. Now, a past event has a characteristic which a present event or a future event does not have. For it is never possible for a past event to become not-past, as a present event is able to become not-present, and as an event which is not necessarily going to happen has the possibility of not happening in the future. Thus, when we say of what is going to happen that it is going to happen, this statement must be true, because it is never the case that what is going to happen is not going to happen. (Similarly, whenever we predicate something of itself, [the statement is true]. For example, when we say “Every man is a man,” or “If he is a man, he is a man,” or “Every white thing is white,” or “If it is a white thing, it is white”: these statements must be true, because something cannot both be and not be the case at the same time.) Indeed, if it were not necessary that everything which is going to happen were going to happen, then something which is going to happen would not be going to happen—a contradiction. Therefore, *necessarily*, everything

which is going to happen is going to happen; and if it is going to happen, it is going to happen. (For we are saying of what is going to happen that it is going to happen.) But [“necessarily” here signifies] subsequent necessity, which does not compel anything to be.

## 3

However, when an event is said to be going to occur, it is not always the case that the event occurs by necessity, even though it is going to occur. For example, if I say “Tomorrow there will be an insurrection among the people,” it is not the case that the insurrection will occur by necessity. For before it occurs, it is *possible* that it not occur even if it *is* going to occur. On the other hand, it is sometimes the case that the thing which is said to be going to occur does occur by necessity—for example, if I say that tomorrow there will be a sunrise. Therefore, if of an event which is going to occur I state that it must be going to occur, [I do so] either in the way that the insurrection which is going to occur tomorrow is, necessarily, going to occur, or else in the way that the sunrise which is going to occur tomorrow is going to occur by necessity. Indeed, the insurrection (which will occur but not by necessity) is said necessarily to be going to occur—but only in the sense of subsequent necessity. For we are saying of what is going to happen that it is going to happen. For if the insurrection is going to occur tomorrow, then—necessarily—it is going to occur. On the other hand, the sunrise is understood to be going to occur with two necessities: (1) with a preceding necessity, which causes the event to occur (for the event will occur because it is necessary that it occur), and (2) with a subsequent necessity, which does not compel anything to occur (for because the sunrise is going to occur, it is—necessarily—going to occur).

Therefore, when of what God foreknows to be going to occur we say that it is necessary that it be going to occur, we are not in every case asserting that the event is going to occur by necessity; rather, we are asserting that an event which is going to occur is, necessarily, going to occur. For something which is going to occur cannot at the same time be not going to occur. The meaning is the same when we say “If God foreknows such-and-such an event”—without adding “which is going to occur.” For in the verb “to fore-

know” the notion of future occurrence is included, since to fore-know is nothing other than to know the future; and so if God fore-knows some event, it is necessary that this event be going to occur. Therefore, from the fact of God's foreknowledge it does not in every case follow that an event is going to occur by necessity. For although God foreknows all future events, He does not foreknow that all of them are going to occur by necessity. Rather, He fore-knows that some of them will occur as the result of the free will of a rational creature.

Indeed, we must note that just as it is not necessary for God to will what He does will, so in many cases it is not necessary for a man to will what he does will. And just as whatever God wills must occur, so what a man wills must occur—in the case, that is, of the things which God so subordinates to the human will that if it wills them they occur and if it does not will them they do not occur. For since what God wills is not able not to occur: when He wills for no necessity either to compel the human will to will or to prevent it from willing, and when He wills that the effect follow from the act of human willing, it is necessary that the human will be free and that there occur what it wills. In this respect, then, it is true that the sinful deed which a man wills to do occurs by necessity, even though the man does not will it by necessity. Now, with respect to the human will's sin when it wills to sin: if someone asks whether this sin occurs by necessity, then he must be told that just as the will does not will by necessity, so the will's sin does not occur by necessity. Nor does the human will act by necessity; for if it did not will freely, it would not act—even though what it wills must come to pass, as I have just said. For since, in the present case, to sin is nothing other than to will what ought not [to be willed]: just as willing is not necessary, so sinful willing is not necessary. Nevertheless, it is true that if a man wills to sin, it is necessary that he sin—in terms, that is, of that necessity which (as I have said) neither compels nor prevents anything.

Thus, on the one hand, free will is able to keep from willing what it wills; and, on the other hand, it is not able to keep from willing what it wills—rather, it is necessary for free will to will what it wills. For, indeed, before it wills, it is able to keep from willing, because it is free. And while it wills, it is not able not to will; rather, it is necessary that it will, since it is impossible for it to



will and not to will the same thing at the same time. Now, it is the will's prerogative that what it wills occurs and that what it does not will does not occur. And the will's deeds are voluntary and free because they are done by a free will. But these deeds are necessary in two respects: (1) because the will compels them to be done, and (2) because what is being done cannot at the same time not be done. But these two necessities are produced by freedom-of-will; and the free will is able to avoid them before they occur. Now, God (who knows all truth and only truth) sees all these things as they are—whether they be free or necessary; and as He sees them, so they are. In this way, then, and without any inconsistency, it is evident both that God foreknows all things and that many things are done by free will. And before these things occur it is possible that they never occur. Nevertheless, in a certain sense they occur necessarily; and this necessity (as I said) derives from free will.

## 4

Moreover, that not everything foreknown by God occurs of necessity but that some events occur as the result of freedom-of-will can be recognized from the following consideration. When God wills or causes something, He cannot be denied to know what He wills and causes and to foreknow what He shall will and shall cause. ([It makes no difference here] whether we speak in accordance with eternity's immutable present, in which there is nothing past or future, but in which all things exist at once without any change (e.g., if we say only that He wills and causes something, and deny that He has willed or has caused and shall will or shall cause something), or whether we speak in accordance with temporality (as when we state that He shall will or shall cause that which we know has not yet occurred). Therefore, if God's knowledge or foreknowledge imposes necessity on everything He knows or foreknows, then He does not freely will or cause anything (either in accordance with eternity or in accordance with a temporal mode); rather, He wills and causes everything by necessity. Now, if this conclusion is absurd even to suppose, then it is not the case that everything known or foreknown by God to be or not to be occurs or fails to occur by necessity. Therefore, nothing prevents God's knowing or foreknowing that in our wills and actions

something occurs or will occur by free choice. Thus, although it is necessary that what He knows or foreknows, occur, nevertheless many events occur not by necessity but by free will—as I have shown above.

Indeed, why is it strange if in this way something occurs both freely and necessarily? For there are many things which admit of opposite characteristics in different respects. Indeed, what is more opposed than coming and going? Nevertheless, when someone moves from one place to another, we see that his movement is both a coming and a going. For he goes away from one place and comes toward another. Likewise, if we consider the sun at some point in the heavens, as it is hastening toward this same point while always illuminating the heavens: we see that the point to which it is coming is the same point from which it is going away; and it is constantly and simultaneously approaching the point from which it is departing. Moreover, to those who know the sun's course, it is evident that in relation to the heavens, the sun always moves from the western sector to the eastern sector; but in relation to the earth, it always moves only from east to west. Thus, the sun always moves both counter to the firmament and—although more slowly [than the firmament]—with the firmament. This same phenomenon is witnessed in the case of all the planets. So then, no inconsistency arises if (in accordance with the considerations just presented) we assert of one and the same event (1) that, necessarily, it is going to occur (simply because it is going to occur) and (2) that it is not compelled to be going to occur by any necessity—except for the necessity which (as I said above) derives from free will.

## 5

Now, Job says to God with reference to man: “You have established his bounds, which cannot be passed.”<sup>1</sup> On the basis of this verse someone might want to prove—in spite of the fact that sometimes someone does seem to us to cause his own death by his own free will—that no one has been able to hasten or delay the day of his death. But his objection would not tell against that which I have argued above. For since God is not deceived and sees only the

<sup>1</sup>Job 14:5.

truth—whether it issues from freedom or from necessity—He is said to have established immutably with respect to Himself something which, with respect to man, can be altered before it is done. This is also what the Apostle Paul says about those who, in accordance with [God's] purpose, are called to be saints: “Whom He foreknew He predestined to become conformed to the image of His Son, so that His Son would be the firstborn among many brethren. And whom He predestined, these He also called. And whom He called, these He also justified. And whom He justified, these He also glorified.”<sup>1</sup> Indeed, within eternity (in which there is no past or future but is only a present) this purpose, in accordance with which they have been called to be saints, is immutable. But in these men this purpose is at some time mutable because of freedom of choice. For within eternity a thing has no past or future but only a present; and yet, without inconsistency, in the dimension of time this thing was and will be. Similarly, that which within eternity is not able to be changed is proved to be, without inconsistency, changeable by free will at some point in time before it occurs. However, although within eternity there is only a present, nonetheless it is not the temporal present, as is ours, but is an eternal present in which the whole of time is contained. For, indeed, just as present time encompasses every place and whatever is in any place, so in the eternal present the whole of time is encompassed at once, as well as whatever occurs at any time. Therefore, when the apostle says that God foreknew, predestined, called, justified, and glorified His saints, none of these actions is earlier or later for God; rather everything must be understood to exist at once in an eternal present. For eternity has its own “simultaneity” wherein exist all things that occur at the same time and place and that occur at different times and places.

But in order to show that he was not using these verbs in their temporal sense, the same apostle spoke in the past tense of even those events which are future. For, temporally speaking, God had not already called, justified, and glorified those who He foreknew were still to be born. Thus, we can recognize that for lack of a verb [properly] signifying the eternal present, the apostle used verbs of past tense; for things which are temporally past are altogether

---

<sup>1</sup>Romans 8:28-29.

immutable, after the fashion of the eternal present. Indeed, in this respect, things which are temporally past resemble the eternal present more than do things which are temporally present. For eternally present things are never able not to be present, just as temporally past things are never able not to be past. But all temporally present things which pass away do become not-present.

In this manner, then, whenever Sacred Scripture speaks as if things done by free choice were necessary, it speaks in accordance with eternity, in which is present immutably all truth and only truth. Scripture is not speaking in accordance with the temporal order, wherein our volitions and actions do not exist forever. Moreover, just as when our volitions and actions do not exist, it is not necessary that they exist, so it is often not necessary that they ever exist. For example, it is not the case that I am always writing or that I always will to write. And just as when I am not writing or do not will to write, it is not necessary that I write or will to write, so it is not at all necessary that I ever write or will to write.

A thing is known to exist in time so differently from the way it exists in eternity that at some point the following statements are true: (1) in time something is not present which is present in eternity; (2) in time something is past which is not past in eternity; (3) in time something is future which is not future in eternity. Similarly, then, it is seen to be impossible to be denied, in any respect, that in the temporal order something is mutable which is immutable in eternity. Indeed, being mutable in time and being immutable in eternity are no more opposed than are not existing at some time and always existing in eternity—or than are existing in the past or future according to the temporal order and not existing in the past or future in eternity.

For, indeed, the point I am making is not that something which always exists in eternity never exists in time, but is only that there is some time or other at which it does not exist. For example, I am not saying that my action of tomorrow at no time exists; I am merely denying that it exists today, even though it always exists in eternity. And when we deny that something which is past or future in the temporal order is past or future in eternity, we do not maintain that that which is past or future does not in any way exist in eternity; instead, we are simply saying that what exists there unceasingly in its eternal-present mode does not exist there in the

past or future mode. In these cases no contradiction is seen to raise an obstruction. Thus, without doubt and without any contradiction, a thing is said to be mutable in time, prior to its occurrence, although it exists immutably in eternity. [In eternity] there is no time before it exists or after it exists; instead, it exists unceasingly, because in eternity nothing exists temporally. For there exists there, eternally, the fact that temporally something both exists and—before it exists—is able not to exist (as I have said). It seems to me to be sufficiently clear from what has been said that free choice and God's foreknowledge are not at all inconsistent with each other. Their consistency results from the nature of eternity, which encompasses the whole of time and whatever occurs at any time.

## 6

But since we do not in all respects have free choice, we must consider where and what that *freedom* of choice is which we believe a man always to have, and what that choice itself is. For choice and the freedom in terms of which the choice is called free are not identical. We speak of freedom and of choice in many cases—as, for example, when we say that someone has the freedom to speak or not to speak and that whichever of these he wills lies within his choice. Likewise, in many other instances we speak of a freedom and of a choice which are not always present or else are not necessary to us for the salvation of our souls. However, the present investigation is being conducted only with respect to that choice and that freedom without which a man, after once being able to use them, cannot be saved. For many people lament because they believe that free choice is of no avail for salvation or condemnation but that as a result of God's foreknowledge only necessity [determines salvation or condemnation]. Therefore, since after a human being has reached the age of understanding, he is not saved apart from being just: the choice and the freedom which are under discussion must be dealt with in terms of where the seat of justice is. Accordingly, first justice must be exhibited and, next, this freedom and this choice.

Indeed, any justice whatever (whether great or small) is uprightness-of-will kept for its own sake. And the freedom [which is under discussion] is the ability to keep uprightness-of-will for its

own sake. I regard myself as already having set forth these definitions with clear reasoning—the first one in the treatise which I wrote *On Truth*, and the second in the treatise which I composed *On this very Freedom*. In the latter, I also showed how this freedom is present in a man inseparably and naturally, even though he does not always use it. Moreover, [I showed] that it is so powerful that as long as a man wills to use it nothing is able to remove from him the aforementioned uprightness (i.e., justice) which he has. By contrast, justice is not a natural possession; in the beginning it was separable from the angels in Heaven and from men in Paradise. And even now in this life [it is separable], not by necessity but by the autonomous willing of those who possess it. Now, since it is evident that the justice by which someone is just is uprightness-of-will, which (as I have said) is present in someone only when he wills what God wills for him to will: it is evident that God is not able to remove this uprightness from him against his will; for God cannot will this removal. Moreover, neither can God will for one who possesses uprightness to desert it unwillingly as the result of some compelling force. (Indeed, [were that the case] God would will for him not to will that which He wills for him to will—which is impossible). Therefore, it follows that in this manner God wills that an upright will be free for willing rightly and for keeping this uprightness. And when the upright will is able [to do] what it wills, it does freely what it does. Hence, we can also recognize very clearly that both a will and its action are free—without its being the case that God's foreknowledge is incompatible therewith, as was demonstrated above.

Let us now posit an example in which there appears an upright (i.e., a just) will, freedom of choice, and an actual choice. And [let us consider] both how the upright will is attacked so that it deserts uprightness and how the upright will keeps uprightness by means of free choice. [Let us suppose that] someone desires to cling to the truth because he discerns that it is right to love the truth. Surely, he already has an upright will and uprightness-of-will. But the will is distinguishable from the uprightness by which it is upright. Now, [suppose that] another man approaches and threatens the first man with death unless he tells a lie. We see that it is now within this man's choice whether to relinquish his life for the sake of uprightness-of-will or to relinquish uprightness for the sake of his

life. This choice—which can be called a judgment—is free; for reason, by means of which uprightness is understood, teaches that this uprightness ought always to be cherished for its own sake and that whatever is extended in order [to induce] the forsaking of uprightness ought to be despised. Moreover, it is the prerogative of the will to reject, and to elect, in accordance with what rational discernment teaches. For to this end, especially, will and reason have been given to rational creatures. Therefore, the will's choice to desert uprightness is not compelled by any necessity, even though the man is beset by the obstacle of death. For although it is necessary either to relinquish his life or his uprightness, no necessity determines which one of these he keeps or relinquishes. Assuredly, the will alone here determines what he keeps; and where only the will's choosing is operative, there the force of necessity accomplishes nothing. Now, someone who is not under the necessity of deserting the uprightness-of-will which he possesses is obviously not lacking in the ability, or freedom, to keep uprightness. For this ability is always free. For this is the freedom which I have defined as the ability to keep uprightness-of-will for its own sake. In terms of this freedom both the choice and the will of a rational nature are called free.

## 7

Since God is believed to foreknow or know all things, we are now left to consider whether His knowledge derives from things or whether things derive their existence from His knowledge. For if God derives His knowledge from things, it follows that they exist prior to His knowledge and, hence, do not derive their existence from Him, from whom they are not able to exist except through His knowledge. On the other hand, if all existing things derive their existence from God's knowledge, God is the creator and the author of evil works and, hence, is unjust in punishing evil creatures—a view we do not accept.

Now, this issue can easily be resolved provided we first recognize that the good that is identical with justice is really something, whereas the evil that is identical with injustice lacks all being. (I have presented this solution very clearly in the treatise on *The Fall of the Devil* and in the short work which I entitled *The Virgin Con-*

*ception and Original Sin.*) For injustice is neither a quality nor an action nor a being but is only the absence of required justice and is present only in the will, where justice ought to be. And every rational nature as well as any of its actions is called just or unjust in accordance with a just or an unjust will. Indeed, every quality and every action and whatever has any being comes from God, from whom all justice and no injustice is derived. Therefore, God causes all the things which are done by a just or an unjust will, viz., all good and evil deeds. Indeed, in the case of good deeds He causes what they are [essentially] and the fact that they are good; but in the case of evil deeds He causes what they are [essentially] but not the fact that they are evil. Now, for anything to be just or good is for it to be something; but it is not the case that for a thing to be unjust or evil is for it to be something. For, indeed, to be good or just is to have justice, and having this is something; but to be evil or unjust is to lack the justice which one ought to have, and it is not the case that this lack is something. For justice is something, but injustice is nothing, as I have said.

But there is another kind of good, which is called benefit; and its opposite is the evil which is detriment. In some cases (e.g., blindness) this evil is nothing; in other cases (e.g., pain) it is something. When this evil is something, we do not deny that God causes it, because (as is read) He is the one who “causes peace and creates evil.”<sup>1</sup> For He creates detriments by means of which He tries and purifies the just as well as punishing the unjust. Therefore, with regard only to that evil which is identical with injustice and by virtue of which a man is called unjust: assuredly, this evil is never something. And it is not the case that for a thing to be unjust is for it to be something. And even as God does not cause injustice, so He does not cause something to be unjust. Nevertheless, He does cause all actions and movements, because He causes the things by which, from which, through which, and in which they are produced; and, unless God grants it, nothing has any power to will or to do anything. Moreover, the act of willing—which is sometimes just, sometimes unjust, and which is nothing other than using the will and the power-to-will which God bestows—is, with respect to the fact that it is, something good and

---

<sup>1</sup>Isaiah 45:7.



is derivative from God. Indeed, when willing exists rightly, it is something good and just; but when it does not exist rightly, then solely in virtue of the fact that it does not exist rightly, it is evil and unjust. However, existing rightly is something, and it is from God; but not existing rightly is not something and is not from God. Now, when someone uses his sword or his tongue or his ability-to-speak, the sword or the tongue or the ability-to-speak is not one thing when its use is correct and something different when its use is incorrect. Similarly, the will, which we use for willing (even as we use reason for reasoning), is not one thing when someone uses it rightly and something different when he uses it wrongly. Now, the will is that in virtue of which a substance or an action is called just or unjust; and when the will is just, it is not any more or any less than which it is essentially than when it is unjust. Thus, then, in the case of all good wills and deeds God causes both what they are essentially and the fact that they are good; but in the case of all evil wills and deeds, He does not cause the fact that they are evil but causes only what they are essentially. For even as the being of things comes only from God, so their rightness comes only from Him.

Now, the absence of this uprightness about which I am speaking—an absence which is identical with injustice—is found only in the will of a rational creature, who ought always to have justice. But why does a creature not have the justice which he always ought to have, and how is it that God causes good things only by means of His goodness and causes evil things only through the fault of man and the Devil? And how does a man, under the guidance of grace, do good works by free choice and do evil by the working only of an autonomous will? And what part does God have, blamelessly, in evil works, and does man have, laudably, in good works, so that nevertheless the good deeds of man are clearly seen to be imputed to God and the evil works to man? By the gift of God [the answers] will become more evident, it seems to me, when we shall take up [the topic of] grace and free choice. But for now I will say only that an evil angel does not have justice because he abandoned it and did not subsequently receive it again. On the other hand, man is deprived of justice because in his first parents he cast it away and subsequently either did not receive it again or else, having received it again, rejected it anew.

I think that by the assistance of God's grace I have shown—provided the points I have made are weighed carefully—that the co-existence of free choice and God's foreknowledge is not impossible and that there can be no objection which is not answerable.

[Second Controversy:] Predestination and Free Choice

1

Therefore, trusting in God, who has led us thus far, let us now undertake to resolve the conflict which seems to exist between predestination and free choice. By means of our preceding discussion we have already made no little progress toward this goal—as will become apparent in what follows.

Predestination is seen to be the same thing as foreordination or predetermination. And so, that which God is said to predestine, He is recognized to foreordain—i.e., to determine to be going to occur. But what God determines to be going to occur must, it seems, be going to occur. Therefore, it is necessary that whatever God predestines be going to occur. Hence, if God predestines the good and the evil actions which are done, nothing is done by free choice but everything occurs of necessity. On the other hand, if He predestines only good actions, only good actions occur of necessity, and there is free choice only with respect to evil actions—a consequence which is utterly absurd. Therefore, it is not the case that God predestines only good actions. But if free choice does any good works through which men are justified apart from predestination, then God does not predestine all the good works which justify men. Accordingly, He did not [predestine] those men who are justified by virtue of the works of free choice. Therefore, it would not be the case that God foreknew these men, since “whom He foreknew, these He also predestined.”<sup>1</sup> But it is false that there are some good works or just men that God does not foreknow. Therefore, it is not the case that some good works of free choice alone are justificatory; instead, only those good works which God predestines are justificatory. Hence, if God predestines all things, and if things predestined occur of necessity: since nothing done by free choice is done by necessity, it seems to follow that as long

---

<sup>1</sup>Romans 8:29.

as there is predestination there is no free choice, or—if we establish that in some cases there is free choice—that in these cases there is no predestination.

## 2

At the outset, then, and before settling the main issue, we must notice that predestination can be said [to apply] not only to good men but also to evil men—even as God is said to cause (because He permits) evils which He does not cause. For He is said to harden a man when He does not soften him, and to lead him into temptation when He does not deliver him. Hence, it is not inappropriate if in this manner we say that God predestines evil men and their evil works when He does not correct them and their evil works. But He is more properly said to foreknow and to predestine good works, because in them He causes both what they are [essentially] and the fact that they are good. But in evil deeds He causes only what they are essentially; He does not cause the fact that they are evil—as I have already said above. We must also realize that just as *foreknowledge* is not properly said to be found in God, so *predestination* is not either. For nothing is present to God either earlier or later, but all things are present to Him at once.

## 3

Let us now consider whether some things which are going to occur as a result of free choice can be predestined. Surely, we ought not to doubt that God's foreknowledge and predestination do not conflict. Instead, just as He foreknows, so also He predestines. In the discussion about foreknowledge we saw clearly that, without any inconsistency, some actions which are going to occur as a result of free choice, are foreknown. Therefore, reason and plain truth also teach that, without any inconsistency, some actions that are going to occur by means of free choice are likewise predestined. For God neither foreknows nor predestines that anyone is going to be *just* by necessity. For he who does not keep justice by means of his free will is not just. Therefore, although things foreknown and predestined must occur, it is nonetheless equally true that some things foreknown and predestined occur not by the necessity which precedes a thing, and causes it, but by the neces-

sity which succeeds a thing—as I have said above. For although God predestines these things, He causes them not by constraining or restraining the will but by leaving the will to its own power. But although the will uses its own power, it does nothing which God does not cause—in good works by His grace, in evil works not through any fault of His but through the will's fault. (As I promised, this shall become clearer when I shall speak about grace.) And just as foreknowledge, which is not mistaken, foreknows only the real thing as it will occur—either necessarily or freely—so predestination, which is not altered, predestines only as the thing exists in foreknowledge. And although what is foreknown is immutable in eternity, it can nevertheless be changed in the temporal order at some point before it occurs. Similarly, the case is in every respect the same for predestination.

Therefore, if these statements which have been made are examined closely, it is evident from them that predestination does not exclude free choice and that free choice is not opposed to predestination. For, indeed, all the considerations by which I have shown above that free choice is not incompatible with foreknowledge show as well that it is compatible with predestination. Therefore, whenever something happens by the agency of free will (e.g., when one man wrongs another man and as a result is killed by this other), it is unreasonable for certain people to give vent loudly to the words: “Thus it was foreknown and predestined by God; and, hence, it was done by necessity and could not have been done otherwise.” Indeed, neither the man who provoked the other by a wrong nor the other who avenged himself did this by necessity. Rather, [each acted] voluntarily, because if each had not freely willed to, neither one would have done what he did.

### [Third Controversy:] Grace and Free Choice

#### 1

It remains now for us to consider grace and free choice—doing so with the assistance of this grace. This controversy arises from the fact that Divine Scripture sometimes speaks in such a way that only grace—and not at all free choice—seems to avail to salvation. On the other hand, it sometimes speaks as if our entire salvation were dependent upon our free will. For, indeed, the Lord says concern-

ing grace: “Without me you can do nothing,”<sup>1</sup> and “No one comes to me unless my father draws him.”<sup>2</sup> And the Apostle Paul [asks]: “What do you have that you have not received?”<sup>3</sup> And concerning God [he says]: “He has mercy on whom He wills to, and He hardens whom He wills to.”<sup>4</sup> [He says] also: “It is not of him who wills or of him who runs but of God, who shows mercy.”<sup>5</sup> We also read many other texts which seem to ascribe our good works and our salvation to grace alone apart from free choice. Furthermore, many people profess to prove by experience that a man is not at all supported by any free choice. For they feel that countless individuals put forth an enormous effort of mind and body. But because these individuals are burdened by some obstacle—indeed, by some impossibility—they either make no headway, or else after having made much headway, they suddenly and irretrievably fail.

But in the following manner Scripture teaches that we do have free choice. God declares through Isaiah: “If you are willing and shall hearken unto me, you shall eat the good things of the land.”<sup>6</sup> And David [says]: “Who is the man who wants life, who loves to behold good days? Keep your tongue from evil; and let not your lips speak guile. Turn away from evil and do good.”<sup>7</sup> And the Lord [says] in the Gospel: “Come unto me all of you who are laboring and are heavily laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn from me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and you shall find rest for your souls.”<sup>8</sup> Moreover, there are countless other passages which are seen (1) to urge free choice to do good and (2) to reprove it because it spurns their admonitions. Divine Authority would never do this if it knew that there were no freedom-of-will in man. And if no one were to do good or evil by free choice, there would not be any way for God justly to reward good men and evil men according to their respective merits.

Therefore, since we find in Sacred Scripture certain passages which seem to favor grace alone and certain passages which are believed to establish free choice alone, apart from grace: there have been certain arrogant individuals who have thought that the whole efficacy of the virtues depends only upon freedom of

---

<sup>1</sup>John 15:5. <sup>2</sup>John 6:44. <sup>3</sup>I Corinthians 4:7. <sup>4</sup>Romans 9:18. <sup>5</sup>Romans 9:16.  
<sup>6</sup>Isaiah 1:19. <sup>7</sup>Psalms 33:13-15 (34:12-14). <sup>8</sup>Matthew 11:28-29.

choice; and in our day there are many who have completely given up on the idea that there is any freedom of choice. Therefore, in regard to this dispute, my intention will be to show that free choice co-exists with grace and cooperates with it in many respects—just as we found it to be compatible with foreknowledge and with predestination.

## 2

We must recognize that just as this controversy (as I have said above) concerns no other free choice than that without which no one (after he has reached the age of understanding) merits salvation, so it concerns no other grace than that without which no man is saved.<sup>1</sup> For every creature exists by grace, because by grace he was created; moreover, by grace God gives in this life many goods without which a human being can still be saved. Indeed, in the case of infants who die, baptized, before they are able to use their free choice, the harmony which we are seeking does not appear. For in their case grace alone accomplishes salvation apart from their free choice. For the following fact occurs by grace: viz., that to others is given the will to assist, by their faith, these infants. Therefore, the solution we are seeking must be exhibited with regard to those who have reached the age of understanding, because the controversy concerns them alone.

There is no doubt that whoever of these are saved are saved because of justice. For eternal life is promised to the just, because “the just shall live forever, and their reward is with the Lord.”<sup>2</sup> Now, Sacred Authority often teaches that justice is uprightness-of-will. It suffices to cite one example of this fact. David said: “The Lord will not cast off His people or forsake His inheritance until justice is turned into judgment.”<sup>3</sup> And after he had said this, then in order to teach us what justice is, he asked: “And who is conformed to justice?” To this he replies, answering himself: “All who are upright in heart”—i.e., all who are upright in will. For although we both believe and understand in our heart, even as we will in our heart, nevertheless the Holy Spirit does not deem to have an upright heart a man who believes rightly or understands rightly but does not will rightly. For this man does not use the uprightness of

<sup>1</sup>In the corresponding printed Latin text “*salvator*” should be corrected to “*salvatur*” (S II, 264:18). <sup>2</sup>Wisdom of Solomon 5:16. <sup>3</sup>Psalms 93:14-15 (94:14-15).

faith and of understanding for rightly willing; and rightly believing and rightly understanding are given to a rational creature for the sake of rightly willing. For he who does not rightly will in accordance with right understanding ought not to be said to have right understanding. And he who does not rightly will to act in accordance with faith—for this is the reason for which faith is given—is not said to have any faith except a dead faith. Therefore, we correctly understand David to have meant by “the upright in heart” the upright in will. But lest someone think that Divine Authority calls just or upright a man who keeps uprightness-of-will only for the sake of something else, we say that justice is uprightness-of-will kept for its own sake. For he who keeps uprightness only for the sake of something else does not cherish uprightness but cherishes that thing for whose sake he keeps uprightness. And so he must not be called just, and such uprightness must not be called justice.

When I dealt with foreknowledge and free choice, I showed by an example that uprightness-of-will, which I am calling justice, can co-exist with free choice. (By means of this one example it is easy to discern that the same thing holds true in many other instances.) Therefore, if we can show that no creature can obtain uprightness-of-will except by means of grace, the harmony between grace and free choice will be manifest. This is the harmony which we are seeking and whose purpose is man's salvation.

## 3

Assuredly, there is no doubt that the will wills rightly only because it is upright. For just as sight is not acute because it sees acutely but sees acutely because it is acute, so the will is not upright because it wills rightly but wills rightly because it is upright. Now, when it wills uprightness-of-will, then without doubt it wills rightly. Therefore, it wills uprightness only because it is upright. But for the will to be upright is the same as for it to have uprightness. Therefore, it is evident that it wills uprightness only because it has uprightness. I do not deny that an upright will wills an uprightness which it does not have when it wills more uprightness than it already has. But I maintain that the will is not able to will any uprightness unless it has the uprightness by which

to will uprightness.

Let us now consider whether someone who does not have uprightness-of-will can in some way have it from himself. Surely, he could have it from himself only by willing it or without willing it. But, indeed, it is not the case that by willing it someone is able to obtain it by his own efforts, because he is able to will it only if he has it. On the other hand, no one's mind accepts the view that someone who does not have uprightness-of-will can acquire it by himself without willing it. Therefore, a creature can in no way have uprightness from himself. But neither can one creature have it from another creature. For just as one creature cannot save another creature, so one creature cannot give to another creature the necessary means for salvation. Thus, it follows that only by the grace of God does a creature have the uprightness which I have called uprightness-of-will. Now, I have shown that uprightness-of-will can be kept by free choice (as I stated above). Therefore, by the gift of God we have found that His grace harmonizes with free choice in order to save human beings. Thus, as happens in the case of infants, grace alone can save a human being when his free choice can do nothing; and in the case of those with understanding, grace always assists the natural free choice (which apart from grace is of no avail to salvation) by giving to the will the uprightness which it can keep by free choice.

Now, God does not give to everyone; for "He shows mercy to whom He wills to, and He hardens whom He wills to."<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, He does not give to anyone on the basis of any antecedent merit; for "who has first given to God and it shall be recompensed to him?"<sup>2</sup> But if by free choice the will keeps what it has received and thereby merits either an increment of received justice or, as well, the power for a good will, or some kind of reward: all of these are the fruits of the first grace and are "grace for grace."<sup>3</sup> And so, everything must be imputed to grace because "it is not of him who wills" that he wills "or of him who runs" that he runs, but, instead, "is of God, who shows mercy."<sup>4</sup> For to all except God alone it is said: "What do you have that you have not received? And if you have received it, why do you glory as if you had not received it?"<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Romans 9:18. <sup>2</sup>Romans 11:35. <sup>3</sup>John 1:16. <sup>4</sup>Romans 9:16. <sup>5</sup>I Corinthians 4:7.



## 4

I deem myself to have shown in my treatise on *Freedom of Choice* how it is that a free will which is keeping its received uprightness is not beset by any necessity to abandon it but is beset by difficulty and yields to this difficulty willingly rather than unwillingly. Since grace assists in many ways, I cannot list all the ways in which grace aids free choice (after free choice has received this uprightness) to keep what it has received. Nonetheless, it will not be useless to say something about this matter. Assuredly, no one keeps this received uprightness except by willing it. But no one can will it unless he possesses it. And he cannot at all possess it except by means of grace. Therefore, just as no one receives uprightness except by means of grace preceding, so no one keeps uprightness except by means of this same grace following. Assuredly, even though uprightness is kept by free choice, still its being kept must be imputed not so much to free choice as to grace; for free choice possesses and keeps uprightness only by means of prevenient and of subsequent grace.

However, grace so follows its own gift that the only time grace ever fails to bestow this gift—whether it is something large or something small—is when free choice by willing something else forsakes the uprightness it has received. For this uprightness is never separated from the will except when the will wills something else which is incompatible with this uprightness—as when someone receives the uprightness of willing sobriety and rejects it by willing the immoderate pleasure of drinking. When a man does this, it is by his own will; and so, through his own fault he loses the grace which he received. For when free choice is under attack to abandon the uprightness it has received, grace even assists free choice—either by mitigating the assailing temptation's appeal, or by completely eliminating its appeal, or by increasing free choice's affection for uprightness. Furthermore, since everything is subject to the ordinance of God, all of what happens to a man which assists free choice to receive or to keep this uprightness of which I am speaking must be imputed to grace.

I have said that all justice is uprightness-of-will kept for its own sake. Hence, it follows that everyone who has uprightness-of-will has justice and is just (since everyone who has justice is just). But

it seems to me that eternal life is promised not to all who are just but only to those who are just without any injustice. For these are properly and unqualifiedly called just in heart and upright in heart. For [there is a case where] someone is just in some respect and unjust in another respect (for example, a man who is both chaste and envious). The happiness of the just is not promised to such individuals, since even as true happiness exists without any deficiency, so it is given only to him who is just without being at all unjust. The happiness which is promised to the just shall be like unto that of God's angels. Therefore, even as in the good angels there is no injustice, so no one with any injustice will be admitted into their company. But it is not my purpose to show how a man becomes free of all injustice. Nevertheless, we do know that for a Christian this state is attainable by means of holy endeavors and the grace of God.

## 5

If the points which have been made are considered carefully, one recognizes clearly that when Sacred Scripture says something in favor of grace, it does not completely do away with free choice; and when it speaks in favor of free choice, it does not exclude grace. The case is not as if grace alone or free choice alone sufficed to save a man (as it seems to those who are the cause of the present controversy). Indeed, the divine sayings ought to be construed in such way that, with the exception of what I said about infants, neither grace alone nor free choice alone accomplishes man's salvation.

Indeed, when the Lord says: "Without me you can do nothing,"<sup>1</sup> what He means is not "Your free choice is of no avail to you," but "It is of no avail without my grace." And when we read "It is not of him who wills or of him who runs but is of God, who shows mercy,"<sup>2</sup> Scripture is not denying that free choice is of some use in the case of one who wills or runs; rather, it is indicating that the fact that he wills and the fact that he runs have to be credited to grace rather than to free choice. For when Scripture says "It is not of him who wills or of him who runs," we must supply: "The fact that he wills and the fact that he runs." The case is like

---

<sup>1</sup>John 15:5. <sup>2</sup>Romans 9:16.

someone's giving clothes to a naked person to whom he owes nothing and who by himself is unable to obtain a garment. Although the naked person has the ability to use and not to use the clothing he has received, still if he does use it, the fact that he is clothed must be credited not to him but to the one who gave him clothes. Therefore, we can speak as follows: "The fact that he is clothed is not of the one who is clothed but is of the one who shows mercy—i.e., of the one who gives the clothing." Much more would this be said if the one who gave the clothing had also given the ability to keep it and to use it—as when God gives to a man the oft-mentioned uprightness, He also gives the ability to keep and to use it, because He first gave the free choice for keeping and using uprightness. Now, if clothing were not given to this naked person to whom nothing is owed, or if this person were to throw it away after having received it, his state of nakedness would be credited to no one but himself. Similarly, when God gives willing and running to someone conceived and born in sin,<sup>1</sup> to whom He owes nothing except punishment, "it is not of him who wills or of him who runs but is of God, who shows mercy." And as for one who does not receive this grace, or one who rejects it after having received it: the fact that he remains in his obduracy and iniquity is due to him rather than to God.

The same interpretation—viz., that free choice is not ruled out—must be held to in the other passages in which Scripture speaks in favor of grace.

Likewise, when the divine sayings are expressed in such way that they seem to attribute man's salvation to free choice alone, grace ought in no respect to be excluded. Therefore, just as although natural functioning does not procreate an offspring apart from a father or except through a mother, nevertheless not even any rational thought excludes either a father or a mother from an offspring's generation: so too, grace and free choice are not incompatible but cooperate in order to justify and to save a man.

## 6

Yet, in regard to those passages in which Scripture is seen to

---

<sup>1</sup>Psalms 50:7 (51:5).

invite free choice to right-willing and right-working, people wonder why it invites a man to will rightly and why it condemns him if he is disobedient, seeing that no one can have or receive uprightness unless grace bestows it. We must note [the following comparison]: Without any cultivation on man's part the earth produces countless herbs and trees by which human beings are not nourished or by which they are even killed. But those herbs and trees which are especially necessary to us for nourishing our lives are not produced by the earth apart from seeds and great labor and a farmer. Similarly, without learning and endeavor human hearts freely germinate, so to speak, thoughts and volitions which are not conducive to salvation or which are even harmful thereto. But without their own kind of seed and without laborious cultivation human hearts do not at all conceive and germinate those thoughts and volitions without which we do not make progress toward our soul's salvation. Hence, those men upon whom such care-taking is bestowed the apostle calls "God's husbandry."<sup>1</sup> Now, the word of God constitutes the seed of this husbandry—or, better, not the word but the meaning which is discerned by means of the word. (For, indeed, without meaning, a word forms nothing in the mind. ) And not only does the meaning of the word [of God] constitute a seed of willing rightly but so also does the entire meaning or signification of "uprightness"—which signification the human mind conceives either as a result of hearing or of reading or of reasoning or in whatever other way. For no one is able to will what he does not first conceive in his mind. Now, to will to believe what ought to be believed is to will rightly. Therefore, no one can will this if he does not know what ought to be believed. For after the apostle had first stated "Whoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved," he added: "How, then, shall they call upon Him in whom they have not believed? Or how shall they believe Him whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach unless they are sent?"<sup>2</sup> And a little later [he said]: "Therefore, faith [comes] by hearing; and hearing [comes] by the word of Christ."<sup>3</sup>

Now, the apostle's statement that faith is derived from hearing

---

<sup>1</sup>1 Corinthians 3:9. <sup>2</sup>Romans 10:13-15. <sup>3</sup>Romans 10:17.

must be interpreted to mean that faith is derived from that which the mind conceives as a result of hearing—derived not in such way that the mere mental concept produces faith in a man, but in such way that the concept is a necessary condition of faith. For, indeed, when uprightness-of-willing is added to the concept, faith is produced by grace, because the man believes what he hears. “And hearing comes by the word of Christ”—i.e., by the word of those who preach Christ. But there are no preachers unless they are sent. But the fact that they are sent is a grace. Therefore, preaching is a grace, because what derives from grace is a grace; and hearing is a grace, and the understanding which comes from hearing is a grace, and uprightness-of-willing is a grace. But sending, preaching, hearing, and understanding are worthless unless the will wills what the mind understands. But the will can do this only if it has received uprightness. For, indeed, it wills rightly when it wills what it ought. Thus, what the mind conceives as a result of hearing the word constitutes the seed of the preacher; and uprightness constitutes the growth which God gives—without which growth “neither he who plants nor he who waters is anything, but only God, who gives the growth.”<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, just as in the beginning God miraculously (without seeds and without a cultivator) created wheat and other things which grow from the earth for the nourishment of men, so He miraculously (without human teaching) made the Gospels and the hearts of the prophets and apostles to be rich in salutary seeds. From these seeds we receive whatever we beneficially sow, in God's husbandry, for the nourishment of our souls—just as that which we cultivate for the nourishment of our bodies comes to us only from the first seeds of the earth. For, indeed, we preach, usefully to our spiritual salvation, nothing that Sacred Scripture, made fruitful by the miracle of the Holy Spirit, has not set forth or does not contain within itself. Now, if on the basis of rational considerations we sometimes make a statement which we cannot clearly exhibit in the words of Scripture, or cannot prove by reference to these words, nonetheless in the following way we know by means of Scripture whether the statement ought to be accepted or rejected. If the statement is arrived at by clear reasoning and if Scrip-

---

<sup>1</sup>I Corinthians 3:7.

ture in no respect contradicts it, then (since even as Scripture opposes no truth, so it favors no falsity) by the very fact that Scripture does not deny that which is affirmed on the basis of rational considerations, this affirmation is supported by the authority of Scripture. But if Scripture unquestionably opposes a view of ours, then even though our reasoning seems to us unassailable, this reasoning should not be believed to be supported by any truth. In this way, then, Sacred Scripture—in that it either clearly affirms them or else does not at all deny them—contains the authority for all rationally derived truths.

Let us now see in terms of examples how the word is the seed. When those to whom it is addressed hear the phrase “If you are willing and will hearken unto me . . . ,” they understand and conceive of what is called willing and and hearkening, i.e., obeying. (For he who hears and does not obey is said not to hear.) Now, they cannot obey unless they will to. But to will to obey is to will rightly. And no one can will rightly unless he has uprightness-of-will, which a man has only by grace. But uprightness-of-willing something is given to no one except to one who understands willing and what he ought to will. Thus, we see (1) that unless uprightness is added, the words “If you are willing and will hearken unto me . . .” are not at all a seed which bears fruit by itself and (2) that uprightness-of-will is given only by means of seeds.

Likewise, when God says “Be converted to me,”<sup>1</sup> the seed is without germination as long as God does not turn a man's will to willing the conversion which this man thinks when he hears the words “Be converted”; but without this seed no one can will to be converted. Even to those who are already converted the command “Be converted,” is addressed—either so that they become still further converted or so that they maintain the fact of their conversion. Now, those who say “Convert us, O God”<sup>2</sup> are already to some extent converted, because in willing to be converted they have an upright will. But because of the fact that they have already received conversion they are praying that their conversion be increased—even as those who were already believers requested: “Increase our faith.”<sup>3</sup> It is as if both the former and the latter were saying: “Increase in us what You have given; complete

<sup>1</sup>Isaiah 45:22. <sup>2</sup>Psalms 84:5 (85:4). <sup>3</sup>Luke 17:5.

what You have begun.”

What I have shown with respect to these cases must be understood [to hold true] in similar cases as well.

So it is not the case that without seeds the earth naturally brings forth those plants which are especially necessary for the health of our bodies. And although God does not give growth to every seed, nevertheless our farmers do not cease to sow in the hope of some small harvest. Similarly, the soil of the human heart does not bring forth the fruit of faith and of justice without the appropriate seeds. And although God does not cause all seeds of this kind to grow, nevertheless He commands His husbandmen to sow His word earnestly and in hope. I have shown, it seems to me, how it is not superfluous to invite men to faith in Christ and to those things which this faith demands, even though they do not all accept this invitation.

## 7

I said that we can also ask why those who do not accept the word of God are blamed, seeing that they cannot do this unless grace directs their wills. For the Lord says, with reference to the Holy Spirit: “He will accuse the world of sin because they do not believe in me.”<sup>1</sup> Although it may be difficult to reply to this question, I ought not to keep to myself what I am able to answer with God's help. We must note that the inability which results from [someone's] guilt does not, as long as the guilt remains, excuse the one who has the inability. Hence, in the case of infants, in whom God demands from human nature the justice which it received in our first parents, together with its receiving the ability to keep justice for all its offspring: the inability to possess justice does not excuse human nature, since human nature fell into this inability blamably. For, indeed, the very fact that human nature does not possess that which it is unable by itself to re-acquire [viz., justice] constitutes its inability to have [justice]. Human nature fell into this [condition of] inability because it freely abandoned that which it was able to keep. Therefore, since human nature abandoned justice by sinning, the inability which it brought upon itself by sinning is reckoned to it as sin. And in those who are not baptized,

---

<sup>1</sup>John 16:8-9.

not only the inability to have justice but also the inability to understand it is likewise reckoned as sin, for this latter inability also results from sin.

We can also reasonably maintain the following point: the fact that human nature was corrupted and diminished in relation to the original dignity and strength and beauty of the human condition is reckoned to it as sin. For human nature thereby diminished, as much as it could, the honor and the praise of God. Indeed, the wisdom of an artisan is praised and proclaimed in accordance with the excellence of his work. Therefore, the more human nature diminished and marred in itself the precious work of God, from which God was supposed to receive glory, the more it dishonored God by its own fault. And this dishonoring is reckoned to it as such a grave sin that it is blotted out only by the death of God.

Indeed, Sacred Authority shows clearly that the following are reckoned as sin: viz., the impulses or appetites to which (as are brute animals) we are subject as a consequence of Adam's sin. The apostle calls these appetites flesh and concupiscence. And when he says "What I hate, that I do"<sup>1</sup> (i.e., "against my will I inordinately desire"), he evidences that against his will he experiences concupiscence. Indeed, the Lord says of merely the impulse to anger, unexpressed in deed or word: "He who is angry with his brother will be held accountable for it at the judgment."<sup>2</sup> When He says this, He shows clearly that this guilt is not light—a guilt from which such grave condemnation (viz., the condemnation to death) follows. It is as if He were to say: "He who does what a man ought not to do, and who would not have done it if he had not sinned, ought to be removed from among men." And Paul says regarding those who against their will experience the flesh, i.e., carnal desires: "There is no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus, who do not walk after the flesh"<sup>3</sup>—i.e., who do not freely consent [to the flesh]. When he says this, without question he signifies that those who are *not* in Christ are followed by condemnation as often as they feel carnal desire, even if they do not walk in accordance with it. For man was made in such way that he ought not to feel carnal desire, just as I said regarding anger.

---

Romans 7:15. <sup>2</sup>Matthew 5:22. <sup>3</sup>Romans 8:1.



Therefore, if anyone considers carefully what I have said, he does not at all doubt that those who cannot—by their own fault—receive the word of God are rightly to be blamed.

## 8

But as regards those to whom the grace of Christian faith is given: just as in baptism the original injustice with which they are born is forgiven them, so [in baptism] there is forgiven all guilt of inability and of all the corruption which they incurred because of the sin of our first parent—corruption through which God is dishonored. For after baptism they are not blamed for any of the guilt which was in them before baptism even though the corruption and the appetites which are the penalty for sin are not immediately blotted out in baptism. Moreover, after baptism no transgression is charged to them except that which they commit of their own volition. Hence, it appears that the corruption and the evils which were the penalty for sin and which remain after baptism are not in themselves sins. For, indeed, only injustice is in itself a sin; and until injustice is forgiven, these evil consequences which follow from injustice are, due to their cause, *deemed* to be sins. For if they were [properly] sins, they would be blotted out in baptism, in which all sins are washed away by the blood of Christ. Likewise, if they were properly called sins they would be sins in the case of brute animals, after whose likeness our nature undergoes these evil consequences as a result of sin.

There is something else which can be discerned in human nature's first sin and which must be greatly feared. Since man is a "wind which goes out and does not return":<sup>1</sup> after he freely falls—to speak now only of voluntary sins—he can in no way rise up again unless he is raised up by grace. And unless he is held back by mercy, he is plunged by his own doing from one sin into another, down into the bottomless abyss (i.e., the measureless depth) of sins, in such way that even the good becomes something hateful to him and is for him unto death. Hence, the Lord says to the apostles: "If the world hates you, know that it hated me before hating you."<sup>2</sup> And the apostle [says]: "We are a good odor to God—among some the odor of death unto death but among oth-

<sup>1</sup>Psalms 77:39 (78: 39). <sup>2</sup>John 15:18

ers the odor of life unto life.”<sup>1</sup> For this reason Scripture says concerning God: “He shows mercy to whom He wills to, and He hardens whom He wills to.”<sup>2</sup> But He is not equally merciful to all to whom He is merciful; and He does not equally harden all whom He hardens.

## 9

Another question is why in this life the penalty for sin remains in us after the sin has been blotted out. Although I did not plan to deal with this question now, I will say briefly that if the faithful were immediately transformed at baptism or at martyrdom into the state of incorruption, then merit would perish and men would be saved without any merit (except for those first men who would believe without any precedent). Surely [in that case, then,] faith and hope—without which no man who has understanding can merit the Kingdom of God—would vanish. (For faith and hope are directed toward those things which are unseen.) For since men would see those who would be converted to Christ pass over immediately into the state of incorruptibility, there would be no one who would be able even to will to turn away from this very great happiness which he would behold. Therefore, in order that through the merit of faith and of hope we may more gloriously obtain the happiness we desire, we remain—for as long as we are in this life—in this state which is no longer reckoned unto us as sin, even though it has resulted because of sin.

Moreover, it is not the case that through baptism and the Christian faith we are assured of the happiness which Adam had in Paradise before sinning. Rather, we are assured of the happiness which he was going to have when the number of men who were to be added to fill up the Heavenly City would be complete. This city is to be filled with angels and men; but in it men will not procreate, as they would have done in Paradise. Therefore, if converts to Christ were immediately to pass over into that state of incorruptibility, there would not remain men from whom this number could be gathered, because no one would be able to keep from rushing toward the happiness he would behold. I think that this is what the apostle means when he says regarding those who

---

<sup>1</sup>II Corinthians 2:15-16. <sup>2</sup>Romans 9:18.

through faith have worked justice: “And all of these, approved by the witness of their faith, did not receive the promise, since God is providing something better for us, so that they are not made complete without us.”<sup>1</sup> Now, if one asks what better thing God has provided for us from their not having received the promise, I do not see that anything can be replied more suitably than what I said above, viz., the following: If the happiness promised to the just were not delayed for those who have been approved, merit would perish in those who would learn of this fact by experience rather than by faith. Also the process of human procreation from which we are begotten would stop, since all men would run after that incorruptibility which they would see to be present. Therefore, God provided a great good for us when for the saints who have been approved by the witness of their faith He delayed the reception of the promise. [He caused this delay] in order that we would continue to be propagated and that faith would remain—by which faith we would together with them merit the promise and would be made perfect at the same time as they.

There is also another reason why the baptized and the martyrs do not immediately become incorruptible. Suppose that a master severely scourges his servant, whom he had planned to enrich some day with great honors, for a wrong for which the servant is not at all able by himself to make satisfaction. And suppose that after this scourging the master is going to thrust his servant, at a fixed time, into a dreadful prison where he will be afflicted with grievous punishments. Suppose, furthermore, that someone influential with his master makes satisfaction for him and reconciles him. Surely, the stripes which the guilty servant deservedly received prior to the satisfaction and while he was at fault, are not removed; but the graver torments into which he was not yet thrust are averted by the preventing reconciliation. Moreover, as for the honors which, had he not sinned, he was going to receive in due time and of which, had he not been reconciled, he was going to be deprived after his wrongdoing: because of the complete satisfaction these honors are given to him without any alteration, as was originally determined. Indeed, if he had been disinherited of

---

<sup>1</sup>Hebrews 11:39-40.

these honors before his reconciliation (just as, had he not been reconciled, he was to be deservedly and irrecoverably disinherited of them after his wrongdoing), there would have been no way for any reconciliation to assist [in their recovery]. But since he could not be disinherited of an honor which he did not yet have and was not required to have, the reconciliation can intervene prior to this disinheritance and can avert it—provided that while lying in the soreness of his stripes until such time as this soreness passes away, the servant pledges in heart and in word both fidelity to his master and self-reform, and provided he fulfills his pledge.

The relationship between God and man is analogous to this one. Indeed, when human nature first sinned, it was scourged with the following penalty: (1) it would never by natural means beget offspring except in that state in which we observe infants to be born; (2) after this life it would be forever banished into Hell—banished from the Kingdom of God, for which it was created. [This was to happen] unless someone reconciled human nature—something which human nature was unable to do by itself. But Christ is the only one by whom human nature is able to be reconciled. Therefore, in all infants who are begotten by natural means human nature is born with sin and its penalty. When human nature enters the state of reconciliation, this penalty which it received before reconciliation deservedly remains. But those torments which human nature was going to suffer in Hell are remitted for those whom Christ redeems. And human nature is presented with the Kingdom of God, which in due time it was going to receive after its sojourn in the earthly paradise—provided that the redeemed persevere unto the end in the faith which they promise at baptism.

## 10

Certain individuals think that free choice is proved by experience to be able [to accomplish] nothing; for many people make an enormous effort to live rightly; and yet, because of some impossibility (as they call it) which stands in their way, they either make no headway or else after having made some progress they fail irreparably. But the fact [that they think this] does not destroy the point which has been rationally demonstrated: viz., that free choice can [accomplish something] cooperatively with grace. But

in my opinion the fact that when they make an effort they either do not make any headway or else after having made some progress they fail, occurs not because of an impossibility but because of an obstacle which is sometimes serious, sometimes easily surmountable. Indeed, very often we are accustomed to say that something which we are unable to accomplish without difficulty is impossible for us. For if each of us carefully examines his own acts of willing, he will discern that he never abandons uprightness-of-will (which he has received by grace) except by willing something else which he cannot will compatibly [with willing uprightness]. Surely, he abandons uprightness-of-will not because the ability to keep it fails him (which ability constitutes, freedom of choice) but because the will to keep it fails him. The will-to-keep-uprightness is not deficient in itself but ceases because another willing expels it (as I said).

## 11

But since this last consideration especially concerns the will, I deem it necessary to say in more detail about the will something which shall not be useless, it seems to me. In our bodies we have five senses and [various] members, each of which, distinctly, is adapted for its own special function. We use these members and senses as instruments. For example, the hands are suited for grasping, the feet for walking, the tongue for speaking, and sight for seeing. Similarly, the soul too has in itself certain powers which it uses as instruments for appropriate functions. For in the soul there is reason, which the soul uses (as its instrument) for reasoning; and there is will, which the soul uses for willing. Neither reason nor will is the whole of the soul; rather, each of them is something within the soul. Therefore, since the distinct instruments have their essence, their aptitudes, and their uses, let us distinguish in the will—in regard to which we are discussing these matters—the instrument, its aptitudes, and its uses. In regard to the will we can call these aptitudes inclinations (*affectiones*). Indeed, the instrument-for-willing is modified by its own inclinations [*aptitudines*]. Hence, when a man's soul strongly wills something, it is said to be inclined to will that thing, or to will it affectionally.

Assuredly, the will is seen to be spoken of equivocally—in three

senses. For (a) the instrument-for-willing, (b) the inclination of this instrument, and (c) the use of this instrument, are distinguishable. The instrument-for-willing is that power-of-the-soul which we use for willing—just as reason is the instrument-for-reasoning, which we use when we reason, and just as sight is the instrument-for-seeing, which we use when we see. The inclination (*affectio*) of the instrument-for-willing is that by which the instrument is so inclined to will some given thing (even when a man is not thinking of that which he wills) that if this thing comes to mind, then the will wills [to have] it either immediately or at the appropriate time. For example, the instrument-for-willing is so inclined to will health (even when a man is not thinking of it) that as soon as health comes to mind, the will wills [to have] it immediately. And the instrument-for-willing is so inclined to will sleep (even when a man is not thinking of this) that when it comes to mind, the will wills [to have] it at the appropriate time. For the will is never inclined in such way that it ever wills sickness or that it wills never to sleep. Likewise, in a just man the instrument-for-willing is so inclined to will justice (even when a man is asleep) that when he thinks of justice, he wills [to have] it immediately.

On the other hand, the use of this instrument is something which we have only when we are thinking of the thing which we will.

Now, the word “will” applies to the instrument-for-willing, to the inclination of this instrument, and to the use of this instrument. (1) Indeed, we call the instrument *will* when we say that we direct the will toward various things (e.g., now toward willing to walk, now toward willing to sit, now toward willing something else). A man always possesses this instrument even though he does not always use it. The case is similar to his having sight, in the sense of the instrument-for-seeing, even when he does not use it (e.g., when he is asleep). But when he does use it, he directs it now toward seeing the sky, now toward seeing the earth, now toward seeing something else. Moreover, the case is similar to our always possessing the instrument-for-reasoning, viz., reason, which we do not always use and which, in reasoning, we direct toward various things. (2) But the inclination of the instrument-for-willing is called will when we say that a man always possesses the will for his own well-being. For in this case we label as will that inclination (of the

instrument) by which a man wills his own well-being. [The same thing is true] when in this way we say that a saint—even when he is sleeping and is not thinking about living justly—continually has the will to live justly. Moreover, when we say that one person has more of the will to live justly than another person, the only thing we are calling *will* is the instrument's inclination, by which a man wills to live justly. For the instrument itself is not greater in one person and less in another. (3) But the use of the instrument-for-willing is called will when someone says “I now have the will to read” (that is, “I now will to read”)—or says, “I now have the will to write” (that is, “I now will to write”). Indeed, seeing is using sight that is the instrument-for-seeing; and the use of sight is seeing, or sight (in cases, that is, where “sight” signifies the same thing as “seeing,” for “sight” also signifies the instrument-for-seeing). Similarly, willing is using the will that is the instrument-for-willing; and the use of the will is the willing which occurs only when we are thinking of that thing which we will.

Therefore, there is only one will in the sense of the instrument; that is, there is in a man only one instrument-for-willing (even as there is only one reason, i.e., only one instrument-for-reasoning). But the will by which the instrument is modified is twofold. For just as sight has several aptitudes (viz., an aptitude for seeing light and an aptitude for seeing figures by means of light and an aptitude for seeing colors by means of figures), so the instrument-for-willing has two aptitudes, which I am calling inclinations. One of these is the inclination to will what is beneficial; the other is the inclination to will what is right. To be sure, the will which is the instrument wills nothing except either a benefit or uprightness. For whatever else it wills, it wills either for the sake of a benefit or for the sake of uprightness; and even if it is mistaken, it regards itself as referring what it wills to these two ends. Indeed, because of the inclination to will what is beneficial, a man always wills happiness and to be happy. On the other hand, because of the inclination to will uprightness, he wills uprightness and to be upright (i.e., to be just). Now, he wills something for the sake of a benefit when, for instance, he wills to plow and to labor in order to have the wherewithal to preserve his life and health, both of which he deems to be benefits. And [he wills something] for the sake of uprightness when, for example, he wills to work at learning in

order to know rightly, i.e., to live justly. But the will which is the use of this oft-mentioned instrument is present only when someone is thinking of that thing which he wills, as was already said. The distinctions of this will are multiple; I shall not discuss them now, though perhaps elsewhere I shall.

Indeed, “to will” has equivocal senses, just as does “to see.” For just as “to see” is predicated both of the one who uses his sight and of the one who does not use it even though he has the aptitude to see, so “to will” is predicated both of the one who (while he is thinking of the thing he wills) uses the instrument-for-willing and—since he has the inclination (i.e., the aptitude) to will—of the one who does not use it.

From the consideration which follows, we can also recognize that the instrument-for-willing, the inclination of this instrument, and the use of this instrument are different “wills”: A just man is said to have—even while he is asleep and is not thinking of anything—the will to live justly. And an unjust man is denied to possess—when he is sleeping—the will to live justly. Now, the same will which is being affirmed of the just man is being denied of the unjust man. But obviously when we deny that the will to live justly is in the unjust man who is sleeping, we are not denying that the will which I have called the instrument is in him; for every man, both while asleep and awake, always has this will. Therefore, since no other will than that will which is absent from the evil man is said thus to be present in the good man: it is not the will-as-instrument which is being signified to be present in the good man; rather [what is being signified is] that will by means of which the instrument is modified. Now, there is no doubt that the will-as-use is not present in a sleeping man (unless he is dreaming). Hence, when the will to live justly is said to be present in a just man who is asleep, the will-as-use is not meant. Therefore, the will-as-inclination is not identical with the will-as-instrument or with the will-as-use. Moreover, everyone knows that the will-as-instrument is not identical with the will-as-use; for when I say that I do not have the will to write, no one interprets this to mean that I do not have the instrument-for-willing. Consequently, the will-as-instrument, the will-as-inclination, and the will-as-use are not identical.

Indeed, the will-as-instrument moves all the other instruments



which we freely use—both those instruments which are a part of us (such as our hands, our tongue, our sight) and those that are independent of us (such as a pen and an ax). Furthermore, it causes all of our voluntary movements; but it moves itself by means of its inclinations. Hence, it can be called an instrument that moves itself. I am saying that the will-as-instrument causes all our voluntary movements. Yet—if we consider the matter carefully—God is more truly said to cause everything that our nature or our will causes, for He causes [i.e., creates] the nature and the instrument-for-willing, together with the instrument's inclinations, without which the instrument does nothing.

## 12

A man's every merit, whether good or evil, derives from these two inclinations which I am also calling wills. These two wills also differ in that the one for willing what is beneficial is inseparable, but the one for willing what is upright was (as I have said above) separable, originally, in angels and in our first parents; and it is still separable in those who remain in this life. These two wills also differ in that the one for willing benefit is not this thing which it wills, but the one for willing uprightness is uprightness. Indeed, no one wills uprightness except someone who has uprightness; and no one is able to will uprightness except by means of uprightness. But it is clear that this uprightness belongs to the will considered as instrument. This is the uprightness I am speaking of when I define “justice” as uprightness-of-will kept for its own sake. This uprightness is also the truth of the will wherein the Lord charges the Devil with not having remained steadfastly, as I have stated in the treatise *On Truth*.

We must now consider how men's merits (as I was saying)—whether merits unto salvation or unto condemnation—proceed from the two wills which I am calling aptitudes or inclinations. In itself, to be sure, uprightness is a cause of no evil merit but is the mother of every good merit. For uprightness favors the spirit as it strives against the flesh; and uprightness “delights in the law of God in accordance with the inner man,”<sup>1</sup> i.e., in accordance with

---

<sup>1</sup>Romans 7:22.

the spirit [which strives against the flesh]. However, [even] if evil sometimes seems to follow from uprightness, it is not from uprightness but is from something else.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, because of their uprightness the apostles were a good odor unto God.<sup>2</sup> But the fact that unto certain men the apostles were “the odor of death unto death”<sup>3</sup> did not proceed from their justice but from evil men's wickedness. Now, the will for willing what is beneficial is not always evil but is evil when it consents to the flesh as it strives against the spirit.<sup>4</sup>

## 13

But in order to understand this matter more clearly, we must investigate the reason why the will [for what is beneficial] is so corrupt and so prone to evil. For we must not believe that in our first parents God created it such. Now, when I stated that because of sin human nature became corrupt and acquired appetites similar to those of brute animals, I did not explain how such a will arose in man. Indeed, base appetites are one thing; a corrupt will that assents to these appetites is another thing. Therefore, it seems to me, we must ask about how such a will became the lot of man.

The cause of such a will as this shall readily become apparent to us if we consider the original condition of rational nature. The intention of God was to create rational nature just and happy in order that it would enjoy Him. Now, it was able to be neither just nor happy without the will-for-justice and the will-for-happiness. Assuredly, the will-for-justice is itself justice; but the will-for-happiness is not happiness, because not everyone who has the will-for-happiness has happiness. However, everyone believes that happiness—whether angelic happiness is meant or the happiness which Adam had in Paradise—includes a sufficiency of suitable benefits and excludes all need. For although the happiness of angels is greater than was the happiness of man in Paradise, still Adam cannot be denied to have had happiness. For, indeed, nothing prevents Adam from having been happy in Paradise and free of all need, in spite of the fact that angelic happiness was greater than his. (By comparison, an intense heat is free of all cold; and,

<sup>1</sup>The corresponding sentence in the printed Latin text should read: “... non est ex ipsa sed ex alio.” (S II, 284:28). <sup>2</sup>II Corinthians 2:15. <sup>3</sup>II Corinthians 2:16. <sup>4</sup>Galatians 5:17.

nevertheless, there can be another more intense heat. And cold is free of all heat, even though there can be a more intense cold.) To be sure, having less of a thing than does another is not always identical with being in need; to be in need is to be deprived of something when it is necessary to have it<sup>1</sup>—a condition which was not true of Adam. Where there is need there is unhappiness. God created rational nature for knowing and loving Him; but it is not the case that He created it unhappy when it had no antecedent guilt. Therefore, God created man happy and in need of nothing. Hence, at one and the same time rational nature received (1) the will-for-happiness, (2) happiness, (3) the will-for-justice (i.e., uprightness, which is justice itself), and (4) free choice, without which rational nature could not have kept justice.

Now, God so ordained these two “wills,” or inclinations, that (1) the will-as-instrument would use the will-which-is-justice for commanding and governing (though being itself instructed by the spirit, which is also called mind and reason), and that (2) without any detriment it would use the other will to the end of obedience. Indeed, God gave happiness to man—not to speak of the angels—for man's benefit. But He gave man justice for His own honor. [He gave] justice in such way that man was able to abandon it, so that if he did not abandon it but kept it perseveringly, he would merit being elevated to fellowship with the angels. But if man did abandon justice, he would not thereafter be able to regain it by himself; nor would he attain to the happiness of the angels. Rather, he would be deprived of that happiness which he possessed; and falling into the likeness of brute animals, he would be subjected with them to corruption and to the appetites I have often mentioned. Nevertheless, the will-for-happiness would remain in order that by means of man's need for the goods which he had lost he would be justly punished with deep unhappiness.

Therefore, since he abandoned justice, he lost happiness. And the will which he received as being good and as being for his own good is fervent with desire for benefits which it is unable to keep from willing. And because it is unable to have the true benefits which are suitable for rational nature but which rational nature

---

<sup>1</sup>In the corresponding printed Latin text “haberi” should be corrected to “habere” (S II, 286:2).

has lost, it turns itself to benefits which are false and which pertain to brute animals and which bestial appetites suggest. And thus when the will inordinately wills these benefits it either (1) shuns uprightness, so that it does not accept uprightness when uprightness is offered, or else (2) it casts uprightness away after having received it. But when the will wills these benefits within proper bounds, it does not do this [i.e., it neither shuns nor casts away uprightness].

So the will-as-instrument was created good, with respect to the fact that it has being; moreover, it was created just and having the power to keep the justice it received. And in the above manner it was made evil by free choice. [It was made evil] not insofar as it exists but insofar as it was made unjust as a result of the absence of justice, which was freely abandoned and which it was always supposed to have. Moreover, it now became powerless to will the justice it had deserted. For it is not the case that by free choice the will can will justice when it does not have justice—as it is the case that [by free choice] the will can keep justice when it has justice. Furthermore, the will-for-the-beneficial, a will which was created good insofar as it is something, became evil (i.e., unjust) because it was not subordinate to justice, without which it ought to will nothing. Therefore, since the will-as-instrument freely became unjust: after having abandoned justice, it remains (as regards its own power) a servant of injustice and unjust by necessity. For it is unable by itself to return to justice; and without justice the will is never free, because without justice the natural freedom of choice is futile. The will was also made the servant of its own inclination for the beneficial, because once justice has been removed, the will is able to will only what this inclination wills.

I predicate “to will” of both the instrument and its inclination; for the instrument is *will*, and the inclination is *will*. And without impropriety “to will” is predicated of both these wills. For the instrument, which wills by means of its inclination, does indeed will; and the inclination, by means of which the instrument wills, also wills. (Similarly, “to see” is predicated both of the man who sees by means of sight and of the sight by which the man sees.) Hence, we can without absurdity say that the inclinations of this will which I have called the soul's instrument are, so to speak, “instruments” of this instrument, because it does something only by means of

them. Therefore, when the “instrument”-for-willing-justice (i.e., when uprightness) has been lost, the will-as-instrument cannot at all will justice, unless justice is restored by grace. Therefore, since the will-as-instrument ought to will nothing except justly, whatever it wills without uprightness, it wills unjustly. None of the appetites which the apostle calls the flesh and concupiscence are evil or unjust with respect to the fact that they exist; rather they are called unjust because they are present in a rational nature, where they ought not to be found. For, indeed, they are not evil or unjust in brute animals, because they ought to be present there.

## 14

From what has already been said above, one can recognize that the reason a man does not always possess justice (which he ought always to have) is that he cannot at all acquire or regain it by himself. It is also clear that God causes good works only by His goodness, since He creates the will with free choice and gives it the justice in accordance with which it is acting. But God causes evil deeds only because of man's fault; for God would not cause these deeds if man did not will to do them. Nevertheless, God causes that which they are [essentially], since He has placed in man the will which man uses without justice. And so, the evil deeds which God causes occur only by man's fault. For it is not the case [that they occur] by the fault of God, who created in man a will with freedom of choice and who conferred justice on it so that it would will nothing except justly. Rather, [they occur] by the fault of man, who abandoned the justice which he could have kept. Therefore, in the case of good works God causes both the fact that they are good with respect to their being and that they are good with respect to their justice. But in the case of evil works God causes only the fact that they are good with respect to their being; He does not cause the fact that they are evil with respect to the absence of required justice—an absence which is not anything. Man, however, in the case of good deeds, causes the fact that they are not evil, because although he was able to abandon justice and to do evil deeds, he did not abandon it but kept it by means of free choice—[justice] being given and followed up by grace. Now, in the case of evil deeds [man causes] only the fact that they are evil,

because he does them by an autonomous will (i.e., by an unjust will).

I think that I can now fittingly conclude this treatise which has dealt with three difficult controversies—a treatise which I undertook in the expectation that God would help me. If I have herein said something<sup>1</sup> which ought to suffice any inquirer, I do not impute it to myself, for it is not my [doing] but is [the work of] God's grace in me. However, I do make the following claim: Had someone given me—when I was asking about these issues and when my mind, perplexed, was seeking in them a rationale—the answers which I have written, I would have been grateful, because he would have satisfied me. Therefore, since what I know about this topic, by God's revelation, was especially pleasing to me: knowing that it would likewise please certain others if I recorded it, I wanted freely to bestow, on those who are seeking, that which I have freely received.

---

<sup>1</sup>In the corresponding printed Latin text the word “qui” should be corrected to “quid” (S II, 288:12).