

ture and the Fathers in favor of each side, then the conclusion, in which they endeavor to find a way of reconciling the opposite views. On these great theologians, overrated once, underrated now, we would gladly dwell, did our limits permit. Bonaventura, the Seraphic Doctor, (born 1221) handles this subject with great clearness and simplicity. He almost adopts Anselm's theory, and then lets it fall by denying the absolute necessity of satisfaction. God, he says, being omnipotent, might have chosen some other way. But when the reason has seen a thing to be necessary, it is absurd to place above this necessity the abstract notion of an Omnipotence which may make it unnecessary. For in this case, the notion, really uppermost is that of the entire incomprehensibility of God, which of course overthrows every theory founded on a supposed knowledge of his attributes.

The theory of St. Thomas Aquinas, the Angelic Doctor, (born 1224) is chiefly distinguished by its doctrine of "*satisfactio superabundans*." Christ has restored to God *more* than was taken from him by human sin. This surplus became afterward a stock of merit belonging to the church, and was the ground on which it based the right of selling indulgences. In the main Aquinas agrees with Anselm, nevertheless he also gives up the absolute necessity of satisfaction.

Opposite to St. Thomas stands Duns Scotus, (flourished 1300) the Subtle Doctor, whose view directly contradicts that of Anselm. He denies the infinite guilt of sin and the infinite merit of Christ, declaring that guilt and merit take their character from their subject not their object.

He declares that the belief of the infinite character of sin, involves Manicheism. Sin, however, though not in-