

I:

ON THE ORIGIN OF THE CONTROVERSY

I. [Introduction]

It is truly a matter of sorrow and great sadness that, either from the misfortune or the disease of our age, those mysteries of our religion made known to us for the peace and comfort of our souls are consistently made a topic of litigation and argument. Who could ever have thought that the death of Christ, which was designed to establish peace and destroy enmity, as the Apostle says in Eph. 2:14, 17 and Col. 1:20–21, could have become such a fertile ground for begetting such quarrels? Yet, this situation seems to arise from the innate curiosity of human beings, who are more anxious to scrutinize the hidden purposes of God than to embrace the benefits openly offered to them. Accordingly, because there is so much bickering about the question *for whom did Christ die and for whom did he not die?*, each of us spends too little time considering that the death of Christ ought to be applied

to ourselves by a true and lively faith for the salvation of our own souls.

In dealing with this subject, I hope to appease these disputes rather than to excite them anew. Therefore, given that those who extend the death of Christ to every person concede that, as to its beneficial reception, it is applied only to certain people in particular; and because, on the other hand, those who limit it to the elect alone still admit that it would benefit all who are called—indeed—all human beings, if they would believe, both sides seem to acknowledge a twofold consideration of the death of Christ. For both sides regard Christ's death as a universal cause of salvation applicable to each and every human being if they should believe, and as a special cause of salvation effectually applied to certain persons in particular who have believed. If I discuss the death of Christ under this twofold perspective, it will perhaps appear that in some of the things which are fiercely disputed, these are just various modes of speaking rather than different positions. I will therefore defend some short and perspicuous theses: first, those which set forth the death of Christ as a universal cause of salvation applicable to all. Next, I will add other theses on the death of Christ as being a special cause of salvation applied efficaciously to certain people, or at least infallibly to be applied in God's own time.

Moreover, I do not wish to enter into any battle or fight, but instead to give a plain and calm exposition of the whole subject. I do not intend to engage with any disputant, unless he should stand in our way such that we could not otherwise open the way to truth without contending with him. But before I propose the aforementioned theses before you, I will premise some things about the origin of this controversy, the views of the Fathers respecting it, and other similar issues

which may seem necessary for a thorough understanding of the history of this controversy. For just as it is especially important to be well-acquainted with the origin and causes of diseases in order to cure them, likewise, in order to settle controversies, it is essential to thoroughly understand on what occasion they arose, by whom they were fought, in what way, and to what end those controversies were debated by the Fathers. [2] Therefore, let us apply ourselves to a short exposition of this topic.

II. [Pre-Augustine, Augustine, and the Augustinians]

Thus, I think it can be rightly said that, previous to the dispute between Augustine and Pelagius, there was no debate concerning the death of Christ, whether it was to be extended to all people or restricted only to the elect. For the holy Fathers, when speaking of the death of Christ, describe it to us as undertaken and endured for the redemption of the human race. However, not a word (that I know of) occurs among them of the exclusion of anyone by the decree of God. They agree that it is actually beneficial only to those who believe, yet they confess everywhere that Christ died for all. Thus, Clement of Alexandria says, “Christ freely brings (or bestows) salvation to the whole human nature.”¹ And Origen is of the same opinion, “Jesus is declared to have come for all sinners wherever they may be that they would

1. Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus*, in *Clementis Alexandrini Opera Graece et Latine* (Leiden: Ioannes Patius, 1616), I.11 [pg. 98]. In translation: Clement of Alexandria, “Christ the Educator,” trans. Simon P. Wood, in *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation*, vol. 23 (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1954), 85.

forsake their sins and entrust themselves to God.”² Agreeing with Origen, Primasius on 1 Tim. 2:[6] (“Who gave himself a ransom for all”) says, “Indeed the blood of Christ has been shed for all human beings, but it is beneficial only for those who believe.”³

From this disciple of Augustine, we may conjecture what was the doctrine of Augustine himself. His opponents were nevertheless accustomed to accuse Augustine and others who agreed with his doctrine of predestination, claiming that they taught that Christ was crucified for the predestined alone. Indeed, on account of this accusation by the Pelagians, some in the following ages seemed to take this as an opportunity to stir-up this aforementioned controversy. This is clear from the objections of the Vincentians, who first object to this thesis: “That our Lord Jesus Christ did not suffer for the salvation and redemption of all human beings.”⁴ This is also clear from Prosper’s *Responses to the Articles of the Gallican Theologians*, where their ninth objection reads thus: “That the Savior was not crucified for the redemption of the whole

2. Origen, *Contra Celsum*, in *Origenis Adamantii Operum Complectentium, Pars Secunda* (Paris: Compagnie de la Grand Navire, 1604), lib. 4 [pg. 464]. In translation: Origen, *Contra Celsum*, trans. Henry Chadwick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), IV.28 [pg. 204].

3. Primasius, *In Universas Divi Pauli Epistolas*, in *Magna*, Tom. 6 pars 2, ad loc. 1 Tim. 2:6 [pg. 105].

4. Prosper of Aquitaine, *Ad Capitula Objectionum Vincentianarum Responiones*, in *Divi Prosperi Aquitanici, Episcopi Rhegiensis, Viri eruditissimi, Opera Accurata Exemplarium Vetustorum Collatione a mendis pene innumeris repurgata...* (Cologne: Arnoldus Kempensus, 1609), Objection 1 [pg. 335]. In translation: Prosper of Aquitaine, “Answers to the Vincentian Articles,” in *Defense*, 164.

world.”⁵ The Semipelagians rejected this as being novel, hateful, and erroneous.

Yet, Prosper deals with these accusations not by maintaining that Christ suffered only for the elect, but by showing the source from which the passion of Christ becomes profitable and saving to the elect alone; namely, because the elect alone obtain, by a gift of special grace, persevering faith, whereby they are enabled to apply the death of Christ to themselves. All others, without the assistance of this special grace, by their own fault either remain entirely in unbelief or forsake the faith they once received and therefore are deprived of the benefit of redemption.

This is the import of those passages in the *Response* to the aforementioned objection of Vincentius: “With respect to the magnitude and potency of the price, and to the one cause of the human race, the blood of Christ is the redemption of the whole world; but those who pass through this life without faith in Christ and the sacrament of regeneration do not partake of this redemption.”⁶ A little afterwards, “The cup of immortality, which is composed of our infirmity and divine goodness, has indeed in itself what is profitable for all, but if it is not drunk, it does not heal.”⁷ The remarks brought

5. Prosper of Aquitaine, *Ad Capitula Objectionum Gallorum Calumniantium Responsiones*, in *Opera*, Objection 9 [pg. 324]. In translation: Prosper of Aquitaine, “Answers to the Objections of the Gauls,” in *Defense*, 149.

6. Prosper of Aquitaine, *Ad Capitula Objectionum Vincentianarum Responsiones*, in *Opera*, Objection 1 [pg. 336]. In translation: Prosper of Aquitaine, “Answers to the Vincentian Articles,” in *Defense*, 164.

7. Prosper of Aquitaine, *Ad Capitula Objectionum Vincentianarum Responsiones*, in *Opera*, Objection 1 [pg. 336]. In translation: Prosper of

forward in response to the ninth objection of the Gallican theologians are not dissimilar. For there it is confessed that, although “Christ may be said to have been crucified only for those whom his death profited,” that is, for the regenerate and those that persevere in belief, “it may also be said that the Redeemer of the world gave his own blood for the world, and the world refused to be redeemed.”⁸

Finally, the fact that Prosper, following Augustine’s view, extends the particular benefit of Christ’s passion, namely, the remission of original sin, even to infants not predestined, clearly proves that Augustine did not teach that Christ died for the predestined alone: “The one who says that the grace of baptism being received does not take away original sin from those who are not predestined to life is not a Catholic.”⁹ Even the Synod of Valence embraced this position some ages after Augustine, as it appears in its fifth canon.¹⁰ From these things, it is evident that although the seeds of this controversy were sown, yet Augustine and his disciples never wished

Aquitaine, “Answers to the Vincentian Articles,” in *Defense*, 164.

8. Prosper of Aquitaine, *Ad Capitula Objectionum Gallorum Calumniantium Responsiones*, in *Opera*, Objection 9 [pg. 324]. In translation: Prosper of Aquitaine, “Answers to the Objections of the Gauls,” in *Defense*, 149.

9. Prosper of Aquitaine, *Ad Capitula Objectionum Gallorum Calumniantium Responsiones*, in *Opera*, Sent. 2 [pg. 329]. In translation: Prosper of Aquitaine, “Answers to the Objections of the Gauls,” in *Defense*, 157.

10. [Ed. note: Cf. Heinrich Denzinger, *Compendium of Creeds, Definitions, and Declarations on Matters of Faith and Morals*, ed. Peter Hünermann, Robert Fastiggi, and Anne Englund Nash, 43rd ed. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012), 625–33, esp. 632 [pg. 217].]

to be patrons of the doctrine, *that Christ suffered for the predestined alone.*

III. [Two Wrong Interpretations Regarding Pelagius and His Followers]

But leaving aside Augustine, let us come to Pelagius and his followers. And here it is worthwhile to observe that in the more recent discussions of this controversy, two errors opposite to each other have been attributed to Pelagius, albeit falsely. [3] For, those who hold that Christ died for the elect alone claim that the opposite opinion, namely, *that Christ died for all*, is one of the Pelagian errors. On the other hand, those who are on the opposite side cry out that it is mere Pelagianism to say *Christ did not die for all human beings*. But they do injustice to both sides, to Pelagius and to themselves.

With respect to the first group, a certain learned man¹¹ claims that universal redemption and a limited deliverance was the position attributed to the Pelagians and Semipelagians. He relies on a certain passage from Augustine against Julian where the former attacks the Pelagians in this manner: “Go on then, go on and say that in the sacrament of the Savior infants are baptized, but are not saved; are redeemed, but are not freed; are washed, but are not absolved; so also

11. [Ed. note: Davenant is possibly referring to the President of the Synod of Dort, Johannes Bogerman. See Johannes Bogerman, *Ad Scripti...Hugonis Grotii...Partes priores duas, In quibus tractat causam Vorstii et Remonstrantium, sive Pastorum ullorum qui sequuntur sententiam I. Arminii, Annotationes In gratiam Lectoris veritatis studiosi conscriptae* (Franeker: Rombertus Doyema, 1614), 140. Cf. Michael J. Lynch, *John Davenant’s Hypothetical Universalism: A Defense of Catholic and Reformed Orthodoxy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), 34–35.]

say that his blood is shed for them for the remission of sins, but they are not cleansed by the remission of sin. You say astonishing things. You say novel things. You say false things,” and so on.¹² But in this place, Augustine only has in mind infants, and he does not say this in order to show that it is Pelagian to teach that Christ died for those who on account of their own unbelief are not saved, but instead to show that it is Pelagian to say that he died for those, or redeemed those, who were not subject to sin, and therefore had no guilt from which they should be freed. For with regard to infants, Pelagius gave lip-service to the idea that they were redeemed, but in reality taught that they had no need of redemption. This is clear given that he held that “in them, there was nothing depraved, nothing held under the power of the devil,” in one word, “nothing which should be redeemed by so great a price.”¹³ Therefore, this is what Augustine finds fault with—not that Pelagius had taught that Christ suffered for all.

It can be shown that this position of Pelagianism was not condemned in any council formed against the Pelagians, nor in any work of Augustine written against the Semipelagians. He carefully deals with the errors of the Semipelagians in his books *On the Predestination of the Saints* and *On the Gift of Perseverance*, yet he never attempts to undermine the prop-

12. Augustine, *Contra Julianum*, in vol. 7 of *Opera Omnia*, III.3 [pg. 676]. In translation: Augustine, “Answer to Julian,” trans. Roland J. Teske, S.J., in *Answer to the Pelagians, II*, 1/24 of *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century* (Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 1998), 344.

13. Augustine, *Epistolae*, Epist. 90 [pg. 477]. In translation: Augustine, *Letters 156–210 (Epistolae)*, trans. Roland J. Teske, S.J., in II/3 of *Works*, letter 175 [pg. 137].

osition that *Christ died for all human beings*. Thus, it is certain that whatever may be concluded about the truth of this proposition (which hereafter will be seen), that it was never thought to be a Pelagian dogma, as some people, leaning on weak foundations, have confidently asserted.

But I come to the opposite thesis. For there is one man who accuses Pelagianism of this opposite position and writes that Pelagius taught that *Christ did not die for all human beings*. Accordingly, [Nicolaas] Grevinchovius, in his *Dissertation on the Death of Christ*, involving our own [William] Ames, says, “Pelagius taught (as Faustus of Riez testifies¹⁴) that Christ did not die for all human beings. Therefore, acknowledge and realize that this error which I have opposed is common to you [i.e., Ames] and Pelagius.”¹⁵ But I do not know why—whether by design or ignorance—he produces as a witness against Pelagius the outrageous apostate Faustus of Riez, who, under the pretense of opposing Pelagius, strenuously maintained his cause and everywhere threw shade at the catholic theologians, while concealing their names.

But however serviceable a witness Faustus of Riez might be on this topic, Grevinchovius committed a stupid error when he thought that the aforementioned opinion was to be attributed to Pelagius. If he had ever looked into the books of

14. Faustus of Riez, *Fausti Episcopi De Gratia Dei Et humanae mentis libero arbitrio* (Basil: [1528]), I.16 [fol. 35^v].

15. Nicholas Grevinchovius (and William Ames), *Dissertatio Theologica De Duabus Quaestionibus Hoc Tempore controversis, Quarum, Prima Est De Reconciliatione per mortem Christi impetrata omnibus ac singulis hominibus: Altera, De Electione ex fide praevisa...* (Rotterdam: Mathias Sebastianus, 1615), 51: “ista Pelagius: at docuit tamen... *Christum non esse mortuum pro omnibus hominibus.*”

Faustus, he might have easily noticed that in that particular place, he was not writing against the Pelagians, but against those who attribute everything to divine grace and mercy, that is, against Augustine, Prosper, and the rest of the orthodox, whom he babbles against as being “different in their kind of beliefs, but like the Pelagians in impiety.”¹⁶ Therefore, if Grevinchovius desires to prove from this passage that this opinion was heretical, he ought to make it a mark of Augustinian heresy, not a Pelagian one. But actually, Faustus made the same error as the other Semipelagians had done, as we saw beforehand in the *Objections of the Vincentians* and the *Articles of the Gallican Theologians*; that is, he calumniously imputed this opinion to Augustine and the orthodox as being necessarily connected with the doctrine of predestination; which they, nevertheless, never wished to acknowledge.

IV. [Three Errors of Pelagianism and Semipelagianism on the Death of Christ]

But we should return to Pelagius and the Semipelagians, who certainly erred in some things regarding the death of Christ, although neither of the aforementioned beliefs was reckoned an error of Pelagius among the ancient Fathers. [4] In the first place, Pelagius himself erred by extending the death of Christ beyond its proper limits, not directly but indirectly and by consequence, in maintaining that all infants, whether elect or not elect, were free from original sin, whom he nevertheless affirmed were redeemed by the death of Christ. Therefore, he extended redemption by the death of Christ

16. Faustus of Riez, *De Gratia Dei*, I.3–4 [fols. 15^r–17^r]. [Ed. note: The Allport translation has the citation: I.3, 6. The quote from Faustus is found in *De Gratia Dei*, I.1 [fol. 10^v].]

even to those whom he thought to be free from sin, as we said before. That is, he declared that those who had no sins from which they could be redeemed were redeemed by the death of Christ.

This is the stupid doctrine which Augustine continually rejects, namely, that through baptism the death of Christ is applied to those who had no sin which could be expiated by the death of Christ. The words of Pelagius himself are, “Who is so impious as to forbid to a little child of whatever age that redemption which is common to the human race?”¹⁷ And the Council of Carthage, in their Epistle to Innocent, notes that Celestius had already confessed in the Carthaginian Church that “the redemption even of little children was effected by the baptism of Christ.”¹⁸ Moreover, those who nominally admitted the redemption of children still held that “those same infants do not need the grace of the Savior to deliver them from perdition because they have not contracted any contagion from Adam which deserves damnation.”¹⁹ They held

17. Augustine, *De Peccato Originali contra Pelagium & Celestium*, in vol. 7 of *Opera Omnia*, 19 [pg. 539]. In translation: Augustine, *The Grace of Christ and Original Sin*, trans. Roland J. Teske, S.J., in *Answer to the Pelagians, I*, I/23 of *Works*, 444.

18. Augustine, *Epistolae*, Epist. 90 [pg. 478]. In translation: Augustine, *Letters 156–210 (Epistulae)*, letter 175 [pg. 137]. [Ed. note: The 1650 ed. wrongly cites letter 94, instead of 90. This is probably because the citation was intended for the next quote. This affects the next two citations. Curiously, at this point, the Allport translation cites letter 59.]

19. [Ed. note: The citation in the 1650 ed. has Augustine, *Contra Duas Epistolas Pelagianorum* IV.2. The quote, however, comes from Augustine, *Epistolae*, Epist. 94 [pg. 488]. In translation: Augustine, *Letters 156–210 (Epistulae)*, letter 178 [pg. 151]. The editor of the

that “baptism is necessary for people of all ages in order that the baptized person might be adopted as a son of God, not because he obtained from his parents anything which might be expiated by the laver of regeneration.”²⁰ In a word, “The grace of the Redeemer finds in them what he may adopt, not what he may purify.”²¹ This, then, is the first error attributed to the Pelagians about the death of Christ, not that they affirmed that he suffered for all, as some have thought, nor that they denied that he suffered for all, as some imagine, but that they dared to hold these two opposite doctrines at the same time: *Redemption through the death of Christ pertains to all human beings of all ages*, and, *Infants are altogether free from sin and damnable guilt, from which they could be redeemed*. So much for the first error of Pelagius.

Secondly, the Pelagians or Semipelagians erred in explaining the universality of the death of Christ by joining with it an absurd, false, and very obscure condition. Prosper describes their opinion in his *Epistle to Augustine*: “Our Lord Jesus Christ died for the whole human race, and no one is entirely excluded from the redemption by His blood, even if he should intentionally live his whole life altogether

1650 ed. clearly misapplied the citations found in Davenant’s original ms. See the previous footnote.]

20. Augustine, *Contra Duas Epistolas Pelagianorum ad Bonifacium*, in vol. 7 of *Opera Omnia*, IV.2 [pg. 619]. In translation: Augustine, *Answer to the Two Letters of the Pelagians*, trans. Roland J. Teske, S.J., in 1/24 of *Works*, 186.

21. Augustine, *Hypognosticon contra Pelagionos et Celestianos*, in vol. 7 of *Opera Omnia*, V [pg. 958]. [Ed. note: Augustine did not author this work.]

alienated from it.”²² In this same vein is that addition mentioned by the Church of Lyon in their little book *On the Three Epistles*, “If some Fathers can be found who say that the Lord was crucified even for the wicked who continue in their wickedness, it is surprising and incredible if they can prove this from direct testimonies of the divine Scriptures.”²³ The orthodox thought that a conditional addition of this kind should rightly be rejected.

In the first place, what the Pelagians meant by that addition is uncertain. If they mean that any benefit or advantage could be derived from the death of Christ by those who spent their whole lives in impiety and unbelief, then they openly contradict the Scriptures, which do not promise any benefit from the death of Christ to such people, but threaten them with eternal damnation on account of their contempt for the death of Christ. Secondly, if they mean that even those who die in their impiety and unbelief, if they had believed, that is, if they had not died in their unbelief, might have been saved through faith by the merit of Christ crucified, then they confusedly and obscurely express their meaning, and what they seem to assert in one part of their statement, they foolishly deny in another. Lastly, if they understand that aforementioned addition as if Christ, in offering himself, had considered certain people as finally unbelieving and impenitent, and yet under this consideration had offered himself up to the Father to obtain pardon and life for them, it is

22. Prosper of Aquitaine, *Epistola ad Augustinum de Reliquiis Pelagianae Haereseos*, in *Opera*, 883. In translation: Prosper of Aquitaine, *Letter to Augustine*, in *Defense*, 43.

23. *Magna*, Tom. 9, *De Tenenda Veritate Scripturae*, 1063. [Ed. note: Mispaginated as pg. 1065].

clearly false and erroneous. For just as a physician does not think of restoring health to a sick man under this formal consideration, namely, even if the sick man should obstinately despise and reject the medicine which the physician had prepared, so neither does the Physician of souls wish that the precious medicine of his blood should profit anyone under this condition: no matter how that person may finally trample upon and despise it.

[5] Therefore, it should be noted that when Prosper and Hilary refer to the opinion of the Semipelagians, the former combine many things together, some of which agree with the truth, while others smack of error. Hence, when they recount that the Semipelagians taught, along with some other things, that all people sinned in Adam and that our Lord Jesus Christ died for the whole human race, they do not claim these as their errors, but do so in order to show how far they agree with the orthodox and to explain the whole system and logic of the Semipelagian doctrine.

Thus, they greatly err who think that all the things which are attributed to the Semipelagians by Prosper and Hilary are erroneous and Pelagian. We claim, therefore, that Augustine never attempted to impugn that proposition of the Semipelagians, *Christ died for the whole human race*, but with all his might refuted the addition they had made to it, when he shows that the right or benefit of redemption, that is, eternal life, belongs to the predestined alone because they alone do not pass through this life in unbelief, they never die in their impiety.

The third and most grievous error of the Pelagians and Semipelagians about the death of Christ respects the primary cause of this dissimilar outcome, namely, that this death of Christ infallibly brings eternal life to certain persons and does

not bring it to others. They assigned the primary cause of this difference to the human will, presuming that God equally willed the salvation of all human beings in Christ, and that God, by a special decree of predestination, did not appoint to certain persons that faith and perseverance by which they apply to themselves the death of Christ for salvation. On the opposite side, Augustine, along with the orthodox, contended that that persevering faith, by means of which the death of Christ brings salvation to individuals, is extended to the elect by a special gift of mercy, and not on account of some people using their free will well, rather than others.

Here the controversy directly deals with the grace of predestination and free will and obliquely touches upon the death of Christ, inasmuch as the orthodox, assigning a reason why it eventually brings salvation to some people, always ascend to divine predestination, while the Pelagians descend to the human will. Prosper, in his *Epistle to Augustine*, expresses their opinion in this matter thus: "Insofar as it pertains to God," they say, "eternal life has been prepared for all; but as it pertains to free will, those who of their own free will believe in God and receive the help of grace through the merit of their believing apprehend eternal life."²⁴ A little afterwards, "They fear to attribute the merits of the saints to the divine operation, and they do not admit that the predestined number of the elect can neither increase nor decrease."²⁵

24. Prosper of Aquitaine, *Epistola ad Augustinum*, in *Opera*, 883–84. In translation: Prosper of Aquitaine, *Letter to Augustine*, in *Defense*, 44.

25. Prosper of Aquitaine, *Epistola ad Augustinum*, in *Opera*, 884. In translation: Prosper of Aquitaine, *Letter to Augustine*, in *Defense*, 44.

Neither Prosper nor Augustine blames the Semipelagians for asserting that Christ died for the whole human race; but they are blamed, having posited this, for inferring that there is no special will of God in predestinating by which he effectually produces that faith in the elect by which they will individually apply to themselves Christ, who died for all, for salvation. Instead, they suspend all of this relating to the application of salvation on the uncertain chance of the human will. This is either the sole or the principal error against which Augustine contended in his books *On the Predestination of the Saints* and *The Gift of Perseverance*. Prosper also attacked this error in his poem *On the Ungrateful*, in which he recounts the opinion of the Pelagians that God equally willed the redemption of all people by the death of Christ:

But each the voice of his free will obeys,
And of his own accord sends forth his mind
To embrace the offered light.²⁶

Yet the same Prosper declares that God, by his predestinating and operating will, willed that those alone have been redeemed to whom he grants those things by which they are infallibly led to salvation. And, lastly, he shows that this efficacious will of saving some by the death of Christ and not saving others did not flow from the discriminating acts of the human will. To this those words relate:

26. Prosper of Aquitaine, *De Ingratis Contra Pelagionos*, in *Opera*, X [pg. 554]. In translation: Prosper of Aquitaine, *Carmen de Ingratis S. Prosperi Aquitani: A Translation with an Introduction and a Commentary* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1962), X [pg. 59].

Do the various impulses of the soul produce such things?
Does not freedom effect in all one cause?
Therefore, God's will shall stand firm against man's will
Or weakly yield, etc.²⁷

[7] Therefore, Prosper does not attack (what he elsewhere acknowledges) that Christ suffered for all, but instead that, by the merit of the passion of Christ, God equally willed that all human beings were *de facto* redeemed and had entrusted the efficacy of redemption to the will of human beings. For this is that ulcer of Pelagian doctrine which Faustus of Riez endeavors to conceal under the cover of these words: "God as the rewarder of their good will, redeemed the willing."²⁸ Rightly indeed! But if we are talking about efficacious redemption, he first made them willing, being the inspirer of their good wills. If the Pelagians had held that the death of Christ became beneficial to people according to the special decree and operation of the divine will, the orthodox would have never accused them with the error that they held that *Christ died for all*.

Up to this point (as we have seen) that controversy between the orthodox and the Pelagians about the death of Christ was not formed or dealt with as it is now debated in our day. For Augustine never opposed as erroneous the proposition, *Christ died for the redemption of the whole hu-*

27. Prosper of Aquitaine, *De Ingratis Contra Pelagionos*, in *Opera*, XIII [pg. 556]. In translation: Prosper of Aquitaine, *Carmen*, XIII [pg. 63].

28. Faustus of Riez, *De Gratia Dei*, I.16. [fol. 26^v]. [Ed. note: The 1650 ed. has the citation: I.17.]

man race; nor did he ever acknowledge or defend, *Christ did not die for all human beings, but only for the predestined*. Let us move on, and we will, from the records of antiquity, dig into the controversies about the death of Christ which arose after the age of Augustine.