

---

---

# ON THE SUBJECT OF THE '*WORD MADE FLESH*'

By Pierre Beaudry, 12/22/17

---

---

## PREFACE

The idea of creativity is one of the oldest ideas in the world, but it is also one of the least understood because the popular view is that creativity comes easily by letting your sense perception loose and engaging your mind in some form of free association. Nothing is further from the truth.

Once you see how John the Apostle and Saint Irenaeus of Lyons demonstrate the full significance of the idea of the "*Word made flesh*," you will discover that if you apply to your intellect the same beryl looking glass of Nicholas of Cusa as "*Word made flesh*," it will glow as the light of the creative process of God's Mind.

However, I must warn you that I have no intention of approaching this difficult biblical text from the religious exegetical standpoint of faith; I intend to approach it from the vantage point of epistemology; that is, from the vantage point of how reason must seek to know the nature of that paradoxical statement as a matterofmind.

## INTRODUCTION

Today, the time has come when the whole of mankind is about to make a discovery of principle of historical proportions; therefore, it is an appropriate time to go back to a crucial moment in history and recall to mind when a similar discovery was made earlier by a few exceptional individuals.



**Figure 1** Fra Angelico: The Cortona Altarpiece (The Annunciation), 1433-34.

When Saint John the Apostle, also known as John the Divine, wrote [\*The Revelation\*](#) for the benefit of the seven dioceses of Western Turkey during the decade of 80's AD, it was to announce that such a historical moment of change had come to change the world. That change was revealed to him through what he termed the "*Word*" of God.

In that revealing document, John reminded the Bishops of Southwest Asia not only about a great religious truth, but also about an epistemological truth concerning the crisis that human beings have to go through when they make a "life or death" discovery of principle about the nature of the creative human mind; that is, the experience of a horrifying hellish state that the mind has to go through in order to survive the ordeal of an axiomatic transformation of the soul.

In such a moment of high density of singularities, one's old dying identity becomes transformed into a new immortal state of existence. Such was the epistemological nature of the process that John relived for us in [\*The Revelation\*](#).

If you think that confessing your sins is enough to open the gates of heaven, think again, and read [\*The Revelation\*](#) to discover that what is required for you to access eternal life is a complete axiomatic transformation, a complete overhaul of your previous life. The key to resolving that state of crisis is to offer yourself for the benefit of mankind as God did when He gave his own Son for the remission of our sins; that is, as the "*Word made flesh.*"

## **1. LYNDON LAROCHE AND THE CONTINUING FIGHT AGAINST GNOSCICISM**

In 1981, Lyndon LaRouche gave a short account on the nature of his political organization with respect to the Catholic Church of Rome. He made the emphatic point of identifying the community of principle that his international organization, the International Caucus of Labor committees (ICLC), had established with respect to the principles of the Catholic Church in a report he



wrote for Executive Intelligence Review dated November 17, 1981. This report, entitled *The Jesuits Charge that LaRouche is 'an agent of the Vatican'*, identified how the most severe problem the Church had to solve after the European Renaissance had been to deal with the corrosive presence of the Venetian controlled Society of Jesus within its ranks. Lyn wrote:

“Contrary to popularized mythology, the Jesuits are neither a part of nor a product of Western Christianity. The Order [of Jesus] was created at Venice during the 16th century, to be the new secret-intelligence arm of the powerful family funds of Venice. Through Venice's control over the Hapsburg Emperor, Charles V, the Hapsburgs conquered and looted Rome in 1527 A.D., and made the Vatican virtually a prisoner of Venetian-Hapsburg policy during much of the period, until the Vatican was freed through the successful defeat of the Hapsburgs in 1653 by the successive work of Cardinals Richelieu and Mazarin.”<sup>1</sup>

Lyn precisely identified the subversion of the Catholic Church as being the specific form of Gnosticism known as the *Delphic method of sophistry* which had been established by the masters of Aristotle under the authority of the ancient secret intelligence service based on the Cult of Apollo at Delphi during the fourth century BC. Lyn specifically identified the source of the internal struggle of the Church in the same way that Raphael had identified the problem in his great Vatican frescoes of *The School of Athens* and the *Dispute of the Holy Sacrament*.<sup>2</sup> Lyn wrote:

“On one side were aligned forces of republicanism, guided jointly by Plato's Academy at Athens, and the Cyrenaic Temple of Amon, the two institutions which cosponsored and guided Alexander the Great. On the opposite side were the Magi of Mesopotamia and the cult of Thebes, with

---

<sup>1</sup> Lyndon LaRouche, *The Jesuits Charge that LaRouche is 'an agent of the Vatican.'* EIR, November 17, 1981, p. 41.

<sup>2</sup> See my reports on Raphael in <http://www.amatterofmind.us/classical-artistic-composition/european-art/plastic-art-book-i/>.

the Delphi Temple of Apollo the principal arm of the Magi (Lucifer-worshippers) in Greece and controlling the Latin city of Rome.”<sup>3</sup>

This is the same Gnostic tradition that the Apostolic Church had to contend with during the first century AD. And, John the Apostle had intended to counter those Aristotelian Gnostics by means of an epistemological doctrine that he called the “**Word made flesh;**” that is, a performative form of verbal action which expressed the creative process in such a manner that he was able to cause a change in the minds of receptive people. This new idea of creativity was based on what John had written about God’s creation of the world:

*“1In the beginning was the Word (λόγος), and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. 2The same was in the beginning with God. 3All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. 4In him was life; and the life was the light of men. 5And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not.”<sup>4</sup>*

I cannot but tremble with a certain amount of awe while reading these words, because I fear that I might not do them justice. Nevertheless, I have chosen to talk about them because of their precious epistemological content. It is clear that these words are not easily understood at first reading; so, I urge the reader to be patient and to read them again, very attentively, because they are worth the effort.

In fact, John had a reason for not making it easy to immediately understand what he meant by the word “**Word.**” He was urging us to think about it because the subject is one of the most profound that there is and our effort will be well rewarded after we have discovered and assimilated what it means. He is talking about the relationship between the creative process of God’s mind and the human mind.

When you read the above statement for the first time, you not only go into a state of perplexity, but you don’t immediately believe what you read. You are stunned by the force of the metaphor. That’s normal and that’s good for you

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibidem, p. 41

<sup>4</sup> [John 1-5](#). King James Bible.

because that is the first necessary step to take in order to understand the creative process of discovery. The next step is that once you have gone over this first difficulty, you have begun to be immune to the fallacies of the Gnostics. And, John knew that his use of the word “**Word**” would have such an effect. So, the first thing you have to inquire is its epistemological meaning. What is the significance of the word “**Word**” for knowledge?

“**Word**” is translated from the very rich Greek term called “**logos**,” which has many different meanings such as word, reason, proportion, foundation, form, decision, resolution, condition, promise, order, dialogue, composition, common sense, relation, and more. “**Logos**” also refers to the verbal action of creating. In that sense, “**Word**” means the power to think creatively, the power to create by means of Divine Reason, and in John’s mind, this term also has a very special function: its intention is to change the false preconceptions the reader has about the idea of divine creativity.

In essence, what John said, he actually accomplished at the same time; that is, he made a perplexing statement of verbal action, and in doing so, he put the reader into an awkward situation of perplexity where his first contact with “who Jesus is” corresponds to His state of being with the Father and the Holy Spirit before the beginning of time, “*The same was in the beginning with God.*” This is not an easy mental exercise for any human mind to grasp and master, because you now have to deal with the Trinity.

However, your state of perplexity has only just begun. Not only does the word “**Word**” have a multifarious variety of meanings, it is also the “**Word made flesh**”; that is, it becomes something, in this case, someone: Christ. Here, John takes you to a higher level of perplexity, because this not only pertains to the birth of Jesus, but it also pertains to the *paradox of Creativity* in the universe: something infinite becomes finite; something perfect becomes imperfect; something immortal becomes mortal. Such an outrageous idea destroys all popular opinions about how God has been conceived up until and since that time.

It is also important to know that John was the Apostle who knew Jesus the best, and he was also, probably with Paul coming as good second, the brightest

mind of the twelve. He knew how to throw the Gnostics back to their own misconstrued fallacies of composition. So, the opening statement of his Epistle is made both to challenge the Christians and to confuse the Gnostics: ***“In the beginning was the Word (λόγος), and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.”***

The deductive logic of the Gnostics takes a real beating on this one because they claim that you can't have it both ways: You can't say that the ***Word is with God*** and that the ***Word is God*** at the same time. It has to be one or the other, as Aristotle would say. You cannot be here and there or in and out at the same time. Indeed, John defies logic and its curve-fitting corsets. How do you solve this paradox? Why did John choose a word which expresses two states of being at the same time? He is ***with God*** as man, and He ***is God*** as Christ.

The notion of “***Word***” is also the closest term that can come to the term “thought,” so why didn't John use the term “***Thought***” instead of “***Word***?” The reason is very likely because the idea of “***Word (λόγος)***” is more material, tangible, communicative, and multifarious than “thought” is, and therefore, “***Word***” can better be used in a dialogue with both the Father and with men.

Moreover, this is the context in which the “***Word made flesh***” must be understood as the actualization of the creative process, because the creative process requires a product. Therefore, when you say something and you do it at the same time, your mind is accomplishing something and is experiencing the creative process of the ***Word made flesh***; it is a communion with God because, as Christ does, you are not only bringing the message, you are the product of the message as well.

This process of the “***Word made flesh***” is also an excellent way to counter the fallacies of the two sides of the false debate between creationists and evolutionists. As Lyn stated in the same paper quoted above:

“Apostolic Christianity, like the Judaism of Philo of Alexandria and the Islam of Ibn Sina's (Avicenna's) Metaphysics, rejects the pagan-cult doctrines of "big bang," or fixed creation. The arguments of Philo of



Alexandria against Aristotle's evil "fixed creation" doctrine are identical with those of Apostolic Christianity. The universe is 'an evolving process of lawfully-ordered continuing creation. This principle of continuing creation, as opposed to the pagan dogma of "fixed creation," is the heart and essence of the Gospel of St. John and of the Nicene doctrine of Christianity.

“Man, although born as an irrational, hedonistic beast, is also born with a divine spark of potentiality which distinguishes the human individual from beasts. This potentiality is man's power to bring his knowledge and practice into ever-more-perfect agreement with the lawful principles of continuing creation: the Logos of the Gospel of St. John and of the Nicene doctrine, or what is known to scientists such as Leibniz as "sufficient reason." The Christian doctrine adds to the Judaic doctrine of the Messiah (e.g., Philo) the assertion of the divinity of Jesus Christ, and the crucial further principle that the Logos flows from Christ consubstantially as it flows from God the Composer of the Universe. Christ expresses for Christians the living God in the form of man born of woman. Christianity as a body of practice is based, therefore, on the principle of *imago vivo Dei*, to develop oneself and one's practice in the image of the living God.”<sup>5</sup>

There is an important lesson to be learned from Lyn here for the purpose of defining the creative principle of artistic composition. With the “*Word made flesh*” John the Apostle is telling us that a creative action has to break not only with deductive logic, but also with public opinion, because for truth to be beautiful it must not be a means of bringing about a transient pleasure by imitating something familiar to you. On the contrary, true artistic function causes a change in the spectator. True art does not seek sympathy, it does not imitate what exists; it always calls on the spectator to reach to a higher level of mental life by having him accept an impossible challenge to his axioms. The true artist must provoke you with something impossible, as John does by identifying the “*Word made flesh*” as

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibidem, p. 36.



being both infinite and finite. How can such a paradox be solved? It can only be done, as Lyn often showed, through a leap into the transfinite.

The lesson, therefore, is that art is not the ability to create in the mind of the viewer the transient pleasure of an emotion that is pleasing. On the contrary, as Schiller established, the true artist creates in the mind of the viewer the unpleasant reality of something truthful about a false underlying assumption whose truth will liberate him from his bad habits. Thus, the artist must speak to the yearning of the spectator and get him to access the highest degree of truth that he can muster. This is how Schiller identified the matter:

“It is not true, as one usually hears the claim made, that the audience degrades art; the artist degrades the audience, and at all times when art degenerated, it fell because of the artists. The audience needs nothing more than receptivity, and this it possesses. It steps before the curtain with an indeterminate yearning, with a manifold capacity. Among the highest of these, it brings an ability, it takes pleasure in what is intelligent and right, and if it once begins to be satisfied with what is bad, it will assuredly cease to demand what is excellent, even when it is provided.”<sup>6</sup>

Similarly, by using the “*Word made flesh*”, John proved that if it is not impossible, it is not worth attempting. Therefore, the irony is that without the “*Word made flesh*” there is no memory of something new that man could invent and build as part of his own monuments without the glory of the “*Word*” of God, because there is no memory of the past which was not already known by God and prophesized by a few divine men who have been mostly misunderstood from the very beginning.

It is not as if one could recollect simply by rediscovering some forgotten prophecy from the past. As an *alpheste*, man has an infinite duty to investigate and discover something of the highest order, because he can never satisfy his thirst for more advanced knowledge.

---

<sup>6</sup> Friedrich Schiller, [\*On the Employment of Chorus in Tragedy\*](#), Schiller Institute, translated by George Gregory, 1993.

The reason for the state of perplexity before the word “**Word**” is because what is to be remembered by time-reversal has been forgotten as a prophecy of the past as opposed to a prophesy of the future. It has been forgotten because access to time-reversal thinking has been denied to humanity, as has been the creative process itself. Remember what the prophecy in *Ecclesiastes* said about time-reversal: “*That which hath been is now; and that which is to be hath already been; and God requireth that which is past.*”<sup>7</sup> Therefore, time-reversal is at the very heart of this creative process in the simultaneity of temporal eternity.

## 2. SAINT JOHN'S 'REVELATION' AND THE FEARS OF THE CREATIVE PROCESS

Unfortunately, [\*The Revelation\*](#) has been interpreted, more often than not, as some sort of conspiracy theory, in which the second coming of Jesus Christ would take place in the midst of nuclear war tribulations at the end of the world. However, it were better to understand the epistemological implications of [\*The Revelation\*](#)'s message as the coming of the end of one's own former sinful mortal life through the tribulations of an axiomatic change.

Think of the prologue of John's [\*The Revelation\*](#) as being like the musical Overture of a great symphonic composition expressing *the revelation of the fears to be overcome in the creative process*.

The book was written by John the Apostle while he was exiled on the Island of Patmos in the Aegean Sea during the late 80 and early 90's AD, and its content was intended as precise message being delivered by the Archbishop of Western Turkey to the seven Bishops of the Seven Dioceses of that region who were fighting against the heresies of the Gnostics that the Roman Emperor was sending against them.

---

<sup>7</sup> [\*Ecclesiastes\*](#), Chapter 3: 6.



**Figure 2** The seven Bishoprics of John the Apostle and the Isle of Patmos where he wrote [\*The Revelation\*](#).

The key to rediscovering John's discovery of principle can be everywhere found in [\*The Revelation\*](#), but most especially by rediscovering the full epistemological significance of John's statement at **3:21** where he wrote: *"To him that overcometh, will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I overcame, and sit with my Father in his throne."*<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Saint John the Apostle, [\*The Revelation\*](#), 3, 21. The King James Bible.

## THE REVELATION OF JOHN THE DIVINE

### *The Argument*

*“It is manifest, that the Holy Ghost would as it were gather into this most excellent book a sum of those prophecies, which were written before, but should be fulfilled after the coming of Christ, adding also such things as should be expedient, as well to forewarn us of the dangers to come, as to admonish us to beware some, and encourage us against others. Herein therefore is lively set forth the Divinity of Christ, and the testimonies of our redemption; what things the Spirit of God allowed in the ministers, and what things he reproveth; the providence of God for his elect, and of their glory and consolation in the day of vengeance, how that the hypocrites which sting like scorpions the members of Christ, shall be destroyed, but the Lamb Christ shall defend them, which bear witness to the truth, who in despite of the beast and Satan will reign over all. The lively description of Antichrist is set forth, whose time and power notwithstanding is limited, and albeit that he is permitted to rage against the elect, yet his power stretched no farther than to the hurt of their bodies; and at length he shall be destroyed by the wrath of God, when as the elect shall give praise to God for the victory; nevertheless for a season God will permit this Antichrist, and strumpet under the color of fair speech and pleasant doctrine to deceive the world; wherefore he advertised the godly (which are but a small portion) to avoid this harlots flatteries, and brags, whose ruin without mercy they shall see, and with the heavenly companies sing continual praises; for the Lamb is married; the Word of God hath gotten the victory; Satan that a long time was united, is now cast with his ministers into the pit of fire to be tormented forever, where as contrariwise the faithful (which are the holy City of Jerusalem, and wife of the Lamb) shall enjoy perpetual glory. Read diligently; judge soberly, and call earnestly to God for the true understanding hereof.”<sup>9</sup>*

---

<sup>9</sup> Saint John the Apostle, [The Revelation](#). Preface. King James Bible.



This great composition has all the earmarks of a symphony dedicated to the immortality of the soul. If such a great work of epistemological insight into the human soul is not what it appears to be, it is because it defies the embarrassments of deductive logic of a proud mind. So, let's leave our deductive reasoning aside and embark on one of mankind's most fascinating adventures.

### 3. JOHN'S AND IRENAEUS'S EPISTEMOLOGY OF THE 'WORD' (LOGOS) AS THE CREATIVE PROCESS

What is a prophecy? Normally, in mystical theology, prophecy means the foreknowledge of some future event. However, prophecy can also be applied to the past, by recollecting something of which there is no memory or whose significance has been hidden from the light of reason since the time when it was revealed. For example, when Saint Paul speaks of prophecy in *1 Corinthians, 14:1* he does not attribute the knowledge only to some future event, but also to some hidden present day mystery which may be attributed to some present condition of the human mind, some current manifestation of inner knowledge which relates to God and not to men. Remember what Paul said:

*“1 Make charity your aim, the spiritual gifts your aspiration; and, by preference, the gift of prophecy. 2 The man who talks in a strange tongue is talking to God, not to men; nobody understands him, he is holding mysterious converse with his own spirit; 3 whereas the prophet speaks to edify, to encourage, to comfort his fellow men.”<sup>10</sup>*

As I shall presently show with Irenaeus of Lyons, the epistemology of the “Word” (λόγος) is a prophecy applied to the past because it is something of which there is no memory since John and Irenaeus pronounced it, or at best, since the early Renaissance when Fra Angelico and Joan of Arc, applied it as I have

---

<sup>10</sup> Saint Paul, 1, [Corinthians 14:1-3](#). New Advent, The Knox Bible.

indicated in my previous report: [FRA ANGELICO, JOAN OF ARC, AND SAINT IRENAEUS.](#)

During the second century AD, Irenaeus wrote extensively on this question in order to counter the fallacies of the Gnostics, and it is very unfortunate that the theologians and the historians of the Church have not seen fit to explain this to the ordinary believer, especially the full epistemological significance of John the Apostle's doctrine of the "*Word made flesh*" as the key to the Christian conception of creativity. Irenaeus was very clear on this matter of God's creative process when he wrote:

*"He created and made all things by His Word, while He neither required angels to assist Him in the production of those things which are made, nor of any power greatly inferior to Himself, and ignorant of the Father, nor of any defect or ignorance, in order that he who should know Him might become man. But He Himself in Himself, after a fashion which we can neither describe nor conceive, predestinating all things, formed them as He pleased, bestowing harmony on all things, and assigning them their own place, and the beginning of their creation. In this way He conferred on spiritual things a spiritual and invisible nature, on super-celestial things a celestial, on angels an angelical, on animals an animal, on beings that swim a nature suited to the water, and on those that live on the land one fitted for the land— on all, in short, a nature suitable to the character of the life assigned them— while He formed all things that were made by His Word that never wearies.*

*"5. For this is a peculiarity of the pre-eminence of God, not to stand in need of other instruments for the creation of those things which are summoned into existence. His own Word is both suitable and sufficient for the formation of all things, even as John, the disciple of the Lord, declares regarding Him: All things were made by Him, and without Him was nothing made. (John 1:3) Now, among all things, our world must be embraced. It too, therefore, was made by His Word, as Scripture tells us in the book of Genesis that He made all things connected with our world by*

*His Word. David also expresses the same truth [when he says] For He spoke, and they were made; He commanded, and they were created. Whom, therefore, shall we believe as to the creation of the world— these heretics who have been mentioned that prate so foolishly and inconsistently on the subject, or the disciples of the Lord, and Moses, who was both a faithful servant of God and a prophet? He at first narrated the formation of the world in these words: In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth, (Genesis 1:1) and all other things in succession; but neither gods nor angels [had any share in the work].”<sup>11</sup>*

What the tenants on both sides of the debate between creationists and evolutionists have not taken under consideration in their respective positions on the question of “Creation,” was the epistemological nature of the question of the creative process itself. This is what Irenaeus emphasizes here in a performative manner of speaking by proposing two measures essentially; one is the fact that the Creator did not require outside help “*His own Word is both suitable and sufficient for the formation of all things*”; and two, He created the universe with such a purpose that the human mind would be able to understand and replicate it; that is, “*He made all things connected with our world by His Word.*”

Firstly, when Irenaeus wrote that “*His own Word is both suitable and sufficient*,” he implied that the “*Word*” contained the principle of sufficient reason and the principle of harmonic proportion, as Leibniz understood it, and that He instilled in the universe as a whole, from the beginning. He did not mean simply that God only had to say something in order to create it. He meant that “*His Word*” caused things to exist by actually performing a principle of action which comes alive inside of individuals when they cause someone else to change; that is, by shaping the principle of their becoming better through change. In that sense, “*His Word*” was a command and an ordering action such that it gave proportion and harmony of unity among opposites, such as power and reason for example. This is the crucial paradox that is expressed by the “*Word made flesh*” which has to be resolved by the human mind. Furthermore, what Irenaeus also meant was that it was impossible for anything that exists not to be created by “*His Word*,” as if the

---

<sup>11</sup> Saint Irenaeus, [Against Heresies](#), Book II, Chapter 2, 4-5.

“**Word**” were the One of the Many; as if the “**Word**” were the unity of all universal differentiation and dissemination which had assigned everything to its proper place throughout the universe.

Secondly, but not in the succession of logical clock-time, the Father used the method of bringing Christ to mankind as a means of showing how man can also be creative through the imitation of Christ. This is the compact between God and man. Such an action of making “*everything connected with our world by His Word,*” implied that the creative process represents a *multiply-connected manifold of universal principles of change* which human reason was able to internalize, understand, and communicate to others in the simultaneity of temporal eternity.

The most important question that Irenaeus raised was the fact that creation was for the first time made intelligible as opposed to magical or mystical. “*His Word has shown that in many modes he may be seen and known.*” The fact that man can know God and that God made that possible is an extraordinary acknowledgment of the human mind created in the Living Image of God. As Irenaeus wrote:

*“There is therefore one God, who by the Word and Wisdom created and arranged all things; but this is the Creator(Demiurge) who has granted this world to the human race, and who, as regards His greatness, is indeed unknown to all who have been made by Him (for no man has searched out His height, either among the ancients who have gone to their rest, or any of those who are now alive); but as regards His love, He is always known through Him by whose means He ordained all things. Now this is His Word, our Lord Jesus Christ, who in the last times was made a man among men, that He might join the end to the beginning, that is, man to God. Wherefore the prophets, receiving the prophetic gift from the same Word, announced His advent according to the flesh, by which the blending and communion of God and man took place according to the good pleasure of the Father, the Word of God foretelling from the beginning that God should be seen by men, and hold converse with them upon earth, should confer with them, and should be*



*present with His own creation, saving it, and becoming capable of being perceived by it, and freeing us from the hands of all that hate us, that is, from every spirit of wickedness; and causing us to serve Him in holiness and righteousness all our days, (Luke 1:71, 75) in order that man, having embraced the Spirit of God, might pass into the glory of the Father.”<sup>12</sup>*

So far, Irenaeus has provided us with the following crucial elements of the Apostolic Christian idea of the creative process: 1) it involves the harmonic ordering of everything in a multiply-connected universe; 2) it involves the transfinite paradox of God becoming man; and 3) it involves human reason which is empowered to know this entire process by time-reversal in the simultaneity of temporal eternity. The revolutionary idea, here, is that man is only capable of knowing God through such a process of creativity; that is, through Christ revealed as the “*Word made flesh*.” But this knowledge can only be true if the sins of others are forgiven. And, that’s the rub.

This last point is possibly the most difficult aspect of this entire process of creativity, because it calls for going into an inversion of what appears to be the opposite of any individual’s personal interest.

*“Why should I forgive the nastiness that my neighbor did to me?”*

The reason is because the system of the creative process doesn’t work without forgiveness. And the irony is that this is part of God’s plan concerning sin and forgiveness. This aspect is the most contradictory idea that Irenaeus exposed with a certain *je ne sais quoi* of ironical tongue in cheek. He wrote that although man had become the enemy of God by “*transgressing his commandment*,” God chose to forgive man. Why did God do that? Irenaeus explained as follows:

*“Now this being is the Creator (Demiurgus), who is, in respect of His love, the Father; but in respect of His power, He is Lord; and in respect of His wisdom, our Maker and Fashioner; by transgressing whose commandment we became His enemies. And therefore in the last times the Lord has restored us into friendship through His incarnation,*

---

<sup>12</sup> Saint Irenaeus, [Against Heresies](#), Book IV, Chapter 20, 4.

*having become the Mediator between God and men; 1 Timothy 2: propitiating indeed for us the Father against whom we had sinned, and cancelling (consolatus) our disobedience by His own obedience; conferring also upon us the gift of communion with, and subjection to, our Maker. For this reason also He has taught us to say in prayer, 'And forgive us our debts;' (Matthew 6:12) since indeed He is our Father, whose debtors we were, having transgressed His commandments. But who is this Being? Is He some unknown one, and a Father who gives no commandment to anyone? Or is He the God who is proclaimed in the Scriptures, to whom we were debtors, having transgressed His commandment?*

*"Now the commandment was given to man by the Word. For Adam, it is said, heard the voice of the Lord God. (Genesis 3:8) Rightly then does His Word say to man, Your sins are forgiven you; (Matthew 9:2; Luke 5:20) He, the same against whom we had sinned in the beginning, grants forgiveness of sins in the end. But if indeed we had disobeyed the command of any other, while it was a different being who said, Your sins are forgiven you; (Matthew 9:2; Luke 5:20) such a one is neither good, nor true, nor just. For how can he be good, who does not give from what belongs to himself? Or how can he be just, who snatches away the goods of another? And in what way can sins be truly remitted, unless that He against whom we have sinned has Himself granted remission through the bowels of mercy of our God, in which He has visited us (Luke 1:78) through His Son?"<sup>13</sup>*

There are a number of difficult ideas here, but in the main, there are two crucial ones. The first one is "*cancelling (consolatus) our disobedience by His own obedience.*" Why should God humiliate Himself before man by replacing our "*disobedience*" by his "*obedience*?" Shouldn't He abide by the law of the fittest and apply an eye for an eye? The only possible explanation for this action is love (*agape*). One can only forgive out of love; no other state of mind and heart can do that. However, there is more than forgiveness here: God forgives by sacrificing his

---

<sup>13</sup> Saint Irenaeus, [Against Heresies](#), Book v, Chapter 17, 1

own son, not only by making him mortal, but by sacrificing his flesh and blood for the remission of man's sins. This takes more than love; it takes courage.

The other difficulty is *“how can he be good, who does not give from what belongs to himself?”* Thus, God demonstrates his goodness by sacrificing His own Son for the remission of man's sins, and therefore: *“how can he be just, who snatches away the goods of another?”* This is an amazing question, because for the first time during Apostolic Christianity, one discovers that creativity is not possible without giving from your own self for the *benefit of the other*, and without expecting anything in return. Indeed, it is only with the Peace of Westphalia of 1648 that Europeans became politically aware and capable of applying this Christian principle of divine goodness for the advantage of their fellow man. And this is precisely the axiomatic change which is required of mankind today. However, such a principle of human conduct can only be assumed as a transfinite function of the *“Word made flesh.”*

#### 4. *“FELIX CULPA!”* BREAKING THE CHAINS OF PROMETHEUS

In the end, the epistemological question arises: How does one go beyond the mental limitations established by the original sin? How can guilt and revenge be transformed into joy? This question is the most difficult of all questions, because it calls for breaking with the historical chains which have held the soul of man down for millennia. So, how could Christ save Prometheus? How can He break the chains of vengeance that Zeus had imposed on Prometheus?

That is the question that all great composers, poets, and artists necessarily must come to grips with if they wish to go beyond the cycle of guilt and vengeance. One can only become truly unbound through redemption, because the principle of all great art is to break the chains of pettiness in man; and that break can only come through companionship with the Holy Spirit.

The historical chains of guilt and vengeance have held man enslaved ever since Cain slew Abel, because the historical underlying assumption has always been that the flesh had to be saved by redemption; otherwise, the human mind would have been incapable of accessing *the transfinite function of the creative mind*. In other words, the function of Christ in history is an expression of the transfinite function embedded in the “*Word made flesh*,” because the geometry of such a transfinite has been already implanted as potential in the human mind from the beginning of God’s creation. Therefore, with the advent of Christ, the time had come when the beginning had to be connected with the end through such an axiomatic transformation of the creative process. Here, I am using the term “*transfinite*” in the sense that Lyndon LaRouche used the term with reference to the “*cardinal powers*” of the “*higher hypothesis*” in his 1994 paper on the creative principle. As Lyn wrote:

“To illustrate the meaning of the term *higher hypothesis*, reference the given list of the four general levels of cardinality (“power”) in mathematics. Looking back across the internal history of mathematics from the vantage-point of Cantor's higher transfinite orderings, the succession of axiomatic-revolutionary changes defining the succession *rational, algebraic, transcendental, Alephs* mathematical types of cardinalities is derivable by a constant method of hypothesis-making. So, in the language of Plato's *Parmenides*, the conception of this type of constant method of hypothesis-making is a *One*, relative to the four *Many* (the four types of cardinalities).”<sup>14</sup>

But how does the One capture the Many? How does the unity of opposites come together? For Lyn, the process of change of numbers as a whole is quadratic; that is, following the quadratic and biquadratic ordering of the theory of numbers as well as Lydian musical intervals of change. Let’s take a look at how Irenaeus formulated this problem. He developed a similar principle of the *higher hypothesis* by means of understanding how the universe as a whole had to be in accordance

---

<sup>14</sup> Lyndon LaRouche, [\*The Creative Principle in Art and Science, The Fraud of Algebraic Causality\*](#), Schiller Institute, October 3, 1994.



with the true nature of divine providence with respect to flesh and blood. You have to read the following statement very slowly and very attentively in order to capture the whole historical breath of its quadratic epistemological significance. Irenaeus wrote:

*“Unless the flesh were to be saved, the Word would not have taken upon Him flesh of the same substance as ours: from this it would follow that neither should we have been reconciled by Him.*

*“1. And inasmuch as the apostle has not pronounced against the very substance of flesh and blood, that it cannot inherit the kingdom of God, the same apostle has everywhere adopted the term ‘flesh and blood’ with regard to the Lord Jesus Christ, partly indeed to establish His human nature (for He did Himself speak of Himself as the Son of man), and partly that He might confirm the salvation of our flesh. For if the flesh were not in a position to be saved, the Word of God would in no wise have become flesh. And if the blood of the righteous were not to be inquired after, the Lord would certainly not have had blood [in His composition]. But inasmuch as blood cries out (vocalis est) from the beginning [of the world], God said to Cain, when he had slain his brother, ‘The voice of your brother's blood cries to Me’. (Genesis 4:10) And as their blood will be inquired after, He said to those with Noah, ‘For your blood of your souls will I require, [even] from the hand of all beasts’; and again, ‘Whosoever will shed man's blood, it shall be shed for His blood’. In like manner, too, did the Lord say to those who should afterwards shed His blood, ‘All righteous blood shall be required which is shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zacharias the son of Barachias, whom you slew between the temple and the altar. Verily I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this generation.’ He thus points out the recapitulation that should take place in his own person of the effusion of blood from the beginning, of all the righteous men and of the prophets, and that by means of Himself there should be a requisition of their blood. Now this [blood] could not be required unless it also had the capability of being saved; nor would*

*the Lord have summed up these things in Himself, unless He had Himself been made flesh and blood after the way of the original formation [of man], saving in His own person at the end that which had in the beginning perished in Adam.”<sup>15</sup>*

How does one escape the interminable vengeance cycle of this bloodletting geometry? How, for instance, does one go beyond geopolitics? The answer can be found in the *Exultet* proclamation of the Easter Vigil service which reveals the pathway: ***“O truly necessary sin of Adam, which the death of Christ has blotted out! O Happy Fault that merited such and so Great a Redeemer!”<sup>16</sup>*** In other words, if the world had not been in need of being changed, it would not have required ***“you”*** to change it by means of a creative form of your own mental resources from a *higher hypothesis*. This is why ***what must come to be requires that we think about what might not have been.***

When Saint Augustine looked at the fall of man and the source of the original sin, he discovered that evil did not exist in and of itself; he discovered that evil had to come from the lack of good: ***“For God judged it better to bring good out of evil rather than to permit any evil to exist.”<sup>17</sup>*** And, that’s the key to understanding the conclusion of Irenaeus. What is fortunate about the fall of Adam is not in the fault itself but in its outcome.

Therefore, Irenaeus emphasized the ***“recapitulation”*** of the inversion of Adam into Christ. Indeed, is there a better way to restore man’s fault to the glory of God than by going through such an excellent axiom busting process of redemption time-reversal? As the teacher of Saint Augustine, Saint Ambrose said:

***“O Lord Jesus, I am more a debtor to your outrages for my redemption than to your power in my creation. It would have been useless for us to have been born if we had gone without the benefit of being redeemed.”<sup>18</sup>***

---

<sup>15</sup> Saint Irenaeus, [\*Against Heresies\*](#), Book V, Chapter 14, 1.

<sup>16</sup> ***O Happy Fault!***

<sup>17</sup> Saint Augustin, [\*Handbook on Faith, Hope, and Love\*](#), VII, 420 AD.

<sup>18</sup> Saint Ambrose, [\*In Lucam II, 41\*](#).

And then, he added:

*“I thank the Lord our God who created such a marvelous work in which to find his rest. He created the heavens, and I do not read that he rested; he created the earth, and I do not read that he rested; he created the sun, the moon, the stars, and I do not read that even then he rested; but I read that he created man and that at this point he rested, having a being whose sins he could forgive”<sup>19</sup>*

**FIN**

---

<sup>19</sup> Saint Ambrose, [Hexameron, IX 76](#). Quoted by Milanese Archbishop, Cardinal Giacomo Biffi in [The Manifold Wisdom of God](#). Biffi added this very beautiful insight: “As can be seen, according to Ambrose, God creates the universe for man, and creates man in order to be merciful. It cannot be said that he creates man as a sinner or in order that he should sin; but it must certainly be said that the ultimate rest of Christ in his redemptive death and manifestation of divine mercy represent the ultimate and highest meaning of creation.”