

Eirini ARTEMI, The influence of Origen to John Scottus Eriugena  
about “The return of all things to God”

## The influence of Origen to John Scottus Eriugena about “The return of all things to God”

### La influencia de Orígenes sobre Juan Escoto Eriúgena acerca de “El regreso de todas las cosas a Dios”

Eirini ARTEMI

National and Capodistrian University of Athens

[eartemi@theol.uoa.gr](mailto:eartemi@theol.uoa.gr)

Recibido: 11/02/2014

Aceptado: 25/04/2014

**Abstract:** One of the most criticized doctrines held by Origen is his belief in a universal salvation. For Origen, to affirm a belief in an eternal hell over which the devil had dominion was to become dualistic by making the devil a god in his own right. Because Origen was very concerned with Gnostic beliefs and sought to counter them, when he speaks of salvation he explains that the Satan is not equal to God, so the Satan will not be the winner in the end. For him, the focus is on God and the individual. Within Christian theology, especially of the medieval period, there has been a dialectic between those thinkers who attempt to follow Aristotle and those who see greater promise in neo-Platonism. The works of John Scottus Eriugena demonstrate that he was strongly influenced by Origen and his thoughts. To find the influence from Origen’s work on John Scottus Eriugena, we will expose the basic differences and similarities of the work of John Scottus Eriugena with the works of Origen. John was not only influenced by Gregorius of Nyssa but in fact by Origen. For this reason, both theologians refer to return of all things to God. Origen’s thought through the works of Augustine had influenced one more time John Scottus Eriugena.

**Keywords:** *Apocatastasis*, return, Origen of Alexandria, John Scottus Eriugena.

**Resumen:** Una de las más criticadas doctrinas sostenidas por Orígenes es su creencia en una salvación universal. Para Orígenes, afirmar la creencia en un infierno eterno sobre el que el diablo dominase se convertiría en dualista, al convertir al diablo en un dios con su propio derecho. Debido a que Orígenes estaba muy preocupado por las creencias gnósticas y trataba de hacerles frente, cuando él habla de la salvación no lo hace de una manera que permitiría a un mal llegase de alguna manera a ser igual a un bien o a Dios. Para él, la atención se centra en Dios y en el individuo. Dentro de la teología cristiana, especialmente la de la época medieval, ha habido una dialéctica entre los pensadores que tratan de seguir a Aristóteles y los que ven mayor promesa en el neoplatonismo. Las obras de Juan Escoto Eriúgena demuestran que este fue fuertemente influenciado por Orígenes y sus pensamientos. Para conocer la influencia de la obra de Orígenes sobre Juan Escoto Eriúgena, vamos a exponer las diferencias y similitudes básicas de la obra de Juan Escoto con las obras de Orígenes. Juan no solo fue influenciado por Gregorio de Nisa, sino de hecho por Orígenes. Por esta razón, ambos teólogos se refieren al retorno de todas las cosas a Dios. El pensamiento de Orígenes a través de las obras de Agustín había influido una vez más a Juan Escoto

**Palabras clave:** *Apocatastasis*, regreso, Orígenes de Alejandría, Juan Escoto Eriúgena.

**Contents:** 1. Introduction. 2. John's Scottus Eriugena and Origen on the Doctrine of God and Creation. 2.1. John's Scottus Eriugena and Origen's teaching about God's transcendence and the creation of world. 2.2. The Sin, the Fall and the *Apocatastasis*: the Restitution of all things. 3. Conclusions. Sources and Bibliography.

## 1. Introduction

Origen of Alexandria's (c. 185-254AD) personality, ideas and works have always been the source of passionate and enthusiastic controversies. Origen was one of the most important and distinguished early Christian theologian in the patristic tradition. He was influenced by the beliefs of Greek philosophy, mainly by Plato's teaching. In many of his works, he tried to reconcile Christian beliefs with Greek philosophy, leading him to develop doctrines which were eventually judged heretical by Christian authorities. Because of this, he has left a mixed inheritance in the orthodox Christian world<sup>1</sup>. On the one hand, he is undoubtedly the most highly accomplished apologist and exegete of the pre-Nicene period. His teaching was not merely theoretical, but was also imbued with an intense ethical power. On the other hand, the person and works of Origen have fallen under grave ecclesiastical censure on several important occasions. In his own lifetime, he was expelled from the Alexandrian Church, and 150 years after his death several of his theological opinions were condemned as heretical at the Synod of Constantinople (543) by the Patriarch Mennas of Constantinople and the condemnation was ratified in 553 by the Fifth Ecumenical Council<sup>2</sup>. Despite the censure criticism and the condemnation of Origen's teaching, his works and his ideas were adopted the following years by some eastern and western theologians as John Scottus Eriugena<sup>3</sup>.

Johannes Scottus (c.800-c.877), who signed himself as “Eriugena” in one of his manuscript came from Ireland. His name underlines his nationality: “Scottus” meant “Irishman” or “Gaelic” in the Latin of this period, and “Eriugena”, a neologism that was invented by John himself, is an elaborating way of saying the same thing<sup>4</sup>. The nickname “Eriugena” means “Ireland (Ériu)-born”. His name is translated as “John, the Irish-born Gael”. This name Eriugena was devised by himself on the occasion of his translation of the Pseudo Dionysius, probably after the analogy of the Maxime Graiugena, which occurs in one of his poems<sup>5</sup>. He has been praised as the “Greatest mind of the early western Medieval period —or the last great mind of Antiquity”. Eriugena

---

<sup>1</sup> POPE BENEDICT XVI, “Origen of Alexandria: life and work”, *Libreria Editrice Vaticana*, [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/benedict\\_xvi/audiences/2007/documents/hf\\_ben-xvi\\_aud\\_20070425\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/audiences/2007/documents/hf_ben-xvi_aud_20070425_en.html) (2007).

<sup>2</sup> VL. FEIDAS, *Ecclesiastic History I*, Athens 1994, p. 708-722.

<sup>3</sup> F. PRAT, “Origen and Origenism”, *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 11, Robert Appleton Company, New York 1911, 17 Aug. 2013: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/11306b.htm>.

<sup>4</sup> J. MARENBOON, “Introduction”, in St. Gersh, “John Scottus Eriugena and Anselm of Canterbury”, *history\_philosophy.enacademic.com/142/John\_Scottus\_Eriugena\_and\_Anselm\_of\_Canterbury*, Routledge History of Philosophy, Taylor & Francis e—Library, 2005, p. 1.

<sup>5</sup> JOHANNES SCOTTUS ERIUGENA, *Versus de ambiguis S. Maximi*. PL 122, 1236A: “Quiusquis amat formam pulchrae laudare sophiae, Te legat assidue, Maxime Grajugena” This more likely than that is composed directly from the Gaelic Ériu. Graiugena is also found in Columbanus, *Ad Fidolium*, 119. Cf. Also, ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ ΓΡΑΙΥΤΕΝΩΝ in a poem by an anonymous Irishman, Traube, MGH, *Poet. Lat.* 3, 686, where the Y suggests that this Greek word is a “calque” on the Latin.

lived in the Carolingian era. He could read and write the Greek language fluently. So, the familiarity with the Greek language afforded him access to the Greek Christian theological tradition, from Origen, the Cappadocian fathers (Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa) to Maximus the Confessor. Besides the Greek patristic texts, Scottus studied carefully the writings of Latin Fathers –mainly Ambrose of Milan and Augustine of Hippo and many texts of Platonism and Neoplatonism. All these were the sources of his “De divisione naturae” or “Periphyseon”, but his main source was the writings of Origen<sup>6</sup>.

## 2. John's Scottus Eriugena and Origen on the Doctrine of God and Creation

### 2.1. John's Scottus Eriugena and Origen's teaching about God's transcendence and the creation of world

Which is the bond –*desmos* in Greek— between theology and philosophy, between Jerusalem and Athens? Perhaps the answer will be exposed in seeing the work of John Scottus Eriugena “De divisione naturae” or “Periphyseon” and Origen's “On First Principles” (*De principiis*). Scottus and Origen lived in different ages, but theology and philosophy of the latter influenced the theological teaching of the first. They tried to reconcile the Platonic and Neoplatonism philosophy with the Christian theology.

Eriugena's thought is best understood as a sustained attempt to create a consistent, systematic, Christian Neoplatonism from diverse but primarily Christian sources. In his main work, “De divisione naturae” or “Periphyseon” Eriugena tried to make an intellectual synthesis between Bible and neoplatonist philosophy. On the other hand, Origen is the most systematic and philosophical theologian of the AD 3<sup>rd</sup> century. Origen is deserved credit and glory of indissolubly linking vital Christian beliefs to Greek Philosophy<sup>7</sup>. Having been educated in classical and philosophical studies, some of his teachings are influenced by and engaged with aspects of Neo-Pythagorean, Neo-Platonist, and other strains of contemporary philosophical thought. As a theologian, in *De principiis* (*On First Principles*), he articulates one of the first philosophical expositions of Christian doctrines, including that the Holy Trinity —based upon the standard Middle Platonic triadic emanation schemas—; the pre-

---

<sup>6</sup> “In the Periphyseon Eriugena refers to the Latin translation of Origen's *De principiis* and quotes a passage from it, in fact a rather short section of that work (Book III 6, 2-5). Did Eriugena have direct access to the whole Latin text? The editors of the critical text of the *De principiis* are extremely cautious about the possibility of any direct contact with the text: ‘The whole of the Middle Ages knew his teaching almost entirely from the general school tradition and from comments of others. Not even for Scottus Eriugena, who cites the Peri archon literally, can it be said with certainty that he acquired his knowledge of Origen without mediation’. I think the editors are over-cautious here. Clearly Eriugena had access to a good version of the text —perhaps not the complete work, but very definitely a good excerpt from it”, D. MORRAN, *The Relationship between Neoplatonism and Christianity*, ed. by T. Finan and V. Twomey with a foreword by J. J. O'Meara, Dublin, Four Courts Press, Kill Lane, Blackrock, Co., 1992, 27-54, p. 32.

<sup>7</sup> G.L. PRESTIGE, *Fathers and Heretics*, publ. SPCK, London, 1977, p. 43.

existence and fall of souls; multiple ages and transmigration of souls; and the eventual restoration of all souls to a state of dynamic perfection in proximity to the Godhead<sup>8</sup>.

John Scottus Eriugena develops the platonic philosophy<sup>9</sup> with the way of thinking of Greeks Fathers in text of “Periphyseon”. The way of thinking of Greek Fathers is different to the one of the Western Fathers<sup>10</sup>. The first one is not shaped strictly with the confines of logic and dialectic, and it is open to explore more fields of philosophy and speculation<sup>11</sup>. The reality of God and of the world united inseparably in one single movement of emanation and return (*exitus et reditus*)<sup>12</sup>, following neo-Platonic philosophy. The created world therefore has no consistency except as a theophany, that is to say, a manifestation of God, insofar as it is created by Him and returns to Him<sup>13</sup>. The reality of God in Himself is in fact unknowable, but creation is one

---

<sup>8</sup> E. MOORE, “Origen of Alexandria (185-254 AD)”, *Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, <http://www.iep.utm.edu/origen-of-alexandria>, 2 May 2005.

<sup>9</sup> Much of the material on Middle Platonism in this section is condensed from E. MOORE, “Middle Platonism”, *The Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy* <http://www.iep.utm.edu/m/midplato/htm> (2013).

<sup>10</sup> “Richard Woods writes ‘It is largely through his efforts that the mystical Neoplatonism of the Eastern Church entered the Latin West. And Deidre Carabine puts it: “Eriugena was responsible for the meeting of Athens and Rome in Gaul”’; T. CONWAY, “John Scottus Eriugena The Greatest Theologian of Early Medieval Christianity”, <http://peterspearls.com.au/jse.htm> (2012), cf. D. CARABINE, *John Scottus Eriugena*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000, p. 59. D. CARABINE, *The Unknown God: Negative Theology in the Platonic Tradition: Plato to Eriugena*, Oxford, W.B. Eerdsman, 1995, p. 89.

<sup>11</sup> JOHANNES SCOTTUS ERIUGENA, *Operum S. Dionysii Aeropagitae*. PL 122, 1031C: “... *verum etiam in augmentum aedificationis catholicae fidei novis editionibus in laudem christiani dogmatis Έλληνας Patres addidicistis consulere. Hinc est, quod et ingenioli nostri parvitatem non dedignati estis impellere, nec nos velut oliosos inertiaeque somno sopitos perpassi estis dormire, ne, dum hesperis solummodo apicibus studium impendimus, ad purissimos copiosissimosque Graieum latices recurrere, haustumque inde sumere non valeremus*”. JOHANNES SCOTTUS ERIUGENA, *Ambiguorum S. Maximi*. PL 122, 1196C: “*Vestrae judicio non respuatis roborari, et inter similia sanae doctrinae instrumenta recipi, cum ex praeclarissimis Graecorum fontibus non dubietis derivari. In quibus si quid incognitae adhuc nobis doctrinae inveniatur, auctoribus ipsis est deputandum, quia nemo aliud in hoc opere recte mihi debet tribuere, nisi solummodo simpliciter transtulisse*”. Citations are translated to English by I. P. Sheldon-Williams with the collaboration of Ludwig Bieler J, in *Periphyseon (The Division of Nature)*, The Dublin Institute for advanced Studies, Dublin 1968.

<sup>12</sup> JOHANNES SCOTTUS ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, I, 72. PL 122, 518AB: “*Non ergo aliud est Deo esse, et aliud facere, sed ei esse id ipsum est et facere. Huic conclusioni resistere non audeo. Cum ergo audimus, Deum in omnibus esse, hoc est, essentiam omnium subsistere. Ipse enim solus per se vere est, et omne, quod vere in his, quae sunt, dicitur est, ipse solus est. Nihil enim eorum, quae sunt, per se ipsum vere est. Quodcumque autem in eo vere intelligitur, participatione ipsius, unius qui solus per se ipsum vere est, accipit*”.

<sup>13</sup> W. OTTEN, *The Anthropology of Johannes Scottus Eriugena*, Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1991, p. 49.

manifestation of Him. God is the cause that is uncaused. As we can understand, Eriugena's theology is negative or apophatic<sup>14</sup>.

But Origen's theology is apophatic too, which describes God by saying that he is not. He insists that the divine lies beyond words, concepts and understanding. The apophatic theology of Origen is constantly transgressed<sup>15</sup>. Such transgression can occur even when apophaticism is explicitly affirmed. Origen insists repeatedly on divine unknowability but still define God as “Monad (*monas*) and Unity (*enas*)... the source and origin of intellectual and spiritual nature”<sup>16</sup> [*uti ne majus aliquid et inferius in se habere credatur, sed ut sit ex omni parte μονάς, et ut ita dicam ἐνάς, et mens, ac fons ex quo initium totius intellectualis naturae vel mentis est*]. For Origen negative theology has a positive view on it. For Origen, also, the result of this apophaticism is to reject “any notion obstructing the knowledge of the divine nature defined positively as the *One*”.<sup>17</sup> The Origen's naming of God as “One” as resulting in an apophaticism in service of cataphaticism. The latter becomes superior to the former, especially when, as with Origen, the locus for the encounter with God is *Nous*.

*Animae igitur purgatae per actionem... Deum incognitum aeternaliter volvitur, ultra et suam et omnium rerum naturam Deum omnino absolutum ab omnibus, quae et dici et intelligi possunt... quae de eo praedicantur, non proprie sed translative de eo praedicari approbans, νοῦς a Graecis... Deum ultra omnem creaturam verissime vocari et subsistere intellectum. Sed quo modo, vel qua ratione intellectus, dum intra terminos humanae naturae concluditur... quaerendum puto.*<sup>18</sup>

In his first book, Scottus coins the term nature for the universe. Instead of traditional Christian dichotomy of God versus creation, Eriugena presents a unified view of reality, the intimidating whole of which he can only conceive by submitting it to a process of division. All creatures are divisible into those that exist and those that don't exist, or better they have no being, no substance. Nature is divided into four kinds: 1) the “being” that creates and it is not created. In this category God belongs, because He is the source of everything's creation. 2) The “being” that creates and it is created. Here, there are the Divine

---

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.

<sup>15</sup> B. HUGHES, “Origen and the Incorporation of Platonic/Apophatic Theology into the Christian System”, <http://www.brenhughes.com/Research/ApophaticTheology.pdf>, (2009)p.2.

<sup>16</sup> ORIGEN OF ALEXANDRIA, *Peri Archon*, I. PG 11, 125A. Cf. L. WOODHEAD, “Apophatic Anthropology”, in *God and Human Dignity*, ed. K. Soulen and L. Woodhead, Michigan USA, W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 2006, 233-246, p. 235

<sup>17</sup> A. PAPANIKOLAOU, *Being with God, Trinity, Apophaticism, and Divine—Human Communion*, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 2006, p. 18.

<sup>18</sup> JOHANNES SCOTTUS ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, II. PL 122, 574A—576C. See A. PAPANIKOLAOU, *Being with God, Trinity, Apophaticism, and Divine-Human Communion*, University of Notre Dame Press, Indiana 2006, p. 18-19.

Ideas, the Primordial Causes. 3) The “being” that is created but it can create nothing. In this species belong all created things; and 4) The “being” that neither creates nor is created. Here, there is the Fourth God as the end to which all things-beings which are creatures and do not have the ability to create will at last come back<sup>19</sup>.

He says that every nature that is made from God was good. It is eternal, without trace of corruption and sin on it.

*Omnis natura ex Deo est; omne autem peccatum ex natura; ex Deo est igitur omne peccatum. Quod si hoc absurdissimum est concedere, relinquitur verissimus ille atque piissimus syllogismus, et caritatis et catholicae fidei plenissimus, qui sic proponitur: Omne bonum aut Deus est aut ex Deo factum est; omne quod ex Deo factum est, nullum vitium boni efficit; omne igitur bonum nullam vitium boni efficere potest; et redexim: nullum igitur vitium boni ex bono est: omne vitium boni ex bono non est: omne peccatum, quia malum est, ex bono esse non potest. Omnis creatura rationis particeps magnum bonum est: ex nullo bono malum: ex nulla igitur creatura rationis particeps peccatum est.*<sup>20</sup>

Sin was something strange from the nature<sup>21</sup>:

*Bonus homo de bono thesauro cordis sui profert bona, malus homo de malo thesauro cordis sui profert mala... Quapropter substantia non est malum. Sic enim nec aqua malum est, nec animal, quod vivit in aere; nam istae substantiae sunt.*<sup>22</sup>

Eriugena underlines that “the Divine History mentions but one Paradise and but one man created in it –though the one man includes both male and female, if the words of the Holy Fathers are to be followed”: [*Unum namque paradisum divina narrat historia, et unum hominem in ipso creatum, in quo videlicet homine vir et mulier intelligitur esse, si verba sanctorum Patrum sequenda sunt*].<sup>23</sup> He counters that humanity was created in the image of God and was designed to multiply in the same (ineffable) manner as the angels<sup>24</sup>. However, the fall into sin brought the consequence of death to humanity, necessitating that God endow the species with another mechanism for

---

<sup>19</sup> R.M. LEMOS, *A Neomedieval Essay in Philosophical Theology*, N. York USA, Lexington Books, 2001, p. 35.

<sup>20</sup> JOHANNES SCOTTUS ERIUGENA, *De Divina Praedestinatione*, 16, 4, 120-121. PL 122, 420C-421A. *Ibid*, 16, 5, 161. PL 122, 421D.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>23</sup> ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, IV. PL 122, 833A.

<sup>24</sup> B.E. RICH, “The Origin of Gender in Eriugena’s Periphyseon”, <http://www.brycerich.com/2011/11/eriugena-creation.html> (2011).

procreation –one resembling the manner in which irrational animals reproduced– if humanity was to fulfil God's original plan to produce the full number of people that God intended<sup>25</sup>. Thus in addition to the original *imago dei* imprinted on humanity, God went further to make humans as male and female. Nature was a virtual synonym for Reality —the whole reality, our natural world as well as the reality of God<sup>26</sup>.

God is truly God, utterly free of all limiting human notions of space-time, distinct entities, finite relationships and other constraints which had more to do with ignorant human conceptions than the actual Divine nature. God surpasses every intellect and every sensible and intelligible meaning and is One Who is better known by not knowing, of Whom ignorance is true knowledge.

*Nunc itaque vides, ex incorporeis, mutabili videlicet informitate formarum quidem capaci, ex ipsaque forma quoddam corporeum, materiam dico corpusque, creari... Condecis itaque, ex incorporalium coitu corpora posse fieri. Concedo ratione coactus. Atqui dum haec ita sint, necessario fateberis, corpora in incorporea posse resolvi, ita ut corporea non sint, sed penitus soluta. Incorporea vero naturali suo concursu mirabilique harmonia ita corpora conticiunt, ut naturalem suum statum immobilemque vigorem nullo modo desinant habere.*<sup>27</sup>

Eriugena underlines that God is totally beyond human understanding, he is said not to be. But that, somehow, seems to limit the Divine nature. Eriugena prefers to further distance God from the limitations of both being and non-being<sup>28</sup>. God cannot “literally” (*proprie*) be said to be substance or essence (*ousia, essentia*), nor can He is described in terms of quantity, quality, relation, place or time. He is “*superessentialis*”:

*Essentia ergo dicitur Deus, sed proprie essentia non est, cui opponitur nihil; ὑπερούσιος igitur est, id est, superessentialis. Item bonitas dicitur, sed proprie bonitas non est; bonitati enim malitia opponitur; ὑπεράγαθος igitur, plusquam bonus, et ὑπεραγαθότης, id est, plusquam bonitas. Deus dicitur, sed non proprie Deus est; visioni enim caecitas opponitur.*<sup>29</sup>

God for Eriugena's theology is transcendent and self-existent. However, Eriugena asserts that God might be said to be created in creatures, he means

---

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>27</sup> ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, I. PL 122, 501B.

<sup>28</sup> M. BRENNAN, *John Scottus Eriugena. Treatise on Divine Predestination*, with an Introduction by Avital Wohlman, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 1998, p. 5.

<sup>29</sup> ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, I. PL 122, 459D. Also: “the ‘superessential and hidden divinity’ —*superessentialis et occulta divinitas*—”, I. PL 122, 510B. Also “divine superessentiality” —*divina superessentialitas*—, III . PL 122, 588BC, 634B.

that “God “appears” or appears Himself in creatures, that creatures are a “theophany”<sup>30</sup>. Our knowledge for God is based on the “transcendence of God” and the “immanence of God”. The “transcendence” and “immanence” of God are not opposite but complement each other. “Ordinarily, the more emphasis a theologian places on transcendence, the less she will place on immanence; the more on immanence, the less on transcendence”<sup>31</sup>. It is obvious that Eriugena supports that “Creation is God's emanation from Himself and return toward Himself: Thus going forth into all things in order He makes all things and is made in all things, and returns to Himself, calling all things back to Himself, and while He is made in all things He does not cease to be above all things”<sup>32</sup>.

God is a “nothingness” (*nihilum*) whose real essence is unknown to all created beings, including the angels.<sup>33</sup> God does not suffer, but neither can God be a creator. This happens because God’s pre-existence would put God in time and make the creation as God's misadventure; and even if creation is eternal and identical with God, this creative action cannot be ascribed to God. “When it is heard that God makes all things, nothing else be understood but that God is

---

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, I. PL 122, 446D: *Non enim essentia divina Deus solummodo dicitur, sed etiam modus ille, quo se quodam modo intellectuali et rationali creaturae, prout est capacitas uniuscuiusque, ostendit, Deus saepe a sacra Scriptura vocitatur. Qui modus a Graecis theophania, hoc est, Dei apparitio solet appellari.* Cf “While by itself and in itself it is immutable and eternally at rest, yet it is said to move all things since all things through it and in its subsist and have been brought from not—being into being, for by its being, all things proceed out of nothing, and it draws all things to itself”. (*Ibid.*, 521C.). F.A. COPLESTON, *History of Philosophy*, Book. I, vol. II, *Augustine to Scotus*: New York, 2009, Image Books/Doubleday, p. 117.

<sup>31</sup> ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, III. PL 122, 678C: *Nam et creatura in Deo subsistens, et Deus in creatura mirabili et ineffabili modo creatur, seipsum manifestans, invisibilis visibilem se faciens, et incomprehensibilis cognitum, et forma et specie carens formosum ac speciosum, et superessentialis essentialem, et supernaturalis naturalem, et simplex compositum, et accidentibus liber accidentibus subjectum, et accidens, et infinitus finitum, et incircumscribitus circumscriptum, et supertemporalis temporalem, et superlocalis localem, et omnia creans in omnibus creatum, et factor omnium factus in omnibus, et aeternus coepit esse et immobilis movetur in omnia, et fit in omnibus Omnia.* L. O' BRIAN, “John Scottus Eriugena”, in ebook *Journeys of Janus: Explorations in Irish Philosophy*, 22 April 2013: “It follows that we ought not to understand God and the creature as two things distinct from one another, but as one and the same. For both the creature, by subsisting, is in God; and God, by manifesting himself, in a marvelous and ineffable manner creates himself in the creature...”.

<sup>32</sup> ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, I. PL 122, 683B: *Deinde per multiplices effectuum formas, usque ad exiremum lotius naturae ordinem, quo corpora continentur, procedit. Ac sic ordinate in omnia proveniens facit omnia, et fit in omnibus omnia, et in se ipsum redit, revocans in se omnia, et dum in omnibus proveniens facit omnia et fit in omnibus omnia, et in se ipsum redit, revocans in se omnia, et dum in omnibus fit, super omnia esse non desinit. Ac sic de nihilo facit omnia, de sua videlicet superessentialitate producit essentias, de supervitalitate vitas, de super intellectualitate intellectus, de negatione omnium, quae sunt et quae non sunt affirmationes omnium, quae sunt et quae non sunt. Et hoc manifestissime docet omnium reditus contemplabimur.*

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 447C: *Nam si angelicae contemplationis purissimam virtutem divinae essentiae superat altitudo; praedictis enim rationibus confectum est, divinam essentiam nulli intellectuali creaturae comprehensibilem esse, quae maxime in angelis consistere dubium non est; nobis quoque nulla alia felicitas promittitur, quam ad angelicam naturam aequalitas.*



in all things, is the essence of all things. For Him the only truth alone truly is, and everything which is truly said to be in those things which are, is God alone”<sup>34</sup>. Scottus underlines the teaching *creatio ex nihilo*<sup>35</sup>. Eriugena says that “the Creative nature permits nothing outside itself because outside it can be nothing, yet everything which it, He has created and creates it contains within itself, but in such a way that it itself is other, because it is superessential, than what it creates within itself”<sup>36</sup>.

The reality of the whole nature or the world is the authenticity of God, so that if all-that-is were a circle, God would be the centre with the radii of primordial causes and, farther out, phenomena, coming from, being, and returning to God. God is truly everything, since He creates all things and is created in all things. “When we hear that God makes all things”, Scottus supports, “we should understand nothing else but that God is in all things, i.e. is the essence of all things. For Him the only truth is, and everything which is truly said to be in those things which are, is God alone”<sup>37</sup>. Nature is One, is all that is, and the One is God<sup>38</sup>. The creator deity and the created are God, one and the same, for God can be said to be “created in creatures” in that the One exposes itself to itself, creating in itself and from itself that it might know itself. The divine nature of God has the knowledge of the divinity of God, reflexively, in the declaration of creation<sup>39</sup>. Even though Eriugena sets forth a pantheism, such that everything that is is God, he is also not a pantheist in the thought there is a distinction being God, who is Being, and creatures, which are Being and God only in as particulars and divisions. Eriugena’s pantheism is an ontological and at least quasi-Christian manifestation of pantheism. But, at the

---

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 518a: *Cum ergo audimus, Deum omnia facere, nil aliud debemus intelligere, quam Deum in omnibus esse, hoc est, essentiam omnium subsistere. Ipse enim solus per se vere est, et omne, quod vere in his, quae sunt, dicitur esse, ipse solus est. Nihil enim eorum, quae sunt, per ipsum vere est.* cf. COPLESTON, *History of Philosophy*, p. 120.

<sup>35</sup> ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, I. PL 122, 517AB: *ex nihilo, nihil fit.*

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, III. PL 122, 675C: *Nam quod dixisti de divina natura, extra quam nihil est, ita intelligis, ut arbitror, creatricem quidem naturam nihil extra se sinere, quia extra eam nihil potest esse; totum vero, quod creavit, et creat, intra seipsam continere; ita tamen, ut aliud sit ipsa, quia superessentialis est, et aliud, quod in se creat.*

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, I. PL 122, 518A: *Cum ergo audimus, Deum omnia facere, nil aliud debemus intelligere, quam Deum in omnibus esse, hoc est, essentiam omnium subsistere. Ipse enim solus per se vere est, et omne, quod vere in his, quae sunt, dicitur esse, ipse solus est. Nihil enim eorum, quae sunt, per ipsum vere est].*

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, II. PL 122, 518A.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. PL 122, 920C: “And if anyone who saw God understood what he saw, it would not be God that he saw but one of those creatures which derive their existence and unknowability from Him”. – *Et si quis videns Dominum intellexit quod vidit, non ipsum contemplatus est, sed quid eorum ab ipso existentium et cognitorum; ipse autem super animum et super essentiam collocatus, universaliter non cognoscitur, neque videtur, sed est superessentialiter et super animum cognoscitur.*

same time, his ontological and quasi-Christian pantheism still does not fall into any orthodox Christian schema<sup>40</sup>.

For Origen's God is inconceivable and incomprehensible, because He is unseen and without body, incorporeal, a perfect unity, transcending all things material. Although God's nature is likewise unchangeable, and transcends space and time, His almightiness is restricted by His goodness, justice, and wisdom; and, though entirely free from necessity, his goodness and omnipotence constrained him to reveal himself<sup>41</sup>. Origen supports the doctrine of *creation ex nihilo*, that God created the whole universe from nothing. The whole creature is characterised by the goodness of God and the freedom of the creature. The God's transcendence is the root of every existence. He is the one who continually wills existence. He is good, just, and omnipotent<sup>42</sup>. This almightiness is not a mere power emptied of moral quality; one cannot appeal to it to rationalize absurdity or the extraordinary. Because of His overflowing and endless love, God created rational and spiritual beings through the Logos (Word); this creative act involves a degree of self-limitation on God's part<sup>43</sup>.

Origen explains that because of this limitation and in connection with the creation and His created order, God can be characterised as both different things, free and under necessity, conditioned and unconditioned, since he is transcendent to and immanently active in it. In one sense, the universe is eternally necessary to God since one cannot conceive such goodness and power as inactive at any time<sup>44</sup>. Yet in another sense, the cosmos is not necessary to God but is dependent on his will, to which it also owes its continued existence. Origen was aware that there is no solution of this dilemma<sup>45</sup>. Besides that,

---

<sup>40</sup>PH. SCHAFF, *History of the Christian Church, Volume IV: Mediaeval Christianity*. Grand Rapids, Christian Classics Ethereal Library, 1882, p. 484-491.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid, vol. II, p. 272.

<sup>42</sup>ORIGEN, *De Principiis*, I, 4, 1. PG 11, 156BC: *Si vero dissimulet ab exercitiis, et negligat ab industria, paulatim primo per negligentiam pauca excidunt, tum deiunde etiam plura, et ita per multum tempus abeunt omnia in oblivionem, atque universa ex memoria penitus abolentur...Transferamus nunc haec ad eos qui se Dei scientiae ac sapientiae dederunt, cuius eruditio atque industria incomparabilibus omnes reliquas disciplinas supereminet modis, et secundum propositae similitudinis formam vel quae sit assumption scientiae, vel quae sit eius abolition contemplerur].*

<sup>43</sup>W. DONIGE (ed), “Origen”, *Merriam-Webster's Encyclopedia of World Religions*, New York, 1999, p. 830.

<sup>44</sup> ORIGEN, *De Principiis*, III, 5, 3 PG 11, 327D-328A: *Sed solent nobis objicere dicentes: “Si coepit mundus ex tempore, quid ante faciebat Deus quam mundus inciperet? Otiosam enim et immobilem dicere naturam Dei, impium est simul et absurdum, vel putare quod bonitas aliquando bene non fecerit, et omnipotentia aliquando non egerit potentatum. Hoc nobis objicere solent dicentibus mundum hunc ex certo tempore coepisse, et secundum Scripturae fidem annos quoque aetatis ipsius numerantibus”. Ad quas propositiones non arbitror aliquem haereticorum secundum rationem dogmatis sui posse facile respondere. Nos vero consequenter...quoniam non tunc primum cum visibilem istum mundum fecit Deus, coepit operari, sed sicut post corruptionem huius erit alius mundus, ita et antequam hic esset, fuisse alios credimus... Hoc ipsum quod creandum et nihil est omnino recens sub sole.*

<sup>45</sup> W. DONIGE (ed), “Origen”, p. 830; “Origen”, in *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol. 8, Great Britain 1997, p. 998.

every creature that is made by God is incorruptible and the whole universe can be thought as the temporal expression of an eternal and omnipotent order. All of these cannot be possession of human's mind. This happens because the human intelligence is feeble and limited. It is impossible for any logical being (spiritual and corporeal) to understand how during the whole of God's existence His creatures have existed also, and how those things, which we must undoubtedly believe to have been created and made by God have subsisted, if we may say so, without a beginning...<sup>46</sup>. Origen postulates creation as an eternal act of God. God has always been the all-powerful Creator, and “we cannot even call God almighty if there are none over whom He can exercise His power”<sup>47</sup>.

Also, Origen teaches for creation of man, that he is created from nothing by God in the divine image. The human beings are divided into sexes through sin, are restored through grace to their spiritual essences and then through grace and nature acting simultaneously they are returned into the eternal life<sup>48</sup>.

As it is obvious, Eriugena in his *Periphyseon* followed Origen's *On First Principles* both in its title and general project and in many details as the nature of God and the creation. Eriugena and Origen had an influence of Neoplatonism theology. Both of them tried to define what is God, beginning with what God is not. It is a common idea of them that God is the Absolute Being though in place of the passive qualities of beauty and goodness he asserted the active quality of love. They describe God as a simple intellectual existence without a body<sup>49</sup>. They agree that It is impossible to define God. He is in all things, but not equated with all that is. He can never be fully grasped with our finite minds and experiences. The Origen's view is that “creation is an eternal, not temporal, act of God, and of course Eriugena reproduces a version

---

<sup>46</sup> ORIGEN, *De Principiis*, I, 4. PG 11, 156BC: *Si vero dissimulet ab exercitiis, et negligat ab industria, paulatim primo per negligentiam pauca excidunt, tum deinde etiam plura, et ita per multum tempus abeunt omnia in oblivionem, atque universa ex memoriapenitus abolentur... Transferamus nunc haec ad eos qui se Dei scientiae dediderunt, cuius erudition atque industria incomparabilibus omnes reliquas disciplinas supereminet modis, et secundum propositae similitudinis formam vel quae sit assumptio scientiae, vel quae sit eius abolitio contemplemur.*

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>48</sup> ORIGEN, *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*. PG 14, 1038B: *Quod enim nos latini habemus denuo, Graeci ἄνωθεν dicunt, qui sermo utrumque significat, et denuo et de superioribus. In hoc ergo loco, quia qui baptizatur a Iesu in spiritu sancto baptizatur, non ita denuo dicitur, ut 'de superioribus intelligi conueniat. Nam denuo dicimus, cum eadem quae gesta sunt repetuntur. Illic autem non eadem nativitas repetitur vel iteratur sed, terrena hac omissa, de superioribus suscipitur noua nativitas.*

<sup>49</sup> ORIGEN, *De Principiis*, I, 1,1. PG 11, 129AB: *Aliud est videre, aliud cognoscere; videri et videre corporum res est, cognosci et cognoscere intellectualis naturae est. Quidquid ergo proprium corporum est, hoc nec de Patre est, nec de Filio sentiendum... Quia igitur de incorporea natura et invisibili, nec videre proprie dicitur, nec videri; idcirco neque Pater a Filio, neque Filius a Patre videri in Evangelio dicitur, sed cognosci. Quod si proponat nobis aliquis, quare dictum est: “Beati mundo corde, quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt;” multo magis etiam ex hoc, ut ego arbitror, assertion nostra firmabitur: nam quid aliud est corde Deum videre, nisi secundum id quod supra exposuimus mente eum intelligere atque cognoscere?.*

of this argumentation. Furthermore, Origen holds a theory of the original creation as involving only the creation of a sphere of intelligible being no matter”<sup>50</sup>. Eriugena believes the same.

As a conclusion we can say that Origen and Scottus Eriugena underline that God’s immanence and transcendence relate to His relationship with the created world. These actions of God do not refer to His specific actions, but to His relationship with the world. The two attributes are opposite but complimentary, and need to be kept in the proper balance to understand God. He is both superior to, and absent from, His creation and yet very present and active within the universe. The immanence of God is seen in His presence and activity within nature, with humans, and in history. The other important implication of His immanence, especially seen in His omnipotence and omnipresence, is that God is infinite. He is not limited to a certain spot within nature, He is beyond nature. There is nowhere that He cannot be found. He is infinite in relation to time, He is timeless. God does not develop or grow. His understanding and wisdom are immeasurable. His power is unlimited and He is completely free of external influences. God is unlimited and unlimitable, unlike anything that man experiences. Thus, they see God’s transcendence even within His immanence.

As far as creation is concerned, Origen argues that Creation is *necessary and eternal*. Creation is *ex nihilo*— that is, “out of nothing”. Here is the argument: If you think creation *ex nihilo* is unintelligible, suppose the contrary. That is, suppose that matter always existed independently, as a kind of brute fact without any further cause or explanation. Then, of course, there would be no reason for its existence. But that is unintelligible — or at least it is no more intelligible than creation *ex nihilo*. For Origen creation is not dependent on. Still, he seems to recognize that the notion of creation *ex nihilo* has the ring of paradox about it. There still seems to be no real accounting for creation — but neither would there be for the existence of matter, if we denied the doctrine of creation and just took that existence as a brute fact.

On the other hand Eriugena’s treatment of the doctrine of creation includes a particularly innovative understanding of *creatio ex nihilo*. “Nothing” has two meanings. The lowest rung in the hierarchy of being, unformed matter, is “almost nothing” (*prope nihil*), “nothingness through privation” (*nihil per privationem*). In contrast, God is non-being through excellence. Creation from nothing cannot mean creation from a principle outside God, since there is nothing outside God. *Ex nihilo* creation then means “out of God’s superabundant nothingness”. Eriugena gives a very complex discussion of the meaning of ‘*ex nihilo*’ in the concept of *creatio ex nihilo*. When Eriugena calls God ‘nothing’ or No-thing, he means that God transcends all created beings, God is *nihil per excellentiam* — ‘nothingness on account of excellence’ — or, as he puts it, *nihil per infinitatem* — ‘nothingness on account of infinity’ —.

---

<sup>50</sup> D. MORAN, *The Philosophy of John Scottus Eriugena: A Study of Idealism in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004, p. 108; J. MEYENDORFF, *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes*, New York, Fordham University Press, 1974, p. 26-27; R. SORABJI, *Time, Creation and Continuum*, London, Duckworth, 1983, pp. 194-197.

Matter, on the other hand, is also called ‘nothing’ but it is ‘nothing through privation’ —*nihil per privationem*—<sup>51</sup>.

God creates out of himself and all creation remains within him. God and the creature are one and the same: “It follows that we ought not to understand God and the creature as two things distinct from one another, but as one and the same. For both the creature, by subsisting, is in God; and God, by manifesting himself, in a marvelous and ineffable manner creates himself in the creature”.<sup>52</sup> All created things are essentially incorporeal, immaterial, intellectual and eternal. Place and time are definitions which locate things, and since definitions are in the mind, then place and time are also in the mind. The sensible, corporeal spatio-temporal appearance of things is produced by the qualities or ‘circumstances’ of place, time, position and so on, which surround the

---

<sup>51</sup> ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, III. PL 122, 675C: *De eo, quod nulla natura subsistat praeter Deum et creaturam, non dubitare te crediderim, imo etiam satis videre te video. Nam quod dixisti de divina natura extra quam nihil est, ita intelligis, ut arbitror, creaticem quidem naturam nihil extra se sinere, qui extra eam nihil potest esse; totum vero, quod creavit, et creat, intra superessentialis est, et aliud, quod in se creat. Nam seipsum creare non tibi verisimile videtur. Totam conceptionem cogitationis meae de Deo et creatura perspexisti. Firmiter enim atque inconcusse teneo nullam naturam vel creatam vel non creatam extra Deum subsistere, et nullo modo esse; omne vero, quod subsistit, sive creatum, sive non creatum, intra ipsum contineri...]. Ibid, III. PL 122, 634C: *Quid ergo intelligam, quaeso, te audiens, Deum de nihilo omnia, quae sunt, fecisse? Intellige ex non existentibus existentia per virtutem bonitatis divinae facta fuisse. Ea enim, quae non erant, acceperunt esse de nihilo. Namque facta sunt, quia non erant, priusquam fierint. Eo namque vocabulo, quod est nihilum, non aliqua materies existimatur, non cause quaedam existentium, non ulla processio seu occasio, quam sequeretur eorum, quae sunt, conditio, non aliquid Deo coessentialis et coaeteram neque extra Deum per se subsistens, seu ab aliquo, unde Deus veluti materiam quandam fabricationis mundi susceperit, significari.**

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, III. PL 122, 678C: *Nam et creatura in Deo subsistens, et Deus in creatura mirabili et ineffabili modo creatur, seipsum manifestans, invisibilis visibilem se faciens, et incomprehensibilis comprehensibilem, et occultus apertum, et incognitus cognitum, et forma et specie carens formosum ac speciosum, et superessentialis essentialis, et supernaturalis naturalem, et simplex compositum, et accidentibus liber accidentibus subjectum, et accidens, et infinitus finitum, et incircumscriptus circumscriptum, et supertemporalis temporalem, et superlocalis localem, et omnia creans in omnibus, et aeternus coepit esse, et immobilis movetur in omnia, et fit in omnibus omnia.* IV. PL 122, 759B: “For just as God is both beyond all things and in all things—for He Who only truly is, is the essence of all things, and while He is whole in all things He does not cease to be whole beyond all things, whole in the world, whole around the world, whole in the sensible creature, whole in the intelligible creature, whole creating the universe, whole created in the universe, whole in the whole of the universe and whole in its parts, since He is both the whole and the part, just as He is neither the whole nor the part—in the same way human nature in its own world—in its own subsistence—in its own universe and in its invisible and visible parts is whole in itself, and whole in its whole, and whole in its parts, and its parts are whole in themselves and whole in the whole”. – *Mirror, cur te talia moverent, cum videas, in hoc maxime imaginem et similitudinem Dei in humana natura posse cognosci. Ut enim Deus et supra omnia et in omnibus est, ipse siquidem essentia omnium est, qui vere solus est, et cum in omnibus totus sit, extra omnia totus esse desinit, totus in mundo, totus circa mundum, totus in creatura sensibili, in intelligibili totus, totus universitatem facit, in universitate totus fit, in toto universitatis totus, in partibus eius totus, quia ipse est et totum et pars, et neque totum neque pars: ita humana natura in mundo suo, in universitate sua, in partibus suis visibilibus et invisibilibus tota in seipsa est, et in toto suo tota est, et in partibus suis tota, partesque eius in seipsis totae, et in toto totae.*

incorporeal essence. The whole spatio-temporal world and our corporeal bodies are a consequence of the Fall, an emanation of the mind<sup>53</sup>.

## **2.2. The Sin, the Fall and the Apocatastasis: the Restitution of all things**

Among Origen's thoughts was the doctrine of the souls' pre-existence. The soul must be pre-existent and eternal because, “as no one can be a Father without having a son, nor a master without possessing a servant, so even God cannot be called omnipotent unless there exist those over whom he may exercise his power; and therefore, that God may be shown to be almighty, it is necessary that all things should exist “. Did he gain more power as he created more people? Rather, “He must always have had those over whom He exercised power, and which were governed by Him either as king or prince”.<sup>54</sup>

He underlines that the souls of human beings were created before the creation of the world. This means that only spiritual beings –and not our world– were first created by God. They were characterised by a free will and were based and relied on God. Unfortunately, they became self-congratulatory in their adoration of God and turned away from Him. Then, the material world was brought into being by the consequence of this fall and not by accident or chaos. Origen's argument for the pre-existence and eternity of the soul is heavily dependent on Platonism. He argues that God had made other worlds before this one, and would make more in the future<sup>55</sup> In creation, “we are to

---

<sup>53</sup> ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, V. PL 122, 889D: *Totus igitur peribit, nequeulla pars sui post suum interitum remanebit sine interitu. Sunt autem partes eius locus et tempus. In ipso igitur et cum ipso peribunt locus et tempus. In ipso igitur et cum ipso peribunt locus at tempus. Locum nunc dico non rerum definitionem, quae semper manet in animo, sed spatium, quo corporum quantitas extenditur.* D. MORAN, “Eriugena, Johannes Scottus”, *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, in E. CRAIG (Ed.), publ. Routledge, London 1998. Retrieved September 14, 2012, from <http://www.rep.routledge.com/article/B038SECT4>.

<sup>54</sup> ORIGEN, *De Principiis* I, 2, 10. PG 11, 138C-139A: *Videamus etiam de eo quod dictum est, quoniam aporrhoea est purissima gloriae Omnipotentis; et prius quidem consideremus quid est gloria omnipotentis Dei, deinde etiam quid si eius aporrhoea sentiemus. Quemadmodum pater non potest esse quis si filius non sit neque dominus quis esse potest sine possessione, sine servo; ita ne omnipotens quidem Deus dici potest, si non sint in quos exerceat potentatum; et ideo ut omnipotens ostendatur Deus, omnia subsistere necesse est. Nam si quis est qui velit vel saecula aliqua, vel spatia transire, vel quodcunque aliud nominare vult, cum nondum facta essent quae facta sunt; sine dubio hoc ostendet quod in illis saeculis vel spatiis omnipotens factus est, ex quo habere coepit in quos ageret potentatum; et ideo ut omnipotens ostendatur Deus, omnia subsistere necesse est. Nam si quis est qui velit vel saecula aliqua, vel spatia transisse, vel quodcunque aliud nominare vult, cum nondum facta essent quae facta sunt; sine dubio hoc ostendet quod in illis saeculis vel spatiis omnipotens non erat Deus et postmodum omnipotens factus est, ex quo habere coepit in quos ageret potentatum; et per hoc videbitur profectum quemdam accepisse, et ex inferioribus ad meliora venisse; siquidem melius esse non dubitatur, esse eum omnipotentem quam non esse.*

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 3, 6. PG 11, 194B, 195AB: *His pro nostris viribus de mundi ratione dissertis, non incongruum etiam videtur ipsius mundi, appellatio quid sibi velit inquirere; quae appellatio in Scripturis sanctis diversa significans frequenter ostenditur. Quod Latine mundum dicimus Graece κόσμος appellatur; κόσμος autem non solum mundum sed et ornamentum significant.... Dicitur etiam mundus ista universitas quae ex coelo et terra continetur, sicut Paulus ait: "Transiet enim habitus huius mundi". Designat sane et alium quendam mundum praeter hunc visibilem etiam Dominus et Salvator noster, quem revera describere et*

suppose that God created so great a number of rational or intellectual creatures—or by whatever name they are to be called—, which have formerly termed understandings, as he foresaw would be sufficient”<sup>56</sup>.

The entrance of the soul into the body was not simply due to a kind of spiritual gravity, an attraction to the flesh; it was rather the result of divine judgement<sup>57</sup>. Nevertheless, Origen points out that it was necessary for Christians to believe that the devil was an angel who had fallen<sup>58</sup> and if it was merit, the cause of the differentiation of angels and demons, perhaps merit determined the diversity between human beings, angels and demons, and also the diversity among human beings. Furthermore, the choice of Jacob over Esau in the womb ‘not on grounds of justice and according to their deserts; but undeservedly’<sup>59</sup> seemed to Origen to contradict the scriptural truth that “God shows no partiality”<sup>60</sup>. Also Origen believes in a real Fall, in which one woman (Eve) was deceived, and one man (Adam) fell from grace. As it had not been for the Fall, man would have escaped the grim fate of bodily corruption, which

---

*designare difficile est: ait namque: Ego on sum de hoc mundo". Tanquam enim ex alio quodam eset mundo, ita dicit, quod " Non sum de hoc mundo" Cuius mundi difficilem nobis esse expositionem id idcirco praediximus, ne forte praebeatur aliquibus occasio illius intelligentiae, qua putent non imagines quasdam quas Graeci ιδέαζ nominant, affirmare: quod utique a nostris alienum est, mundum incorporeum dicere, in sola mentis phantasia vel cogitationum lubrico consistentem; et quomodo Salvatorem inde esse, vel sanctos quoque illuc ituros poterunt affirmare, non video. Verumtamen praeclarius aliquid et splendidius quam iste qui praesens aliquid et splendidius quam iste qui praesens est mundus, indicari a Salvatore non dubium est, quo etiam credentes in se tendere provocat et hortatur. Sed utrum mundus iste quem sentiri vult, separatus ab hoc sit longeque divisus, vel loco, vel qualitate, vel gloria; an gloria quidem et qualitate praeceat, intra tamen est, et, ut ego arbitror, humanis adhuc cogitationibus et mentibus inusitatum.*

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 9, 1. PG 11, 225BC: *In illo ergo initio putandum est tantum numerum rationabilium creaturarum vel intellectualium vel quoquomodo appellandaesunt quas mentes superius diximus, fecisse deum, quantum sufficere posse prospexit.*

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 9,8. PG 11, 233A: *Ita ergo possibile est intellegi etiam antea fuisse vasa rationabilia vel purgata vel minus purgata, id est quae se ipsa purgaverint aut non purgaverint, et ex hoc unumquodque vas secundum mensuram puritatis aut impuritatis suae locum vel regionem vel condicionem nascendi vel explendi aliquid in hoc mundo accepisse; quae omnia deus usque ad minimum virtute sapientiae suae providens atque dinoscens moderamine iudicii sui, aequissima retributione universa disposuit, quatenus unicuique pro merito vel succurri vel consuli deberet.*

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 1, 6. PG 11, 119A: *De diabolo et angelis eius contrariisque virtutibus ecclesiastica praedicatio docuit, quoniam sunt quidem haec; quae autem sint, aut quomodo sint, non satis clare exposuit. Apud plurimos tamen ista habetur opinio quod angelus fuerit iste diabolus, et apo— stata effectus quamplurimos angelorum secum declinare persuaserit, qui et nunc usque angeli ipsius nuncupantur.*

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, *De Principiis* I, 7,4. PG 11, 174A: *Nam quantum ad homines spectat, quomodo cum corpore simu; ficta anima videbitur eius qui in ventre suum fretrem supplantavit, id est Jacob? Aut quomodo simul cum corpore ficta est anima, vel plasmata eius qui adhuc in ventre matris suae positus, repletus est Spiritu sancto?*

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, Rom. 2, 11: *Nunquid personarum acceptio est apud Deum?*

is our lot. In other words, Origen taught that human beings would not have died if Adam and Eve had not fallen<sup>61</sup>.

One of the most criticized doctrines held by Origen is his belief in a universal salvation, the *apokatastasis*<sup>62</sup>, the Restitution of All Things<sup>63</sup>. Origen,

---

<sup>61</sup> ORIGEN, *De Principiis* II, 3, 4. PG 11, 192B: *Jam vero qui indissimiles sibi mundos ac per omnia pares aliquando evenire confirmant, nescio quibus id possint asserere documentis. Si enim similis per omnia mundus dicitur, erit ut iterum Avam vel Eva eadem faciant quae fecerunt; idem iterum erit diluvium, atque idem Moyses rursus populum sexcenta fere millia numero educet ex Aegypto.*

<sup>62</sup> “The earliest philosophical occurrence of the term *apokatastasis* is to be found in Empedocles, where it refers to the eternal relation of Love and Strife in the maintenance of the cosmic order”, Diels, Kranz, (ed.), Empedocles, fragment 16, in, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, Berlin, Weidmann, 1951. The term *apokatastasis* also occurs in the pseudo-Platonic treatise Axiochus in reference to the “revolutions of the stars.” But this is a later, Hellenistic-era work, not from Plato’s pen, and therefore representative of later conceptions. See Ps.-Plato, *Axiochus* 370b, tr. J. P. Hershbell, in J. M. COOPER, ed., *Plato: Complete Works*, Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1997. “By Apocatastasis ‘restoration’ is meant the ultimate restitution of all things, including the doctrine that eventually all men will be saved. The term comes from the Greek of Acts 3, 21, but is given a wider meaning than it has in that passage. The doctrine first appears in Clement of Alexandria (flourished 200) in the declaration that the punishments of God are ‘saving and disciplinary, leading to conversion’ (Stromateis VI. 6). His successor at the head of the Alexandrian catechetical school, Origen taught that all the wicked would be restored after they had undergone severe punishment and had received instruction from angels and then from those of higher grade (*De principiis*, I, 4, 1-3. PG 11, 123B: *Sed ad ipsum iam sermonem Evangelii transeundum est, udi scriptum est quia “Deus spiritus est” et ostendendum est quam consequenter bis quae diximus intelligi debeat.* (cf. John 4, 24). He also raised the question whether after this world there perhaps would be another or others in which this instruction would be given (*De principiis*, II, 3, 1. PG 11, 188A: *Superest ut post haec requiramus ultrum ante hunc mundum, qui nunc est, mundus alius fuerit; et si fuit, ultrum talis fuerit qualis iste qui nunc est, an paulo diffentior, vel inferior aut omnino non fuerit mundus, sed tale aliquid fuerit, qualem illum intelligimus post omnium finem futurum, cum tradetur regnum Deo et Patri: qui nihilominus alterius mundi fuerit finis, illius scilicet post quem hic mundus coepit: lapsus autem varius intellectualium naturarum conditionem mundi. Sed et illud similiter requirendum puto, utrum erit, asperior quidem et doloris plena erga eos qui rationabilemque institutionem, per quampossent qui in praesenti vita in haec se studia dederunt, et mentibus purgatiores effecti, capaces iam hinc divinae sapientiae perrexerunt, et si post haec statim finis omnium consequetur; et pro correctione et emendatione eorum qui talibus indigent, alius rursus mundus erit, vel similis isti qui nunc est, vel hoc melior, aut multo deterior; et qualiscumque ille erit post hunc mundus, quamdiu erit; et si erit aliquando cum nullus unquam sit mundus, aut si fuit aliquando cum mundus non fuerit omnino; aut sifuerint plures, vel erunt, aut si accidat aliquando ut alter alteri aequalis et similis per omni atque indiscretus eveniat), and interpreted Paul’s teaching respecting the subjection of all things to God as implying the salvation of the “lost” (*De principiis*, III, 5, 7. PG 11, 331C: *Ventio nescio quo pacto haeretici non intelligentes Apostoli sensum qui his verbis continetur, subjectionis in Filio nomen infamant; cuius appellationis si proprietates requiruntur, ex contrariis facile poterit inveniri. Nam si subjectum esse non est bonum, restat ut illud quod contrarium est, bonum sit, id est non esse subjectum. Sermo namque Apostoli secundum quod isti volunt, hoc videtur ostendere, dum dicit: “ Cum autem ei subjecta fuerint omnia, tuae et ipse Filius subjectus erit ei qui sibi subdidit omnia, ut quasi is qui nunc Patri subjectus non sit, subjectus futurus sit tunc cum prius Pater ei universa subjecerit.* (cf. I Cor. 15, 28.)”, *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, vol. I:*

Aachen – Basilians <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/encyc01.html?term=apocatastasis>.



promulgated a doctrine of universal salvation: everyone, even including Satan himself, would ultimately be redeemed by God. In other places, Origen does not seem so sure about the final rehabilitation of the demons. In the Treatise *De principiis (On First Principles)*, he asks whether they “could, by virtue of their free will, become converted in future aeons, or whether their evilness, habitually ingrained for so long as to have become, so to speak, natural, would prevent this and leaves it up to his readers to decide. He himself seems inclined to believe that such repentance is possible”<sup>64</sup>.

For Origen, to affirm a belief in an eternal hell over which the devil had dominion was to become dualistic by making the devil a god in his own right. According to the teaching of Origen, the souls of men go through purification to reconciliation with God. Other souls arrive in purification and reconciliation with God in this life, but others need more time, so we return again to life, with another bodily form. So talk of successive reincarnations until the dot clearance every soul, and union with God. In this spirit, the punishments of wicked and demons will be temporary. When all souls are purified, then defeated the devil, we all bow down to God and will be restored everything, will follow the

---

<sup>63</sup> Most scholars admit that the matter is not at all clear and that there is no conclusive evidence that Origen definitively held the radical form of apocatastasis which has come to be associated with his name. H. CROUZEL, *Origen: The Life and Thought of the First Great Theologian*, tr. A.S. Worrall, San Francisco, T.&T. Clark Ltd, 1989, p. 262-266. H. DE LUBAC, “Du hast mich betrogen, Herr”, *Johannes*, Einsiedeln 1984, p. 84-85. J. R. SACHS, “Apocatastasis in Patristic Theology”, *Theological Studies*, 54 (1993), 617-640, p. 622.

<sup>64</sup> ORIGEN, *De Principiis* I, 6, 3. PG 11, 168C-169AB: *Sciendum tamen est quosdam qui ex uno principio, quod supra diximus, delapsi sunt, in tantam indignitatem ac malitiam se dedisse ut indigni habiti sint institutione hac, vel eruditione qua per carnem humanum genus adjutorio virtutum coelestium instituitur atque eruditur, sed econtratio etiam adversarii atque repugnantes his qui erudiuntur atque imbuuntur existant. Unde de agones quosdam atque certamina omnis haec habet vita mortalium, reluctantibus scilicet et repugnantibus adversum nos his qui sine ullo respectu de statu meliori delapsi sunt, qui appellantur diabolus et angeli eius, caeterique ordines malitiae, quos Apostolus de virtutibus contrariis nominavit. Jam patu si aliqui ex his ordinibus qui sub principatu diaboli agunt, ac malitiae eius obtemperant, poterunt aliquando in futuris saeculis converti ad bonitatem, pro eo quod est in ipsis liberi facultas arbitrii; an vero permanes et inveterata malitia velut in naturam quandam ex consuetudine convertatur, etiam tu qui legis probato, si omni mode neque in his quae videntur temporalibus saeculis, neque in his quae non videntur et aeterna sunt, penitus pars ista ab illa etiam finali unitate atque convenientia discrepabit... Interim tam in his quae videntur et temporalibus saeculis quam in illis quae non videntur et aeterna sunt, omnes isti pro ordine, pro ratione, pro modo et meritorum dignitatibus dispensantur; ut alii in primis alii in secundis, nonnulli etiam in ultimis temporibus, et per maiora ac graviora supplicia, necnon et diuturna ac multis, ut ita dicam, saeculis tolerate asperioribus emendationibus reparati et restituti eruditionibus primo angelicis, tum deinde etiam superiorum graduum virtutibus, et sic per singula ad superiora proveci usque ad ea quae sunt invisibilia et aeterna perveniant, singulis videlicet quisbusque coelestium virtutum officiis quadam eruditionum peragratis. Cf. SACHS, “Apocatastasis in Patristic Theology”, p. 622. H. CROUZEL, *Origen: The Life and Thought of the First Great Theologian*, p. 262. L. HENNESSEY, “The Place of Saints and Sinners after Death”, *Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy* in C. Kannengiesser and W. L. Peterson, eds., Indiana, University Notre Dame, 1988, 293-312, p. 307.*

resurrection of humans with spiritual bodies. This view will all return to original state<sup>65</sup>.

Basic principle of Origen is that the end of the world must be same or identical to the beginning of it. So then, when the end has been restored to the start, and the termination of things compared with their commencement, that condition of things will be re-established in which rational nature was placed, when it had no need to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil; so that when all feeling of wickedness has been removed, and the individual has been purified and cleansed, He is alone and the one good God becomes to him “all”, and that not in the case of a few individuals, or of a considerable number, but Himself is “all in all”. And when death shall no longer anywhere exist, nor the sting of death, nor any evil at all, then verily God will be “all in all”<sup>66</sup>. The

---

<sup>65</sup> ORIGEN, *De Principiis* I, 6, 3. PG 11, 169C: *Ex quo, ut opinor, hoc consequentia ipsa videtur ostendere, unamquamque rationalilem naturam posse ab uno in alterum ordinem transeuntem per singulos in omnes, et ad omnibus in singulos pervenire, dum accessus profectuum defectuumve varios pro motibus vel conatibus propriis unusquique pro liberi arbitrii facultate perpelitur.* ORIGEN, *Commentaria in Evangelium Joannis*, 1.16. PG 14, 49C; ἡ μὲν γὰρ τις ὡς μεταβάσεως, αὕτη δεέσθιν ἢ ὡς ὁδοῦ και μήκους, ὅπερ δηλοῦται ἐκ τοῦ Ἀρχῆ ὁδοῦ ἀγαθῆς το ποιεῖν τὰ δίκαια. Τῆς γὰρ ἀγαθῆς ὁδοῦ μεγίστης τυγχανούσης, κατὰ μὲν τὰ πρῶτα νοητέον εἶναι το πρακτικόν, ὅπερ παρίσταται διὰ τοῦ, ποιεῖν τὰ δίκαια· κατὰ δε τὰ ἐξῆς το θεωρητικόν, εἰς ὃ καταλήγειν οἶμαι και το τέλος αὐτῆς ἐν τῇ λεγομένη ἀποκαταστάσει, διὰ το μηδένα καταλείπεσθαι τότε ἐχθρόν, εἴγε ἀληθές τό· Δεῖ γάρ αὐτόν βασιλεύειν ἕως ἄν θῆ τους ἐχθρούς αὐτοῦ ὑπό τους πόδας αὐτοῦ, ἔσχατος δε ἐχθρός καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος. ORIGEN, *Commentaria ad Romanos*, 5.10. PG 14, 1053AB: *Haec ergo et his similia proponens, easdem etiam in futuris saeculis dispensationes a Christo repetendas esse arbitrantur. Sed ad haec nos breviter prout possumus respondebimus. Manere quidem naturae rationabili semper liberum arbitrium non negamus; sed tantam esse vim crucis Christi, et mortis huius, quam in saeculorum fine, suscepit, asserimus, quae ad sanitatem et remedium non solum praesentis et futuri, sed etiam praeteritorum saeculorum, et non solum humano huic nostro ordini, sed etiam coelestibus virtutibus ordinibusque sufficiat. Secundum sententiam namque ipsius Pauli apostoli. Christus pscificavit “ per sanguinem eracis suae” non solum “quae in terra sunt”, sed et “uae in coeluisin coelis”. Quid autem sit quod in futura saeculis teneat arbitrii libertatem, ne rursus corruat in peccatum, brevi nos sermone Apostolus docet, dicens: “Charitas nunquam cadit”. Indirco enim et fide et spe major charitas dicitur, quia sola erit per quam delinqui ultra non poterit. Si enim in id anima perfectionis ascenderit, ut ex toto corde suo, et ex tota anima sua, et ex totis viribus syuis diligat Deum, et proximum suum tamquam seipsam, ubi erit peccati locus?. Ibid 9.41. PG 14. 1243C-1244A: *Flectet autem genu omnis creatura Deo in nomine Jesu, per quem reconciliata est ei, secundum quod idem Apostolus dicit, quia in nomine Jesu omne genu flectetur coelestium, terrestrium, et infernorum. Flectere sane genu, et omnem linguam confliteri Deo, de Isaiaie prophetae sermonibus assumpsit Apostolus. Quod tamen non est carnaliter accipies dum, ut putemus quod etiam coelestia, quae dicit genu flectere, carnalibus membris facere haec credantur: verbi causa, ut putetur vel sol, vel luna, vel stellae, vel etiam angeli, et quaecunque sunt quae coelestia nominantur, corporabilibus inflex genibus adorare, aut etiam etiam lingua carnali, et taleo membro quali nos homines loquitur, putentur comfiteri Deum, de quibus dicitur quia sint spiritus et et ignis.**

<sup>66</sup> ORIGEN, *De Principiis* III, 6, 3. PG 11, 336AB: *omnibus omnia dicitur, significet etiam in singulis eum omnia esse. Per singulos autem omnia erit hoc modo, ut quidquid rationabilis mens expurgata omnium vitiorum faece atque omni penitus abstersa nube malitiae, vel sentire, vel intelligere, vel cogitare potest, omnia Deus sit, nec ultra iam aliud aliquid nisi Deum videat, Deum teneat, omnis motus sui Deus modus et mensura sit; et ita erit omnia Deus: non enim iam ultra boni malique discertio, quia nosquam malum; omnia enim Deus*

punishment of sinners was enforced by God. Its beginning is from this life and it will continue after death until becoming the purification and restitution of all things, until all subjects go to God. This purity of all logical beings takes place through the purifying fire that “sterilizes” the world from its old garment and renews all things. So, the prevalence of the good will win the malice. As a conclusion of all these, it can be said that Origen connects the restoration of all things in the recycling of souls. This is that Wisdom in whom God delighted when the world was finished, in order that we might understand from this that God ever rejoices. In this Wisdom, therefore, whoever existed with the Father, the creation was always present in form and outline, and there was never a time when the pre-figuration of those things which hereafter were not to exist in Wisdom<sup>67</sup>.

According to Origen, this saving knowledge would come “slowly and gradually, seeing that the process of amendment and correction will take place imperceptibly in the individual instances during the lapse of countless and unmeasured ages, some outstripping others, and tending by a swifter course towards perfection, while others again follow close at hand, and again a long way behind”. Thus, “through the numerous and uncounted orders of progressive been who are being reconciled to God from a state of enmity, the last enemy is finally reached, who is called death, so he also may be destroyed, and no longer be an enemy. When, therefore, all rational souls shall have been restored to a condition of this kind, then the nature of this body of ours will undergo a change into the glory of a spiritual body”<sup>68</sup>.

---

*est, cui iam non adjacet malum; nec ultra ex arbore sciendi bonum et malum manducare concupiscet, qui semper in bobo est, et cui omnia Deus est. Sic ergo finis ad principium reparatus, et rerum exitus collatus initiis, restituet illum statum quem tunc habuit natura rationalis, cum de ligno sciendi bonum et malum comedere non egebat; ut amoto omni malitiae sensu, et ad sincerum purumque deterso, solus qui est unus bonus Deus hic ei fiat omnia, et non in paucis aliquibus vel pluribus, sed in omnibus ipse sit omnia. Cum iam nusquam mors, nusquam aculeus mortis, nusquam omnino malum, tunc vere Deus omnia in omnibus erit.*

<sup>67</sup> E. MOORE, “Origen of Alexandria and apokatastasis: Some Notes on the Development of a Noble Notion”, *Quodlibet Journal*: Vol. 5, 1, (January 2003), <http://www.quodlibet.net/articles/moore—origen.shtml>. H. Crouzel, *Origen: The Life and Thought of the First Great Theologian*, tr. A. S. Worrall, San Francisco, T. & T. Clark Ltd., 1989, p. 268.

<sup>68</sup> ORIGEN, *De Principiis* III, 6, 6. PG 11, 338D-339A: *In hunc ergo statum omnem hanc nostrum substantiam corporalem putandum est perducendam, tunc cum omnia restituentur, ut unum sint, et cum Deus fuerit omnia in omnibus. Quod tamen non ad subitum fieri, sed paulatim et per partes intelligendum est, infinitis et immensis lacentibus saeculis, cum sensuum et per singulos emendatio fuerit et correctio prosecuta, praecurrentibus aliis et velociori curse ad summa tendentibus, aliis vero proximo quoque spatio insequentibus, tum deinde aliis longe posterius, et sic per multos et innumeros ordines proficientium ac Deo se ex inimicis reconciliantium pervenitur usque ad novissimum inimicum qui dicitur mors, ut etiam ipse destruat ne ultra sit inimicus. Cum ergo restitutae fuerint omnes rationalibes animae in huiusce mundi statum, tunc natura etiam huius corporis nostril in spiritalis corporis gloriam perducetur. Sicut enim de rationalibus naturis videmus, non alias esse quae pro peccatis in indignitate vixerint, et alias quae pro meritis ad beatitudinem invitatae sint, sed has easdem quae ante fuerant peccatrices, conver as postmodum et Deo reconciliatas videmus ad beatitudinem revocari; ita etiam de natura corporis sentiendum est, quod non*

On the other hand, for Eriugena, man is a microcosm<sup>69</sup> of the universe, a kind of miniature of the entire cosmos<sup>70</sup>. Hence, the sin of Adam —original sin— is not just his own personal fall, and not even just the Fall of the entire human race. On the contrary, it is an event of cosmic proportions. With the sin of Adam, the entire creation fell. Hence, Redemption is not just redemption of the human race, but of all of creation<sup>71</sup>. The Fall of man is interpreted allegorically, in a way that reminds one of Origen. Humanity, not individual man, called Adam, chooses the knowledge of visible things, seduced to this choice by the outer sense, called Eve<sup>72</sup>. The serpent is the representation of a carnal delight in visible things. As a consequence of the fall, the serpent, the irrational, carnal desire is cursed, for it can never find fulfillment since the objects of its desire are not real. “In sorrow shalt thou bring forth children”<sup>73</sup>. It is known that sin has a terrible price tag to it, and is never worth the pain, agony, and sorrow that it brings. Eve is made subject to Adam, and this is a promise of the subjection of the outer sense to the intellect. The flaming sword of the angel points the way back: “behold, Adam has become as one of us. And the Lord God sent him forth out of paradise, that he might labor on the earth out of which he was formed. Now therefore, may he not perchance put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of me, and eat of it, and live forever. And he cast Adam out, and set Cherubim before the paradise of pleasure, and a flaming sword turning every way to guard the path to the tree of life”<sup>74</sup>.

---

*aliud corpus est quo nunc in ignobilitate et in corruptione et infirmitate utimur, et aliud erit illud quo in incorruptione, et in virtute, et in gloria utemur.*

<sup>69</sup> ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, IV. PL 122, 793C: “For they call him a microcosm, that is a little word, consisting of the same elements as those from which the universe is created. But those who praise man with the title have forgotten themselves, for the properties for which they honour him are common to mouse and the flea”. *Dicunt enim, hominem μικρόκοσμον, id est, parvum mundum esse, ex iisdem, quibus universus elementis consistit.*

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>71</sup> ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, I. PL 122, 446CD: *At si causa omnium ab omnibus, quae ab ea creata sunt, remota est, absque ulla dubitatione rationes omnium rerum, quae aeter naliter et incommutabiliter in ea sunt, ab omnibus, quorum rationes sunt, penitus remotae sunt. In angelicis vero intellectibus earum rationum theophanias quasdam esse, hoc est, comprehensibiles intellectuali naturae quasdam divinas appartiones non autem ipsa rationes, id est principalia exempla, quisquis dixerit, non ut arbitror, a veritate errabit. Quas theophanias in angelica creatura sanctum Augustinum ... Non enim essential divina Deus so solummodo dicitur, sed etiam modus ille, quo se quodammodo intellectuali et rationali creaturae, prout est capacitas uniuscuiusque, ostendit, Deus saepe a sacra Scriptura vocitatur.*

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, III. PL 122, 847C-848C.

<sup>73</sup> Gen. 3,16.

<sup>74</sup> ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, V. PL 122, 860D: *Fecit quoque Dominus Deus Aadae et uxori tunicas pelliceas, et induit eos, et ait: Ecce Adam factus est quasi unus ex nobis. Et emisit eum Dominus Deus de paradiso, ut operaretur terram, de qua sumptus est. Nunc ergo, ne forte mittat manum suam, et sumat etiam de ligno vitae, et comedat, et vivat in aeternum. Ejecitque Adam, et collocavit ante paradisum voluptetis Cherubim, et flammeum gladium atque reselitem ad custodiendam viam ligui vitae] cf. Gen. 3,22-24. ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, IV. PL 122, 763A-C: *Quis autem sanum sapiens futuram hominis transmutationem crediderit veluti ex animali inferiori in animal superius, ex terreno in**

The second consequence of the fall is the creation of man, with the help of God, of a material body, since he needs this body as an instrument of sense knowledge. The Fall (original sin) is regarded as a kind of dropping away from the ideal man —and of course the Ideal man is the divine idea of “man”. The third consequence is the division of humanity into two sexes<sup>75</sup>, if man had not fallen, he would have multiplied by pure thought, without sex. Hence, the *true man* has no sex. The division into sexes is a consequence of the Fall, of original sin. Hence, at the end of the world, when all things are reabsorbed into their primordial causes the division of the sexes will vanish again. The fourth consequence of the fall is that the eternal, primordial ideas<sup>76</sup>, which man

---

*caeleste, ex temprali in aeternum, ex tius omnia, quae in hac vita in hominibus sanctis ceteris communia animalibus seu intelliguntur seu sentiuntur, in illa essentiam caelestem et ineffabili quadam mutatione transferri, quod etiam homini, si non peccaret, futurum erat? Quare igitur homo in genere animalium, quae de terra producta sunt, creatus sit, in quo semper non manebit? Squidem cum mundus iste cuius pars animalis homo est, interierit, omne, quod in homine animale est, cum ipso et in ipso peribit. Non enim sinit vera ratio, totum pati interitum, partes vero illius ab interitu salvari. Porro si totus mundus cum omnibus suis partibus interiturus erit, quomodo homo, in quantum pars mundi est, post mundum manebit, aut ubi aut, aut quomodo, non satis video. Ac per hoc huius quaestionis nodulos solvas, obnixè flagito. Altam valde humanae conditionis physicam theoriam postulas, nostramque “disputationem” longins progredi compellis. Et mihi sufficerent interroganti tibi, quare Deus homine in genere animalium creaverit, quem ad suam imaginem facere proposuit, breviter respondere, quia ita voluit eum condere, ut quoddam animal esset, in quo imaginem suam exressam manifestaret.*

<sup>75</sup> Ibid., IV. PL 122, 807B: *Num tibi videtur, quod propterea Deus hominem in genere animalium fecerit, quia illum animaliter victurum praescientia, inque irrationabiles motus eorum relicta divinae imaginis pulchritudine ac dignitate casurum? Verisimile videtur. Fecit enim futura, qui fecit omnia simul.*

<sup>76</sup> Ibid., II. PL 122, 529A-C. Eriugena calls these *primordial causes* (causae primordiales): *Universalis itaque naturae, ut iam dictum est, ea forma secunda eninet, quae creatur et creat, et non nisi in primordialibus causis rerum, ut aestimo, intelligenda est. Ipsae autem primordiales rerum causae a Graecis πρωτότυπα, hoc est, primordialia exempla, vel πορίσματα, hoc est, praedestinationes vel definitiones vocantur; item ab eisdem θεῖα θελήματα, hoc est, divinae voluntates dicuntur; ἰδέαι quoque, id est, species vel formae, is quibus omnium rerum faciendarum, priusquam essent, incommutabiles rationes conditae sunt, solent vocari. De quibus atius in processu operas dicemus, testimoniisque sanctorum Patrum roborabimus. Et nec immerito sic appellantur, quoniam Pater, hoc est principium omnium, in Verbo suo, quas faciendas esse voluit, prius quam in genera et species numerosque atque differentias, ceteraque, quae in condita creatura aut considerati possunt et considerantur, aut considerari non possunt prae sui altitudine, et non considerantur et tamen sunt, praeformavit. Sed priusquam ad primordialium causarum theoriam perveniamus, visum est mihi, sententiam venerabilis Maximi de divisione omnium, quae facta sunt, huic disputationi nostrae, si tibi placet inserere. Ibid, III. PL 122, 622Bff: *Primordialium causarum seriem divinae providentiae solers investigator sanetus Dionysius Aeropagita in libro de divinis Nomimibus apertissime disposuit. Summae siquidem bonitatis, quae nullius particeps, quoniam per se ipsum bonitas est, primam donationem et participationem asserit esse per se ipsam bonitatem, cuius participationem, quaecumque, bona sinit. Ideoque per seipsam bonitas dicitur, quia per seipsam summum bonum participat. Cetera enim bona non per seipsa summum bonum participat. Cetera enim bona non seipsa summum et substantiale bonum participant, sed peream, quae est per se ipsam summi boni prima participationem. Et haec regula in omnibus primordialibus causis immiformiter observatur, hoc est, quod par se ipsas participationes principales sunt unius omnium causae, quae Deus est. Quoniam vero summae**

chooses to know by the senses, are divided into sensible objects. Christ came to draw men away from temporal to eternal<sup>77</sup>. By turning away from the world of sense to the real world, man is saved<sup>78</sup>.

---

*ac verae naturae prima consideratio est, qua intelligitur summa ac vera bonitas secunda vero, qua intelligitur summa ac vera essentia, nec immerito primordialium causarum secundum locum obtinet per seipsam essentia, quae cum summae ac verae essentiae prima participatio sit, omnia, quae post se sunt, sua participatione accipiunt esse, ac per hoc non solum bona, verum etiam existentia sunt, tertia divinae naturae intentio est, qua intelligitur summa veraque vita, ideoque tertia in primordialibus causis per scripsam vita communeratur, quae summae ac verae vitae prima per se participatio subsistens, ut omnia post eam viventia participatione eius viverent, creata est: hinc conficitur et bona, et existentia, et viventia esse.* Ibid, I. PL 122, 442B: “the first is understood to be the cause of all things that are, who is God; the second to be the primordial causes; and the third those things that become manifest through coming into being in times and places”— [*Nam de aliis tribus nullo modo haesitare ausim, cum prima, ut arbitrator, in causa omnium, quae sunt et quae non sunt, intelligatur; secunda vero in primordialibus causis; tertia in his, quae in generatione temporibusque et locis cognoscuntur. Atque ideo de singulis disputari subtilius necessarium, ut video. Recte aestimas. Sed quo ordine ratiocinationis via tenenda sit, hoc est, de qua specie naturae primo discutiendum, tuo arbitrio committo. Ratum mihi videtur, ante alias de prima, quicquid lux mentium largita fuerit, dicere.* While explaining this nature of God, Eriugena also lists 15 Primordial Causes: Goodness, Essence, Life, Reason, Intellect, Wisdom, Power, Blessedness, Truth, Eternity, Magnitude, Love, Peace, Unity, and Perfection. These 15 causes are ultimate; they are the ideal goodness, essence, life, etc., and from them all other aspects of creation are given their goodness, essence and life. The term *primordiales causae* as applied to the forms appears to originate with Eriugena. There is an important Greek antecedent in Iarbnlichus: *πρωτογενῶν αἰτίων*, which deserves more attention than it has yet received as a source of Eriugena's doctrine. In order to understand how Eriugena can identify the primordial causes with both genera and individual substances, we must first understand the difference between the primordial causes as causing the created world, and as containing the substance of the created world. Eriugena makes a useful distinction between the two concepts: “causes we name the ‘reasons’ of the first order or generality which were established instantaneously and together in the mind of God: while substances are the individual and most special properties and ‘reasons’ of individual and most special objects, properties and ‘reasons’ which are distributed among the causes and established in them”: *Causas dicimus generalissimas omnium rerum simul rationes in Verbo Dei constitutas. Substantias vero singulas et specialissimas singularum et specialissimarum rerum proprietates et rationes, in ipsis causis distributas et constitutas.* ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, V. PL 122, 887A. “On the one hand, the primordial causes are the most general genera, in which the species are pre-contained. The causes contain the essences of all things —each individual object has an essence which belongs to it alone, and so the place of essences must contain even individuals. These are two separate trains of Greek thought which Eriugena blends, accepting both”, L.M. HARRINGTON, *Human Mediation in Eriugena's Periphyseon*, master thesis, Nova Scotia, Dalhousie University Halifax, 1997, p. 30.

<sup>77</sup> ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, V. PL 122, 873C: *Nisi quando descendet Dominus in gloria sua, descendet ad iudicium vivorum et mortuorum, suam potentiam manifestaturus in terra extrema, hoc est in fine mundi, quando caelum et terra transibunt in ascensione eorum, hoc est, in exaltatione Sanctorum in aeternam beatitudinem, vel certe in communi omnium resurrectione? Siquidem resurrectio communis omnium ascensio est ex morte in vitam, ex animali corpore et corruptibili in spirituale et incorruptibile.*

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., V. PL 122, 865BC: *Quod autem ipse sit lignum vitae, multis divinae Scripturae locis comperitur vitae, multis divinae Scripturae locis comperitur apertissime, ita ut nullo indigeat testimonio. Multipliciter itaque in hoc loco sanctae Scripturae Dei Verbi symbolica nomina exaggerata sunt. Nam et Cherubim, et flammeus gladius versatilis, et via, et lignum vitae*

Eriugena supports, as Origen does, the redemption of man and his apokatastasis. He will earn his restitution, but not only Him. All nature, all the universe will have the final restitution. As all things flow out of God, so they also return to God, *omnia in omnibus*<sup>79</sup>. All motion in nature is cyclical, and all things terminate in their beginnings. The universal cause draws all things back into itself. As things cease to exist temporally they are not annihilated, but they pass back into their eternal causes and there exist as they have existed from eternity. Such a scheme leaves no room for real evil, nor for the eternal consequences of sin. In Periphyseon, Eriugena highlights that “the return to God of evil doers consists in eternally preserving their malicious fantasies, their quest for the things that are not: For the entire abolition of all evil generally in all human nature—which is its return—is something different from the phantasies of evil always preserved in the particular consciences of the vicious in this life, and, in this way, always punished”<sup>80</sup>.

It is to this perfect human nature that man must aspire to return to, and will eventually return to. This belief is not the pantheism that Eriugena has been accused of, but is similar to that of Origen, in that there seems to be a corporate unity but not a unity of natures. In Origen, the final end of all the saints is to be incorporated fully into the Word as members, and achieve full knowledge of God, the same is true of Eriugena, full knowledge and participation in God the Cause is the final end. This end is the end for all men because Eriugena, believes that all men were simultaneously created of Adam and that, had the fall not occurred, man would have reproduced asexually in the manner of angels. Since all men participated in this first nature, then, they should all equally endeavour to return to it. Eriugena explains this return in his book IV of *On the Division of Nature*: “The Divine Nature is believed not to be created because it is the Primal Cause of all, beyond which there is no beginning by

---

*appellatur, ut per hoc intelligamus, quod ipsum Verbum nunquam cordis nostri ebtribus recedat, et quod semper ad illuminandos nos praesentissimum sit, et beatitudinis, quam praevaricando perdidimus, nusquam nunquam memoriam perdere sinit, ad eandem semper redire nos volens, et, donec id fiat, condolendo suspirans, perque scientiae et actionis perfectos gradus iter, quod illuc ducit, carpere nos instigans...Se priusquam de ipso reditu nostrae naturae tractemus, quaedam ex sensibilitus probatissima argumenta, quibus docemur incunctanter credere, ipsum futurum esse, sumenda existimo, si tibi videtur. Ibid., IV. PL 122, 748B: Nisi granum frumenti cadens in terram mortuum fuerit, ipsum solum manet. Si autem mortuum fuerit, multum fructum fuerit. Emilles, inquit, Spiritum tuum, et renovabis faciem terrae, hoc est, restitues intergritatem naturae.*

<sup>79</sup> ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, V. PL 122, 935C. Aside from the general return of all things to God, Eriugena claim “there is a special return whereby the elect achieve ‘deification’ (*deificatio, theosis*) whereby they will merge with God completely, as lights blend into the one light, as voices blend in the choir, as a droplet of water merges with the stream. God shall be all in all”. *Et si ita est, mundus iste aut totus aut aliqua pars eius reservabitur, in qua damnandi perpetuo damnabuntur. Ac per hoc non solvetur omnino, neque consummabitur, hoc est, in causas suas non reversurus est, quando Deus omnia in omnibus erit. Ipsa est enim, ut praediximus, consummatio mundi, et non alia, Deum omnia in omnibus esse.*

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., V. PL 122, 948CD: *Aliud est enim omnem malitiam generaliter in omni humana natura penitus aboleti, aliud phantasias eius, malitiae, dico, in propria conscientia eorum, quos in hac vita vitiaverat, semper servari, eoque modo semper puniri.*

which It can be created. But after the return of all things to their primordial causes contained in Divine Nature, no nature will be generated from It any more or multiplied into sensible or intelligible species; they will be one in It just as they are now and always in their causes. It is deservedly believed, therefore, and understood not to create anything; for what will It create when It alone will be all things in all things?”<sup>81</sup>.

For Eriugena's teaching there are many points of reference and departure between his doctrine of salvation and that of Origen. His doctrine of Fall is connected with the doctrine of human creation and there is as well as its connection to Origen's thought. Morran underlines that “Drawing on the two accounts of the creation of man in Genesis, and following in a rich tradition of biblical commentary stemming from Philo and Origen, Eriugena's theory of human nature understands humanity under two aspects: 1) perfect human nature as it might be thought before the Fall and 2) present-day fallen human nature”<sup>82</sup>.

Eriugena supports that there are two creations of man, “an indivisible and universal humanity, very similar to angelic nature and lacking sexual differentiation; and a secondary nature, ‘which was added to the rational nature as a result of the foreknowledge of the fall’ and which is sexually differentiated”<sup>83</sup>. By affirming this dual creation theology and asserting in fact that the original human nature was higher than that of angels because humans were created in the image of God, Eriugena creates a promising ending point for his idea of the final return to the paradise of “perfect human nature”<sup>84</sup>. Accordingly, since human nature was perfect then “perfect knowledge of self

---

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., IV. PL 122, 743B : *Natura creata et creatrice disoutabamus, quam in principiis rerum, id est, in primordialibus causis subsistere diximus. Nam et ab una omnium causa, quae est summa bonitas, cuius proprium est, omnia de non existentibus in existentia sua ineffabili virtute producere, creatur. Cetera, vero quae post eam sunt, participatione sua creare non cessat.* Ibid., IV. PL 122, 760D.

<sup>82</sup> MORRAN, *The Philosophy of John Scottus Eriugena: A Study of Idealism in the Middle Ages*, p. 156. cf. Gen. 1, 26; 2,7.

<sup>83</sup> ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, IV. PL 122, 817A: *Qui duas hominis conditiones esse asserunt, unam quidem ad imaginem Dei, in qua nec masculus nec femina intelligitur, sed sola universalis et simplex humanitas, simillimaque angelicae naturae, quam omni sexu omnino carere et auctoritas incunctanter et vera docet ratio: alteram vero atque secundam propter praescitum rationabilis naturae delictum suoerraditam, in qua sexus constituitur.*

<sup>84</sup> ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, IV. PL 122, 810AB. For Eriugena the abrogation of male and female occurs not in the birth of Christ, but rather in his resurrection. In Periphyseon II, 537D-538A he writes, "... the Lord Jesus united in himself the division of (our) nature that is male and female. For it was not in the bodily sex but simply in man that He rose from the dead. For in Him there is neither male nor female although it was in that masculine sex in which He was born of a Virgin and in which He suffered that he appeared to His disciples after His resurrection... For otherwise they would not recognize Him if they did not see the shape that was known to them" – [*Primo igitur Dominum Jesum divisionem naturae, id est, masculinum et feminam in seipso adunasse edocet; non enim in sexu corporeo, sed in homine tantum surrexit ex mortuis, in ipso enim nec masculus ne femina est, quamvis in ipso sexa virili, in quo natus est ex virgine, et in quo passus est, apparuit discipulis suis post resurrectionem, ad confirmandam resurrectionis suae fidem.*]



and Creator was inherent in human nature before sin”<sup>85</sup> and it should not be surprising that “it still has such knowledge potentially only, but even actually in the case of the best men”<sup>86</sup>. It is a privilege to this perfect human nature that man should yearn for returning to, and will return to at the end of created time. This belief is not the pantheism that Eriugena has been accused of, but is similar to that of Origen, in that there seems to be a corporate unity but not a unity of natures. In Origen, the final end of all the saints is to be incorporated fully into the Word as members, and achieve full knowledge of God, the same is true of Eriugena, full knowledge and participation in God the Cause is the final end. This end is the end for all men because Eriugena, like Origen<sup>87</sup>, argues that all men were simultaneously created of Adam and that, had the fall not occurred, man would have reproduced asexually in the manner of angels<sup>88</sup>. Since all men participated in this first nature, then, they should all equally endeavor to return to it and there will be no sexes into human beings<sup>89</sup>. Eriugena explains this return in book IV of *On the Division of Nature* that he Divine Nature is believed not to be created because it is the Primal Cause of all, beyond which there is no beginning by which It can be created. But, after the return of all things to their primordial causes contained in Divine Nature, no nature will be generated from It any more or multiplied into sensible or intelligible species; they will be one in It just as they are now and always in their causes. It is deservedly believed, therefore, and understood not to create anything; for what will It create when It alone will be all things in all things?

---

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., IV. PL 122, 778C: *Si ergo humanae naturae ante peccatum inerat et suimet perfecta cognition, et Creatoris sui, quid mirum, si rationabiliter de ea intelligatur, plenissimam scientiam sililium sui naturarum, ut sunt caelestes essentiae, et inferiorum se, ut est mundus iste cum rationibus suis intellectui succumbentibus, habuisse, et adhuc sola possibilitate et reipsa in summis hominibus habere?*

<sup>86</sup> Ibid.

<sup>87</sup> ORIGEN, *De Principiis* III, 6, 3. PG 11, 337D-338A: *Et ego quidem arbitror, quia hoc quod omnibus omnia dicitur esse Deus, significet etiam in singulis eum omnia esse. Per singulos autem omnia erit hoc modo, ut quidquid rationabilis mens expurgata omnium vitorum faece, atque omni penitus abstersa nube malitiae, vel sentire, vel intelligere, vel cogitare potest, omnia Deus sit, nec ultra iam aliud aliquid nisi Deum videat, Deum teneat, omnis motus sui Deus modus et mensura sit; et ita erit omnia Deus: non enim iam ultra boni malique discernitio, quia nasquam malum; omnia enim Deus est, cui iam non adiacet malum; nec ultra ex arbore sciendi bonum et malum manducare concupiscet, qui semper in bono est, et cui omnia Deus est.*

<sup>88</sup> Ibid. ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, V. PL 122, 935C: *omnia in omnibus-*

<sup>89</sup> ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, III. PL 122, 543A: “For who is there who, hearing such things, would not be horrified and at once break out in these words: ‘Then after the resurrection there will be no sexual division of male [and] female if each is to be totally removed from human nature? Or what form will appear in man if no one has either male or female form? Or what sort of recognition will there be if there is to be an extermination of both sexes and an amalgam of all men, whether spiritual and incorporeal or visible and corporeal (and) circumscribed by place and time, into a simple unification, not divided by difference of forms?’— *enim talia audient non expavecent confestimque in haec verba non erumpat dicturos: Non ergo post resurrectionem masculi feminaeque futurus est sexus, si uterque ab humana penitus auferetur natura! Aut quails forma in homine apparebit, si nemo masculi seu feminae formam habuerit?*”

And Origen would agree and he would say that the final union of the souls with God as that stage in which the souls will no longer be conscious of anything other than God; it will think God and hold God and God will be the mode and measure of its every movement. God will be all in all to souls.

The similarities with Origen are again apparent and although Eriugena’s thought displays more development and obviously benefited from the intervening centuries and thinkers, the final concept is the same, all things eventually return to their cause and God will be All in All.

### 3. Conclusions

Eriugena is influenced by the theology of Origen. Generally, it could be said that their theology has an apophatic view of theology. They describe God by saying what he is not. They underline that the divine lies beyond words, concepts and understanding. Both of them agree that only God is an incorporeal unity, while the rational creature is always a corporeal multiplicity. The creation of the corporeal world was a consequence of sin. Origen and Scottus Eriugena underline that God’s immanence and transcendence relate to His relationship with the created world. These actions of God do not refer to His specific actions, but to His relationship with the world. According to their theology, Man put his divine nature in the “coat of Skin” as Genesis says in 3:21, because of his original sin. This coat, the tunic of skin was added to man as a punishment for his disobedience, after the transgression, and therefore outside the Paradise. After the Fall, the mortal and corruptible body was superimposed upon man, which therefore takes its origin not from the nature but from his sin. The Return of All thing to God will proceed gradually and then it will become the corporeal logical creature into incorporeal. Eriugena and Origen teach the redemption of man and his apokatastasis. They explain that the man will earn his restitution, but not only him. All nature, all the universe will have the final restitution. As all things flow out of God, so they also return to God, *omnia in omnibus*. Origen and Eriugena support that after the apokatastasis God will be All in All.

In the end, we must say that general opinion that Eriugena is influenced by the ideas of Augustine of Hippo, of Gregory of Nazianzen or Gregory of Nyssa, of Dionysius Aeropagite can be thought as correct but the base of his teaching was the theology of the Greek Father Origen.

\* \* \*

### Sources and Bibliography

#### Sources

JOHN SCOTTUS ERIUGENA, *De divisione naturae*, Jacques-Paul Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Latina* (PL), vol. 122, 439-1022.

ORIGEN OF ALEXANDRIA, *De Principiis*, Jacques-Paul Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Graeca* (PG), vol. 11, 107-413.

## Bibliography

- BRIAN, L. O', “John Scottus Eriugena”, in ebook *Journeys of Janus: Explorations in Irish Philosophy*, 22 April 2013.
- BURCH, G. B., *Early Medieval Philosophy*, King's Crown Press, Columbia University, NY, 1951, p. 1-30.
- CAPPUYNS, M., *Jean Scot Erigène: sa vie, son oeuvre, sa pensée*, Louvain, 1933.
- CARABINE, D., *The Unknown God: Negative Theology in the Platonic Tradition: Plato to Eriugena*, W.B. Eerdsmans, Oxford, 1995.
- CARABINE, D., *John Scottus Eriugena*, Oxford, 2000.
- COPELSTON, F. A., *History of Philosophy*, Book. I, vol. II, Augustine to Scotus, Image Books/Doubleday, New York, 1992.
- CROUZEL, H., *Origen: The Life and Thought of the First Great Theologian*, tr. A.S. Worrall, publ. T.&T. Clark Ltd, San Francisco, 1989.
- DE LUBAC, H., “Du hast mich betrogen, Herr”, *Johannes*, Einsiedeln, 1984, p. 84-85.
- DEWULF, M. *History of Medieval Philosophy*, Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1935, pp. 121-135.
- FEIDAS, VI. *Ecclesiastic History A*, Athens, 1994<sup>2</sup>.
- GERSH, S., *From Iamblichus to Eriugena. An Investigation of the Prehistory and Evolution of the Pseudo-Dionysian Tradition*, Leiden, 1978.
- GERSH, S., “Omnipresence in Eriugena. Some Reflections on Augustino-Maximian Elements in Periphyseon”, in *Beierwaltes* (1980) 55-74
- GERSH, S., “The Structure of the Return in Eriugena's Periphyseon”, in *Beierwaltes* (1990a), p. 108-25
- GERSH, S., “Eriugena's Fourfold Contemplation: Idealism and Arithmetic”, in *Gersh and Moran* (2006), p. 151-67
- GERSH, S. and Moran, D. (eds) (2006), *Eriugena*, Berkeley and the Idealist Tradition (Notre Dame, Ind.)
- HARRINGTON, L. M., *Human Mediation in Eriugena's Periphyseon*, master thesis, Dalhousie University Halifax, Nova Scotia, 1997.
- HENNESSEY, L., “The Place of Saints and Sinners after Death”, in *Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy*, C. Kannengiesser and W. L. Peterson, eds., University Notre Dame, Notre Dame, 1988, p. 293-312.
- HUGHES, B., “Origen and the Incorporation of Platonic/Apophatic Theology into the Christian System”,  
<http://www.brenhughes.com/Research/ApophaticTheology.pdf> (2012)
- LEMONS, R. M., *A Neomedieval Essay in Philosophical Theology*, Lexington Books, 2001
- MCKEON, R., *Selections from Medieval Philosophers*, vol. I, publ. Scribner's, New York, 1929, p. 100-141.
- MARENBOON, J., “Introduction”, in St. Gersh, “John Scottus Eriugena and Anselm of Canterbury”,  
[history\\_philosophy.enacademic.com/142/John\\_Scottus\\_Eriugena\\_and\\_Anse\\_lm\\_of\\_Canterbury](http://history_philosophy.enacademic.com/142/John_Scottus_Eriugena_and_Anse_lm_of_Canterbury), Routledge History of Philosophy. Taylor & Francis e-Library. 2005, p. 1-15.

- MEYENDORFF, J., *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes*, Fordham University Press, New York, 1974.
- MOORE, E., “Origen of Alexandria and apokatastasis: Some Notes on the Development of a Noble Notion”, *Quodlibet Journal*: Vol. 5, 1, (January 2003), <http://www.quodlibet.net/articles/moore-origen.shtml>.
- MOORE, E., “Origen of Alexandria (185-254 AD)”, *Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, <http://www.iep.utm.edu/origen-of-alexandria>, 2 May 2005.
- MORRAN, D., *The Relationship between Neoplatonism and Christianity*, edited by T. Finan and V. Twomey with a foreword by J. J. O'Meara, Four Courts Press, Kill Lane, Blackrock, Co., Dublin, 1992, p. 32 (27.54)
- MORRAN, D. *The Philosophy of John Scottus Eriugena: A Study of Idealism in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge University press, Cambridge, 1989.
- New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, vol. I: Aachen-Basilians <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/encyc01.html?term=apocatastasis>.
- “Origen “, *Merriam—Webster's Encyclopedia of World Religions*, edited by W. Donige, USA, 1999, p. 830-833.
- OTTEN, W., *The Anthropology of Johannes Scottus Eriugena*, publ. E. J. Brill, Leiden 1991.
- PAPANIKOLAOU, A., *Being with God, Trinity, Apophaticism, and Divine-Human Communion*, publ. University of Notre Dame Press, Indiana, 2006.
- POPE BENEDICT XVI, “Origen of Alexandria: life and work”, *Libreria Editrice Vaticana*, [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/benedict\\_xvi/audiences/2007/documents/hf\\_ben-xvi\\_aud\\_20070425\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/audiences/2007/documents/hf_ben-xvi_aud_20070425_en.html) (2007)
- PRAT, F., “Origen and Origenism”. *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 11, Robert Appleton Company, New York. 1911, 17 Aug. 2013: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/11306b.htm>.
- PRESTIGE, G. L. *Fathers and Heretics*, publ. SPCK, London 1977.
- RICH, B. E., “The Origin of Gender in Eriugena’s Periphyseon”, <http://www.brycerich.com/2011/11/eriugena-creation.html> (2011).
- SCHAFF, Ph., *History of the Christian Church, Volume IV: Mediaeval Christianity*. Grand Rapids, Christian Classics Ethereal Library, 1882.
- WOODHEAD, L., “Apophatic Anthropology”, in *God and Human Dignity*, ed. K. Soulen and L. Woodhead, publ. W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, Michigan, 2006, p. 233-246.