

The Unity of Love For God and Neighbour

- I. Expressions of the unity of love for God and neighbour: “una caritas” and its parallels
 - A. Introduction: does distinction mean separation?
 - B. Early indications of unity: *De Moribus* 1,30,62 and parallels
 - C. The unity established by “una majestas” — “unus Christus”
 - D. ‘Unum praeceptum pro utroque’ — ‘una caritas’
- II. One commandment can and does stand for both. How?
 - A. From “mandata” to “mandatum”: implicit recognition that love for neighbour in fact suffices
 - B. How one commandment can serve to indicate both, or why one commandment cannot be kept without the other
 1. *Who can love the neighbour as himself unless he loves God?*
 2. *God, whom we are to love wholly, commands us to love the neighbour*
 3. *Love of God can be tested in everyday practice of love of neighbour and it has to begin there*
- III. By the very fact that a person loves his brother, he sees love; and love is God
 - A. What are the implications of the expression “love of love”?
 1. *Parallel uses of the formula*
 2. *The “praecipue” of ‘whoever loves his brethren loves, in a particular and distinctive way (praecipue), love itself’*
 3. *Love of form and truth as illuminating love of love*
 - B. Love is God because “God is love” (1 Jn. 4,8,16)
 1. *The Holy Spirit as love of the Father and the Son; love as the gift of God himself*
 2. *The inversion of 1 Jn. 4,8,16 in other love of God — love of neighbour contexts*
 - C. Clarification of misunderstandings centering on the concept of interiority
 1. *J.B. du Roy’s principal criticisms of De Trinitate, Book 8, in general and in detail*
 2. *The case for Augustinian interiority with a human Christian face*

I. EXPRESSIONS OF THE UNITY OF LOVE FOR GOD AND NEIGHBOUR: “UNA CARITAS” AND ITS PARALLELS

A. INTRODUCTION: DOES DISTINCTION MEAN SEPARATION?

Up until this our approach to the question of love for the neighbour and God has been analytical rather than synthetic. We have laid bare and examined the foundations for distinguishing the one from the other. Basically what this amounted to was that God is different from us and

greater than we are. Therefore, while a rule can be found for love of neighbour, because we are our neighbour's equals, no rule drawing upon a comparison can be discovered in relation to love for God, because God has no equal. What can be said of love for God, however, is that it is to be with the whole heart, soul and mind, *ex toto*. All our loving is to be directed to God; both our love for self and for neighbour are to be orientated to God, they are to be taken up in the movement of love for him. But, far from disenfranchising and emasculating love for neighbour, it is precisely its God-orientation which guarantees its authenticity, broadens and deepens it, and gives it unfailing vigour and ultimately reliable bearings. To be sure, only God can claim our love completely, *ex toto*, because he alone is capable of providing unshakeably solid foundations for our hope for justification and for conducting our search for eternal happiness to its true goal. In this sense, no one can dethrone God as the proper object of *frui*-love; but it may indeed be *in* the human neighbour that he reveals to us his fidelity and attracts us by his loveliness, that he commands us to honour and praise him, or, as we shall see, that he begs us to support him in his poverty and helplessness. God is most appropriately associated with the fulness of *frui*, i.e. happiness in giving oneself to him totally. The neighbour, however, is not insulted or demeaned by being associated with *uti* love. Indeed, by the very fact that he is the human neighbour, he transforms run-of-the-mill *uti* such that *uti*-love for neighbour is considered to be to his advantage and such that it can also be said of him that he may be enjoyed "in the Lord". The neighbour does not miss out on anything because God demands our all. It is not as if what was given to God were thereby lost and unavailable to the neighbour. Nor, consequently, are the neighbour and God to be pictured as making competitive demands on our love, as each defending his own claims in a tussle in which God would ideally always turn out to be the highest bidder. Loving God one loves oneself best. A person then who loves the neighbour as himself will do all in his power to make the neighbour too a lover of God and of his fellow human beings. Thus, the more open our lives are to God and the stronger the orientation of our love to him, the more the neighbour — who may be anyone from those dearest to us to our very worst enemy — is likely to benefit genuinely from our loving. From this point of view, Augustine's statement is understandable that love for God is first to be commended, that it is prior in the order of the precept (*prior ordine praecipendi*), for it is impossible to love the neighbour fruitfully unless a person, in response to

God's commandment, is intent upon God with all that lives in him. From the practical angle, however, love for neighbour, which is second to be commended in Matthew's statement of the double-commandment, turns out to be love's starting-point. In everyday life this is where love first makes its claims felt or manifests to us that it is missing. Love for neighbour is therefore *prior ordine faciendi*; if we do not love the brother whom we can see, how do we love God whom we cannot see? For we have not yet reached the Lord, but we do have the brother with us.

When Augustine speaks of love for God as prior in one regard and love for neighbour as prior in another, we may get the impression of two loves which are indeed connected to each other but which are yet essentially separate, such that it would be possible to give a comprehensive account of the one without referring to the other. Thus, it is commonly claimed that for the early Augustine of the *De Moribus* period love for neighbour was distinguished from love for God as merely human effort is from divinely-aided achievement. Thus, even though it remains true that if a person despises his neighbour he cannot come to the God whom he loves — which might be seen as an early formulation of love for neighbour's priority in the order of operation — his dealings with his neighbour are on a different level from his love for God. There is, P. Agaësse asserts, following G. Hultgren, at first discontinuity and rupture between the two loves¹). The two may meet; but it is across a chasm. They do not embrace.

While not at all contesting that there is a discernible evolution in Augustine's sensitivity to the unity and harmony of love for God and neighbour, nor that his reading of the first letter of John played a large part in opening his eyes to this close relation²), we nevertheless consider

¹) P. Agaësse, *Saint Augustin. Commentaire de la première épître de S. Jean* (Sources Chrétiennes, 75) Paris, 1961, p. 47-48: "L'amour du prochain est donc subordonné à l'amour de Dieu, il est en quelque sorte un moyen de s'y exercer. Mais cet 'exercice' est conçu comme une activité morale, dont l'homme est la source et le principe, et qui nous prépare en quelque sorte négativement à l'amour de Dieu, lequel ne nous est donné que par grâce. Il y a donc comme une rupture entre ces deux amours: nous dirons aujourd'hui que l'un est une vertu morale naturelle, l'autre une vertu théologale et surnaturelle". Cf. G. Hultgren, *Le commandement d'amour chez Augustin*, Paris, 1939, p. 70. Similarly, D. Dideberg, *Saint Augustin et la première épître de saint Jean*, Paris, 1975, p. 138, accepts the judgment of Hultgren and Agaësse: "au lendemain de sa conversion, il considérait l'amour du prochain comme une œuvre propre de l'homme, un degré pour s'élever à l'amour de Dieu, un moyen de s'y exercer".

²) P. Agaësse, *op. cit.*, p. 48, rightly underlines the decisive role played by 1 Jn.: "Sans doute Augustin continue de voir dans la charité fraternelle une purification progressive qui nous prépare à voir et à aimer Dieu, mais il n'y a plus discontinuité ni

that to speak of discontinuity and rupture in *De Moribus* and in other works of that new convert phase of Augustine's life is at least an exaggeration. This, it will be recalled, is the period of the "step and cradle" representations of love for neighbour; and indeed these images make only a faltering and brief appearance on the Augustinian stage and soon give way to considerations of greater consistency. The "step and cradle" love for neighbour texts, however, are not such unassailable witnesses to discontinuity from love for God as they are often made to appear. In a previous article we were able to show firstly that the *vinculum* amongst human beings which allows us to believe that there is no more certain step (*gradus*) to love for God is itself the outcome of more than human beings' own unaided powers³); secondly, *gradus* love for neighbour, which may be equated with the most beautiful *actus* human beings are capable of performing, can exist simultaneously with contemplation of God, and in this act of love for neighbour God himself can be perceived working through us⁴); and, thirdly, insofar as the task of love for neighbour is to bring him to love God perfectly, it will be difficult to see how it does not rise above the sphere of the human⁵).

rupture entre les deux amours: l'un et l'autre viennent de la même source, l'un et l'autre ont pour sujet premier Dieu lui-même qui donne à l'homme d'aimer son frère comme il lui donne de répondre à son amour. Les raisons de l'évolution d'Augustin sont sans doute complexes, mais la méditation de l'Épître (de Jean) semble avoir été décisive. Car chaque fois qu'il s'efforce de montrer comment l'amour de Dieu est impliqué dans l'amour fraternel, Augustin, plus ou moins directement, fait allusion au verset de l'Épître: 'Celui qui n'aime pas son frère qu'il voit ne saurait aimer Dieu qu'il ne voit pas' (1 Jn. 4.20)". D. Dideberg, *op. cit.*, p. 139, makes showing how 1 Jn. has been decisive in this regard the project of his sixth chapter: "Il reste à voir comment cette conception nouvelle (c'est-à-dire, cette identification de l'amour de l'homme à l'amour de Dieu) découle d'une lecture de la *Prima Ioannis* et quelle est sa portée dans la réflexion du Docteur de la charité". He proceeds in three stages: I. Celui qui aime son frère, aime Dieu ou le Christ. II. Celui qui aime son frère, voit le Dieu-Amour. III. Celui qui aime (son frère), demeure en Dieu et Dieu en lui. T.J. van Bavel, while acknowledging the decisive role of 1 Jn., sees the evolution as being already in process by the time of *Expositio Epistolae ad Galatas* which dates from 395. See *Augustinus*, Baarn, 1970, p. 90: "Er is een soort accentverschuiving te bespeuren in het denken van Augustinus. Het accent wordt verlegd van boven naar beneden, van God naar de mens. Dit is geheel in overeenstemming met de grondtoon van de brief van Johannes. Daarom zou het mij niet verwonderen als juist de intensieve bezinning op Johannes een heel bijzondere rol gespeeld heeft in de ontwikkeling van Augustinus' geestelijk leven. Ik meen dat Paul Agaësse gelijk heeft met zijn beschrijving van deze evolutie, al begint deze ontwikkeling misschien iets eerder dan hij veronderstelt".

³) See *De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae* 1,26,51 (ML 32,1332) and 1,30,64 (ML 32,1337).

⁴) *De Quantitate Animae* 34,78-35,79 (ML 32,1078-1079).

⁵) *De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae* 1,26,49 (ML 32,1336).

B. EARLY INDICATIONS OF UNITY: DE MORIBUS 1,30,62 AND PARALLELS

There is, moreover, a still more pressing argument against the separation of love for God and neighbour in *De Moribus*. The catholic church, asserts Augustine, recommends that we worship God and cleave to him alone, not to contingent, mutable, time-bound things. He continues:

(You, church) neither confuse what eternity, truth, indeed peace itself distinguishes, nor again (do you) separate what the one sovereign majesty joins together (*nec rursum separans quod majestas una conjungit*). (Not only do you, catholic church, commend to us worship of God), but you also embrace love and *charitas* for the neighbour, such that you abound in the remedy for the various maladies which souls suffer on account of their sins⁶).

Majestas una is apparently the equivalent of eternity, truth, peace itself. On Augustine's own statement, therefore, worship of God and love of neighbour have been joined together by one and the same sovereign majesty who distinguishes between the eternity of God, to which alone human beings are to be subject, and created realities in time. Worship of God and love of neighbour are together too in forming the abundant remedy stored up in the catholic church for the various maladies which souls suffer on account of their sins. The early Augustine does, therefore, posit a kind of divinely-decreed union of adoration and service of God and love of neighbour; and they are united in the catholic church's saving outreach to sinful and suffering humanity. We wish to follow up the principal ideas offered by this text from *De Moribus* in two directions. Firstly, we shall try to show that this cautionary word in favour of unity is not a solitary flash in the pan in the young Augustine. Secondly, as a prelude to the presentation of later *una caritas* expressions, we shall indicate an explication and a deepening of the manner in which the one sovereign majesty joins love for God and for neighbour together: *nec rursum separans quod majestas una conjungit*. This occurs through a growing awareness of the one sovereign majesty as the Word made flesh.

In *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, from just shortly after *De Moribus*, Augustine calls the love of neighbour, which according to Rom. 13. 10 is the fulness of the law, the same love (*eandem caritatem*) as that

⁶ *Ibid.*, 1,30,62 (ML 32, 1336): "... neque confundens quod aeternitas, quod veritas, quod denique pax ipsa distinguit, nec rursum separans quod majestas una conjungit: sed etiam proximi dilectionem atque charitatem ita complecteris, ut variorum morborum, quibus pro peccatis suis animae aegrotant, omnis apud te medicina praepolleat".

contained in the twin precept of Matt. 22.37-40⁷). In 388-389 A.D. Augustine does not dwell on this point, but the expression does provide us with an allusion to a formulation which by 407 A.D. was on the point of becoming a characteristically Augustinian acquisition, viz. "from one and the same love we love God and the neighbour": *ex una eademque caritate deum proximumque diligimus*⁸). Certainly, the latter formulation is pregnant with a richness of life-experience and of reflection upon the Scriptures from which the former *eamdem caritatem* could not yet benefit. It is nevertheless revealing to find at such an early stage the neighbour-love of Rom. 13.10 referred to, even if cursorily, as the "same" as the love envisaged by the double commandment of Matt. 22.37-40. In its own way, the *eamdem caritatem* provides an intriguing confirmation that the *nec rursus separans quod majestas una conjungit* of *De Moribus* does not stand isolated and alone. As a link between the *eamdem caritatem* of 388-389 and the mature *ex una eademque caritate* we might consider an expression from the commentary on the letter to the Galatians which dates from 395 A.D. There we are told that the peace by which we are reconciled to God is the same peace (*eademque pace*) which is preserved among human beings when they treat one another with due moderation, forbearance, kindness and goodness that is ready to forgive⁹). Indeed, in the same commentary, Augustine goes so far as to state, for the first time, not only that the precept of love for God cannot stand without that of love for neighbour, and vice versa, but also that to mention one of these precepts is often sufficient to indicate them

⁷) *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 2,23,36 (ML 34,215): "Apostolus dicit, *Plenitudo autem Legis, charitas* (Rom. 13.10); et videamus *eamdem* charitatem praecepto illo gemino contineri, *Diliges Dominum Deum tuum ex toto corde tuo, et ex tota anima tua, et ex tota mente tua; et diliges proximum tamquam teipsum; in quibus duobus praeceptis tota Lex pendet, et Prophetiae* (Matt. 22.37,39,40)". This "*eamdem caritatem praecepto illo gemino*" is paralleled by *En. in ps.* 140,2 (CC 40,2027. ML 37,1816) (Date: 414-415) which speaks of "ista caritas" of 1 Tim. 1.5 having "duo praecepta". There are two precepts because, although "una charitate diliguntur, non sunt tamen unum qui diliguntur": *Sermo* 265,9 (ML 38,1223). Elsewhere, Augustine uses the expressions: "*istam geminam caritatem dei et proximi*": *De Doctrina Christiana* 1,86 (CSEL 80,30) = 1,36,40 (CC 32,29. ML 34,34) (Date: post-396); "... una caritas totum implet. Sed ipsa caritas *gemma* est: in deum et in proximum": *Sermo Wilmar* 2,3 (MA 1,676) (Date: pre-410); "*geminum opus dilectionis*": *Epistola* 149,1,4 (CSEL 44, 352. ML 33,632) (Date: 415).

⁸) *De Trinitate* 8,9,12 (CC 50,289. ML 42,959).

⁹) *Expositio Epistolae ad Galatas* (CSEL 84,128. ML 35,2142): "Huic itaque pax contraria est, qua reconciliamur deo, *eademque pace* etiam cum hominibus custodita veneficiorum ... dissensionumque vitia sanantur in nobis, ut autem in aliis, inter quos vivimus, iusta moderatione tractentur et ad sustinendum longanimitas et ad curandum benignitas et ad ignoscendum bonitas militat".

both¹⁰). We shall return to discuss the reason for this shortly when the unity issue is dealt with from other perspectives.

What concerns us principally at this point is the fact that a certain unity between love for God and neighbour is not completely unattested in the Augustine of the period 388-395. Some examples have already been given. Two other texts, while employing alternative terminology, are worth adding to the list. According to *De Quantitate Animae* 78 of 387-388 A.D., the only true and perfect religion (*haec sola religio*) is constituted by love of enemies. Such love makes the soul apt to be reconciled to God and worthy of that perfect freedom into which it enters when it shows itself pleasing to God by serving him¹¹). The impression given is strongly that one pleases God by serving him when one loves one's enemies: *haec est vera, haec perfecta, haec sola religio*. Even though reconciliation with God and perfect freedom flow from this love of enemies, the latter is not to be seen as a merely "human" preparation for freer and more harmonious love of God, but rather as an integral part of the soul's living according to its bond of service to God by which it is pleasing to him. *De Vera Religione* of 390 A.D. is even clearer in this regard. When we love our enemies, as we who wish to become free are bound to love them in obedience to God's unchangeable law, we in fact become invincible because we are now unable to lose the object of our love, viz. God's unchangeable law. This one thing (*quae res una*) — i.e. love of enemies in obedience to God's unchangeable law — makes us invincible and perfect¹²). Thus, love for God is manifested by showing love for his law, and one does this by loving the enemy. Again, love for enemies is here more than an unaided "human" preparation for invincibility and perfection in love for God. It opens the way to invincibility and perfection precisely because it is the *res una* which expresses love for God's unchangeable law. Enemies are loved when we

¹⁰) *Ibid.*, 45 (CSEL 84,119. ML 35,2138): "Cum ergo utrumque praeceptum ita sit, ut neutrum sine altero possit teneri, etiam unum horum commemorare plerumque sufficit ...".

¹¹) *De Quantitate Animae* 78 (ML 32,1078): "Haec est vera, haec perfecta, haec sola religio per quam Deo reconciliari pertinet ad animae, de qua quaerimus, magnitudinem, qua se libertate dignam facit: nam ille ab omnibus liberat, cui servire omnibus utilissimum est, et in cuius servitio placere perfecta et sola libertas est ...".

¹²) *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, cui quicumque serviunt, soli sunt liberi. Sic enim eis quod diligunt auferri non potest: quae res una invictos facit et perfectos viros".

obey God's law which we love; and this a person cannot attain by his own resources (*per seipsum*), but only through the law itself¹³). The general idea here corresponds once more to a feature of the commentary on the letter to the Galatians: love of neighbour is inextricably linked to love for God because the God we love commands that we should love our neighbours¹⁴). This feature will become more common after 395 A.D.; but, as we have seen, it is present, at least in an inchoate manner, in works as early as *De Vera Religione* and even *De Quantitate Animae*.

There are therefore sufficient resonances in the young Augustine to add a certain amount of weight to his statement that what the one sovereign majesty has joined together is not to be separated. Granted, the expression *una caritas* does not appear at this time. Rom. 13.10 and Matt. 22.37-40, however, are said to refer to the same love (*eandem caritatem*); and love of enemies appears as *haec sola religio* and *quae res una* which make human beings perfectly invincible and free in the loving service of God's law. Human beings' own efforts are insufficient to this task. The elements we have drawn attention to in order to attenuate a too crudely naive understanding of the *vinculum* and the "step and cradle" texts of *De Moribus* also support the contention that love for neighbour in the eyes of the pre-395 Augustine cannot simply be equated with what is congruent and possible to human resources alone. To speak here of discontinuity and rupture between love for God and love for neighbour is to use inappropriately strong language. They may not have embraced, but they are already on closer terms than might have been expected. When Augustine states with some certainty in *De Moribus* that if a person despises his neighbour he cannot come to the God whom he loves, we now know that he does not consider this respect for the neighbour a discardable "human" phase due to be superseded by the divine event of love for God. He sees the loves rather as having been joined together and made inseparable by the one sovereign majesty himself; he sees love of enemies as constituting the *sola religio* and *quae res una* through which human beings are freed and perfected; he sees the loves, at least once

¹³) *Ibid.*: "Non enim per seipsum quisquam hominum invictus est; sed per illam incommutabilem legem, cui quicumque serviunt, soli sunt liberi".

¹⁴) *Expositio Epistolae ad Galatas* 45 (CSEL 84,119. ML 35,2137-2138): "Consequens est autem, ut, qui ex toto corde, ex tota anima, ex tota mente deum diligit, diligat et proximum tamquam seipsum, quia hoc iubet ille, quem ex toto corde, ex tota anima, ex tota mente diligit".

explicitly, as the same love, and, by 395, as promoting the same peace and reconciliation.

Undeniably, these instances of unity are, hardly surprisingly, few in comparison to those that are encountered after 395. Admittedly also, the unity is not at all as explicit and well-defined, nor is it the object of the interest, significance, emphasis and wonderment that it will later become. Finally, despite the assertion that the loves are not to be separated, there is no escaping the fact that, in the statement of principle in *De Moribus*, love for God is highlighted, while the neighbour appears in a subordinate phrase and role: "... no one should think that while he despises his neighbour he will come to beatitude and to the God whom he loves"¹⁵). Showing due respect for the neighbour is elsewhere in the same work explicated at its loftiest as bringing him to love God¹⁶). As *De Doctrina Christiana*, begun in 396 A.D., has it: whatever we love should be drawn to the same goal towards which the whole élan of our love (*totus dilectionis impetus*) is running.

Whoever therefore loves his neighbour rightly ought to act in his regard in such a way that the neighbour himself may also love God with all the heart, all the soul, and all the mind. For, loving the neighbour as himself in this way, a person draws all the love he has for himself and for the neighbour into that love for God which permits no trickle to be led off from itself, for by this turning away it would be diminished¹⁷).

Here it is the love for God as all-embracing and all-demanding which is the driving-force of unity. Within its flow love for neighbour has a privileged, integral, but subordinate role. There is virtue in this focus in that love for self and for neighbour are thus kept intent on their true goal; the danger that love's genuine élan will be stemmed or diverted is obviated. While the post-395 Augustine never falls to insist upon this orientation of all love to God, who is to be loved with all that lives in us, he does come to employ a different focus on the unity question, and

¹⁵) *De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae* 1,26,51 (ML 32,1332): "... ne se quisquam credat, contempto proximo ad beatitudinem et ad Deum quem diligit esse venturum".

¹⁶) *Ibid.*, 1,26,49 (ML 32,1331).

¹⁷) *De Doctrina Christiana* 1,43 (CSEL 80,19) = 1,22,21 (CC 32,18. ML 34,27): "... sed quidquid aliud diligendum venerit in animum, illuc rapiatur, quo totus dilectionis impetus currit. Quisquis ergo recte proximum diligit, hoc cum eo debet agere, ut etiam ipse toto corde, tota anima, tota mente diligit deum. Sic enim eum diligens tamquam seipsum, totam dilectionem sui et illius refert in illam dilectionem dei, quae nullum a se rivulum duci extra patitur, cuius derivatione minuatur".

indeed to give more attention to the question itself. It is this focus that brings love of neighbour into a light that is at once more positive than *De Moribus' ne contempto proximo* and more sharply disclosive than that love joined together with love for God by the one supreme majesty and seeking to draw the neighbour to love God totally with heart, mind and soul.

C. THE UNITY ESTABLISHED BY "UNA MAJESTAS" — "UNUS CHRISTUS"

An appreciation of the newness evoked by the expressions of unity familiar to Augustine after 395 A.D. can be gained by taking up a second point in relation to *De Moribus* 1,30,62: the one sovereign majesty, peace itself, unites love for God and love for neighbour. Noticing the increasing nuancing of what such unity entails in relation to the *una majestas*, and how it can be brought about, can lead us into a central dimension of Augustine's later view of the unity matter. *De Moribus* tells us that God has joined worship of God and love of neighbour together and that together they form the church's pharmacy against sin. No reason is given for the union but divine decree, and nothing more is said of its nature. Now, one significant advance made on this position comes about under the influence of the figure of Christ, the neighbour, who will be recalled from the previous chapter. By the last decade of his life Augustine considered the two commandments to be one in that they are to be found and fulfilled in Christ, the Word made flesh (Jn. 1.14), who has become our neighbour. He is commenting on the psalm verse: "Look how I yearn for your precepts: give me life by your righteousness" (Ps. 118(119).40).

Look, I have yearned from my whole heart, from my whole soul, and from my whole mind, to love you and my neighbour as myself. Give me life not by my own but by your righteousness. That is to say, fill me with this love for which I have yearned. Help me to do what you put before me; you yourself, give me what you command. *Give me life by your righteousness* ... Your righteousness is Christ ... And in him I find your commandments which I have yearned for, so that you might give me life by your righteousness, that is, in him. For he is himself the Word who is God. And the Word has become flesh so as to be my neighbour as well (cf. Jn. 1.14).¹⁸

¹⁸ *En. in ps. 118, sermo 12,5* (CC 40,1074. ML 37,1435): "Ecce concupivi ex toto corde, ex tota anima, ex tota mente diligere te, et proximum sicut me: non in mea, sed in tua iustitia vivifica me, hoc est, ista caritate quam concupivi, imple me. Adiuvā ut faciam quod

In Christ, the righteousness of God, we can become as fully alive as we have yearned to become. Christ fills us with that total love for God and neighbour for which we have longed. Furthermore, in him, the Word made flesh, both God and the neighbour can be found, and, with his life-enhancing help, they can be loved. As *Sermo* 261 — which may date from as early as 397 or as late as 418 — puts it: “In Christ you have the whole (of the double commandment). Do you wish to love your God? You have Him in Christ. ‘In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God’ (Jn. 1.1). Do you wish to love your neighbour? You have him in Christ. ‘The Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us’ (Jn. 1.14)”¹⁹). Christ, who is both God and the neighbour, is the unifying factor in both the commentary on psalm 118 and *Sermo* 261. Through his taking on human flesh, the *una majestas* has determined in his own person, the Incarnate Word, that love for God and love for neighbour are inseparable. *En. in ps.* 118, directed against the Pelagians, adds to this that the very love with which Christ, God and neighbour, is loved comes to enliven us through the righteousness of God, that is, in Christ himself. For *En. in ps.* 140,2 (Date: 414-415), the love which is described by 1 Tim. 1.5 as coming from a pure heart, a good conscience and unfeigned faith, i.e. the love which has two precepts, is said to be Christ²⁰). Thus, the *una majestas*, the Incarnate Word, has also determined that the precepts regarding God and the neighbour be inseparable because he himself is the love (*ipsa caritas — haec caritas*) which loves genuinely from a pure heart according to the mind of God (*secundum Deum*). In Christ, therefore, we have both God and the neighbour to be loved, and Christ in us loves them. Or, as it may also be expressed, we in Christ love them.

These considerations as a whole bear a striking resemblance to the text which perhaps better than any other reveals Augustine’s mature

commendas, dona ipse quod mandas. *In tua iustitia vivifica me* (v. 40) ... *Iustitia tua Christus est* ... Et in illo invenio mandata tua quae concupivi, ut in tua iustitia, hoc est in illo, vivifices me. Ipse est enim Verbum Deus; et Verbum caro factum est, ut esset et proximus meus (cf. Jn. 1.14)”.

¹⁹) *Sermo* 261,8,8 (ML 38,1206): “In Christo habes totum. Deum tuum vis diligere? Habes in Christo: *In principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat Verbum* (Jn. 1.1.). Proximum vis diligere? Habes in Christo: *Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis* (Jn. 1.14)”.

²⁰) *En. in ps.* 140,2 (CC 40,2027. ML 37,1816): “*Ista caritas definita ab Apostolo habet duo praecepta, dilectionis dei et dilectionis proximi ... Haec caritas clamat de corde puro, de corde talium in his verbis, qualis hic modo orat. Et quis iste sit, cito dixerim: Christus est*”.

mind on our *magna quaestio*. It is tract 10,3 of *In Epistolam Ioannis*, dating from 407, which deserves to be quoted at length. John in his first letter moves rapidly from speaking of love for the Son of God (1 Jn. 5.1) to speaking of love for the children of God (1 Jn. 5.2). He can do this, says Augustine,

because the children of God are the body of the only Son of God. Since he is the head and we the members, there is but *one Son of God*. Therefore, whoever loves the children of God loves the Son of God, and whoever loves the Son of God loves the Father. No one can love the Father unless he loves the Son, and whoever loves the Son also loves the children of God.

Who are the children of God? The members of the Son of God. Through love a person becomes a member of Christ, and through love he is taken up into the organism of Christ's body. Thus it comes about that there will be *one Christ loving himself*²¹).

The *una majestas* has here become the one Son of God, head and members, the one body of Christ. Not only did God become our neighbour when the Word became flesh, such that both God and the neighbour are to be found in Christ, but the same Christ incorporates us into himself, making us members of his body. His love establishes an unbreakable unity between head and members, such that it is impossible to love the one without the other. For the one Son of God, the one body of Christ, is loved. Moreover, the love in the body is Christ, just as in *En. in ps.* 140,2 the love from a pure heart according to the mind of God is called Christ. Therefore, Augustine can foresee that when love will have reached perfection, the ultimate unity between love for God and neighbour will be achieved: "there will be *one Christ loving himself*". The *una majestas* as "one Christ loving himself" makes of the two inseparable loves one Christ-love. In what follows Augustine proceeds to draw out the implications of this insight into the Total Christ's radicalising of the manner in which, almost twenty years earlier, *una majestas* was said to join love for God and love for neighbour. The one Christ will, of course, love himself when the entire body, head and members, love one another.

²¹) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 10,3 (ML 35,2055): "... quia filii Dei corpus sunt unici Filii Dei; et cum ille caput, nos membra, unus est Filius Dei. Ergo qui diligit filios Dei, Filium Dei diligit; et qui diligit Filium Dei, Patrem diligit; nec potest quisquam diligere Patrem, nisi diligit Filium; et qui diligit Filium, diligit et filios Dei. Quos filios Dei? membra Filii Dei. Et diligendo fit et ipse membrum, et fit per dilectionem in compage corporis Christi; et erit unus Christus amans seipsum".

For when all the members love one another, the body loves itself. "If one member is suffering, all members suffer with it. If one member is given special honour, all members enjoy it. Now you together are Christ's body; but each of you is a different member" (1 Cor. 12.26-27). Speaking of fraternal love, John says: "How can someone who does not love the brother whom he can see, love God whom he does not see?" (1 Jn. 4.20). Do you think that when you love your brother you are loving him alone and not Christ as well? That is impossible, because you are loving the members of Christ. When you love Christ's members, you love Christ himself. When you love Christ, you love the Son of God. When you love the Son of God, you love the Father. Love cannot be split up. Begin loving somewhere, and the rest will follow. You say: I love God the Father alone. That's not true. If you love him, then you do not love him alone, for whoever loves the Father loves the Son also. Look, you say, I love the Father and the Son, but these two only: God the Father and God the Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, who ascended into heaven and sits at the right hand of the Father, that Word through whom all things have been made and who became flesh and has dwelt amongst us. Only this do I love. That is not true. For if you love the head, you love the members too. If indeed you do not love the members, then you do not love the head. Aren't you surprised by the voice of the head that cries from heaven on behalf of his members: "Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me?". Christ called the man who persecuted his members his own persecutor. He considers that the one who loves his members loves himself. You know who his members are: they are God's church.

"We can be sure that we love God's children if we love God himself" (1 Jn. 5.2). Is there then no distinction between the children of God and God himself? Whoever loves God also loves his commandments. And God's commandments are: "A new commandment I give you: you are to love one another" (Jn. 13.34). No one has to excuse himself for passing over from the one love to the other; this love is so entirely of one piece. Just as love itself has been woven into unity, so it unifies all who come under its influence. Like a fire it smelts them together. When gold is smelted it forms one ingot. But without the fire of love, it will never be possible to bring many people together in unity²²).

²²) *Ibid.*, (ML 35,2055-2056): "Cum enim se invicem amant membra, corpus se amat. Et si patitur unum membrum, compatiuntur omnia membra; et si gloriatur unum membrum, congaudent omnia membra. Et quid secutus ait? Vos autem estis corpus Christi et membra. Dicebat paulo ante de dilectione fraterna, et ait: Qui non diligit fratrem quem videt: Deum quem non videt quomodo poterit diligere? Si autem diligit fratrem, forte fratrem diligit, et Christum non diligit? Quomodo, quando membra Christi diligit? Cum ergo membra Christi diligit: Christum diligit; cum Christum diligit: Filium Dei diligit; cum Filium Dei diligit, et Patrem diligit. Non potest ergo separari dilectio. Elige tibi quid

While love is so entirely of one piece that it cannot be split up, there still remains a distinction between God and the children of God. It is true that, because there is one Son of God, one body of Christ, "if you love the head, you love the members too" and "when you love Christ's members, you love Christ himself", and therefore also the Father. While, however, the love is one and the same so that we need no excuse for passing over from love of neighbour to love for God, and vice versa, those loved, God and the children of God, head and members, are not one and the same. Augustine here characterises God as the one who gives the commandment of love, i.e. Jn. 13.34, and who may therefore also be understood as the source of unity. The children of God, on the other hand, are those who, in loving one another in obedience to God's commandment, in fact love God himself. It is as if Augustine at this point wishes for a moment to bracket the powerful idea of the Total Christ, lest his hearers gain the mistaken impression that there is no difference between God and the children of God. He therefore introduces the notion of God as the law-giver or commandment-giver, which we have seen in *De Vera Religione* and in the commentary on Galatians, and which had already made an appearance in his previous sermon on 1 Jn.: "If however you do not love your brother, whose commandment are you despising?"²³). But this perspective also immediately leads him back to

diligas; sequuntur te cetera. Dicas: Deum solum diligo, Deum Patrem. Mentiris: si diligis, non solum diligis; sed si diligis Patrem, diligis et Filium. Ecce, inquis, diligo Patrem, et diligo Filium; sed hoc solum: Patrem Deum et Filium Deum et Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum qui ascendit in caelos, et sedet ad dexteram Patris, illud Verbum per quod facta sunt omnia, et Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis; hoc solum diligo. Mentiris: si enim diligis caput, diligis et membra; si autem membra non diligis, nec caput diligis. Non expavescis vocem capitis de caelo clamantem pro membris: *Saule, Saule, quid me persequeris?* Persecutorem suum vocavit persecutorem membrorum suorum: dilectorem suum vocavit dilectorem membrorum suorum. Jam quae sunt membra ejus nostis, fratres; ipsa est Ecclesia Dei. *In hoc cognoscimus quia diligimus filios Dei, quia Deum diligimus.* Et quomodo? Non aliud sunt filii Dei, aliud Deus? Sed qui Deum diligit, praecepta ejus diligit. Et quae sunt praecepta Dei? *Mandatum novum do vobis, ut vos invicem diligatis.* Nemo se excuset per aliam dilectionem, ad aliam dilectionem; omnino sic se tenet ista dilectio: quomodo ipsa compaginata est in unum, sic omnes qui ex illa pendent, unum facit, et quasi conflatur illos in ignem. Aurum est, conflatur massa, et fit unum aliquid: sed nisi fervor charitatis accendat, ex multis in unum conflare non potest".

²³) *Ibid.*, tr. 9,11 (ML 35,2053): "Si autem fratrem non diligis; quomodo eum diligis, cujus mandatum contemnis?". Note the shift of emphasis from *De Moribus* "ne se quisquam credat, contempto proximo ... ad Deum quem diligit esse venturum". There, if a person failed to love the neighbour, he would not come to the God he loved. Here, if someone neglects love of neighbour, he shows contempt for the God whose law is precisely love of neighbour.

an insistence on the unity of love for God and neighbour. For, while they are evidently not the same, this love is so entirely of one piece that a person has only to begin loving somewhere. The rest will follow as a matter of course.

While despising one's neighbour (*contempto proximo*), one cannot come to the God one loves. The neighbour loved should be drawn to the same goal, i.e. God, towards which the whole élan of our love (*totus dilectionis impetus*) is running. These are the perspectives of *De Moribus* and of *De Doctrina Christiana* respectively. Both bespeak a context of ascent from man to God, but, as we have attempted to show in previous articles, these assertions are not unaccompanied by certain elements corresponding to a context of descent, viz. God is not uninterested and uninvolved in the love neighbour envisaged, and indeed growth in one's relationship with God is to the advantage of the neighbour. *Totus dilectionis impetus*, while concerned that the neighbour too ascends to God, is closely related to the demand to love God *ex toto*, and therefore strives to prevent such love being diminished by any trickle leading off from it. The stress is on total love for God within which love for neighbour takes its place. In tract 10,3 of *In Epistolam Ioannis*, however, the *totus dilectionis impetus* may be considered to be running in the direction of the "one Christ loving himself". In this one Christ are both God and the neighbour to be loved. God and the neighbour are not identical; but, because Christ has through love identified himself with the non-identical²⁴) by becoming the human neighbour and by making the neighbour a member of his own body, it is now impossible to affect our neighbour's life without affecting God. When we love the brother whom we can see, we love a member of the one body of the Son of God, and we thereby love God the Father himself whom we cannot see. When we give to our needy brother, it is the one Christ himself, who is both God and the neighbour, who receives our gifts. In the light of such identification it is impossible to make a difference to our neighbour's life, for better or for worse, without making a difference to God. Similarly, one cannot claim to love God or Christ alone without the neighbour, for, on the one hand, it is God's very law that the neighbour should be loved, and, on the other hand, Christ himself has become the neighbour. Furthermore, the same Christ is the love which fulfils the double commandment. Seen from this

²⁴) See D. Soelle, *Christ the Representative. An Essay in Theology after the 'Death of God'* (English translation: David Lewis) London, 1967, p. 152.

perspective, the neighbour emerges in a new light. The *una majestas*, here the *unus Christus*, has joined the two loves together not only in the sense of *ne ... contempto proximo*, i.e. if you despise the neighbour you will not reach God. The loves are made inseparable such that their mutual interdependence is stressed. In this network the neighbour plays a key role. The *totus dilectionis impetus* does not just carry the neighbour on in its movement towards God, but also streams out from God the law-giver to the members of Christ's body. One loves God-Christ in the very love for these members. The two loves are made inseparable to the extent of becoming one love, one Christ-love. In Christ himself we find the neighbour whom we are not to despise; and with the one Christ-love we are able to fulfil the commandment to love this neighbour and God. The *totus dilectionis impetus* has been metamorphosised into the one *totus Christus*, head and members: the *unus Christus amans seipsum*.

The strong parallel expressions of *una caritas* that claim the attention of the reader of *In Epistolam Ioannis* do not arise completely out of the blue. The earlier expressions which we have considered, however, are quite enriched there by their association with the *totus Christus*, God and the neighbour. Such formulations included *sola religio, eademque caritatem, majestas una, res una, eademque pace* and *totus dilectionis impetus*. *In Epistolam Ioannis* represents quite an advance on these earlier indications of unity not least in its accentuation of the indivisibility of love, but most of all in its explanation of the genesis of such inseparability by introducing the idea of Christ's identification of himself with the members of his body. In the figure of Christ the balance and the inter-change between the contexts of ascent and descent comes clearly and explicitly to the fore. The context of ascent is not the explicitly predominating one, as tended to be the case in the writings of the younger, less scripturally-conscious Augustine. Augustine's development of the idea of *totus Christus* has certainly led to a radical change of focus in the matter of love for God and the neighbour, and indeed to a perceptible deepening of unity in Christ. Nevertheless, to claim that it constitutes a rupture and discontinuity with what has gone before is, for the reasons adduced above, not quite fair to the early writings themselves. The descent context was to some extent present there, even if only implicitly and not so strongly. The seeds of synthesis, therefore, may be said to have already been sown, albeit perhaps scatteredly. They would grow through an increased understanding of Christ who is love diffused among his members.

In any case, in the period between the earliest writings dating from 386-390 and *In Epistolam Ioannis* (407 A.D.), the quite striking developments of the latter are not totally unprecedented. As far as Christ the neighbour is concerned, *quaestio* 71, from the years 389-396, offers a foretaste: "Therefore, imploring God's mercy, we should take great care that Christ is not neglected because of a man's faults. It is precisely the weak person we ought to love for Christ's sake"²⁵). Christ, who has laid down his life for the weak, will himself be overlooked if the weak person is looked down upon because of his weakness. The general idea of *totus Christus* itself, which speaks with such resounding unifying tones in 407 A.D. in relation to love for God and neighbour, is attested as early as *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, dating from 388-389. Here it is a matter of the person of Christ being present in the Christian²⁶), but the step to seeing precisely the neighbour to be loved as Christ is not specifically made. It is only later that Augustine brings the idea of *totus Christus*, which under the particular influence of Matt. 25.31-46 he especially favours, into direct relation with our theme. *Quaestio* 71 (389-396 A.D.) foreshadows this fruitful union. And by 397 it is already beginning to manifest itself in the clear tones which in *In Epistolam Ioannis* will rise to a forceful crescendo²⁷).

D. 'UNUM PRAECEPTUM PRO UTROQUE' — 'UNA CARITAS'

As regards the love that cannot be split up because it is so much of one piece, we have already pointed out that the commentary on Galatians (from 395 A.D.) underlines the intrinsic inter-relatedness of

²⁵) *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83, q. 71,7 (CC 44A,207. ML 40,83): "Quapropter ingenti cura et implorata dei misericordia cogitandum est, ne Christum negligamus propter infirmum, cum infirmum debeamus diligere propter Christum".

²⁶) *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 2,25,38 (ML 34,216): "unusquisque christianus non incongrue sustinet personam Christi". It is of note that this is also the work in which we have found the earliest appearance of the expression "eamdem caritatem". But at this stage the ideas merely occur close on each other's heels, without any inherent link.

²⁷) Apart from *quaestio* 71,7, the earliest examples we have been able to find of Christ being affected by our conduct towards our neighbour are *De Disciplina Christiana* 8,8 (CC 46,215-216. ML 40,673-674) (Date: 397): "Inter has voces tuas laudantis sarcinam tuam, adhuc Christus petit, et non accipit ... Cum enim uni ex minimis meis fecisti mihi fecisti (Matt. 25.40) ... Ecce quis eget ..."; and *Sermo Mai* 13,4 (MA I,291), dating from 399 at the latest: "In minimis suis laborantibus in terra quodammodo personam suam misericorditer esse voluit, subveniens de caelo omnibus qui laborant. Christo ergo das, cum das egenti". The idea is also present, but in a polemical form, in *Sermo* 178,4 (ML 38,962-963) which authors date post-396.

the precepts. One precept cannot be kept unless the other is kept too. So closely are they joined together that, far from the one being patent of description without mentioning the other, one can in fact be sufficient to indicate them both. Love for neighbour is more suited to this task in that it can be more easily tested by experience²⁸). The insight that nothing more than love of neighbour is required to refer to both precepts is again expressed in *De Disciplina Christiana*, from 397 A.D.

“Love is the one thing that cannot hurt your neighbour; that is why love is the law in all its fulness” (Rom. 13.10). What is this love? Love for our fellow-man. Paul seemingly says nothing of love for God. What he does assert is that love for neighbour alone is sufficient to fulfil the law. For every other commandment can be summarised and at the same time fulfilled in one short sentence. What is that sentence? “Love your neighbour as yourself”. You see, it has all to do with the one thing. It is true that there are two commandments and that on these two the whole Law and the Prophets depend. As you see, however, these two can be presented even more concisely ... What had formerly been two commandments have been made into one. In a word, love your neighbour, and that is sufficient²⁹).

The statement of *De Disciplina Christiana* - *Ecce quae duo (praecepta) erant, unum factum est*³⁰) — may be considered a forerunner of the classic unity text of *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 10,3: *et erit unus Christus amans seipsum*. It anticipates the *una caritas* which after 407 A.D. will become the more common formulation.

Book 8 of *De Trinitate* dates from shortly before *In Epistolam Ioannis*. Augustine asserts there that “not without cause Scripture

²⁸) *Expositio Epistolae ad Galatas* 45 (CSEL 84,119. ML 35,2138): “Cum ergo utrumque praeceptum ita sit, ut neutrum sine altero possit teneri, etiam unum horum commemorare plerumque sufficit, cum agitur de operibus iustitiae, sed oportunius illud, de quo quisque facilius vincitur”.

²⁹) *De Disciplina Christiana* 5,5-6,5 (CC 46,212-213. ML 40,672): “*Dilectio proximi malum non operatur. Plenitudo autem legis, caritas*. 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 ... Ecce quae duo erant, unum factum est. Prorsus proximum dilige, et sufficit”.

³⁰) In *De Disciplina Christiana* 5,5-6,5 the idea of the unity of love's precept is not immediately brought into connection with that of the “totus Christus” being affected when his members are affected. But in 8,8 of this same work the Christ of Matt. 25,40&45, who identifies himself with the neighbour, is strongly present.

commonly puts one (precept) for both"³¹). When love for God is mentioned in Rom. 8.28, 1 Cor. 8.3 and Rom. 5.5, love for neighbour is implied as well, for he who loves God obeys his command to love the neighbour. Similarly, the love for neighbour referred to in Gal. 5.14 & 6.2 and Matt. 7.12 implies love for God. Why this latter is so Augustine explains in a new and quite unfamiliar way in *De Trinitate*, and also in *In Epistolam Ioannis*: whoever loves the neighbour loves, in a particular distinctive way, love itself³²). The point to which we are now attending is the formula of unity itself: ... *non immerito plerumque scriptura pro utroque unum ponit*. If we hold fast to the Lord's precept to love one another, we will in fact be doing whatever else is commanded. For in the precept of love for neighbour we have whatever else is commanded³³). Together with its open acknowledgement, which had been heralded by the commentary on Galatians and *De Disciplina Christiana*, that love for God and the neighbour is so much of one piece that one precept alone can serve to indicate them both, *De Trinitate* 8 also witnesses to the first use of the expression *una caritas* formally as such. Certainly, the earlier expressions of unity have prepared the way for this, and, more importantly, tract 10,3 of *In Epistolam Ioannis* discloses a central Christological and ecclesial dimension of the idea. But *De Trinitate* gives its own twist to the unity of love:

Do not let the question disturb us how much love we ought to devote to our brother and how much to God. For we should love our brother as ourselves; and the more we love God the more we love ourselves. Therefore we love God and the neighbour from one and the same love (*ex una igitur eademque caritate*). But we love God because he is God; we love ourselves and the neighbour, however, as orientated to God³⁴).

³¹) *De Trinitate* 8,7,10 (CC 50,284. ML 42,956): "... non immerito plerumque scriptura pro utroque unum ponit".

³²) *Ibid.*, (CC 50,285. ML 42,957): "... qui proximum diligit, consequens est ut et ipsam praecipue dilectionem diligit".

³³) *Tractatus in Evangelium Ioannis* 83,3 (CC 36,536. ML 35,1846) (Date: 418-421): "Hoc ergo praeceptum domini teneamus, ut nos invicem diligamus; et quidquid aliud praecepit, faciemus; quoniam quidquid est aliud hic habemus". Some codices and editions have "faciamus", but the CC edition gives preference to "faciemus".

³⁴) *De Trinitate* 8,8,12-8,9,12 (CC 50,288-289. ML 42,959): "Nec illa iam quaestio moveat quantum caritatis fratri debeamus impendere, quantum deo. Fratri enim quantum nobis ipsis; nos autem ipsos tanto magis diligimus quanto magis diligimus deum. Ex una igitur eademque caritate deum proximumque diligimus, sed deum propter deum, nos autem et proximum propter deum". This is the reading given by CC. The Maurini, however, have inserted after the first sentence of our quotation: "incomparabiliter plus quam nobis deo".

The one love fulfils the entire law³⁵). God and the neighbour are loved with one and the same love, but God and the neighbour are not simply one and the same³⁶). Therefore, even though one precept may stand for both because of love's radical inseparability — for indeed love is Christ — there are still two distinct precepts³⁷). But, because we love ourselves best when we love God with our whole selves for himself alone, we love the neighbour as ourselves in the most fruitful way when we are totally intent upon God. There can be no anxiety that by loving God more we might have to be content to love the neighbour less, or vice versa. The nature of genuine love as orientated to God, *propter deum*, assures this. For true love of neighbour that orientates him to God cannot flow from a person who does not love God. The more a person loves God, however, the more he loves his neighbour as himself.

This has been an initial surveying of the ground covered by the unity question. Here we have been principally concerned with the development of the formulations employed by Augustine to suggest the inter-relatedness of love for God and neighbour. The most striking of these have been *ex una eademque caritate* and *erit unus Christus amans seipsum*,

Then comes "Fratri autem" instead of "Fratri enim". This quite changes the sense of the passage. If we are to devote incomparably more love to God than to ourselves, then the implication might well be that we are to devote incomparably more love to God than to the neighbour we are to love as ourselves. Augustine may then be seen not to consider the question a moving one because he takes it for granted that incomparably more love is to be given to God than to the neighbour. In the CC version, what defuses the issue 'how much to God — how much to the neighbour' is the insight that all genuine love is of one piece. The more I love God (and this, of course, will be incomparably more than I love my selfish self), the more I love my true self, and therefore the more I love my neighbour as myself. Of the love proposed by 1 Tim. 1.5 — "de corde puro et conscientia bona, et fide non ficta" — Augustine states in *Tractatus in Evangelium Ioannis* 87,1 (CC 36,544. ML 35,1852) (Date: 418-421): "Hac diligimus invicem, hac diligimus deum". Cf. *Epistola* 167,5,16 (CSEL 44,603. ML 33,739) (Date: 415): "... plenitudo legis caritas est qua deus proximusque diligitur ...". Note the plural subject with the singular verb "diligitur". Cf. also *Sermo* 350,2 (ML 39,1534) (Date: 425-430): "... caritas, qua Deum proximumque diligimus".

³⁵) *Sermo Wilmari* 2,3 (MA I,676) (Date: pre-410): "Non te misit in multa, nec in decem, nec in duo: una caritas totum implet".

³⁶) *Sermo* 265,9 (ML 38,1223) (Date: probably 412): "... quia non alia caritas diligit proximum, quam illa quae diligit Deum. Non ergo alia caritas est. Qua charitate proximum, ipsa charitate diligimus et Deum. Sed quia aliud est Deus, aliud proximus; una charitate diliguntur, non sunt tamen unum qui diliguntur ...".

³⁷) *En. in ps.* 140,2 (CC 40,2027. ML 37,1816): "*Caritas ergo de puro corde est quae est secundum deum, et conscientia bona, et fide non ficta* (1 Tim. 1.5). *Ista caritas definita ab apostolo habet duo praecepta, dilectionis dei et dilectionis proximi ... Haec caritas clamat de corde puro, de corde talium in his verbis, qualis hic modo orat. Et quis iste sit, cito dixerim: Christus est*".

together with the apprehension that mentioning one commandment suffices to indicate both. In the second part of this article, after showing that in a number of instances Augustine in fact lets the one commandment of love for neighbour stand for both, we will attempt to enter more fully into the meaning disclosed by these expressions of unity and to follow up Augustine's principal explanations of how one precept can sum up and fulfil the entire law.

II. ONE COMMANDMENT CAN AND DOES STAND FOR BOTH. HOW?

In both the commentary on Galatians and *De Trinitate* it is Augustine's contention that referring to one commandment immediately puts us in mind of both³⁸). Later, in his 65th sermon on John's gospel, he maintains that people of sound understanding will be able to find both commandments in each of the two individual precepts³⁹); while, in the 83rd tract on the same gospel, it is precisely the precept of love for neighbour that is singled out as incorporating also love for God⁴⁰). When the second part of the double commandment is observed, the first cannot but be adhered to also. The inverse is true as well; but Augustine more frequently refers to the former movement. A corollary of this position is that the precepts are joined together in such a manner that either both are obeyed or none at all; one commandment cannot be kept without the other⁴¹). Before individuating the various reasons why this is so, and thus disclosing what motivates Augustine to regard love as being so much of one piece, it will be useful to display a few instances of his taking the unity of love simply for granted. Even when he does not explicitly draw our attention to what he is doing, Augustine in fact from time to time allows one commandment to stand for both.

³⁸) *Expositio Epistolae ad Galatas* 45 (CSEL 84,119. ML 35,2138); *De Trinitate* 8,7,10 (CC 50,284-285. ML 42,956-957).

³⁹) *Tractatus in Evangelium Ioannis* 65,2 (CC 36,492. ML 35,1809): "Sed bene intellegentibus utrumque invenitur in singulis".

⁴⁰) *Ibid.*, 83,3 (CC 36,536. ML 35,1846): "... quoniam quidquid est aliud hic habemus".

⁴¹) *De Fide et Operibus* 10,16 (CSEL 41,54. ML 40,207): "... nam diligenter considerata ista duo praecepta, ita ex alterutro connexa reperiuntur, ut nec dilectio dei possit esse in homine, si non diligit proximum, nec dilectio proximi, si non diligit deum".

A. FROM "MANDATA" TO "MANDATUM": IMPLICIT RECOGNITION THAT LOVE FOR NEIGHBOUR IN FACT SUFFICES

Sermo 352, dating from 396-400, refers to psalm 139,7-9: "Where could I go to escape your spirit? Where could I flee from your face? If I climb up to heaven, you are there; you are there too if I go down into hell. If I were to take on wings and fly to the ends of the sea ...". Augustine's comment on this is:

With the hope I have I shall meditate on the end of the world, I shall live according to your precepts, I shall be lifted up by the two wings of love. Therefore, fulfil the two wings of love. Love your neighbour as yourself; and do not cherish hatred by which you would flee your creditor⁴²).

According to Ps. 139.7-8 the creditor one would try to flee in hatred is the spirit of God. Augustine's brief remarks on these verses in the immediate context specify the creditor as Christ. Because of our sins we are in debt to Christ. And so long as we refuse to deal mercifully with our debtors, with those who have offended us, Augustine pictures us as trying to flee from Christ. "So as not to have to forgive your enemy, will you turn away from Christ?"⁴³). Matt. 25.40 — "when you did it to one of the least of mine, you did it to me" — which is quoted here, suggests the identification of Christ and the neighbour in need not just of our material goods but also of our forgiveness. Although Augustine does not openly make the connexion, perhaps it is this identification alluded to in the context which enables him to sum up the two precepts of love in one. "Therefore, fulfil the two wings of love. Love your neighbour as yourself". What follows — viz. "do not cherish hatred by which you would flee your creditor" — evidently refers to hatred for and an unforgiving attitude towards one's brethren. Earlier on in the same paragraph such attitudes are said to stifle the very source of love. The phrase may therefore be considered as in apposition to love for neighbour as oneself. When a person forgives his enemy as he himself wishes to be forgiven, he turns towards Christ and is enabled to face his own creditor. When the neighbour is forgiven and hatred for him driven out, the two wings of love are fulfilled. Through forgiving a debtor a

⁴²) *Sermo* 352,7 (ML 39,1558): "... spe mea finem saeculi meditabor, in praeceptis tuis vivam, duabus alis charitatis attolar. Imple ergo duas alas charitatis. Dilige proximum sicut te ipsum; et non teneas odium, unde fugias creditorem".

⁴³) *Ibid.*, (ML 39,1557): "Ne ignoscas inimico, deviabis a Christo".

person comes close to Christ, his own creditor, and may without fear pray to be forgiven himself. In that loving forgiveness of neighbours is here envisioned as fulfilling both love for neighbour and love for God, we are reminded of the *ecce unum est* of *De Disciplina Christiana* which dates from around the same time as *Sermo* 352. "What had been two commandments have been made into one. In a word, love your neighbour, and that is sufficient"⁴⁴). "Let us therefore keep the commandment of the Lord to love one another. Then we shall be doing whatever else he commands, because here we have whatever other precept there is"⁴⁵). This latter statement dates from more than twenty years after *Sermo* 352 and *De Disciplina Christiana*. It helps to clarify the otherwise puzzling assertion of *Sermo* 352: "Therefore fulfil the two wings of love. Love your neighbour as yourself". In *Sermo* 352 the *totus Christus* idea in connexion with Matt. 25.40 is latent in the context as a possible explanation: Christ the creditor may also well be the debtor in search of our forgiveness just as he is the one who receives what is given to the poor person: "but here also on earth, when you gave to the person entreating you (i.e. to Christ), He himself supplies what you have given"⁴⁶). Christ may make himself one also with the neighbour in need of forgiveness. But, to a great extent, it is still as if Augustine has come up with the answer — i.e. loving the neighbour fulfils both wings of love — without showing the working. In *De Disciplina Christiana* and tract 83 on John's gospel, however, the reasoning is provided, viz. a person cannot love his neighbour genuinely unless he loves himself properly by loving God.

Other texts from the pre-400 period exemplify the same tendency to see both precepts on which the whole law and the prophets depend as present in the commandment to love one's neighbour. In *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, dating from 398-399, Augustine quotes Rom. 13.9-10 which maintains that all the commandments are summed up in the single command to love the neighbour as oneself. Apropos of these verses he says: "There are found those two precepts of love for God and love for

⁴⁴) *De Disciplina Christiana* 6,5 (CC 46,212-213. ML 40,672): "Ecce quae duo erant, unum factum est. Prorsus proximum dilige, et sufficit".

⁴⁵) *Tractatus in Evangelium Ioannis* 83,3 (CC 36,536. ML 35,1846): "Hoc ergo praeceptum domini teneamus, ut nos invicem diligamus; et quidquid aliud praecepit, faciemus; quoniam quidquid est aliud hic habemus".

⁴⁶) *Sermo* 352,7 (ML 39,1557): "Sed hic quoque in terra, quo iubente praestitisti, ipse supplet quod dedisti".

neighbour which are set out on the two tablets of stone"⁴⁷). This is rather surprising in that Rom. 13.9 lists only commandments such as "you shall not commit adultery" which Augustine proceeds to classify among the seven contained on the second tablet. He does not here say how the three commandments of the Decalogue written on the first tablet are to be found in Rom. 13.9-10, but Romans' assertion that all the commandments are summed up in the single command to love the neighbour as oneself leaves him in no doubt that love for God is included here too. Similarly, in *Sermo Mai* 14, dating from 399, when Augustine wishes to show that the whole gospel can be characterised as love, he calls upon the services of Jn. 13.34 which he quotes as follows: "A new commandment I give to you, that you love one another". Of this he remarks: "... the lord did not tell you of any other commandments of his but that you should love one another. And he called this commandment itself new. It leads to our renewal, it makes new people of us, and promises a new heritage, the same and eternal"⁴⁸). The Lord's renewing commandment then is that of love for neighbour. The whole Gospel is based on this love. But, as *De Natura et Gratia* of 415 A.D. has it, this love commandment of God comes easily to those who are orientated towards Him wholly with heart and soul⁴⁹). In this sense the accomplishment of God's commandment of love for neighbour as the fulness of the law (cf. Rom. 13.10) may be seen as requiring and implying the movement of one's whole being towards God. When one is totally intent upon God, Christ's renewing commandment on which the whole Gospel is founded, i.e. Jn. 13.34, becomes a light and sweet burden (cf. Matt. 11.30; 1 Jn. 5.3.).

Not unexpectedly, *In Epistolam Ioannis* offers a number of alerting

⁴⁷) *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 15,4 (CSEL 25/1,423. ML 42,306): "Ibi sunt duo illa praecepta, dilectionis dei et dilectionis proximi, singulis tabulis explicata".

⁴⁸) *Sermo Mai* 14,1 (MA I,292-293): "... quanto magis evangelium, quod testamentum novum apertissime dicitur, non pertinet nisi ad caritatem, quando et mandatum suum dominus non dixit, nisi ut vos invicem diligatis? Et novum dixit ipsum mandatum, et ad innovationem nostram venit, et novos homines nos fecit, et novam hereditatem eandemque aeternam promisit".

⁴⁹) *De Natura et Gratia* 69,83 (CSEL 60,298. ML 44,289): "Conversus ergo quisque ... ad dominum deum suum ex toto corde suo, et ex tota anima sua, mandatum dei non habebit grave. Quomodo est enim grave, cum sit dilectionis mandatum? Aut enim quisque non diligit, et ideo grave est: aut diligit, et grave esse non potest. Diligit autem, si quod illic admonetur Israel, conversus fuerit ad dominum deum suum ex toto corde suo, et ex tota anima sua. Mandatum, inquit, novum do vobis, ut vos invicem diligatis (Jn. 13.34): et Qui diligit proximum legem implevit: et Plenitudo legis caritas (Rom. 13.8&10)".

examples of the trend to allow love for neighbour to sum up both commandments. In tract 6,4, having quoted 1 Jn. 3.21b-22 — i.e. “we have confidence in God’s presence, and whatever we ask him we shall receive, because we keep his *commandments* (*mandata*)” — Augustine goes on to ask what these commandments are. He replies by adducing Jn. 13.34: “A new commandment I give to you (*mandatum novum do vobis*), that you love one another”⁵⁰). This shift from *mandata* to *mandatum* reflects the orientation of Augustine’s thought as a whole in this passage. Genuine love is that which seeks no reward for itself, but only the well-being of one’s brother. The change from *mandata* to *mandatum* is already present in 1 Jn. itself: John moves from “τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ” in 1 Jn. 3.22 to “ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτοῦ” in 3.23, and Augustine was evidently working with a Latin translation which remained faithful to this nuance. In fact, in tract 6,9 of his commentary on 1 Jn. he quotes both verses 22 and 23. Verse 23 reads in Augustine’s rendering: “And this is his commandment (*mandatum*): that we believe in the name of his Son Jesus Christ and that we love one another”. What is in the foreground in his commentary, however, is not so much faith in Christ as love for one another. He plainly states a little after his quotation of verse 23 that no other commandment is given to us except to love one another⁵¹). Then in his quotation of verse 24a, where both the Greek and Vulgate revert to the plural — “whoever keeps his commandments (τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ” — *mandata eius*) remains in God, and God in him” — Augustine retains the singular, *mandatum*. Those who observe the commandment to love one another remain in God and God in them.

Tract 10 of the same commentary on 1 Jn. also evidences the sufficiency of love for neighbour to stand for the whole. In the classic passage on the unity of love already referred to, we read: “Whoever loves God also loves his commandments. And God’s commandments (*praecepta*) are: ‘A new commandment (*mandatum*) I give to you, that you love one another’. No one has to excuse himself for passing over from the one love to the other; this love is so entirely of one piece”⁵²).

⁵⁰) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 6,4 (ML 35,2021): “*Fiduciam ergo habemus ad Deum; et quicquid postulaverimus, ab eo accipiemus: sed, quia mandata eius servamus. Quae sunt mandata eius? Numquid semper repetendum est? Mandatum novum do vobis, ut vos invicem diligatis*”.

⁵¹) *Ibid.*, tr. 6,9 (ML 35,2025): “... videtis quia nihil aliud nobis praecipitur, nisi ut diligamus invicem”.

⁵²) *Ibid.*, 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*. Nemo se excuset per aliam dilectionem, ad aliam dilectionem; omnino sic se tenet ista dilectio ...”.

Here once again Jn. 13.34 does service for the *praecepta Dei*. Later in the same sermon, however, apropos of 1 Jn. 5.3. — i.e. “for this is love of God: keeping his commandments (*praecepta*)” — Augustine makes mention of the double commandment of Matt. 22.37-40, and comments: “Look at the *two commandments* that the whole letter of John is concerned with”⁵³. Two remarks may appropriately be made on this statement. Firstly, in the passage in question, Augustine’s exhortation to hold firm to the two-fold love of Matt. 22.37-40 (*tenete ergo dilectionem*) is dwelt upon exclusively in terms of love for neighbour, extending even to enemies. Secondly, a comparison with tract 8,4 is illuminating. In that earlier sermon Augustine had noted that, even though 1 Jn. does not pass over love for God in silence, it nonetheless does not speak of it at all so frequently as love of neighbour⁵⁴). Now in tract 10,7 we are directed to the *two* commandments (Matt. 22.37-40) of which the *whole* first letter of John speaks. *Ecce de quibus praeceptis narrat tota ista Epistola*. This could hardly be the case unless the much more frequently mentioned love of neighbour (*mandatum*) were understood to embrace the little mentioned love for God, and thus to sum up the entirety of God’s *mandata* and *praecepta* in one short phrase.

B. HOW ONE COMMANDMENT CAN SERVE TO INDICATE BOTH, OR WHY ONE COMMANDMENT CANNOT BE KEPT WITHOUT THE OTHER

By the year 413 Augustine did not feel that he had to delay in explaining the inter-connexion of the two commandments. “For when these two precepts are looked at closely, they are found to be so entwined that there can be no love of God in a person if he does not love his neighbour and no love of neighbour unless he loves God”⁵⁵). Where, however, Augustine takes the time to explain this necessary linking of the one to the other, four main inter-related trends may be discerned. Firstly,

⁵³) *Ibid.*, tr. 10,7 (ML 35,2059): “Ecce de quibus praeceptis narrat tota ista Epistola”.

⁵⁴) *Ibid.*, tr. 8,4 (ML 35,2037): “Fortassis autem moverit aliquos vestrum, ex quo istam Epistolam beati Joannis tractamus vobis, quare non commendaverit maxime nisi fraternam charitatem. *Qui diligit fratrem*, dicit; et: *Praeceptum nobis est datum, ut diligamus invicem*. Assidue nominavit charitatem fraternam: Dei autem charitatem, id est qua debemus diligere Deum, non tam assidue nominavit; sed tamen non omnino tacuit”.

⁵⁵) *De Fide et Operibus* 10,16 (CSEL 41,54. ML 40,207): “Nolo pluribus immorari: nam diligenter considerata ista duo praecepta, ita ex alterutro connexa reperiuntur, ut nec dilectio dei possit esse in homine, si non diligit proximum, nec dilectio proximi, si non diligit deum”.

as became evident in relation to love of self, a person cannot love his neighbour fruitfully "as himself" unless he loves God *ex toto*. Love for neighbour without love for God will not be genuine; it will more closely resemble hatred than love. Secondly, love for God will not be genuine if a person fails to obey God's commandment which is precisely to love the neighbour. Moreover, Jn. 21.15-19 presents Christ enjoining Peter, who loves Him, to feed His sheep. This applies the idea of the lover of God obeying His command in a more specifically Christological, pastoral, ministerial context. Thirdly, love of neighbour may serve as the acid-test for love of God. In the line of 1 Jn. 4.20b lack of love for the brethren may be taken as a sign that love for God is missing too, even indeed that one has no real faith in the Incarnation. Fourthly, whoever loves his brother loves love itself, and, claims Augustine, inverting 1 Jn. 4.8 & 16, love is God himself. This fourth line of argumentation warrants special treatment and will be dealt with in its own right in the final part of this chapter. The first three trends are in some respects not unfamiliar to us from many of the texts we have already presented, and they therefore need not detain us unduly. These three tendencies may be rehearsed summarily by looking again at the commentary on Galatians. The tenor of their reasoning will then be further brought out by a brief comparison with other similar formulations.

It can be asked why Paul here (in Gal. 5.15 & 16) mentioned only love of neighbour and said that by it the law was fulfilled. Also, when he dealt with the same question in the letter to the Romans, he said: "he who loves the other has fulfilled the law. For 'thou shalt not commit adultery', 'thou shalt not kill', 'thou shalt not steal', 'thou shalt not covet', and whatever other commandment there is, is summed up in this one sentence: Love your neighbour as yourself, for love of neighbour does no harm. And love is the fulness of the law" (Rom. 13.8-10).

(2) Since therefore love is not complete except in the two precepts of love for God and neighbour, why does Paul in both Galatians and Romans mention only love of neighbour? Is the reason not that, since love for God is not so frequently put to the test, people can deceive themselves about it? In love for neighbour, however, they can more easily be clearly shown that, so long as they act unjustly towards other people, they do not have love for God.

(3) It is fitting that the person who loves God with the whole heart, the whole soul and the whole mind, should also love the neighbour as himself, for the reason that God, whom he loves with the whole heart, the whole soul and the whole mind, commands this.

(4) And also who can love the neighbour — by which all people

are meant — as himself unless he loves God by whose precept and gift he is able to fulfil love of neighbour?

(5) Therefore, since both precepts are such that neither can be kept without the other, it is very often sufficient to mention just one of them when it is a matter of the works of justice. But that one is more appropriate by which a person is made aware of his shortcomings.

(6) Thus John says: "For if a person does not love his brother whom he sees, how can he love God whom he does not see?" (1 Jn. 4.20).

(7) The Galatians were deceiving themselves that they had love for God. They were shown clearly that they did not have it by the hatred among brothers about which it is easy to judge in daily life and conduct⁵⁶).

1. Who can love the neighbour as himself unless he loves God?

This point is briefly noted in paragraph (4) of the text quoted from the commentary on Galatians. Because it has already been elaborated *ad lungum et ad latum* in a previous article, we will rest content here with pointing out its appearance in three other places where it has the specific function of explaining how the commandment of love for neighbour alone can be said to be the fulness of the law. We recall the unity formula of *De Disciplina Christiana*: *Ecce quae duo erant, unum factum est. Prorsus proximum dilige, et sufficit*. Augustine goes on to explain,

⁵⁶) *Expositio Epistolae ad Galatas* 45 (CSEL 84, 119-120. ML 35, 2137-2138): "Quaeri autem potest, cur apostolus et hic solam commemoravit proximi dilectionem, qua legem dixit impleri, et ad Romanos, cum in eadem quaestione versaretur, *qui enim diligit alterum, inquit, legem implevit, nam: Non adulterabis, non homicidium facies, non furaberis, non concupisces et si quod est aliud mandatum, in hoc sermone recapitulatur: Diliges proximum tuum tamquam teipsum, dilectio proximi malum non operatur. Plenitudo autem legis caritas.* (2) Cum ergo nonnisi in duobus praeceptis dilectionis dei et proximi perfecta sit caritas, cur apostolus et in hac et in illa epistola solam proximi dilectionem commemorat, nisi quia de dilectione dei possunt mentiri homines, quia rariores temptationes eam probant, in dilectione autem proximi facilius convincuntur eam non habere, dum inique cum hominibus agunt? (3) Consequens est autem, ut, qui ex toto corde, ex tota anima, ex tota mente deum diligit, diligit et proximum tamquam seipsum, quia hoc iubet ille, quem ex toto corde, ex tota anima, ex tota mente diligit. (4) Item diligere proximum, id est omnem hominem tamquam seipsum, quis potest, nisi deum diligit, cuius praecepto et dono dilectionem proximi possit implere? (5) Cum ergo utrumque praeceptum ita sit, ut neutrum sine altero possit teneri, etiam unum horum commemorare plerumque sufficit, cum agitur de operibus iustitiae, sed oportunius illud, de quo quisque facilius vincitur. (6) Unde et Iohannes dicit: *Qui enim non diligit fratrem suum, quem videt, deum, quem non videt, quomodo potest diligere?* (7) Mentiebantur enim quidam dilectionem se dei habere et de odio fraterno eam non habere convincebantur, de quo iudicare in cotidiana vita et moribus facile est".

however, that in order to love our neighbour as ourselves we must first really love ourselves. And we will in fact hate ourselves, and thereby our neighbour too, if we fail to love God with all that is in us⁵⁷). The necessary connexion between love of neighbour and love for God, designed to safeguard the former from degenerating into less worthy forms of love conceived by distorted self-love, occurs also in the commentary on John's gospel where Augustine is keen to show that whatever commandments there are are to be found in love for neighbour: *quoniam quidquid est aliud hic habemus*⁵⁸. Similarly, in an earlier tract on the same gospel, Augustine explains how people of sound understanding can find both precepts in each individual precept: *bene intellegendis utrumque invenitur in singulis*. One reason, beginning with love of neighbour, is that a person who loves the neighbour chastely and spiritually loves God in him⁵⁹. He comes to the neighbour as Christ has come to us (cf. Jn. 13.34), as a doctor who wishes to restore health. And this health is to have God in our midst through His gift of love. The God loved when the neighbour is chastely and spiritually loved is here conceived not just as protecting love of neighbour from distortion but as actually living in the community of His body. Thus a dimension is added to the two former instances we have adduced in which love for God was presented as the central structural moment of genuine love of neighbour. We cannot authentically love the neighbour without loving God because it should be the aim of all upright love for neighbour that God be all in all (cf. 1 Cor. 15.28)⁶⁰).

2. God, whom we are to love wholly, commands us to love the neighbour

The second reason why those of sound understanding may discern both commandments in each individually begins from love for God. "The person who loves God cannot despise him when he commands us to love our neighbour"⁶¹). It is, according to paragraph (3) of the

⁵⁷) *De Disciplina Christiana* 6,5-6,6 (CSEL 46,212-213. ML 40,672).

⁵⁸) *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?"

⁵⁹) *Ibid.*, 65,2 (CC 36,492. ML 35,1809): "... qui sancte et spiritaliter diligit proximum, quid in eo diligit nisi deum?"

⁶⁰) *Ibid.*, 83,3 (CC 36,536. ML 35,1846): "Non est haec dilectio in omnibus hominibus; pauci se propterea diligunt, ut sit deus omnia in omnibus".

⁶¹) *Ibid.*, 65,2 (CC 36,492. ML 35,1809): "Nam et qui diligit deum, non eum potest contemnere praecipientem ut diligit proximum ...".

passage quoted above from the commentary on Galatians, the God whom we are to love with heart, mind and soul, who requires us to love the neighbour. The Lord, whom we are to love totally, gives no other commandment for the renewal of human beings than that of Jn. 13.34⁶²). Therefore a person loves God to the extent that he carries out the commandment of the Lord to love the neighbour⁶³). As a text from *In Epistolam Ioannis* puts it, no one can claim that he loves the emperor and yet hate his laws. For the emperor will judge whether he is loved by how his laws are kept throughout the provinces. Christ's law is that of love for neighbour (Jn. 13.34). "You say that you love Christ. Then keep his commandment, love your brother. If you do not love your brother, whose commandment are you despising?"⁶⁴).

For Augustine, however, fulfilling God's commandment of love for neighbour is not merely "proof" that one loves God simply because God, who is to be loved, has given us this commandment of love of neighbour. It is not merely the best touchstone for judging whether a person is serious about loving God, "the whole matter resting ultimately nevertheless in two partial fulfilments of Christian human existence and in two commandments"⁶⁵), the easier and less important of which would be love of neighbour. If this were so, love for God could exist and be understood without that love for neighbour which is concerned with the neighbour as such. There may be other, equally important, albeit less effective, "proofs" and touchstones. Love for neighbour might then seem to be nothing more than the dutiful observance of a divine imperative prompted by a person's love for God and revealing his conscientiousness in it. It would be a consequence of love for God, but different from it in kind. If such were the case for Augustine, he could not allow, as he does, that each commandment may serve to indicate both, that the whole law

⁶²) *Sermo Mai* 14,1 (MA I,293): "... mandatum suum dominus non dixit, nisi ut vos invicem diligatis? Et novum dixit ipsum mandatum, et ad innovationem nostram venit, et novos homines nos fecit ...".

⁶³) *De Trinitate* 8,7,10 (CC 50,284. ML 42,956): "... consequens est ut faciat quod praecepit deus, et in tantum diligit in quantum facit; consequens ergo est ut et proximum diligit, quia hoc praecepit deus".

⁶⁴) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 9,11 (ML 35,2053): "Dicis ergo te diligere Christum; serva mandatum ejus et fratrem dilige. Si autem fratrem non diligis; quomodo eum diligis, cujus mandatum contemnis?"

⁶⁵) This is the formulation of the issue offered by K. Rahner, "Reflections on the Unity of the Love of Neighbour and the Love of God", in *Theological Investigations*, VI (English translation: Karl-H. and Boniface Kruger) (Baltimore and London, 1969) 231-249, p. 235.

and the prophets may be summed up in the commandment to love the neighbour as oneself, that it is "from one and the same love that we love God and the neighbour"⁶⁶), and that the basic mystery of this love will be fully revealed in "the one Christ loving himself"⁶⁷).

Indeed, a Christological variant on this theme is introduced by Augustine's understanding of Jn. 21.15-19⁶⁸). Three times Christ asks Peter does he love Him, and, on receiving Peter's assurance that he does, Christ tells him to feed His lambs, to feed His sheep. A good example of Augustine's approach to this dialogue between Christ and Peter is provided by *Sermo* 253, dating from after 412.

... in answer to Jesus' three-fold question (i.e. do you love me?) Peter replies that he does love Him. To Peter who answers in this way the Lord Jesus commends His lambs; He says: "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep". It is as if He said: how can you repay me now that you love me? Show your love by taking care of my sheep. Your very love for me I have given to you. What then can you offer me now that you love me? But there is a place where you can show your love towards me, there is a domain where you can practise your love for me: "feed my sheep"⁶⁹).

Peter leaves Jesus in no doubt of his love. But Augustine imagines the Lord questioning Peter further: how can you repay me now that you love me? "What will your love for me be able to offer me? What can you a human being bestow upon your creator? What will your love enable you to bring to me? What can you the redeemed contribute to your redeemer? At most, what can you a soldier contribute to your king?"⁷⁰). According to Augustine, the pastoral commission with which Peter is

⁶⁶) *De Trinitate* 8,9,12 (CC 50,289. ML 42,959).

⁶⁷) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 10,3 (ML 35,2055).

⁶⁸) See M. Pellegrino, "Doppioni e varianti nel commento di S. Agostino a Giov. XXI,15-19", in *Studi in onore di A. Pincherle*, (Rome, 1967), 403-419, especially p. 405-406 and 413-414. Regarding the meaning of the dialogue between Christ and Peter, see p. 413: "... il vero amore per il Salvatore si dimostra nel pascere le pecore ch'egli affida a coloro che costituisce pastori in nome suo".

⁶⁹) *Sermo* 253,2 (ML 38,1180): "... in ipso ternario numero interrogationis suae Dominus Jesus respondenti amorem commendat agnos suos, et dicit, *Pasce agnos meos, pasce oves meas*: tanquam diceret, Quid mihi retribuisti, quia diligis me? Dilectionem tuam ostende in ovibus meis. Quid mihi praestas, quia diligis me; quando ego tibi praestiti, ut diligeres me? Sed dilectionem tuam erga me, habes ubi ostendas, habes ubi exerceas: *pasce agnos meos*".

⁷⁰) *Sermo* Denis 12,1 (MA I,51): "Et quid praesturus es, amans me? quid mihi collaturus es homo creatori tuo? quid collaturus es de amore tuo, redemptus redemptori tuo, ut multum, miles regi tuo? quid es collaturus?". Cf. *Sermo Bibl. Casin.* I, 133, 13 (MA I,410): "Quid praestas deo, ut sit maior ... quod erat".

charged by Jesus provides the answer⁷¹). “Feed my sheep” indicates the field where a person’s love for God can be practised and something of value offered to Him⁷²). By fulfilling this command one shows love for Christ⁷³). Indeed, because caring for his sheep is all that Christ demands, Augustine asks where but here can a person show that he loves Him⁷⁴). This manifestation of love for Christ in accordance with his commandment is not presented as a “proof” Peter has to produce or as a test he has to undergo in order to demonstrate the strength of his love for God. Christ’s reply to Peter’s threefold profession of love for Him rather indicates where God has made it humanly possible for him and wishes him to do as He says: in caring for the neighbour. As *Sermo Denis* 12,1 puts it, “it is as if there were no other way for Peter to show his love for Christ than to be a faithful shepherd under the prince of all shepherds”⁷⁵). Now, in that Peter in many of these texts personifies all shepherds and the whole church⁷⁶), it is not out of the question that there is no other way for the Christian people as a whole to show love for Christ than to be faithful in taking care of his sheep. The only expression of love that the Lord required is that a person does for others what Christ has done for him⁷⁷), in other words, that a person loves like Christ. “...it is as if he says, ‘Feed my sheep’, I commend my sheep to you. The sheep I mean are those I have bought with my blood. I have died for them. Do

⁷¹) *Tractatus in Evangelium Ioannis* 123,5 (CC 36,678. ML 35,1967): “Sit amoris officium pascere dominicum gregem, si fuit timoris indicium negare pastorem”.

⁷²) *Sermo* 137,4 (ML 38,756): “Quasi diceret, hoc mihi dabis, hoc mihi praestabis, si amas me, ut pascas oves meas”; *Sermo Bibl. Casin.* I, 133, 13 (MA I,410): “Quid habes praestare deo, homo cordate? ... *Pasce oves meas* ... attende iuxta te, ne forte proximo praestare debeas, quod perveniat ad deum”.

⁷³) *Sermo* 146,1 (ML 38,796): “Tamquam ei diceret: Amas me? hoc ostende quia amas me: *Pasce oves meas*”; cf. *Sermo Guelf.* 16,1 (MA I,493); *Sermo Guelf.* 32,3 (MA I,565).

⁷⁴) *Sermo Denis* 12,1 (MA I,51): “Hoc solum exigo: *Pasce oves meas*”. *Sermo Guelf.* 32,3 (MA I,565): “Ubi mihi ostendis quia amas me, nisi pascendo oves meas?”.

⁷⁵) *Sermo Denis* 12,1 (MA I,51): “... tamquam non esset ubi ostenderet Petrus amorem suum in Christum, nisi esset pastor fidelis sub principe omnium pastorum ...”.

⁷⁶) *Sermo Guelf.* 10,2-3 (MA I,493-494): “Nam quid aliud ipse Petrus quam figuram gerebat ecclesiae? Dominus ergo quando Petrum interrogabat, nos interrogabat, ecclesiam interrogabat ... cum ille commendat oves pastoribus, redigitur totus numerus pastorum ad corpus unius pastoris ... Erit unus grex et unus pastor, omnis innumerabilis pastorum numerus ad corpus unius pastoris redigitur. Sed ibi estis et vos, membra ipsius estis”. See M. Pellegrino, *art. cit.*, p. 405-406.

⁷⁷) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 5,5 (ML 35,2015): “*Pasce oves meas*; id est, Fac pro fratribus quod pro te feci”.

you love me? Die for them”⁷⁸). This does not mean that it does not matter whether a person loves Christ or not, so long as he is fully committed to his neighbour. Rather it is precisely because Jesus has the assurance of Peter’s love for Himself that he entrusts the precious sheep purchased with His own blood to Peter’s care. “Do you love me? Die for them”. What this does mean is that service of the brethren is the proper and required manifestation of love for Christ in this time. In *En. in ps.* 102,3 we are told that there were people who rendered service to God even to the point of death⁸⁰). As the context makes clear, Augustine is referring to the martyrs. But the death he sees them undergoing is expressed in terms of 1 Jn. 3.16 and Jn. 15.13: a laying down of one’s life for the brethren and friends. Service to God even to the point of death, therefore, is here equivalent for him to service of the neighbour even to death. Augustine considers laying down one’s life for others a witness to truth so that they too may follow the way of truth⁸¹).

Clearly the idea of the Total Christ is not far below the surface of these texts. Further on in the same sermon in which we have read, “Do you love me? Die for them (i.e. for the sheep I have bought with my blood)”, we come across it explicitly: “Direct your attention to those close at hand. Perhaps you ought to give your neighbour what comes to God. ‘When you did it to one of the least of mine, you did it to me’ (Matt. 25.40)”⁸²). The Total Christ is also obviously present in the 47th tract on John’s gospel. Having quoted 1 Jn. 3.16, Augustine proceeds: *Ideo Petro quem facere volebat pastorem bonum, non in ipso Petro, sed in corpore suo ait: Petre, amas me? pasce oves meas*⁸³). Translating the first and last parts of the sentence presents no difficulty: “Therefore, the Lord said to Peter whom He wished to make a good shepherd: Peter, do you

⁷⁸) *Sermo Bibl. Casin.* I,133,4 (MA I,403-404): “... tamquam dicens: *Pasce oves meas*, commendo tibi oves meas. Quas oves? Quas emi sanguine meo. Mortuus sum pro eis. Amas me? Morere pro eis”.

⁷⁹) *Sermo Guelf.* 17,3 (MA I,497): “Quia amas me, quia diligis me, committo tibi oves meas”.

⁸⁰) *En. in ps.* 102,3 (CC 39,1452. ML 37,1317): “Homines ministerium suum usque ad mortem deo retribuerunt”.

⁸¹) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 5,5 (ML 35,2015): “... Fac pro fratribus quod pro te feci. Omnes sanguine meo redemi: nolite dubitare mori pro veritatis confessione, ut ceteri vos imitentur”.

⁸²) *Sermo Bibl. Casin.* I,133,13 (MA I, 410): “Ergo attende iuxta te, ne forte proximo praestare debeas quod perveniat ad deum. *Quando uni ex minimis meis fecistis, mihi fecistis*”.

⁸³) *Tractatus in Evangelium Ioannis* 47,2 (CC 36,405. ML 35,1733).

love me? Feed my sheep". The problem lies in the phrase *non in ipso Petro, sed in corpore suo ait*. The question is: is Christ, not in himself but in *corpore suo*, asking Peter for love, or is it rather that Peter, as representative of Christ's body, not just in his own right, is asked to feed Christ's sheep? From the context it is obvious that Peter is asked to love Christ by laying down his life for Christ's, the prince of all shepherds, sheep. In *Sermo Guelf.* 16,1 these sheep are called members of Christ, and for this reason one can show love for the shepherd, Christ, by loving the sheep who are members of His Body and for whose sake the shepherd himself has become a sheep⁸⁴). Although this meaning — i.e. Christ not in himself but in his body asks for love, similarly to Matt. 25.40 and Acts 9.4⁸⁵) — would be akin to the trend of thought in the context of the sentence quoted from the commentary on John, it seems however more likely that the *non in ipso Petro, sed in corpore suo ait* has to be read from another angle. We have already mentioned that Peter can represent the whole church and that all shepherds and all members of the church can be seen as forming the body of Christ, the one shepherd⁸⁶). It is probably the case here too that Jesus' question and injunction are directed not just to the one person, Peter himself, but to the entire body of Christ. All are to care for one another under the prince of shepherds, and they thereby, and in no other way, manifest their love for Him. "Loving like God and with God they love God himself"⁸⁷).

⁸⁴) *Sermo Guelf.* 16,1 (MA I,493): "Amando oves, ostende amorem habere pastoris; nam et ipsae oves membra sunt pastoris. Ut membra eius essent oves, ovis esse dignatus est: ut membra eius essent oves, sicut ovis ad immolandum ductus est (Is. 53.7): ut membra eius essent oves, de illo dictum est, *Ecce agnus dei, ecce qui tollit peccata mundi* (Jn. 1.29)".

⁸⁵) Thus, for example, it is said of Christ: "... cum vero illud caput ita sit caput ... ut tamen laboret in terra, *non in se, sed in membris suis*": *Sermo Denis* 19,5 (MA I,103). Might it not be that it is in his body, his members, his sheep, that he asks to be served? It is tempting to read "non in ipso Petro, sed in corpore suo ait" in this way in the light of such texts as *Sermo Denis* 19,5. But the grammar has to be strained almost to the point of incredibility if we are to do so. "Petro" would have to be a repetition of the dative in the first phrase of the full sentence. Then, "in ipso", referring to Christ, would stand over against "in corpore suo", as in the phrase of *Sermo Denis* 19,5, "non in se, sed in membris suis". Apart from the anomaly of the "in ipso", instead of "in se", this construction is perhaps rather far-fetched.

⁸⁶) *Sermo Guelf.* 10,2-3 (MA I,493-494).

⁸⁷) P. Agaësse, *op. cit.*, p. 52: "En aimant comme Dieu et avec Dieu, nous l'aimons lui-même". This is Agaësse's comment after having quoted Augustine's explanation of Jn. 21.15-19 from *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 5,4 (ML 35,2014). (On p. 52 the reference is mistakenly given by Agaësse to tr. 5,5). A person loves "like God" by being prepared even to lay down his life for Christ's sheep. He loves "with God" because God has given him the very possibility to love in this way: "Quidquid enim retribuere volueris, ab ipso accepisti ut

3. Love of God can be tested in everyday practice of love of neighbour and it has to begin there

If one commandment is to stand for both, then that of love for neighbour is more appropriate in that its observance may more readily be checked. This is the import of paragraphs (5) to (7) of our passage from the commentary on Galatians. The scriptural underpinning for love of neighbour's value as an indicator of the presence of love for God is found in 1 Jn. 4.20b: "For if a person does not love his brother whom he sees, how can he love God whom he does not see?". Thus, if anyone wishes to maintain that it is sufficient simply to love God, then on the basis of 1 Jn. 4.20b it may be shown him that, in considering love for neighbour inessential, he does not even love God as he thinks he does⁸⁸). Or, if someone is of the opinion that he can deal unjustly with his fellow human beings and yet not offend God in any way, 1 Jn. 4.8 ("God is love") can demonstrate that he is mistaken, for to slight love is to slight God⁸⁹). From another point of view, because it was love that led Christ to become man and to suffer for men — "A man can have no greater love than to lay down his life for his friends" (Jn. 15.13) — those without love effectively deny the reality of the Incarnation⁹⁰). Those cut off from love like the Donatists may bemoan the fact that Christ was killed, but by their very separation from love they are themselves killing Christ in human beings⁹¹). By their loveless deeds towards others Christ is

reddas". When he is abundantly filled with love ("satiari charitate"), which a little further on in these sermons on 1 Jn. is identified with God, he is able to become perfect in love by being prepared to lay down his life for his brother.

⁸⁸) *Sermo Mai* 126,13 (MA I,367): "Una ala est, *Diliges dominum deum tuum ex toto corde tuo, et ex tota anima tua, et ex tota mente tua*. Sed noli ad unam alam remanere; nam si unam habere te putas, nec ipsam habes. *Diliges proximum tuum tamquam te*. Nam si fratrem quem vides non diligis, deum, quem non vides, quomodo potes diligere? Accedat et alia, sic volabis, sic de terrenis auferes cupiditatem, figes in caelestibus caritatem".

⁸⁹) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 7,5 (ML 35,2031): "Jam videte quia facere contra dilectionem, facere contra Deum est. Nemo dicat: In hominem pecco, quando non diligo fratrem meum. Intendite: Et facile est peccatum in hominem; in Deum solum non peccem. Quomodo non peccas in Deum, quando in dilectionem peccas? *Deus dilectio est* ... Ecce habetis, fratres, Scripturas Dei: canonica est ista Epistola; per omnes gentes recitatur, orbis terrae auctoritate retinetur, orbem terrarum ipsa aedificavit. Audis hic a Spiritu Dei: *Deus dilectio est*. Jam si audes, fac contra Deum, et noli diligere fratrem tuum".

⁹⁰) *Ibid.*, tr. 6,13 (ML 35,2028): "Charitas ergo illum adduxit ad carnem. Quisquis ergo non habet charitatem, negat Christum in carnem venisse". Cf. tr. 7,3 (ML 35,2030): "Et qui diligit mundum, et negligit charitatem, audistis quia negat Jesum in carne venisse".

⁹¹) *Ibid.*, tr. 2,3 (ML 35,1991): "Pii homines et misericordes, multum dolent occisum esse Christum, et occidunt in hominibus Christum".

rejected and destroyed. Thus, probing love of neighbour not only reveals the presence or absence of love for God but also whether or not a person still has a living faith in the Incarnation of Christ.

On the one hand, love of neighbour allows us to judge relatively easily to what extent love for God is in us, while, on the other hand, practically this is where love has to begin. The former flows from the latter. In paragraph (6) of the passage from the commentary on Galatians, 1 Jn. 4.20b supports the former point. The Galatians were clearly shown that they did not have love for God by the hatred which raged among themselves and about which it is easy to judge in daily life and conduct. In *Sermo* 265,9, however, 1 Jn. 4.20b's demonstration of the practical necessity of setting out from love of neighbour is insisted upon. If we wish to fulfil the first part of the double commandment, we have to take the second part as our point of departure: *a secunda autem incipitur, ut ad primam perveniat*⁹²). Elsewhere Augustine elaborates the movement itself in terms of vision. He makes of the negatively formulated question of 1 Jn. 4.20b the positive statement: when you love the neighbour whom you do see, you cleanse your eye for the vision of God⁹³). In the *ordo faciendi* love of neighbour comes first; therefore Augustine urges his hearers to begin by loving their neighbours: *incipi ergo diligere proximum*⁹⁴). But the goal of this journey now seems to be described not so much as "loving" the God whom we do not yet see, as "seeing God". Tract 5,7 of the commentary on 1 Jn. manifests this Augustinian extrapolation of 1 Jn. 4.20b for the first time:

Now we see through faith, then we shall see with full vision. If we love so much now even while we do not see, how passionately shall we love when we do see? But where should we practise love? In fraternal love. You can always tell me: I have not seen God; but can you ever say to me: I have not seen a human being? Love your brother. For if you love the brother whom you see, then you will see

⁹²) *Sermo* 265,9 (ML 38,1223): "... quia ergo magna est primitus commendanda dilectio dei, secunda dilectio proximi; a secunda autem incipitur, ut ad primam perveniat: Si enim fratrem quem vides non diligis; Deum quem non vides, quomodo diligere poteris?"

⁹³) *Tractatus in Evangelium Ioannis* 17,8 (CC 36,174. ML 35,1531): "... diligendo proximum promeris quem videas; diligendo proximum purgas oculum ad videndum deum, evidenter Iohanne dicente: Si fratrem quem vides non diligis, deum quem non vides quomodo diligere poteris?". For Augustine's exegesis of 1 Jn. 4.20b, see D. Dideberg, *op. cit.*, p. 147-150, 153-155.

⁹⁴) *Tractatus in Evangelium Ioannis* 17,8 (CC 36,174-175. ML 35,1531-1532).

God too at the same time, because you will see love itself, within which is God's dwelling⁹⁵).

Fraternal love specifies where love is to be practised during the time of faith⁹⁶). Love of neighbour is the inescapable starting-point. There is no way around it. No one can possibly use the excuse that he has not seen a human being. In the first sentence of our quotation from tract 5,7 Augustine states that "we *see* through faith", and, in the second sentence, that we love even while we do *not see*. The "seeing" of the second sentence evidently refers to the time of full vision in which we shall love even more: *quomodo amplectemur cum viderimus?* Seeing does not diminish love; it enhances it. But, we have not yet reached the stage of full vision and love. The "seeing through faith" of the first sentence, however, surely belongs to this present time which ought to be characterised by the practice of fraternal love. But who or what is seen through faith during human time in this world? Human beings are seen, no doubt, but faith is hardly required for this. Who then is seen through faith? Augustine's answer is that love which is God's dwelling is seen, indeed that God himself is seen. This presupposes, however, that human beings are not merely seen but also loved, that they are seen with the eyes of faith and love as well as with those of the flesh. Vision of God through faith presupposes that the fraternal love appropriate to the time of faith is practised. When this is the case, when all attempts to skip over the starting-point prove unsuccessful, then "you will see God too at the same time (as you love your brother), because you will see love itself, within which is God's dwelling". In the practice of love for neighbour itself

⁹⁵) In *Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 5,7 (ML 35,2016): "Modo cum fide vides, tunc cum specie videbis. Si enim amamus cum non videmus, quomodo amplectemur cum viderimus? Sed ubi nos debemus exercere? in amore fraterno. Potes mihi dicere: Non vidi Deum; numquid potest mihi dicere: Non vidi hominem? Dilige fratrem. Si enim fratrem quem vides dilexeris, simul videbis et Deum; quia videbis ipsam charitatem, et intus inhabitat Deus".

⁹⁶) This is the essential import of 1 Jn. 4.20b for Augustine. He does not use it as "merely — after all — a simple *argumentum ad hominem*, an inference from the easier (which has not been achieved) to the more difficult (which will then certainly and *a fortiori* not be fulfilled)": K. Rahner, *art. cit.*, p. 235. To say that love for neighbour is more easily tested is not to say that it is more easily achieved. Augustine, however, can see it as the best test and the essential practical starting-point for love of God precisely because he does "take the words of St. John (i.e. 1 Jn. 4.12) absolutely seriously, so that the 'God in us' is really the one who alone can be loved and who is reached precisely in the love of our brother and in no other way ...": *ibid.*

(*simul*)⁹⁷) God becomes visible to faith, and even though vision of him is not complete, we may presume that he is loved more passionately for being seen at all: *quomodo amplectemur cum viderimus?* The practical starting-point is therefore much more than a mere starting-point. God becomes visible and is loved. But how is this relation between God and love to be explained? The key is to be found in Augustine's unusual interpretation of the statement that "God is love" (1 Jn. 4.8 & 16).

III. BY THE VERY FACT THAT A PERSON LOVES HIS BROTHER, HE SEES LOVE; AND LOVE IS GOD

In *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 Augustine reaches the conclusions now familiar to us that the two commandments of love for God and the neighbour cannot exist without each other. How does he argue this position there? 1 Jn. 4.8 plays an essential role in it, and the context and ramifications of the argument itself will lead into as yet uncharted territory. The text reads:

What therefore does love love except that which we love with love? Now this, to begin from what is nearest to us, is our brother. And listen how the Apostle John impresses brotherly love upon our hearts: "He that loves his brother abides in the light, and there is no scandal in him" (1 Jn. 2.10). It is clear that John has placed the perfection of goodness in love of the brother, for he is certainly perfect in whom there is no scandal. And yet he seems to have passed over the love of God in silence. This he would never have done unless he intended that God be understood in brotherly love itself. For, a little further on in this same letter, he says this most plainly: "Beloved, let us love one another, because love comes from God. And everyone who loves is born of God and knows God. He that does not love does not know God, for God is love" (1 Jn. 4.7-8). This connexion of ideas shows sufficiently and clearly that this same brotherly love itself (for it is brotherly love by which we love one another) is proclaimed by so great an authority as the Apostle John not only to come "from God" but also to be God. Therefore, when we love our brother from love, we love our brother from God; nor can it be that we do not love in a particular and distinctive way the same love with which we love our brother. From this it may be gathered that these two commandments cannot exist without each other. For since "God is love", he who loves love certainly loves

⁹⁷) P. Agaësse in his translation, *Saint Augustin, Commentaire de la première épître de S. Jean*, Paris, 1961, p. 263, translates "simul" as "par le fait même". See also Agaësse's introduction to his translation, p. 49-50.

God, and he who loves his brother necessarily loves love ... A person sees his brother with human sight with which God cannot be
 25 seen. But if he loved with spiritual love this brother whom he sees with human sight, he would see God who is love itself with the inner sight by which he can be seen. Therefore, "how can someone who does not love his brother whom he sees love God whom he does not see?" (1 Jn. 4.20b). He cannot see God precisely because "God is love", and it is love which
 30 the person who does not love his brother is lacking. And do not let the question disturb us, how much love we ought to devote to our brother and how much to God. For we should love our brother as ourselves; and the more we love God the more we love ourselves. Therefore we love God and the neighbour from one and the same
 35 love. But we love God because he is God; we love ourselves and the neighbour, however, as orientated to God⁹⁸).

D. Dideberg provides a tidy summary of the major argument of this passage, and of a text from *In Epistolam Ioannis*⁹⁹), in the following syllogism:

He who loves his brother necessarily loves love.

But, love is God, because "God is love" (1 Jn. 4.8,16).

Therefore, he who loves his brother loves God¹⁰⁰).

⁹⁸) *De Trinitate* 8,8,12-8,9,12 (CC 50,287-289. ML 42,958-959): "Quid ergo diligit caritas nisi quod caritate diligimus? Id autem ut a proximo provehamur frater est. Dilectionem autem fraternam quantum commendat Iohannes apostolus attendamus: *Qui diligit, inquit, fratrem suum in lumine manet, et scandalum in eo non est*. Manifestum est quod iustitiae perfectionem in fratris dilectione posuerit; nam in quo scandalum non est utique perfectus est. Et tamen videtur dilectionem dei tacuisse. Quod numquam faceret nisi quia in ipsa fraterna dilectione vult intellegi deum. Apertissime enim in eadem epistula paulo post ita dicit: *Dilectissimi, diligamus invicem quia dilectio ex deo est, et omnis qui diligit ex deo natus est et cognovit deum. Qui non diligit non cognovit deum quia deus dilectio est*. Ista contextio satis aperteque declarat eandem ipsam fraternam dilectionem (nam fraterna dilectio est qua diligimus invicem) non solum *ex deo sed etiam deum* esse tanta auctoritate praedicari. Cum ergo de dilectione diligimus fratrem, de deo diligimus fratrem; nec fieri potest ut eandem dilectionem non praecipue diligamus qua fratrem diligimus. Unde colligitur duo illa praecepta non posse sine invicem. *Quoniam quippe deus dilectio est*, deum certe diligit qui diligit dilectionem; dilectionem autem necesse est diligit qui diligit fratrem ... Fratrem autem videt humano visu quo videri deus non potest. Sed si eum quem videt humano visu spiritali caritate diligeret, videret deum qui est ipsa caritas visu interiore quo videri potest. Itaque *qui fratrem quem videt non diligit, deum, quem propterea non videt quia deus dilectio est* qua caret qui fratrem non diligit, quomodo potest diligere? Nec illa iam quaestio moveat quantum caritatis fratri debeamus impendere, quantum deo. Fratri enim quantum nobis ipsis; nos autem ipsos tanto magis diligimus quanto magis diligimus deum. Ex una igitur eademque caritate deum proximumque diligimus, sed deum propter deum, nos autem et proximum propter deum".

⁹⁹) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 9,10 (ML 35,2052).

¹⁰⁰) D. Dideberg, *Saint Augustin et la première épître de saint Jean*, p. 142: "Celui qui

We propose firstly to investigate the meaning of this love for love itself which Augustine here discloses in brotherly love, then, secondly, to question the significance of the inversion of 1 Jn. 4.8,16 found in the minor premiss, in order to show how he understands the person who loves his brother to be loving God.

A. WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE EXPRESSION "LOVE OF LOVE"?

In lines 19-20 of the passage quoted above from *De Trinitate* we are told that in brotherly love we necessarily and "in a particular and distinctive way love the same love with which we love our brother". Similarly, according to lines 22-23, "he who loves his brother necessarily loves love". These expressions are almost exactly paralleled by a sentence in the ninth tract of *In Epistolam Ioannis: Necesse est qui diligis fratrem, diligas ipsam dilectionem*¹⁰¹). In the fifth tract of the same work, we have already learnt that, if we love the brother whom we see, then we will see love itself¹⁰²). What is to be made of this strange "love of love itself" (or, vision of love or knowledge of love itself) which occupies such a central place as the major premiss in Augustine's argument to establish that, where love of neighbour is present, there too is love for God? This question will be approached from three different angles: firstly, the contribution made by other similar expressions, found outside *De Trinitate*, to the elucidation of "love of love itself" will be assessed; secondly, it will be necessary to discuss how the *praecipue* of 'whoever loves the neighbour loves, in a particular and distinctive way (*praecipue*), love itself' is to be interpreted; and thirdly, we will have to judge to what extent a comparison of love of *dilectio* with the love of *forma* and of *veritas*, which appears in the proximate context in *De Trinitate*, is illuminating.

1. Parallel uses of the formula

At the beginning of Book 3 of the *Confessions* Augustine vividly portrays the passions of his student days in Carthage: "I went to Carthage, where the hissing din of shameful loves echoed around me on every side. I did not yet love but I loved to love (*amare amabam*) ... I

aime son frère, aime nécessairement l'amour. Or, l'amour est Dieu, puisque 'Dieu est amour' (1 Io. 4.8.16). Donc, celui qui aime son frère, aime Dieu".

¹⁰¹) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 9,10 (ML 35,2052).

¹⁰²) *Ibid.*, tr. 5,7.

went looking for an object for my love, for I loved to love (*amans amare*) ..."¹⁰³). The love of love here envisaged by Augustine is obviously that of lustful loving bent only on its own pleasure, or, at least, of being in love with the feeling of being in love. Well over twenty years later, in his commentary on psalm 118, he will insist that we should hold such love in abhorrence for it is intent upon what ought not to be loved. Since it is identical with that concupiscence by which the flesh wages war against the spirit, this love of lustful loving should be hated¹⁰⁴). Nonetheless, lascivious wanton loving can disclose something of the structure even of the highest forms of love. To return for a moment to Book 8 of *De Trinitate*:

But love is of someone who loves, and with love something is loved. See then, there are these three: the person who loves, and what is loved, and love. Therefore, what is love but a life of a kind that unites or seeks to unite two beings, namely, the one who loves and that which is loved? And this is so even in outward and carnal loves. But that we may drink at a purer and clearer source, let us tread down the flesh and ascend to the rational soul. What does the rational soul love in a friend but the rational soul? There, then, also are these three: the person who loves, and what is loved, and love. It remains to mount up even higher and to seek those things which are above, insofar as it is given to human beings to do so¹⁰⁵).

All love, therefore, from the lowest, outward and carnal forms, through the higher form of friendship, to the most elevated love it is given to human beings to find, manifests this tripartite structure: *amans, et quod amatur, et amor*¹⁰⁶). In *Sermo* 34 Augustine quotes the case of a

¹⁰³) *Confessiones* 3,1,1 (Skutella 36. CSEL 33/1,43. ML 32,683): "Veni Carthaginem, et circumstrepebat me undique sartago flagitiosorum amorum. Nondum amabam et amare amabam ... Quaerebam quid amarem, amans amare ...".

¹⁰⁴) *En. in ps. 118, sermo* 8,4 (CC 40,1688. ML 37,1521): "... sicut odio habenda est dilectio qua diligitur quod diligi non oportet? Odio quippe habemus concupiscentiam nostram qua caro concupiscit adversus spiritum; et quid est ista concupiscentia, nisi mala dilectio?"

¹⁰⁵) *De Trinitate* 8,10,14 (CC 50,290-291. ML 42,960): "Amor autem alicuius amantis est, et amore aliquid amatur. Ecce tria sunt: amans, et quod amatur, et amor. Quid est ergo amor, nisi quaedam vita duo aliqua copulans, vel copulari appetens, amantem scilicet, et quod amatur? Et hoc etiam in extremis carnalibusque amoribus ita est. Sed ut aliquid purius et liquidius hauriamus, calcata carne ascendamus ad animum. Quid amat amicus in amico, nisi animum? Et illic igitur tria sunt: amans, et quod amatur, et amor. Restat etiam hinc ascendere, et superius ista quaerere, quantum homini datur".

¹⁰⁶) This triad forms one of the eight images of the Trinity brought forth by Augustine in Books 8-15 of *De Trinitate*. On this point, see the note of F. Cayré in *Œuvres de saint Augustin* (Bibliothèque Augustinienne, 16), p.586-588. "Amans, et quod amatur, et

person who, seduced by the beauty of another's body, loves lasciviously and unchastely. At the same time, however, this person inwardly (*intus*)

amor", which occurs for the first time here at the end of Book 8, is prepared for by the statement of Trinitarian faith in *De Trinitate* 6,5,7 (CC 50,236. ML 42,928): "Et ideo non amplius quam tria sunt: unus diligens eum qui de illo est, et unus diligens eum de quo est, et ipsa dilectio". In the final book of *De Trinitate*, Augustine concludes his summary of Book 8, "et per caritatem, quae in scripturis sanctis deus dicta est, per quam coepit utcumque etiam trinitas intellegendis apparere, sicut sunt amans, et quod amatur, et amor": 15,3,5 (CC 50A,465. ML 42,1060). Cf. also 15,6,10 (CC 50A, 472. ML 42,1064). In 8,10,14 it seems that Augustine envisaged the Trinity coming to light gradually in inter-personal relationships, specifically in that of friendship: "Quid amat amicus in amico, nisi animum? Et illic igitur tria sunt: amans, et quod amatur, et amor" (CC 50,291. ML 42,960). It is not entirely clear how this is to be related to the undertaking of 8,8,12 (CC 50,287. ML 42,958): "Immo vero vides trinitatem, si caritatem vides. Sed commonebo, si potero, ut videre te videas ...". Is it in the "amans, et quod amatur, et amor" of inter-personal relationships that the Trinity is seen, or just in the love itself with which one loves one's brother? In 7,6,11 (CC 50,261-262. ML 42,943) the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are called three persons in the same way that we speak of three friends or three neighbours or three relatives, i.e. "quod sint ad invicem, non quod unusquisque eorum sit ad se ipsum". In one sense, this would suggest that the former is the case, i.e. the Trinity is seen in the inter-personal love expressed in "amans, et quod amatur, et amor"; and, indeed, at least thirteen times between 409 and 428, in contexts outside *De Trinitate*, Augustine argues from ecclesial unity, illustrated by Acts 4.32 ("erat illis anima una et cor unum"), to the greater unity of the Trinity. Human inter-personal community thereby functions as an image of the Trinity. See *Tractatus in Evangelium Iohannis* 39,5 (CC 36,347-348. ML 35,1684). On this argument, see M. Nédoncelle, "L'inter-subjectivité humaine est-elle pour saint Augustin une image de la Trinité?" in *Augustinus Magister* (Paris, 1954) 595-602, p. 595-596; and, in greater depth, J.B. du Roy, "L'expérience de l'amour et l'intelligence de la foi trinitaire selon saint Augustin" in *Recherches Augustiniennes, Hommage au R.P. Fulbert Cayré*, Volume II, (Paris, 1962) 415-445, p. 422-425. Conversely, in *De Trinitate* 6,5,7 (CC 50,235. ML 42,928) Augustine moves from Trinitarian unity to the loving human community which shares in the Trinitarian life by grace, the unifying gift of the Holy Spirit: "sed suo proprio (dono) servantes unitatem spiritus in vinculo pacis (Eph. 4.3). Quod imitari per gratiam, et ad deum et ad nos ipsos iubemur ... quia ipsius (dei) munere inter nos unum; cum illo autem unus spiritus (1 Cor. 6.17), quia agglutinator anima nostra post eum". In *De Trinitate* 9,4,6, however, Augustine points to a weakness of human inter-subjectivity which diminishes its effectiveness as an image of the unity of the Trinity. People who have been friends may cease to be so: "... non tamen sicut amici homines possunt seorsum esse ab invicem, sic amans et amor, aut sciens et scientia ... verumtamen fieri potest ut amicus amicum etiam odisse incipiat, et eo ipso amicus esse desinat, nesciente illo, et adhuc amante": (CC 50,298. ML 42,964). Perhaps for the very reason that friendship may be unstable, Augustine, in *De Trinitate* 6,5,7 (CC 50,235. ML 42,928), while not rejecting "amicitia" as a way of speaking of the gift which unites Father and Son, and which makes human beings one in union with them, nevertheless finds "caritas" more appropriate. In Book 9, however, the search for Trinitarian images moves from the domain of interpersonal relationships to the conscious life of the human subject. *De Trinitate* 9,2,2 (CC 50,294-295. ML 42,961-962) marks the beginning of this shift: "Tria ergo sunt: amans, et quod amatur, et amor. Quid, si non amem nisi me ipsum? Nonne duo erunt: quod amo et amor?". By 9,4,4 (CC 50,296. ML 42,963), with the introduction of the elements of the intellectual soul and knowledge, a new intra-subjective tripartite structure has emerged: "Ipsa igitur mens et amor et notitia eius tria quaedam sunt, et haec tria unum sunt, et cum perfecta sunt, aequalia sunt".

desires to have his love reciprocated. If, on the contrary, he discovers that his beloved hates him, his passion for the physical beauty of the other will cool. But is it not the same bodily form by which he was once enchanted which now repels him? The lover, however, while impassioned for the beautiful body that he saw, also made heart-felt demands for something that he did not see. "If, in fact, he knew that he was loved in return, how much more ardently would he be inflamed? The beloved sees the lover, the lover sees the beloved, no one sees love; and yet this very love, which is not seen, is loved"¹⁰⁷). The scheme is similar to that of *De Trinitate*, Book 8: the lover, the beloved, and love itself which, while unseen, is nonetheless loved inwardly and from the heart (*intus, de corde*). Augustine does not make clear in *Sermo* 34 whether this inner desire is for a love that is worthy, or whether perhaps it stems from a still lustful heart and distorted interiority. Whatever genre it belong to, however, the threesome *amans, et quod amatur, et amor* remains. For, what we notice in the lower forms of loving can help us to discern what may be found in the higher ones: ... *in inferioribus attendamus, quod in superioribus inveniamus*.

It is of worthy love Augustine is speaking, however, when he asks in *quaestio* 35 whether love itself is also to be loved, and answers that only the love loved for its own sake is rightly said to be loved. "And consequently, whatever can be taken away from an enduring and fruitive love ought not to be loved. Isn't the only love that should be loved the one whose object cannot possibly be missing when it is loved?"¹⁰⁸). What this amounts to is that only *frui*-love for the eternal may really be loved for itself alone. The kind of loving which enthralled Augustine when he first came to Carthage is certainly excluded here, as is the inner, unseen love which the impassioned lover desired to have reciprocated by his comely beloved. At least two texts from the *Confessiones* take up the line of *quaestio* 35: "For love of your love (*amore amoris tui*) I shall retrace my wicked ways ..." ¹⁰⁹). Since Augustine in the previous sentence had

¹⁰⁷) *Sermo* 34,4 (CC 41,425. ML 38,211): "Si vero cognoscat quia vicissim amatur, quomodo vehementius inardescit? Videt illa illum, videt ille illam, amorem nemo videt: et tamen ipse amatur qui non videtur".

¹⁰⁸) *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83, q. 35,1 (CC 44A, 50-51. ML 40,23-24): "... an amor quoque ipse amandus est? ... Nihil enim aliud est amare, quam propter se ipsam rem aliquam appetere ... Et ideo non amandum est, quod manenti et fruendi amoris auferri potest. Cuius ergo rei amor amandus est, nisi eius quae non potest deesse dum amatur?".

¹⁰⁹) *Confessiones* 2,1,1 (Skutella 25. CSEL 33/1,29. ML 32,675): "Amore amoris tui facis istuc, recolens vias meas nequissimas ...".

stated that he intended to do this not for the wicked ways themselves, but so that he might love God, we are justified in understanding “*amore amoris tui*” in the sense of ‘for Augustine’s love of God’s love’. This would also be the meaning of the expression in Book 11 where he writes: “I have said before, and I shall say it again, that I write this book for love of your love”¹¹⁰).

Thus, to sum up briefly, for *quaestio* 35 *frui*-love for the eternal is to be loved, while the *Confessiones* witness to love of God’s love. Again, more than twenty years later, the commentary on psalm 118 urges that “the love by which what ought to be loved is loved should itself also be loved”¹¹¹). The Latin reading Augustine had of Ps. 118 (119).20, which is rendered by a modern version “my soul is overcome with an incessant longing for your rulings”, more than likely prompted him to refer again to “love of love”: *Concupivit anima mea desiderare justificationes tuas in omni tempore*. On the basis of this version he can conclude that the good love which should be loved is equivalent to that “concupiscence” by which our spirit wages war against the flesh¹¹²). But it is also equivalent to the love prescribed by the double commandment which the stranger on earth prays may not be hidden from him (cf. Ps. 119.19). Therefore, the love which is loved is that of both God and the neighbour, that which is the sole or principal requirement of the commandment. The “concupiscence” of our spirit against the flesh is seen as our orientation towards fulfilling this double commandment and such praiseworthy “concupiscence” is therefore to be loved¹¹³).

Closer in time to Book 8 of *De Trinitate* is the commentary on 1 John, in the seventh tract of which we read that it is precisely through love that all else is loved properly. How worthy of love then is this love itself¹¹⁴)! Further on in the same tract it becomes quite clear which love Augustine has in mind.

¹¹⁰) *Ibid.*, 11,1,1 (Skutella 263. CSEL 33/1,280. ML 32,809): “Iam dixi et dicam: amore amoris tui facio istuc”.

¹¹¹) *En. in ps.* 118, *sermo* 8,4 (CC 40,1688. ML 37,1521): “... quod diligenda sit etiam ipsa dilectio qua diligitur quod diligi oportet ...”.

¹¹²) *Ibid.*: “Et diligimus concupiscentiam nostram qua spiritus concupiscit adversus carnem; et quid est ista concupiscentia, nisi bona dilectio?”.

¹¹³) *En. in ps.* 118, *sermo* 8,3 (CC 40,1686-1687. ML 37,1520): “Quid autem diligendo diligitur, si ipsa dilectio non diligitur? Unde consequenter iste incola in terra, cum dei mandata ne sibi absconderentur orasset, in quibus dilectio praecipitur vel sola vel maxime; et ipsius dilectionis dilectionem se velle habere proclamat, dicens: *Concupivit anima mea desiderare iustificationes tuas in omni tempore*. Laudabilis est ista concupiscentia, non damnabilis”.

¹¹⁴) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 7,1 (ML 35,2030): “Qua charitate fit ut caetera bene amentur, ipsa quomodo amanda est?”.

No one can say what kind of face love has, or what its form or stature is, or what its hands and feet are like. Yet love has feet, for loving feet bring us to the church. Love has hands, for loving hands reach out to the poor. Love has eyes, for loving eyes see which of our fellow human beings are in need. "Blessed the person who takes care of the destitute and the poor" (Ps. 41.2). Love has ears, for the Lord says: "He who has ears to hear, let him hear" (Lk. 8.8). It is of course not a matter of distinct localised organs, but the person who loves has the perception to see the whole at one time. Dwell in love and you will be dwelt in by it; remain in love and it will remain in you¹¹⁵).

The love that brings us to the church, that perceives the need of the poor and reaches out to them, that is able to listen to God and the neighbour: this is the love which, by our loving and dwelling in it, will remain dwelling in us. Of this love, which is worthy to be loved and which is concretised here largely in terms of love of neighbour, Augustine has already stated that it is God, because it comes from God and because in it we may discern the Holy Spirit who pours out love in our hearts¹¹⁶). Similarly to the procedure he adopts in *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 of appealing to the authority of the Apostle John in relation to 1 Jn. 4.8 ("God is love"), Augustine in *In Epistolam Ioannis* stresses the canonicity and universal reception of this letter¹¹⁷), as if he anticipated that eye-brows would be raised when he claimed that "love is God". We may then conclude provisionally that particularly tract 7 of the commentary on 1 Jn. reveals strong affinities with the passage we have quoted above from *De Trinitate* 8,8,12,¹¹⁸) and especially with lines 10-20, the key sentences

¹¹⁵) *Ibid.*, tr. 7,10 (ML 35,2034): "Qualem faciem habet dilectio? qualem formam habet? qualem staturam habet? quales pedes habet? quales manus habet? nemo potest dicere. Habet tamen pedes, nam ipsi ducunt ad Ecclesiam; habet manus, nam ipsae pauperi porrigunt; habet oculos, nam inde intelligitur ille qui eget: *Beatus inquit qui intelligit super egenum et pauperem* (Ps. 41.2). Habet aures, de quibus dicit Dominus: *Qui habet aures audiendi, audiat* (Lk. 8.8). Non sunt membra distincta per locos, sed intellectu totum simul videt qui habet charitatem. Habita, et inhabitaberis; mane, et manebitur in te".

¹¹⁶) *Ibid.*, tr. 7,6 (ML 35,2031-2032): "Si Filius Deus, et Spiritus Sanctus Deus, et ille diligit in quo habitat Spiritus Sanctus: ergo dilectio Deus est; sed Deus quia ex Deo ... Quia vero dicit Apostolus: *Charitas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris per Spiritum Sanctum qui datus est nobis* (Rom. 5.5); intelligamus in dilectione Spiritum Sanctum esse".

¹¹⁷) *Ibid.*, tr. 7,5 (ML 35,2031).

¹¹⁸) According to A.-M. La Bonnardière, *Recherches de chronologie augustinienne*, Paris, 1965, p. 53, *In Epistolam Ioannis* dates from the spring of 407 A.D. On the other hand, it is probable that at least a rough first redaction of Book 8 of *De Trinitate* had been completed by the second half of 405, just over a year beforehand. Which - if any - emendations were made to the passage of *De Trinitate* of interest to us before the work was

of which are: "These words (i.e. 1 Jn. 4.7-8) show sufficiently and clearly that this same brotherly love itself ... not only comes "from God" but also is God ... Therefore, when we love our brother from love, we love our brother from God; nor can it be that we do not love in a particular and distinctive way (*praecipue*) the same love with which we love our brother". The love loved is, as in *In Epistolam Ioannis*, the love with which we love our brethren.

2. The "*praecipue*" of 'whoever loves his brethren loves, in a particular and distinctive way (*praecipue*), love itself'

The major premiss of Dideberg's syllogistic representation of Augustine's argument is: "He who loves his brother necessarily loves love". This reflects well the statement of *In Epistolam Ioannis* 9,10: "*Necesse est qui diligit fratrem, diligas ipsam dilectionem*". But, when we come to Book 8 of *De Trinitate*, it becomes imperative to notice in similar contexts the frequent occurrence of the adverb "*praecipue*" which is not present in the tracts on the first letter of John. We have been able to find the following five explicit and implicit instances:

a. "... Qui proximum diligit consequens est ut ipsum *praecipue* dilectionem diligit"¹¹⁹).

b. "... nec fieri potest ut eandem dilectionem non *praecipue* diligamus qua fratrem diligimus ... dilectionem autem necesse est diligit qui diligit fratrem"¹²⁰).

c. "... *magis* enim novit dilectionem qua diligit quam fratrem quem diligit"¹²¹).

d. "Homo ergo qui creditur iustus, ex ea forma et veritate diligitur, quam cernit et intellegit apud se ille qui diligit; ipsa vero forma et veritas *non est quomodo aliunde diligatur*"¹²²).

e. "Et nisi hanc formam, quam semper stabilem atque incommutabilem cernimus, *praecipue* diligeremus, non ideo diligeremus illum, quia eius vitam, cum in carne viveret, huic formae coaptatam et congruentem fuisse fide retinemus"¹²³).

The expressions (a) and (b) are virtually the same: in loving others it

eventually published as a whole in mid-419, it is beyond our competence to judge. On the dating and history of composition of *De Trinitate*, see the note of E. Hendrikx in *Œuvres de saint Augustin* (Bibliothèque Augustinienne, 15), p. 557-566.

¹¹⁹) *De Trinitate* 8,7,10 (CC 50,285. ML 42,957).

¹²⁰) *Ibid.*, 8,8,12 (CC 50,288. ML 42,958).

¹²¹) *Ibid.*, (CC 50,286. ML 42,957).

¹²²) *Ibid.*, 8,6,9 (CC 50,283. ML 42,956).

¹²³) *Ibid.*, 8,9,13 (CC 50,290. ML 42,959-960).

is fitting or necessary that we love love itself *praecipue*. The formulation (c) varies from this on two counts: *novit* replaces *diligit*, and instead of *praecipue* we read *magis*. For (e) it is not *dilectio* that is said to be loved when the life of a good person such as the Apostle Paul sets us aflame with love, but *hanc formam ... semper stabilem atque incommutabilem*, and this form we are said on the one hand to perceive, and on the other to love, *praecipue*. Note that *praecipue* modifies *diligeremus* not *cernimus*. Similarly to (e) the expression (d) substitutes *forma et veritate* for *dilectio*, and introduces the element of perception and understanding as well as that of love. The word *praecipue* itself is missing here, but there is a strong chance that the same idea is rendered by the phrase, “*ipsa vero forma et veritas non est quomodo aliunde diligitur*”. Note again that it is the loving that is specifically so modified, not the knowing. This form or truth, then, is to be loved from no other source than itself. As we may anticipate, because this source will be identified with God himself¹²⁴), therefore the stable and unchangeable form is to be loved from no other source than God himself. From another point of view, however, *non est quomodo aliunde diligitur* gives evidence of kinship with the expression used in relation to *frui*-love of God with the whole self, *viz. propter seipsum*. *Quaestio* 35, in treating love of love, has already alluded to this context: *Sed si propter alia quae amanda sunt amor amatur, non recte amari dicitur*. Only the love which cannot be taken away from *frui* is to be loved *propter seipsum*¹²⁵). Thus, in (d) above, only the form and truth of goodness, which Augustine sees as realised in the life of a good person, ought to be considered as the anchor of human beings’ deepest hopes and as the ultimate criterion for human appraisal of, or involvement in others’ lives.

Perhaps this is the surest direction in which to seek the meaning of *praecipue* in (a), (b) and (e). We may then translate it as “in a particular

¹²⁴) *Sermo* 34,3 (CC 41,424. ML 38,210): “Certe quia dixit: *Caritas dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris per spiritum sanctum qui datus est nobis*, ideo est consequens ut quia spiritus sanctus deus est, nec diligere possumus deum, nisi per spiritum sanctum, amemus deum de deo”. God is not only the source of love for unchangeable form and truth, but also of love for neighbour. See *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 (CC 50,288-289. ML 42,958-959): “Cum ergo de dilectione diligimus fratrem, de deo diligimus fratrem ... Ex una igitur eademque caritate deum proximumque diligimus ...”. Cf. *Tractatus in Evangelium Ioannis* 17,8 (CC 36,175. ML 35,1532): “Dilige ergo proximum, et intueri in te unde diligis proximum; ibi videbis, ut poteris, deum”.

¹²⁵) *De Diversis Quaestionibus* 83, q. 35,1 (CC 44A,50. ML 40,24): “Et ideo non amandum est, quod manenti et fruendi amoris auferri potest”.

and distinctive way", in the sense that *frui*-love is distinctive¹²⁶). This is not, however, to place the form or the truth or the love that is to be loved "in a particular and distinctive way" in a water-tight category of its own, as if, once attained through love of neighbour, it no longer exercised any influence on that love of neighbour. *Praecipue* may rather be understood almost as a synonym of *necessario* in the sentence, "ubi dilectio proximi ibi *necessario* dilectio dei"¹²⁷), where it is Augustine's intention to show that pure love of neighbour can only exist where there is unsullied love of self, and that this latter necessarily entails the distinctive all-important orientation of one's whole being to God. Another possible approach would be to read *praecipue* in (a), (b) and (e) in the light of the expression (c): "... *magis enim novit* dilectionem qua diligit quam fratrem quem diligit". Perhaps this sentence has influenced those translators who render *praecipue* as "above all else"¹²⁸). While not mistaken in itself, nevertheless its tempting association with (c), which when looked at more closely is not making exactly the same point, is bound to lead to certain serious misunderstandings. For example, one may thus be inclined to reason in this way: the love with which we love the brother is loved more than the brother himself; indeed, this love, which one finds within oneself and which is identified with God, is loved "above all else". The implication is that one retreats from love of neighbour, which is less, to love for God in one's own interiority, which is "more". Thus, the question of how much weight is to be given to love for God and how much to love for neighbour would indeed be important, and would clearly have been decided in favour of the former which is "above all else".

The impression given by these reflections, sparked off by the association of *praecipue* with *magis*, needs to be corrected in the light of

¹²⁶) The first meaning of "praecipue" given in P.G.W. Glare et alii (editors), *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Fascicle VI, p. 1425, is: "in a manner which is special to the particular case mentioned, peculiarly". An example is quoted from Cicero's *pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo* 4: "labor in hoc defendendo *praecipue* meus est, studium vero conservandi hominis commune mihi vobiscum esse debet". To say then that one loves love-God "praecipue" when one loves the brother is similar to saying: "Ex una igitur eademque caritate deum proximique diligimus, sed deum propter deum, nos autem et proximum propter deum". *De Trinitate* 8,9,12 (CC 50,289. ML 42,959).

¹²⁷) *Tractatus in Evangelium Iohannis* 83,3 (CC 36,536. ML 35,1846).

¹²⁸) See the translation of S. McKenna in *Saint Augustine. The Trinity* (Fathers of the Church, 45), p. 264. Cf. P. Agaësse in *Œuvres de saint Augustin* (Bibliothèque Augustinienne, 16), p. 67: "avant tout"; and G. Beschin in *Sant'Agostino. La Trinità* (Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana, 4), p. 355: "principalmente".

Augustine's texts themselves. Firstly, it is as well from the outset to be quite clear that Augustine does not say that one *loves* love-God more (*magis*) than the brother loved. The verb modified by *magis* in (c) is *novit* not *diligit*. Secondly, a translation of *praecipue*, which does indeed occur with the verb *diligit*, in the sense of *magis* is blatantly at odds with Augustine's concluding assertions in *De Trinitate* 8,8,12. For he claims there that the question how much love we ought to devote to our brother and how much to God should not trouble us. Why not? "For we should love our brother as ourselves; and the more we love God the more we love ourselves. Therefore we love God and the neighbour from one and the same love ..." ¹²⁹). From this we may conclude that Augustine sees love as so much of a unity that the more we love God, the more we love our neighbour as ourselves. Thirdly, in the contexts of both the expressions (d) and (e), in which *dilectio* is replaced by *forma* and *veritas*, we shall find good reason to reject speaking of love for love-God as "more", and as thereby implying that love of neighbour is less.

3. Love of form and truth as illuminating love of love

In *De Trinitate* 8,6,9 Augustine declares that we ought to love human beings "either because they are righteous or in order that they may become righteous" ¹³⁰). In the contexts of (d) and (e) above he is dwelling upon love of the former kind such as might be inspired by acquaintance with the life of the Apostle Paul and with the hardships he endured for the sake of his ministry as they are described in 2 Cor. 6.2-10. The wonderful thing, according to *De Trinitate* 8,6,9, is that, even though a person may himself not yet be righteous, he still knows what righteousness is. He sees this within himself (*apud se ipsum videt*). But, continues Augustine:

how will people be able (to see and to say what a righteous soul is) except by cleaving to that very same form (*forma*) itself which they behold, so that they may be formed by it and become righteous souls? Then they will not only discern and say that that soul is

¹²⁹) *De Trinitate* 8,8,12-8,9,12 (CC 50,289. ML 42,959): "Fratri enim quantum nobis ipsis; nos autem ipsos tanto magis diligimus quanto magis diligimus deum. Ex una igitur eademque caritate deum proximumque diligimus ...". The variant reading, according to which "incomparabiliter plus quam nobis deo" is inserted before "fratri", is preferred by Migne. The variant makes no substantial challenge to the validity of the point we are making here.

¹³⁰) *De Trinitate* 8,6,9 (CC 50,283. ML 42,956): "Qui ergo amat homines, aut quia iusti sunt, aut ut iusti sint, amare debet".

5 righteous which, through ordering its life and conduct according to the dictates of knowledge and of reason, assigns to everyone what is his due. But, cleaving to that form, they will themselves live righteously and conduct themselves righteously by assigning to everyone what is his due, "so that they may owe nothing to anyone
 10 except to love one another" (Rom. 13.8). And how can one cleave to that form but by loving? ... Why then do we love another whom we believe to be righteous and not love the form itself in which we see what a righteous soul is, so that we too may be able to be righteous? Or is it not rather that, unless we also loved that form, we should
 15 not love him at all whom we love in conformity with it (*ex ea*), but while we are not righteous, we love that form too little to give us the power to become righteous? The man therefore who is believed to be righteous is loved in conformity with that form and truth (*ex ea forma et veritate*) which he who loves discerns and understands
 20 within himself; but this form and truth itself cannot be loved from any source other than itself¹³¹).

What role does love of form and truth play here? J.B. du Roy considers Augustine's position to be this: just as in our quest for learning we are led by others, mutable creatures that they are, to the stability of inner truth, so, in our loving, others can do no more than to refer us to the inner love with which we love¹³²). In the text just quoted, however, the other is a palpably more significant figure than du Roy gives him credit for. The movement encountered here does not merely go by way of the changeable, including other human beings, to immutable inner truth; it is not just that a person, inspired by love for the kind of righteous life he believes the Apostle Paul to have lived, discerns and understands the stable form and truth of righteousness within himself (*apud se ipsum*

¹³¹) *Ibid.* (CC 50,283. ML 42,955-956): "Quod unde esse poterunt, nisi inhaerendo eidem ipsi formae quam intuentur, ut inde formentur et sint iusti animi; non tantum cernentes et dicentes iustum esse animum qui scientia atque ratione in vita ac moribus sua cuique distribuit, sed etiam ut ipsi iuste vivant iusteque morati sint, sua cuique distribuendo, ut nemini quidquam debeant, nisi ut invicem diligant? Et unde inhaeretur illi formae, nisi amando? Cur ergo alium diligimus quem credimus iustum, et non diligimus ipsam formam ubi videmus quid sit iustus animus, ut et nos iusti esse possimus? An vero nisi et istam diligereamus, nullo modo eum diligereamus quem ex ista diligimus, sed dum iusti non sumus, minus eam diligimus quam ut iusti esse valeamus? Homo ergo qui creditur iustus, ex ea forma et veritate diligitur, quam cernit et intellegit apud se ille qui diligit; ipsa vero forma et veritas non est quomodo aliunde diligitur".

¹³²) J.B. du Roy, *art. cit.*, p. 434: "... autrui ne peut que nous renvoyer à l'amour dont nous l'aimons, de même qu'il ne nous enseigne qu'en nous ramenant à l'attestation de la vérité intérieure". Du Roy quotes *Confessiones* 11,8,10 (Skutella 271. CSEL 33/1,287. ML 32,813) in this connection: "Quis porro nos docet nisi stabilis veritas? Quia et per creaturam mutabilem cum admonemur, ad veritatem stabilem ducimur, ubi vere discimus ...".

videt). This moment of inner recognition, comparable to the inner vision or knowledge or love of love, is by no means the end of the journey. '*Per creaturam mutabilem ad veritatem stabilem*' is patently insufficient as a summary of our text: more is afoot than the movement from the exterior other to the discernment of form and truth within one's own interiority. Lines 7-10 show this clearly. When, through loving, a person cleaves to the form of righteousness (*inhaerendo eidem ipsi formae*),¹³³ he will be enabled to live righteously and love alone will characterise his relationships with others. According to lines 14-17, we would not be able to love a righteous person such as Paul unless we also loved the form or truth in conformity with which (*ex ea*) we love him and and which we discern and understand within ourselves. Since this form or truth is itself the very source of our love for it, it has also to be considered the source of love for those whom we love in conformity with it (*ex ea forma et veritate*). In this sense Augustine speaks in *De Trinitate* 8,9,13 of loving in a particular and distinctive way (*praecipue*) this stable and unchangeable form, which is at the same time source and norm of love. Only then will we be capable of loving the lives of others because we believe them to have been lived in accordance with the form of righteousness, in short, "because they are righteous (*quia iusti sunt*)"¹³⁴.

Thus, Augustine can claim in Book 9 of *De Trinitate*, "I love a faithful and strong man with a chaste and genuine love"¹³⁵). What happens, however, if it is discovered that a person whose life I believed to have been in accordance with the form of righteousness turns out on closer acquaintance to have acted out of error, or greed, or vainglory? Obviously I cannot still love him because he is righteous, for he is evidently not so.

This love then is withdrawn from that unworthy person, yet it remains in that form in conformity with which (*ex qua*) I had loved him when I believed him to be worthy. Unless perhaps I now love him to this end, that he may become such as I have ascertained that he
5 was not. But in the person himself nothing has changed; yet he can

¹³³) As we have seen, "inhaerere" is a favourite verb of Augustine's for indicating total commitment to God.

¹³⁴) *De Trinitate* 8,9,13 (CC 50,290. ML 42,959-960): "Et nisi hanc formam, quam semper stabilem atque incommutabilem cernimus, praecipue diligereamus, non ideo diligereamus illum, quia eius vitam, cum in carne viveret, huic formae coaptatam et congruentem fuisse, fide retinemus".

¹³⁵) *De Trinitate* 9,6,11 (CC 50,302. ML 42,966): "Amo itaque fidelem ac fortem virum amore casto atque germano".

be changed and can become what I had once believed him to be. However, the appraisal I had made of him in my mind has changed; this is now different from what it once had been. But, by the command of unchangeable and transcendent righteousness, the
 10 same love has been turned from its intention to enjoy and re-directed with the intention of taking care of others. It is indeed the form itself of unshaken and abiding truth in which I enjoy a person when I believe him to be good and in which I care for him that he may become good. This form bathes both the glance of my mind
 15 and that cloud of mere appearances which I discern from above, with the same light of incorruptible and most pure reason. It is in the light of this form that I think of the same person whom I had seen¹³⁶).

The love of the form of unshaken and abiding truth, which remains even when love is withdrawn on account of manifest unworthiness, emerges here in its special role, stressing again why it should be referred to as *praecipue*. When we enjoy (*frui*) the faithful and righteous lives of others, we do so genuinely and chastely if we enjoy them in and from unchangeable and transcendent righteousness (lines 11-14). If, however, this essential fruible dimension is missing from the lives of others, that is, if they are not righteous, then our unfailing attachment to the form of righteousness brings it about that our intention in loving others is re-directed from *frui* to taking care of them (*consulere*) "so that they might become righteous" (lines 8-11). The form that sheds the light of incorruptible reason on the glance of my mind and that dispels the cloud of mere appearances offers me a significantly new perspective on my own life and on that of others (lines 14-18). This light can enable me to prompt others beyond themselves as it has prompted me beyond myself by orientating me towards the form of stable truth. Indeed, the form, i.e. unchangeable and transcendent righteousness, *commands* that I take care of others (lines 8-11) by keeping the transcendent perspective on their lives open, that I now love them to this end, that they may become

¹³⁶) *Ibid.* (CC 50,302-303. ML 42,966-967): "... atque ab indigno homine ablatus, in ea forma permanet, ex qua eum talem credens amaveram. Nisi forte ad hoc amo iam, ut talis sit, cum talem non esse comperero. At in illo homine nihil mutatum est, mutari tamen potest, ut fiat quod eum iam esse credideram. In mente autem mea mutata est utique ipsa existimatio, quae de illo aliter se habebat, et aliter habet; idemque amor ab intentione perfruendi ad intentionem consulendi, incommutabili desuper iustitia iubente deflexus est. Ipsa vero forma inconcussae ac stabilis veritatis, et in qua fruerer homine bonum eum credens, et in qua consulo ut bonus sit, eadem luce incorruptibilis sincerissimaeque rationis et meae mentis aspectum, et illam phantasiae nubem quam desuper cerno, cum eumdem hominem quem videram cogito, imperturbabili aeternitate perfundit".

righteous as I have ascertained that they were not (lines 3-6). Our attachment to transcendent form ensures that a change for the better in the lives of those we love always remains a possibility, that for them too the cloud of mere appearances may be dissolved.

The parallel in *De Trinitate* between "love of love" and love of form or truth is indeed striking. The form that is loved directs us with a command to the service of our neighbour; similarly, the love which is loved is that with which we continue to love our brother¹³⁷), and which can only be loved with love (*caritate*) if it is actually engaged in loving someone or something¹³⁸). Clearly, therefore, it is unfair to Augustine to state that for him "the encounter with the other is for man only the occasion for discovering his own eternal truth"¹³⁹). This is like drawing what is to be the hypotenuse of a right-angle triangle, and then claiming to have drawn a right-angle triangle. For Augustine it can also be the love of form or eternal truth that stirs us to love and to enjoy the lives of those who have lived in harmony with it. Attention to these lives may in turn awaken a more eager love for the immutable form of righteousness which we perceive in God. But this form constitutes the norm according to which human beings ought to live, that is, the norm by which all genuine self-love and love of neighbour are to be measured, the source from which they are to flow, and the goal towards which they are to be orientated¹⁴⁰). The process of loving by no means comes to a close once the illuminated soul gazes inwardly upon eternal truth. As we have seen, the transcendent and unchangeable form of righteousness actually commands its adherents to take care that other human beings are aided,

¹³⁷) Consider the following phrases from *De Trinitate* 8,8,12-8,9,12 (CC 50,287-289. ML 42,958-959):

(a) "Quid ergo diligit caritas nisi quod *caritate* diligimus?"

(b) "Cum ergo *de dilectione* diligimus fratrem, de deo diligimus fratrem; nec fieri potest ut *eandem dilectionem* non praecipue diligamus *qua fratrem diligimus*".

(c) "Sed si eum quem videt humano visu *spirituali caritate* diligeret, videret deum ...".

(d) "*Ex una igitur eademque caritate* deum proximumque diligimus ...".

¹³⁸) *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 (CC 50,287. ML 42,958): "... sic et caritas diligit quidem se, sed nisi se aliquid diligentem diligit non caritate se diligit".

¹³⁹) J.B. du Roy, *art. cit.*, p. 441: "... la rencontre d'autrui n'est pour l'homme que l'occasion de découvrir sa vérité éternelle".

¹⁴⁰) *De Trinitate* 8,9,13 (CC 50,290. ML 42,960): "Ita et ipsorum vitam facit a nobis diligi formae illius dilectio, secundum quam vixisse creduntur, et illorum vita credita in eandem formam flagrantior excitat caritatem; ut quanto flagrantius diligimus deum tanto certius sereniusque videamus, quia in deo conspiciamus incommutabilem formam iustitiae, secundum quam hominem vivere oportere iudicamus".

insofar as possible, to the discovery and to the realisation of the truth and norm of their lives. "Cleaving to that form, they will themselves live righteously and conduct themselves righteously by assigning to everyone what is his due, 'so that they may owe nothing to anyone except to love one another'".

This attempt to comprehend the expression "love of love" by comparing it to love of form or of truth or of transcendent righteousness leads us to support the following contentions of P. Agaësse: (a) "Love of love" transposes, in the context of Christian thought, the Platonic and Plotinian theory according to which love of the Absolute Good (comparable to the transcendent and unchangeable form of righteousness in *De Trinitate*) is implied in all human knowing and willing; (b) people cannot truly love, in the spiritual sense of the term, unless they are related to this ideal Good which is at the same time norm and act of perfect love; all true love for others is measured by this absolute Good - which in *De Trinitate* 8,7,10 and 8,8,12 and in *In Epistolam Ioannis* appears as Love itself — towards which we orientate ourselves; (c) this absolute Good-Love, which we love for itself, can be known and grasped only in the very act by which we cling to it; it is loved *praecipue* when other human beings are loved¹⁴¹).

As we proceed now to investigate Augustine's identification of this love, which is loved *praecipue*, with God — that is, on the basis of the inversion of 1 Jn. 4.8 by which he makes of it "love is God" — we will have the opportunity to test the accuracy of two further assertions of Agaësse against the texts themselves: firstly, because God is not only supreme perfection but subsistent Love, he is the first subject and source of the love which we have for our brother; for God communicates to us progressively and at each instant his own act of loving; secondly, people can love God only with a love they receive from him; this gratuitous love received from God is love of the brethren; loving with and like God we love God himself¹⁴²). In our examination of the inversion of 1 Jn. 4.8 it should also become clearer that positions such as the following stop too short, because they tend to isolate and objectify the aspect of interiority and thereby truncate the full dynamic movement of Augustine's thought.

God is Love and, in order to know him, one has to enter into oneself. He is to be found at the very source of all our loves. In this

¹⁴¹) P. Agaësse, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

¹⁴²) *Ibid.*, p. 51-52.

way we link up with the movement of Augustinian "mysticism"; we find ourselves on the "axis" of Augustine's reflexive thought. At least once, Augustine tries to follow this route to the end, with the wish to discover at the terminus of this return towards Love-the Source, the divine Trinity, the God who is Love. This is in *De Trinitate*, Book 8¹⁴³).

B. LOVE IS GOD BECAUSE "GOD IS LOVE" (1 JN. 4.8,16)

The lengthy text quoted from *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 which served as a springboard for our reflections in the previous section provides a striking statement of the thesis that the love loved when we love our neighbour is God himself:

"Beloved, let us love one another, because love comes from God. And everyone who loves is born of God and knows God. He that does not love does not know God, for God is Love" (1 Jn. 4.7-8). This connexion of ideas shows sufficiently and clearly that this same brotherly love itself (for it is brotherly love by which we love one another) is proclaimed by so great an authority as the Apostle John not only to come "from God" but also to be God¹⁴⁴).

Love of form and truth with which love of love merits comparison is not explicitly stated by Augustine to be love for God. The *form* of unshaken and abiding truth, in which we enjoy a good person and take care of others that they may become good, is not expressly identified with God. But we are said to perceive the form of unchangeable righteousness "in God"¹⁴⁵), and this same transcendent righteousness is credited with the divine prerogative of commanding us to love our neighbour so that he may become righteous¹⁴⁶). As far as the *love* loved is concerned,

¹⁴³) J.B. du Roy, *art. cit.*, p. 417: "Dieu est Amour et, pour le connaître, il faut rentrer en soi. On le trouve à la source même de tous nos amours. C'est, par là, le mouvement de la 'mystique' augustinienne que nous rejoignons; nous nous trouvons sur l'axe de la pensée réflexive. Une fois au moins saint Augustin tentera de suivre cette voie jusqu'au bout, jusqu'à vouloir découvrir, au terme de ce retour vers l'Amour-Source, la Trinité divine, le Dieu qui est l'Amour. C'est le VIII^e livre du *De Trinitate*". Cf. p. 427, n. 94: "... par le 'retour sur soi', il (le sujet) isole l'amour de la rencontre qui le fait vivre: il en fait un sentiment".

¹⁴⁴) *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 (CC 50,288. ML 42,958): "... *Dilectissimi, diligamus invicem quia dilectio ex deo est, et omnis qui diligit ex deo natus est et cognovit deum. Qui non diligit non cognovit deum quia deus dilectio est. Ista contextio satis aperteque declarat eandem ipsam fraternam dilectionem (nam fraterna dilectio est qua diligimus invicem) non solum ex deo sed etiam deum esse tanta auctoritate praedicari*".

¹⁴⁵) *Ibid.* 8,9,13 (CC 50,290. ML 42,960): "... quia in deo conspiciamus incommutabilem formam iustitiae, secundum quam hominem vivere oportere iudicamus".

¹⁴⁶) *Ibid.* 9,6,11 (CC 50,303. ML 42,967): "... idemque amor ab intentione perfruenti ad intentionem consulendi, incommutabili desuper iustitia iubente deflexus est".

however, Augustine from the very beginning leaves us in no doubt that he is speaking of the God-Love. The love loved is therefore not to be confined to the realm of abstract or ideal form, for, in Augustine's mind, it is already infused with the living God who comes to light wherever human beings truly love one another. *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 opens with Augustine making this identification:

Let no one say: I do not know what to love. Let him love his brother and let him love the same love. For he knows the love with which he loves more than the brother whom he loves. And so, God can now become better known to him than the brother; clearly
5 better known because more present, better known because more inward (*interior*), better known because more trustworthy (*certior*). Embrace love-God and embrace God with love. It is love itself which unites all the good angels and all the servants of God in the bond of holiness and which joins us and them to one another and
10 makes us subject to itself. Therefore, the more we are healed of the swelling of pride, the more we are full of love. And of what but God is he full who is full of love?

But a person may say: "I see love, and, insofar as I am able, I gaze upon it with my mind, and I believe Scripture when it says: 'For
15 God is love, and he who remains in love remains in God'. But when I see love I do not see the Trinity in it". But you do indeed see the Trinity if you see love¹⁴⁷).

It goes beyond our brief to pronounce on the success or failure of the ensuing attempt to show the objector that he can grasp the Trinity intellectually if he directs his attention to the dynamic of love¹⁴⁸). Yet, insofar as the reflections to which this undertaking gives rise have a bearing on the relation between love for God and neighbour, it is of

¹⁴⁷) *Ibid.* 8,8,12 (CC 50,286-287. ML 42, 957-958): "Nemo dicat: 'Non novi quod diligam'. Diligat fratrem et diligat eandem dilectionem; magis enim novit dilectionem qua diligit quam fratrem quem diligit. Ecce iam potest notioem deum habere quam fratrem, plane notioem quia praesentioem, notioem quia interioem, notioem quia certioem. Amplectere dilectionem-deum et dilectione amplectere deum. Ipsa est dilectio quae omnes bonos angelos et omnes dei servos consociat vinculo sanctitatis, nosque et illos coniungit invicem nobis et subiungit sibi. Quanto igitur saniores sumus a tumore superbiae tanto sumus dilectione pleniores. Et quo nisi deo plenus est qui plenus est dilectione? 'At enim caritatem video, et quantum possum eam mente conspicio, et credo scripturae dicenti: *Quoniam deus caritas est, et qui manet in caritate in deo manet*. Sed cum eam video non in ea video trinitatem'. Immo vero vides trinitatem si caritatem vides".

¹⁴⁸) J.B. du Roy, *art. cit.*, p. 417, 440-445, considers it a failure largely because the love which appears in the historic initiative of God in Jesus Christ and in the church is left out of consideration. We shall deal with the implications of du Roy's position to the extent that they impinge upon our theme.

importance to take them into account. Thus, the apparent identification with God (lines 2-4) of the love with which the brother is loved, and the clear identification of brotherly love itself with God further on in *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 (...*eandem ipsam fraternam dilectionem ... deum esse ...*) will have to be probed. What is implicit in the former is made explicit by means of the inversion of 1 Jn. 4.8,16 in the latter. In order to understand more deeply the significance of the inversion, "love is God", we propose to look briefly at two of the other contexts in which it occurs, namely, in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as love-God and in the presentation of love as the gift of God¹⁴⁹). Then, we will be in a position to look again at the inversion in relation to our theme. Finally, it will be necessary to address ourselves to challenging certain misunderstandings of the love that is God which characterise it impersonally in terms of introspection, subjective sentiment, faceless illumination, *une fusion sans rencontre*¹⁵⁰).

1. *The Holy Spirit as love of the Father and the Son; love as the gift of God himself*

While still a priest Augustine had the exceptional honour to preach for the African bishops assembled in council at Hippo in October, 393. In this address, known as *De Fide et Symbolo*, in which he quoted 1 Jn. 4.8,16 for the first time, he pointed out that John had not written *dilectio deus est* but *deus dilectio est*¹⁵¹). Augustine was speaking there of the Holy Spirit. In a classic text concerning the Holy Spirit, however, which is found in Book 6 of *De Trinitate*, he reveals that he has been having second thoughts about John's *deus dilectio est*. His aim here is to show that the Holy Spirit is coeternally and consubstantially equal to the Father and the Son, the *generator* and the *genitus*, whose own gift of unity the Spirit is. Having remarked that this same gift unites us to one another and makes us one spirit with God, Augustine continues:

Therefore, the Holy Spirit is something common to the Father and the Son, whatever this may otherwise be, or the consubstantial

¹⁴⁹) For a sense of orientation in this question I am grateful to D. Dideberg, *Saint Augustin et la première épître de saint Jean*, p. 142-143, n. 17.

¹⁵⁰) These characteristics have been formulated by J.B. du Roy, *art. cit.*, p. 437, n. 9: "l'introspection"; "sentiment subjectif"; p. 430: "une illumination englobante, sans visage"; p. 431: "une fusion sans rencontre".

¹⁵¹) *De Fide et Symbolo* 9,19 (CSEL 41,25. ML 40,192): "Etiam hic enim non ait, 'dilectio deus est', sed: *deus dilectio est*, ut ipsa deitas dilectio intellegatur". The inversion can be made in Latin without grammatical incongruity; but this is not so in Greek where "God" in 1 Jn. 4.8 is accompanied by the definite article: ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν.

and eternal communion itself. And if this communion can appropriately be called friendship, then let it be so called, but it is more aptly called love. And this love too is a substance, because God is a substance, and, as it is written: "God is love" (1 Jn. 4.8,16)¹⁵².

The Holy Spirit is the communion of Father and Son which is aptly called love. In order to show that this Holy Spirit-communion-love is consubstantially God, Augustine make use of 1 Jn. 4.8,16 in a tacitly inverted form. For the essence of the argument is: the Holy Spirit is love; but love is substantially God; therefore the Holy Spirit is substantially God. *De Trinitate* 15,17,31-15,18,32, however, quite explicitly employs the inversion of 1 Jn. 4.8,16 in relation to the Holy Spirit:

... "God is love". When therefore God the Holy Spirit who proceeds from God is given to men, he inflames them with love for God and the neighbour, and he is himself love. For men do not love God by their own power, but only with a love they receive from God himself (*ex deo*). For this reason John says a little later: "Let us love, for he (i.e. God) has first loved us" (1 Jn. 4.7 & 10) ... Therefore, the love which is from God and which is God is properly the Holy Spirit, through whom the love of God is poured out in our hearts (cf. Rom. 5.5). Through this love the whole Trinity dwells in us. For this reason the Holy Spirit, being God, is also very rightly called gift of God¹⁵³).

Apropos of this text we would like to make the following three points:

a. In line 3 we are told that the Holy Spirit is himself love, and then in lines 7-8 that the love which is God is properly the Holy Spirit. In the commentary on 1 John, Augustine further elaborates the latter aspect.

¹⁵²) *De Trinitate* 6,5,7 (CC 50,235. ML 42,928): "Spiritus ergo sanctus commune aliquid est patris et filii, quidquid illud est, aut ipsa communio consubstantialis et coaeterna; quae si amicitia convenienter dici potest, dicatur, sed aptius dicitur caritas; et haec quoque substantia quia deus substantia et deus caritas sicut scriptum est". On the role of the Holy Spirit in Augustine's theology, see J.J. Verhees C.S.Sp., *God in beweging. Een onderzoek naar de pneumatologie van Augustinus*, Wageningen, 1968; especially chapter VI: "De Geest in Augustinus' Triniteits-theologie" (p. 265-332).

¹⁵³) *De Trinitate* 15,17,31-15,18,32 (CC 50A, 506&508. ML 42,1082-1083): "... Deus dilectio est. Deus igitur spiritus sanctus qui procedit ex deo, cum datus fuerit homini, accendit eum in dilectionem dei et proximi, et ipse dilectio est. Non enim habet homo unde deum diligat, nisi ex deo. Propter quod paulo post dicit: Non diligamus eum, quia ipse prior dilexit nos ... Dilectio igitur quae ex deo est et deus est, proprie spiritus sanctus est, per quem diffunditur in cordibus nostris dei caritas, per quam nos tota inhabitet trinitas. Quocirca rectissime spiritus sanctus, cum sit deus, vocatur etiam donum dei".

Why was it first stated that “love is from God” (1 Jn. 4.7) and now that “love is God” (cf. 1 Jn. 4.8)? For God is the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. The Son is God from God, and so too is the Holy Spirit. And these three together are one God, not three gods. If the Son and the Holy Spirit are God, and if it is precisely the person in whom the Holy Spirit dwells who loves, then love must be God. And love is God because it is from God. For this reason we find both these assertions juxtaposed in this letter: “love is from God” and “love is God”. Only of the Father does Scripture not say that he is from God. “From God” therefore refers either to the Son or to the Holy Spirit. From the words of the Apostle Paul, “love for God is poured out in our hearts through the Holy Spirit who is given to us” (Rom. 5.5), we may understand that the Holy Spirit is present in love¹⁵⁴).

Augustine reasons here not, as in *De Trinitate* 6,5,7, from an implied inversion of 1 Jn. 4.8 to the divinity of the Holy Spirit, but, conversely, from the Holy Spirit, who is “God from God” and who pours out love for God and the neighbour in our hearts, to the conclusion that, because the Holy Spirit is necessarily present in love, love is itself therefore God. “Love is God because it is from God”. Love is God because we cannot speak of it in the absence of the Spirit of God¹⁵⁵). When we begin to love, God begins to dwell in us; and when we are filled with love, we are filled with the Holy Spirit who is *donum dei*¹⁵⁶).

b. Lines 10-11 of the text quoted above from Book 15 of *De Trinitate* present the Holy Spirit as gift of God. For *Sermo* 156,5,5 dating from 418-419, the love poured into our hearts by the Holy Spirit is to such an extent the gift of God that it is called God himself¹⁵⁷). This is a

¹⁵⁴) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 7,6 (ML 35,2031-2032): “Quomodo ergo jamdudum: *Dilectio ex Deo est*; et modo: *Dilectio Deus est*. Est enim Deus Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus: Filius, Deus ex Deo; Spiritus Sanctus, Deus ex Deo; et hi tres unus Deus, non tres dii. Si Filius Deus, et Spiritus Sanctus Deus, et ille diligit in quo habitat Spiritus Sanctus: ergo dilectio Deus est; sed Deus quia ex Deo. Utrumque enim habes in Epistola; et *Dilectio ex Deo est*, et *Dilectio Deus est*. De solo Patre Scriptura non novit dicere quia ex Deo est. Cum autem audis *ex Deo*; aut Filius intelligitur, aut Spiritus Sanctus. Quia vero dicit Apostolus: *Caritas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris per Spiritum Sanctum qui datus est nobis*; intelligamus in dilectione Spiritum Sanctum esse”.

¹⁵⁵) *Ibid.*, tr. 6,10 (ML 35,2026): “Non potest esse dilectio sine Spiritu Dei ...”. Similarly, in *En. in ps.* 140,2 (CC 40,2027. ML 37,1816) love from a pure heart as in 1 Tim. 1.5 is said to be Christ who is also “God from God”.

¹⁵⁶) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 8,12 (ML 35,2043).

¹⁵⁷) *Sermo* 156,5,5 (ML 38,852-853): “Ut autem habeamus dilectionem, et ex ea possimus habere bonam operationem, numquid eam nobis dare non possumus, cum scriptum sit, *Charitas Dei diffusa in cordibus nostris per Spiritum sanctum qui datus est nobis* (Rom. 5.5). *Charitas usque adeo est donum Dei, ut Deus vocetur, Apostolo Ioanne dicente,*

clarification of the assertion of *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 7,6 that "love is God because it is from God (*ex deo*)". When therefore Augustine in *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 states that "when we love our brother from love, we love our brother from God (*de deo*)", he is presumably referring to something more than form or truth which is, perhaps naturally¹⁵⁸), discerned

Deus charitas est, et qui manet in charitate, in Deo manet, et Deus in eo (1 Jn. 4.16)". Cf. *Epistola* 186,3,7 (to Paulinus) (Date: 417) (CSEL 57,50. ML 33,818); *Epistola* 188,1,3 (to Juliana) (Date: 417-418) (CSEL 57,121. ML 33,849).

¹⁵⁸) J.B. du Roy, *art. cit.*, p. 442, maintains that Augustine's theological epistemology is ambiguous. He had, according to du Roy, a profound experience of the Spirit, a sense of God as radical personal interiority, but he failed to refer this experience explicitly enough to the historical initiative of God in Christ. "Dès lors, cette expérience spirituelle risque toujours de retomber au niveau d'une expérience naturelle, philosophique ou mystique" (My emphasis). For du Roy, this is particularly the case from the beginning of Book 9 on: "Mais au début de ce livre IX, nous nous mouvons au plan psychologique, et il s'agit seulement de montrer que l'amour est toujours à la fois transitif et réfléchi" (p. 439). But, since he considers those passages in Book 8 in which the form of righteousness and truth appear as later insertions added in view of the argument incorporating knowledge of oneself — the argument which Book 9, on Augustine's taking up the *De Trinitate* project again after an interval, sets out to develop — these passages must also be regarded as subject to the risk of falling back to the natural, psychological plane. In his introduction to the second part of *De Trinitate* in *Œuvres de saint Augustin* (Bibliothèque Augustinienne, 16), p. 10 & 12, E. Hendrikx contests the possibility implied by du Roy of splitting Augustine's search for Trinitarian images in human knowledge and love into two distinct levels, such that there would be considerable risk that the natural level would reduce the datum of faith to human analogies and would thus attenuate the disconcerting nature of the mystery for human reason. "Il n'y a pas, chez saint Augustin, une théorie de la conscience pleinement élaborée indépendamment de la réflexion sur le mystère. Que saint Augustin fasse appel à l'expérience intérieure, qu'il raisonne selon les lois d'une dialectique rationnelle, qu'il reprenne et utilise les découvertes de Platon ou de Plotin, c'est incontestable. Mais cet effort de la raison est intégré dans un mouvement de pensée qui est suscité par la foi. Augustin ne se place pas hors du dogme pour projeter sur lui une lumière qui viendrait d'analogies tirées de l'ordre créé. Il part de la plénitude de la Révélation, et si un progrès de la connaissance est possible, ce n'est qu'à l'intérieur de la foi. La recherche est valable non à l'épreuve d'une explication extérieure au dogme, mais à la lumière d'une adhésion qui se fait de plus en plus intérieure et profonde ... Il ne s'agit pas là d'abord d'une analyse psychologique, mais ontologique, et cette ontologie elle-même est fondée sur la Révélation". [On du Roy's insertion claim, see *art. cit.*, p. 433, n. 82: "Je conjecture qu'Augustin aura inséré, après une première rédaction de ce livre VIII, deux passages dont le premier va de 4,6 à 6,9 (P.L. XLII,951-956), le second étant constitué par le chap. 9,13 (*ibid.*, 959-960)". This theory, however, presupposes, between the composition of Books 8 and 9, a lapse of a certain period of time during which Augustine gained the fresh insight necessary to break out of the impasse, which du Roy sees as blocking the Doctor's progress at the end of Book 8,8,12, and to make a fresh start on the basis of self-love and self-knowledge at the beginning of Book 9. The external evidence, however, does not support this supposed break between Books 8 and 9. See E. Hendrikx on the date of composition of *De Trinitate* in *Œuvres de saint Augustin* (Bibliothèque Augustinienne, 15) p. 557-566 (i.e. note 2); especially, p. 562-563. "On peut affirmer avec assez de certitude qu'Augustin, en composant son traité sur la Trinité, avait devant les yeux un plan fondamental esquissé au

and understood within himself by a person who loves righteous lives in conformity with it (*ex ea forma et veritate*)¹⁵⁹). At least by the time *De Trinitate* was published as a whole in mid-419, Augustine would have understood the love with which we love our brother as more than an ideal form of righteousness, the norm and model of love, which is rooted in God and which we perceive inwardly; as more therefore than the Absolute Good implied in all human knowing and willing¹⁶⁰). It is evident from Book 15 that the love which is God because "from God" is the Holy Spirit, such that, when a person is said in Book 8 to love the brother "from love" (*de dilectione*), then the Holy Spirit, who is consubstantial with the Father and the Son and indeed "*donum dei*", is both the living source of this love and is actually present in it¹⁶¹). If love

moins en grandes lignes. En effet, dès le début de son entreprise, il se proposa comme but l'approfondissement de notre connaissance du mystère trinitaire au moyen de son analogie avec la vie de l'esprit de l'homme, ce qui forme précisément l'objet de la 2^e partie de son traité" (p. 562). Moreover, from the point of view of internal criteria, the alleged inserted passages do not so clearly interrupt the flow of Book 8 as to allow of no other solution than that they were added later in view of a development that had not been anticipated when this Book was originally dictated].

¹⁵⁹) See *De Trinitate* 8,6,9 (CC 50, 283. ML 42,956).

¹⁶⁰) J.B. du Roy, *art. cit.*, p. 437, sees the love implied in human love of neighbour ("de dilectione diligimus fratrem": *De Trinitate* 8,8,12) as the terminus ad quem of "l'action objectivante de la réflexion d'Augustin, trop foncièrement introspective". Cf. p. 436: "La charité est toujours nécessairement réfléchie en même temps qu'extravertie". This, however, too easily evokes the suspicion of navel-gazing: an objectified reality, Absolute Good-Love, reflectively perceived in one's own inwardness. The impression is thereby given that Absolute Good-Love-God is present, even if inwardly and reflexively, as an object that can be grasped not dissimilarly to other objects. K. Rahner, *art. cit.*, p. 245, provides a corrective to this approach which is closer to Augustine's thought than the God-objectivism ascribed to him by du Roy: "God is primarily and originally given in (or as) the transcendental, unclassified horizon of the knowing and acting intentionality of man and not as an 'object' represented by an idea with this in within horizon". Cf. p. 238: All interhuman love "is orientated towards God, not indeed by an explicitly categorised motive but ... by its inescapably given transcendental horizon, which is given gratuitously by God's always prevenient saving grace".

¹⁶¹) It would be a mistake to understand the love which is the Holy Spirit as being largely a figure in Augustine's intra-Trinitarian speculations, without having any direct or important role to play in the actual history of our salvation. On God who makes himself salvifically present in the Spirit, see J.J. Verhees, *God in beweging*, p. 343-344: "Voor het overige wordt de heilspresentie van de Geest in de Kerk weliswaar voorgesteld als geconditioneerd door Christus' actuele heilbemiddeling — *sub tanto capite uno eius Spiritu fidelia membra vegetantur* —, maar op de aard en het karakter van die heilbemiddeling wordt niet nader ingegaan. Hetzelfde geldt met betrekking tot de samenhang die een enkele maal wordt aangegeven tussen de heilsactiviteit van de Geest enerzijds en de historische, verleden heilsdaden van Jezus anderzijds. Degenen die de triniteitstheologie van de bisschop ooit essentialistisch hebben genoemd, hebben in zoverre gelijk dat de heilshistorie

is so great a gift of God as to be God himself, then, in relation to "loving the brother from love", P. Agaësse's conclusions may be seen to be justified: people can love God and the neighbour only with a love they receive from God; and God, the first subject of love (cf. 1 Jn. 4.10), communicates to us progressively his own act of loving, i.e. the Holy Spirit. In that, in *De Trinitate* 8,8,12, the love loved is the source (*de dilectione*) of continuing love of neighbour and constantly calling it forth¹⁶²), this love which is God the Holy Spirit enters into the very heart of love of neighbour itself. The *donum dei* is so much the fabric of love for neighbour that Augustine sees no contradiction in calling brotherly love itself God¹⁶³).

c. In *De Trinitate* 6,5,7 we read that "by God's gift (i.e. the Holy Spirit) we are one amongst ourselves and one spirit with Him (cf. 1 Cor. 6.17), because our soul clings fast to Him"¹⁶⁴). This same gift is surely at work when Augustine speaks of love-God as uniting us to one another and to God. "Embrace love-God and embrace God with love. It is love itself which unites all the good angels and all the servants of God in the bond of holiness and which joins us and them to one another and makes us subject to itself"¹⁶⁵). But through this gift of love (cf. Rom. 5.5), God from God, which is properly the Holy Spirit, the whole Trinity dwells in

als verleden gebeuren op directe wijze inderdaad nauwelijks fungeert in die theologie. Anders is het gesteld met Gods heilsnabijheid als actueel gebeuren. Vanuit dit actueel gebeuren n.l., zoals het beschreven wordt in de Schrift, ziet Augustinus de God van de bijbel-christelijke traditie als een God die in de Geest mens- en wereldnabij is, heilsgod is. Zelfs waar, in een gerijpt werk als het *Enchiridion*, het historisch feit van de incarnatie ter sprake komt, is het de Géést door wie God in Jezus heilsnabij komt aan allen. De begunadiging van de mens Jezus moest in de Schrift als begunadiging-door-de-Géést worden aangeduid, *quia ipse proprie sic est deus, ut dicatur etiam dei donum*. Zoals de mens Jezus invalspoort werd voor de genade in de tijd, is de Geest dit als *donum donabile*, als Gods bereidheid tot zelfmededeling, van eeuwigheid".

¹⁶²) In fact, in *De Trinitate* 9,6,11 (CC 50,303, ML 42,967), "righteousness" is said to command love of neighbour: "... idemque amor ab intentione perfruendi ad intentionem consulendi, incommutabili desuper iustitia iubente deflexus est". It is not incongruous that the "love loved" of 8,8,12 should exercise the same function.

¹⁶³) *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 (CC 50,288. ML 42,958): "Ista contextio satis aperteque declarat eandem ipsam fraternam dilectionem (nam fraterna dilectio est qua diligimus invicem) non solum ex deo sed etiam deum esse tanta auctoritate praedicari".

¹⁶⁴) *Ibid.*, 6,5,7 (CC 50,235. ML 42,928): "... beati quia ipsius munere inter nos unum; cum illo autem unus spiritus, quia agglutinator anima nostra post eum".

¹⁶⁵) *Ibid.*, 8,8,12 (CC 50,286-87. ML 42,957): "Amplectere dilectionem-deum et dilectione amplectere deum. Ipsa est dilectio quae omnes bonos angelos et omnes dei servos consociat vinculo sanctitatis, nosque et illos coniungit invicem nobis et subiungit sibi".

us¹⁶⁶). The Holy Spirit, who pours out upon all creatures his immense generosity and abundance so that due order may be preserved, is precisely the sweetness of the Father and the Son¹⁶⁷). This sweetness of the Father and the Son sees to it that we are united to one another and to God. Therefore, being steeped in the sweetness of the Father and the Son, which causes the whole Trinity to dwell in us, ought not to be conceived solely in terms of God in the heart of the individual lover, but also essentially in relation to the community of "all the good angels and all the servants of God in the bond of holiness". Community amongst human beings forms a fundamental dimension of the due order which can be preserved thanks to the abundant and generous outpouring of the Holy Spirit, the sweetness of the Father and the Son, by which the whole Trinity comes to dwell in us. In these existential terms Augustine may well be taken at his word when he makes the bold claim: "But you do indeed see the Trinity if you see love"¹⁶⁸). All love is gift, the Holy Spirit who makes the whole Trinity present: fraternal love is called God because it is to such an extent "from God" as to be God himself.

2. *The inversion of 1 Jn. 4.8,16 in other love of God - love of neighbour contexts*

"God is love" (1 Jn. 4.8). What more could be said, sisters and brothers? If we were to hear only this one word from the mouth of God's Spirit, "God is love", it would be quite sufficient. If throughout this entire epistle and the rest of Scripture nothing at all were said in praise of love, we would not have to search any further¹⁶⁹).

1 Jn. 4.8, therefore, seems to contain the most fundamental scriptural teaching on love: "God is love". In the next sermon on 1 Jn., however, in a similar spirit of enthusiasm for 1 Jn. 4.8, Augustine shifts the perspective: "John could not have recommended love more highly

¹⁶⁶) *Ibid.*, 15,18,32 (CC 50A,508. ML 42,1083): "Dilectio igitur quae ex deo est et deus est, proprie spiritus sanctus est, per quem diffunditur in cordibus nostris dei caritas, per quam nos tota inhabitat trinitas".

¹⁶⁷) *Ibid.*, 6,10,11 (CC 50,242. ML 42,932): "... et est in trinitate spiritus sanctus, non genitus, sed genitoris genitique suavitas ingenti largitate atque ubertate perfundens omnes creaturas pro captu earum, ut ordinem suum teneant et locis suis acquiescant".

¹⁶⁸) *Ibid.*, 8,8,12 (CC 50,287. ML 42,958): "Immo vero vides trinitatem, si caritatem vides".

¹⁶⁹) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 7,4 (ML 35,2031): "Quia Deus dilectio est. Quid amplius dici potuit, fratres? Si nihil de laude dilectionis dicetur per omnes istas paginas hujus Epistolae, si nihil omnino per ceteras paginas Scripturarum, et hoc solum unum audiremus de voce Spiritus Dei: Quia Deus dilectio est; nihil amplius quaerere deberemus".

than to have called it God"¹⁷⁰). Twice in summarising the argument of Book 8 of *De Trinitate* the ageing bishop tells us that Scripture calls love God, and that through this love, which is *amans, et quod amatur, et amor*, the Trinity begins to appear to the perceptive¹⁷¹). The love with which the commentary on 1 Jn. and *De Trinitate*, Book 8, are specifically concerned, however is clearly love of neighbour, fraternal love. We may say then that the highest recommendation is given there to fraternal love by the fact it is called God.

The penultimate tract on the first letter of John takes up again the theme of "love of love", familiar from *De Trinitate*:

"How can someone who does not love his brother whom he sees love God whom he does not see?" (1Jn. 4.20). How is this? Does the person who loves his brother love God also? Yes, he who loves his brother necessarily loves God; he cannot do otherwise than to love
 5 love itself. A person cannot love his brother without loving love. He necessarily loves love. But does the fact that someone loves love mean that he therefore loves God? Indeed it does. In loving love a person loves God. You haven't forgotten what was said a little earlier in 1 Jn.: "God is love" (1 Jn. 4.8,16)? If God is love, then
 10 whoever loves love loves God. Therefore, love your brother and be without fear. You cannot say: I love my brother, but not God. Just as it is a lie to say 'I love God' if you do not love your brother, so you are deceiving yourself when you say 'I love my brother' if you think that you do not love God. A person who loves his brother
 15 necessarily loves love itself; and love is God; therefore he who loves his brother necessarily loves God¹⁷²).

"In loving love, a person loves God" (lines 7-8). "Therefore, love

¹⁷⁰) *Ibid.*, tr. 8,14 (ML 35,2044): "Amplius tibi non potuit dilectio commendari, quam ut diceretur Deus".

¹⁷¹) *De Trinitate* 15,3,5 (CC 50A,465. ML 42,1060): "... et per caritatem quae in scripturis sanctis deus dicta est, per quam coepit utcumque etiam trinitas intelligentibus apparere, sicut sunt amans, et quod amatur, et amor". Cf. 15,6,10 (CC 50A,472. ML 42,1064).

¹⁷²) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 9,10 (ML 35,2052): "*Qui enim non diligit fratrem suum quem videt: Deum quem non videt, quomodo potest diligere?* Quid ergo? Qui diligit fratrem, diligit et Deum? Necesse est ut diligit Deum, necesse est ut diligit ipsam dilectionem. Numquid potest diligere fratrem, et non diligere dilectionem? Necesse est ut diligit dilectionem. Quid ergo, quia diligit dilectionem, ideo diligit Deum? Utique ideo. Diligendo dilectionem: Deum diligit. An oblitus es quod paulo ante dixisti: *Deus dilectio est*? Si Deus dilectio, quisquis diligit dilectionem: Deum diligit. Dilige ergo fratrem, et securus esto. Non potes dicere: Diligo fratrem, sed non diligo Deum. Quomodo mentiris si dicas: 'Diligo Deum', quando non diligis fratrem; sic falleris, quando dicis: 'Diligo fratrem', si putes quia non diligis Deum. Necesse est qui diligis fratrem, diligas ipsam dilectionem; *dilectio autem Deus est*: necesse est ergo ut Deum diligit quisquis diligit fratrem".

your brother and be without fear" (lines 10-11), for "a person cannot love his brother without loving love" (line 5), and "love is God" (line 15). The corollary of this is straightforward: if one fails to love one's brother, God is opposed¹⁷³). I can as little love God without loving my brother as I can love my brother without loving God. If God is opposed when fraternal love is lacking, then he is favoured when it is present, because love itself is truly favoured, and this love is God. As tract 10,4 puts it, love itself makes God present¹⁷⁴). We have already described the love that makes God present and in the absence of which God is opposed: its hands are stretched out in aid to the poor and its eyes full of compassion for those in need¹⁷⁵). This is the love that is promoted, favoured, and loved, when the neighbour is loved. In it the Holy Spirit, from whom it stems and through whom it is poured out, may be discerned; the love loved is his personal gift, the sweetness of the Father and the Son, as it is accepted by human beings in the practice of fraternal love¹⁷⁶). Yet the love loved may also be seen from another perspective to be related to Christ and to the Father. Just as a person cannot love his brother without loving love, nor can he do so without loving Christ, for the brother is a member of Christ. And, because Christ is the Son of God, one cannot love him without also loving the Father. "Love cannot be split up. Begin loving somewhere, and the rest will follow"¹⁷⁷). In tract 9,10 of *In Epistolam Ioannis* it may well be for the reason that Augustine sees love as being so much of one piece, as ideally "one Christ loving himself", that "a person who loves his brother necessarily loves love itself, and (that since) love is God, therefore he who loves his brother necessarily loves God" (lines 14-16). Love forms such a unity that it could not otherwise. Therefore, when we love our brother genuinely, we may be

¹⁷³) *Ibid.*, tr. 7,5 (ML 35,2031): "Audis hic ab Spiritu Dei, *Deus dilectio est*. Iam si audes, fac contra Deum, et noli diligere fratrem suum".

¹⁷⁴) *Ibid.*, tr. 10,4 (ML 35,2057): "... ipse amor praesentem me tibi facit".

¹⁷⁵) *Ibid.*, tr. 7,10 (ML 35,2034).

¹⁷⁶) *Ibid.*, tr. 7,6 (ML 35,2031-2032). Cf. *Tractatus in Evangelium Ioannis* 17,8 (CC 36,175. ML 35,1532) for which it is in the actual loving that the source of love for neighbour comes to light: "Dilige ergo proximum, et intueri in te unde diligis proximum; ibi videbis, ut poteris, deum. Incipe ergo diligere proximum. *Frangere esurienti panem tuum ...* (Is. 58,7). *Faciens autem ista quid consequeris? Tunc erumpet velut matutina lux tua* (Is. 58,8). *Lux tua deus tuus est ...*".

¹⁷⁷) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 10,3 (ML 35,2055-2056): "Si autem diligis fratrem, forte fratrem diligis, et Christum non diligis? Quomodo, quando membra Christi diligis? Cum ergo membra Christi diligis: Christum diligis; cum Christum diligis: Filium Dei diligis; cum Filium Dei diligis, et Patrem diligis. Non potest ergo separari dilectio. Elige tibi quid diligas; sequuntur te cetera".

without fear that anything essential will be lacking to love, for that love is God to its core.

There are at least five other instances of the inversion, or implied inversion, of 1 Jn. 4.8,16 in love of God - love of neighbour contexts. These, however, do not contain any reference to love of love; their tendency is rather to stress the indwelling of God in those who love, who are envisioned as the temple of God¹⁷⁸), the seat and the city of God¹⁷⁹). In *En. in ps.* 149,4 it is stated that, if love dwells in a person's conscience, he has only to direct his attention there in order to see God¹⁸⁰). It is to be recalled, however, that this love which a person describes dwelling in his conscience does not live there in gentlemanly ease. For, according to *En. in ps.* 99,5, "in the measure that that love grows in you which moulds you and calls you back to being like God, so will your love also extend to your enemies"¹⁸¹). By growing like God through love of enemies, "you come closer to him and experience him more deeply in the measure that love grows in you — for love is also God ..." ¹⁸²). As *In Epistolam Ioannis* tr. 9,2 points out, however, the expression "love grows in you" is not to be isolated from its explanatory complement, i.e. "you grow in love"¹⁸³. God's progressive indwelling is to be regarded in the light of our dwelling in him. We dwell in love-God, on the one hand, through showing concern for one another¹⁸⁴) and through loving him who already lives in our midst¹⁸⁵, and, on the other hand, through being

¹⁷⁸) *Sermo* 350,1 (ML 39,1533): "... nec dubitari ullo modo potest, quod templum Dei sit homo, in quo habitat charitas. Dicit enim et Ioannes, *Deus charitas est*". The love mentioned in context is that of the neighbour as in Jn. 13.34.

¹⁷⁹) *En. in ps.* 98,4 (CC 39,1381. ML 37,1260-1261): "Habeto ergo caritatem in deum et in proximum, et eris sedes dei ... Homines enim amantes se invicem, et amantes deum suum qui in illis habitat, faciunt civitatem dei. Quia lege quadam civitas continetur; lex ipsa eorum, caritas est; et ipsa caritas, deus est; aperte enim scriptum est: *deus caritas est*. Qui ergo plenus est caritate, plenus est deo; et multi pleni caritate, civitatem faciunt deo".

¹⁸⁰) *En. in ps.* 149,4 (CC 40,2181. ML 37,1952): "Quisquis habet caritatem, utquid illum mittimus longe, ut videat deum? Conscientiam suam adtendat, et ibi videt deum. Si caritas ibi non habitat, non ibi habitat deus; si autem caritas ibi habitat, deus ibi habitat".

¹⁸¹) *En. in ps.* 99,5 (CC 39,1396. ML 37,1952): "In quantum autem in te caritas crescit, efficiens te et revocans te ad similitudinem dei, pertendit usque ad inimicos ...".

¹⁸²) *En. in ps.* 99,6 (CC 39,1396. ML 37,1274): "Et cum accedere coeperis similis, et persentiscere deum, quantum in te caritas crescit, quia et caritas deus est ...".

¹⁸³) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 9,2 (ML 35,2045): "Nam si caritas Deus est, nec proficit nec deficit Deus: sic dicitur proficere in te caritas, quia tu in ea proficis".

¹⁸⁴) *Ibid.*, tr. 7,10 (ML 35,2034). Having presented the physiognomy of love largely in communitarian terms, Augustine concludes: "Habita et inhabitaberis; mane et manebitur in te".

¹⁸⁵) *En. in ps.* 98,4 (CC 39,1381. ML 37,1261): "Homines enim amantes se invicem, et amantes deum suum qui in illis habitat, faciunt civitatem dei".

embraced and sustained by him¹⁸⁶. He dwells in us not in such a way as to be grasped by us, but in order to sustain us and make us like himself by enlarging the compass of our love to embrace even enemies. To say, therefore, that the conscience of the lover of God and the neighbour is the seat and the temple of God is to speak of a seat and a temple filled with the deepest, surest, and broadest possible love of neighbour, and of a conscience which is not only that of the individual lover, but also that of many lovers who form a community which, because its law is love, may rightly be called the city of God¹⁸⁷). *De Praesentia Dei* of mid-417 is quite unambiguous in seeing God's presence on earth in his upbuilding, unifying, indwelling activity in the midst and on behalf of the community of those who obediently do his will by loving him and the neighbour. "... *God is love*. When indeed you think of his dwelling, think of the unity and communion of the saints ... He dwells on earth, building up his house which is to be dedicated until the end of time"¹⁸⁸).

C. CLARIFICATION OF MISUNDERSTANDINGS CENTERING ON THE CONCEPT OF INTERIORITY

1. J.B. du Roy's principal criticisms of *De Trinitate*, Book 8, in general and in detail

Within the perspective of our topic, the most fundamental objections raised by J.B. du Roy to the Augustine of the texts we have been examining — viz. especially *De Trinitate* 8,8,12, but also *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 5,7 and tr. 9,10, and *Tractatus in Evangelium Ioannis* 17,8 — can be reduced to the following. Because of the strong influence of his own spiritual experience and because of a basically introspective nature, Augustine sought God in human interiority, at the root of human subjectivity. But taking this "voie régressive"¹⁸⁹), however, in which the

¹⁸⁶) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 8,14 (ML 35,2044): "Vicissim in se habitant, qui continet et qui continetur. Habitas in deo, sed ut continearis: habitat in te deus, sed ut te contineat, ne cadas".

¹⁸⁷) *En. in ps.* 98,4 (CC 39,1381. ML 37,1261): "Quia lege quadam civitas continetur; lex ipsa eorum, caritas est; et ipsa caritas, deus est; aperte enim scriptum est: deus caritas est. Qui ergo plenus est caritate, plenus est deo; et multi pleni caritate, civitatem faciunt deo".

¹⁸⁸) *Epistola* 187,13,41 (= *De Praesentia Dei*) (CSEL 57,118. ML 33,848): "... *Deus caritas est*. Cum vero habitationem eius cogitas, unitatem cogita congregationemque sanctorum ... in terra, ubi aedificans habitat domum suam in fine saeculi dedicandam".

¹⁸⁹) J.B. du Roy, *art. cit.*, p. 435. Du Roy sums up the shortcomings of this "voie régressive", p. 440-443, where he outlines the causes of what he regards as Augustine's failure in *De Trinitate*, Book 8, to give perfect expression to his profound intuition of the

all-important movement is the return to self and to the love-God within, he bypassed the inter-subjectivity of love, distinguished love as a subjective sentiment from love as an inter-personal relationship and concentrated his attention upon the former. He thus gave insufficient attention to the actual economy of salvation in history and to the ecclesial dimension of love, and in fact attributed to the neighbour no greater role than providing an occasion for us to discover our own eternal truth¹⁹⁰), which is tantamount to saying that, in returning to ourselves in search of God, we in fact turn away from the neighbour¹⁹¹).

Trinity in love: "... une intuition profonde qui n'a jamais réussi à s'exprimer parfaitement" (p. 417).

¹⁹⁰) *Ibid.*, p. 441: "... la rencontre d'autrui n'est pour l'homme que l'occasion de découvrir sa vérité éternelle ... Lorsqu'il écrit l'histoire de cette (c'est-à-dire, sa propre) conversion, qui est une conversion à l'éternel, il n'accorde guère à la médiation historique d'autrui, dans l'Église, qu'un rôle occasionnel". Cf. p. 434 & 443.

¹⁹¹) Du Roy makes every effort to be fair to Augustine here. See his first reaction to the question, *art. cit.*, p. 429: "Mais faudra-t-il, pour se retourner vers Dieu, se détourner du prochain? Il ne semble pas: c'est en aimant notre frère que nous connaissons l'amour qui est Dieu ...". Shortly afterwards, however, having noted that love of neighbour is described as an exercise purifying the eye for the vision of God, he begins to doubt: "Le prochain ne serait-il alors qu'une occasion de nous exercer à aimer Dieu? Saint Augustin tend parfois à le comprendre ainsi". In *Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 5,7 (ML 35,2016) and tr. 9,10 (ML 35,2052-2053), on purification through the exercise of love for neighbour, have raised du Roy's suspicions in this regard. However, in the text on the physiognomy of love found in tr. 7,10 (ML 35,2033-2034) he gathers some momentary reassurance that "il n'est plus question ici de se retourner, mais de s'engager. L'expérience de la charité devient une connaissance vécue de Dieu. Il ne faut donc pas détourner son regard de nos frères, de l'Église" (p. 430). What this implies is that, in tracts 5,7 and 9, 10, it is not a question of committing oneself but of returning to oneself, and that these two movements are mutually exclusive. Even though, in the concluding summary remarks on this section of his article, i.e. "La conversion à l'amour même", du Roy can write that "nous trouvons Dieu dans l'amour même dont nous aimons nos frères" (p. 441), his suspicion that contemplation (as distinguished from experience) of the interior God hinders commitment to the neighbour has not been resolved: "Mais peut-on se retourner pour l'y contempler alors que l'amour est toujours en acte? L'amour nous fait seulement 'éprouver' Dieu, en nous donnant de vivre l'amour que Dieu est" (p. 441).

Indeed, the concluding sentences of the section on the conversion to love itself reveal that du Roy has already described an oscillation between a subjective pole, i.e. love-God (= the Holy Spirit within), and an objective pole, also called God, which he describes as "une connaissance objectivée de l'amour qui, coupée du dialogue ecclésial, n'apparaîtra plus comme une communion de personnes" (p. 430). [A terminological clarification, p. 437, n. 94, implies, as I understand it, that these two poles are basically the same in that they share the same ill of impersonality: "Les impressions que j'emploie peuvent paraître contradictoires. Mais je crois qu'*objectiver* l'amour ou le réduire à un *sentiment subjectif* revient au même, car l'introspection objective l'expérience intérieure." Le sujet ne peut sans doute se connaître, comme tel que dans une rencontre personnelle; par le 'retour sur soi', il isole l'amour de la rencontre qui le fait vivre: il en fait un sentiment"]. This oscillation, which

"Therefore, the encounter with the personal God will be for him (i.e. Augustine) the recognition of an interior presence, at the root of our subjectivity"¹⁹²). If Augustine had presented the Trinitarian dogma less immanently and more in terms of the Christian history of salvation, the expression of his "mystical" experience in terms of the characteristic "interior God" would have been attenuated and he would have been able to articulate his faith with a more explicitly ecclesial dimension¹⁹³). In du Roy's view, the concepts of unity and of love tug Augustine in opposite directions. The concept of unity is both Scriptural and rich in meaning for the Bishop as a result of his ecclesial experience and pastoral responsibilities. But, while unity implies a certain reciprocity, the concept "of love offers no resistance to his penchant for introspection: it is subjectivised, and we are back to the interior God"¹⁹⁴).

Let us now look at some of the details of du Roy's interpretation which are of importance for our theme. Firstly, apropos of Augustine's statement in *De Trinitate* 8,8,12, "you see the Trinity if you see love"¹⁹⁵, he remarks: "Bypassing the intersubjectivity of love in order to envisage it only in the subject, he (i.e. Augustine) calls his interlocutor to enter into himself"¹⁹⁶). Thus, du Roy appears to understand Augustine's position to be: the Trinity will be seen not in our experience of the

appears to have us swinging back and forth between a faceless illumination and an objectified impersonal God — thereby hindering us from real relationships with one another — is said to be accentuated in *De Trinitate*, Book 8, which du Roy is about to examine (p. 431-440). Before undertaking the analysis of that text, however, he points out what will be his prime condition for a Trinitarian theology in the light of Christian charity, and, by maintaining that Augustine fails to fulfil it, in fact discredits the Doctor of the Trinity with recommending a return to the self that is at the same time a turning away from our neighbour: "Ne faudrait-il pas pour nous en assurer et pour empêcher notre conversion de se perdre dans une fusion sans rencontre, qu'intervienne le Christ, manifestation du Père, dont la rencontre seule peut nous convertir au Père sans nous replier sur nous-mêmes et sans nous détourner de nos frères" (p. 431).

¹⁹²) J.B. du Roy, *art. cit.*, p. 441: "La rencontre du Dieu personnel sera donc pour lui la reconnaissance d'une présence intérieure, à la racine de notre subjectivité".

¹⁹³) *Ibid.*, "On peut penser qu'une présentation plus 'économique' du dogme trinitaire eût donné à l'expérience 'mystique' d'Augustin un accent plus expressément ecclésial".

¹⁹⁴) *Ibid.*, p. 442: "... celui de charité n'offre aucune résistance (à) son penchant pour l'introspection: il se subjectivise et nous revenons au Dieu intérieur".

¹⁹⁵) Du Roy may well be right in his astonishment at this assertion in the light of *De Trinitate*, Book 9. "Voilà de quoi nous étonner! Il ne s'agit pas du tout d'une simple image lorsque saint Augustin nous disait au livre VIII: 'Tu vois la Trinité, si tu vois la charité'. Mais il ne s'agit plus maintenant que d'une image trinitaire en l'homme" (*Ibid.*, p. 438).

¹⁹⁶) *Ibid.*, p. 435: "Dépassant l'intersubjectivité de l'amour pour ne l'envisager plus que dans le sujet, il appellera son interlocuteur à rentrer en lui-même".

intersubjectivity of love (“*amans, et quod amatur, et amor*”), but in the vision of *caritas* within and at the root of the individual subject. That such is indeed du Roy’s interpretation — and this is our second point of detail — is confirmed by his explanation of *cum ergo de dilectione diligimus fratrem*¹⁹⁷). Augustine, in search of the Trinitarian God, fails to fulfil our expectation that he will discern an analogy of the Trinity in the three terms of fraternal love: “(nos) *de dilectione diligimus fratrem*”¹⁹⁸). Rather, he follows up the middle term, “*dilectione*”, which will lead him not to the three-personed God, but only to the one God. Thus, with all concentrated on the middle term, “it is from now on a matter of subjective sentiment (*dilectio fratris* or *erga fratrem*), and it is love alone, its object excluded, which is God”¹⁹⁹). We are given the impression of the one love-God enthroned in splendid indifference at the heart of human interiority and functioning merely as an object of contemplation. Augustine, who in the previous sentence of *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 had boldly proclaimed that brotherly love itself, love for one another, is God²⁰⁰), makes an abrupt aboutturn in what follows. Thinking better of the matter and succumbing to his putative penchant for introspection, he seeks safe ground by retreating to the “interior God” within the inwardness of individual human subjects. Thus, every man is an island, joined to others not by dialogue but only by the parallel possibility, common to all, of experiencing a mystical return to oneself and a mystical vision of an objectless, motionless love-God within one’s own depths²⁰¹). We are said to be obliged to love our brother *in order to be able* to love this love²⁰²).

¹⁹⁷) *De Trinitate* 8,8,12,41-42 (CC 50,288. ML 42,958).

¹⁹⁸) J.B. du Roy, *art. cit.*, p. 437. The author comments on this sentence we have quoted: “Au lieu de ‘nous nous aimons’, nous lisons maintenant ‘j’aime mon frère par l’amour’”. This is unwarrantedly to prejudice the issue in favour of understanding love here as the subjective sentiment of an individual. What we in fact read is: “we love our brother from love”, which leaves open the possibility that Augustine is still speaking of love for one another as such.

¹⁹⁹) *Ibid.*, p. 437: “Il s’agit désormais d’un sentiment subjectif (*dilectio fratris* ou *erga fratrem*) et c’est la *dilectio* seulement, à l’exclusion de son objet, qui est Dieu”. If only the middle term is followed up, one could almost equally well say that the subject (i.e. “nos”) is excluded as well as the object, which would leave the one love-God hovering in mid-air.

²⁰⁰) *De Trinitate* 8,8,12,38-41 (CC 50,288. ML 42,958).

²⁰¹) J.B. du Roy, *art. cit.*, p. 435: “Il n’y a pas de dialogue, mais une maïeutique qui fait appel à une expérience parallèle”.

²⁰²) *Ibid.*, p. 436: “...il faut aimer son frère pour pouvoir aimer la charité même ...”. The sentence continues immediately: “... et cette charité nous renvoie au frère, car elle n’est charité qu’en aimant quelque chose”. Surprisingly, du Roy leaves the insight of this latter

A third and final point of detail concerns du Roy's use of the terms "interior" and "exterior". Earlier in his article, the return to oneself is described as becoming like God through the disinterestedness displayed in one's love of enemies²⁰³). But these are not the terms in which du Roy customarily portrays Augustinian interiority. Interiority is mentioned twice specifically in *De Trinitate* 8,8,12:

Let a person love his brother and let him love the same love. For he knows the love with which he loves more than the brother whom he loves. And so, God can now become better known to him than the brother; clearly better known because more present, better known because more inward (*interior*), better known because more certain (*certior*). Embrace love-God and embrace God with love ... A person sees his brother with human sight with which God cannot be seen. But if he loved with spiritual love this brother whom he sees with human sight, he would see God who is love itself with the inner sight (*visu interiore*) by which he can be seen²⁰⁴).

How does du Roy understand this inwardness? He takes a lead from the fact that *interior* is linked in this text to *certior*. Now, God's being *certior* means for him that God appears as "the Truth", the primary interior certitude which is and assures the truth of all knowledge. The Truth, which is attained by a return to one's own interiority, transcends and founds all certitude: "I would more easily doubt of my life than of the existence of the truth"²⁰⁵). "But who is our teacher except unchangeable Truth? And when we are put in mind of truth by a changeable creature, we are led to the Truth which does not change, and there we really learn ..." ²⁰⁶). By way of the creature, therefore, one

phrase entirely to one side when he proceeds to analyse "(nos) de dilectione diligimus fratrem" (p. 437).

²⁰³) *Ibid.*, p. 426-427. See *En. in ps.* 99,5 (CC 39,1396. ML 37,1274-1275). On p. 427, n. 53, of du Roy's article the reference is misprinted "*En. in ps.* 49,5".

²⁰⁴) *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 (CC 50,286 & 288. ML 42, 957-959): "Diligat fratrem et diligat eandem dilectionem; magis enim novit dilectionem qua diligit quam fratrem quem diligit. Ecce iam potest notioem deum habere quam fratrem, plane notioem quia praesentioem, notioem quia interioem, notioem quia certioem. Amplectere dilectionem-deum et dilectione amplectere deum ... Fratrem autem videt humano visu quo videri deus non potest. Sed si eum quem videt humano visu spiritali caritate diligeret, videret deum qui est ipsa caritas visu interiore quo videri potest". We retain for the moment du Roy's translation of "certior" as "plus certain".

²⁰⁵) *Confessiones* 7,10,16 (Skutella 141. CSEL 33/1,158. ML 32,742): "... faciliusque dubitarem vivere me quam non esse veritatem ...". See J.B. du Roy, *art. cit.*, p. 434.

²⁰⁶) *Confessiones* 11,8,10 (Skutella 271. CSEL 33/1,287. ML 32,813): "Quis porro nos docet nisi stabilis veritas? Quia et per creaturam mutabilem cum admonemur, ad veritatem stabilem ducimur, ubi vere discimus ...".

comes to the Truth through whom all things were created: '*per creaturam ad Veritatem*'. Du Roy suggests that this conversion *ad interiora* in the order of knowledge is exactly paralleled in the order of love. In both cases we are led back "to our own inner selves in order to discover there God-Truth or God-Love"²⁰⁷). Thus, what the other we love principally means to us is an opportunity to discover our own eternal truth²⁰⁸). Just as the other can teach us only by leading us to bear witness to interior truth, so, when we love the other, he can be no more than a pointer for us back to the interior love with which we love²⁰⁹), to the love which grounds and transcends all loving. If in the *voie régressive*, however, God is contemplated in human interiority, what becomes of the face of Christ and of the "exterior" historical events of Christian revelation²¹⁰)? Isn't the real authority of Christ bypassed as well as human inter-subjectivity²¹¹)?

2. The case for Augustinian interiority with a human Christian face

I would like to propose and to show grounds for an alternative interpretation of the meaning of 'love of love-God' in Augustinian interiority. With special attention to the context of *De Trinitate* 8,8,12, the points of detail of du Roy's position that have been presented will be responded to in such a way that love may be seen more personally than as a faceless illumination and more ecclesially than as a subjective sentiment which, by concentrating upon itself, finds God in its own depths.

a. When Augustine states: "you see the Trinity if you see love", is he referring to the love in the individual's heart, as du Roy maintains, or to inter-subjective love? As the text proceeds, we have reason to answer: he

²⁰⁷) J.B. du Roy, *art. cit.*, p. 443: "Elle (c'est-à-dire, l'économie rédemptrice selon Augustin) nous ramène à l'intérieur de nous-mêmes pour y découvrir le Dieu-Vérité ou le Dieu-Amour". To illustrate the point, du Roy refers in n. 112 to *De Trinitate* 8,7,11.

²⁰⁸) *Ibid.*, p. 441.

²⁰⁹) *Ibid.*, p. 434: "... autrui ne peut que nous renvoyer à l'amour dont nous l'aimons, de même qu'il ne nous enseigne qu'en nous ramenant à l'attestation de la vérité intérieure".

²¹⁰) *Ibid.*, p. 434-435: "A fortiori faut-il se demander s'il peut faire entrevoir la Trinité dans l'intériorité du sujet sans la médiation extérieure du Christ et de l'histoire du salut".

²¹¹) *Ibid.*, p. 442. Submission of one's own spiritual experience to Christ is "toujours de l'extérieur, comme une *auctoritas*" for Augustine; in other words, Christ would not have been bone and marrow of his theology. If we compare this quotation with that under the previous note, a certain inconsistency in the evaluation of the term "exteriority" will be evident.

means both, for fraternal love is not only "from God" but also "God"²¹²), and these need not — indeed may not — be seen as separated from one another as subjective sentiment and an objective knowledge of love that is no longer a communion of persons. The fact that Augustine moves from fraternal love as "God" to fraternal love as being "from God" does not necessarily entail that he thereby repudiates the former. And why should it be supposed that, when he speaks of fraternal love being "from God", he is no longer really speaking of interpersonal fraternal love at all but rather of a faceless presence which illuminates the eyes of our soul that are turned within? If we attend carefully to what precedes the statement, "you see the Trinity if you see love", it becomes increasingly difficult to cling fast to the conviction that only the inner love of the subject is envisaged. Certainly, the passage begins with God's being better known than our brother because he is more inward (*interior*). It continues, however: "Embrace love-God and embrace God with love. It is love itself which unites all the good angels and all the servants of God in the bond of holiness and which joins us and them to one another and makes us subject to itself"²¹³). Possible sudden changes of mind put to one side, what Augustine evidently intends here by the love that is God, and the love with which God is embraced, is the communion of saints subject to God. Nothing has to be forced in order to see the harmony between this statement and *De Praesentia Dei*'s interpretation of 1 Jn. 4.8: "... *God is love*. When indeed you think of his dwelling, think of the unity and communion of the saints"²¹⁴). The love, then, with which God is embraced and in which the Trinity is seen, may well be understood as the highest and broadest form of inter-subjectivity open to human beings, the communion of men and angels in the bond of holiness and in obedience to love-God.

b. Does Augustine find that he has been too bold in calling fraternal love "God", even if he does have St. John's authority for it? Does he turn back in mid-stream to the stiller waters of love in the subject? Is this love, which is identified with God, really without an object? A comparison with *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 7,6 proves enlightening here:

²¹²) *De Trinitate* 8,8,12,38-41 (CC 50,288. ML 42,958).

²¹³) *Ibid.*, 8,8,12,6-9 (CC 50,286-287. ML 42,957): "Amplectere dilectionem-deum et dilectione amplectere deum. Ipsa est dilectio quae omnes bonos angelos et omnes dei servos consociat vinculo sanctitatis, nosque et illos coniungit invicem nobis et subiungit sibi".

²¹⁴) *Epistola* 187,13,41 (= *De Praesentia Dei*) (CSEL 57,118. ML 33,848): "... *Deus caritas est*. Cum vero habitationem eius cogitas, unitatem cogita congregationemque sanctorum ...".

... if it is precisely the person in whom the Holy Spirit dwells who loves, then love must be God. And love is God because it is from God. For this reason we find both these assertions juxtaposed in this letter: "love is from God" and "love is God" ... From the words of the Apostle Paul, "love for God is poured out in our hearts through the Holy Spirit who is given to us" (Rom. 5.5), we may understand that the Holy Spirit is present in love²¹⁵).

Augustine in this text is not conscious of any opposition between love's being "God" and its being "from God". It is the former because its living and sustaining source is God, the Holy Spirit. But this same Holy Spirit, through whom love comes to us, is the sweetness of the Father and the Son actively pouring out upon all creatures his immense generosity and abundance²¹⁶). He is not a subjective sentiment, love-God alone, without object. He is rather the gift of God which makes us one amongst ourselves and one spirit with himself²¹⁷). When we read, therefore, that the Holy Spirit of Rom. 5.5 is present in love, this should be understood of the love that is actually loving the neighbour and God²¹⁸), that actually unites us to one another and to God. The love that is "from God" is therefore not found exclusively in human "interiority", in du Roy's sense of the word. Even apart from these compelling parallels, however, one is not justified in concluding from *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 that the encounter with the personal God is for Augustine "the recognition of an interior presence at the root of our subjectivity"²¹⁹). The import of the text is that God is at the source not of our subjectivity but of our fraternal love (*de deo diligimus fratrem*), and it is as such that we direct our attention to him and love him especially (*nec fieri potest ut eandem dilectionem non praecipue diligamus qua fratrem diligimus*). Moreover, the sweetness and the unifying power of love-God, i.e. the Holy Spirit, so abundantly pervades fraternal love that this love is itself called God.

²¹⁵) *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 7,6 (ML 35,2031-2032): "... et ille diligit in quo habitat Spiritus Sanctus: ergo dilectio Deus est; sed Deus quia ex Deo. Utrumque enim habes in Epistola; et *Dilectio ex Deo est*, et *Dilectio Deus est* ... Quia vero dicit Apostolus: *Caritas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris per Spiritum Sanctum qui datus est nobis*; intelligamus in dilectione Spiritum Sanctum esse".

²¹⁶) *De Trinitate* 6,10,11 (CC 50,242. ML 42,932).

²¹⁷) *De Trinitate* 6,5,7 (CC 50,235. ML 42,928): "Nos autem ex ipso, et per ipsum, et in ipso (Rom. 11.36) beati quia ipsius munere inter nos unum; cum illo autem unus spiritus (1 Cor. 6.17), quia agglutinator anima nostra post eum".

²¹⁸) *Ibid.*, 15,17,31 (CC 50A,506. ML 42,1082): "... Deus dilectio est. Deus igitur spiritus sanctus qui procedit ex deo, cum datus fuerit homini, accendit eum in dilectionem dei et proximi, et ipse dilectio est".

²¹⁹) J.B. du Roy, *art. cit.*, p. 441.

To imply that there is a substantial distinction between fraternal love and love "from God", such that the latter, locked within the individual, is isolated from the encounter which enlivens it, is to do violence to the text²²⁰). There is a very strong argument against it in *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 itself. Following his assertion that "you see the Trinity if you see love", and prior to the so-called daring statement that fraternal love is God and to the alleged immediate turn-about, Augustine discourses for ten lines on the nature of love. He concludes: "love indeed loves itself, but, unless it loves itself loving something, it does not love itself with love. What therefore does love love, except what we love with love?"²²¹). In the face of this it will be difficult to maintain that the inner love which is God has no object. Love-God must be loved in the act of loving something or someone if it is to be said to be loved with love. Love that loves nothing is not love at all. Love loves what is actually loved with love. The latter is obviously the brother²²²). Therefore, on the basis of this passage we have grounds for supposing that the love that is the "interior" God — which is loved "in a particular and distinctive way" and from which the brother is loved — is properly loved in its act of love for the brother. Du Roy does deal with this passage, and he is, inescapably, aware that "this love sends us back to the brother"²²³), but he curiously fails to see its applicability to the "interior" love-God. When we love this love-God, he too sends us back to the brother, for it is necessary that he be loving something or someone if he is to be loved with love.

c. Is Augustinian interiority such that the neighbour, being a changeable uncertain creature, has ultimately to be turned away from when we direct ourselves to the stable and unchangeable God at our inner centre? Is

²²⁰) Nor does *Tractatus in Evangelium Ioannis* 17,8 (CC 36,175. ML 35,1532) give any warranty for what in fact amounts to radical separation. The God who can be seen by attending to the source of love for neighbour within oneself comes to light not when we turn our attention at a certain moment from the neighbour to God within, but in concrete love for neighbour itself.

²²¹) *De Trinitate* 8,8,12,24-26 (CC 50,287. ML 42,958): "... et caritas diligit quidem se, sed nisi se aliquid diligentem diligit non caritate se diligit. Quid ergo diligit caritas nisi quod caritate diligimus?"

²²²) *De Trinitate* 8,8,12,42-43&56 (CC 50,288. ML 42,958): "... eandem dilectionem ... qua fratrem diligimus"; "Sed si eum quem videt humano visu spiritali caritate diligeret ...".

²²³) J.B. du Roy, *art. cit.*, p. 436: "... il faut aimer son frère pour pouvoir aimer la charité même et cette charité nous renvoie au frère ...".

there a 'by means of the *exterior* neighbour to the *interior* God' scheme at work here? When speaking earlier of the comparison between love of love and love of form or truth, we were able to show that *De Trinitate* 8,6,9 cannot be satisfactorily inserted into a '*per creaturam mutabilem* (in this case, the human neighbour) *ad veritatem stabilem*' framework, if this is taken to mean that once the truth is attained there is no point to further interest in the neighbour. The contrary is in fact the case: "But, cleaving to that form, they will themselves live righteously and conduct themselves righteously by assigning to everyone what is his due 'so that they may owe nothing to anyone except to love one another' (Rom. 13.8)"²²⁴). Attention to the truth which is interiorly present²²⁵) is not without its salutary effect for the neighbour. Equally, as far as *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 is concerned, love of love, or vision of the interior God, is not a private viewing of God so deep in one's own inwardness as to exclude the neighbour. We have already shown why this cannot be: firstly, the love loved is described as the communion of saints and the God seen is said to be discerned also in fraternal love; and, secondly, the love loved is that with which we actually love our brother, and the love-God seen cannot be genuinely loved unless he is loving something or someone (*aliquid diligentem*) and thereby sending us back to the neighbour.

From another point of view, however, it is questionable how much weight ought to be attached to the parallelism between interior Truth and interior Love as du Roy draws it. The '*per ... ad ...*' scheme associated with the former breaks down even when confronted with love for interior truth in *De Trinitate* 8,6,9. Furthermore, does the translation "more certain" go far enough in rendering the *certior* of *De Trinitate* 8,8,12,6? Du Roy draws a comparison with *Confessiones* 7,10,16: "I would more easily doubt of my life than of the existence of the truth"²²⁶). To paraphrase: I am more certain of the Truth through which all things are made than I am of my own life. For *De Trinitate* 8,8,12,6, however, I do not know God more than the brother because, in

²²⁴) *De Trinitate* 8,6,9 (CC 50,283. ML 42,955): "... inhaerendo eidem ipsi formae ... ut ipsi iuste vivant iusteque morati sint, sua cuique distribuendo, ut nemini quidquam debeant, nisi ut invicem diligant?"

²²⁵) These terms, reminiscent of *De Trinitate* 8,8,12,3-6, do appear in 8,6,9 (CC 50,283. ML 42,955): "An illud quod videt, veritas est interior praesens animo qui eam valet intueri?"

²²⁶) *Confessiones* 7,10,16 (Skutella 141. CSEL 33/1,158. ML 32,742): "... faciliusque dubitarem vivere me quam non esse veritatem ...".

the first instance, I am "more certain" of him, but because God himself is *certiorem*. 'Certus' used of persons can have the meaning 'sure, to be depended upon, true, faithful'²²⁷). This may well be its significance here: I know God more than my brother because he is more dependable, more true, more faithful²²⁸). Because God is 'certior' in this sense — because in him is the *unchangeable* form of goodness which benefits all mankind — we can also be certain of him, of his unchanging fidelity. And the more we love him in response to this absolute fidelity, the more surely (*certius*) and serenely we see him²²⁹). Note again, however, that our text does not say that, because God is more faithful, I love him "more" than my brother. The God whom I *know* more than my brother is more present, more inward, *certiorem*. If we are right in seeing the final term as an acknowledgement that God's fidelity is greater than that of human beings, and that therefore we can be more sure of him and serenely trusting in his regard, then the God who appears at the core of human interiority so long as the neighbour is loved, has a distinctly more personal mien than a faceless illumination giving us our absolute certitude.

Be this as it may, in order to interpret the "interiority" of *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 correctly, we need to look carefully at the passage immediately preceding it, which deserves to be quoted in full.

Consequently, those who seek God through the intermediary of those powers which rule over the world, or parts of the world, are removed and cast far away from him. They find themselves far away from him not in spatial terms but because of affections that are
 5 contradictory to him. For they presume to go by outward paths, and thereby forsake their own inwardness in the intimacy of which God dwells (*interiora sua deserunt, quibus interior est Deus*). Therefore, even when they hear of some holy heavenly power or

²²⁷) C.T. Lewis and C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, p. 320-321. Cf. P.G.W. Glare et alii (editors), *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Fascicle II, Oxford, 1969, p. 305. "Certus" can be used of persons in various capacities with the meaning "absolutely dependable, certain, true". For example, see Cicero's *Pro Tullio* 5: "me ... M. Tullio fidelem certumque amicum esse".

²²⁸) In other words, God's love can be depended on completely. The love of another human being cannot be, not even that of a friend. See *De Trinitate* 9,4,6 (CC 50,298. ML 42,964): "... verumtamen fieri potest ut amicus etiam odisse incipiat, et eo ipso amicus esse desinat, nesciente illo, et adhuc amante".

²²⁹) *De Trinitate* 8,9,13 (CC 50,290. ML 42,960): "... ut quanto flagrantius diligimus deum tanto certius sereniusque videamus, quia in deo conspicimus incommutabilem formam iustitiae, secundum quam hominem vivere oportere iudicamus".

10 imagine how it might be, they prefer to seize upon its powerful
deeds, at which human weakness marvels, rather than to imitate its
obedient love by which one enters into God's rest. For, in their
pride, they choose to be able to do what an angel does rather than to
be faithfully what an angel is. No holy person rejoices in his own
power, but in the power of Him from whom he has the capacity to
15 do whatever can fittingly be done. And he knows that there is more
power in being united to the Omnipotent by a conscientiously good
will than in being able by his own power and will to accomplish such
marvellous deeds as to make those who are incapable of them
tremble. The Lord Jesus Christ himself performed such deeds so
20 that he might teach those who marvelled at them still greater things.
He wanted to turn those who were attentive to and uncertain about
these unusual temporal wonders to eternal and inward realities (*ad
aeterna atque interiora converteret*). Therefore he said: "Come to
me all you who suffer and are burdened, and I will refresh you; take
25 my yoke upon you". And he does not say 'learn from me because I
raise those who have been dead for four days'; he says rather:
"Learn from me for I am meek and humble of heart". For humility,
which is most solid, is more powerful and safer than highly inflated
haughtiness. And he goes on to say: "And you will find rest for your
30 souls" (Matt. 11.28-29). For "love is not puffed up" (1 Cor. 13.4);
and "God is love" (1 Jn. 4.8); and "those who are faithful in love",
called back from the din which is without to silent joys, "will rest in
him" (Wis. 3.9). See, "God is love". Why then do we move with all
haste towards the heights of the heavens and the depths of the earth
35 in search of Him who is with us (*apud nos*), if we wish to be with
Him?²³⁰).

²³⁰) *De Trinitate* 8,7,11 (CC 50,285-286. ML 42,957): "Quapropter qui quaerunt deum per istas potestates quae mundo praesunt vel partibus mundi auferuntur ab eo longeque iactantur non intervallis locorum sed diversitate affectuum; exterius enim conantur ire et interiora sua deserunt quibus interior est deus. Itaque etiamsi aliquam sanctam caelitem potestatem vel audierint vel utcumque cogitaverint, facta magis eius appetunt quae humana miratur infirmitas; non imitantur pietatem qua divina requies comparatur. Malunt enim superbe hoc posse quod angelus quam devote hoc esse quod angelus. Non enim sanctus quisquam potestate sua gaudet sed eius a quo habet posse quidquid congruenter potest, et novit potentius esse coniungi omnipotenti pia voluntate quam propria voluntate posse quod contremescant qui talia non possunt. Itaque ipse dominus Iesus Christus talia faciens ut mirantes doceret ampliora et temporalibus insolitis intentos atque suspensos ad aeterna atque interiora converteret: *Venite, inquit, ad me qui laboratis et onerati estis, et ego vos reficiam; tollite iugum meum super vos*. Et non dixit: 'Discite a me quia triduanos mortuos suscito', sed ait: *Discite a me quia mitis sum et humilis corde*. Potentior est enim et tutior solidissima humilitas quam ventosissima celsitudo. Et ideo sequitur dicens: *Et invenietis requiem animabus vestris*. *Dilectio enim non inflatur, et deus dilectio est, et fideles in dilectione adquiescunt illi revocati ab strepitu qui foris est ad gaudia silentia*. Ecce, *deus dilectio est*. Ut quid imus et currimus in sublimia caelorum et ima terrarum quaerentes eum qui est apud nos si nos esse velimus apud eum?"

The opposition between interiority and exteriority in this text is that between humility and pride, between *solidissima humilitas* and *ventosissima celsitudo* (lines 27-29). For this reason exteriority is rejected and interiority highly prized. The meaning of the latter becomes clear if it is set over against the attributes of pride. Following the path of pride, by which inwardness (*interiora*) is forsaken, casts us far from God because pride's affections are so opposed to Him (lines 1-7). Pride's object is to be able to achieve the stunning deeds of power it imagines angels to perform, and in this way it designs to have ordinary mortals marvel at it (lines 8-10). It rejoices in its own power (lines 13-14) and in the strength of its own will to carry out deeds that will cause others to tremble (lines 17-19). This pride, says Augustine rather charmingly, is a high-flown windbag (*ventosissima celsitudo*)!

There we have Augustine's understanding of exteriority. It is pride, characterised by the traits we have outlined, which is opposed to Augustinian interiority. The principal feature of Augustine's inward path is not therefore a *retour sur soi* as such, but humility. Humility prefers to go the inward way of *pietas*, of obedient love for God; it desires to imitate the angels' fidelity to God rather than to acquire their wonderful powers (lines 11-13). To be humble, to live inwardly, is to come to Christ and to follow him. Christ did not rejoice in the power which enabled him to perform unusual and baffling wonders. As the holiest of persons he knew his power to stem from his "being united to the Omnipotent by a conscientiously good will" (lines 15-17). This power he used not to dazzle onlookers but in order to do whatever can fittingly be done (lines 13-15). For Christ, the humble one, this meant pointing people beyond his astounding temporal works of power, to which they may have been inclined to remain attached, *ad aeterna atque interiora* (lines 21-23). It meant encouraging people to wish to be really with him (lines 35-36) by faithful obedient love for the Omnipotent God, and it also meant making people followers of his humble inward way in accordance with which the power the faithful have from God is used not only for temporal things which can fittingly be done, but also in order to direct others to the eternal wonder of human being and to the enjoyment of "silent joys" in God's rest.

Since interiority has principally to do with humility, Augustine's statement at the beginning of *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 that God is better known than the brother because "more inward" (*interiorem*) is surely open to the interpretation that God is better known to those who follow

the inward path of Christian humility. Note, however, that the text does not state that the brother is not *interior* at all; it says only that God is “more inward”²³¹). Immediately following that statement the text calls us to embrace the love-God, and this love, as we know, is presented as that which, while making us subject to itself, creates a bond of holiness between angels and men. The inward love-God that is embraced is the same love that unites us to the good angels, to one another, and, in obedient submission, to God himself. “Therefore”, Augustine continues, “the more we are healed of the swelling of pride, the more we are full of love. And of what but God is he full who is full of love?”²³²). Thus, the more we find our power in humble attachment to God and the more we use it, not to make others marvel at us and tremble, but in order to do what can be done for them in time and to teach them still greater things, the more are we full of that interior love which is God. True interiority is not set over against our neighbour, but against the way of pride²³³). It may well be that the *praecipue* in *De Trinitate* 8,7,10 and 8,8,12²³⁴) — passages antiphonating our interiority-humility text — can indeed be translated “above all else”. But then we have to be very careful to

²³¹) In *Confessiones* 3,6,11 (Skutella 45. CSEL 33/1,53. ML 32,688) the same point is made of God in relation to the self: “Tu autem eras interior intimo meo et superior summo meo”. To say that God is more inward than my most intimate self is to imply no offence to the self. Similarly, to say that God is more inward than the intimate self of others, or more inward than the intimate love which joins us even to our closest friends, is not to downgrade the inwardness of others or to bypass the intimacy between us, but to acknowledge that human inwardness and intimacy are grounded in a being that is ‘interior intimo nostro et superior summo nostro’.

²³²) *De Trinitate* 8,8,12,9-11 (CC 50,287. ML 42, 957-958): “Quanto igitur saniores sumus a tumore superbiae tanto sumus dilectione pleniores. Et quo nisi deo plenus est qui plenus est dilectione?”.

²³³) In this scheme of things, the neighbour can only improperly be said to belong to the order of exteriority, and that only insofar as we might look to him proudly for vain praise. Then, of course, it is a question of our exteriority rather than of his. A comparison between *De Trinitate* 8,7,10 and 8,7,11 is instructive in this regard. The latter contrasts the ways of interiority and exteriority, which is surely an elaboration of the former’s contrast between “dilectio” and “cupiditas”. Note the neighbour-centeredness of the description of true love, the way of interiority: “Haec est autem vera dilectio, ut inhaerentes veritati iuste vivamus (Tit. 2.12); et ideo contemnimus omnia mortalia prae amore hominum, quo eos volumus iuste vivere. Ita enim et mori pro fratribus utiliter parati esse poterimus, quod nos exemplo suo dominus Iesus Christus docuit”: *De Trinitate* 8,7,10 (CC 50,284. ML 42,956).

²³⁴) *De Trinitate* 8,7,10,31-34 (CC 50,285. ML 42,957): “... et qui proximum diligit consequens est ut ipsam praecipue dilectionem diligit. Deus autem dilectio est, et qui manet in dilectione in deo manet. Consequens ergo est ut praecipue deum diligit”. *Ibid.*, 8,8,12,42-43 (CC 50,288. ML 42,958): “... nec fieri potest ut eandem dilectionem non praecipue diligamus qua fratrem diligimus”.

emphasise that it is the humble love *with which we love our brother and which unites us to one another* that is to be loved “above all else”, and not any prideful “exterior” love goading us to grasp and to enjoy our own power. Such haughty exteriority confuses and frightens the neighbour. However, when, above all this, love-God is loved in the intimacy of humble human interiority, the neighbour may expect to benefit from others’ power to do whatever can fittingly be done for him and to be taught and turned to the still greater reality of the human vocation to the eternal.

A final point on interiority: in lines 10-11 of the passage quoted above from *De Trinitate* 8,7,11 we read that, through living interiorly by imitating the obedient love of the angels, one enters into God’s rest (*divina requies comparatur*); then again in lines 31-33: “‘those who are faithful in love’, called back from the din which is without to silent joys, ‘will rest in Him’”. Does this rest in God, this finding rest for our souls in coming to and following the humble Christ (cf. Matt. 11.28-29), imply that human inter-subjectivity is really ultimately bypassed in Augustinian interiority? Such an inference is not justified, for why should it not be possible that those who are faithful in loving the love *with which the brother is loved and which unites us to one another* experience the highest form of communication with their sisters and brothers when they are “called back from the din which is without to silent joys”? Might quite a new level of inter-subjectivity not be opened up when prideful ways buckle before humble love? In *Epistola* 73 to Jerome — written in 404 A.D., just before the first redaction of *De Trinitate*, Book 8 — Augustine speaks of himself as resting in God when he experiences the faithful love of those with whom he is most intimate and friendly: “I rest in their love without any preoccupation. For I feel that God is there, and in safety I give myself up to him, and safely *I rest in him*”²³⁵). In fraternal love itself one may rest in God: not in the “interior God” at the root of our individual subjectivity, but in the interior God who is present in the best of human love as its source, sustainer, and pledge of its fidelity.

To conclude this response to du Roy’s reading of Augustine, two further comments are in order. The first concerns du Roy’s contention

²³⁵) *Epistola* 73,3,10 (CC 34/2,276. ML 33,250): “... in ea (caritate) sine ulla sollicitudine requiesco: deum quippe illic esse sentio, in quem me securus proicio, et in quo securus requiesco”.

that the concepts of unity and love pull Augustine in opposite directions, the former to his brothers in the church, the latter to isolating introspection. In *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 the latter is considered to predominate, while, with the *unus Christus amans seipsum* of *In Epistolam Ioannis*, tr. 10,3, Augustine is said to have most perfectly gone beyond his subjectivism²³⁶). Now, more than sufficient has been said to show that love of love in *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 is neither isolatingly introspective nor subjectivistic. Furthermore, one important strand of the text even quite explicitly combines the concepts of unity and love. Indeed the theme of the passage can be regarded as having already been announced towards the end of *De Trinitate* 8,6,9 and most explicitly in 8,7,10 where Augustine's compelling presentation of the unity of love uncompromisingly turns enrichingly to the neighbour.

True love, however, is this: being constantly intent upon truth "we live righteously" (Titus 2.12), and consequently we consider all that is mortal of no value in comparison to love for people by which we desire that they live righteously. For thus we will be able to prepare ourselves even to die for the good of the brethren, following the example which the Lord Jesus Christ himself taught us²³⁷).

Such is the love Augustine himself states that he is concerned with in his quest for the Trinity and knowledge of God²³⁸). Even if one judges that his search for the Trinity (*amans, et quod amatur, et amor*) in such love is a failure, one cannot deny, without imputing to Augustine blatant contradiction, that it is love of this kind he means: intent upon the truth, we ourselves live righteously and, above all mortal things, we love other people by desiring that they too live righteously and by being prepared to follow Christ even to death for the good of the brethren. Love prepared to die for the sake of another's right relationship to God is that "which unites all the good angels and all the servants of God in the bond of holiness and which joins us and them to one another and makes us subject to itself". Because this true love has such unifying power and is so

²³⁶) J. B. du Roy, *art. cit.*, p. 437, n. 94: "Saint Augustin a le plus parfaitement dépassé son subjectivisme lorsqu'il parle du Corps mystique: 'unus Christus amans seipsum. Cum enim se invicem amant membra, corpus se amat' (In Ep. Io. Tr. X,3, P.L., XXXV, 2047)". In fact, Augustine does not speak of "the one Christ loving himself" as "the mystical Body" but as "the total Christ".

²³⁷) *De Trinitate* 8,7,10 (CC 50,284. ML 42,956). See text under n. 223 above.

²³⁸) *Ibid.*: "Quapropter non est praecipue videndum in hac quaestione quae de trinitate nobis est et de cognoscendo deo nisi quid sit vera dilectio, immo vero quid sit dilectio".

much of one piece, Scripture not inappropriately often has just one commandment of love stand for both²³⁹). Indeed, God and the neighbour are loved with one and the same love:²⁴⁰) the more we love God, the more we love ourselves, and consequently the more we are able to "consider all that is mortal of no value in comparison to love for people by which we desire that they live righteously".

Our reading of *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 which stresses the dimension of unity of love for God and the neighbour is clearly germane to the strong ecclesial character of *unus Christus amans seipsum*, even though the *totus Christus* does not appear there. Furthermore, in parallel texts, the Holy Spirit we have encountered in and at the source of love for God and the neighbour is well worthy of the description: a "presence at the same time totally interiorised and totally ecclesial"²⁴¹). If the way of interiority is understood as Christian humility orientating others to the fulness of their lives in God, then it coincides with the mission of the church in the power of the Spirit that is Love. According to du Roy, "Christian love, from which we live through the Spirit, makes us recognise Christ in our brothers. Therefore, this Love, poured out in our hearts, not only precedes us from within, but it comes before us still in Christ, in the Church"²⁴²). Augustine's *voie régressive*, du Roy claims, moves dangerously counter to this and, as such, it breaks with and betrays his own very profound experience of love²⁴³). Whatever evidence in favour of his view

²³⁹) *Ibid.*: "... non immerito plerumque scriptura pro utroque unum ponit".

²⁴⁰) *De Trinitate* 8,8,12-8,9,12 (CC 50,289. ML 42,959): "Fatri enim quantum nobis ipsis; nos autem ipsos tanto magis diligimus quanto magis diligimus deum. Ex una igitur eademque caritate deum proximumque diligimus, sed deum propter deum, nos autem et proximum propter deum". J.B. du Roy, *art. cit.*, p. 437, n. 96, asserts that "on pourrait citer d'innombrables parallèles aux deux dernières phrases du *De Trin.*, VIII, 8,12 ...". A review of the references he gives, however, reveals clear parallels to the expressions, "deum propter deum" and "proximum propter deum", but not to "ex una igitur eademque caritate". The latter, I would like to maintain, is not just a commonplace way — and here, as it were, a convenient afterthought — of rounding off a failed quest to discern the Trinity in inter-subjective love, but a theme very close to the essence of Augustine's enterprise from *De Trinitate* 8,6,9 on.

²⁴¹) J.B. du Roy, *art. cit.*, p. 444: "Il fallait que le Christ se dérobe à leur amour encore charnel, pour n'être plus présent qu'en Esprit, présence à la fois totalement intériorisée et toute ecclésiale". This occurs in du Roy's own sketch for a Trinitarian theology in the light of Christian love.

²⁴²) *Ibid.*, p. 444: "La charité chrétienne, dont nous vivons par l'Esprit, nous fait reconnaître le Christ en nos frères. Cet Amour répandu en nos cœurs ne nous précède donc pas seulement de l'intérieur, mais il vient encore au-devant de nous dans le Christ, en Église".

²⁴³) *Ibid.*, p. 444-445, n. 116.

may be gleaned from *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 — and we hope to have demonstrated sufficiently that, in this inexhaustibly intricate matter, the evidence for a thorough-going *voie régressive* is at least open to respectful questioning — there is a whole spectrum of Augustinian texts which present Christ coming before us still in our neighbour. “Each of you expects to receive Christ seated in heaven. Turn your attention to him lying in the street; direct your attention to Christ who is hungry and suffering from the cold, Christ in need and a stranger”²⁴⁴). *De Trinitate* 8,8,12 and parallels have led some critics to suspect that Augustine is too little aware of Christ who comes to meet us in the neighbour and that, for him, commitment to the neighbour and turning to God in interiority are at least seriously at odds with each other. Along with our own strong reservations about this reading of *De Trinitate* 8,8,12, however, the frequency and force with which Augustine returns to his favourite Scriptural text, Matt. 25.40, shatters the one-sidedness of this impression and requires us to reflect more deeply still on the significance of the neighbour for his theology as a whole.

R. CANNING

²⁴⁴) *Sermo* 25,8,8 (CC 41,339. ML 38,170-171): “Expectat unusquisque vestrum suscipere Christum sedentem in caelo. Attendite illum iacentem sub porticu, attendite esurientem, attendite frigus patientem, attendite egenum, attendite peregrinum”.