

“Love your Neighbour as Yourself” (Matt. 22. 39)

Saint Augustine on the lineaments of the self to be loved

GENERAL OUTLINE

- I. Self-love as instinct, rebellion, or love for God?
 - A. Luther's campaign against self-love
 - B. Is the self-love envisaged by the commandment to be identified with the natural instinct for self-preservation?
 1. Burnaby's identification of three forms of Augustinian love
 2. *De Doctrina Christiana* I, 45-47
 3. *De Doctrina Christiana* I, 57-58
 - C. Self-love as love for God
- II. Further specification of the relation of self-love to love for God
 - A. Augustine's radical use of Ps. 10. 6: God or iniquity
 - B. Love for God as obedience to and service of him
 - C. Loving God more than oneself, ex toto
- III. First steps in the relation between self-love and love for neighbour
 - A. Testing the genuineness of self-love as a protection for the neighbour
 - B. Love for neighbour throws back light on self-love

The Apostle says: “The whole law is fulfilled in one word: You are to love your neighbour as yourself” (Gal. 5. 14). This love comes from the Holy Spirit. “Love your neighbour as yourself”. First see if you (already) love yourself; then I will entrust to you the neighbour whom you are to love as yourself. If however you do not yet know how to love yourself, I am afraid that you may deceive your neighbour as you do yourself. For if you love iniquity, you do not love yourself. The psalm witnesses to this: “He who loves iniquity hates his own soul” (Ps. 10. 6). If you hate your own soul, of what benefit is it to you that you love your body? If you hate your soul and love your body, your body will rise up; but it will do so in such a way that the soul is tortured. Therefore, first the soul is to be loved. The soul is to be subjected to God such that its servitude preserves the order established by Him: the soul subjected to God, the body to the soul. Do you wish your body to be subject to your

soul? Let your soul be at the service of God. You have to be ruled so that you may be able to rule¹).

This text, dating from 412-416, contains in embryo a great number of the themes treated in this chapter: Augustine's hesitancy to entrust the neighbour to our love for fear that he may be led astray; his insistence that self-love first be in order; his use of Ps. 10. 6 to show that this is not so if one does not love God; the identification of true self-love with subjection to God and service of Him²); the origin of this love in the Holy Spirit. By investigating these elements we hope to be able to determine the nature of that self-love which Augustine sees proposed as the model of love for neighbour, and, having discovered that it consists in obedient loving service to God, to show how the neighbour is the ultimate beneficiary of a right self-love, even indeed that there can be no proper self-love that does not take the neighbour into account.

I. SELF-LOVE AS INSTINCT, REBELLION, OR LOVE FOR GOD?

A. Luther's campaign against self-love

Anders Nygren sets the thought of Luther on self-love in stark antithesis to that of Augustine³). Luther knows no justifiable self-love; since all self-love is selfishness, egocentricity, *σάρξ*, self-love in the Christian is to be totally annihilated. Far from the second part of the great commandment, "You are to love your neighbour as yourself", implying that one ought to love oneself, for Luther it contains a direct

¹) *Sermo* 128, 3, 5 (ML 38, 715): "*Omnis, inquit, Lex in uno sermone impletur, in eo quod est, Diliges proximum tuum sicut te ipsum. Ista dilectio de Spiritu sancto est. Diliges proximum tuum sicut te ipsum. Prius vide si jam nosti diligere te ipsum, et committo tibi proximum, quem diligas sicut te ipsum. Si autem nondum nosti diligere te, timeo ne decipias proximum tuum sicut te. Si enim amas iniquitatem, non diligis te. Psalmus testis est: Qui autem diligit iniquitatem, odit animam suam. Si autem odisti animam tuam, quid tibi prodest quia diligis carnem tuam? Si odisti animam tuam, et diligis carnem tuam, resurget caro tua, sed ut torqueatur anima tua. Ergo prius anima diligenda est, quae Deo subdenda est, ut ordinem suum servitus ista custodiat, anima Deo, animae caro. Vis serviat caro tua animae tuae? Deo serviat anima tua. Debes regi, ut possis regere*".

²) This is to be understood in relation to Ragnar Holte's understanding of *frui* as an unreserved act of love for God and in relation to the subjection of rational action to rational contemplation which preserves the order established by God. Cf. *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 22, 27 & 28 (CSEL 25/1, 621-622. ML 42, 418-419).

³) A. Nygren, *Agape and Eros*, p. 709-716. Cf. p. 538, n. 2: even though Augustine, like Luther, sees "superbia" (i.e. amor sui; egocentricity) as the root of sin, it is plain for Nygren that these terms have quite a different resonance for Luther from what they had for Augustine.

prohibition of every kind of self-love. The life of a Christian is straightened when he loves the neighbour with the same intensity that he wrongly, crookedly, loved himself. Thus, "only love to our neighbour is commanded, whilst the manner in which we love ourselves in obedience to our selfish nature is set forth as a pattern"⁴). Luther sees himself as making a break with the Augustinian interpretation on this point. In his commentary on the letter to the Romans, he writes:

"Thus *caritas*, in order to be *caritas*, tends towards the other", as Gregory says. "For no one is said to have *caritas* for himself". In the comment I have said that love (*caritas*) is *amor* not to oneself, but to one's neighbour. So when the Apostle rejected pleasing oneself, he went on straight away to teach that we should please our neighbour. Therefore to please one's neighbour is not to please oneself. But this statement of Gregory and of ours seems to be contradicted by that famous distinction and order of loving. For according to the blessed Augustine, even the Master teaches that "*first* God is to be loved, *then* our soul, *next* our neighbour's soul, and *lastly* our body". Thus, ordered love (*caritas ordinata*) begins with itself. The answer is, that just this, due to our lack of proper understanding, is one of those things by which we have been carried away from love ... True love for yourself is hatred for yourself ... And so, saving the judgment of others with due respect for the Fathers, in my opinion — I speak as a fool — that interpretation does not seem to be sound which is alleged concerning the precept of loving one's neighbour, whereby it is said that in the precept is the loving form with which one loves the neighbour, in that it says: "as thyself". Therefore they conclude: It is necessary that thou *first* love thyself and thus, after the pattern of thy love for thyself, love also thy neighbour⁵).

⁴) *Ibid.*, p. 711.

⁵) Martin Luther, *Der Brief an die Römer* 15, 2, in *Werke*, vol. 56, Weimar, 1938, p. 516-517: "'Sic enim Charitas' (Ut B. Gregorius) 'in alterum tendit, Ut charitas esse possit. Nemo enim in seipsum charitatem habere dicitur'. Et in glossa dixi, Quod Charitas est Amor non in seipsum, Sed in alterum. Ita et Ubi Apostolus abnegavit Complacentiam sui, statim docuit, Ut placeremus proximo. Ergo et Placere proximo Est non sibi placere. Sed huic dicto Gregorii et nostro Videtur repugnare famosa illa differentia et ordo diligendi. Quia secundum B. Augustinum Et Magister allegat: 'Deus *primo*, *deinde* anima nostra, *post* anima proximi, *tandem* corpus nostrum diligenda sunt'. Ergo Charitas ordinata incipit a seipsa. Respondetur, Quod hoc ipsum est unum illorum, quibus abducti sumus a charitate, dum male intelleximus ... Sed verus amor in teipsum est odium in teipsum ... Unde Salvo Iudicio aliorum et Reverentia patrum meo sensu Ut stultus loquor: Non Videtur ista intelligentia solida, Quae de precepto diligendi proximi est allata, Qua dicitur, Quod in ipso precepto diligens sit forma, qua proximum diligit, Nempe ait: 'sicut teipsum'. Ergo concludunt: Oportet, Ut primo diligas te et ita ad exemplar tui dilectionis et proximum diligas". Luther's quotation from Gregory is from *XL Homiliarum in Evangelia*

As far as the quotation from Augustine is concerned, Luther, according to the Weimar edition of his works, is referring to *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 23, 22 (ML 34, 27). Luther has: “*Deus primo, deinde anima nostra, post anima proximi, tandem corpus nostrum diligenda sunt*”⁶). However, the edition of Migne and subsequent critical editions have: “*Cum ergo quattuor sint diligenda, unum quod supra nos est, alterum quod nos sumus, tertium quod iuxta nos est, quartum quod infra nos est, de secundo et quarto nulla praecepta danda erant*”⁷). The difference is significant. It seems likely, therefore, that Luther is either paraphrasing or quoting by heart, or perhaps both. But, in any case, the understanding that his rendering of Augustine implies is questionable. Augustine states that there are four realities due our love and he lists them, as it were for convenience sake, one to four: “*unum ... alterum ... tertium ... quartum ...*”. Certainly, God, who appears at the head of the list, outranks the infra-human creation which turns up fourth. But this does not necessarily impose on us the conclusion, as Luther’s version does (“*primo ... deinde ... post ... tandem ...*”), that Augustine here envisages a strict hierarchy or order of love in which the self is given precedence over the neighbour, and in which it is right to please oneself first, *then* the neighbour⁸). We could infer from Luther’s presentation that Augustine

I 17, 1 (on Lk. 10. 1-9) (ML 76, 1139). The reference to Paul is Rom. 15. 2. (Emphasis throughout is mine).

⁶) Luther’s first interpretative comment on this is: “*Ergo Charitas ordinata incipit a seipso*”. Does this mean that ordered love begins with God who is himself love? Or is it that the human being exercising ordered love begins by loving himself? The second meaning is certainly the one that Nygren fixes upon. See *op. cit.*, p. 711: “... there stands the universally accepted axiom that ‘ordered love begins *with oneself*’, and there stands also the immense authority of *Augustine*”. Nygren, then, understands what he gives as his translation of Luther, i.e. “ordered love (*charitas ordinata*) begins *with itself*”, in the sense of beginning ‘*with oneself*’. And, from the context, it appears that Luther himself has this more in mind, for the whole discussion is concerned with whether love is to be “*in seipsum*” or “*in alterum*”, and shortly after the statement quoted above Luther pits his own position against what he takes to be Augustine’s: “*Inde enim quodlibet bonum primo nobis usurpavimus, nihil de proximo solliciti. Sed verus amor in teipsum est odium in teipsum ... Igitur qui se odit et proximum diligit, hic se vere diligit. Quia iam extra se seipsum diligit, ideo pure se diligit, dum se in proximo diligit*”: *op. cit.*, p. 517. For Luther apparently, then, Augustine puts love for one’s own soul first, whereas, even according to his version of Augustine, if there is any kind of hierarchy intended in the love required of people, God, if anyone, would seem to have been given preference.

⁷) *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 45 (CSEL 80, 19) = 1, 23, 22 (CC 32, 18. ML 34, 27).

⁸) Luther’s misguided understanding of this passage of Augustine may have been prompted by Nicholas of Lyra. See the note on the quotation from Augustine in Luther, *op. cit.*, p. 517, where Lyra is quoted: “*quia secundum ordinem charitatis magis debet diligere*

considers the self as a grade higher than the neighbour, and that to love such a self would be to put one's own interests before those of others. Consideration for others would come only after ("post") that given to oneself. However, in this chapter and the next we will become acquainted with Augustine's insistence on the equality of the self with the neighbour, and on the necessity of true self-love, not such that the interests of the neighbour are pushed into second place, but such that they are genuinely protected and more highly esteemed.

This latter emphasis springs from the intimate link between self-love and love for God — although, as has already been alluded to and as we shall see in what follows, this connection too can be drastically distorted if God, *Summum Bonum*, is conceived exclusively eudaimonistically as the prize of pious individuals. A major part of the present chapter will concern itself with the delicate operation of exposing the relation of love for self and for God as Augustine envisions it. In the passage from Luther we have quoted, he ignores, indeed implicitly rejects, a positive connection or interchange between love for God and for self. For self-love is execrable and to be eradicated. This is the point at issue with Augustine. Luther seems to maintain — and Nygren surely does — that for Augustine ordered love begins with one's own soul, and that it is necessary that one *first* love oneself, which in Luther's eyes is something pernicious, before one proceeds to love one's neighbour in the same way⁹). It is as if Augustinian self-love were quite separable from love for God and intrinsically possible without any reference to it or to the neighbour. It seems too as if, were there a question of priority, the self had won the day in Augustine's vision, even against God's claims on love. This is indeed the opinion of Anders Nygren who quotes Luther with approval on this matter. For Nygren, even Augustinian love for God is ultimately self-love getting its own way. "When he (a man) loves God, he does so ultimately in order to obtain satisfaction for the demands of self-love"¹⁰). The Lutheran position, on the other hand, is that to love is the same as to hate oneself. "*Est enim diligere se ipsum*

proprium salutem quam alterius". The quip, however true its content, has entered the theological folklore: "Si Lyra non lyrasset, Lutherus non saltasset". See the entry under Nicholas of Lyra in F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone (editors), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, London, New York, Toronto, 2nd edition, 1974, p. 972-973.

⁹) Luther, *op. cit.*, p. 517: "Ergo Charitas ordinata incipit a seipsa ... Ergo concludunt: Oportet, Ut primo diligas te et ita ad exemplar tui dilectionis et proximum diligas".

¹⁰) A. Nygren, *op. cit.*, p. 541.

odisse"¹¹). From time to time in Augustine we do come across admonitions to despise oneself, to consider oneself as worthless; but, in these texts, such is Augustine's way of underlining that only God is to be the true goal of *frui* and that the commandment of love for Him requires the whole self¹²). Loving God totally, and thereby "despising" oneself, acknowledging one's own "worthlessness", one truly loves oneself¹³). For Augustine, to love oneself apart from God and his double commandment, which includes the neighbour, is really precisely to hate oneself. This specific form of self-hatred, which we might call theological, is identified with *superbia* and it augurs ill for the neighbour¹⁴). In the

¹¹) Luther, *op. cit.*, 9, 3: p. 392. Cf. 15, 2: p. 517: "Sed verus amor in teipsum est odium in teipsum. Sicut Dominus dicit: *Qui amat animam suam, perdet eam, et qui odit animam suam, inveniet eam*. Et Apostolus Phil. 2.: *Singuli non, que sua sunt, considerantes, Sed que aliorum*. Et 1 Cor. 13: *Charitas non querit, que sua sunt*. Igitur Qui se odit et proximum diligit, hic se vere diligit. Quia iam extra se seipsum diligit, ideo pure se diligit, dum se in proximo diligit". There is, then, it seems, a pure love for self according to Luther. It arises out of and accompanies love for neighbour. "Quia iam extra se seipsum diligit, ideo pure se diligit, dum se in proximo diligit". For Augustine true love for self arises out of and accompanies love for God and fidelity to His commandment of love. In both cases, the self loved is the other (Other)-directed self. These standpoints may not be so irreconcilable as they had at first appeared and as Anders Nygren strongly suggests.

¹²) See *De Libero Arbitrio* 3, 25, 76, 262-263 (CC 29, 320. CSEL 74, 153. ML 32, 1308) (Date: 392-396): "Melior est autem cum obliviscitur sui prae caritate incommutabilis Dei, vel seipsum penitus in illius comparatione contemnit. Si autem tamquam obvis sibi placet sibi ad perverse imitandum Deum, ut potestate sua frui velit, tanto fit minor, quanto se cupit esse maiorem".

Sermo Denis 17, 6 (MA I, 86-87) (Date: pre-400): "Quicquid ergo amamus in terra, in comparatione dei nihil est. Parum est, nihil est quod amamus; et nos ipsi nihil sumus. Ipse amator, in comparatione rei quae amanda est, vilescere sibi debet. Ipsa est illa caritas quae iubetur *ex tota corde, ex tota anima, et ex tota mente*. Sed adiunxit et ait: *Diliges proximum tuum, tamquam te ipsum*. In his duobus praeceptis tota lex pendet et prophetae (Matt. 22. 37-40)".

¹³) *Sermo Denis* 17, 6 (MA I, 87): "... ut, cum tu dilexeris dominum, scias quia tunc te diligis, si diligis dominum. Si vero deum non diligis, nec te ipsum diligis. Cum ergo te didiceris diligere diligendo deum, rape proximum ad deum, ut simul fruaris bono, et tanto bono quod deus est".

¹⁴) See *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 46-47 (CSEL 80, 20) = 1, 23, 23 (CC 32, 18-19. ML 34, 27): "Magnum autem aliquid adeptum se putat, si etiam sociis, id est aliis hominibus, dominari potuerit. Inest enim vitioso animo id magis appetere et sibi tamquam debitum vindicare, quod uni proprie debetur deo. Talis autem sui dilectio melius odium vocatur. Iniquum est enim, quia vult sibi servire quod infra se est, cum ipse superiori servire nolit, rectissimeque dictum est: *Qui autem diligit iniquitatem, odit animam suam* (Ps. 10. 6) ... Cum vero etiam eis qui sibi naturaliter pares sunt, hoc est, hominibus, dominari affectat, intolerabilis omnino *superbia* est". As we shall see, there are many Augustinian self-love texts in which the quotation from Ps. 10. 6 turns up. It is as if for Augustine the life-choice is that between God and iniquity, which stand over against each other. To love the former is to love oneself; to love the latter is to hate oneself. And, if a person hates himself, to

course of this chapter we will return with a wider and more penetrating eye to these texts. For the present it is sufficient to note a misreading of Augustine by Luther, possibly under the influence of the biblical commentaries of Nicholas of Lyra — a misreading which, by picturing Augustine as looking *first* to the individual's good and only *afterwards* to that of others, can easily obscure his real thought and hinder us from taking him at his word.

B. *Is the self-love envisaged by the commandment to be identified with the natural instinct for self-preservation?*

1. *Burnaby's identification of three forms of Augustinian love*

In response to Nygren's contention that there are two contradictory expressions of self-love in Augustine — i.e. (i) as the root of sin, the irreconcilable opposite of *amor Dei*, and (ii) as at once belonging to man's nature and defining his highest duty as the image of God: to love himself as God loves himself — John Burnaby points out that there are three clear forms of Augustinian love for self, "the first natural and morally neutral, the second morally wrong and the third morally right"¹⁵). The first, morally neutral, meaning of the term self-love refers to the natural instinct for self-preservation. For rational man natural self-love "is the undetermined direction of the will to the well-being of the self, however that well-being may be conceived — a pure egoism which for Augustine is a fact of human nature, neither laudable nor reprehensible"¹⁶). The second, morally wrong, guise of self-love may be characterised variously as *amor potestatis suae*, love of one's own power, *amor excellentiae propriae*, that pride which spills over into envy and avarice, and *amor sui usque ad contemptum Dei*, which is "self-assertion rather than self-love, the desire of a possession which is necessarily

whom will he be of any good? See *De Civitate Dei* 21, 27 (CC 48, 800-801. CSEL 40/2, 574-575. ML 41, 747) where Ecclesiasticus 14. 5 is quoted in this sense: "Qui sibi malignus est, cui bonus erit?"

¹⁵) J. Burnaby, *Amor Dei*, London, 1938 (reprinted 1947), p. 117-118.

¹⁶) *Ibid.*, p. 118. It is important to note that Burnaby sees this "undetermined direction of the will to the well-being of the self" as one form of self-love, but not as the *basic* form of Augustinian love, as if it were to be typified as undifferentiated desire seeking its own satisfaction and determined for good or for evil by the nature of the object it fixes upon. For the view that love is *basically* undifferentiated desire, the morality of which is determined by its object, see A. Nygren, *op. cit.*, p. 494-495; and for a critique of Nygren, see R. Holte, *Béatitude et Sagesse*, p. 256, 259 & 269.

exclusive, the enjoyment of which actually consists in the exclusion of others"¹⁷). For Burnaby, this is to wish to put oneself in the place of God; it is "not selfishness, but blasphemous rebellion"¹⁸). The third, morally right, love of self is the only one that properly deserves the name of self-love. It consists in loving God, the Supreme Good. This love is not "the desire of private possession (which) is just what Augustine regards as the perversion of self-love and the destruction of all love to God"¹⁹), but the total abandonment of the self to God at all the levels of one's being. "He who created you demands your *whole* self": "*Totum exigit de te qui fecit te*"²⁰).

When, therefore, Augustine in *De Doctrina Christiana*, having stated that the fulness and fulfilment of the law is to be found in love for God and neighbour, adds that "there is no need of a precept that each person love himself"²¹), what has he in mind? Is there no need of such a precept because, simply, people love themselves naturally just as irrational animals do? In this case we could give a more determined emphasis to the short phrase "*ut se quisque diligat praecepto non opus est*" by translating: "in order for each person to love himself there is no need of a precept" (because this is precisely what each one of us is naturally inclined to). We all wish to be happy, and loving ourselves is to follow our natural bent for beatitude²²). Or, is Augustine's meaning that there is, as it were, a hidden precept of self-love already contained in the double commandment and not requiring further explication such that "there is no need of the (separate, explicit) precept that each person is to love himself"? If the former is true, the basis for love of neighbour 'as oneself' in Augustine is morally neutral natural egoism, the first of Burnaby's three categories of self-love. If the latter, then love for neighbour 'as oneself' is founded on morally good love for God in accordance with the commandment, the third of the forms identified by Burnaby. Moreover, as we shall see, the self-love demanded by the double commandment is

¹⁷) *Ibid.*, p. 121.

¹⁸) *Ibid.*

¹⁹) *Ibid.*, p. 117.

²⁰) *Sermo* 34, 7 (CC 41, 427) (ML 38, 212). Cf. Burnaby, *op. cit.*, p. 121-126.

²¹) *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 84 (CSEL 80, 30) = 1, 35, 39 (CC 32, 29. ML 34, 34): "... ut se quisque diligat praecepto non opus est".

²²) Cf. *De Civitate Dei* 10, 3, 2 (CC 47, 275. CSEL 40/1, 450-451. ML 41, 281): "Non enim qui se diligit aliud vult esse quam beatus".

paradoxically based on the very love for neighbour itself²³). As far as Burnaby's second form of self-love is concerned, *amor potestatis suae*, Augustine will call it hatred of self — in a very different sense from Luther, obviously, for whom hatred of ourselves is the ideal. Augustine will campaign vigorously to prevent this hatred, an outgrowth of "the manner in which we love ourselves in obedience to our selfish nature"²⁴), from becoming an acceptable relationship to ourselves and from being set forth as the pattern of our love for neighbour.

"There is no need of a precept that each person love himself". Why not? Let us examine Augustine's explanations closely.

2. *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 45-47

In the first instance, from *De Doctrina Christiana*, it may at a glance appear that there is no need of specific commandments to love oneself and one's body because such love naturally stays with us, no matter how depraved we otherwise may have become. It may seem then that natural egoism, the natural desire to preserve the self even in the midst of moral collapse and misery, will be held out as the foundation of love for the neighbour 'as oneself' — Burnaby's first form of Augustinian self-love. Let us test this hypothesis against the text itself, which will be quoted in full.

Therefore, while there are four realities to be loved — one that is above us, another that we ourselves are, a third together on the same level with ourselves, and a fourth which is below us — no precepts are given regarding the second and the fourth. For, however far a man falls away from the truth, self-love and love for his own body stays (*remanet*) with him. For the spirit that flees the unchangeable light which rules over all things does so in order to be himself master over his life and over his own body. And consequently he cannot but love himself and his body²⁵).

²³) As already hinted, it appears that Luther himself would not have objected to speaking of genuine self-love if its foundation were love for neighbour. See Luther, *Der Brief an die Römer* 15, 2, in *Werke*, Vol. 56, p. 517: "Igitur qui se odit et proximum diligit, hic se vere diligit. Quia iam extra se seipsum diligit, ideo pure se diligit, dum se in proximo diligit".

²⁴) See Nygren, *op. cit.*, p. 711.

²⁵) *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 45 (CSEL 80, 19-20) = 1, 23, 22 (CC 32, 18. ML 32, 27): "Cum ergo quattuor sint diligenda, unum quod supra nos est, alterum quod nos sumus, tertium quod iuxta nos est, quartum quod infra nos est, de secundo et quarto nulla praecepta danda erant. Quantumlibet enim homo excidat a veritate, remanet illi dilectio sui et dilectio corporis sui. Fugax enim animus ab incommutabili lumine omnium regnatore id agit, ut ipse sibi regnet et corpori suo, et ideo non potest nisi et se et corpus diligere".

The self-love envisaged here is that of a person who turns away from God as master of his life to himself. He wishes to put the self in the place of God. Rather more than the natural instinct for self-preservation, this "remaining" self-love has the features of "blasphemous rebellion", Burnaby's second form. We could almost say that no precept of self-love has been given, because certain people may wrongly think that this perverted form, quite opposed to complete love for God, is being held out to them as a model. Pleasing oneself, arrogantly playing God, wishing to enjoy one's own power, all diminish a human being²⁶); they are the opposite of love. A little further on from the passage quoted above, Augustine states this specifically:

Such love of self, however, is better called hate. For it is not right that a man want the infra-human creation to serve him if he himself is unwilling to serve the one greater than himself. It is quite rightly said: "He who loves iniquity hates his own soul" (Ps. 10. 6). And consequently the spirit becomes feeble and the mortal body becomes a torment to it. For the spirit unavoidably loves the mortal body and is oppressed with the weight of its corruption²⁷).

²⁶) *De Libero Arbitrio* 3, 25, 76, 262-263 (CC 29, 320. CSEL 74, 153. ML 32, 1308): "Si autem tamquam obvis sibi placet sibi ad perverse imitandum Deum, ut potestate sua frui velit, tanto fit minor, quanto se cupit esse maiorem ...".

²⁷) *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 46-47 (CSEL 80, 20) = 1, 23, 23 (CC 32, 18-19. ML 34, 27): "Talis autem sui dilectio melius odium vocatur. Iniquum est enim, quia vult sibi servire quod infra se est, cum ipse superiori servire nolit, rectissimeque dictum est: *Qui autem diligit iniquitatem, odit animam suam*. Et ideo fit infirmus animus et de mortali corpore cruciatur. Necesse est enim ut illud diligat et eius corruptione praegravetur". Similar formulations, in conjunction with Ps. 10. 6, of loss of self as a result of making self rather than God the centre of one's life, occur also in *Epistola* 155, 4, 15 (CSEL 44, 445. ML 33, 672): "... videlicet ut intellegeretur nullam esse aliam dilectionem qua quisque diligit se ipsum, nisi quod diligit Deum. Qui enim aliter se diligit, potius se odisse dicendus est: fit quippe iniquus, privaturque luce iustitiae, cum a potiore ac praestantiore bono aversus, atque inde vel ad seipsum conversus, ad inferiora et egena utique convertitur; fitque in ipso quod veracissime scriptum est, *Qui autem amat iniquitatem, odit animam suam*"; and in *De Trinitate* 14, 14, 18 (CC 50 A, 445-446. ML 42, 1049-1050): "*Qui diligit iniquitatem, odit animam suam*. Qui ergo se diligere novit, Deum diligit, qui vero non diligit Deum, etiam si se diligit, quod ei naturaliter inditum est, tamen non inconvenienter odisse se dicitur, cum id agit quod sibi adversatur, et se ipsum tamquam suus inimicus insequitur ... Quamvis enim se ita diligat, ut si alterutrum proponatur, malit omnia quae infra se diligit, perdere, quam perire; tamen superiorem deserendo, ad quem solum posset custodire fortitudinem suam, eoque frui lumine suo, cui canitur in Psalmo: *Fortitudinem meam ad te custodiam* (Ps. 58. 10); et in alio, *Accedite ad eum et illuminamini* (Ps. 33.5); sic infirma et tenebrosa facta est, ut a se quoque ipsa, in ea quae non sunt quod ipsa, et quibus superior est ipsa, infelicius laberetur per amores quos non valet vincere, et errores a quibus non videt qua redire".

There is indeed an inevitability, a necessity about this love ("*necesse est enim ut illud diligat*"), but it is a burden of necessity and a captivity a person has not the strength to escape:

... if he abandons the one greater than himself, he becomes so enfeebled and benighted that, falling away from himself, he is miserably drawn down to realities which are not himself and to which he is superior, by loves which he has not the strength to conquer and by errors he does not know how to turn back from²⁸).

It is hardly likely that Augustine will enshrine such debilitating self-love as the model of love for neighbour. The love of self that "remains", which is identified with wanting to control and to rule one's own life and body, is for Augustine totally out of harmony with love for others in accordance with the commandment. If we follow up the immediate continuation of the two passages quoted above from *De Doctrina Christiana*, the truth of this assertion becomes yet more obvious. At the close of the former passage Augustine had reached the following conclusion regarding "the spirit that flees the unchangeable light which rules over all things": "consequently he cannot but love himself and his body" ("*et ideo non potest nisi et se et corpus diligere*"). But what does this manner of self-love, which is necessary and not dignified by a precept, lead to? Augustine follows on without hesitation:

Moreover, he (who wants to be master over his own life and body) thinks it is a great attainment for himself if he is also able to lord it over his companions, that is, over other people (i.e. those *iuxta nos*). For it is characteristic of a corrupt spirit (i.e. one that has exchanged God's light and truth for its own) to grasp more for this power over others and to claim as its own due what is properly due to God alone. Such love of self, however, is better called hate²⁹).

Not content to play God for oneself, one prides oneself on doing so for others as well, on having power and mastery over their lives and winning their adulation. The corrupt spirit, seeking its own glory among men, makes men its victims and becomes its own victim. Once the order of love is violated at its highest point, so that God is no longer honoured and

²⁸) *De Trinitate* 14, 14, 18. See text, part of which is translated here, under previous note.

²⁹) *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 46 (CSEL 80, 20) = 1, 23, 23 (CC 32, 18. ML 34, 27): "Magnum autem aliquid adeptum se putat, si etiam sociis, id est aliis hominibus, dominari potuerit. Inest enim vitioso animo id magis appetere et sibi tamquam debitum vindicare, quod uni proprie debetur deo. Talis autem sui dilectio melius odium vocatur".

served as God, it breaks down all along the line. Having asserted that "the (corrupt) spirit unavoidably loves the mortal body and is oppressed with the weight of its corruption" ("*necesse est enim ut illud diligat et eius corruptione praeagravetur*"), Augustine indicates the consequences of this breakdown and suggests the remedy:

Immortality and the uncorruptedness of the body spring from the health of the spirit, and the health of the spirit is to cling firmly to the one who is better than ourselves, that is, the unchangeable God. To aspire to have domination, however, even over those who are naturally one's *equals*, that is, other people, is pride and not at all to be tolerated³⁰).

The intolerable pride of wanting to be above and before one's fellow-creatures, one's natural equals, is a consequence of disordered love for self, a self-love that has drifted from its firm moorings in adherence to the unchangeable God.

It is worthwhile comparing *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 45-47 with a text from *De Civitate Dei* 10, 3, 2. In the latter text Augustine is not specifically dealing with the question why no precept of self-love is given, but perhaps, we may think, he does indirectly provide an answer to it by indicating a kind of self-love that appears to be identified with one's (natural) desire to be happy. "For if a man loves himself, his one wish is to achieve blessedness"³¹). However, from the context, the identification can patently not be extended to mean: our wanting to be happy, *tout court*, is that very love for self that the commandment to love the neighbour 'as oneself' refers to. Indeed, the self-love that seeks its own bliss has to be schooled, instructed and orientated by the double commandment, if it is going to lead to anything more than wretchedness for ourselves and than our importunate demands that others serve us. Whereas in *De Doctrina Christiana* we encountered a barbaric self-love that was directed just to oneself, in *De Civitate Dei* we meet a civilised self-love that is fully intent upon God. Only this latter protects the neighbour from the buffeting of our egoism and our proud rebellious-

³⁰) *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 47 (CSEL 80, 20) = 1, 23, 23 (CC 32, 19. ML 34, 27): "Immortalitas enim et incorruptio corporis de sanitate animi existit, sanitas autem animi est firmissime inherere potiori, hoc est incommutabili deo. Cum vero etiam eis qui sibi naturaliter pares sunt, hoc est, hominibus, dominari affectat, intolerabilis omnino superbia est".

³¹) *De Civitate Dei* 10, 3, 2 (CC 47, 275. CSEL 40/1, 450-451. ML 41, 281): "Non enim qui se diligit aliud vult esse quam beatus".

ness and offers him a perspective on his life in which we do not interpose ourselves for God. The text reads:

For in order that a man may know how to love himself an end has been established for him to which he is to refer all his action, so that he may attain to bliss. For if a man loves himself, his one wish is to achieve blessedness. Now this end is "to cling to God" (Ps. 73. 28). Thus, if a man knows how to love himself, the commandment to love his neighbour bids him to do all he can to bring his neighbour to love God. This is the worship of God; this is true religion; this is the right kind of devotion; *this is the service which is owed to God alone.*

Therefore every immortal Power, however great its strength (*virtus*), will have no other wish, if it loves us as itself, than that we, for our happiness, should be *subjected to God*, seeing that it is such subjection that also gives that power its blessedness. If it does not worship God, it is wretched, because deprived of God; if it worships God, it will not wish itself to be worshipped in the place of God³²).

What is said of the angels, the 'immortal Powers' of great strength ("virtus"), in our regard³³), can also be said of the relationship of human

³²) *De Civitate Dei* 10, 3, 2 (CC 47, 275-276. CSEL 40/1, 450-451. ML 41, 281): "Ut enim homo sese diligere nosset, constitutus est ei finis, quo referret omnia quae ageret, ut beatus esset; non enim qui se diligit aliud vult esse quam beatus. Hic autem finis est adhaerere Deo. Iam igitur scienti diligere se ipsum, cum mandatur de proximo diligendo sicut se ipsum, quid aliud mandatur, nisi ut ei, quantum potest, commendet diligendum Deum. Hic est Dei cultus, haec vera religio, haec recta pietas, haec tantum Deo debita servitus. Quaecumque igitur immortalis potestas quantalibet virtute praedita si non diligit sicut se ipsam, ei vult esse subditos, ut beati simus, cui et ipsa subdita beata est. Si ergo non colit Deum, misera est, quia privatur Deo; si autem colit Deum, non vult se coli pro Deo". English translation (with slight alterations): Henry Bettenson, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1972, p. 376. Underlining in the text is mine.

³³) In this same context Augustine quotes the first part of the double commandment in two forms: (i) the most usual one, corresponding to Matt. 22. 37: "Diliges Dominum Deum tuum in tota corde tuo et in tota anima tua et *in tota mente tua*"; and (ii) the form used by Deut. 6. 5 in which the last phrase is replaced by "*in tota virtute*". Mk. 12. 30 retains Deut. 6. 5 in its entirety, unlike Matt. 22. 37, but inserts "*tota mente tua*" as well. Luke 10, 27 follows him in this, but "*tota virtute tua*" becomes "*omnibus viribus tuis*". Extrapolating from the latter part of the text we have quoted from *De Civitate Dei*, where the word "*virtus*" also occurs, could it not be suggested that, associated with the meaning of loving God with all one's strength, is the injunction to refrain from using that power to lord it over others and to use it rather to bring others to their only Lord? With regard to strength, its evil use in lust for domination and its good use in loving service, see the famous passage contrasting the two cities in Book 14, 28 (CC 48, 451-452. CSEL 40/2, 56-57. ML 41, 436): "Fecerunt itaque civitates duas amores duo, terrenam scilicet amor sui usque ad contemptum Dei, caelestem vero amor Dei usque ad contemptum sui. Denique illa in se ipsa haec in Domino gloriatur. Illa enim quaerit ab hominibus gloriam; huic autem Deus conscientiae testis maxima est gloria. Illa in gloria sua exaltat caput suum; haec dicit Deo

beings who are equals to one another. Again the warning is sounded against attempting to displace God in one's own life and in the lives of others, and against domination, wishing oneself to be worshipped in the place of God.

But someone may object that, in this constellation, self-love in search of one's own happiness still comes out on top³⁴). This objection stems from a mistaken conception of bliss in 'clinging to God' as the fulfilment of a possessive desire; this makes of God just one object among others capable of satisfying our needs. Therefore, it is instructive to refer again to what has already been learnt of Augustinian *frui deo* and to foreshadow the treatment of God as *Bonum Commune*. However, even from this text of *De Civitate Dei* itself, it emerges that self-love, our desire to attain to bliss, to achieve blessedness in clinging to the end that has been established for us, God, is rather subjection to Him to whom alone worship and service are due. In this service of God one's desire for happiness is trained to transcend the boundaries of egoism, of natural "appetitus", and, in the spirit of obedient attention to God, to love the neighbour by bringing him to love God.

This is a theme to which we shall return: love for God as service of God and obedience to his commandment. For the present let us repeat our findings so far: the natural love for oneself and one's own body, and the natural desire for one's own happiness, are not in themselves alone satisfactory explanations of why "there is no need of a precept that each person love himself", if this is understood to mean that such self-love, in which the precept has no say, is being encouraged as a Christian course of action. Loving oneself is evidently not something that a person does well naturally, if he is unguided and unaided. And, as such, it is certainly

suo: *Gloria mea et exaltans caput meum* (Ps. 3.4). Illi in principibus eius vel in eis quas subiugat nationibus dominandi libido dominatur; in hac serviunt invicem in caritate et praepositi consulendo et subditi obtemperando. Illa in suis potentibus diligit virtutem suam; haec dicit Deo suo: *Diligam te, Domine, virtus mea* (Ps. 17.2)".

³⁴) E.g. A. Nygren, *Agape and Eros*, p. 541, apropos of *De Civitate Dei* 10, 3, 2: "Augustine can actually say that the commandment of love to God was given to teach us rightly to love ourselves" — as if Augustine really favoured the precedence of self over God and the 'subjection' of God to fulfilling basic human needs. Josef Brechtken, *Augustinus Doctor Caritatis*, p. 138, explicitly and simply identifies the self-love that forms the basis of love for neighbour with the "appetitus" for one's own highest good. "... es geht ihm nur um die Parallele: ich strebe zum höchsten Gut — der andere strebt zum höchsten Gut; und den Nächsten liebe wie sich selbst heisst: bei dem anderen Menschen den appetitus als Elementarbefund so in Rechnung zu stellen und zu berücksichtigen wie bei sich selbst, eben als appetitus, wie er ja gerade bei mir in der Selbstliebe das Ganze ausmacht" (my emphasis).

not a recommended basis for the future of one's relationship to oneself and for one's dealings with the neighbour. Untutored, it leads to the desire to make others subject to one's corrupt self rather than to be oneself subject to God. Recourse to the argument of natural self-love, then, is, as it were, only the first stroke of the brush for Augustine; as has already been suggested and as will now become quite clear, with that first stroke the picture has by no means been completed.

3. *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 57-58

De Doctrina Christiana 1, 48-56, the passage that joins the text discussed in the previous section with that which we will now pass under review, is chiefly concerned to show, in accordance with Ephesians 5. 29, that "no one ever hates his own body, but he feeds it and looks after it; and that is the way Christ treats the church". The spirit does not fight against the flesh in order to destroy the body but so that the body may be subjugated to the spirit and its concupiscence to evil overcome. Augustine considers that he has already shown that no one hates himself by having pointed out that love for self, no matter how corrupted, remains even when one has fallen away from God's Truth. The man, who rejecting God wants to be lord over his own life and that of others, thinks he is doing well for himself, even though he is actually hating himself. He is not consciously moved to corrupt action, and consequent self-destruction, by hatred of his own soul, but by a love that is in fact disordered³⁵).

Towards the end of this passage Augustine gives us a precious hint of the shape his subsequent strokes will take. "Therefore", he asserts:

³⁵) Augustine describes this disordered self-love in human beings and in animals in *De Trinitate* 14, 14, 18 (CC 50 A, 445-446. ML 42, 1050): "This is certainly a monstrous error: that, while all wish to be of benefit to themselves, many do only what is most damaging to themselves". Between the natural wish and the effective reality of self-love something is needed. The text from *De Trinitate* 14, 14, 18 runs: "Qui ergo se diligere novit, Deum diligit, qui vero non diligit Deum, etiam si se diligit, quod ei naturaliter inditum est, tamen non inconvenienter odisse se dicitur, cum id agit quod sibi adversatur, et se ipsum tamquam suus inimicus insequitur. Qui profecto est error horrendus, ut cum sibi omnes prodesse velint, multi non faciant nisi quod eis perniciosissimum sit. Similem morbum mutorum animalium cum poeta describeret: *Dii, inquit, meliora piis, erroremque hostibus illum! Discissos nudis laniabant dentibus artus*. Cum morbus ille corporis fuerit, cur dixit errorem, nisi quia omne animal cum sibi natura conciliatum sit ut se custodiat quantum potest, talis ille erat morbus, ut ea quorum salutem appetebant, sua membra laniarent?" The lines quoted are from Vergil, *Georgics*, 3, 513-514.

man has to be instructed (*praeciendus*) in the way in which he is to love himself in order to be of benefit to himself. To doubt that he loves himself and wishes to be of benefit to himself is madness. He also has to be taught how to love his body so that he may take care of it in an orderly fashion and with prudence³⁶).

Natural self-love has to be shaped and moulded. For it to be effective and of benefit to a person, he has to be taught the way. This teaching, which Augustine at this point does not reveal, is in the nature of an instruction, even a precept ("*praeciendus*"). It appears, therefore, that, while no precept is needed for people to love themselves, they do need some kind of precept if that love in going to lead them not to moral misery and slavery to corruption but to benefit for themselves ("*ut prosit sibi*"). And, as Augustine makes plain further on, the self-love in which one has been instructed for one's own benefit does not create a self-centered world. For, unless a person has conquered covetousness and his own corrupting baseness, he cannot relate to the neighbour but by inflicting harm on him. In other words, not loving oneself to one's own benefit ("*ut prosit sibi*"), one cannot possibly love others to their benefit: "*quia nemo potest ex eo quod non habet, prodesse alteri*"³⁷). This does not mean that one pleases oneself first, and only then looks to the interests of the neighbour.

In the light of this hint we can look at the text of 1, 57-58. Again the argument proceeds in two movements.

Therefore there is no need of a precept that each person love himself and his body. This is so because we love what we are and what is below us (and is yet related to us) by an unshakeable law of nature, which has been promulgated also for beasts. For beasts too

³⁶) *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 54 (CSEL 80, 22) = 1, 25, 26 (CC 32, 20. ML 34, 29): "Modus ergo diligendi praeciendus est homini, id est quomodo se diligat ut prosit sibi — quin autem se diligat et prodesse sibi velit, dubitare dementis est —, praeciendum etiam quomodo corpus suum diligat, ut ei ordinate prudenterque consultat".

³⁷) *De Doctrina Christiana* 3, 88 (CSEL 80, 89) = 3, 10, 16 (CC 32, 87-88. ML 34, 72): "Caritatem voco motum animi ad fruendum deo propter ipsum et se atque proximo propter deum; cupiditatem autem motum animi ad fruendum se et proximo et quolibet corpore non propter deum. Quod autem agit indomita cupiditas ad corrumperendum animum et corpus suum, flagitium vocatur; quod autem agit ut alteri noceat, facinus dicitur. Et haec sunt duo genera omnium peccatorum, sed flagitia priora sunt. Quae cum exinaniverint animum et ad quandam egestatem perduxerint, in facinora prosilunt, quibus removeantur impedimenta flagitiorum aut adiumenta quaerantur. Item quod agit caritas quo sibi prosit, utilitas est; quod autem agit ut prosit proximo, beneficentia nominatur. Et hic praecedat utilitas, quia nemo potest ex eo quod non habet prodesse alteri. Quanto autem magis regnum cupiditatis destruitur, tanto caritatis augetur"

love themselves and their bodies. Thus it remained for us to accept precepts regarding Him who is above us and regarding those who are alongside us on the same level³⁸).

So far the line of reasoning is very familiar: there is no need of a precept because we love ourselves naturally as animals do. Note that this love is neither the object of an injunction nor is it approved or disapproved. It is simply a fact of nature corresponding to Burnaby's first form of self-love: each of us does look out for his own good. Then, with the second movement there is a shift:

Consequently, the end of the precept is love (cf. 1 Tim. 1. 5), and this love is twofold, love for God and for the neighbour. Now, if you consider yourself as a whole, that is as rational soul and body, and if you consider the neighbour as a whole, that is as his rational soul and body — for man is composed of a rational soul and a body — you will see that *no category of things to be loved has been omitted in these two precepts*. For when love for God takes precedence and the prescribed way of loving him is seen to require that all the other loves converge on him, nothing seems to have been said about love for yourself. But when it is said “love your neighbour as yourself”, love for yourself by yourself is not left out either³⁹).

Indeed, then, there is a precept of self-love. It is included in the double commandment and is most clearly seen in the precept to love the neighbour as oneself. “No category of things to be loved has been omitted in these two precepts”. Therefore the self-love intended is more than the natural instinct man has in common with animals which had been the theme of the first movement. It makes no sense to command an innate inclination. The newness of this self-love lies precisely in the fact that it is the object of a commandment, albeit one that takes some

³⁸) *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 57 (CSEL 80, 22) = 1, 26, 27 (CC 32, 21. ML 34, 29): “Ergo quoniam praecepto non opus est ut se quisque et corpus suum diligat, id est quoniam id quod sumus et id quod infra nos, ad nos tamen pertinet, inconcussa naturae lege diligimus, quae in bestias etiam promulgata est, nam et bestiae se atque corpora sua diligunt, restabat ut et de illo quod supra nos est et de illo quod iuxta nos est praecepta sumeremus”.

³⁹) *Ibid.*, 1, 58 (CSEL 80, 23) = 1, 26, 27 (CC 32, 21-22. ML 34, 29): “Finis itaque praecepti est dilectio et ea gemina, id est dei et proximi. Quod si te totum intellegas, id est animum et corpus, et proximum totum, id est animum et corpus eius — homo enim ex animo constat et corpore —, nullum rerum diligendarum genus in his duobus praeceptis praetermissum est. Cum enim praecurrat dilectio dei eiusque dilectionis modus praescriptus appareat, ita ut cetera in illum confluant, de dilectione tua nihil dictum videtur. Sed cum dictum est: *Diliges proximum tuum tamquam te ipsum*, simul et tui abs te dilectio non praetermissa est”.

looking for. But it seems that in God's command to love him *totally*, nothing is said of self-love, even that there is no place for it. Is the first part of the double commandment then in conflict on this point with the second part which Augustine sees as implying a prescribed love for self? Or is Augustine not rather concerned to avoid giving the impression that just any form of self-love, in the common-sense meaning of the term, can dwell harmoniously with love for God with the whole heart, the whole soul and the whole mind? He does not elaborate here on the prescribed love for self he has detected and identified. But, as we shall see in the texts now to be presented, it is only the self totally intent upon God to whom the commandment of self-love applies.

C. Self-love as love for God

"Clearly", says Augustine in *Epistola* 155 written in 413-414 to Macedonius, "it is to be understood that there is no other love with which one loves oneself than that one loves God"⁴⁰). Love for self and love for God are one. There is no need for separate precepts. The commandment remains a double, not a triple commandment, so closely is the love for self identified with love for God⁴¹). For, "because no one not loving God loves himself, and the precept of love to God had been given, it was not necessary to command man to love himself, since in loving God he loves himself"⁴²). But this does not give us permission to speculate that Augustine may have in mind a boon to self outside of and independent of the requirements of the divine commandment, as if the intention in loving God were to take advantage of this great opportunity to win what is best for ourselves, what slakes the thirst of our natural quest for happiness. There can be no doubt that, insofar as love to God is commanded, self-love is commanded. "One ought to love God *and oneself* and the neighbour *with the love the divine law demands* ... and there is no other love with which one loves oneself than that one loves

⁴⁰) *Epistola* 155, 4, 15 (CSEL 44, 445. ML 33, 672): "... videlicet ut intellegeretur nullam esse aliam dilectionem qua quisque diligit seipsum, nisi quod diligit deum".

⁴¹) *Ibid.*: "Cum ergo illa dilectione quam divina lex imperat, debeat homo diligere deum, et seipsum, et proximum; non tamen ex hoc tria praecepta data sunt, nec dictum est, In his tribus, sed, *In his duobus praeceptis tota Lex pendet et Prophetae*, id est in dilectione dei ex toto corde, ex tota anima, et ex tota mente, et proximi tamquam sui ipsius".

⁴²) *Ibid.*, (CSEL 44, 445-446. ML 33, 672-673): "Quia igitur nemo, nisi deum diligendo, diligit seipsum; non opus erat ut dato de dei dilectione praecepto, etiam seipsum homo diligere iubetur, cum in eo diligit seipsum, quod diligit deum".

God”⁴³). It is an integral part of the challenge to fulfil the commandment to love God totally and flows from one’s alacrity to meet this challenge. If there is a hidden commandment of self-love, it is the very commandment of love for God. In *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 58 an implicit precept of love to self had been discovered in the second part of the double commandment, to love one’s neighbour ‘as oneself’; in *Letter* 155 the self-love envisaged by the commandment is seen to coincide with love for God. If for *De Doctrina Christiana* it “seems” that there is no mention of love for self in the presentation of the first part of the double commandment, the reason is that self-love is included in the movement of total self-giving to God. It arises in and converges on love to God; it presupposes that one is fully intent upon God. A text from *De Trinitate*, Book 14, dating from late 418 or early 419, also reveals this trend in Augustine’s thought. “Indeed, when a person loves God, he loves himself with a love that is not blameworthy but upright”⁴⁴). “But he who does not love God, even if he loves himself, a love which comes naturally to him, can be rightly said to hate himself, because he does what is contrary to himself and persecutes himself like his own enemy”⁴⁵).

Thus, even though the human mind is so constituted that it never ceases to love itself, when it is hurtful to itself, it in fact hates itself⁴⁶). The mind’s natural love for itself (and for the body), then, so susceptible to disorder, error and to being turned into the opposite, is for Augustine too unreliable and shifting a base on which to build and to pattern love

⁴³) *Ibid.*: “Cum ergo illa dilectione quam divina lex imperat, debeat homo diligere deum, et seipsum, et proximum ... nullam esse aliam dilectionem qua quisque diligit seipsum, nisi quod diligit deum”.

⁴⁴) *De Trinitate* 14, 14, 18 (CC 50 A, 446. ML 42, 1050): “Iam enim se non perverse sed recte diligit, cum Deum diligit”.

⁴⁵) *Ibid.*, (CC 50 A, 445-446. ML 42, 1050): “... qui vero non diligit Deum, etiam si se diligit, quod ei naturaliter inditum est, tamen non inconvenienter odisse se dicitur, cum id agit quod sibi adversatur, et se ipsum tamquam suus inimicus insequitur”. Cf. *Epistola* 155, 4, 15 (CSEL 44, 445. ML 33, 672): “... videlicet ut intellegeretur nullam esse aliam dilectionem qua quisque diligit seipsum, nisi quod diligit deum. Qui enim aliter se diligit, potius se odisse dicendus est: fit quippe iniquus, privaturque luce iustitiae, cum a potiore ac praestantiore bono aversus, atque inde vel ad seipsum conversus, ad inferiora et egena utique convertitur; fitque in ipso quod veracissime scriptum est, *Qui autem amat iniquitatem, odit animam suam* (Ps. 10. 6)”.

⁴⁶) *De Trinitate* 14, 14, 18 (CC 50 A, 445. ML 42, 1049): “Sic itaque condita est mens humana, ut numquam sui non meminerit, numquam se non intellegat, numquam se non diligit. Sed quoniam qui odit aliquem, nocere illi studet; non immerito et mens hominis, quando sibi nocet, odisse se dicitur”.

for one's neighbour. He therefore grounds love for neighbour not on the natural instinct to preserve oneself nor on the natural inclination to seek one's own happiness, to be of benefit to oneself, but on God, who is not shifting and unreliable. Attachment to God shores up the foundations of love for neighbour by giving the lover new strength and light, beauty and joy. As the text from *De Trinitate* continues:

When the human mind loves God, and consequently as we have said, remembers him and understands him, it may rightly be commanded with respect to its neighbour to love him as it loves itself. Indeed, when a person loves God, he loves himself with a love that is not blameworthy but upright. Through partaking of God, not only is a person his image, but he also arises *renewed* from the state of the "old man", he arises *comely* from his deformity, *happy* from his unhappiness. He may love himself in such a way that, if an alternative proposes itself, he prefers to love all those things below himself which he loves, rather than perish. But, if he abandons the one greater than himself, he becomes so enfeebled and benighted that, falling away from himself, he is miserably drawn down to realities which are not himself and to which he is superior, by loves which he has not the strength to conquer and by errors he does not know how to turn back from. Only by turning to the one greater than himself can a person preserve his strength and is he able to enjoy Him as his light to whom the psalmist sings: "Turning to you I have preserved my strength" (Ps. 58 (59). 10: LXX); and elsewhere: "Approach Him and you will be illuminated" (Ps. 33 (34). 5). Therefore, when through the mercy of God the person who has abandoned him repents, he cries out in the psalms: "My strength has deserted me, and the light of my eyes is no longer with me" (Ps. 37 (38). 10)⁴⁷.

Self-love loosened from God threatens to drag the neighbour down into the same deformity and unhappiness, weakness and blindness as itself. It

⁴⁷) *De Trinitate* 14, 14, 18 (CC 50 A, 446-447. ML 42, 1049): "Cum autem Deum diligit mens, et sicut dictum est, consequenter eius meminit, eumque intellegit, recte illi de proximo suo praecipitur, ut eum sicut se diligit. Iam enim se non perverse sed recte diligit, cum Deum diligit, cuius participatione imago illa non solum est, verum etiam ex vetustate renovatur, ex deformitate reformatur, ex infelicitate beatificatur, Quamvis enim se ita diligit, ut si alterutrum proponatur, malit omnia quae infra se diligit perdere, quam perire; tamen superiorem deserendo, ad quem solum posset custodire fortitudinem suam, eoque frui lumine suo, cui canitur in Psalmo: *Fortitudinem meam ad te custodiam*; et in alio: *Accedite ad eum et illuminamini*; sic infirma et tenebrosa facta est, ut a se quoque ipsa, in ea quae non sunt quod ipsa, et quibus superior est ipsa, infelicius laberetur per amores quos non valet vincere, et errores a quibus non videt qua redire. Unde iam Deo miserante poenitens clamatur in Psalmis: *Deseruit me fortitudo mea, et lumen oculorum meorum non est mecum*".

has nothing of value to offer; it simply cannot please the neighbour in Paul's sense (Rom. 15. 1-2). The upright person loving himself loving God is the lover Augustine understands the second part of the double commandment to refer to; the neighbour is to be loved as the self of the upright person, created in the image of God and recreated and renewed, arising “comely from his deformity and happy from his unhappiness”. No self other than this will do.

This is to anticipate a theme — love for neighbour as oneself — that will be more explicitly handled shortly. For the present let us return to investigate what further light the relation of love for God to self-love throws on the latter.

II. FURTHER SPECIFICATION OF THE RELATION OF SELF-LOVE TO LOVE FOR GOD

A. Augustine's radical use of Ps. 10. 6: God or iniquity

That love for self goes hand in hand with love for God is attested from all the periods of Augustine's work at least from 388 on⁴⁸). In fact, as we have seen in *Epistola* 155, 4, 15, dating from 413-414, Augustine can refer to them as one love: “*nullam esse aliam dilectionem qua quisque diligit seipsum, nisi quod diligit deum*”. Any other love of self, that is, any self-love that is not fully intent upon God and serving him, Augustine calls self-hatred. When one's life is not totally orientated to God, room is left for a person to turn to perverse enjoyment of himself, as if *he* were the end of all; this leads to degeneration and loss of self in the multitude

⁴⁸) See, for example: *De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae* 1, 26, 48 (ML 32, 1331) (Date: 388): “Siquidem ille se satis diligit, qui sedulo agit, ut summo et vero perfruatur bono: quod si nihil est aliud quam Deus, sicut ea quae dicta sunt docuerunt, quis cunctari potest, quin sese amet, qui amator est Dei?”; *Sermo Denis* 17, 6 (MA I, 87) (Date: prior to 400): “... ut, cum tu dilexeris dominum, scias quia tunc te diligis, si diligis dominum. Si vero deum non diligis, nec te ipsum diligis. Cum ergo te didiceris diligere diligendo deum, rape proximum ad deum, Ut simul fruaris bono, et tanto bono quod deus est”; *Sermo Wilmart* 2, 5 (MA I, 677) (Date: prior to 410): “Video enim quia diligis te ipsum, quia diligis deum”; *Epistola* 177, 10 (to Pope Innocent) (CSEL 44, 679. ML 33, 768): “Et quoniam nisi diligat deum, nemo diligit seipsum, ideo dominus in iis duobus praeceptis totam Legem Prophetasque dicit pendere”; *Sermo* 34, 8 (CC 41, 427. ML 38, 212) (Date: 418): “Prorsus non diligebas te, quando deum non diligebas, qui fecit te; sed cum odisses te, putabas quod amares te. *Qui enim diligit iniquitatem odit animam suam* (Ps. 10. 6)”; *Tractatus in Evangelium Ioannis* 87, 1 (CC 36, 544. ML 35, 1852) (Date: 418-421): “Neque enim vera dilectione diligeremus invicem, nisi diligentes deum. Diligit enim unusquisque proximum tamquam seipsum, si diligit deum; nam si non diligit deum, non diligit seipsum”.

of lower things⁴⁹). “If you consider yourself as the end, that is also the end for you. But it is not the end in the sense of fulfilment, but in the sense of destruction”⁵⁰). For Augustine it appears that there is no half-way house between fulfilment and destruction. Either one loves God, in which case one loves oneself and the end is fulfilment, or one loves “iniquity”, in which case one hates one’s own soul and the end is destruction. Therefore, if one does not love God, one necessarily loves “iniquity” and falls into a state of enmity with oneself. There is no other choice but God or “iniquity”. The option is fundamental; failure to choose the former implies that one will go the self-destructive way of the latter. It is in this sense that Augustine employs Ps. 10. 6 in texts dealing with self-love; “He who loves iniquity hates his own soul”. “Where there is love for neighbour, there is necessarily love for God too. For how can a person who does not love God love his neighbour as himself, seeing that he does not even love himself? He is ungodly and wicked. Not only does the one who loves iniquity not love, he hates his own soul”⁵¹). To

⁴⁹) *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 41 & 46 (CSEL 80, 18 & 20) = 1, 22, 21 & 1, 23, 23 (CC 32, 17-19. ML 34, 26-27): “Tunc est quippe optimus homo, cum tota vita sua pergit in incommutabilem vitam et toto adfectu inheret illi. Si autem se propter se diligit, non se refert ad deum, sed ad se ipsum conversus non ad incommutabilem aliquid convertitur ... Iniquum est enim, quia vult sibi servire quod infra se est, cum ipse superiori servire nolit, rectissimeque dictum est: *Qui autem diligit iniquitatem, odit animam suam*. Et ideo fit infirmus animus et de mortali corpore cruciatur”. Cf. *De Trinitate* 14, 14, 18.

⁵⁰) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 10, 5 (ML 35, 2058): “Si ibi ponis finem, finiris; sed non finiris quasi perficiaris, sed finiris ut consumaris”.

⁵¹) *Tractatus in Evangelium Ioannis* 83, 3 (CC 36, 536. ML 35, 1846): “Itaque ubi dilectio est, ibi necessario fides et spes; et ubi dilectio proximi, ibi necessario etiam dilectio Dei. Qui enim non diligit Deum, quomodo diligit proximum tamquam seipsum, quandoquidem non diligit et seipsum? Est quippe impius et iniquus; *qui autem diligit iniquitatem*, non plane diligit, sed *odit animam suam*”. Ps. 10. 6 also has this contrasting function in the following texts: *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 46 (CSEL 80, 20) = 1, 23, 23 (CC 32, 19. ML 34, 27); *De Disciplina Christiana* 4, 4-5, 5 (CC 46, 211-212. ML 41, 671-672); *Sermo* 128, 3, 5 (ML 38, 715); *Epistola* 155, 4, 15 (CSEL 44, 445. ML 33, 672): “*Qui autem amat iniquitatem, odit animam suam*. Quia igitur nemo, nisi deum diligendo, diligit seipsum”; *Sermo Denis* 16, 6 (MA I, 79): “Peccas propter amicum tuum, et, ne illum offendas, negas Christum ... Iste tibi amicus non esset, si tu tibi esses; sed, quoniam ipse inimicus es tibi, amicum putas inimicum tibi. Unde autem ipse inimicus es tibi? Quia amas iniquitatem: *Qui autem amat iniquitatem, odit animam suam*. Sed non negatur Christus, ut amico impio et perverso placeatur ... contemne amicum hominem, habebis amicum deum. Sed illic ubi amicum habebis deum, sine amico proximo non eris”. The ‘amicus homo’ of the penultimate sentence is really an enemy since he leads people to deny Christ. This is “iniquity”, self-hatred; *En. in ps.* 140, 2 (CC 40, 2026-2027. ML 37, 1816): “Si enim male te diligis, et inutiliter; ita et proximum diligendo, quid ei consulis? Quomodo autem te male diligis? Quomodo innuit Scriptura, quae neminem palpat, et convincit quia non te diligis; immo convincit quia et odisti te: *Qui autem, inquit, diligit iniquitatem, odit animam suam*. Si

the extent that we are not entirely intent upon God, Augustine sees us as loving iniquity and thereby hating our own souls. Not to love God is itself to love iniquity. What this comes down to is the injunction: choose to direct your whole life to God or perish. And perishing oneself means being of no value to others.

In a eudaimonistic framework, however, it may be objected that this close association of self-love and love for God only boosts the attention given to the self and is at heart egocentric. One is concerned primarily to increase one's love for God because this means advantage to the self, growth in self-love. *De Trinitate* 8, 8, 12, read in this light, would be a scandalous assertion of the primacy of self: "The more we love God, the more we love ourselves"⁵²). Josef Brechtken sees the inner identity of love for God and self-love as confirmation of the unquestioned all-pervasiveness of the "*appetitus*"-schema in Augustine. The self, seeking enjoyment for itself, "necessarily" loves God who provides it⁵³). That

ergo diligis iniquitatem, putas quod teipsum diligas? Erras: ita et proximum diligens, ad iniquitatem duces, et dilectio tua laqueus erit dilecti. *Caritas ergo de corde puro est quae est secundum Deum, et conscientia bona, et fide non ficta* (1 Tim. 1. 5)"; *De Trinitate* 8, 6, 9 (CC 50, 283-284. ML 42, 956) and 14, 14, 18 (CC 50 A, 445-446. ML 42, 1049-1050); *Sermo* 34, 8 (CC 41, 427. ML 38, 212).

⁵²) *De Trinitate* 8, 8, 12 (CC 50, 289. ML 42, 959): "... nos autem ipsos tanto magis diligimus, quanto magis diligimus deum". A. Nygren, *Agape and Eros*, p. 541, gives as his sole support for the contention that Augustinian man loving God "does so ultimately in order to obtain satisfaction for the demands of self-love" a short quotation from *Tractatus in Evangelium Ioannis* 83, 3 (CC 36, 536. ML 35, 1846): "Qui autem se propter habendum deum diligunt, ipsi se diligunt: ergo ut se diligant, deum diligunt". (Nygren's emphasis, p. 541, n. 3). He obviously takes the "se" to mean simply "themselves", such that individuals' love for God promotes each individual's love for himself. Read in context, however, there is no doubt that the "se" should be translated as "one another", and that the sentence refers not to self-love but to love for one another 'as Christ has loved us'. "Discernitur quippe ista dilectio ab illa dilectione qua se invicem diligunt homines sicut homines; nam ut discernetur, adiunctum est: *sicut dilexi vos*. Utquid enim diligit nos Christus, nisi ut regnare possimus cum Christo? Ad hoc ergo et nos invicem diligamus, ut dilectionem nostram discernamus a ceteris, qui non ad hoc se invicem diligunt, quia nec diligunt. Qui autem se propter habendum deum diligunt, ipsi se diligunt; ergo ut se diligant, deum diligunt. Non est haec dilectio in omnibus hominibus; pauci se propterea diligunt, ut sit deus omnia in omnibus".

⁵³) J. Brechtken, *Augustin Doctor Caritatis*, p. 143, in commenting on *Tractatus in Evangelium Ioannis* 83, 3 (CC 36, 536. ML 35, 1846): "... et ubi dilectio proximi, ibi necessario etiam dilectio Dei. Qui enim non diligit deum, quomodo diligit proximum tamquam seipsum, quandoquidem non diligit et seipsum?" Brechtken remarks: "Was soll dieses 'tamquam te ipsum' und die damit angezielte Verbindung von Nächsten- und Selbst-(Gottes)-Liebe, wenn doch letzteres, aktidentisch wie es bei Augustin von jeher gemeint ist, nicht anderes als die Totalität des appetitus bestätigt und dieser appetitus nicht im geringsten in Frage gestellt wird? Inwiefern muss ich überhaupt 'notwendigerweise' Gott

the self does seek enjoyment for itself is self-evident (*"schon von sich selbst her"*). Although not much is said on the matter of *"appetitus"* when Augustine designates legitimate self-love with the formula *'se referre ad deum'*⁵⁴, not a great deal needs to be said because *"self-love is of itself"* already firmly inserted in the *'appetitus'*, without there being any further indication of where the *'appetitus'* is heading"⁵⁵).

Our difficulty with this presentation is the inference that the orientation to God (*'se referre ad deum'*) is only a heightening of the *'appetitus'*-striving of that self-love (obviously, natural self-love) which *"is of itself"* already firmly inserted in the *'appetitus'*". Is Augustinian self-love just deprived desire that will remain empty, until, in conjunction with love for God, it is filled with the enjoyment of its supreme good? In this case there is no breaking open of the "I", no self-transcendence. The "I" that finds merely satisfaction and quietistic rest in the full enjoyment of God never really changes, except that its craving has been filled and it is replete with being. Is it ultimately this self-seeking self, fundamentally as it was in the beginning, that one loves in loving God? Or does the introduction of the commandment of love for God into the discussion of self-love perhaps demand certain basic changes of the self which *"is of itself"* already firmly inserted in the *'appetitus'*"? Is the impact of the commandment more that of an indicator directing us to seek our

lieben, und zwar auf fruitive Weise, in fruitiver Absicht — das meint ja doch diese innere Identität mit der Selbstliebe —, um Nächstenliebe zu realisieren? Hier ist doch alles verkehrt, und damit die Nächstenliebe in ihrem eigentlichen Wesen völlig verkannt, nur weil schon in blinder Fixierung auf die Totalität des appetitus das *'tamquam te ipsum'* überstrapaziert, überinterpretiert ist" (My emphasis). It can be argued that the necessity of love for God in *Tractatus in Evangelium Ioannis* 83, 3 is occasioned by the concern that love of neighbour be genuine (for, not loving God, one hates oneself loving iniquity) and that the bond joining Christian lovers be something more solid than honour among thieves, namely, the desire that God be all in all. Brechtken's presupposition seems to be that Augustine means that self is "necessarily" instinctually inclined to God in search of the enjoyment of fulfilment for itself. This is for Brechtken a bad sign for counter-instinctual self-sacrificing love which is thereby caught up and contorted in the appetitus-vortex.

⁵⁴) E.g. *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 41 (CSEL 80, 18) = 1, 22, 21 (CC 32, 17. ML 34, 26): "Si autem se propter se diligit, non se refert ad deum, sed ad se ipsum conversus non ad incommutabilem aliquid convertitur".

⁵⁵) Josef Brechtken, *op. cit.*, p. 119, speaking of *"se referre ad deum"*: "Damit führt Augustin hier eine weitere *uti-Definition* ein, die zumindest geeignet ist, auch das nicht direkt als *'gebrauchen'* zu bestimmende Verhältnis zu mir selbst im bekannten Rahmen des appetitus zu benennen, auch wenn damit dem appetitus-Sachverhalt nach nicht viel gesagt ist. Nun ist das letztere hier in der Selbstliebe ja kein besonderer Mangel, da ja die Selbstliebe ohnehin fest in den appetitus eingefügt ist, *schon von sich selbst her*, ohne Angewiesenheit auf weitere appetitus-Bestimmungen" (My emphasis).

happiness in God rather than in lower things, a simple rechanneling of the momentum of natural desire; or is it the force of the commandment's requirements to bring us beyond undetermined native egoism — which, outside the commandment, easily slips into enslavement to the infra-human creation, hatred and loss of self, and the desire to enslave others — to worship and service of God and the gift to him of one's life in all its dimensions? Does the commandment call just for a change of direction of an already present desire for happiness, or does it require, in the face of the Highest Good, a transformation of this desire and of the self in search of happiness?

In the former interpretation God is really what we want him to be, the fulfilment of our natural desire; in the second God confronts us as *he* is and demands a radical transformation of the self loving him and itself. God's love for the self, not natural egoism, is according to *Sermo* 9 the basis for authentic self-love. The perspective on one's life offered by the plans of God's love leads to a radical change of attitude towards oneself which enables one to love God *as he is* ("*qualis est*") for the first time.

God wishes to make you like himself and you are trying to make him like yourself. You should rather be pleased with God as he is, not as you want him to be. For you are evil, and you wish God to be like yourself, not as he is. If however he pleased you as he is, you would be corrected and you would direct your heart to that rule, hostility to which deforms you. Let God be pleasing to you as he is; love him as he is. He himself does not love you as you are, rather he hates you as you are. Therefore, hating you as you are, he has compassion on you in order to make you what you are not yet. For he does not promise you that he will make you what he is. You will be what he is, but only after a fashion; that is, you will be an imitator of God just like an image, but not as the Son is the image of the Father ... Therefore, as I began to say, God hates you as you are, but he loves you just as he wants you to be, and therefore he exhorts you to change. Be of one mind with him, and begin to wish what is good first and to hate yourself as you are. Let this be the beginning of harmony with the word of God for you, that you hate yourself as you are. When you begin to hate yourself as you are, just as God hates you as such, you begin to love God as he is⁵⁶).

⁵⁶) *Sermo* 9, 9 (CC 41, 124-126. ML 38, 82): "Vult te deus facere similem sui, et conaris tu deum facere similem tui. Placeat tibi ergo deus qualis est, non qualem illum esse vis. Perversus enim es, et talem vis deum qualis es, non qualis est. Si autem placeat tibi qualis est, corrigeris, et diriges in eam regulam cor tuum, a qua nunc alienus distortus es. Placeat tibi deus qualis est, ama qualis est. Non te ipse amat qualis es, sed odit te qualis es. Ideo tui miseretur, quia odit te qualis es, ut faciat te qualis nondum es. Faciat te, dixi, qualis

Love for God *as God* seems to presuppose that a person distance himself from his present self; that, in imitation of God, he hate his present self⁵⁷). For this self tends to distort the reality of God, to fabricate a God pleasing to itself in its own image. It too is thereby deformed. God hates it as such and wants, in his compassion, to re-create it in his own image, to make it what it is not yet. We begin to live in harmony with the word of God, to be of one mind with him and to direct our hearts to his commandment⁵⁸), when we model our love for self on his love for ourselves, when, as it were, we love him loving ourselves⁵⁹). In other

nondum es. Nam illud tibi non promittit quia faciet te qualis est. Nam eris qualis est, sed ad quemdam modum, id est, imitator dei velut imago, sed non qualis imago est filius ... Ergo ut dicere coeperam, odit te deus qualis es, sed amat te talem qualem te esse vult, et ideo ille te ut muteris hortatur. Concorda cum illo, et incipe primo bene velle et odisse te qualis es. Hoc sit tibi initium concordiae cum sermone dei, ut incipias primo tu odisse te qualis es. Cum coeperis et tu odisse te talem qualis es, sicut te talem odit deus, incipis iam ipsum diligere deum qualis est”.

⁵⁷) This conscious “self-hatred”, with a view to becoming more pleasing to God, is evidently not to be confused with that unwitting self-hatred which is the lot of those who love not God but iniquity. Cf. Ps. 10. 6: “He who loves iniquity hates his own soul”. The former may be compared with Luther’s “Est enim diligere se ipsum odisse”. See Luther, *Der Brief an die Römer* 9, 3, in *Werke*, Vol. 56, p. 392; cf. 15, 2: p. 517. However, for Luther, hatred of self is explicated as pleasing not oneself but the neighbour while for Augustine here it is a matter of allowing oneself to be loved, led and commanded by God “as he is”, not by the deformed self which is hateful to God.

⁵⁸) In *Sermo* 9, 7 (CC 41, 120. ML 38, 82), shortly prior to our passage, the double commandment of Matt. 22. 37-40 is quoted and commented upon. It is, therefore, more than likely that “regula” and “sermo dei” in our text refer to God’s commandment. Furthermore, there is a notably close association between the commandment and God himself as he is: “Si autem placeat tibi (deus) qualis est, corrigeris, et diriges in eam regulam cor tuum, a qua nunc alienus distortus es. Placeat tibi deus qualis est, ama qualis est ... Concorda cum illo, et incipe primo bene velle et odisse te qualis es. Hoc sit tibi initium concordiae cum sermone dei ...”.

⁵⁹) In *De Trinitate* 8, 8, 12 (CC 50, 287. ML 42, 957) Augustine states that to see love is to see God, the Trinity, who is Love. He continues: “Sed commonebo, si potero, ut videre te videas; adsit tantum ipsa, ut moveamur caritate ad aliquod bonum. *Quia cum diligimus caritatem, aliquid diligentem diligimus, propter hoc ipsum quia diligit aliquid.* Ergo quid diligit caritas, ut possit etiam ipsa caritas diligi? Caritas enim non est, quae nihil diligit. Si autem se ipsam diligit, diligit aliquid oportet, ut caritate se diligit. Sicut enim verbum indicat aliquid, indicat etiam se ipsum, sed non se verbum indicat, nisi se aliquid indicare indicet; sic et caritas diligit quidem se, sed nisi se aliquid diligentem diligit, non caritate se diligit. Quid ergo diligit caritas nisi quod caritate diligimus?” (My emphasis). Now, if we love “caritas” loving something (“aliquid diligentem”), and if God, the Trinity, is the “caritas” we see and love, then we properly love God, who is Love, loving something. According to *Sermo* 9, 9, among the ‘somethings’ God loves are ourselves as he wants us to be. Therefore, when we love God “as he is”, we could say with *De Trinitate* that we love him in his very act of love for ourselves by which he makes us what he wants us to be. We love ourselves when we love *him loving ourselves*. Of course, the “something” God loves

words, God remains God, and is loved and obeyed and pleasing just as he is, when we, amenable to his exhortation to change, are corrected. Fulfilment of the first part of the double commandment does therefore imply a new God-given vision on the self and its future, and a preparedness for radical change — from a self that is hateful to God to one he is making lovable to himself. In short, from *Sermo* 9, bringing self-love into the arena of our love for God entails the breaking open of the self, its being challenged by God's loving perspective on its life to transcend itself in accordance with the commandment to love him wholly, as he is ("*qualis est*").

There is further evidence for this trend in Augustine in those texts in which he stresses that love for God is service, subjection, worship and obedience, and especially in the passages in which God demands to be loved more than the self, indeed with the whole self, *ex toto*. Taking the former texts, we become aware that loving God means serving, being subject to, adoring him and heeding his commandment. *De Trinitate* 8, 8, 12 ("The more we love God, the more we love ourselves") can be read in this light too: the more we serve, adore and are subject to him and his commandment, the more we love ourselves. For the alternative is to make an idol of something less than God — one's own wishes perhaps — and to reverence and be enslaved to that. The alternative is, following psalm 10. 6, to love iniquity, and, being subjected to it and dictated to by it, to hate one's own soul. The paradoxical nature of the alerting sentence from *De Trinitate* 8, 8, 12 should not be overlooked: the more God, not ourselves, becomes master of our lives, the more we love ourselves, that is, the less we are inclined to want to be sole masters of our own destiny and of that of others. The more we are servants of God, the less we are servants of iniquity. Or, as the *ex toto* texts will have it, the more fully we are directed away from ourselves to God, the more we truly love ourselves. The self loved is the self *ex toto* intent upon God and his law.

B. Love for God as obedience to and service of him

This does not mean to say that the human wish to achieve may also be the neighbour. Therefore, we may speak too of our love for God, which is at the same time genuine love of self, as love for *him loving our neighbour*. In its very essence, then, genuine love of self would be brought face to face with the neighbour loved by God. These are some of the implications of the openness, breadth and dynamism of love emphasised in *De Trinitate* 8, 8, 12. For, unless "*caritas*" loves *itself loving something*, it does not love itself with *caritas*: "... sed nisi se aliquid diligentem diligit, non caritate se diligit".

blessedness does not play an important role in Augustine's thought. But, insofar as it bears on the relation between self-love and love for God, it is more often than not accompanied by, tempered and transformed by the idea of love for God as service of him, and, as we shall see, by other ideas that take it beyond the realm of sublime selfishness and categories of individualistic possession, e.g. that of God as *Bonum Commune*. We have already encountered this blending of themes in *De Civitate Dei* 10, 3, 2 (Date: 416): "clinging to God" (Ps. 73. 28), which a person wishing to attain bliss is directed by the commandment to do, is described as worship of God, the service which is owed to God alone, and it includes following God's commandment to love the neighbour. Happiness lies in being subjected to God, not wishing oneself to be worshipped in his place⁶⁰). At the very end of the fourteenth book of the same work, written a couple of years later, i.e. between 418 and 420, in contrasting the heavenly city to the earthly city, Augustine again brings together the ideas of love for God (*pietas*) as right worship of the true God and as man's only wisdom, which can look to be rewarded⁶¹). This wisdom is shown to excel that of the wise men of the earthly city who pursue the goods of the body or of their own mind or of both. And, at least as early as 412, in *De Gratia Novi Testamenti*, Augustine unhesitatingly characterises this supreme and true wisdom which is love and worship of God with the whole heart and the whole soul as a gift of God, a love that is poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit who is given to us (Rom. 5. 5)⁶²). Thus, the more one loves and adores God under the influence of

⁶⁰) See *De Civitate Dei* 10, 3, 2 (CC 47, 275-276. CSEL 40/1, 450-451. ML 41, 281): "Ut enim homo sese diligere nosset, constitutus est ei finis, quo referret omnia quae ageret, ut beatus esset; non enim qui se diligit aliud vult esse quam beatus. Hic autem finis est adhaerere Deo (cf. Ps. 72. 28). Iam igitur scienti diligere se ipsum, cum mandatur de proximo diligendo sicut se ipsum, quid aliud mandatur, nisi ut ei, quantum potest, commendat diligendum Deum. Hic est Dei cultus, haec vera religio, haec recta pietas, haec tantum Deo debita servitus. Quaecumque igitur immortalis potestas quantalibet virtute praedita si nos diligit sicut se ipsam, ei vult esse subditos, ut beati simus, cui et ipsa subdita beata est. Si ergo non colit Deum, misera est, quia privatur Deo; si autem colit Deum, non vult se coli pro Deo".

⁶¹) *De Civitate Dei* 14, 28 (CC 48, 452. CSEL 40/2, 57. ML 41, 436): "... in hac (civitate Dei) autem nulla est hominis sapientia nisi pietas, qua recte colitur verus Deus, id expectans praemium in societate sanctorum non solum hominum, verum etiam angelorum, ut sit Deus omnia in omnibus (1 Cor. 15. 28)".

⁶²) *De Gratia Novi Testamenti* = *Epistola* 140, 18, 45 (CSEL 44, 193. ML 33, 557): "Dixit enim homini sicut scriptum est: *Ecce pietas est sapientia* (Job 28. 28: LXX). Porro pietas cultus Dei est, nec colitur ille nisi amando. Summa igitur et vera sapientia est in praecepto illo primo, *Diliges Dominum Deum tuum ex toto corde tuo, et ex tota anima tua* (Matt. 22. 37): ac per hoc sapientia est caritas Dei: nec diffunditur in cordibus nostris, nisi per Spiritum sanctum qui datus est nobis (cf. Rom. 5. 5)".

the Holy Spirit, the more one is truly wise, the more one loves oneself. The love for God that engenders wisdom and happiness is more a matter of graced reverential being than egocentric having. But what of the reward this enables one to expect? In *De Civitate Dei* 14, 28 above, the "*praemium*" is unambiguously described in terms of community; God is more than an individual good; the reward will be "in the company of the saints, not only holy men but also holy angels, so that 'God may be all in all' (1 Cor. 15. 28)"⁶³). Furthermore, even in eternal life, when God is loved fully, the attitude of service is retained, the law of love is kept in its fulness ("*ipsam legis plenitudinem servabimus*")⁶⁴). Even in the time of reward, of God's being all in all, the self remains subject in its enthrallment to God, even if now, happily, we no longer have any fear of straying from love, which is the fulness of the law.

But perhaps these eudaimonism-transforming accompanying ideas are a feature only of Augustine's later works. In this regard it is instructive to compare two texts from *De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae*, dating from 388. God is the supreme and true good. Who can doubt, therefore, that the lover of God loves himself, since he is thereby loving his own highest good⁶⁵)?

⁶³) *De Civitate Dei* 14, 28 (CC 48, 452. CSEL 40/2, 57. ML 41, 436): "... id expectans praemium in societate sanctorum non solum hominum, verum etiam angelorum, ut sit Deus omnia in omnibus". J. Burnaby addresses this question of the reward, the growth of love for self ensuing from love for God, in *Amor Dei*, p. 122: "The less we love what is our own (*proprium*), the more closely are we joined to God (*De Trinitate* 12, 16). 'The more we love God, the more we love ourselves' (*De Trinitate* 8, 12). These two sentences from *De Trinitate* conflict with one another only if intention is confused with effect, act with consequence. To him who loves God, the private interest of the self *cannot* be the end sought. Augustine knows ... that to love God *in order that* our love for self may be satisfied is impossible. The self-love which is native to the human soul will become injurious to the self, will turn in effect to self-hatred, unless the image of God is restored by the transformation of this self-love into the love of Him in whose image the soul was made (cf. *De Trinitate* 14, 18). But the lover of God no more intends a private good for himself than is the lover of iniquity consciously moved by hatred of his own soul".

⁶⁴) *En. in ps.* 118, *sermo* 13, 4 (CC 40, 1707. ML 37, 1538) (post-422): "*Plenitudo legis caritas* (Rom. 13. 10) ... Neque enim praecepta legis, sicut hic, etiam ibi accepturi sumus quae custodiamus, sed ipsam legis, ut dixi, plenitudinem sine ullo peccandi timore servabimus; quia et Deum plenius, cum viderimus, amabimus, et proximum, quia Deus erit omnia in omnibus; nec falsae cuiquam de proximo suspicioni erit locus, ubi nullus ulli erit occultus".

⁶⁵) *De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae* 1, 26, 48 (ML 32, 1331): "Non enim fieri potest ut seipsum, qui Deum diligit, non diligit: imo vero solus se novit diligere, qui Deum diligit. Siquidem ille se satis diligit, qui sedulo agit, ut summo et vero perfruatur bono: quod si nihil est aliud quam Deus, sicut ea quae dicta sunt docuerunt, quis cunctari potest, quin sese amet, qui amator est Dei?"

If therefore for those who love God all things turn to good (cf. Rom. 8. 28), no one doubts that not only is the supreme good (which is also called the good *par excellence*) to be loved, but that we ought (*debeamus*) to love it in such a way as to love nothing more than it. This is what the words, "with the whole soul, and the whole heart, and the whole mind", mean and express. These things having been established and most firmly believed, who will doubt, I ask, that there is anything excellent for us but God and that we should (*oporteat*) hasten to attain to him before all the rest. Moreover, if nothing separates us from his love (cf. Rom. 8. 38, 39), what could be better, what could be more certain than this good⁶⁶?

This may sound like the eudaimonistic quest for happiness in possessing its highest good, but there are elements in the text that hint at something more. The obligation ("*debeamus*", "*oporteat*") to love the supreme good "in such a way as to love nothing more than it" takes us beyond the field of natural inclination. For native egoism it is not natural to love God more than myself, which for Augustine is the only healthy way of loving myself⁶⁷). If Augustine envisages a person who perceives that in God, the good *par excellence*, is the satisfaction of all his desires and his ultimate security, why is the introduction of a commandment to love Him necessary? Is it not that one's spontaneous desires easily lead to idolatry and look to the satisfaction of the self rather than to God as he is? It is then as if God as God has to be asserted for man's good. For failure to respect the order established by him, in which the active life is to be subordinated to the contemplative, leads to havoc among the natural instincts at all levels of human being — what might be called an unhealthy love of self. Order returns, the soul is restored to health, when one is united to God in subjection to him ("*deo subditus haereat*")⁶⁸).

⁶⁶) *Ibid.*, 1, 11, 18 (ML 32, 1319): "Si igitur diligentibus Deum omnia procedunt in bonum; et summum bonum quod etiam optimum dicitur, non modo diligendum esse nemo ambigit, sed ita diligendum ut nihil amplius diligere *debeamus*; idque significatur et exprimitur quod dictum est: *Ex tota anima, ex toto corde, et ex tota mente*: quis quaeso dubitaverit, his omnibus constitutis, et firmissime creditis, nihil nobis aliud esse optimum, ad quod adipiscendum postpositis ceteris festinare *oporteat*, quam Deum? Item si nulla res ab eius charitate nos separat, quid esse non solum melius, sed etiam certius hoc bono potest". It is unclear in the final sentence whether Augustine means our love for God or his love for us. As we have seen in Chapter One, it is possible that in 1, 26, 51 (ML 32, 1332), where the context is similar, Augustine has the latter in mind; and in 1, 30, 64 (ML 32, 1337) it is rather more than possible.

⁶⁷) *Ibid.*, 1, 26, 49 (ML 32, 1331): "Te autem ipsum salubriter diligis, si plus quam te diligis Deum".

⁶⁸) See *De Vera Religione* 262 (CSEL 77, 67) = 48, 93 (CC 32, 248. ML 34, 163-164) (Date: 390): "Quem ergo delectat libertas, ab amore mutabilium rerum liber esse appetat;

The second text from *De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae* further elaborates the nature and the effect of the "*beatissima vita*" which love for God brings:

You commend us quite rightly, catholic church, true mother of Christians, to worship (*colendum*) God himself most purely and most chastely. Attaining him is the most blessed life. You do not propose to us any created thing that is to be adored (*adorandam*) and that we are commanded to serve (*servire jubeamur*). You exclude from that uncorrupted and inviolable eternity, to whom alone man is to be subjected (*subjiciendus*) and in union (*cohaerendo*) with whom alone the rational soul is not unhappy, all that has been created, all that is subject to change and to time ... Not only do you commend to us worship of God alone, but you also embrace love and *caritas* for the neighbour, such that you abound in the remedy for the various maladies which souls suffer on account of their sins⁶⁹).

It is to be noted that both love for God and love for neighbour belong to the remedy by which the disordered self is restored to health. Again the theme of worship, adoration, service and subjection to God qualifies love for him and happiness in union with him. True freedom and true mastery over one's life consist in being united with and subject to God ("*deo subditus haereat*"), who alone rules over all things, and, in this sense, to love him more than oneself⁷⁰). The wisdom flowing from such freedom, i.e. service of God⁷¹), and the perspectives opened up by it on one's life, (i.e. perfection: invincibility to the proud desire to lord it over others, to envy and other destructive passions), encourage one to hate one's present

et quem regnare delectat, uni omnium regnatori Deo subditus haereat, plus eum diligendo quam seipsum. Et haec est perfecta iustitia, qua potius potiora, et minus minora diligimus".

⁶⁹) *De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae* 1, 30, 62 (ML 32, 1336): "Merito, Ecclesia catholica, mater Christianorum verissima, non solum ipsum Deum, cuius adeptio vita est beatissima, purissime atque castissime colendum praedicat; nullam nobis adorandam creaturam inducens, cui servire jubeamur; et ab illa incorrupta et inviolabili aeternitate, cui soli homo subjiciendus est, cui soli rationabilis anima cohaerendo non misera est, excludens omne quod factum est, quod obnoxium commutationi, quod subditum tempori; ... sed etiam proximi dilectionem atque charitatem ita complecteris, ut variorum morborum, quibus pro peccatis suis animae aegrotant, omnis apud te medicina praevalleat".

⁷⁰) *De Vera Religione* 262 (CSEL 77, 67) = 48, 93 (CC 32, 248. ML 34, 164): "... uni omnium regnatori Deo subditus haereat, plus eum diligendo quam seipsum".

⁷¹) *De Vera Religione* 245-246 (CSEL 77, 63) = 46, 87 (CC 32, 244. ML 34, 161): "Diligamus ergo, ut praeceptum est, etiam inimicos nostros, si vere invicti esse volumus. Non enim per seipsum quisquam hominum invictus est; sed per illam incommutabilem legem, qui quicumque serviunt, soli sunt liberi. Sic enim eis quod diligunt auferri non potest: quae res una invictos facit et perfectos viros".

foolish self which is not in the service of God but at the beck and call of its disordered love of changeable things⁷²).

Thus, the paradox cutting across the eudaimonistic framework, which is introduced by the idea of service to God and submission to his law, may be traced even as far back as *De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae*. For *De Vera Religione*, perfection, freedom, wisdom and invincibility to pride and disorder are attained not by man's own efforts ("per se ipsum") but by the observance of God's unchangeable law⁷³). The alternative to loving God, then, in serving him, is slavery to corruption, foolishness, arrogance and weakness⁷⁴). Love for God is obedience to him and to his unchangeable law. Augustine's reading of 1 Jn. 5. 3, i.e. "This is love for God: that we keep his commandments", brings into the foreground an element that has already previously been alluded to. At least twice in the tenth tract of the commentary on the letter of John, God's commandments can be seen to be summed up in love for neighbour⁷⁵). Thus love for neighbour is indispensable to obedient service to God and therefore also indispensable to genuine love for self. When we accept God as our Highest Good, he demands that we take him commandment and all, with the neighbour too. This is quite a different idea to that which sees love for neighbour as increasing our own love for

⁷²) *De Vera Religione* 262-263 (CSEL 77, 67) = 48, 93 (CC 32, 248. ML 34, 164): "Sapientem animam atque perfectam talem diligit, qualem illam videt; stultam non talem, sed quia esse perfecta et sapiens potest: quia nec seipsum debet stultum diligere. Nam qui se diligit stultum, non proficiet ad sapientiam; nec fiet quisque qualis cupit esse, nisi se oderit qualis est". In context, this follows immediately after the text quoted in n. 68 above.

⁷³) *De Vera Religione* 245 (CSEL 77, 63) = 46, 87 (CC 32, 244. ML 34, 161): "Non enim per se ipsum quisquam hominum invictus est, sed per illam incommutabilem legem, cui quicumque serviunt soli sunt liberi".

⁷⁴) See again *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 46-47 (CSEL 80, 20) = 1, 23, 23 (CC 32, 18-19. ML 34, 27): "Iniquum est enim, quia vult sibi servire, quod infra se est, cum ipse superiori servire nolit, rectissimeque dictum est: *Qui autem diligit iniquitatem, odit animam suam* (Ps. 10. 6), et ideo fit infirmus animus et de mortali corpore cruciatur. Necesse est enim ut illud diligit et eius corruptione praegravetur. Immortalitas enim et incorruptio corporis de sanitate animi existit, sanitas autem animi est firmissime inherere potiori, hoc est incommutabili deo. Cum vero etiam eis qui sibi naturaliter pares sunt, hoc est, hominibus, dominari affectat, intolerabilis omnino superbia est". Cf. *De Trinitate* 14, 14, 18 (CC 50 A, 445-446. ML 42, 1049-1050).

⁷⁵) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 10, 3 (ML 35, 2056): "Sed qui Deum diligit, praecepta eius diligit. Et quae sunt praecepta Dei? Mandatum novum do vobis, ut vos invicem diligatis (Jn. 13. 34)". The answer to a plural question is the singular: love for neighbour. Tr. 10, 7 (ML 35, 2058-2059) also contains a commentary on 1 Jn. 5. 3: "Haec est enim dilectio Dei, ut praecepta eius servemus". Even though the double commandment is quoted, the whole text speaks of love for neighbour.

God conceived as tranquillity, enjoyment, reward for ourselves⁷⁶). That love for neighbour is integral to the love for God in which one truly loves oneself is expressed very forcefully in an anti-Donatist sermon, *De Utilitate Ieiunii*, possibly dating from 411. The self-love of an individual who has, for example, been able to subdue his own flesh may well fall short of the authentic self-love that springs from obedience to God⁷⁷). There is a move in this text beyond the integrity of the individual self to that of the community self in response to God's commandment. The fact that this shift occurs explicitly in a highly polemical sermon does not of itself invalidate the way of thinking as an ideological construct designed to cast scorn on the fasting practices of the Donatists and to cudgel them back into the unity of the *Catholica*. As we have seen, the social aspect of self-love as obedience to God is hinted at in earlier works (*De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae*)⁷⁸), and is also present in non-polemical works (e.g. *De Doctrina Christiana*). It is not devised here merely for the occasion, and, as we shall see, has a broader than polemical resonance⁷⁹).

⁷⁶) See, for example, G. Hultgren, *Le commandement d'amour chez Augustin*, p. 180: "Si notre amour du prochain visant à ramener celui-ci à Dieu apporte un accroissement de l'amour de Dieu, ce n'est donc pas uniquement notre prochain qui profite de l'amour dont il est l'objet, mais nous en profitons nous aussi, étant donné que notre amour de Dieu s'accroît lui aussi, pendant que nous pratiquons l'amour du prochain. C'est sur ce point de vue égocentrique que repose la conception de l'amour du prochain comme 'un degré certain' pour nous élever à l'amour du Dieu. Mais c'est précisément cette conception qui risque de compromettre l'amour du prochain".

⁷⁷) See *De Trinitate* 14, 14, 18 (CC 50 A, 446. ML 42, 1050): "Quamvis enim se ita diligit, ut si alterutrum proponatur, malit omnia quae infra se diligit perdere, quam perire; tamen superiorem deserendo, ad quem solum posset custodire fortitudinem suam, eoque frui lumine suo, cui canitur in Psalmo: *Fortitudinem meam ad te custodiam*; et in alio: *Accedite ad eum et illuminamini*".

⁷⁸) See *De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae* 1, 30, 62 (ML 32, 1336). Love for neighbour belongs to the remedy by which the disordered self is restored to health.

⁷⁹) Augustine's argument here runs: you are concerned about the integrity of your own body; then be concerned about the integrity and unity of the church, i.e. Christ's body, of which you along with others are members. This movement from the integrity of the individual body to that of the collectivity found in this text is paralleled on the level of the heart and soul by Augustine's growingly communitarian understanding of Acts 4. 32 a, i.e. "the whole group of believers was united heart and soul": "multitudinis autem credentium erat *cor unum et anima una*". L. Verheijen in his article, "Acts 4. 31-35 in the Monastic Texts of Saint Augustine", in *Second Annual Course on Augustinian Spirituality*, Rome, 1976, p. 47-59, shows that Augustine originally understood *cor unum* in the sense "of the *cor simplex*, the individual heart integrated, unified and at peace. This heart is able to remain free from the disorderly multitude of temporal things which come and go, which are born and which die. The *cor simplex* — and because *simplex* also *unum* — renounces temporal and ephemeral things for it loves that which is eternal and one, and wants to remain attached to our Lord who is one" (p. 49-50. Verheijen is here paraphrasing *En. in*

But, if your flesh obeys you and you do not obey your God, are you not condemned by that flesh when it is submissive to you? ... And you say: 'What greater being should I obey?' You had said that you were a lover of justice. Then listen to Christ speaking: "A new commandment I give you: that you love one another" (Jn. 13. 34). Therefore hear your Lord giving the commandment to love one another. He makes of us all a body for himself. In this body we are as members, and it has one head, the Lord and Saviour himself. But you tear yourself away from the members of Christ, you do not love unity ... If any part of your body is not in agreement with the other parts, you seek somebody to remedy this. Why then do you not seek to be healed so that you may be recalled to the union of the members of Christ, and be in agreement with that body and with your own? ... You do not maintain unity in the members of Christ. What then are your fasts and of what benefit are they? You think a God who is served in unity (*in unitate serviatur*) by all who believe in him a God unworthy of the name, and yet you wish to preserve unity in your body, in your members, in your hair⁸⁰).

In this text self-love in being related to love for (obedience to) God is drawn far beyond the natural individualistic concern for the harmony and health of one's own body and beyond the desire to subdue it and to

ps. 4, 10, dating from 392). However, Augustine's religious *Rule*, which Verheijen dates 397, opens with the quotation of Acts 4. 32 a, now obviously understood collectively. Verheijen considers that "thanks to a letter from Paulinus of Nola (i.e. *Epistola* 30 in Augustine's correspondence, dating from 395), Augustine began to attribute to *anima una* and *cor unum* a more collective meaning and to understand these terms in the sense of 'unanimity' and 'concord' between several persons. Also, in the *Rule*, at the beginning of Saint Augustine's episcopate, the ascetical ideal, expressed by Acts 4. 32 b, c + 35 b, is enveloped in the ideal of fraternity, expressed in 4. 32 a, understood now in a collective sense. Saint Augustine realized that this fraternity in a monastery is a concrete form of the brotherly spirit of the whole church: the *anima una* is the *anima unica Christi* (cf. the letter to Laetus, *Epistola* 243, 3-4) ..." (p. 58). For a development of this communitarian interpretation of Acts 4. 31-35, see T.J. van Bavel O.S.A., "De eerste christelijke commune en het religieuze leven", in *Tijdschrift voor geestelijk leven* 5 (1979) 498-542, especially p. 507-515.

⁸⁰) *De Utilitate Ieiunii* 6, 7-8 (CC 46, 236-237. ML 40, 712): "Quid, si caro tua obedit tibi, et tu non obedis Deo tuo? Nonne ab ipsa damnaris, cum tibi obtemperat? ... 'Et cui', inquit, 'maiori obtemperem?' Ecce Christus loquitur — iustitiae amatorem te dixeris —: *Mandatum novum do vobis, ut vos invicem diligatis*. Audi ergo Dominum tuum mandatum dantem ut nos invicem diligamus. Cum ex nobis omnibus tamquam membris corpus sibi faciat, quod corpus habeat unum caput ipsum Dominum et Salvatorem, tu contra divellis te a membris Christi, non amas unitatem ... Si autem aliquid in tuo copore dissentiat ab aliis partibus, quaeris qui emendet. Cur ergo non quaeris emendari, ut compagini membrorum Christi revoceris et congruas in ipso corpore et tuo? ... et tu in membris Christi non tenes unitatem. Quid sunt ergo, aut cui rei prosunt ieiunia tua? Indignum deum putas, cui ab omnibus qui in eum credunt, in unitate serviatur; et tamen vis in membris tuis, in corpore tuo, in capillis tuis unitatem servari".

have control over it. Essential to a worthy love for God is serving him in unity (“*in unitate serviatur*”) with Christ’s other members, such that a breach of that integrity may be considered a failure to love oneself properly.

C. *Loving God more than oneself, ex toto*

In a sermon preached before 410 Augustine defines self-love or love of self as “the love with which you love yourself such that you love God”⁸¹). In view of the texts considered in the previous section we could now paraphrase this assertion: self-love is the love with which one loves oneself in such a way as to subject oneself to God’s reign and rule; the self one loves is the self serving God wholly, or at least open to serving him with the whole heart, the whole soul and the whole mind, even though it is not fully possible in this life⁸²). The other side to the relation is that, loving God more than ourselves, we love ourselves best, becoming wise and truly free from attachment to changeable things⁸³). For *Sermo Denis* 17, 6, given prior to 400, the whole Law and the Prophets are said to hang on the double commandment as formulated “such that, when you have loved the Lord, you may then know that you love yourself, if you love the Lord”⁸⁴). The love for the Lord precedes

⁸¹) *Sermo Wilmart* 2, 4 (MA I, 677): “Haec est ergo dilectio tua vel dilectio tui, id est, dilectio qua te diligis, ut deum diligas”.

⁸²) The lack of love’s wholeness in this life is recognized especially in anti-Pelagian texts e.g. *De Perfectione Iustitiae Homini* 8, 19 (CSEL 42, 17-18. ML 44, 300-301) (Date: 416): “In qua plenitudine caritatis praeceptum illud implebitur, *Diliges Dominum Deum tuum ex toto corde tuo, et ex tota anima tua, et ex tota mente tua*. Nam cum est adhuc aliquid carnalis concupiscentiae, quod vel continendo frenetur, non omni modo ex tota anima diligitur Deus ... Cur ergo non praeciperetur homini ista perfectio, quamvis eam in hac vita nemo habeat? Non enim recte curritur, si quo currendum est nesciatur. Quomodo autem sciretur, si nullis praeceptis ostenderetur?” In this life, however, progress in openness to total love for God is made in concrete love for neighbour. See *Tractatus in Ioannis Evangelium* 17, 9 (CC 36, 175. ML 35, 1532): “Diligendo proximum, et curam habendo de proximo tuo, iter agis. Quo iter agis, nisi ad Dominum Deum, ad eum quem diligere debemus ex toto corde, ex tota anima, ex tota mente? Ad Dominum enim nondum pervenimus, sed proximum nobiscum habemus. Porta ergo eum cum quo ambulas, ut ad eum pervenias cum quo manere desideras”.

⁸³) See *De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae* 1, 26, 49 (ML 32, 1331): “Te autem ipsum salubriter diligis, si plus quam te diligis Deum”; *De Vera Religione* 262 (CSEL 77, 67) = 48, 93 (CC 32, 248. ML 34, 163-164): “Quem delectat ergo libertas, ab amore mutabilium rerum liber esse appetat, et quem regnare delectat, uni omnium regnatori deo subditus haereat plus eum diligendo quam se ipsum”.

⁸⁴) *Sermo Denis* 17, 6 (MA I, 87): “... ut, cum tu dilexeris dominum, scias quia tunc te diligis, si diligis dominum”.

love of self and accompanies it; the self loved is that loving the Lord, that which considers itself "worthless" in comparison to him⁸⁵), not that which coolly and independently sizes up the possibilities for wisdom, happiness and freedom and opts for God as offering the best deal to achieve them. The good that accrues to the self loving God is not the prize earned through having orientated one's instinctual love for self appropriately to one's best advantage, but the gift that paradoxically flows from a person's preferring to be God's rather than one's own, the gift that unsolicited comes to meet total self-gift in response to the commandment. Before 396 Augustine has phrased this tentatively as follows:

But when God is loved more than the soul such that a man prefers to be God's rather than his own (*ut malit homo eius esse quam suus*) then he truly cares best for the soul, and consequently for the body. He is not now impelled by any instinct to be solicitous about himself; he only accepts what is presented and offered to him. On the other hand, love's poison is the hope to acquire and keep temporal things⁸⁶).

⁸⁵) *Ibid.*, (MA I, 86-87): "Ipse amator, in comparatione rei quae amanda est, vilescere sibi debet. Ipsa est illa caritas quae iubetur *ex toto corde, ex tota anima, et ex tota mente*. Sed adiunxit et ait: *Diliges proximum tuum, tamquam te ipsum*. In his duobus praeceptis tota lex pendet et prophetae; ut, cum tu dilexeris dominum, scias quia tunc te diligis, si diligis dominum. Si vero deum non diligis, nec te ipsum diligis". "Vilescere" is to be understood not in the sense of downplaying man to give God glory, but as stressing that man's true greatness is to be found not in enjoyment of himself but of God. The "contemnit" of *De Libero Arbitrio* 3, 25, 76, 262-263 (CC 29, 320. CSEL 74, 153. ML 32, 1308) gives us the key to the proper understanding of "vilescere" in *Sermo Denis* 17, 6: "Melior est autem cum obliviscitur sui prae caritate incommutabilis Dei, vel seipsum penitus in illius comparatione contemnit. Si autem tamquam obvis sibi placet sibi ad perverse imitandum Deum, ut potestate sua frui velit, tanto fit minor, quanto se cupit esse maiorem". It is interesting to note that "contemnere" is used in later texts, in conjunction with Jn. 15. 13 (i.e. "No one has greater love than this: to lay down his life for his friends") and 1 Jn. 3. 16, to describe the attitude of martyrs towards their lives in this world. See, for example, *De Natura et Gratia* 70, 84 (CSEL 60, 298. ML 44, 290) (Date: 415). In *En. in ps.* 102, 3 (CC 40, 1452. ML 37, 1317) (Date: 412) the "contemnere" of one's own present life is equated with service of God, even to dying for him, but this death is on behalf of "brothers" and "friends". One "despises" oneself in the service of God in favour of others: "Hoc enim considerantes martyres ... et omnes omnino sancti qui vitam ipsam contempserunt, et sicut audistis in Epistola Ioannis, animas suas pro fratribus posuerunt (cf. 1 Jn. 3. 16), quae est perfectio caritatis, dicente Domino: *Maiorem caritatem nemo habet, quam ut animam suam ponat pro amicis suis* (Jn. 15. 13); hoc ergo considerantes sancti martyres, contempserunt animas suas hic, ut ibi eas invenirent, sequentes verba Domini dicentis: *Qui amat animam suam, perdet eam; et qui perdiderit eam propter me, in vitam aeternam inveniet eam* (Jn. 12. 25). Voluerunt enim retribuere: qui? et quid? et cui? Homines ministerium suum usque ad mortem Deo retribuerunt".

⁸⁶) *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83, q. 36, 1 (CC 44 A, 54. ML 40, 25): "Sed cum deus

Preferring to be God's rather than one's own means that a person is open not only to fulfil His commandment but to receive His gifts, "to accept what is presented and offered to him". True self-love is itself a gift of God, not a covetous striving on the model of desire for temporal things. A person cares best for himself, not by being solicitous about himself in response to instinct, but by caring more to give himself over to God, by desiring *to be* God's rather than *to acquire* goods for himself, to allow God to possess him rather than to possess a multitude of things.

True self-love — that by which a person with all that lives in him loves God ("*qui ex toto quod in eo vivit, deum diligit*") — can be described in terms of the *frui* of God, not of changeable things⁸⁷). But this is to stress that only God is worthy of *frui* and total self-gift, and that to have a *frui*-attitude towards realities other than God would be to love iniquity and therefore to hate one's own soul (cf. Ps. 10. 6). Furthermore, it is by God's grace and favour that one loves oneself loving him, enjoying (or hoping to enjoy) him, not temporal things. The gift theme in these terms is strongly present even as early as *De Vera Religione* (390). Turning from mortal affections to *frui* of God, Wisdom, the Unchangeable, comes about through the Holy Spirit who is himself the gift of God. Thus, one can spiritually ("*spiritualiter*") love oneself, since the Holy Spirit makes loving God with all one's life possible. The very self which is offered to him in all its dimensions — "*omnes cogitationes tuas et omnem vitam et omnem intellectum*" — the very life that is intent upon him, *frui* of the Unchangeable, is from the very beginning God's gift⁸⁸).

magis diligitur quam animus, ut malit homo eius esse quam suus, tunc vere animo summeque consulitur, consequenter et corpori, nobis id non curantibus aliquo appetitu satagente, sed tantum prompta et ablata sumentibus. Caritatis autem venenum est, spes adipiscendorum aut retinendorum temporalium".

⁸⁷) *De Vera Religione* 65-66 (CSEL 77, 18) = 12, 24 (CC 32, 202. ML 34, 132): "Si autem, dum in hoc stadio vitae humanae anima degit, vincat eas, quas adversum se nutrit, cupiditates fruendo mortalibus et ad eas vincendas gratia dei se adiuvare credat mente illi serviens et bona voluntate, sine dubitatione reparabitur et a multis mutabilibus ad unum incommutabile revertetur reformata per sapientiam non formatam, sed per quam formantur universa, fruaturque deo per spiritum sanctum, quod est donum dei. Ita fit homo spiritualis omnia iudicans, ut ipse a nemine iudicetur, diligens dominum deum suum in toto corde, in tota anima, in tota mente et diligens proximum suum non carnaliter, sed tamquam se ipsum. Se autem spiritualiter diligit, qui ex toto quod in eo vivit deum diligit. In his enim duobus praeceptis tota lex pendet et prophetae" (My emphasis).

⁸⁸) *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 41-42 (CSEL 80, 18-19) = 1, 22, 21 (CC 32, 17. ML 34, 26-27): "Sed nec se ipso quisquam frui debet, si liquide advertas, quia nec se ipsum debet propter se ipsum diligere, sed propter illum quo fruendum est. Tunc est quippe optimus homo, cum tota vita sua pergit in incommutabilem vitam et toto adfectu inheret

Now we wish to refer to two further texts that present worthy self-love as love for God "*ex toto te*". Again we meet the paradox that only when one is *ex toto* given to God, i.e. *ex toto* directed away from one's instinctually egoistic self, does one truly love and find preservation for oneself. The double commandment does embrace self-love; it does not leave it to the instincts, which lead many to love themselves badly and to lose their sense of orientation: a shaky foundation for love of neighbour. Prior to 410 Augustine spoke to his congregation in these words:

Therefore, if there are three things to be loved, why are there only two precepts? Listen. God did not judge that you had to be instructed to love yourself, for there is no one who does not love himself. But, because many, loving themselves badly, lose themselves, a rule as to how you are to love yourself has been given to you in that you are told to love your God with your whole self. Do you wish to love yourself? Love God with your whole self, for there you will find yourself and not lose yourself in yourself. If you love yourself in yourself (*te in te*), you will fall away from yourself too and will go out of yourself in search of a multitude of things ... Look, say you have chosen to love yourself; let us see whether you remain even in yourself. You do not; having fallen away from God, you fall away from yourself too. For in God is your strengthening; you should cling to him and make him your fortress and place of refuge. Now, however, you have slackened the bond of your love for him, you have broken off with him to turn to yourself. And you do not remain in yourself. Listen therefore to the Apostle. When he said: "For there will be men loving themselves", he added immediately "lovers of money" (2 Tim. 3. 2). Didn't I say you would not even remain in yourself? You are not money, are you? Look how you, who have abandoned God, have become lost even to yourself ... [The example of the Prodigal Son is adduced. Lost, he

illi. Si autem se propter se diligit, non se refert ad deum, sed ad se ipsum conversus non ad incommutabile aliquid convertitur. Et propterea iam cum defectu aliquo se fruitur, quia melior est cum totus haeret atque constringitur incommutabili bono, quam cum inde vel ad se ipsum relaxatur. Si ergo te ipsum non propter te debes diligere, sed propter illum ubi dilectionis tuae rectissimus finis est, non suscenseat alius homo, si etiam ipsum propter deum diligis. Haec enim regula dilectionis divinitus constituta est: *Diliges, inquit, proximum tuum tamquam te ipsum*, deum vero *ex toto corde, ex tota anima, ex tota mente*, ut omnes cogitationes tuas et omnem vitam et omnem intellectum in illum conferas a quo habes ea ipso quae confers". And further 1, 64 (CSEL 80, 24) = 1, 29, 30 (CC.32, 23. ML 34, 30): "... quid nos in societate dilectionis dei agere convenit, quo perfrui beate vivere est, et a quo habent omnes qui eum diligunt et quod sunt et quod eum diligunt, de quo nihil metuimus ne cuiquam possit cognitum displicere, et qui se vult diligi, non ut sibi aliquid, sed ut eis qui diligunt aeternum praemium conferatur, hoc est ipse quem diligunt?" (My emphasis).

says: "I will rise and go to my Father" (Lk. 15. 18)] ... Therefore a rule has been laid down for you as to how you are to love yourself: love the one better than you and you have loved yourself. I mean better by nature, not by will. For many people are found to be better than you by will, but only God is so by nature: God, the creator, the unmade maker. Attach yourself to him. Listen now at last and say ... "It is good for me to cleave to God" (Ps. 72. 28), that is, not to be unfaithful and to take myself away from God. Do you wish to see what is promised you in this matter? "But anyone who cleaves to the Lord is one spirit with him" (1 Cor. 6. 17). Therefore self-love or love of yourself is this: the love with which you love yourself such that you love God⁸⁹).

Only strengthened and supported by God, the creator, the source of life, can self-love be prevented from turning to sour selfishness. Only when a person is with all his being intent upon God, the only being better and stronger than he by nature, is he freed from loving himself badly and to perdition. The rule of self-love contained in the commandment breaks through the tendency to love oneself in oneself ("*te in te*"), and directs the self to be fully open to the gifts of the source of life, to take refuge in God's strength (which prevents one slipping into little idolatries), and to become "one spirit with him" (1 Cor. 6. 17). Then a person will truly 'love himself such that he loves God'; 'when he has loved the Lord, he will then know that he loves himself, if he loves the Lord'. Considering

⁸⁹) *Sermo Wilmart* 2, 4 (MA I, 676-677): "Ergo si tria sunt diligenda, quare duo sunt praecepta? Quare? Accipite. Non iudicavit deus monendum te, ut diligas te: nemo est enim, qui non diligit se. Sed quoniam multi male se diligendo perdunt se, dicendo tibi ut diligas deum tuum ex toto te, ibi tibi data est regula quemadmodum diligas te. Vis diligere te? Dilige deum ex toto te: ibi enim invenies te, ne in te perdas te. Si te in te diligis, casurus es et a te, et multa quaesiturus es praeter te ... Ecce eligisti amare te: videamus si remanes vel in te. Falsum est, non ibi remanes: a deo lapsus, et abs te laberis. Ibi est enim firmamentum: ibi haerere debuisti, illum tibi facere locum munitum et domum refugii. Nunc vero vinculum amoris tui relaxasti, vel dirupisti ab illo ad te; non remanes nec in te. Audi denique ipsum apostolum. Cum dixisset, *Erunt enim homines seipsos amantes*, continuo subiecit: *amatores pecuniae* (2 Tim. 3. 2). Nonne dixi quia non eras remansurus vel in te? Numquid pecunia tu es? Ecce et a teipso peristi, qui a deo recessisti ... Ergo constituta est tibi regula, quemadmodum te diligas: dilige meliorem te, et dilexisti te. Sed meliorem dico natura, non voluntate. Multi enim homines inveniuntur meliores te voluntate, sed solus deus natura: creator, institutor, factor a nullo factus. Ibi te fige. Intellege aliquando, et dic ... *mihi autem adherere deo bonum est* (Ps. 73. 28), hoc est, non fornicari a deo, non me tollere a deo. Vis videre autem in hac re quid tibi promittatur? *Qui autem adheret domino unus spiritus est* (1 Cor. 6. 17). Haec est ergo dilectio tua vel dilectio tui, id est, dilectio qua te diligis, ut deum diligas". Cf. *Ibid.*, 2, 3 (MA I, 676): "... ex toto, quod in te vivit, diliges fontem vitae".

himself "worthless", that is, losing himself as it were to God who alone is essentially better than he, a person finds his true, eminently lovable self.

This paradox is most sharply posed in a sermon dating from 418:

The price of wheat is your money, the price of a farm your silver, the price of a pearl your gold. The price of love is you ... If you wish to have love, seek yourself and find yourself. For why are you afraid to give yourself? Are you afraid you will annihilate yourself? Rather, if you do not give yourself, you lose yourself ... For see if Jesus wished to release to you any part of yourself with which to love yourself, when he says to you: "You are to love the Lord your God with your whole heart and your whole soul and your whole mind". What remains of your heart to love yourself? What remains of your soul, of your mind? "With the whole" he says. He who created you claims your whole self. (*Totum exigit de te, qui fecit te*)⁹⁰.

God alone has the right to require that we give ourselves to him entirely. He leaves no side of our being unclaimed by which we might be able to love ourselves in ourselves and escape the necessity of self-giving. Fears for the preservation of the self militate against the demand of the commandment to love God *ex toto*, and therefore against an upright love of self. "You lose yourself if you do not give yourself". Seeking to preserve the self leads inevitably to its loss and to love of and enslavement to iniquity. Only if there is no refusal to respect God's, the creator and source of life's, claims to the whole self, does a person find himself, in a proper, obedient and orderly fashion, loving himself.

III. FIRST STEPS IN THE RELATION BETWEEN SELF-LOVE AND LOVE FOR NEIGHBOUR

A. *Testing the genuineness of self-love as a protection for the neighbour*

We alluded above to the intolerable pride of wanting to be above and before one's fellow-creatures, one's natural equals, which is the consequence of a disordered love for self, a self-love that has drifted from

⁹⁰) *Sermo* 34, 7 (CC 41, 426-427. ML 38, 212): "Pretium tritici, nummus tuus; pretium fundi, argentum tuum; pretium margaritae, aurum tuum; pretium caritatis, tu ... Si vis autem habere caritatem, quaere te, et inveni te. Quid enim times dare te, ne consumas te? Immo si non te dederis, perdis te ... Vide enim, si aliquid voluit dimittere in te unde ames vel te, qui tibi dixit: "*Diliges dominum deum tuum ex toto corde tuo, et ex tota anima tua, et ex tota mente tua*. Quid remanet de corde tuo, unde diligas te ipsum? Quid de anima tua? Quid de mente tua? *Ex toto*, inquit. Totum exigit de te, qui fecit te".

its firm moorings in adherence to the unchangeable God⁹¹). Augustine's awareness of this proud desire of the soul leads him on several occasions, at least from 397 until near the end of his life, to raise a warning cry against arrogance and to insist that the self-love that serves as the basis for love of neighbour be genuine. His ultimate concern in this is that the neighbour not be subjected to the self's egoism nor corrupted by its idolatrous and disordered attachments. Therefore, he hesitates to commit the neighbour to our love, for fear that the neighbour might come off the worse for our having had anything to do with him. The anxiety of Augustine to protect the neighbour from perverted self-love is perhaps best illustrated by quoting at some length from *De Disciplina Christiana*, probably dating from 397:

You ask yourself: how have I to love my neighbour? Look attentively at yourself, and as you love yourself, love your neighbour too. There can be no mistake about it. Therefore, I should like to entrust your neighbour to you for you to love him as yourself. I should like to do that, but there is still something that makes me hold back. I should like to say: love your neighbour as you love yourself. And yet I hesitate, because I first want to discuss how you ought to love yourself. I hope that you will not take this amiss. This is not a matter that can be dealt with lightly in passing. I can't make it too easy for you, for you are the one to whom the neighbour is to be entrusted⁹²).

Look how many neighbours one single person has. His neighbours are all those whom he meets in one way or another, all those with whom he can enter into relation. Seeing that so many neighbours are to be entrusted to one person for him to love them as

⁹¹) *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 47 (CSEL 80, 20) = 1, 23, 23 (CC 32, 19. ML 34, 27). Augustine had pointed to the tendency of the proud soul to dominate as early as *De Musica* 6, 13, 41 (ML 32, 1185) (Date: 389): "Iste autem animae appetitus est sub se habere alias animas; non pecorum, quas divino iure concessum est, sed rationales, id est, proximas suas, et sub eadem lege socias atque consortes. De his autem appetit operari anima superba, et tanto excellentior videtur haec actio quam illa de corporibus, quanto anima omnis omni corpore est melior. Sed operari de animis rationalibus, non per corpus, sed per seipsum, solus Deus potest".

⁹²) *De Disciplina Christiana* 3, 3 (CC 46, 210. ML 40, 670-671): "Quaeris quomodo diligas proximum? Attende te ipsum, et quomodo te diligis, sic dilige proximum. Non est ubi erres. Volo iam ergo et ibi committere tibi proximum tuum, ut diligas eum tamquam te ipsum; volo, sed adhuc timeo. Volo tibi dicere: Dilige proximum tuum sicut diligis te ipsum, et timeo; adhuc enim discutere volo quomodo diligas te ipsum. Noli ergo aegre ferre. Non es tu ipse facile dimittendus, cui est proximus committendus: non transitorie tecum agendum est".

himself, how necessary it is to investigate if that person really loves himself⁹³).

Let us follow Augustine in this investigation:

How do you love yourself? Each of you listening to me in this school (i.e. the church) — or rather, listening to God through me — consider how you love yourself. If I ask you whether you love yourself, you will of course answer that you do. After all, who hates himself? That is what you will say: who hates himself? But implied in love for yourself is that you do not love what is evil. For if you love evil, then I tell you — no, it is not I who say it, but listen to the psalm: “Whoever loves evil hates his own soul” (Ps. 10. 6). If, therefore, you love evil, listen to the truth, a truth that has no wish to flatter, but that tells you quite openly: you hate yourself. The more you protest that you love yourself, the more bitterly you hate yourself, for “whoever loves evil hates his own soul”.

What then is to be said of the lesser part of man, namely, of his body? If a person hates his soul, how can he love his body? Indeed, those who love evil and hate their souls use their bodies only for all kinds of disgraceful things. How then could you, who love evil, want the neighbour to be entrusted to you for you to love him as yourself? Why are you letting yourself go to rack and ruin? If you love yourself in such a way as to bring about your own destruction, then you will certainly also corrupt your neighbour whom you love as yourself. If this is the way things are with you, it's far better that you corrupt only yourself. Either set your love in order, or keep away from others altogether⁹⁴).

⁹³) *Ibid.*, 4, 4 (CC 46, 210. ML 40, 671): “Videte ergo quantos proximos habeat unus homo. Omnes homines in quos incurrerit, quibus iungi potuerit, proximi eius sunt. Quomodo ergo discutiendus est utrum diligat se, qui committendi sunt tot proximi, ut sic eos diligat tamquam se?”

⁹⁴) *Ibid.*, (CC 46, 211. ML 40, 671): “Quomodo te diligis? Quisquis me audis, immo quisquis deum per me audis, in hac domo disciplinae, attende te, quomodo te diligis. Profecto enim si te interrogem utrum diligas te, respondes quia diligis. “Quis enim se odit?” Ergo non diligis iniquitatem, si te diligis. Nam si diligis iniquitatem, non ego dico, psalmum audi: *Qui diligit iniquitatem, odit animam suam* (Ps. 10. 6). Ergo si diligis iniquitatem, audi veritatem; veritatem non te palpantem, sed aperte tibi dicentem: “Odis te”. Quanto magis dicis quia amas te, odis te: *Qui, autem, diligit iniquitatem, odit animam suam*. Quid dicam de carne, quae pars vilior est hominis? Si animam odit, carnem quomodo diligit? Denique qui amant iniquitatem, et oderunt animam suam, omnem turpitudinem exercent de carne sua. Iam ergo, qui diligis iniquitatem, quomodo tibi volebas committi proximum, ut diligeres eum tamquam te? Homo, qui perdis te? Si enim tu ipse sic te diligis ut perdas te, sic profecto perditurus est et eum quem diligis sicut te. Nolo ergo quemquam diligas: vel solus peri. Aut corrige dilectionem, aut respue societatem”.

Augustine's interest that the neighbour benefit from our love is unfeigned. But what is disorder and what order?

You will tell me: I love my neighbour as myself. Good, good, I hear you saying it already. What you want to do is to go and get drunk with the one you love as yourself. You say: "We'll have a good time today and drink as much as we can". See, in loving yourself in this mistaken way, you draw another to yourself, and you lead him to what you yourself love ... Listen rather to the truth and do the truth: "lift up your heart"; then you will not be telling lies in the school (i.e. the church). When you hear, "lift up your heart", make the response; but see that your response is true. Love yourself genuinely, and then love your neighbour as yourself without fear. For what else does lifting up one's heart mean than what has already been said: "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind"⁹⁵?

Loving oneself genuinely, that is, lifting up one's heart and being fully intent upon God, one may love the neighbour without fear of deceiving, ensnaring or harming him⁹⁶). If a person loves God — love for God being understood, as explained above, as a gift of the Holy Spirit the enjoyment of which lies in service of, subjection and complete self-giving

⁹⁵) *Ibid.*, 5, 5 (CC 46, 211-212. ML 40, 671-672): "Dicturus mihi eris: 'Diligo proximum tamquam me ipsum'. Audio plane, audio. Inebriari vis cum illo, quem diligis tamquam te ipsum. Bene nobis faciamus hodie, quantum possumus bibamus. Vide quia sic te diligis, et illum ad te trahis, et ad quod amas vocas. Necesse est ut quem diligis tamquam te ipsum, illuc illum trahas ad quod et tu amas ... imo verum audi et verum fac. Sursum cor; ne mentiaris in domo disciplinae. Quando enim audis, responde: sed sit verum quod respondes. Sic te dilige, et diliges proximum tamquam te ipsum. Quid enim sursum habere cor, nisi prius quod dictum est: *Diliges dominum deum tuum ex toto corde tuo, et ex tota anima tua, et ex tota mente tua*?"

⁹⁶) See *Sermo* 278, 8 (ML 38, 1272) (Date: 400-410): "Ille enim innocens est, qui nulli nocet: quia dilectionis proximi regula ab ipso est. Hoc enim dixit Deus, *Diliges proximum tuum tamquam te ipsum*. Quomodo ergo in te salva est dilectio proximi, quando dilectio tui per intemperantiam vulneratur?"; *Sermo* 128, 3, 5 (ML 38, 715) (Date: 412-416): "Prius vide si jam nosti diligere te ipsum; et committo tibi proximum, quem diligas sicut te ipsum. Si autem nondum nosti diligere te, timeo ne decipias proximum tuum sicut te"; *En. in ps.* 140, 2 (CC 40, 2026-2027. ML 37, 1816) (Date: 414-415): "*Finis praecepti est caritas de corde puro* (1 Tim. 1. 5). Iam videte utrum inter se latrones habeant caritatem de puro corde. Purum cor in caritate hoc est, quando diligis hominem secundum Deum; quia et te ipsum sic debes diligere, ut non erret regula, *Diliges proximum tuum tamquam te ipsum*. Si enim male te diligis et inutiliter, ita et proximum diligendo, quid ei consulis? Quomodo autem te male diligis? ... *Qui autem, inquit, diligit iniquitatem, odit animam suam*. Si ergo diligis iniquitatem, putas quod te ipsum diligas? Erras: ita et proximum diligens, ad iniquitatem duces, et dilectio tua laqueus erit dilecti".

to him — the neighbour can be committed to his love without fear, for loving God ensures a true (“*vera dilectione*”) and helpful love for neighbour⁹⁷). “For loving God (which is a gift that has to be prayed for and which wrests power from the pull of iniquity), one loves oneself such that one can wholesomely (“*salubriter*”) also love the neighbour as oneself”⁹⁸). The bearing of this mature statement (post-422) of love’s constellation is towards enabling a sound and ordered love of neighbour.

During the same period Augustine asks himself how he is to understand the psalmist’s prayer: “I am a stranger on earth; do not hide your commandments from me” (Ps. 118 (119). 19). Is the double commandment (Matt. 22. 37-40) not quite clear? But, it may seem that, while it is difficult to know God, the neighbour is more easily known. The lawyer who asked Jesus “who is my neighbour?” was led himself to judge that the neighbour is the one who shows mercy (cf. Lk. 10. 29).

And it is clear that, when it comes to works of mercy, no one is to be excluded from the care of him who loves his neighbour. But there are many who do not know themselves, for not everybody has the quality of knowing himself as he ought to come to know himself. How therefore does a person love the neighbour as himself if he doesn’t even know himself? For, in the story of that younger son who left for a distant country where he squandered his fortune on a life of debauchery, it is not without significance that, before saying “I will leave this place and go to my father” (Lk. 15. 18), he returned to himself. He had gone so far in his roving that he had even abandoned himself. He would not have returned to himself, however, if he had lost all knowledge of himself. Nor would he have said: “I will leave this place and go to my father”, if he were totally lacking in knowledge of God. It is true, therefore, that these realities are known in some measure. But not without cause do we request further knowledge so that we may know them even more deeply.

⁹⁷) See *Sermo Wilmarit* 2, 4 (MA I, 677) (Date: prior to 410): “Haec est ergo dilectio tua vel dilectio tui, id est, dilectio qua te diligis, ut deum diligas. Iam committo tibi et proximum, quem diligas tamquam te ipsum; video enim quia coepisti diligere te ipsum. Quem diligis ergo tamquam te ipsum, duc quo duxisti te ipsum”; *Tractatus in Evangelium Ioannis* 87, 1 (CC 36, 544. ML 35, 1852) (Date: 418-421): “... (*caritas*) de corde puro et conscientia bona et fide non ficta (1 Tim. 1. 5). Hac diligimus invicem, hac diligimus deum. Neque enim vera dilectione diligeremus invicem, nisi diligentes deum. Diligit enim unusquisque proximum tamquam seipsum, si diligit deum: nam si non diligit deum, non diligit seipsum”.

⁹⁸) *En. in ps. 118, sermo* 27, 6 (CC 40, 1759. ML 37, 1582) (Date: after 422): “Quanto autem magis regnat in quocumque dei caritas, tanto minus ei dominatur iniquitas. Quid ergo aliud petit, quam ut donante deo diligat deum? Diligendo enim deum, diligit seipsum, ut diligere salubriter possit et proximum sicut seipsum ...”.

Thus, God has to be known in order for us to know how to love him. And to know how to love the neighbour as oneself, a person ought first to love himself in loving God. But how will he succeed in doing this if he knows neither God nor himself? Therefore, quite rightly one says to God: "I am a stranger on earth; do not hide your commandments from me"⁹⁹).

The prodigal's love would have been of no advantage to his neighbour, for he had abandoned himself to debauchery. Only when he returns fully to himself by abandoning himself to love for God, is he enabled to love and to show mercy to his many neighbours in accordance even with the hidden depths of the Lord's commandment. Indeed, self-love which coincides with love for God is in a certain sense first ("*prius debet diligendo deum diligere seipsum*"), but this priority is designed to ensure that the neighbour not be subjected to the dangerous love of someone who has not, with God's help, acquired the degree of self-knowledge that is required of him, i.e. someone who has not 'left this place and gone to the father', fully intent upon Him.

Luther's concern for true love of neighbour leads him to reject all self-love — by which he understands the self seeking its own — as "crooked". "So the sense of the precept is seen to be, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, that is, Thou lovest thyself alone and perversely, but if Thou wert to direct this kind of love to thy neighbour, then thou wouldst truly love'"¹⁰⁰). For Augustine, on the other hand, loving oneself alone and perversely, loving the self seeking its own, which entails

⁹⁹) *En. in ps. 118, sermo 8, 2* (CC 40, 1686. ML 37, 1519-1520): "... patuitque in facienda misericordia neminem alienum esse deputandum ab eo qui diligit proximum. Sed multi nec seipsos noverunt; quia et seipsum nosse, quemadmodum homo sibi debet innotescere, non omnium hominum est. Quomodo ergo diligit proximum tamquam seipsum, qui nescit et seipsum? Non enim frustra ille filius iunior, qui profectus in regionem longinquam, ubi dissipavit substantiam suam vivens prodige, ut diceret: *Surgam, et ibo ad patrem meum* (Lk. 15. 18), prius reversus est in semetipsum, nisi quia tam longe peregrinatus est, ut relinqueret etiam semetipsum. Nec tamen reverteretur ad se, si omni modo nesciret se; nec diceret: *Surgam, et ibo ad patrem meum*, si penitus ignoraret deum. Quocirca et aliquatenus ista sciuntur, et ut magis magisque sciantur, non immerito sciendo poscuntur. Quapropter ut sciamus diligere deum, sciendus est deus; et ut sciat homo diligere proximum tamquam seipsum, prius debet diligendo deum diligere seipsum; quod unde poterit, si nescit deum, si nescit et seipsum? Recte itaque dicitur deo: *Incola ego sum in terra; ne abscondas a me mandata tua* (Ps. 118. 19)".

¹⁰⁰) Martin Luther, *Werke*, vol. I, Weimar, 1883, p. 654: "Ideo sensus praecepti esse videtur 'Diliges proximum tuum sicut teipsum, id est, diligis te solum et perverse, si autem amorem eiusmodi in proximum tuum dirigeres, iam vere diligeres'". Quoted in translation by A. Nygren, *Agape and Eros*, p. 712, n. 2.

loss of self — as, for example, when one becomes a lover of money — is overcome by directing love of this same intensity to God. Augustine has God speak in this vein in the continuation of the text quoted above from *De Disciplina Christiana*:

What is told you of God? Look, this is what Wisdom herself says to you: love me “as you love money” (Prov. 2. 4). It is unworthy and insulting to bring Wisdom into relation with money. But, in the Book of Proverbs, one love is compared with the other in this way. For from experience I know that you are so attached to money that, impelled by love for it, you take all sorts of burdens upon yourselves, put up with hunger, journey across the sea and leave yourselves exposed to the dangers of wind and waves. I can offer you something preferable to be loved. But I have nothing to offer that will make the love that inspires you any stronger. “Love me as passionately as that”, says God, “I do not desire that you love me more. I say to wicked people, I say to selfish people: you love money, love me as fervently. Certainly, I am incomparably better than money, but I desire no greater love than that. Love me so much as you love money”¹⁰¹).

Being prepared to take on all sorts of burdens and to expose oneself to danger for the love of God to whom one is totally given over: this is to love truly for Augustine. It is to straighten and deepen one's love for self by opening the self wholly and with all intensity to God's summons to his service¹⁰²); and this manner of loving ourselves in obedience, not to our selfish nature, but to God's commandment to love him, is set forth as a pattern for our love to neighbour. Thus, loving God, we love ourselves,

¹⁰¹) *De Disciplina Christiana* 10, 11 (CC 46, 218-219. ML 40, 675): “De deo quid tibi dicitur? Ecce hoc tibi dicit ipsa sapientia: Amate illam *tamquam pecuniam* (Prov. 2. 4). Indignum est, iniuriosum est, ut sapientia pecuniae comparetur, sed amor amoris comparatur. Video enim hic sic vos amare pecuniam, ut iubente amore pecuniae labores suscipiatis, ieiunia toleretis, mare transeatis, ventis et fluctibus vos committatis. Habeo unde eligam quod ametis, sed non habeo quod addam ad amorem quo amatis. Sic amate, plus nolo me amari, ait deus. Improbis loquor, avaris loquor: Pecuniam diligitis, tantum me diligite. Certe melior sum incomparabiliter: nolo a vobis ampliorem amorem; quantum diligitis pecuniam tantum me amate”. Presuming consistency in *De Disciplina Christiana*, we have to point out that this love for God with the same *intensity* as that for inferior things is not a love of the same *kind* (as if it were a basic primitive impulse simply turning its desire to a higher object). See *Ibid.*, 3, 3 (CC 46, 209. ML 40, 670): “Ecce quod discitur in domo disciplinae: Diligere deum, diligere proximum; deum tamquam deum, proximum tamquam te. Non enim invenis parem deo, ut possit tibi dici: Dilige deum sicut diligis illum”.

¹⁰²) *Ibid.*, 6, 6 (CC 46, 213. ML 40, 672): “Quaerere habes quomodo diligas te ipsum: et audire habes: *Diliges dominum deum tuum ex toto corde tuo, et ex tota mente tua, et ex tota anima tua* (Matt. 22. 37)”.

no longer alone and perversely, but wholly God-directed and uprightly; loving ourselves in this way, we are in a position to fulfil the Lord's precept to love the neighbour which can be seen as summing up and fulfilling all that can be asked of love¹⁰³). The neighbour, the other, then, marks genuine love whatever way you look at it; and the stress on true love for self is in view of this fulfilment.

B. Love for neighbour throws back light on self-love

In distinguishing between love for God and love for neighbour we referred to an unusual text from *De Disciplina Christiana* 3, 3:

“You are to love the Lord, your God, with your whole heart, and with your whole soul and with your whole mind. And you are to love your neighbour as yourself. On these two commandments depend the whole Law and the Prophets” (Matt. 22. 37, 39-40). See what is learnt in the school (i.e. the church): to love God and to love your neighbour, God as God and your neighbour as yourself. For you do not find anyone who is equal to God, and therefore no one can say to you: love God as you love so-and-so. But concerning the neighbour a rule has been fashioned for you, since you yourself have been created equal to your neighbour. You ask yourself: how have I to love my neighbour? Look attentively at yourself, and as you love yourself, love your neighbour too. There can be no mistake about it¹⁰⁴).

¹⁰³) *Ibid.*, 5, 5 (CC 46, 212-213. ML 40, 672): “Quia ergo duo praecepta sunt, si unum diceret, non sufficeret? Sufficit et unum, si intellegatur. Nam aliquando sic loquitur scriptura, sicut Paulus apostolus: *Non adulterabis, non homicidium facies, non concupisces: et si quod est aliud mandatum, in hoc sermone recapitulatur: Diliges proximum tuum tamquam te ipsum. Dilectio proximi malum non operatur. Plenitudo autem legis, caritas* (Rom. 13. 9-10). Quid est caritas? Dilectio. Nihil videtur dixisse de dilectione dei, sed solam proximi dilectionem dixit sufficere ad implendam legem. Quidquid est aliud mandati, in hoc sermone recapitulatur, in hoc sermone impletur. In quo? *Diliges proximum tuum tamquam te ipsum*. Ecce unum est. Certe duo sunt in quibus praeceptis tota lex pendet et prophetae. Videte quomodo plus brevium est, et adhuc pigri sumus. Ecce quae duo erant, unum factum est. Prorsus proximum dilige, et sufficit. Sed dilige quomodo te ipsum diligis, non quomodo te ipsum odisti. Dilige proximum tuum tamquam te ipsum, sed prius est ut diligas te ipsum”.

¹⁰⁴) *De Disciplina Christiana* 3, 3 (CC 46, 209-210. ML 40, 670): “*Diliges dominum deum tuum ex toto corde tuo, et ex tota anima tua, et ex tota mente tua; et diliges proximum tuum tamquam te ipsum. In his duobus praeceptis tota lex pendet et prophetae. Ecce quod discitur in domo disciplinae: Diligere deum, diligere proximum; deum tamquam deum, proximum tamquam te. Non enim invenis parem deo, ut possit tibi dici: Dilige deum sicut diligis illum. De proximo inventa est tibi regula, quia inventus es proximo tuo par tu ipse. Quaeris quomodo diligas proximum? Attende te ipsum, et quomodo te diligis, sic dilige proximum. Non est ubi erres*”.

The sentence of greatest interest is: "*De proximo inventa est tibi regula, quia inventus es proximo tuo par tu ipse*". We have translated the sentence: "concerning the neighbour a rule has been fashioned for you, since you yourself have been created equal to your neighbour"¹⁰⁵). This formulation follows logically from the observation that no one can be found equal to God, and that therefore there can be no rule of love for God but God himself. For someone can be found equal to the neighbour, namely, our very selves, and therefore a rule of love for neighbour has been fashioned for us: "Love your neighbour as yourself". As such the progression of thought is fairly straightforward. It is only when we look at what Augustine might have said, but in fact did not say, that it becomes possible to perceive the text at another level. It may seem to us that the text as it stands simply underlines the role of the self as rule, measure and norm of love for neighbour, without saying anything more about the nature of this privileged self. In this case, "*quia inventus es proximo tuo par tu ipse*" would be read in too carefree a manner as if its meaning were equivalent to: 'since your neighbour has been created equal to you, and as you love yourself, so you are to love your neighbour who is your equal'. In fact, however, we find in Augustine that the places assigned to the self and the neighbour are the reverse of what those approaching the passage from a Brechtkenian 'love-as-appetitus' perspective would more easily have anticipated. Instead of 'myself and then the neighbour as my equal', we are told that "you yourself have been created equal to your neighbour". This places the neighbour, not the self, at the centre of the comparison. Thus, the self loved as a model for love of neighbour is the self that is equal to the neighbour. In such a perspective the love of self that is to be a pattern of love for neighbour cannot possibly be understood as arbitrariness or self-will, nor as the individualistic desire for private joy sought in the love for God. The circle is broken open by the discovery that there are others to whom I can be

¹⁰⁵) Since the preposition "de" can be understood in the sense of "of" or "from" to indicate a thing's origin or derivation (see C. T. Lewis and C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, p. 513, A, 2), it is not out of the question grammatically that the first part of the sentence be rendered, "*from* (i.e. *in*) the neighbour a rule has been fashioned for you", which would make the neighbour himself the rule of love for self and for the neighbour. Congenial as this is to the interpretation we will offer of the explanatory subordinate clause of the sentence, it accords less well than "*concerning* the neighbour" with the logical structure of the passage as a whole.

compared and whose equal I am as a fellow-creature¹⁰⁶). My equality with the neighbour summons me to reject the desire to conduct my own life as if no one else existed, and to acknowledge and to take the neighbour into account even in my love of self. It is as if, then, a precept of self-love could be formulated as follows: love yourself in relation to your neighbour to whom you have been created equal. In view of the following steps Augustine takes in the sermon *De Disciplina Christiana* — his suspicion of self-love without further specification, his hesitancy to entrust the neighbour to a love based on it, and his thorough scrutiny of self-love to test it for genuineness — it is not unlikely that he already senses at this point the necessity of broadening the concept of self-love as a foundation of love for neighbour. He does so in such a way as to make it impossible to think of the self not only without God but also without the neighbour.

Thus, an element of otherness is introduced into the very love of self. The neighbour, whom the Lord commands us to love, and to whom the self is equal, is present in self-love as a guide to its genuineness. It is almost as if the commandment stated that we were to love ourselves as we love our neighbour whose equal we are, or ourselves as orientated towards loving the neighbour, or ourselves together with our neighbour. A glance at some later texts shows that Augustine did indeed understand love for neighbour to throw back light on self-love in this way.

1. In the second book of *De Doctrina Christiana* we read:

At this level, a person so cleanses the eye of his heart that he does not put even the neighbour himself before the truth, nor does he see pleasing others on the same level as truth; *because this is the case with the one he loves as himself, it is to be the case with himself too*. Therefore, the holy man will be so sincere and pure of heart that he will not be turned away from truth either by a desire to gratify men

¹⁰⁶) This is an equality under God. See, for example, *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 8, 5 (ML 35, 2039) where Augustine is referring to the proper attitude of the giver towards the needy. "Opta aequalem, ut ambo sub uno sitis cui nihil praestari potest". Love strives for equality: "charitate optabat (Apostolus) omnes aequales": *Ibid.*, tr. 8, 8 (ML 35, 2040). It is not content to rest in superiority to others or in having others open to the possibility of exploitation created by their dependency. Its opposite is the pride of domination. See *De Civitate Dei* 19, 12 (CC 48, 677. CSEL 40/2, 393. ML 41, 639): "Sic enim superbia perverse imitatur Deum. Odit namque cum sociis aequalitatem sub illo, sed inponere vult sociis dominationem suam pro illo. Odit ergo iustam pacem Dei et amat iniquam pacem suam". Perverse self-love is reflected in my hatred for that which makes me equal to others under God and in my desire to be above them in the place of God.

or by a regard to avoid whatever inconveniences disturb this life¹⁰⁷).

One does not put gratifying the neighbour before clinging to the truth; therefore one should not put pleasing oneself before it either. Although it is here framed negatively, the rule for a person's relationship to himself is brought home to him by looking at his relationship to his neighbour whose equal he is¹⁰⁸). In this case such a rule keeps him intent on nothing less than truth. His guide in life is not the satisfaction of his neighbour's desires — which may be corrupt, deceitful, and power-hungry — nor then is it to be the satisfaction of his own desires. The figure of the neighbour, his equal, makes him sharply aware of this and points him in the direction of a sincere and pure self-love which allows no one to deflect it from intendedness on the truth.

2. In the twenty-first book of *De Civitate Dei* Augustine is contesting the attitude of those who wish to avoid personal conversion by considering that, by giving a pittance to the poor, they are performing acts of mercy in adequate proportion to their sins.

And yet if they had distributed all their goods to the needy members of Christ in atonement for just one sin, this could not have been of any service to them, if they had not abandoned such (evil) practices by the acquisition of the "love which does no evil". Therefore, anyone who would perform acts of mercy in adequate proportion to his sins should begin with himself in their performance. For it is wrong not to do to oneself what one does to one's neighbour, since we have heard God saying, "You shall love your neighbour as yourself"; and we have been told "to have compassion on our own soul by pleasing God". If anyone does not show this mercy to his own soul, that is, by pleasing God, how can he be

¹⁰⁷) *De Doctrina Christiana* 2, 23 (CSEL 80, 39) = 2, 7, 11 (CC 32, 38. ML 34, 40): "In hoc autem gradu ita purgat oculum cordis, ut veritati ne ipsum quidem praeferat aut conferat proximum; ergo nec se ipsum, quia nec illum quem diligit sicut se ipsum. Erit ergo iste sanctus tam simplici corde atque mundato, ut neque hominibus placendi studio detorqueatur a vero nec respectu devitandorum quorumlibet incommodorum suorum quae adversantur huic vitae".

¹⁰⁸) Cf. *De Doctrina Christiana* 1, 60 (CSEL 80, 23) = 1, 27, 28 (CC 32, 22. ML 34, 29), where what is done to all men, that is, to others to whom one is equal, indicates how one is to relate to oneself. "Et si deum omni homine amplius diligendus est, amplius quisque deum debet diligere quam se ipsum". If others are loved best when they are properly related to God and when God is loved more than they, so I learn that I love myself best by loving God more than myself.

said to perform acts of mercy in adequate proportion to his sins? There is another text in Scripture to the same effect: "If a man is mean to himself, to whom will he be generous?"¹⁰⁹).

Again the movement is from conduct towards the neighbour to conduct towards the self¹¹⁰). "For it is wrong not to do to oneself what one does to one's neighbour". In this instance the perils for the neighbour of a person's not showing mercy to himself (spiritually) as he does to his neighbour (materially) are pointed out. "If a man is mean to himself, to whom will he be generous?".

3. For *En. in ps.* 140, 2 (Date: 414-415) it is precisely the distinctive love from a pure heart required by the commandment of love for God and neighbour that necessitates a close examination of love for self. Loving others as orientated towards God demands that one's love for self be of this kind too. The precept of love for neighbour forces a person to review his life-orientation and to test himself for self-deception.

"The end of the precept is love (*caritas*) coming from a pure heart" (1 Tim. 1. 5). See whether thieves have love coming from a

¹⁰⁹) *De Civitate Dei* 21, 27 (CC 48, 801. CSEL 40/2, 574-575. ML 41, 747): "Qui si pro uno scelere omnia sua distribuere indigentibus membris Christi, nisi desisterent a talibus factis, habendo caritatem, quae non agit perperam (1 Cor. 13. 4), aliquid eis prodesse non posset. Qui ergo dignas pro suis peccatis eleemosynas facit, prius eas facere incipiat a se ipso. Indignum est enim, ut in se non faciat qui facit in proximum, cum audiat dicentem Dominum: *Diliges proximum tuum tamquam te ipsum* (Matt. 22. 39). Itemque audiat: *Miserere tuae animae placens Deo* (Ecclus. 30. 24). Hanc eleemosynam, id est, ut Deo placeat, non faciens animae suae, quomodo dignas pro peccatis suis eleemosynas facere dicendus est? Ad hoc enim et illud scriptum est: *Qui sibi malignus, cui bonus erit?* (Ecclus. 14. 5)".

¹¹⁰) This is also in a sense true of *De Civitate Dei* 1, 20 (CC 47, 22. CSEL 40/1, 37-38. ML 41, 34): "*Falsum, inquit, testimonium non dices adversus proximum tuum* (Exodus 20. 16). Nec ideo tamen si adversus se ipsum quisquam falsum testimonium dixerit, ab hoc crimine se putaverit alienum, quoniam regulam diligendi proximum a semetipso dilector accepit, quando quidem scriptum est: *Diliges proximum tuum tamquam te ipsum*". The formula moves from the self to the neighbour — "regulam diligendi proximum a semetipso dilector accepit": "in himself the lover learns the rule of love for neighbour". Augustine's argument, however, moves from what is appropriate with regard to others to what is appropriate with regard to oneself. One is forbidden to give false witness 'against one's neighbour' (cf. Exodus 20. 16); therefore, because of the rule of love, it is also forbidden towards oneself. How much more then is it unlawful to commit suicide, Augustine continues in context, since the commandment, "thou shalt not kill", by omitting "the neighbour", leaves us in no doubt that it may just concern killing others, not ourselves. The formula, "regulam diligendi proximum a semetipso dilector accepit", must be read in the context of the thesis Augustine is here defending, i.e. Christians have no authority to commit suicide in any circumstance.

pure heart. A pure heart in love is this: when you love man as orientated to God (*quando diligis hominem secundum deum*). For in this way you should love yourself too so that there may be no mistake about the rule: "Love your neighbour as yourself" (Matt. 22. 39). If you love yourself badly and uselessly, how can you bring any advantage to the neighbour when it is like this that you love him as well? But how do you love yourself badly? Scripture, which flatters no one, intimates it to you. It convinces you that you do not love yourself, indeed that you hate yourself. "He who loves iniquity hates his own soul" (Ps. 10. 6). If therefore you love iniquity, do you think perhaps that you love yourself? You are mistaken. Loving your neighbour like this you lead him to iniquity also, and your love will be a snare for the beloved. Therefore, "love coming from a pure heart, and a good conscience, and unfeigned faith" is the love that is orientated to God. This love as so designated by the Apostle has two precepts: those of love for God and love for neighbour¹¹¹).

4. Finally, in line with this idea that love for the neighbour is a determining factor of true love for self and that is already throws light on that self-love which Augustine insists be in order before he will entrust the neighbour to it, it is instructive to consider a text from his commentary on the first letter of John. He can remark there: "When you love those who have become one with you, it is almost the same as loving yourself"¹¹²). Loving others in the same communion of love, one as it were loves oneself. The self envisaged is obviously the self in community, not the self alone in Luther's sense. We have seen this broadening of the concept of self at work in other texts, e.g. *De Utilitate Ieiunii* 6, 7-8¹¹³), and also a concern lest love for self be misunderstood as referring to

¹¹¹) *En. in ps.* 140, 2 (CC 40, 2026-2027. ML 37, 1816): "*Finis praecepti est caritas de corde puro* (1 Tim. 1. 5). Iam videte utrum inter se latrones habeant caritatem de puro corde. Puum cor in caritate hoc est, quando diligis hominem secundum deum; quia et te ipsum sic debes diligere, ut non erret regula: *Diliges proximum tuum tamquam te ipsum*. Si enim male te diliges et inutiliter, ita et proximum diligendo, quid ei consulis? Quomodo autem te male diligis? Quomodo innuit Scriptura, quae neminem palpat, et convincit quia non te diligis; immo convincit quia et odisti te: *Qui autem, inquit, diligit iniquitatem, odit animam suam*. Si ergo diligis iniquitatem, putas quod te ipsum diligas? Erras: ita et proximum diligens, ad iniquitatem duces, et dilectio tua laqueus erit dilecti. *Caritas ergo de puro corde* est quae est secundum deum, *et conscientia bona et fide non ficta*. Ista caritas definita ab Apostolo habet duo praecepta: dilectionis dei, et dilectionis proximi".

¹¹²) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 8, 4 (ML 35, 2037): "Prope enim te diligis, qui eos diligis qui tibi adhaerent".

¹¹³) *De Utilitate Ieiunii* 6, 8 (CC 46, 237. ML 40, 712): "Indignum Deum putas, cui ab omnibus qui in eum credunt, in unitate serviatur ...".

one's private interests and gain. Here, however, it is as if Augustine is aware of the dangers even of self-love of this kind. The "I", once having overcome its egocentricity, may degenerate into a selfish "we". But this too is broken open by a commandment, the Lord's commandment of love for one's enemies¹¹⁴). This implies a not resting content with loving the "brothers" we have, those who are one with us, but a striving to make "brothers" even of those who hate us, our enemies¹¹⁵). Again, as has so often been the case in this chapter, it is not the neutral self, either as "I" or as "we", that predominates in Augustine's understanding of Christian love, but the Lord's commands which summon us to continual self-transcendence.

RAYMOND CANNING, O.S.A.

¹¹⁴) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 8, 4 (ML 35, 2037): "Extende dilectionem in proximos, nec voces illam extensionem. Prope enim te diligis, qui eos diligis qui tibi adhaerent. Extende ad ignotos, qui tibi nihil mali fecerunt. Transcende et ipsos: perveni, ut diligas inimicos. Hoc certe Dominus jubet".

¹¹⁵) *Ibid.*, tr. 8, 10 (ML 35, 2042): "Opta illi (inimico) ut habeat tecum vitam aeternam; opta illi ut sit frater tuus. Si ergo hoc optas diligendo inimicum, ut sit frater tuus, cum eum diligis, fratrem diligis".