

# **Augustine's Unfinished Literal Commentary on Genesis**

# LITERAL COMMENTARY ON GENESIS (INCOMPLETE)

AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO

## **Retractations I, 18:**

In composing, against the Manichaeans, two books on Genesis, in which I expounded the words of the divine Scripture in an allegorical sense, I did not dare to explain to the letter so great secrets of the things of nature, it is to say, in what way they could take the things that are said there in true historical sense; that is why I wanted to try now what my strength was in this laborious and difficult matter, but this attempt to re-expose the Sacred Scriptures in a literal sense failed under the weight of such an enormous burden. And even though I had not finished a book, I stopped working, because I saw that I could not stand it. When making the retraction of my tracts, it came to my hands this same as it was, incomplete; the one he had certainly not made public and who had determined to break it; since later I wrote twelve that they take by title: On the Genesis to letter. And although in them it appears rather that they ask many more things than they are, however they can not be compared to this one. Certainly, after having corrected it, I wanted to keep it, so that it would be, I believe, a non-useless index of my beginnings in the investigation and exposition of the divine word. I wanted your title to be incomplete Book of Genesis to the letter. I found it written up to the words "the Father is only Father, the Son is only Son, because, when the likeness of the Father is said, although it is revealed that there is no dissimilarity between the two, nevertheless the Father is not alone it has similarity ». Then (before adding to numbers 16 and 62) I repeated the words of the divine Scripture that again had to be considered and treated: And God said: Let us make man in our image and likeness. So far I had written this incomplete book. The two numbers that follow I thought it convenient to add them when making your review; However, not with this I completed it, but even with this addition I left it incomplete. If I had completed it, I would at least have written of all the works and words of God that pertain to the sixth day. It seemed superfluous to note in this book the things that displease me or defend those that, not being well understood by others, despise them.

I advise you to read the twelve books that I composed much later as a bishop, and for them to criticize them. This book begins: "On the secrets of the things of nature that we judge were made by the omnipotent Artificer, it is to be treated not by affirming, but by searching."

## **Chapter I**

The Catholic faith is exposed in this chapter

1. On the secrets of natural things, which we judge to be made by God, omnipotent Artificer, must be treated not affirming, but seeking what is true; and mainly in the books that the divine Authority entrusts to us, in which the temerity of affirming an insecure and doubtful opinion, hardly avoids the sin of sacrilege; however, the uncertainty of finding such secrets should not exceed the terms of the Catholic faith. But as many heretics are accustomed to exposing the divine Scriptures, adapting them to their opinions, which are against the faith of Catholic doctrine, before presenting this book, the Catholic faith must be briefly proposed.

2. This is that God the Almighty Father made and ordained every creature through his Only Begotten Son, that is, through his wisdom and co-eternal and coeternal power with Him, in unity of the Holy Spirit also consubstantial and co-eternal with Him. The doctrine Catholic teaches us to believe that this Trinity is one God, and that He created and formed, as they are, all things that exist, in such a way that every creature, whether intellectual and corporal, or to put it more briefly according to the words of the divine Scripture, visible or invisible, was not formed of the nature of God, but made out of nothing, by God; and there is nothing in it that belongs to the Trinity, except that the Trinity created it and it was created; therefore, it is not lawful to say that the universal creature is consubstantial to God and coeternal with Him.

3. It also tells us the same faith that all things, made by God, are extremely good, that natural evils do not exist, but that everything that is called evil or sin or penalty of sin; that sin would not exist if we did not direct the evil consent of the free will, and from which we can freely abstain, to those things that justice forbids; that is to say, that sin is not in things, but in the misuse of them. Therefore, the use of things is legitimate when the soul remains in the law of the Lord and surrenders to the one God with perfect love, and administers all things delivered to her without levity and without sensuality, that is, according to the mandate of God; in this way the soul, without difficulty and without work, will govern with great ease and joy. The penalty, then, of sin, is that the soul is tormented by creatures, since they no longer serve him as he does not serve God either; before, when she obeyed God, all creatures obeyed her. Therefore, fire is not an evil, because it is a creature of God, although, nevertheless, it burns our weakness in virtue and punishment of sin. Also natural or proper sins are those who before necessarily helping us the mercy of God necessarily commit after having fallen into this misery by the sin of free will.

4. He also teaches us the faith that man was renewed through Our Lord Jesus Christ, when the ineffable and immutable wisdom of God deigned to take the whole man and be born of the Virgin Mary by virtue of the Holy Spirit and be crucified and buried. and to rise and rise to the heavens, what has already happened; and come to judge the living and the dead at the end of the world, and to raise the flesh of the dead, which is announced as a thing to come. He also confesses that the Holy Spirit is given to those who believe in Him, who was instituted by Him, our mother, the Church, who is called Catholic because it is spread throughout the world and is universally perfect and in no way surrenders. Finally, he teaches that he first remits and forgives sins to penitents, and then promises the kingdom of heaven and eternal life.

## Chapter II

### How to expose the law

5. According to this faith should be considered the things that can be sought and disputed in this book that begins In the beginning God made heaven and earth. In four different ways some law writers expose the law; their names can be stated in Greek and explained and defined in Latin, according to history, allegory, analogy and etiology. We explain things according to history, when the executed facts are narrated, whether they are divine or human; according to the allegory, when the facts and sayings are figuratively taken; they are exposed in analogical sense when the conformity between the passages of the Old and the New Testament is demonstrated; and according to the etiology when the causes are given or the reason for the facts and sayings is said.

## Chapter III

6. Then on what was written: in the beginning God made heaven and earth, he may ask himself if it should be understood only according to the historical sense, or also if it means something figuratively; also in what way it agrees with the Gospel, and, finally, why this book begins like this. According to the historical sense it is asked what meaning it has in the beginning, namely: whether we should understand it as the beginning of time or the Principle, that is, the Wisdom of God, because also the Son of God called himself Principle when He was interrogated: Who are you? and he answered: the Principle that spoke to you<sup>1</sup>. There is, then, a Principle without a principle, and a Principle with another Principle. Principle without principle is only the Father and by this we believe that all things exist because of a single Principle; but the Son is in such a way Principle that by generation comes from the Father. The same first intellectual creature can also call it a principle, since it is the head of all those that God made. And because with all property the head is called the beginning, for this reason the Apostle did not say at that graduation that the woman was the head of some; but the man said it was the head of the woman. and the head of the male Christ, and the head of Christ the God, <sup>2</sup> and thus the creature is united to the Creator.

7. Was it said at the beginning because it was the first thing that was done? Or is it that the first heaven and earth could not be made among the creatures, if the angels and all the intellectual powers were made in the first place? Because it is necessary that we believe that the angels are creatures of God and that they were made by Him, because also the angels listed the prophet among the creatures of God in Psalm 148, when he said: He commanded and they were made. He commanded it and they were created<sup>3</sup>; But if the angels were created before everything else, it may be asked: were they created in time or before time or at the beginning of time? If they were created in time, time existed before the angels were created; and since time is also a creature, we see ourselves in the precision of admitting

that before the angels something began to exist; and if we say that they were created at the beginning of time in such a way that at the same moment that time began to exist, we will say that what some claim is false is that time began when heaven and earth were made.

8. But if the angels were created before time, it must be investigated in what sense and why it was said in the following verses: and God said to make the luminaries in the firmament of heaven so that they illuminate the earth and divide the day and the night and signal the times, the days and the years; because, according to this, it may seem that then began the times when the sky and the luminaries of heaven began to move in their determined orbits. If this is true, in what way could the days be before time existed, if the time had its origin at the beginning of the luminaries, which is said to have been done on the fourth day? Or is it that this distribution of days, according to the custom of speaking of human weakness, was ordered according to the norm or requirement of narrating and insinuating with simplicity the sublime things to the humble, for which it happens that the same discourse The speaker can not exist if they do not occupy some words at the beginning, others the middle and others the end? Or perhaps it was said that the luminaries were created in these times that men measure by the movement of bodies with intervals of duration? But these times would not exist, if there were no movement of bodies, but they are well known by men. If we admit this we see ourselves in the precision of asking whether out of the movement of bodies there can be time in a movement of disembodied creature, such as the soul or the mind; it moves in his thoughts and by this movement in it one thing is first and another final; which can not be understood without a time interval. If we admit this kind of time, it can also be understood that time was made before heaven and earth existed, if angels were created before heaven and earth, since there already existed a creature that constituted time with incorporeal movements, and clearly it will be understood that with it time existed, as in the soul, which is accustomed to notice the bodily movements through the senses of the body; but perhaps this does not happen in the higher and very eminent creatures. Whatever may be of this, since it is a very occult thing and impenetrable to human conjectures, the only certain thing that must be maintained as of faith, although it exceeds the lights of our intelligence, is that every creature has a beginning, and that time is a creature and therefore consists of principle and is not coeternal to the Creator.

9. It can also be understood that perhaps the sky and the earth were named, comprising the universal creation; in such a way that this sky was called visible and ethereal sky, and that invisible creature of excelentísimo to put; and earth to the lower part of the world with all the animals that inhabit it. Or was it called heaven to every sublime and invisible creature, and earth to all the visible, in such a way that what was said could be understood: in the beginning God made heaven and earth by the universal creation? Perhaps properly and in comparison with the invisible creature is called earth to all the visible, and sky to the invisible, understanding the soul in the visible even though she is invisible, since by losing herself in the love of visible things and being enriched with the possession of them, it was called earth as it is written: why are you proud, earth and ashes?

10. It may be asked if by chance heaven and earth were called all things already distinct and ordered, or the name of heaven and earth was given principally to that report which is the subject of all things, which was formed, commanded by God ineffably, in these natures that we see formed and beautiful; for although we read what is written: that you made the world of material matter<sup>5</sup>, however, we can not say that the same matter, in whatever form and form it exists, was not made by Him, from the moment

we believe and confess that He comes from everything; and this is the world called this separation and ordering of each of the things formed and different, and is called heaven and earth to the same matter report, as if it said that it was the seed of heaven and earth; heaven and earth that being as mixed and disordered were fit to receive the forms from the Creator, God. It is enough with what we have investigated so far on what is written: in the beginning God made heaven and earth, since it is not advisable to recklessly affirm anything about these points.

## Chapter IV

11. The earth was, therefore, invisible and in disarray, and the darkness occupied the abyss and the Spirit of God was carried on the waters. The heretics who oppose the Old Testament often criticize this passage when they say: how did God in the beginning do heaven and earth, if the earth already existed? They do not understand that this was added, in order to explain in what state was the land named above when saying: God made heaven and earth. Thus, in the beginning God made heaven and earth, it must be understood that this earth made by God was invisible and reportable until by the same Lord it was divided, and removing it from the confusion constituted it in an orderly state of visible things . Or perhaps it is better understood saying that it is remembered again in this execution, the same matter of things that it previously designated with the name of heaven and earth, so that by saying in the beginning God made heaven and earth he understands that what he called heaven and earth was a certain material matter from which the world would be made, which consists, ordered the elements and received the form, of two great parts, namely, of heaven and earth; and so this intelligence of matter could be made known to any intelligence, however rude, by calling it an invisible and unformed earth or without order and beauty, and saying that the darkness was over the abyss, that is, over the immense depth, which It was once again named, because it could not be understood by any intelligence because of its very information.

12. And the darkness was over the abyss. Was the abyss placed below and the darkness above, as if there were already different places? Or would it be said, since it is still about the materiality of matter, which in Greek is called chaos, that the darkness was over the abyss since light existed? If it had existed, it would certainly be on top, because it is more eminent, and would illuminate all the things that are placed beneath it. Indeed, the one who carefully investigates what darkness is does not find more than a lack of light. Then he said the darkness was over the abyss as if it had been said there was no light over the abyss. Therefore, this matter, which by the subsequent work of God is already distinguished by the formation of things, was called an invisible and reportless earth and depth lacking in light, which was previously designated with the name of heaven and earth, as if it were, as has been said, the seed of heaven and earth. Or perhaps he wanted, when he said heaven and earth, to give us first to know the universality of things, and then to insinuate the matter, to announce to us the work of the formation of the beings of the world.

13. And the Spirit of God was carried on the waters. Up to the present Scripture had not said that God had made the water, and yet, in no way can we believe that the water was not made by God and that it

did not exist before He made something ordered, because He is of who, by whom and in whom are all things, as the Apostle affirms<sup>6</sup>; Then God made the water, and to believe otherwise is a big mistake. Why was not it said that God had already made the water? Was it because he wanted to call water the same matter that he called the name of heaven and earth, and also that of invisible and unformed earth, and abyss? Why, then, could it not be called water, if it could be called earth, being that until then it was not water, different and formed, neither earth, nor anything else? Perhaps it was first called heaven and earth, then invisible and unformed earth, and, finally, with all property water; in such a way that in the first place the matter of that universal creation was designated, under the name of heaven and earth, because it was made out of nothing; and in second term with the name of disordered earth and abyss, to insinuate the informidad, because between all the elements the earth is the grossest and the least noble of all; and thirdly with the name of water, in order to indicate the subject to the action of the artificer, since water is more formable than the earth, and thus by the ease of being worked and by allowing itself to be transformed more easily, by in the hands of the artificer, it was more properly called water than land.

14. Air is certainly more subtle than water. Ether with foundation is believed or judged to be more subtle than air, but air or ether would be called more improperly matter, because it is judged that these elements are more endowed with the power of action, and land and water of passion; but if this is still a secret, I judge very clearly that the wind moves water and many other earthly things; but the wind is the movement of the air and like its own restlessness. But it being evident that the air moves the water, however, the cause by which it is moved to be wind is hidden; Who will doubt then that the water to be moved receives with more property the name of matter, than the air that moves? Being moved is the same as receiving an action, and moving is doing something; from this it follows that the things that the earth begets are irrigated with water, so that they can be born and reach their perfect development; in such a way that it almost seems that water is transformed into things that are born, for which reason water is more rightly called, since it implies being subject to the work of the architect (because of its adaptability and convertibility in the bodies that are born), that air, in which only mobility can be noticed, lacking other qualities for which it would more accurately represent matter. Then the complete meaning is: in the beginning God made heaven and earth, that is, matter, which could receive the perfect form of heaven and earth, whose material was invisible and disordered earth, that is, report and immense abyss without light. Being subject to the action of modeling and the work of the artificer, it was also called water, by its own obedience to the operant.

15. Giving all these meanings to matter, the end of it is implied in the first place, that is, what it was made for; in the second term the same information, and lately the servitude and submission to the architect. Thus, by indicating to us that the matter had been made, he first called it heaven and earth; then, invisible and reportless earth and darkness over the abyss, that is to say, lack of light, for which reason it was called invisible earth; and, finally, he calls it water, subject to the spirit and apt to receive the forms and figures determined and visible. For this reason the Spirit of God was carried on the water, so that we understand that the Spirit was the one who worked; and the waters, that is, the fabricable material, the place where it worked. When we say, then, that these three names, matter of the world, matter report, manufacturable matter, are denominations of a single thing, we imply that the first of them fits very well the sky and earth, the second the dark, confusion, depth, darkness; and to the third the one of adaptability on which the Spirit of the artificer was brought to work.

16. And the Spirit of God was carried on the water. It was not borne in the way water supports oil; or earth to water, that is, as if it held him. If we are to take from the visible things examples to understand this, we will say that the Spirit of God was thus borne, as this light of the sun or the light of the moon, which illuminates the earth, is borne by the terrestrial bodies, not being contained or enclosed in them, but if the sky contains it, it is borne by them; we must also avoid believing that the Spirit of God was carried over matter occupying places. He was carried by a certain active and operative power in order that whatever he had to endure was made and manufactured; in such a way that the will of the craftsman on the wood or on any other material destined to make something of it, is endured, or also as the members of the body bear the will that mobilizes them to act. This resemblance, nevertheless, being as it is of greater excellence than any body, hardly takes place and almost does not serve at all to clarify to us the excellentísimo power of the Spirit of God, to whose virtue the matter of the world is subject to act in her; but we do not find a clearer and more appropriate similarity to evidence the subject matter than these things, which can in any case be understood by men. Therefore, in these intellectual investigations, we must take into account that precept of Scripture: those who bless God exalt him as much as you can, because he is still higher. This was written so that we understand in this passage by the Spirit of God the Holy Spirit, whom we worship in the ineffable and immutable Trinity.

17. Spirit of God can also be understood in another sense; judging him as a vital creature, in which this visible world with all its bodies was contained and moved, to which Almighty God granted a certain power that would serve him to work in those things that were produced. This spirit with property would be called Spirit of God, being as it is more excellent than any ethereal body, since every invisible creature surpasses all that is corporal and visible. Are not things created by God from God? Certainly so, for when speaking of the earth it was said: God is the earth and all the things that it contains<sup>8</sup>; and speaking of the universal set of beings, it is said: O Lord, you love souls, you are all things! <sup>9</sup> Then the word spirit can be understood in this way that I said, if we believe that what was said in the God made heaven and earth principle, only refers to the visible or material creature; and so, then, it was carried on the matter of visible things, at the beginning of its creation, the invisible spirit, which was also a creature, that is, it was not God, but nature made and formed by God. But if we believe that the matter announced under that word of "water" includes the universal creation, namely, the intellectual, animal and bodily creature, in no way can Spirit of God be understood in this place, but by that Immutable Spirit and Holy that was carried on the matter of all things, which God made and perfected.

18. A third opinion can be originated from this word spirit: to judge that under the name of spirit the air element is expressed, so that the four elements of which this visible world is composed, namely, heaven, earth, will be named here water and air; not because they existed apart and ordered, but because in the confusion still report of that matter, were, however, predetermined to be created from it, whose confusion and information was given the name of abyss and darkness. But whatever is true of these sentences, it must be believed that God is the author and creator of all the things that have appeared, both visible and invisible, not in terms of the vices they may have against nature, but insofar as it belongs to the same natures, for there is absolutely no creature that has not received from God the principle of being and the perfection of its own kind and substance.



## Chapter V

19. And God said: let there be light and light was made. We should not believe that by saying God let the light be said by a voice emitted by the lungs, teeth and tongue, but ineffably it was said let there be light. Carnales would be such thoughts, and to understand carnally, is a death<sup>10</sup>. We can ask (excluding this impiety, namely, that the Word of God, the only begotten Son is the voice that is uttered, like our verb), if this was said it was said by the Only Begotten Son, or the Only Begotten Son is that which was said, because the Word of God, by whom all things were created, is called Verbo. The Word of God by whom all things were made, neither began to be, nor will it cease to be: begotten without beginning, coeternal to the Father. Therefore, if that which was said let there be light, it began to be said and finished to be said, we understand that this word was said by the Son before she herself is the Son, however, this was also ineffably said. Do not slip into the soul some carnal idea and torment the holy and spiritual thought; it is a reckless and dangerous opinion to understand, in the proper sense, that in the nature of God something begins and ceases to exist; tolerable opinion in children and carnal, not to remain in it, but to be like the beginning of a resurgence to the fullness of truth. Everything that is said of God, which begins or ends, in no way is to be understood what happens in the nature of God, but in his creature, which is subject to him in a wonderful way.

20. And God said: let there be light. Is it the light that hurts these carnal eyes or some other hidden one that we are not allowed to contemplate with the eyes of the body? And if it is hidden, will it be bodily and will it perhaps expand in the highest parts of the world? Or is it disembodied, as is the soul, to which belongs the examination of what is to be avoided and what is should it be desired by the bodily senses, of which the souls of the beasts are also lacking? Or is it the most excellent that manifests itself in reasoning and that is the beginning of everything that has been created? Whatever light is meant in this word we must believe that it has been made and created, and that it is not that light by which the same Wisdom of God shines, which is not created but begotten by Him. Do not believe that God was without light until He created this one that we are dealing with now; because of this, as the same words show, it is commanded to be done, for they say: and God said: let there be light, and the light was made, One is the light begotten by God and another made by Him; the birth of God is the same Wisdom of God, the one made by Him is any other changeable whether corporeal or incorporeal.

21. Difficult or perhaps absolutely impossible is that man can understand if there is any other light outside of heaven, which, however, diffuses and spills through space and encompasses the world. But as we are allowed here to understand a disembodied light, if we say that this book does not speak only of the visible creature, but of universal creation, why dwell on this controversy? Perhaps what men seek, when they ask when the angels were made, have meaning in this light, in a way that is certainly concise, but also very convenient and very rational.

22. And God saw that the light was good. This sentence is not to be understood as an explosion of joy on the part of God before an unheard-of and strange good, but as an indication of the approval of the work. Because what more properly is said about God, insofar as it can be expressed by men, that when these three words are written, it was said, it was done, it pleased him, it is understood that in that word that was written, he said, the domain is insinuated of God; and in which it was consigned, it was done,

its power declared; and in which he stamped himself, did he like to show his kindness? Since these ineffable things had to be communicated through man to men, so they must also express themselves so that they could take advantage of everyone.

23. And God divided the light of darkness. Here the clarity with which these things of the divine works were executed is clearly manifested, because there is no man to whom it occurs to him that in such a way the light was mixed with the darkness, and, therefore, it was necessary to separate them. after. For the same reason that light was made, the division between light and darkness was followed. Because what company can there be between them? 12 Then God separated the light from the darkness when he made the light. The absence of this is called darkness. The difference between light and darkness is the same as between the one who is clothed and naked, or between what is full and empty, and other things like that.

24. We have already said how many ways the word light can be understood, and also that the privations of it can be called darkness. One is the light that is seen with the eyes of the body, which is also corporeal, as for example that of the sun, that of the moon, that of the stars and some other, if it exists, of the same gender. Opposed to this kind of light are the darknesses, which are where this is not found. There is a light by which we perceive life and it helps us to distinguish the things that are transmitted by the body to the judgment and criterion of the soul, such as white or black, melodious or hoarse, of pleasant or smelly smell, sweet or bitter, hot or cold, and others of the same species. One is the light that is perceived by the eyes and the other that makes us feel for them. It resides in bodies; This, although it perceives through the body the things that it feels, resides in the soul. The darkness, contrary to this, is the insensibility or, to put it better, the lack of the sensitive faculty, that is, they are not feeling, although the things that could be felt were introduced into the sense, if that being were to be given. , this light or this sensitive faculty, for which you feel. This sensitivity is not lacking when the body has no senses, as happens in the blind and deaf, since in their souls there is this light that we are dealing with now; what they only lack are the body's senses. Nor is this sensitivity lacking, just as the sound is lacking in silence when the voice is not heard; this light is found in the soul, and only the soul lacks the means of the body, not what the feeling produces; then although for these reasons he does not feel, he does not lack light for that reason. When the soul of this power lacks, it is no longer usually called this being, soul, but only life, as it is that which the trees, the vines and any other kind of plants manifest; unless we may come to believe that these plants have such a life, for not a few heretics disparaging to the extreme, grant them not only sensitivity through the body, that is, sight, hearing, the distinction between fire and the heat, but also the understanding; and they say they know our reason and distinguish our thoughts. But dealing with these things is another matter. Then the insensibility is the darkness of this light, and these take place when any living being lacks the faculty of feeling. Thus, it is granted that this faculty is properly called light, which grants that we can call light the faculty by which things are perceived. When we say "it is evident that this is pleasant, that this is sweet, that this is cold", and so of the other sensations that we perceive by the senses of the body, then the light by which we perceive these things is certainly inside the soul, although through the senses of the body are introduced into it the things that in this way feel. The third kind of light that exists in creatures can be said to be the one through which we reason; the darkness opposite to this light is the irracionalidad, as they are the souls of the beasts.

25. The primordial meaning that the Scripture wishes to convey about light, whether it is the etheric, whether of the sensory of which the beasts participate, or of the rational one that is common to angels and man, it is that it was created by God in the nature of things; that God divided the light of darkness by the mere fact of having created the light; that it is also important not to forget that light is one thing and deprivation of light is another; that God ordained light and darkness. However, it was not said that God created darkness, because He made beings, but not the lack of being, which belongs to nothingness. Hence, by the Artificer God all things were made, which we also understand were arranged in order by Him, when it was said: and God separated the light from the darkness, not that regulating and administering God all things, not they had their order the same privations. As in the song some moderate intervals of silence intervene, and although they are privations of voice, nevertheless, they are admirably ordered by those who know how to sing, giving the whole song a certain melody; and as the shadows make the most important of them stand out in the painting, and they do not please for their beauty, but for the order in which they are placed, so God is not the author of our vices, but he orders them when he places the sinners in their own place and forces them to suffer the penalties deserved by them, applying to the effect the Gospel passage: the sheep will be placed on the right and the kids on the left<sup>13</sup>. Then certain things God creates and orders them, others just order them. God does and commands the righteous; to sinners, in how much they are sinners, God does not do them, he orders them only, since he places the first on the right, and the left on the second; by commanding these to go to eternal fire he does so taking into account the merits. Thus, He makes and orders the natures and forms of things and only orders, does not do, the privations of the forms and defects of the natures; therefore, let there be light and light was made, but it was not said to do darkness and darkness was made. Of these two things he did, then, one, the other not: but he ordered both to separate God from the light of darkness. In short, doing it, everything is beautiful; By ordering Him, everything is beautiful.

## Chapter VI

26. And God called the light day and the darkness night. Since the words, light and day, names of the same thing, and the words darkness and night, names of another, it was agreed to call each thing with these two names, so that the thing to which the name was imposed could also be called by another name, without being able to mean anything else. And so it was said: God called the light day so that indifferently it could also be said backwards, God called day light and night darkness. But what will we answer to the one who asks us? Did the name of day prevail or the name of light prevail? These two words, as soon as they are pronounced with a human voice in order to signify something, are names. In the same way you can ask about the other two, that is, did the name of night or of darkness have darkness been given? According to what Sacred Scripture narrates, it is clear that in the light the name of day was given and darkness was imposed the name of night, because by saying he did. God the light and divided the light of darkness, it was not yet a matter of assigning names; later, then, the names day and night were used. But being as they are without doubt the words light and darkness, also mean things, the same as day and night; It is evident that you can not enunciate otherwise a thing that has received a denomination, if not by some name. Or is it that this denomination is to be taken as if it were

the same division that God made? Not all light is day nor all darkness is night, for it is designated by the names of *oía* and *de noche* to light and darkness, which are ordered and divided among themselves with certain alternations. Every word is used to designate a thing, for which the name that designates the object is called as denotante or sign. Denote, then, that is, point and continually help to discern. Perhaps the same having divided the light and the darkness, is the same as calling the light day and the darkness night, so that having ordered these things is having called them. Or is it that these words want to suggest to us what he called light and what darkness, as if he said God made light and divided the light of darkness; and in the light he called it day and the darkness he called night, so that you do not believe that it is another light that is not the day nor of other darknesses that are not the night? Because if all light could be understood by day and all the darkness under the name of *roche*, then perhaps there would have been no need to say: and God called day and night darkness.

27. You can also ask what day and night it is. If you want to understand this day that begins with the birth of the sun and ends with its hiding, and from this night that extends from sunset to the birth of the sun, I can not find how this could have been, before the luminaries of heaven. Or is it that perhaps these spaces of hours and times, without alteration of glare and shadow, could already be called that? But and in what way then does it agree with that rational or irrational light, if in these words is understood this change that by the names of day and night is meant? Or is it that, not according to what happens, but according to what can happen, these things are insinuated because error and a certain incapacity of sense can take over reason?

## Chapter VII

28. And the evening was made and the morning was made, one day. It is not called here day in the same way as when it was said and called God in the light of day, but in the same way that we say, for example, of thirty days the month consists, in these days we also include the nights, but previously it was said day to separate it from the night. Thus, as that work of creation implied what was done during the light of day, it is rightly said that the afternoon was made and the morning was done, which they completed one day; One day was completed from the beginning of one day until the beginning of the other, that is, from the morning of one day to the morning of the next day, to whose days, as I said, added the nights, we called days. But how was the evening made and how was the morning done? Did God need so much space to make light and separate it from darkness as it stretches out in the light of day, that is, not counting the night? And if God needs time to execute something, then how do you understand what is written: to you is subject, when you want, the power? 14 Or is it that all things are finished in God, as Are they in reason and in art, not with extension of time, but in the same virtue by which it makes things stable, those that we contemplate but not permanent? It is not credible that as in our conversation, where some words come first and then the others follow each other, happens in art, which, working steadily in conversation, makes a speech beautiful. Then, although there is no need of time for God to work (to whom the power is subject, when he wants), however, the temporal natures temporarily execute their movements. Therefore perhaps it was said: and the *larde* was made and the morning was made one day, first as it understands the reason that it could or should have been done in this way, but not in the way it is done in time intervals. Who said: he who abideth eternally created all

things at once, 15 contemplated, in the same inspiration, the work in his mind, but very comfortably ordered in that book the narration of the things done by God in intervals of time, in order that the true disposition of created things, which could not be comprehended with a permanent gaze by the souls of less scope, exposed in this way of speaking, would see it as with the carnal eyes.

## Chapter VIII

29. And God said: let the firmament be made in the midst of the water and divide the water and the water, and so it was done; And God made the firmament and divided the water that was under the firmament of the water that was above the firmament, were the waters that were above the firmament equal to those visible that were below the firmament? Or is it that in that water seems to be signified the one that carried the Spirit of God and, therefore, we must understand that it was the same matter of the world, in such a way that the inferior is the corporal matter and the superior the animal, since it was divided because the sky was interposed? Let's not forget that it calls firmamento to this that later it calls heaven. Among the bodies there is no better than the celestial body, because although some are the celestial bodies and others the terrestrial ones, nevertheless, the best ones are the celestial ones; and everything that goes beyond the nature of the celestial bodies I do not know how it can be called a body. So perhaps it is a certain virtue or power subject to reason, by which is known God and the truth whose nature, because it is formable through virtue and prudence, with whose vigor is inhibited and moderates the fluctuation of it, appears as material; and, therefore, rightly it is called water by God, exceeding the sphere of corporeal heaven, not by its bodily magnitude, but by virtue of its disembodied nature. But by reason of having been called the firmament heaven, it is not an absurdity to understand that everything that is below the etheric sky, in which all things are calm and stable, is more dissoluble and changeable. There were those who believed that these visible and cold waters completely enveloped the surface of the sky and, therefore, also to this kind of corporeal matter formed before receiving distinction and species by what was called firmament. They put as proof the delay of one of the seven wandering stars (which is greater than the others, and it is called by the Greeks fainon (the brilliant one) and it takes thirty years to turn around its orbit), saying that it is slow march because it is closer to the cold waters, which are above the sky. I do not know how this opinion can be defended by those who ingeniously sought such reasons. Nothing, then, recklessly has to be affirmed in these things, but all of them must be treated with moderation and caution.

30. And God said: Let the firmament be made in the midst of the water and divide the water from the water, and so it was done. After he said and this was done, what need did he have to add again, and did God make the firmament and divide the water that was under the firmament and the water that was above the firmament? Why in saying up, and God said let there be light and light was made, did not add, and God made light; but here after saying, and God said; let it be done, and so it was done, it was added, and did God? Is it that there it manifests that it was not convenient to understand that that light was bodily light, so that it would not appear that God (and when I say here God understood the Trinity) did it through some creature? When it comes to this firmament of heaven, because it is bodily, it is believed perhaps that it has received beauty and form by means of the incorporeal creature, in such a

way that the incorporeal nature was rationally imprinted by the Truth what it would physically imprint. to make the firmament of heaven, and for this reason it was written: and God said, let it be done, and so it was done. Perhaps, I repeat, the firmament was first made in the same rational nature, by which the form was later printed to the body.

## Chapter IX

But when he added: and God made the firmament and divided the water that was under the firmament and the water that was above the firmament, does he mean by these words the cooperation of that matter, so that the body of heaven could be made? Or perhaps it was not said above in the way that was said below, to express itself in another way, so that the narrative did not cause annoyance, and because it was not convenient to determine all things exactly? Choose each one what suits you; just do not say anything recklessly and do not give the hidden things by acquaintances; remember that he is a man and, therefore, he should seek in divine works only as much as he is allowed.

31. And God called heaven heaven. What was said above about the imposition of names, here too can be taken into account, because not every firmament is heaven.

And God saw that it was good. What I said above about this matter would reaffirm it, if it were not for the fact that now the narration does not follow the same order. Above (on the first day) he said: And God saw that the light was good, and immediately afterward he adds: and God divided the light from the darkness and called the light day and the darkness night. Here (on the second day), after he narrated the event, the quo was already finished, and after calling heaven heaven, it is said: And God saw that it was good. If the mode of expression was not changed to avoid disturbing the reader, we are forced to understand it in the sense that God did all things at the same time. Why, when speaking of light, first he saw that it was good, and then he named it, and here when he spoke of the firmament he named it first and then saw that it was good? Surely this difference shows that in the operation of God there are no time intervals, although these are found in the same works. According to these intervals of time, one thing is done first and another after and without them the narration of the facts can not be exposed, although without them God could have done these things. And the afternoon was done and the morning was done, the second day was completed. This was discussed above and I think the same reasons are valid here.

## Chapter X

32. And God said: Let the waters that are under the sky come together in their single aggregate and the arid appear And so it was done. Here, probably, we can believe, as we judge, that the water previously mentioned was the same matter of the world; because if the universe was completely covered with water, where or in what place could it be assembled? But if I had called with the name of water some

material confusion of water, this meeting of now is to be understood as the same formation, so that it would be such a kind of water as we see now. Also that which was added, arid appears, can be understood by the formation of the earth, so that the earth would then acquire this form with which we see it now, because it was said that it was invisible and reportable, when the matter still lacked form . Therefore, God said: congregate the water that is under the sky, that is, take body matter so that this water is what we perceive now. In a single set, here under the name of unity, the same power or energy of the form is proposed to us, since to form certainly is to gather something into a whole, and the highest unit is the beginning of all form. And the arid appears, that is, receives the earth visible, determined and without confusion; rightly the water gathers for the arid to appear, that is, the sea is forbidden to fluctuate so that the one that was hidden may be manifested. And so it was done, perhaps this was first done in the reasons of the intellectual nature, so that what was said later, and the water was gathered in a single set and the arid was discovered, it does not appear to have been added superfluously, when it had already been said and so it was done, but so that we understood that after the rational and disembodied operation, the corporeal one was also followed.

33. And God called the dry land, and called the sea the gathering of water. We still favor the quality of these words. Not all water is sea, nor all the arid earth; then by means of these words it was determined from what water and arid the segregation was made. Without being absurd, it can be understood that the imposition of names by God was the same distinction and formation. And God saw that it was good, here we observed the same order as above, so apply in this place the things that were said there.

## Chapter XI

34. And God said: Let the earth be the herb of food that bears seed according to its kind and likeness, and fruitful tree that yields fruit, whose seed is in itself after its likeness. After the earth and the sea were formed, and after they received the names and were found good by God, what I have often repeated that should not be understood at intervals of time so that there is no delay to the ineffable power of God operative , was not added immediately after, as in the two previous days, the afternoon was made and the morning was done and they completed the third day, but another work was added: germinate the ground food grass that carries seed according to its kind and likeness, and fruit tree that begets fruit whose seed is in itself according to its likeness. This was not said of that light, nor of the firmament, nor of the waters, nor of the arid, for the light has no children to succeed it, nor is the sky born from another heaven, or the earth and the sea beget other lands or seas that replace these; then here, where the likeness of those who are born perpetuates the likeness of those who die, it should be said that they bear seed according to their gender and whose seed is in itself according to their likeness.

35. All these beings are thus on the earth, which adhere to it by the roots, by it they are sustained, and from it in a certain way they separate; for this reason I judge that in the narrative the ordinary course of nature is observed, because on the same day that the earth appeared these things were created, and yet God said again that the earth should germinate: and it was also repeated, and so it was done; and then, according to the rule that we previously expounded, then it was said: and so it was done, the same

execution was added, saying: and the earth produced grass of food, which bears seed according to its kind, and fruit tree that begets fruit, and his seed in him is according to his likeness. And again he says: and God saw that it was good. Thus, in one and the same day these things come together and are separated from each other by the repeated words of God. This I believe was not done when dealing with the land and the sea, because in a special way the nature of these things that are born and die and were propagated by the succession of seed must be discerned. Or will it be because the earth and the sea could have been made at the same time, not only in the reason of the spiritual creature, where all things were made at the same time, but also in their own bodily nature, but the trees and all class of terrestrial roots, they could not have been born without preceeding the earth, in which they would germinate; and, therefore, God's command was to be repeated so that created things could point to intervals of time, not to be done on another day, since the plants take root in the earth through the roots and thus continue to adhere to her all her life? But it can also be asked: why did God not name the plants? Did he overlook it because so many of them did not allow it? We will study this question better later when we consider other works to which God did not name, as it was imposed on light, heaven, earth and sea: And the evening was made and the morning was made, the third day.

## Chapter XII

36. And God said: let the luminaries be made in the firmament of heaven so that they may shine on the earth and divide the day and the night, and be in signs and times, and in days and years and shine in the firmament of heaven and shine on the earth On the fourth day the luminaries were made, of which it is said to be in days. What do you want to indicate these past three days without luminaries, or why these stars were placed to mark the days, if the days could also exist without them? Was it perhaps because the movement of these luminaries can be distinguished more clearly that prolongation of time and intervals of duration? Or is it that this enumeration of days and nights lends itself better to distinguish between that nature that has not been made and those that were, in such a way as to be called tomorrow by the form of things formed and later by the privation of such shape? Because if we look at God by whom they are made, they are beautiful and hernious; but if we look at what they are, they can be diminished, because they were made out of nothing; if they do not annihilate, they do not owe it to their matter, which comes from nothing, but to the supreme Being that keeps them in their gender and order.

37. And God said: let the luminaries be made in the firmament of heaven so that they may shine. Was this said about the stars that are fixed or also those that move? The two luminaries, the largest and the smallest, are counted among the stars that wander. How, then, were all the stars created in the firmament of heaven, when in particular each one of these that move has its own zone or circle? Or was it said because we read in the divine Scripture that there are many heavens and a sky, and therefore in this place, when the firmament is called heaven, it is to be understood that it speaks of all this ethereal realm that contains all the stars, below which reigns the serenity of pure and tranquil air, as under such serenity Is this turbulent and stormy air stirred? So that they shine on the earth and divide day and night. Had not God already divided the light and the darkness, and had called the light day and the darkness night, where it appears to have already divided the day and the night before? What do you



want, then, to tell us now with what is said of the luminaries, and divide the day and the night? Is this division now made by luminaries so that it is known by men who use only their fleshly eyes to contemplate these things? Thus, God would have made this division before moving the stars in their orbits, so that it could not be understood except by very few, by those who were endowed with healthy spirit and clear reason. Or perhaps God made another division between another kind of day and another kind of night, that is, between the form that imprinted that universal reportable mass, and the information that still remained to be formed? Different this day and different tonight, whose alternative is noticed moving the sky, and that can not occur if it is not with the sunrise and sunset.

## Chapter XIII

38. And be in signs and times, and in days and years. It seems to me that what he said are in signs, they fully clarify the following words, and in time, so that thus one thing would not be taken by sign and another by time; because these times of which he now speaks and which are distinguished by their intervals, point out that on them there is immutable eternity, so that they are a sign of it, that is, time appears as a vestige of eternity. Also when he adds and in days and years he declares that he deals with the times when the days are completed by the return of the fixed stars; and the years are evident when the sun crosses the sidereal circle, because the years are less evident, if we count them when each of the planets crosses its orbit. He did not say "and be a sign of months", because perhaps the month is the year of the moon; just as the twelve moons of the year are the year of the star that the Greeks call gaezonta, the same as thirty solar years make up the year of the star called faion; and perhaps this way also when the stars had returned to occupy the same position, the great year is completed of which not a few said many things. Or perhaps he said in signs, to show by them the true way to navigators; and in times, as to indicate the time of spring, summer, autumn and winter, since these seasons also vary and keep their place and order with the circular movement of the stars? They serve as a signal in days and years, we must understand it as it is already exposed.

39. And shine in the firmament of heaven and shine on the earth. It had already been said above make the luminaries in the firmament of heaven to illuminate the earth. Why do we believe that this was repeated? Is it the same that was said about the plants, that they carry seeds and that they are seeds according to their gender and similarity? And, therefore, here too, but in a different way, was it said of the luminaries, do and be, that is to say, do yourselves and not beget but be in themselves? And so it was done. The order of there is also observed here.

40. And God made two luminaries, the luminary greater beginning of the day, and the lesser luminary beginning of the night, and the stars. What the beginning of the day and night means, we will see immediately. What was added and the stars is ambiguous whether they belong or not at the beginning of the night. Some say that here it is implied that the full moon was first made because she gets up at the beginning of the night, that is, immediately after the sun sets. But it is absurd to start counting from the sixteenth and fifteenth fair of the moon, not from the first. And no one should say that the moon must have been perfect, for it is perfect, that is, full every day, but its perfection is only seen by men

when it is opposite to the sun on the other side; when it is placed next to it, as it is under it, it seems that it is without light; but then it is also full because it is illuminated by the other part, although it can not be seen by those who are under it, that is, by those who inhabit the earth; this can not be demonstrated with few reasons, but with clever speeches and with the help of certain visible drawings.

41. And God placed these two luminaries in the firmament of heaven so that they would shine on the earth. How is it that it was previously said to be done in the firmament, and why now it says, did God the luminaries and placed them in the firmament, as if they had first been made out of it, and then they were placed in it, so that Had he already told them to do it there? Was it meant to mean once and for all that God does not work as men usually do, but that men were narrated as much as possible? For men it is one thing to do and another to place, but for God both things are the same, for acting puts and places work.

42. And preside over day and night and divide day and night. What he now expounds saying "preside over the day and the night" was already said by saying that they were the beginning of the day and the night. Then that principle must be understood by presidency, because in the day there is nothing, among the things we see, more excellent than the sun, and in the night nothing more than the moon and the stars. Then we are not disturbed by that ambiguity anymore, and we believe that the stars were placed so that they also belong to the initiation of the night, that is, they have the presidency of it. And God saw that it was good. The same order is observed as before. Let us also remember that God did not name these things, so that it could be said: and God called the luminous stars, because not every luminary is a star.

43. And the evening was made and the morning was made, fourth day. If we consider these days that are distinguished by the birth and sunset, this day is not the fourth, but perhaps the first, since we judge that at that time the sun was born when it was made, and that it was hidden while the other stars They were created. But whoever understands that the sun is in another place when it is nighttime for us, and the night occupies another region when the sun is with us, will better investigate the enumeration of all these days.

## Chapter XIV

44. And God said: come out of the water reptiles of alive and volatile souls that fly on the earth under the firmament of the sky, and thus it was done. Those animals that swim are called reptiles because they do not walk with feet. Or were they called so because there are others who crawl under water on the earth? Or maybe because there are winged ones in the waters like fish, that have scales and others that do not read them, but are adorned with wings? It can be doubted if in this place they should be counted among the birds. There is a small problem here: why do you attribute to the waters, and not to the air, the animals that are perfect volatile? We can not understand that here we are dealing only with waterfowl, such as the sea crow, the duck and others, because if I had only talked about these, I would not have stopped talking about the other birds, among which very many are so far away from the water that they do not even drink; perhaps it called water to this air contiguous to the earth, since it testifies to

be humid, by the dew that in the calm nights falls in the earth and because it also turns into clouds; and the clouds are water, as all those who walk on the mountains among the clouds, or through the flat field in the fog. Certainly, in this air it is said that birds fly; in that other higher and purer, which without a doubt is called air, can not fly, since it is so subtle that it does not bear the weight of them. In it the clouds can not condense, nor the tempest be unleashed; because the wind is totally absent, as seen on the top of Mount Olympus, which they say exceeds in height this humid air. As those who, by custom, climbed the aforementioned mountain on the solemnities of their sacrifices, it happened to write certain letters in the dust and after a year they found them intact and intact.

45. For this reason, with just reason, it can be believed that in the divine Scriptures the space that is up to this point is called the firmament of heaven, and that the most tranquil and serene air belongs to the firmament. Under this name of firmament such serenity and a great part of things can be understood. For which reason I also judge that the following is said in many places of the psalms: and your truth even to the clouds, 16 because nothing is more firm and serene than the truth; but the clouds form below this very tranquil region of the air. Although what has been said is figuratively taken, however, these things have been written as having a certain resemblance to what they represent; in such a way that there seems in reality to exist a certain image of the truth in this most unalterable and pure bodily creature, which extends from the highest part of the sky to the clouds, that is, to the caliginous, stormy and humid air; then rightly they are attributed to the waters, the birds, that fly over the earth under the firmament of the sky, because water is rightly called this air. By this it is to be understood that nothing was spoken of the air; that is, what mode or when it was made, because this low air bears the name of water, and that high, the firmament. And so, no element was overlooked.

46. But perhaps one will say: if by what was said congréguese the water we understand that the water was made of that matter report, and that this congregation God called sea, how do we understand that this air was made there, Well, it's not called the sea, although it can be called water? It seems to me that when arid appears, not only is the formation of the earth insinuated, but also that of this dense air, because through this air the earth is illuminated to make itself visible to us; then in the same and only word that was said to appear are included all the operations, without which the earth could not be manifested, that is, its form, its liberation from water, and being aerated, because through the air the light is transmitted to the earth from the top of the world. Or perhaps, in what was written: congréguese water, rather emphasizes the formation of air, because when it condenses this air seems to form water. So, perhaps, to the condensation in a dense mass, so that the sea would form from it, he called it a congregation of water, so that what is not gathered, that is, that is not condensed and flows over the land, be the water that can hold the birds, but with these two names, subtle water and dense air. But if you ask why this air was made, it is not said there. Or is it perhaps true that some say that the aqueous evaporation of the sea and the earth forms these much denser auras, than the superior and pure air, and so conditions them so that they can withstand the flight of the birds? Such auras are more subtle than the waters with which we wash our bodies, so that in comparison to them, we perceive them as dry and aerial. But as we had already talked about the land and the sea, what need was there to mention its evaporations, that is, the waters where the birds fly, once it has been understood that the pure and tranquil air is assigned to the sky?

47. Nor was it stated how the rivers and springs were made. Those who with great diligence investigate

and discuss these things and say that with the superficial movement of air the vapor of fresh water is invisibly extracted from the sea, and from these evaporations, which we can not feel, the clouds form; moistened the earth with the rains, the water seeps drop by drop gathering in the most hidden caverns; and after the earth transpires as much water as it has gathered, it lets it pass through different conduits, sprouting in small or large springs, apt to form the rivers. From which fact they want to indicate the steam collected from the boiling seawater in a serpentine, whose vapor constitutes fresh water for those who drink it. It is evident to almost all men that, as the scarcity of rain makes itself felt, the sources diminish their flow. Also the divine history testifies: Elías requested the rain in time of dryness and while he prayed he sent to his servant directed the sight towards the sea; and when from that part there appeared a tiny little cloud, then he announced to the King, who was uneasy, that the rain was imminent, with which, even when he was marching from there to run, he got wet. David also says: O Lord, you who draw water from the sea and pour it on the surface of the earth<sup>18</sup>. Therefore, having been named the sea, there was no need to speak of the remaining waters, either of those that produce the dew and lend by their subtlety to the birds their breezes, or of the waters of the rivers and springs, if the first ones are produced by evaporation and the last ones by reciprocal rains, to which it first absorbs the earth and then makes them sprout.

## Chapter XV

48. Produce the reptilian waters of living souls: Why was it added alive? Can there be souls who do not live? Or is it that they wanted to highlight this more ostensible life, which animals have that they feel, but which plants lack? And produce birds that fly over the earth below the firmament of heaven. If the birds do not fly in that pure air, where no cloud forms, it is evident that he belongs to the firmament, because it was said that the birds will fly above the earth beneath the sky. And so it was done, the same order is observed here as in the past works and, therefore, it is added the same as in the others, except in that of light, which was made the first of all.

49. And God made the great fishes and all the souls of the creeping creatures, to whom he produced the water according to their kind, and all volatile according to their kind. Let us remember the time that, according to its genre, it speaks of the creatures that substitute each other for the seminal propagation, as already discussed when talking about herbs and trees. And all volatile wings, why did you add wings? Can a volatile exist without them? Given that such a species may exist, God really created it, although it is not known where it was made. No being can fly without wings, because bats, locusts, flies and if there is any other animal of this kind that lacks feathers, nevertheless it does not lack wings. It was added wings so that we understood that birds were not only talked about, since the fish also have wings and fly over the earth in the middle of the water. For this reason birds were not said, but volatile in general, and volatile of wings. And God saw that it was good. This is to be understood as stated in the other places where the same was said.

50. And God blessed them, saying, Increase and multiply and fill the waters of the sea, and the volatiles multiply, upon the earth. God wanted the blessing to have the force of fecundity, which manifests itself

in the succession of the offspring, so that because of this blessing, since they were created weak and mortal, others being born, they perpetuated their gender. But having as they do also the plants in the birth resemblance with the expired animals, I ask: why did not these bless them? Is it because they lack meaning which is closer to reason? Perhaps it is not without reason that God uses the second person in the blessing, and he does so to induce the generation of these animals, as if in a certain way they understood by saying, "Grow and multiply and fill the waters of the sea." However, he does not continue speaking until the end of the blessing in the second person, but he continues saying: and the volatiles multiply on earth. He did not say, then, multiply on earth. Perhaps for this very reason it is evident that the faculty of sense in animals is not so close to reason that they could perfectly understand the invitation to generate, as can be understood by those who pass and use reason.

51. And so it was done. Here you must completely awaken from your ignorance any rude and understand what days it is. For having given God to the animals determined gestation times, those who keep within a certain order an admirable firmness so that during predetermined number of days each, according to their gender, carry in their womb what they have conceived or incubate the eggs positions, whose law imposed on nature is preserved by the wisdom of God, which embraces all things firmly from one end of the world to the other and orders them with gentleness<sup>19</sup>. I ask: in what way in a single day could you conceive and conceive in the uterus, incubate and nourish what was born and populate the waters and multiply on the earth? Why was it added before the earth appeared and it was done, but it is because without a doubt when it was said the afternoon indicates the matter report, and when it says it was done the morning indicates the form that was printed on the subject in the same God's work, because with the morning, when the work is finished, the day ends. God did not say the afternoon or the morning, because all this is a very brief account of things already done, understood in the words afternoon and tomorrow, meaning the first word the material report, and the second the form; of those that had already been said that God had made them. Moreover, when we pay attention to something imperfect, that is, when we go from shape to formless matter and from it to nothingness, if we believe that the imperfect in this name is insinuated by night or by night, I would not say that it was done, but only ordained by God, as it says above: God divided light and darkness. Therefore, when the afternoon was said, the word "report" was designated by the word "afternoon", which, despite having been made out of nothing, nevertheless exists and is capable of forms and beauty. It can also be taken under the name of darkness absolute nothingness, which God does not do because nothing is, and which made everything that He deigned to do Omnipotent for his ineffable goodness, because out of nothing he did all things.

52. And the evening was made and the morning was made the fifth day. Now after he said, and this was done, he did not add, as usual, the enumeration of the execution of the works, as if they were again made, since he had already enumerated them before. Not even for that blessing that he gave to generate the offspring was some other new creature, fine that through it the already made were conserved by the succession. And for this reason he did not say "and God saw that it was good", because already the same The creature had been pleasing to him and, therefore, only had to be preserved in the seeds. Nothing, then, was repeated, unless what was said and so it was done. After this he immediately speaks of the afternoon and the morning, in whose names we explain that the work executed by God of the material matter and of the form given to it was signified. This is what I understand, although perhaps

something better and more excellent discover the scholars.

53. And God said let the earth produce a living soul, according to its kind, of four-footed animals, and of snakes, and of beasts of the earth after their kind, and so it was done. In the way above, we must consider and understand why it was added alive, having said soul; and what it means according to its gender; and how is understood the customary conclusion by which it is said, and thus it was done. Although the Latin language under the name of beast generally includes all irrational animals, here, however, species must be distinguished so that we understand all the animals of charge by quadrupeds, by snakes all the living creatures that crawl, by beasts or wild beasts all the unruly quadrupeds and animals all quadrupeds that do not help working, but provide some benefit to those who graze them.

## Chapter XVI

54. And God made the beasts of the earth after their kind, and the animals after their kind, and all the serpents of the earth after their kind. This repetition that was made when God said and did when it had already been said and was done, must be understood according to the norm exposed above. Here, under the name of animals, I believe all the quadrupeds that live in the care of man are meant. And God saw that it was good, it must be understood as usual.

55. And God said, let us make man in our image and likeness. In this work of God a certain union and separation of the other living beings must be noted, for it says that man was made on the same day as the beasts and that they are all equally earthly animals; but, nevertheless, by the excellence of reason, according to which man is made in the image and likeness of God, man is separately spoken after, according to custom, the formation of the other animals has ended, saying and seeing God that It was good.

56. We must also consider here what was not said in the formation of other beings, let us do, as if in this way the Holy Spirit wanted to highlight the excellence of human nature; For what did he say now we do, but who was said in the other formations? All things were made for Him and without Him nothing was done<sup>20</sup>. But why do we judge it to have been said in a different way, and do another, but it is because there He did it at the Father's command and now together they did it? Or perhaps it was spoken in this way because all the things that the Father does are done through the Son and, consequently, it was said here that we do it so that he himself, for whom the divine books were written, would see in this way himself that all those things that the Son does speaking the Father, also the Father makes them, so that what was said in the other creatures separately (indicating the Father), and was made (pointing to the Son), here is He states that the narration of the work and its work were not made separately, but that both took place at the same time when it was said here: Let us do.

57. And God said: Let us make man in our image and likeness. Every image is similar to that of who is image, but, nevertheless, not everything that is similar to something, is also an image of it. This is seen in the mirror and in the painting; the represented in them are images, and therefore, similar; but if one of the other is not born, neither can be said to be the image of the other; there is, then, an image when

there is expression of something. Why, then, when it was said to the image was it added and likeness, as if there could be an unlike image? Suffice it to say "to image." Or is it that one thing is similar and another similarity, as one thing is chaste and another is chastity, one strong and the other different strength, so that all who are strong are strong and all who are chaste are chaste because of chastity, and so all who are similar are by similarity? In the same way that where chastity is, by it all chaste things are chaste, where similarity is, by it all things that are similar are similar; for that reason it is not said with all property that our image is our similarity; nevertheless, it is said with complete accuracy that he is similar to us. Chastity, then, is chaste without the participation of anyone, but by the participation of it are chaste things that are chaste; the same happens with God, in whom is the same Wisdom, which, without the participation of anything or anyone, is Wise, but with whose participation every soul is wise. Wherefore also the likeness of God (the Son) by whom all things were made, is properly called likeness, because it is similar not by participation of some other likeness, but rather it is the first likeness, by whose participation they are alike. all the things that God did for her.

58. Then perhaps the exposition will be that the addition, likeness, after saying the image, was added to show that the one that was called image is not similar to God, as if it participated in some other similarity, but that she herself is the similarity, of which all the things that are said to be similar participate; as she herself is chastity, for whose participation the souls are chaste; and wisdom, by whose participation the souls are wise; and beauty, by whose participation all things that are beautiful are beautiful. If, then, he only named the similarity it would not indicate that it was by Him begotten; and if he only made mention of the image, he would certainly make known that by him he was begotten, but he would not manifest that in such a way he was similar, that not only was he, but that he was the same likeness. Just as there is nothing more chaste than chastity itself, and nothing is more wise than wisdom itself, and nothing more beautiful than beauty itself, so nothing can be said or thought or exist more similar than the same resemblance; whereby it is understood that in such a way is similarity to the Father his Semejanza, that fills his nature fully and perfectly.

59. If we consider that all nature, whether it is perceived by the senses or by reason, retains the seal of the unit due to the similarity between the parties, we are allowed to ponder in some way, although it transcends in eminent way human thoughts, to what extent the likeness of God, by which all things were made, has virtue, to imprint the form of creatures. Certainly by the Wisdom of God rational souls are called wise, and this name does not extend beyond beings endowed with reason, because to no animal, much less to trees, or fire, or air, or water, or to the earth, we can call them wise, although as soon as they are, all these things exist by the Wisdom of God. But, nevertheless, we say that the stones are similar to each other the same as the animals, and also the men, and the angels. Well, of each of the things, because they have their parts similar to each other, we say that they have determined their being, and this makes the earth is land and the water is water and would stop being water if any of its parts is not similar to the other parts of it; likewise any part of the air, if it were unlike the rest, could in no way be air; in the same way the particle of fire and light, because it is not unlike the other parts, reaches to be what it is. The same can be seen and understood in each of the stones, or in any of the trees, or in all the animated bodies; for in no way would they exist with the other beings of their kind, nor each of them in itself, if they did not have similar parts to each other. A body is more beautiful, the more similar the parts are to each other. Finally, not only the friendship of some souls with others is based on similar customs, but also in each soul the happy life indicates the similar actions and virtues,

without which the permanence can not exist. Of all these things we can say that they are similar, but not that they are the same similarity. Therefore, although the universe is made up of things similar to each other, so that each one by this similarity is itself what it is, and together they constitute the universe, which God created and governs, however, by the most excellent similarity immutable and uncontaminable of Him, who created all things, were made such, that they are beautiful by like parts of each other. But not all have been made in the likeness of Her, but only the rational substance; therefore, all things by It were made, but in His likeness only the soul.

60. Thus, the rational substance was made without interposition of any nature by the same Likeness of God and like Her; since the human mind to any thing unites if it is not to the Truth itself, which is called Image and Likeness and Wisdom of the Father, which does not perceive it if it is not pure and blissful; then with all rectitude, according to what man has of principal and internal, that is to say, according to the mind, it is taken to make man in our image and likeness, since precisely the whole man must be appreciated for that which exists in man as principal, what separates him from the beasts. The other things that are in man, although they are beautiful in their kind, are common to him with the beasts and that is why in man they should be esteemed little, unless the upright figure of the human body, raised to look at the sky, have also some courage to believe that the same body was made in the likeness of God, so that as the likeness does not depart from the Father, so the body of man is not in opposition to heaven, as are the bodies of the other animals, since inclined to the earth lie on the belly. This property and likeness should not be taken in a rigorous sense, because our body is very different from heaven; but in that Resemblance, which is the Son, nothing can have unlike Him to Whom it is similar. All things that are similar, also by some part are unlike each other, but the same resemblance is by no means unlike itself. The Father, then, is Father, and the Son is nothing other than Son, but when it is said to be the Likeness of the Father, even though it is revealed that there is no dissimilarity between the two, nevertheless, it is not only the Father who is It has similarity.

61. And God said: Let us make man in our image and likeness. With the above, we have more brings enough; and according to this, these words of the divine Scripture, in which we read to have said God we wounded the man in our image and likeness, express that we can understand that the likeness of God according to which man was made is the same Word of God, that is, e! Unigénito Son; but not that man is the same image and likeness to the Father. E «, then, the man image of God as the Apostle clearly demonstrates saying: man should not cover his head being as it is the image and glory of God<sup>21</sup>. But this image, made in the image of God, is not equal and coeternal to the one of whom it is an image, nor would it become so, although it never would have sinned. The sense that we should rather choose in these words, let us make man in our image and likeness, is that we do not understand them as spoken in the singular, but in the plural, because man was not made in the image of only the Father or of only the Son or only of the Holy Spirit, but in the image of this Trinity; whose Trinity is thus Trinity that is one God, and in such a way is one God who is Trinity. Therefore, the Father does not say by the Son, let us make man in your image or in my image, but plurally he says in our image and likeness; and who will dare to separate the Holy Spirit from this plurality? This plurality is not three gods, but only one God; that is why it is to be understood that later the Scripture introduced the singular saying: And God made man in the image of God, so that it would not be taken as if God the Father made man in the image of God, that is, of his Son, otherwise, how true is what was said, in our image, if man was made only in the image of the Son? Because what God said is true, in our image,



that is why it was said thus: God made man in the image of God, as if saying in his image that it is the same Trinity.

62. Many believe that the similar word is not repeated here, that is, God was not said and made man in the image and "likeness" of God, because at that time he was only made in the image; but the likeness of Him was reserved for after the resurrection of the dead; they say as if there could be an image in which there is no resemblance, if it is not completely similar, no doubt there is no image either. However, in order that it does not seem that we treat this matter solely according to the reason, we will adduce the authority of the apostle James, who, speaking of the language of man, says: with it we will bless God and with it we will curse men, those who they were made to "likeness" of God.