
SAINT IRENAEUS OF LYON'S DOCTRINE OF 'RECAPITULATION'

"Then I shall know fully, even as I have been fully known." Saint Paul

By Pierre Beaudry, 1/6/18

FOREWORD

How do you know how your own mind works? The best way to know your own mind is to know how God knows you.

But, how can you know that? And, once you've discovered that higher knowledge, how do you know whether it is true or not?

This is not a matter of religion; this is a matter of epistemological investigation into the difference between the *theology of God* and the *theology of man*; that is to say, the *theology of Promethean Christians*.

Although this process of investigation into the divinity of man is no longer advocated by Christian Churches, it was nevertheless a common practice at the time of the Apostles and was extensively developed by Saint Irenaeus of Lyon in his doctrine of "*recapitulation*."¹

¹ Fortunately, there exists a geometrical form of *analysis situs* which corresponds to this process of "*recapitulation*," which I wrote about, eight years ago, under the name of "inferential knowledge." The epistemological and geometrical construction for that kind of knowledge can be found in my report: [FUSION POWER IS NOT DEMOCRATIC](#).

INTRODUCTION

“The Glory of God is a Man Fully Alive”² is one of the most intriguing statements of Saint Irenaeus of Lyon, and if you Google it, you will find all sorts of different interpretations of its meaning. The statement also has the misleading meaning of man living to the maximum in the most diversified manner.

Some have taken the Latin translation of the lost Greek original to say more succinctly: ***“The Glory of God is a living man.”*** This translation may be less provocative than the first, however, it is nevertheless also questionable, because it somewhat reduces the meaning to suggest that man is the best creature that God has created.

In fact, neither of these meanings renders properly what Irenaeus meant because the phrase is incomplete. If you take the time to ponder on the complete sentence and on the epistemological significance of the idea underlying it, you will realize that it is an axiom buster of the highest order; it is actually a call to a paradigm shift. The complete sentence is the following:

“For the glory of God is a living human being; and the life of the human consists in beholding God. For if the manifestation of God which is made by means of the creation, affords life to all living on the Earth, much more does that revelation of the Father which comes through the Word, give life to those who see God.”³

What precedes this statement is:

“2. This, therefore, was the [object of the] long-suffering of God, that man, passing through all things, and acquiring the knowledge of

² Father Robert Barron, [The Glory of God is a Human Being ‘Fully Alive’](#)

³ Saint Irenaeus, [Against Heresies](#), IV, 20:7.

*moral discipline, then attaining to the resurrection from the dead, and learning by experience what is the source of his deliverance, may always live in a state of gratitude to the Lord, having obtained from Him the gift of incorruptibility, that he might love Him the more; 'for he to whom more is forgiven, loves more:' (Luke 7:43) and that he may know himself, how mortal and weak he is; while he also understands respecting God, that He is immortal and powerful to such a degree as to confer immortality upon what is mortal, and eternity upon what is temporal; and may understand also the other attributes of God displayed towards himself, by means of which being instructed he may think of God in accordance with the divine greatness. For the glory of man [is] God, but [his] works [are the glory] of God; and the receptacle of all His wisdom and power [is] man.'*⁴

The "*Glory of God*," states Irenaeus, is to be found in God's love for fallen man and in His ability to restore the dignity of man and to deify him; that is to say, by projecting into the minds of human beings the divine power of the creative process of the *Word*. This is what has been called the doctrine of "*recapitulation*."

Thus, Christ recapitulates human history by time reversal through restoring what had been lost since Adam and Eve, and by giving mankind a new lease on life. This may also be what John the Apostle meant when he reported Jesus saying: "*I have come that they may have life, and have it to the full.*"⁵

1. LAROCHE AND RAPHAEL ON THE IDEA OF THE TRANSFINITE

"And there, we understand our immortality. When we generate, and transmit, discoveries of principle, to our children, to those who come later, we live forever in the history of mankind. Our mortal existence is no longer a matter of a beginning and an end: Our mortal existence is a place in eternity, from

⁴ Saint Irenaeus, [Against Heresies](#), III, 20: 2

⁵ Saint John, 10:10 [New International Version](#).

which we radiate the experience of generations before us, and radiate our existence into the future. We become the immortal children of the Creator of the universe.” Lyndon LaRouche, [How To Reconstruct A Bankrupt World](#), EIR, December 27, 2002.

It is obvious to me that God should be dependent on human fulfillment, because it is clear that the Creator depends entirely on realizing his plan for the whole of creation. And, since that plan is not yet completed, it is our job to see to it that it is. However, since God is perfect, He does not need to complete the work Himself; whatever remains incomplete must be done by human beings and not by God.

Therefore, *“The Glory of God is a Man Fully Alive”* announces the necessity of a paradigm-shift whereby God is counting on man to become like Him, because His plan depends on human creative actions and demands that man accomplish divine work. The nature of man is such that he can know God and participate in His Glory, because he has been created with the fire of the infinite inside of him. Thus, God is giving man access to Him through the transfinite power of his finite mind, because man and God are related to each other through what Plato's theology might have termed the *hypothesis of the higher hypothesis*. As Lyn wrote in his report on Cantor's idea of transfinite:

“Briefly: Cantor himself insists that his science and theology center around two crucial points of equivalence between his own work on the transfinite and Plato's principle of hypothesis. His opinion on these parallels is broadly correct. Cantor insists that his general notion of the Transfinite is equivalent to Plato's Becoming, and that his own Absolute corresponds to Plato's Good. By Becoming is signified Plato's generalized notion of what Plato terms hypothesizing the higher hypothesis. Obviously, to follow the argument in Cantor's letters (or, elsewhere, for that matter) one must first understand what is signified by Plato's principle of hypothesis.

“For the purposes of formal criticism, especially formal mathematics or mathematical physics, Plato’s principle of hypothesis is best presented in terms of his Parmenides: the ontological paradox of the One and the Many. His solution for that paradox is the formal definition of human creativity, as valid axiomatic revolutions in formal mathematical physics typify creativity, in the sense of Cantor’s definition of type. In Plato, the term hypothesis signifies such a type of discovery, and never anything different. Briefly, work through an illustration of Plato’s discovery of the principle of hypothesis.”⁶

Thus, LaRouche’s view of Cantor and of Plato leads us to understand what Irenaeus means by “*fully alive;*” that is, to be fully free to develop mankind’s power of mind with respect to divine creativity. For LaRouche as for Irenaeus, freedom does not mean freedom to do whatever you wish; it means freedom to seek and discover the least action means which will permit man to improve his species in the future. How do you do that? Irenaeus answers: “*By the revelation of the Word through creation.*” Let us see how Raphael applied that same principle in artistic composition. (Figure 1)

Raphael’s *Transfiguration* illustrates the principal components required for an axiomatic change; that is, the difference that Lyn demonstrates in the passage from the finite to the transfinite. Perhaps no other painting in history can better express the unity of Irenaeus’s idea of the “*Glory of God*” on the one side, and that of “*Man fully alive*” on the other.

Noticeably, the painting has three distinct narratives representing three different states of mind: 1) the radiant Christ in the presence of Elijah and Moses blinding Peter, James, and John in the upper part, and being observed by two martyrs, Felix and Agapit; 2) nine apostles in the lower left section, including John and Peter added one more time, attempting without success to bring succor to a boy who has been possessed; and 3) the possessed boy’s family and friends attempting to obtain a miracle from the Apostles to save the boy. How can these

⁶ Lyndon LaRouche, [Georg Cantor: The Next Century](#), Schiller Institute, July 30, 1994.

three different states relate to Irenaeus's "*recapitulation*"? How does the *Transfiguration* express Plato's ontological paradox of the One and the Many?



Figure 1 Raphael, *The Transfiguration*, 1518-20. Pinacoteca Vaticana.

Art historian Giorgio Vasari described this painting as Raphael's "most beautiful and most divine work" and he identified the kneeling figure in the foreground as "the principal figure." Why? How can the only figure which is not part of any of the three groups be the most important figure of all? That figure is an anomaly because it is the only one who reflects the idea of "*recapitulation*," by being at the same time finite and infinite. And that is the reason why Raphael highlighted her and the possessed boy in a special light, because she is the key to the transfinite triply-connected action of the entire work: she is the singularity which plays the critical role of the spectator inside of the composition.

In fact, the kneeling figure represents the "*connection*" between the mortal condition of man below and the immortal level of Christ above the other two groups. She also establishes the "*connection*" between the nine incapacitated



apostles on the left and the anguished family group on the right. The spiral action of her body-language suggests that she represents the principle of change in the painting. Author Maaïke Dirx, had a beautiful insight into the singular role of this kneeling figure:

"To the 16th century viewer of the altarpiece the importance of her role would have been apparent: her beauty suggests that she represents the manifestation on earth of the radiant Christ seen in the upper register. She thereby emphasizes the message that the Apostles fail to see the sick boy as a test of their faith, which prevents them from being able to heal him."⁷

Figure 2 Raphael's study of Saint Peter and

⁷ Maaïke Dirx, [A Raphael study for the Transfiguration in the Rijksmuseum](#), April 6, 2014.

Saint John for *The Transfiguration*.

The point that Raphael makes is that the incapacitated state of perplexity amongst the nine Apostles in the face of the “*Glory of God*” is precisely the subject of the creative process that Irenaeus identified in his writings on “*recapitulation*.” Raphael’s *Transfiguration* expresses the epistemological content of that idea because it forces the spectator to become the subject of the transformation of what is being represented. The spectator is forced to recapitulate the scene onto himself. And what is being recapitulated is the very nature of the axiomatic transformation that human beings must make if they wish to access the higher requirements of being truly human and made in the image of God.

As **Figure 2** shows, the most appropriate human response to such a state of mind is perfectly reflected in Raphael’s depiction of the compassionate attitude of Peter and of John’s perplexed reaction. Both faces seem to be saying: “*We believe, but we don’t understand.*”

Raphael replicated the appropriate emotion of perplexity regarding the higher hypothesis of this masterpiece. Nothing is missing in the interactive mixture of the inquiries the faces express between despair and hope, and where the kneeling figure facing the entire scene forces the spectator to internalize and investigate her specific function as if she was his mirror image, seeing himself from behind himself through her. Is it any wonder that some consider this painting to be the supreme masterpiece of artistic composition of the entirety of the Italian Renaissance? (See my report: [**RAPHAEL, THE CATENARY-TRACTRIX PRINCIPLE OF THE TRANSFIGURATION.**](#))

You ask: Why all of this tumultuous activity? It is because belief does not know how to find understanding; and because understanding has been misled. Behind Raphael’s *Transfiguration*, there is a profound epistemological underlying assumption which needs to come out of the shadows of sense perception and be put before the light of reason. The problem is to figure out how to deal appropriately with the turmoil of the tragic; and the missing ingredient is the “*understanding*” part. It is as if Raphael were quoting Saint Anselm saying: “*But I yearn to*

understand some measure of Your truth, which my heart believes and loves. For I do not seek to understand in order to believe, but I believe in order to understand. For I believe even this: that unless I believe, I shall not understand.”⁸

In Saint Paul's language, God's highest Glory lies in the creative power of man's ability to “*know even as I am known*;” however, this can only be achieved as if the truth was made intelligible “*through a glass, darkly*.”⁹ Such is the dynamic of the creative process of seeing the *Word* of God in its truthful dimensionality as the upper reach of a transfiguration of the human mind; which is, *in Imago Vivo Dei*.

2. THE HISTORICAL SOURCE OF THE DOCTRINE OF 'RECAPITULATION'

In fact, there is no way to be fully human unless it is by knowing how God the Creator knows us and loves us. At this point, it is essential to go back to the beginning of Christianity and locate where some historians have made a wrong turn; in fact, a turn for the worst.

The little known Christian doctrine called the “*recapitulation theory of atonement*,”¹⁰ has come down to us from the Apostles, but was interpreted in different biased ways throughout history. The best way this doctrine was characterized was by what the Christian Orthodox faith called *theosis*;¹¹ that is, “*divinization of man*” or “*deification of man*.” This is not a theoretical doctrine, but a practical doctrine of man becoming God-like in the same proportion that God became man-like through the *Word made flesh*. This is the paradox that Raphael identifies in the *Transfiguration*.

⁸ Anselm, [*Proslogion*](#), translated by Jasper Hopkins, chapter 1, p. 93.

⁹ Saint Paul, [*I Corinthians*](#), 13:12

¹⁰ [Recapitulation theory of atonement.](#)

¹¹ [*Theosis*](#) (Eastern Christian theology).

Historically, the doctrine of “*recapitulation*” has been expressed as a transformative religious process by means of a *catharsis* purification of both mind and body which can lead one to become mystically united with God. However, what is missing in this practice is the epistemological transformation process of the human mind becoming God-like by means of axiomatic changes, especially as expressed through the performative practice of artistic composition. The form of the Eastern Orthodox religious practice of union with God is probably the most advanced practice, but it is based exclusively on direct spiritual insights of an illumination rather than by the power of human reason.

In the West, the idea of “*recapitulation*” has been kept away from the flock and was generally understood to mean that Christ, the shepherd, is the only one who succeeds in becoming the One of the Many, while Adam and his descendents fail. Such a biased view led to the aristocratic excesses of the Roman Church during the Middle Ages and produced the historical backlash of the Reformation, which put the onus more on the failure of Adam rather than on the time reversal victory of Christ. It is this epistemological dichotomy between faith and reason in the human mind and soul that Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa attempted to correct when he brought together the Eastern and the Western Churches at the Council of Florence during the 1438-45 period.

During the quattrocento, in spite of the fact that the Augustinian Mendicant Orders and Joan of Arc brought about the appropriate correction by addressing the problem directly to the Triumphant Church, the Militant Church of Rome never accepted such a daring action on the part of human reason.¹² The Church required

¹² See Gabriel Hanotaux, *Jeanne D’Arc*, Hachette, Paris 1911, p. 237. « The fourth real mystery lies in the fact that a religious tribunal actually condemned such a woman. A cardinal and two future cardinals, eleven bishops or who became such later, ten Abbots, more than two hundred, perhaps more than three hundred priests, doctors, masters, with and without title, mitred or not, all, according to their favorite expression, ‘solemn clerics;’ an illustrious body, revered as the light of Christendom: the University of Paris. There was another considerable body in the Normandy province, the Chapter of Rouen. In a word, there were a great number of men of the cloth, above suspicion and without disrepute, most of whom living discrete and honorable lives, who more or less agreed with the guilty verdict. According to their own words, they represented the ‘Militant Church,’ and they condemned Joan because she claimed to hear, directly from heaven, commands from the ‘Triumphant Church.’” (Translated by Pierre Beaudry)

over fifty Popes and more than six centuries to reform itself, and it has still not done so.

Since it was the pessimistic view of “*recapitulation*” which gained prominence in Western Europe, especially under the Scholastic Aristotelian rationalizations of the Dominicans and of Thomas Aquinas, the optimistic Platonic, Irenaeanian, and Augustinian view of “*recapitulation*” reflecting the creative process never got a chance to take complete hold.

Thus, *to love as I am being loved and to know as I am also known* was never connected in practice to the “*recapitulation*” doctrine as the axiomatic transformation of the human mind. Now, finally, the time has come when “*recapitulation*” has to be restored properly in the minds of men in order to put an end to religious wars and geopolitics.

Therefore, we must return to the original source. The idea of “*recapitulation*” originally comes from Saint Paul where he said: “... *that in the dispensation of the fullness of times He might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in Him.*” (*Ephesians*, 1:10)

Saint Maximus the Confessor later added to this: “*A sure warrant for looking forward with hope to deification of human nature is provided by the Incarnation of God, which makes man God to the same degree as God Himself became man For it is clear that He Who became man without sin (cf. Heb. 4:15) will divinize human nature without changing it into the Divine Nature, and will raise it up for His Own sake to the same degree as He lowered Himself for man's sake.*”¹³ Reflect this idea into the mirror of Leibniz's principle of proportionality between reason and power.¹⁴

¹³ [*The Philokalia*](#), Vol 2, p. 178.

¹⁴ Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, [*On the Establishment of a Society in Germany For the Promotion of the Arts and Sciences*](#), The Schiller Institute, reprinted from the Spring 1992 issue of FIDELIO Magazine. “All beauty consists in a harmony and proportion; the beauty of minds, or of creatures who possess reason, is a proportion between reason and power, which in this life is also the foundation of the justice, the order, and the merits and even the form of the Republic, that each may understand of what he is capable, and be capable of as much as he understands. If power is greater than reason, then the one who has that is either a simple sheep (in the case where he does not know how to

I am using the term “*recapitulation*” following the original idea that Irenaeus took from Paul and from Justin who said: “*But because the only-begotten Son came to us from the one God, who both made this world and formed us, and contains and administers all things, summing up His own handiwork in Himself, my faith towards Him is steadfast, and my love to the Father immoveable, God bestowing both upon us.*”¹⁵

This reference gives a much more complete view of Saint Paul’s idea of “*recapitulation*” as being the work of Christ in solidarity with human beings in order to make humanity divine; that is, such that Christ might “*...become what we are, that He might bring us to be even what He is Himself.*”¹⁶

Therefore, if the “*Glory of God*” means that human beings use their creative minds to make Christ and his Father the Creator known to all of mankind as the compassionate force of Redemption, how much greater will the “*Glory of God*” be served, when the whole of mankind is transfigured into becoming known as having such a power? How can man complete this historical reconversion or “*recapitulation*”? The answer to these questions can be found in *Ecclesiastes* (*Qoheleth*: book of gathering) which states at the opening, throughout, and at the end:

“I have seen all the works that are done under the sun; and, behold, all [is] vanity and vexation of spirit.”¹⁷

At first glance, this may sound unwelcoming, but the point that this book of the Old Testament makes is that any search for the highest knowledge of God and of Creation is vain and of no profit whatsoever. That is true, and in this regard, the comment of the Conference of Catholic Bishops states quite appropriately:

use his power), or a wolf and a tyrant (in the case where he does not know how to use it well). If reason is greater than power, then he who has that is to be regarded as oppressed. Both are useless, indeed even harmful. If, then, the beauty of the mind lies in the proportionality between reason and power, then the beauty of the complete and infinite mind consists in an infinity of power as well as wisdom, and consequently the love of God, the highest good, consists in the incredible joy which one (even now present, without the beatific vision) draws out of the contemplation of that beauty or proportion which is the infinity of omnipotence and omniscience.”

¹⁵ Saint Irenaeus, [Against Heresies](#), IV, 6:2.

¹⁶ Saint Irenaeus, [Against Heresies](#), V, Preface.

¹⁷ [Ecclesiastes, 1:15](#)

“The book’s honest and blunt appraisal of the human condition provides a healthy corrective to the occasionally excessive self-assurance of other wisdom writers. Its radical skepticism is somewhat tempered by the resigned conclusions to rejoice in whatever gifts God may give (2:24; 3:12–13, 22; 5:17–18; 8:15; 9:7–9; 11:9).¹⁸

Does that mean that such a search is futile and foolish? No. Does it mean that man cannot influence anything, change anything, because he cannot fully understand anything? No. Is there a way to ask these questions without falling into the trap of vanity? Yes: How can I know as I am also known?

The whole matter lies in how to understand the historical question of the “*recapitulation*” of Adam as an attempt to conceive something that is eternal with that which is temporal, something that is infinite with something that is finite, something that is sinful with something that is redeemable.

In October of 1986, during his third pilgrimage to France, Pope John Paul II went to the city of Lyon in order to give an address on the theology of Saint Irenaeus to the Academic Community of the Catholic University of Lyon. The Pope stressed the importance of Irenaeus’s “*theology of man,*” and more specifically, the importance of his doctrine of the harmony between the divine and the human. It is unfortunate that what John Paul said there was not disseminated more broadly.

Pope John Paul II stressed the fact that in his conception of the “*recapitulation*” of Adam, Irenaeus not merely emphasized divine theology, but also human theology. John Paul stated: “*Irenaeus has been at the same time the theologian of God and of man.*”¹⁹ This is an amazing statement coming from a Pope. How can there be a theology of man? Isn’t that an impossible contradiction?

The God of Irenaeus is not only the God of the Old and the New Testaments; it is also the God of whoever internalizes “*how he is known,*” and in doing so,

¹⁸ *Ibidem.*

¹⁹ Mons. Philippe Delhaye, [POPE JOHN PAUL ON THE CONTEMPORARY IMPORTANCE OF ST IRENAEUS](#). Bishop Delhaye is the Secretary General of the International Theological Commission. See Saint Irenaeus, IV, 34, 5-7

“*recapitulates*” the past not as it was, but as it should have been promoting the *divinization of mankind*. In other words, to “*know as I am known*” is to change the past for the improvement of mankind in the future. Pay close attention to how Irenaeus stated this imperative in the Preface of Book V:

*“It will be incumbent upon you, however, and all who may happen to read this writing, to peruse with great attention what I have already said, that you may obtain knowledge of the subjects against which I am contending. For it is thus that you will both controvert them in a legitimate manner, and will be prepared to receive the proofs brought forward against them, casting away their doctrines as filth by means of the celestial faith; but following the only true and steadfast Teacher, the Word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, who did, through His transcendent love, become what we are, that He might bring us to be even what He is Himself.”*²⁰

There you have, in essence, the substantific marrow of axiomatic transformation that Irenaeus emphasized as the method of “*recapitulation*” of all that was untrue in the past as the pathway of restoring the truth of the divine nature of the human mind in the future. The epistemological nature of this process of time reversal is vital for the future of humanity as a whole, because it is the mental principle by means of which a world-wide win-win policy may be achieved in the immediate future ahead and thus change the past forever.

In other words, what is at issue here is not an exclusive religious matter pertaining to a particular faith, and which is to be addressed only to a happy few, but it is an *all-inclusive matter of the divine power of human reason to be made accessible to all human beings*. The time has come, therefore, to recapitulate and restore past humanity to the creative potential of a new human being, and such a new human being will not appear as a religious person, but as a person who is a creative gold-mind for the benefit of all of mankind. The point is to seek and to discover how such “*recapitulation*” works from the vantage point of human epistemology as different from any one religious or imperial ideology.

²⁰ Saint Irenaeus, [Against Heresies](#), V.

Firstly, consider that the “*recapitulation*” that Irenaeus refers to is the epistemological function of Plato’s *One and the Many*; that is, where man is capable of understanding how:

“All things were made by Him; and without Him was not any thing made that was made... He created and made all things by His Word... He formed all things that were made by His Word that never wearies... His own Word is both suitable and sufficient for the formation of all things... He made all things connected with our world by His Word... 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... That the Lord then was manifestly coming to His own things... To gather up into one all things” in Himself... The seed of the Father of all, that is, the Spirit of God, through whom all things were made, mingled and united with flesh, that is, His plasma (formation')... etc”²¹

Secondly, “*recapitulation*” is a time-reversal function of changing the past prophetically into what should have been known and which, from this moment on, must live eternally in the future of mankind. Although it has lived as a doctrine for the selected few up until now, it will from now on, live as a prophecy of what is no longer forgotten, as it will no longer be closed to the future memory of mankind.

As I have emphasized in my last two reports [ON THE SUBJECT OF THE ‘WORD MADE FLESH’](#) and [FRA ANGELICO, JOAN OF ARC, AND SAINT IRENAEUS](#), the pathway of the “*recapitulation*” of Adam is the pathway of “*divinization*” of human progress in the Image of God. The truth of that process of development of mankind is the heart of the restoration of the creative work of God inside of the human mind. So, what is this *theology of man* that John Paul II is referring to?

In accordance with the Old Testament, the doctrine of the “*recapitulation*” takes us back to *Ecclesiastes* around the third century BC, when the Jewish people

²¹ Saint Irenaeus, [Against Heresies](#). Book V, Preface.

cried out to heaven to be saved from the oppressive domination of the Greek kings of Egypt. As the Catholic Bishops report informs us on that point:

*“These kings were highly efficient in their ruthless exploitation of the land and people (4:1; 5:7). The average Jew would have felt a sense of powerlessness and inability to change things for the better. For Qoheleth, God seems remote and uncommunicative, and we cannot hope to understand, much less influence, God’s activity in the world.”*²²

In the New Testament, however, the doctrine of the “*recapitulation*” of human history takes us back to Saint Paul. After that, the doctrine was elaborated extensively by Saint Irenaeus.²³

Twelve centuries later, Fra Angelico and Joan of Arc made the point of restoring the doctrine of the “*recapitulation*” of Adam and Eve in politics as well as in artistic composition. Then, two years after the martyrdom of Joan of Arc, in 1433, Nicholas of Cusa referenced the doctrine of Irenaeus in *Concordancia Catholica*,²⁴ in a letter of Saint Ambrose. However, to my knowledge, Cusa did not elaborate any further. Lastly, Raphael demonstrated how “*recapitulation*” can be uniquely replicated in his *Transfiguration*. Then nothing for centuries, until the great Johannes Brahms transformed this matterofmind into music.

3. JOHANNES BRAHMS ON THE ‘RECAPITULATION’

²² [THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES](#), 3:11; 8:16–17.

²³ Note how it was internalized by Fra Angelico in all of his *Annunciations*: “And thus also it was that the knot of Eve’s disobedience was loosed by the obedience of Mary. For what the virgin Eve had bound fast through unbelief, this did the Virgin Mary set free through faith.” [Against Heresies](#), III, 22, 4. “And if the former disobey God, yet the latter was persuaded to be obedient to God, in order that the Virgin Mary might become the patroness of the virgin Eve. And thus, as the human race fell into bondage to death by means of a virgin, so it is rescued by a virgin; virginal disobedience having been balanced in the opposite scale by virginal obedience.” [Against Heresies](#), V, 19. 1.

²⁴ Nicholas of Cusa, *The Catholic Concordance*, Cambridge University Press, 1995, p. 6. “Eve signifies the Church, because she is the mother of all the living; Adam signifies Christ; their marriage is a spiritual union. Christ is the head of the woman, and the woman, that is the Church, is formed from the side of the man and is flesh of his flesh.”

Not surprisingly, it is the Old Testament prophecy in *Ecclesiastes* which best prepares the human mind to investigate this question of “*recapitulation*,” when it is read in light of the creative process of God. “*That which hath been is now; and that which is to be hath already been; and God requireth that which is past.*”²⁵ How do you make this connection with the “*recapitulation*” of Adam?

How does the “*recapitulation*” of Adam work as a function of time reversal in the simultaneity of temporal eternity? That’s the question. Throughout *Ecclesiastes*, the Preacher keeps telling the reader that there is nothing *new* under the Sun because everything that has been created “*returns*” to its original point of departure in order to assume a new beginning. In other words, there is no difference between cyclical time reversal and circular action. Everything is renewed through the cycle of change, and the key to “*recapitulation*” lies in that cycle of change: “*All rivers run into the sea; yet the sea [is] not full; unto the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return again.*”²⁶ Imagine a container in which you pour water continuously, but without ever filling it.

The important aspect of this process, from the vantage point of epistemology, is to discover that the mind is in a process of continuous cyclical change and no attempt to change that will ever succeed. The point, here, is to discover the axiomatic means of coping with such a change. In other words, the first thing to do is to solve the state of perplexity that every human being finds himself confronted with when he comes under the worst evil possible at the hands of other human beings. How can that be accepted? How can this be changed? As the Ecclesiastesor states: “*because the work that is wrought under the sun is grievous unto me: for all [is] vanity and vexation of spirit.*”²⁷

How do you solve this predicament and supersede the vexation that the Ecclesiastesor is talking about? How do you go from the tragic to the sublime? The way to do it is by assuming the role of “*recapitulator*” of the *Ecclesiastes cycle*; and an excellent way to understand how this works is by listening very attentively

²⁵ [Ecclesiastes](#) 3:15.

²⁶ [Ecclesiastes](#) 1: 7.

²⁷ [Ecclesiastes](#) 2: 17

to the musical performance of the song cycle *Vier Ernste Gesänge* ([Four Serious Songs](#)) Opus 121 by Johannes Brahms.²⁸

The beauty of this musical illustration of the “*recapitulation*” is that it puts you through the crisis to be solved at the same time that it makes you discover the principle of *axiomatic change by time reversal* required to solve it. The entire process has four important steps through which the listener must hear with his mind and heart rather than with his ears. For purpose of identification, the four steps are as follows:

1. *Denn es gehet dem Menschen ...* ¹⁹ *For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no preeminence above a beast: for all is vanity.* ²⁰ *All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again.* ²¹ *Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?* ²² *Wherefore I perceive that there is nothing better, than that a man should rejoice in his own works; for that is his portion: for who shall bring him to see what shall be after him?”* ([Ecclesiastes 3:19–22](#))

2. *“Ich wandte mich, und sahe an ...* ¹ *So I returned, and considered all the oppressions that are done under the sun: and behold the tears of such as were oppressed, and they had no comforter; and on the side of their oppressors there was power; but they had no comforter.* ² *Wherefore I praised the dead which are already dead more than the living which are yet alive.* ³ *Yea, better is he than both they, which hath not yet been, who hath not seen the evil work that is done under the sun.”* ([Ecclesiastes 4:1–3](#))

3. *O Tod, wie bitter bist du ...* ¹ *O death, how bitter is the remembrance of thee to a man that liveth at rest in his possessions, unto the man that hath nothing to vex him, and that hath prosperity in all things: yea, unto him that is yet able to receive meat!* ² *O death, acceptable is thy sentence unto the needy, and unto him whose strength faileth, that is now in the last age, and is vexed with all things, and to him that despaireth, and hath lost patience!”* ([Sirach 41:1–2](#))

²⁸ [3/4 - Anderson sings Brahms - O Tod, wie bitter bist du.](#)

4. *“Wenn ich mit Menschen ... ^d Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. ² And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. ³ And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.[...] ¹² For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known. ¹³ And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity.”* ([1 Corinthians 13:1–3, 12–13](#))

Brahms's references to *Ecclesiastes*, *Sirach*, and to *Corinthians* are exemplary of the necessary steps to be taken in order to successfully go through an axiomatic change with a classical artistic composition. The process, however, is not sensual, nor formal; it can only be accomplished performatively with the participation of the Holy Spirit and cannot take place without the unity of faith and reason. It is Lyndon LaRouche who has, thus far, identified the best conditions for listening to Brahms's *Four Serious Songs*, when he wrote:

“The object, however, is not imitation. The issue is the challenge of escaping from the prison of a shadow-world of heard sounds, to hear the substance of the musical idea. This may be accomplished only by the method of the Platonic dialectic, by the principle of hypothesis. To this end, Classical composition in the tradition of Bach's (Florentine bel canto) method of well-tempered counterpoint — Keplerian counterpoint — afford us the use of a double palette. The palette of the contrapuntal paradoxes specific to the bel canto singing voice, and the palette of the paradoxes expressed by the ironies, including crucial metaphors, of the subject being addressed musically. These two kinds of ironies lie between the notes as transcendental tones sung and heard only in the mind, and as ironies of the subject-matter being treated musically. Nothing better illustrates that doubled irony of great Classical composition, than the great religious music, from Bach's Passions through Mozart, the later Haydn, Beethoven, Schubert, and Brahms.”²⁹

²⁹ Lyndon LaRouche, [Getting Brahm's Idea Across in “Vier Ernste Gesanjenge” \(Four Serious Songs\)](#), Schiller Institute, August 2002.

4. TIME REVERSAL PROPHECY OF THE PAST ACCORDING TO SAINT PAUL AND SAINT IRENAEUS.

If for Irenaeus to live fully is to believe and know fully, then he is in agreement with Paul who said: *“then I shall know fully, even as I have been fully known.”* Saint Paul established the idea of time-reversal of *“knowing and being known”* in *1Corinthians 13*:

“¹³ ¹If I speak in the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal. ²And if I have prophetic powers, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing. ³If I give away all I have, and if I deliver up my body to be burned, but have not love, I gain nothing.

⁴Love is patient and kind; love does not envy or boast; it is not arrogant ⁵or rude. It does not insist on its own way; it is not irritable or resentful; ⁶it does not rejoice at wrongdoing, but rejoices with the truth. ⁷Love bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things.

⁸Love never ends. As for prophecies, they will pass away; as for tongues, they will cease; as for knowledge, it will pass away. ⁹For we know in part and we prophesy in part, ¹⁰but when the perfect comes, the partial will pass away. ¹¹When I was a child, I spoke like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child. When I became a man, I gave up childish ways. ¹²For now we see in a mirror dimly, but then face to face. Now I know in part; then I shall know fully, even as I have been fully known.

¹³ So now faith, hope, and love abide, these three; but the greatest of these is love.”³⁰

As a disciple of Saint Polycarp, who himself was a direct disciple of John the Apostle, Irenaeus was in direct contact with the Apostolic Church. Among all of the contributions of the Apostolic Church of the second century AD, the most

³⁰ Saint Paul, [1Corinthians 13 : 1-13](#)

significant one has been expressed by the idea of the “*recapitulation*” of Adam, because it permitted man to include in his knowledge how God also knows him. And the most paradoxical formulation of that *epistemological recapitulation* came from Saint Paul when he said: “*Now I know in part; then I shall know fully, even as I have been fully known.*”

This divine ability of man to think back on how man was known is an amazing power to prophesize the past, because not only has it the power to change the past into a more beneficial future, but it also has the power to change something that was forgotten for so many centuries into something that will be remembered for all future times to come.

What is epistemologically significant in this idea of “*recapitulation*” is the fact that it is a process of time reversal *in the temporal simultaneity of eternity* through which *to know and to be fully known* is the highest human form of the *Glory of God*, because it corresponds to what Lyn had identified as a *hypothesis of the higher hypothesis*.

In showing the pathway of Irenaeus, I must emphasize the harmonic proportionality between divine creation and the divinization of humanity; that is, between the *Word made flesh* and the redeeming idea of the *Benefit of the other*. It is in that proportional reciprocity of love of mankind, and in the artistic means of expressing it that the ultimate message of Irenaeus can be profitable for mankind as a whole; because it contains and maintains the individual freedom of man in his ability to give direction to the universe as a whole without having to be reduced to a Panurge sheep. It was Belgian Bishop Delhaye who best identified the knot of this matterofmind when he wrote:

*“It is not only in the doctrine of recapitulation by the grace of Christ that Saint Irenaeus wanted to situate the true value of man, which was denied by the Gnostics. He was careful to note the intrinsic dignity of man, let us even say the relative autonomy of the creature capable of freely orienting himself.”*³¹

³¹ [DISCOURS DU SAINT-PÈRE AU CORPS ACADÉMIQUE DE L'UNIVERSITÉ CATHOLIQUE](#), Section 10.

Thus, it becomes clear that God had originally and naturally inserted that divine orienting power in the form of axiomatic transformation of the human mind from the beginning of creation into the minds of intelligent and insightful beings throughout history. He created them and what those intelligent beings had to do was to rediscover the truth of such precepts in the simultaneity of temporal eternity of their own minds. Therefore, if one does not enquire and observe appropriately into the matter of one's own mind, one will never discover the power of prophesying the past. Simultaneity of temporal eternity should be understood as what Irenaeus meant when he said, and as I have already referenced at the beginning of the report: *"...that He is immortal and powerful to such a degree as to confer immortality upon what is mortal, and eternity upon what is temporal ..."*³²

The method of Irenaeus is an amazing Christian formulation reflecting Plato's composition and mixture of *"the world soul."* However, I must warn against the temptation of falling into the trap of semantics on these matters of comparison.

5. PLATO ON THE COMPOSITION OF THE 'WORLD SOUL'

Both Plato and Irenaeus established their conception of the creation of the mind on preestablished harmony, as Leibniz recognized later and made explicit in his principle of *proportion between reason and power*. From the vantage point of epistemology, therefore, these two realities reflect each other in their principle of composition as the principle of unity between two opposites.

Indeed, on the one hand, what Irenaeus is reflecting on, in his book on heresies are two things: one is the process of *creation of the human mind* in accordance with the Holy Trinity based on Love (*αγαπη*), and the other is what Plato reflected on, in his *Timaeus*; that is, the *creation of "the world soul"* in

³² Saint Irenaeus, [*Against Heresies*](#), III, 20: 2.

accordance with a triply-folding principle of double mean proportionality based on the Good (*Καλός*). These two conceptions obviously reflect one another “*as if through a glass darkly*.” Remember what Plato stated in his *Timaeus* dialogue:

*"Midway between the Being which is indivisible and remains always the same and the Being which is transient and divisible in bodies, He blended a third form of Being compounded out of the twain, that is to say, out of the Same and the Other; and in like manner He compounded it midway between that one of them which is indivisible and that one which is divisible in bodies. And He took the three of them, and blended them all together into one form, by forcing the Other into union with the Same, in spite of its being naturally difficult to mix. And when with the aid of Being He had mixed them, and had made of them one out of three, straightway He began to distribute the whole thereof into so many portions as was meet; and each portion was a mixture of the Same, of the Other, and of Being."*³³

Although this text may appear to be obscure and difficult to grasp on first reading, it becomes less difficult once the reader identifies Plato's ideas of **Same**, of **Other**, and of **Being** as transfinite axiomatic states of the mind acting on each other in the process of creative transformation. This may be done in the same way that Cardinal Jules Mazarin solved the conflicts of the Thirty Years War with the Principle of the *benefit of the other* in the Peace of Westphalia of 1648.³⁴

In other words, whatever conflict may arise among three adversarial forces, the axioms of their former state of existence may be superseded and transformed into a higher form of composition, and become changed into a manner of being which is constantly multiplying and dividing itself into higher forms of congruence; thus, creating higher forms of conflict resolutions, by increasing their respective energy-flux-density, which in turn, generates higher levels of the same

³³ Plato, *Timaeus*, (35a-b), Plato in Twelve Volumes, Vol. 9 translated by W.R.M. Lamb. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd. 1925.

³⁴ See my reports: [THE ECONOMIC POLICY THAT MADE THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA](#) and [PEACE OF WESTPHALIA AND THE WATER QUESTION](#).

mixture out of similar unequal partitioning of its original triply-connected and enfolded matterofmind. However, the process is never as a balance of power.

Next, imagine the dynamic relationship among the three to be such that if **Being** eliminates the difference between the **Same** and the **Other**; the **Same** and the **Other** are said to be congruent relative to **Being**; if not, the **Same** and the **Other** are noncongruent. Carl Gauss established such a dynamic for the congruence between a modulo number and two other numbers such that they become residues or nonresidues of each other. That is the principle underlying the shadows of arithmetic behavior,³⁵ which can also be found behind the process of the Peace of Westphalia, and which should be used to finally put an end to the evil of war; because if you eliminate the axiom of the balance of power you will also eliminate geopolitics.

Thus, the highest degree of harmony between reason and faith is to be found in the ability to change the present, the future, and the past, because the greatest power of divine creation is found in the “*recapitulation*” of history by means of the redemption of sins.

Therefore, man is able to transform the *tragic* into the *sublime* by bringing together the infinite within the finite, the immortal within the mortal, the eternal within the temporal; which is the greatest gift of God, because that is *the way to know and also how to be known*.

FIN

³⁵ Carl Gauss, *Disquisitiones Arithmeticae*, Part I, Section 1, p. 1.