

"NO ONE EVER HATED HIS OWN FLESH" EPH. 5:29 IN AUGUSTINE

I. AUGUSTINE'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE BODY IN HIS EARLIEST WRITINGS

Augustine himself admits that he discovered the world of the spirit only shortly before his conversion: "Often I noticed in the discourses of our priest (= Ambrose), and sometimes in yours, that when there was consideration of God or of the soul, which is nearest to God, there was to be no thought at all of anything corporeal"¹. He also avows that he was not able, during the period he was a Manichaean, to make a distinction between sensible and spiritual things, i.e. between the carnal and the spiritual domain, although the Manichees carefully warned him to beware of the beauty of a spouse, the pomp of riches, empty honours, and pernicious pleasures².

When we look at the evolution of his concept of God, as described in his *Confessions*, we see that he never felt doubts about the existence of God, but, at the same time, that he did not know how to think about God's nature³. There are good grounds for assuming that his concept of God developed in three phases. The first was that as an adherent of Manichaeism. At that moment he thought that the whole of creation depended on two separate principles: a good and an evil eternal principle. He considered God as imprisoned and included in the human body, and therefore here greater and elsewhere smaller⁴. In a second phase his concept of God acquired a stoic colour. He thought of God as an immense corporeal and local mass; the world is impregnated by God in a more or less pantheistic

¹ *De beata vita* 1,4. CCL 29,67: "Animadverti enim et saepe in sacerdotis nostri et aliquando in sermonibus tuis, cum de deo cogitaretur, nihil omnino corporis esse cogitandum, neque cum de anima; nam id est unum in rebus proximum deo".

² *De duabus animabus* 12. CSEL 25/1,66: "Verum esto: non poteram illo tempore sensibilia ab intellegibilibus, carnalia scilicet ab spiritualibus diiudicare atque discernere. Non erat actatis, non disciplinae, non cuiusdam etiam consuetudinis, non ullorum denique meritorum - non enim parvi gaudii felicitatisque res est". *De utilitate credendi* 1,3. CSEL 25/1,6: "Fateor enim et illos sedulo monere, ut ista caveantur".

³ *Confessiones* VI,5,7. CCL 27,78.

⁴ Ib. V,10,19. VI,3,4. Ib. 68. 76.

way. If God were not a spatial entity, even though an infinite spatiality, He would coincide with non-being⁵. A complete break-through came about by listening to the sermons of Ambrose and the reading of Neoplatonic books: his materialistic conception of God was replaced by a spiritual view of God⁶. This meant a change from God as an undetermined, cosmic power to the personal God of the Bible.

We find a similar evolution regarding his view of the human soul. Augustine's earliest letters, especially those written to Nebridius, treat almost exclusively the problem of the spirituality of the soul, and the necessity of abandoning the world of the senses⁷. He stresses in one of his earliest works that the greatness of the soul should not be thought of as a corporeal quantity. Such a quantity, mass (*moles*) or swelling (*tumor*) is by definition something belonging to the corporeal world: in that case, an elephant would possess more soul and intelligence than a human being, and a donkey would be cleverer than a bee, which is, according to Augustine, evidently not true. Therefore, we have to turn away, in as far as possible in this life, from our custom to think in corporeal terms⁸.

The discovery of the spiritual world undoubtedly meant something overwhelming for Augustine. There is no question that he reckoned himself as one of the masses of which he says: "Through the familiarity with corporeal things the masses believe easily that all things are corporeal" and "Through love of material things people are deceived, and begin to think that there is only matter (*corpus*)"⁹. Ascending from the outward things to

⁵ Ib. VII,1,1-2. VII,14,20. Ib. 92-93. 106. See also CH. BAGUETTE, *Une période stoïcienne dans l'évolution de la pensée de saint Augustin*, in: *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 16(1970), 47-77.

⁶ Ib. VII,10,16. Ib. 103-104. See O. DU ROY, *L'intelligence de la foi en la Trinité selon saint Augustin. Genèse de sa théologie trinitaire jusqu'en 391*. Paris, Etudes Augustiniennes, 1966, p. 29-37. 45-47. 53-57.

⁷ *Epist.* 1-4. 7-14. CSEL 34/1,1-11. 13-35.

⁸ *De quantitate animae* 14,24. CSEL 89,160-161: "... tumor enim non absurde adpel-latur corporis magnitudo ... Magna quaedam, mihi crede, magna, sed sine ulla mole de animo cogitanda sunt ... Quod facilius contingit his, qui ... ab omni corporum consuetudine, quantum in hac vita permittitur, semet avertunt". Ib. 16,25. Ib. 127: "sine tumore ullo localis magnitudinis ...". Concerning *δορυκος* in Porphyry, see J. PÉPIN, *Une nouvelle source de saint Augustin: le ζήτημα de Porphyre "Sur l'union de l'âme et du corps"*, in: *Ex Platonicorum persona. Etudes sur les lectures philosophiques de saint Augustin*. Amsterdam, Hakker, 1977, p. 244-245. For *tumescere* of the soul (Eccli 10,9-10), see O. DU ROY, o.c., p. 84 and in this article note 35.

⁹ *C. Academicos* III,17,38. CCL 29,58: "... turba sit praeior et consuetudine corporum omnia esse corporea facillime sed noxie credatur ...". *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* 21,38. CSEL 90,43: "Tali enim amore (sc. vanae cognitionis) plerumque decipitur, ut aut nihil putet esse, nisi corpus ...". *Epist.* 1,1. CSEL 34/1,1: "Quid enim convenientius pecori

the inward mind, and from the inward domain to superior reality, or from the earthly things to God, is a description of Augustine's own vital and mystical experience. Thus love is given the opportunity to depart from the creature by which it is bound, to divine wisdom from which all other delights derive. However, Augustine's enthusiasm about the spiritual world has beyond any doubt resulted in an underestimation of the body and the senses. The question is: To what extent? We ask this question with regard to his first books, including *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, dating from 388/389, where we find an allusion to Eph. 5:29 for the first time.

1. The relationship between soul and body

Our starting point will be the human being after the Fall¹⁰. That the human being consists of soul and body is stressed by Augustine from his earliest works on¹¹. He describes the union of soul and body as a *mix-*

est quam putari animam corpus esse?"

¹⁰ It would lead us too far to treat the difficult question of the pre-existence of soul and body (the soul in its pre-fallen state is 'invisible' and yet 'embodied'), fallen from a state of bliss; the soul's fall was that of a 'celestial' body into the 'mortal' bodies of our present experience; originally, God created Adam and Eve as part of the 'invisible creation'; they were created as embodied and as individual man and woman, as referring to their subsequent penal condition. See the last and most clear article of R.J. O'CONNELL, *The 'De Genesi contra Manichaeos' and the Origin of the Soul*, in: *Revue des Etudes Augustiniennes* 39(1993), 129-141. As presented here, this theory is plausible. See for further discussion: G. MADEC, *La condition malheureuse*, in: *Bibl. Augustinienne* 6, 3e éd., Paris 1976, p. 578-583. P. AGAËSSE-A. SOLIGNAC, *La préexistence des âmes*, in: *Bibl. August.* 48, Paris 1972, p. 714-717. G. O'DALY, *Did St. Augustine Ever Believe in the Soul's Pre-existence?*, in: *Augustinian Studies* 5(1974), 227-235. R.J. TESKE, *St. Augustine's View of the Original Human Condition in De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, in: *Augustinian Studies* 22(1991) 141-155. As appears from *C. Julianum* IV, 15, 78 and 16, 83 (PL 44, 778 and 782), Augustine knew Cicero's opinion, expressed in the book *Hortensius*, about a fall of the individual souls: "...nos ob aliqua scelera suscepta in vita superiore poenarum luendarum causa natos esse". See J. DOIGNON, *Souvenirs cicéroniens (Hortensius, Consolation) et virgiliens dans l'exposé d'Augustin sur l'état humain d' "ignorance et de difficulté"* (Aug., lib. arb. 3, 51-54), in: *Vigiliae Christianae* 47(1993), 131-139. The important idea for this article is that Augustine did not consider the body "as such" as a punishment.

¹¹ *De beata vita* 2, 7. CCL 29, 68-69: "... ex anima et corpore nos esse compositos ... cum fateamur cuncti neque sine corpore neque sine anima esse posse hominem ...". *De ordine* II, 11, 31. CCL 29, 124: "homo est animal rationale mortale". *Soliloquia* I, 12, 21. CSEL 89, 33. *De quantitate animae* 1, 2. CSEL 89, 132. *Epist.* 3, 4. CSEL 34/1, 8. *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* 4, 6. CSEL 90, 8: "Quamquam enim duo sint anima et corpus et neutrum homo vocaretur, si non esset alterum - nam neque corpus homo esset, si anima non esset nec rursus anima homo, si ea corpus non animaretur - fieri tamen potest ut unum horum et habeatur homo et vocetur". *De div. quaestionibus* 83, q. 7. CCL 44/A, 15:

tura so that the soul is able to experience bodily pleasure¹², or as a *contemperatio* (the adaptation of one thing to another, to be distinguished from *temperatio* as balance)¹³. I think J. Pépin is right in considering Augustine's view on the union of soul and body in the line of Porphyry: it is neither a unity, nor a juxtaposition, nor a strict mixture, but rather a union or mixture in which the substantial difference of soul and body is maintained¹⁴. How intimate this union is follows from the fact that a human being without body is unthinkable, and that without a body it ceases simply to be a human being¹⁵. Strictly speaking, neither the soul alone nor the body alone can be called a human being. But the soul is, as the seat of

"Anima aliquando ita dicitur, ut cum mente intellegatur, velut cum dicimus hominem ex anima et corpore constare". See G. O'DALY, *Augustine's Philosophy of Mind*. Berkeley-Los Angeles, Univ. of California Press, 1987, p. 54-57. See J. PÉPIN, o.c., p. 230-231.

¹² *De ordine* II,11,34. CCL 29,126: "... anima eo ipso, quod mixta est corpori, percipit voluptatem". *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* II,7,9. PL 34,201: "... si ergo, ut dixi, hominem hoc loco ex corpore et anima factum intelligamus, non absurde ipsa commixtione limi nomen accepit. Sicut enim aqua terram colligit, et conglutinat, et continet, quando ejus commixtione limus ejus efficitur; sic anima corporis materiam vivificando in unitatem concordem conformat, et non permittit labi et resolvi".

¹³ *De quantitate animae* 30,59. CSEL 89,206: "... corpus ... propter quandam cum anima contemperationem ...". The French and the German translation render *contemperatio* as "a happy union", which is a bit too optimistic. This terminology is preserved in Augustine's later works: cf. *De Trinitate* XI,2,2-3. CCL 50,335-336: "... anima tamen commixta corpori per instrumentum sentit corporeum et idem instrumentum sensus vocatur ... ex corpore sentientis animantis cui anima suo quodam miro modo contemperatur ...". For *contemperatio* see R.J. O'CONNELL, *St. Augustine's Early Theory of Man, A.D. 386-391*. Cambridge Mass., Harvard University Press, 1968, p. 140-142 and G. MADEC, *Une lecture de Confessions VII,IX,13-XXI,27. Notes critiques à propos d'une thèse de R.J. O'Connell*, in: *Revue des Etudes Augustiniennes* 16(1970),79-137, esp. p. 121. However, the soul is not the balance or harmony of the body, for then it would be a part of the body: *De immortalitate animae* 10,17. CSEL 89,118: "Quod si temperatio corporis esset animus, non utique id posset accidere (sc. removere intentionem mentis a corporis sensibus)". See J. PÉPIN, o.c., p. 243.

¹⁴ J. PÉPIN, o.c., p. 252-254. About this *unio inconfusa* see also: E.L. FORTIN, *Christianisme et culture philosophique au cinquième siècle. La querelle de l'âme humaine en Occident*. Paris, Et. Augustiniennes, 1959, p. 111-125. 155-159. L. HÖLSCHER, *The Reality of the Mind. Augustine's Philosophical Arguments for the Human Soul as a Spiritual Substance*. London-New York, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986, p. 182-212. E. DINKLER, *Die Anthropologie Augustins*. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1934, p. 202 translates wrongly the text of *De immortalitate animae* 2,2: "... corpus nostrum nonnulla substantia est et melius est esse substantiam quam nihil" by saying: "Da er dem Leib jedoch in jener neuplatonischen Periode kein bonum esse zugestehen kann, so spricht er ihm einfach die Substantialität ab". *Nonnulla*, however, does not mean "no", but "a certain substantiality" in a positive sense.

¹⁵ *Contra Academicos* III,9,20. CCL 29,46: "... animus tuus ea (sc. sapientia) post hanc vitam, id est cum homo esse desieris, facile perfruetur ...".

reason, better and higher than the body¹⁶. This standpoint has far reaching consequences, which we can summarize in the following points:

a) The soul has to govern the body with all its limbs, and the body has to be submitted to the soul. Augustine refers in this context to the Platonic image of the charioteer to describe the soul controlling the body. This is the order willed by God¹⁷. The lordly authority of the soul does not apply only to the body, but also to the lower irrational soul as principle of life; the latter also should be subject to the rational soul¹⁸. Anyone who lives according to the most spiritual, even divine, part of the soul is happy. But Augustine rejects from the beginning the Manichaean thesis of the divinity of the soul; the soul is not a part of God¹⁹. Consequently, Augustine defines the activity of the soul with regard to the body as *uti*: the human being is a rational soul that uses the body²⁰.

b) Augustine describes the striving or longing (*appetitus*) of the soul for the body from four angles:

- in order to possess the body;

¹⁶ *Soliloquia* I,12,21. CSEL 89,33: "... quarum prior (sc. animus) melior, deterius corpus est". *De immortalitate animae* 2,2. CSEL 89,102: "Melior autem ratio nostra quam corpus nostrum".

¹⁷ *De quantitate animae* 13,22. 14,23. 36,80. 36,81. CSEL 89,158. 159. 229. 230. See J.K. COYLE, *Augustine's "De moribus ecclesiae catholicae". A Study of the Work, its Composition and its Sources*. Fribourg Sw., University Press, 1978, p. 317-319.

¹⁸ *De immortalitate animae* 16,25. CSEL 89,127: "Hoc et de irrationali anima vel vita, quod nec in eam rationalis anima convertitur, dici potest. Et ipsa enim, nisi inferiore ordine rationali subiceretur, aequaeumeret speciem et talis esset".

¹⁹ *C. Academicos* I,2,5. CCL 29,6: "Quis, inquam, dubitaverit nihil esse aliud hominis optimum quam eam partem animi, cui dominantem optemperare convenit cetera quaeque in homine sunt? Haec autem, ne aliam postules definitionem, mens aut ratio dici potest". Ib. I,1,1. Ib. 3, Augustine even declares: "... divinum animum mortalibus inhaerentem ...". In *Retractationes* I,1,2. CCL 57,8 he remarks, however, that the mind or the reason are indeed the highest in human being, but that one should not live according to reason in order to be happy, but according to God. I agree with J.J. O'MEARA, *St. Augustine against the Academics* (A.C.W. 12). Westminster (Maryl.), Newman Press, 1950, p. 170: "The epithet 'divine' used with 'spirit' is not employed in its strict sense", because this would be in contradiction with his refusal of the Manichaean position. Augustine stresses the distinction of the substance of the soul and the substance of God: *De ordine* II,11,31. II,17,46. CCL 29,124. 132. *De quantitate animae* 34,77. CSEL 89,225. *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 26,40. PL 34,217. See J. PÉPIN, a.c., p. 233-236.

²⁰ *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* 27,52. CSEL 90,45: "Homo igitur, ut homini apparet, anima rationalis est mortali atque terreno utens corpore". *De immortalitate animae* 14,23. CSEL 89,125: "... tali conmutatione corporis, qualis somnus est, usum eiusdem corporis animae, non vitam propriam, posse minui". The same applies to the senses: *De ordine* II,2,6. CCL 29,109: "... non solum ex corpore et anima, sed etiam ex anima tota constare sapientem, si quidem partem istam, qua utitur sensibus, animae esse negare dementis est"; cf. ib. II,3,10. ib. 113. *Soliloquia* I,7,14. CSEL 89,22.

- in order to give life to the body;
- in order to give it its form somehow;
- in order to help the body in every possible way²¹.

The endeavour of the mind is to act, to know, to sense and to live. The mind is a kind of life²². Because it is giving life to the body, it is its highest good²³. Almost the same scheme recurs in *De quantitate animae* when Augustine speaks of the first three degrees of the soul in its relationship with the body: *de corpore, per corpus, circa corpus*:

- the soul enlivens the body, it brings it together into a unity, and preserves its unity;
- the soul experiences and distinguishes everything through the five senses; it approves and desires what suits the nature of its body (even procreation), and shuns and rejects what is unsuited.
- the soul improves life on earth in a creative way through culture, art and science.

To these three one can add also the fourth degree, insofar as the soul dares to rank itself not only before its own body, but even before the whole corporeal or material universe²⁴.

c) It is striking how often Augustine in his first writings speaks about death. A wise person fears neither death nor pain, but it would be stupid not to avoid them if he or she is able to do so²⁵. In order to achieve that the soul adheres totally to the truth, one should yearn for death as the greatest boon, for death, which was initially an object of fear, means the sheer flight (*fuga*) and escape (*elapsio*) from this body²⁶. Also the man Jesus teaches this²⁷. Augustine praises his mother Monnica because she no longer fears death, and he considers this as the highest form of philosophy²⁸. Leaving the body means an easier or more difficult

²¹ *De immortalitate animae* 13,20. CSEL 89,122.

²² Ib. 9,16. ib. 117: "Est autem animus vita quaedam ...".

²³ *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* 5,7. CSEL 90,10.

²⁴ *De quantitate animae* 33,70-73. 35,79. CSEL 89,217-222. 228.

²⁵ *De beata vita* 4,25. CCL 29,79.

²⁶ *De quantitate animae* 33,76. CSEL 89,225: "Tanta autem in contemplanda veritate voluptas est ... ut neque quicquam praeterea scisse se aliquando aliquis putet, cum sibi scire videbatur, et quo minus impediatur anima toti tota inhaerere veritati, mors, quae antea metuebatur, id est ab hoc corpore omnimoda fuga et elapsio, pro summo munere desideretur". In the same passage the resurrection of the flesh is explicitly mentioned.

²⁷ *De div. quaestionibus* 83, q. 25. CCL 44/A,31: "Pertinet autem ad vitam rectam, ea quae non sunt metuenda non metuere. Mors autem metuenda non est".

²⁸ *De ordine* I,11,32-II,1,1. CCL 29,105-106.

liberation according to the degree one has lived more or less virtuously²⁹. But in spite of the fact that Augustine sees the absence of fear of death as an ideal³⁰, he is conscious of not yet having realized it³¹. He wishes to remain alive, not for the sake of life itself, but he fears death because he has not yet attained wisdom³². He fears especially the loss of three objects: a) the persons he loves; b) his health and, consequently, he is scared of grief and pain; c) his life in this body and, therefore, he dreads dying³³.

2. Negative valuation of the body and senses

According to Plotinus, we should transcend the sensible world, otherwise we will not reach the deepest meaning of human existence. However, the senses are necessary, but not sufficient³⁴. The body and the sensory world are intimately connected in Augustine's earliest works, and, as it seems, in a more negative way than in Plotinus. Everything that is sensory is corporeal, and everything with which the senses come into contact is sensory. If one wishes to know oneself thoroughly, one must obtain the habit of withdrawing oneself from the senses, for these plunge the human being in the fragmented and dispersed domain of the sensory world³⁵. For this reason, one should look down with disdain upon human

²⁹ Ib. II,9,26. ib.122: "... tamen inconcusse credo, mox ut hoc corpus reliquerint, eos, quo bene magis minusve vixerunt, eo facilius aut difficilior liberari". *Epist.* 10,2. CSEL 34/1,23.

³⁰ *De quantitate animae* 33,73. 33,76. CSEL 89,221-222. 225. And within the context of the resurrection of the body: *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* 22,40. CSEL 90,46: "... his cognitio mortem non modo contemnet, verum etiam desiderabit". See J.K. COYLE, o.c., p. 366-368.

³¹ *Soliloquia* II,13,23. CSEL 89,78: "O multum beatos, quibus, sive ab ipsis sive abs quolibet, non esse metuendam mortem, etiamsi anima intereat, persuasum est! At mihi misero nullae adhuc rationes, nulli libri persuadere potuerunt. R. Noli gemere, immortalis est animus humanus".

³² Ib. I,12,20. ib. 32: "R. Non igitur et vitam istam propter seipsam, sed propter sapientiam vis manere. A. Sic est".

³³ Ib. I,9,16. ib. 25.

³⁴ See M.R. MILES, *Augustine on the Body*. Missoula Montana, Scholars Press, 1979, p. 9-22.

³⁵ *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* 12,20. CSEL 90,24: "... animum atque mentem creaturam esse. Alia ergo creatura corpus est ... alia creatura est omne sensibile". cf. ib. 20,37. ib. 41: the *illecebrae corporis* are related to the *sensibilia*. *De ordine* I,1,3-2,3. CCL 29,90: "Qui tamen ut se noscat, magna opus habet consuetudine recedendi a sensibus et animum in se ipsum colligendi atque in se ipso retinendi ... idcircoque illam (sc. pulchritudinem) videre non licet animae, quae in multa procedit sectaturque aviditate paupe-

affairs. The word *despicere*, however, has here a special meaning. The matter is not to be shocked by questions beyond our capacity, such as: why a human being wants to have children and does not have them, while another is worried over the excessive fecundity of his wife; why he who is ready to bestow gifts lavishly is in need of money, while the mean and miserly usurer carefully watches over his hidden treasure; why extravagance spends and wastes an ample inheritance, while the tearful beggar hardly gets a coin; why undeserved honour exalts somebody, and a blameless life passes unobserved in the crowd. Such questions lead easily to the loss of belief in divine providence³⁶. The Christian mysteries command that a person who wishes to be in the likeness of God and to find there the salvation of his soul, must renounce the world (cf. Luke 14:33)³⁷ and despise all that is corporeal. Faith alone can purge us from desire of mortal things³⁸. In the expressions "to leave behind the delights of the body", "to withdraw oneself from the corporeal senses", "the more the soul transcends the body, the more it is wiser" or "we should crucify the lusts and evil desires which tear the mind apart and dissipate it" (referring to Gal. 5:24 "Those who belong to Jesus Christ have crucified their flesh with its

riem, quam nescit sola segregatione multitudinis posse vitari. Multitudinem autem non hominum dico sed omnium, quae sensus attingit". *De div. quaestionibus* 83, q. 9. CCL 44/A,17: "... non est constitutum iudicium veritatis in sensibus. Quamobrem saluberrime admonemur averti ab hoc mundo, qui profecto corporeus est et sensibilis, et ad deum converti". In his *Retract.* I,3,2. CCL 57,12 Augustine remarks that he had better said "the senses of the body" in stead of *sensus* without further specification (probably because he accepts a bit later also a *sensus interior*: see G. O'DALY, o.c., p.102-105). cf. *De quantitate animae* 19,33. CSEL 89,173: "... anima ... quia neglecta mente defluxit in sensus, nihil aliud quam tumuisse ... iudicanda est". See also J. DOIGNON, *État des questions relatives aux premiers Dialogues de saint Augustin*, in: *Internationales Symposium über den Stand der Augustinus-Forschung*. Hrsg. von C. MAYER u. K.H. CHELIUS. Würzburg, Augustinus-Verlag, 1989, p. 62-63. 68-70. 72.

³⁶ *De ordine* II,5,14-15. CCL 29,115: "... unde iam, dum ipsis humanis rebus teneatur, sic eas despiciat cunctaque discernat, ut nullo modo eum moveat, cur alius optet liberos habere nec habeat, alius uxoris nimia fecunditate torqueatur ...".

³⁷ *De quantitate animae* 3,4. CSEL 89,135: "Ideoque bene praecipitur etiam in mysteriis, ut omnia corporea contemnat universoque huic mundo renuntiet - qui, ut videmus, corporeus est - quisquis se talem reddi desiderat, qualis a deo factus est, id est similem deo; non enim alia salus animae est aut renovatio aut reconciliatio auctori suo". *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* I,17,28. PL 34,187: "... propter intellectum ... quamvis etiam corpus nostrum sic fabricatum sit, ut indicet nos meliores esse quam bestias, et propterea Deo similes".

³⁸ *Soliloquia* I,6,12. CSEL 89,20.

perturbations and lusts")³⁹, we should take into account a strong moral component. However, I do not at all deny, that Augustine, in his earlier writings, displays an exaggerated optimism regarding the role of reason and wisdom reserved to an elite. We see that this optimism decreases more and more in Augustine's later works. But even at the moment of writing his first works, he avows that a human being is not able to transcend the body totally: "The human soul, by means of reason and knowledge, withdraws itself *as far as it can* from the body and gladly enjoys the delights of the interior life. The more it stoops to the senses, the greater its similarity to the animal... The soul should not pour itself out in the senses *beyond the measure of necessity*, but rather should collect itself from the senses and become a child of God again, that is, become a new human being after having put off the old" (cf. Eph. 4:22-24)⁴⁰. In this period, Augustine has clearly a predilection for the Neoplatonic terminology "escape-flight" (*fuga*). We should flee from the lusts and the perishable things, from the mortal goods to the immortal⁴¹. We must flee entirely

³⁹ C. *Academicos* III,9,19. CCL 29,46: "... relictis saltem voluptatibus corporis ...". *De immortalitate animae* 10,17. CSEL 89,119: "... animus, cum se avertit a corpore ..." in order to attain true knowledge. *De moribus Manichaeorum* 17,55. CSEL 90,138: "Animam autem hominis, quanto sapientior corpore excesserit, tanto utilius excedere veritas docet ...". *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* I,20,31. PL 34,188: "... conscindunt et dissipant animum ... perturbationes, et libidines, et concupiscentiae malae. De quibus jam nobis praecipitur, ut eas cum quanto possumus labore crucifigamus in nobis, donec absorbeatur mors in victoriam (1 Cor. 15,54)". *De ordine* I,11,32. CCL 29,106: "Esse autem alium mundum ab istis oculis remotissimum, quem paucorum sanorum intellectus intuetur, satis ipse Christus significat, qui non dicit 'Regnum meum non est de mundo', sed: *Regnum meum non est de hoc mundo* (Joh. 18:36)". See the correction in *Retract.* I,3,2. CCL 57, 12-13: the Platonic intelligible world is not identical with the Reign of Christ (Mt. 6:10).

⁴⁰ *De quantitate animae* 28,54-55. CSEL 89,200-201: "Humana vero anima ... suspendit se a corpore, quantum potest, et ea quae intus est, libentius fruitur voluptate; quantoque in sensus declinat magis, tanto similiorem hominem pecori facit ... Quamobrem ... libenter tamen in eo sermone demoror, quo admonetur anima, ne se ultra quam necessitas cogit, refundat in sensus, sed ab his potius ad seipsam conligat et repuerescat deo; quod est novum hominem fieri vetere exuto".

⁴¹ *De ordine* II,16,44: "... vel adhuc servus cupiditatum et inhians rebus pereuntibus vel iam ista fugiens casteque vivens ...". II,19,50: "... a deteriore ad melius, a mortali ad immortale fugiendum est". II,11,31: "... admonendus erat homo, et quo sibi redeundem esset et unde fugiendum". CCL 29,131. 134. 124. But this is also the teaching of the Bible: *De libero arbitrio* I,15,32. CCL 29,233: "Iubet igitur aeterna lex avertere amorem a temporalibus et eum mundatum ad aeterna convertere ...", although the material things as such are good (ib. 33. ib. 234). *Epist.* 2. CSEL 34/1,3: "Horum itaque amorem perniciosissimum...vera et divina philosophia monet frenare atque sopire, ut se toto animus, etiam dum hoc corpus agit, in ea, quae semper eiusdem modi sunt ... feratur atque aestuet". *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* 21,39. CSEL 90,44: "Huic ergo auctoritati novi testamenti, qua iubemur nihil huius mundi diligere (1 Joh. 2,15), illa maxime sententia qua dictum est

from things of sense for they are like glue on the wings and keep us shut up in the cage (*cavea*) of sensible things⁴². Whereas Augustine uses here the term "cage", elsewhere he speaks of the body as "a very heavy chain" (*gravissimum vinculum*)" because of "the old sin", by which he certainly means original sin⁴³. Neither the body nor sense perception are sufficient to know God, although human reason is not even able to know all the corporeal or sensible things⁴⁴.

With regard to marital love we find, on the one hand, the very negative statement that there is nothing which demeans a man's mind more than bodily contact between man and woman⁴⁵, an idea widely spread in many ancient philosophical circles, and, on the other hand, protests raised against the Manichaeans' disdain for marriage. Augustine blames them for considering sexual intercourse as the filthiest thing, because flesh is formed out of this, and flesh displeases the Manichaeans because it is formed from the union of father and mother, by which souls are bound up in the flesh⁴⁶. But Augustine argues that Paul in 1 Cor. 7:1-7 has explicit-

Nolite conformari huic mundo (Rom. 12,2) ... multa inveniuntur pernecessaria iis qui hunc mundum fugere et refugere in Deum desiderant". See J.K. COYLE, o.c., p. 365-366. O. DU ROY, o.c., p. 132-133.

⁴² *Soliloquia* I,14,24. CSEL 89,37: "Penitus esse ista sensibilia fugienda cavendumque magnopere, dum hoc corpus agimus, ne quo eorum visco pennae nostrae impediuntur ... ut ad illum lucem ab his tenebris evolemus, quae se ne ostendere quidem dignatur in hac cavea inclusis ...". In *Retract.* I,4,3. CCL 57,15, Augustine admits that he should have avoided these words because they give the impression that he held the opinion of Porphyry: "Omne corpus esse fugiendum". He justifies himself by declaring that he did not say "all" sensible things but "these" sensible things, meaning corruptible things. *Contra Academicos* II,3,7. CCL 29,21: "... illa (sc. philosophia) visco libidinis detracta caelo suo et inclusa cavea populari ...". See P. COURCELLE; Flügel, in: *Lexikon f. Antike u. Christentum* VIII (1969), 29-65, esp. 56-60. See for *cavea* and *viscum* id., *Connais-toi toi-même de Socrate à Saint Bernard*. Paris, Etudes Augustiniennes, 1975, II, p. 331-342. 381-392. III, 606-615. Courcelle shows also the continuity of this theme in Augustine's later works. J.K. COYLE, o.c., 376-379.

⁴³ *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* 22,40. CSEL 90,45: "Sed inter omnia quae in hac vita possidentur, corpus homini gravissimum est vinculum ... propter antiquum peccatum ...". The text continues with the theme of resurrection. See J.K. COYLE, o.c., 368-370.

⁴⁴ *Soliloquia* I,3,8. II,4,6. CSEL 89,14. 53. *De immortalitate animae* 1,1. CSEL 89,102.

⁴⁵ *Ib.* I,10,17. *ib.* 27: "... nihil mihi tam fugiendum quam concubitus esse decrevi. Nihil esse sentio, quod magis ex arce deiciat animum virilem, quam blandimenta feminea corporumque ille contactus, sine quo uxor haberi non potest".

⁴⁶ *De moribus Manichaeorum* 15,37. CSEL 90,122: "... quiddam sordidissimum remanet, unde per concubitus caro formetur". *Ib.* 16,49. *ib.* 132: "Nam si vobis propterea displiceret caro, quae patris atque matris commixtione formatur ...". *Ib.* 18,65. *ib.* 146: "Nonne vos estis qui filios gignere, eo quod animae ligentur in carne, gravius putatis esse peccatum, quam ipsum concubitus?". Cf. *De Genesi c. Manichaeos* 26,38. PL 34,217.

ly permitted the begetting of children⁴⁷.

3. Positive approach of the body and the senses

God created the world out of nothing and made it most beautiful. All things came not only into existence, but also in such a way that they cannot be better⁴⁸. Not one single being is evil in itself, for all things made by God are good: bodily strength, sight, hearing, persuasive speech, fecundity, native soil, freedom and life⁴⁹. The more a body is impressive and beautiful, the more it is a body (= the more it participates in being)⁵⁰. The body must be healthy; it is necessary not to be blind or deaf in order to be able to live among human beings, but even being deaf or blind, one can acquire wisdom⁵¹. Therefore, it is a duty to care for the body, although Augustine himself leaves the health of his mortal body in the hands of God, because he does not know how long to stay alive in this body will be useful to him, or to those whom he loves (cf. Phil. 1:21-25)⁵². In this context he quotes Rom. 13:14: "Do not care for the flesh (*carnis curam*) by lusts"⁵³. The better the soul governs the body, the better the body will feel. Thus, the good of the body is integrated into the good of the soul. This principle governs Augustine's view of asceticism

⁴⁷ *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* 35,78. CSEL 90,83-85.

⁴⁸ *Soliloquia* I,1,2. CSEL 89,4: "Deus, qui de nihilo mundum istum creasti, quem omnium oculi sentiunt pulcherrimum". *De quantitate animae* 33,73. CCL 89,222: "... qua etiam factum est, ut non modo sint omnia, sed ita sint, ut omnino melius esse non possint". Ib. 35,76. ib. 224: "... ista omnia deo auctore creata ... per se autem considerata mira atque pulchra". The idea that God created the best possible world, is also stressed by Plotinus: see E.P. MEIJERING, *God Cosmos History. Christian and Neo-Platonic Views on Divine Revelation*, in: *God Being History*. Amsterdam-New York, North-Holland Publ.-American Elsevier Publ., 1975, p. 250-254. For a discussion about Plato's view, see A. EHRHARDT, *The Beginning. A Study in the Greek Philosophical Approach to the Concept of Creation from Anaximander to St John*. Manchester, University Press, 1968, p. 98-108.

⁴⁹ *De moribus Manichaeorum* 2,2. 4,6. 9,15. CSEL 90,89. 92. 101.

⁵⁰ *De immortalitate animae* 8,13. CSEL 89,114.

⁵¹ *C. Academicos* III,2,3. CCL 29,36: "... quamvis putetur indigere quibusdam rebus ad corporis valetudinem pertinentibus, illud tamen constat, non his opus esse, ut sapiens sit, sed ut inter homines vivat".

⁵² Ib. III,7,15. CCL 29,43: "... ne concitatus rapiar animo, quam cura corporis poscit". *Soliloquia* I,1,6. CSEL 89,10-11: "Ceterum de salute huius mortalis corporis mei, quamdiu nescio, quid mihi ex illo utile sit vel eis, quos diligo, tibi illud committo, pater sapientissime ...".

⁵³ *De moribus Manichaeorum* 14,31. CSEL 90,114-115.

from his early statements on⁵⁴. In this period, Augustine expresses the value of the body in the following way: "The body is a kind of image of the truth"⁵⁵.

He affirms also the value of the senses by saying that in them vestiges of the human reason are found⁵⁶. Moreover, the senses have the important task of inviting us to grasp the higher and deeper ground of the things we perceive⁵⁷. They function as a ship or as an *admonitio veritatis* for our intellect⁵⁸.

4. Christian aspects in Augustine's view of the body

Although, according to the *Confessions* (IX,4,7), Alypius considered unfitting to mention the name of Christ in the (philosophical!) Dialogues, there are references to the Mystery of the Incarnation in Augustine's earliest works. He describes the Incarnation as follows: "For that philosophy is not of this world which our sacred mysteries most justly detest, but of the other intelligible world. To which intelligible world the most subtle reasoning would never recall souls blinded by the manifold darkness of error and stained deeply by the slime of body, had not the most high God, because of a certain compassion for the masses, bent and submitted the authority of the divine intellect even to the human body itself. By the precepts as well as deeds of that intellect souls have been awakened, and were able, without the strife of disputation, to return to themselves and to become conscious again of (or: to regret - *resipiscere*)

⁵⁴ *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* 5,7-8. CSEL 90,9-11: "Corporis autem si quaerimus quid optimum sit, id certa ratio cogit fateri, per quod fit ut sese corpus quam optime habeat ... Quod si est consequens sicuti est, ut ipsum corpus cum ab anima regitur, quae virtutis compos est, multo et melius regatur et honestius eoque optime sese habeat quo est optima illa ... id erit hominis optimum quod animam optimam facit, etiamsi hominem corpus vocemus". This idea occurs also in later texts: *De disciplina christiana* 4,4. CCL 46,211: "Si animam odit, carnem quomodo diligit?". *Sermo* 128,3,5. PL 38,715: "Si autem odisti animam tuam, quid tibi prodest quia diligis carnem tuam?". *Sermo Lambot* 2, in: *Rev. Bénéd.* 46(1934) p. 405: "Corpora pulchra et carnem diligis, deus creavit ... Sic diligere ut illum (sc. deum) plus diligas".

⁵⁵ *Soliloquia* II,18,32. CSEL 89,90: "... corpus ... quasi quaedam imago veritatis".

⁵⁶ *De ordine* II,11,32 ss. CCL 29,125 ss.

⁵⁷ *Ib.* I,8,26. *ib.* 101: "... quid rursum, quod ipsorum sensuum invitatione caperetur".

⁵⁸ *Soliloquia* I,4,9. CSEL 89,16: "Immo sensus in hoc negotio quasi navim sum expertus". *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* II,20,30. PL 34,211: "Et quoniam necessitate jam per hos oculos et per has aures de ipsa veritate admonemur ...".

their fatherland"⁵⁹. In his clemency God has for our sake deigned to take up a body of our kind and to dwell in it⁶⁰. The divine authority not only exceeds human power in its sensible signs, but also, as human being, it shows to what extent it has debased itself. It is fitting that by deeds it teaches its power, by humility its clemency, and by commandment its nature. All this is delivered to us by the initiation-sacraments⁶¹. The Lord deigned to assume "the cloud of our flesh", and poured out most abundantly "the torrent of the holy Gospel". The word "cloud" has here no negative meaning for it functions as a symbol of divine fecundity, corresponding to the water springing up unto eternal life (John 4:14)⁶². The coming of Christ in this world (John 16:28) means that Christ appeared to human beings in a human being when the Word became flesh (John 1:14). The Incarnation, however, did not involve a change in the nature of God, but the assumption of the nature of an inferior, that is, a human person. The

⁵⁹ *Contra Academicos* III,19,42. CCL 29,60. Regarding the authority of Christ which is stronger than that of the Platonici: ib. III,20,43. ib. 61. O. DU ROY, o.c., p. 162-163 holds that it is the Holy Spirit who brings us back to the highest God through the Intellect, his Son. Augustine does not yet link the Incarnation with the mission of the Holy Spirit. Admonition is here the task of the Holy Spirit, whereas later it becomes the task of the divine Wisdom. I prefer, however, the christological interpretation of D. DOUCET, *Recherche de Dieu, Incarnation et philosophie: Sol. I,1,2-6*, in: *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 36(1990), 91-119. See also G. REMY, *Le Christ médiateur dans l'oeuvre de saint Augustin*. Paris, Librairie H. Champion, 1979, p. 16: "Cette 'admonitio' ne signifierait-elle pas plus simplement une incitation ou une motion intérieures (dont l'Esprit n'est pas exclu), suffisantes pour les 'spirituels', par opposition au 'doctor', c'est-à-dire au pédagogue (et non pas à l'Intellect incarné) dont les charnels ont besoin?"

⁶⁰ *De ordine* II,5,16. CCL 29,116: "Quantum autem illud sit, quod hoc etiam nostri generis corpus, tantus propter nos deus adsumere atque agere dignatus est, quanto videtur vilius, tanto est clementia plenius et a quadam ingeniosorum superbia longe lateque remotius".

⁶¹ Ib. II,9,27. ib. 122: "Illa ergo auctoritas divina dicenda est, quae non solum in sensibilibus signis transcendit omnem humanam facultatem sed et ipsum hominem agens ostendit ei, quo usque se propter ipsum depresserit ... Doceat enim oportet et factis potestatem suam et humilitate clementiam et praeceptione naturam, quae omnia sacris, quibus initiamur, secretius firmitusque traduntur". Cf. ib. I,10,29. ib. 103. Also in the first part of *De div. quaestionibus* 83, whose dates are uncertain, but may be contemporary to some of the texts quoted here, the Incarnation is presented as a way to the spiritual world and as an example of how to live rightly: q. 11: "Sapientia ergo et virtus dei, qui dicitur unigenitus filius, homine suscepto liberationem hominis indicavit"; q. 25: "Sapientia dei hominem ad exemplum quo recte viveremus suscepit"; q. 36,2; q. 43; q. 44. CCL 44/A,18; 31; 56; 64; 65.

⁶² *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* II,5,6. PL 34,199: "Nam propter illam Dominus noster nubilum carnis dignatus assumere, imbrem sancti Evangelii largissimum infudit, promittens etiam quod si quis biberit de aqua ejus, rediet ad illum intimum fontem, ut forinsecus non quaerat pluviam".

self-emptying of Christ (Phil. 2:7) and his union with the Church as two in one flesh (cf. Gen. 2:24) are based upon the Incarnation. The Church is formed from out of Christ's pierced side on the Cross, that is, through the faith in his passion (= the eucharist) and in baptism⁶³. Augustine despises those who ridicule the assumption of the human being by the almighty, eternal, changeless Son of God, his birth of the Virgin, and the other marvels of this story. They are compared to boys who, since they see a painter painting from other drawings which he placed before him, think that a human person cannot be painted unless the painter see another picture⁶⁴. He calls Christ the physician and liberator⁶⁵.

Faith in the resurrection is also present in Augustine's earliest works. In the vision of God, after this life, faith and hope will no longer be there; only love will never come to an end (cf. 1 Cor. 13:8. 13). Although in this text of the *Soliloquia* the resurrection of the body is not explicitly mentioned, it might be presupposed, because Augustine adds that

⁶³ Ib. II,24,37. ib. 215-216: "... *Verbum caro factum est* ... Quod ipsum non commutationem naturae Dei significat, sed susceptionem naturae inferioris personae, id est humanae. Ad hoc valet etiam quod dicitur *Semetipsum exinanivit* ... Ergo et ipse soporatus est dormitione passionis, ut ei conjux Ecclesia formaretur ... Formata est ergo ei conjux Ecclesia de latere ejus, id est de fide passionis et baptismi. Nam percussus latus ejus lancea, sanguinem et aquam profudit (Joh. 19:34)". The cross is also mentioned ib. II,22,34. PL 34,214: "Manus autem porrectio bene significat crucem, per quam vita aeterna recuperatur".

⁶⁴ *De quantitate animae* 33,76. CSEL 89,225: "Iamvero eos, qui ad exemplum salutis nostrae ac primitias a filio dei potentissimo, aeterno, incommutabili susceptum hominem eundemque natum esse de virgine ceteraque huius historiae miracula inrident, sic contemnunt tamquam eos pueros, qui, cum pictorem propositis tabulis, quas intueatur, pingentem viderint, non putent posse hominem pingi, nisi aliam picturam, qui pingit, aspexerit". The meaning of these last words about painting is not an easy one. The following interpretation seems to me the most plausible: in line with *De ordine* II,5,16. CCL 29,116 "non contemnere illa mysteria", Augustine states that the human life of the incarnate Son of God does not detract from his immutable divinity, and not should be despised as if it would destroy the original image. I know only one parallel: *De Trinitate* II,1,3. CCL 50,83 where Augustine explains the text "Neque enim potest filius a se facere quidquam nisi quod viderit patrem facientem" (Joh. 5:19). This means that the Son's power to work is given to Him by the Father, but not that the acts of the Son in the flesh, mentioned in the Gospel, are as such to be attributed to the Father: "Neque enim alia similiter, sicut pictor alias tabulas pingit quemadmodum alias ab alio pictas vidit". *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* 7,12. CSEL 90,14-15: "... non deseruerimus viam quam nobis deus et patriarcharum segregatione et legis vinculo et prophetarum praesagio et suscepti hominis sacramento et apostolorum testimonio et martyrum sanguine et gentium occupatione munivit". J.K. COYLE, o.c., p. 326-328 stresses the anti-manichaeic character of this text, but also the focal point of the Incarnation in salvation history.

⁶⁵ *De moribus Manichaeorum* 11,22. CSEL 90,108. God also is called *liberator*: *De quantitate animae* 34,78. CSEL 89,227.

all bodily troubles and burdens will cease after death⁶⁶. The first explicit mention of the resurrection of the body is found in *De quantitate animae*. When this corporeal nature observes the laws of God, we see so great changes and vicissitudes in it that we hold even the resurrection of the flesh to be as certain as the rising of the sun after it has set. Augustine refers here to the Son of God as *exemplum salutis nostrae ac primitiae*, in which I see a reference to Christ as *primitiae* of the resurrected ones in Paul (1 Cor. 15:20 and 23). But is this not in flagrant contradiction with the Neoplatonic statement *ab hoc corpore omnimoda fuga et elapsio* in the same text?⁶⁷ The body is like a bond or chain that does not wish to be taken away and destroyed, and it vexes the soul by fear of death. The soul loves this bond by force of habit, and it does not realize that the resurrection and transformation of the body will put the latter under its control, without burdening it and by the power and decree of God, if the soul uses

⁶⁶ *Soliloquia* I,7,14. CSEL 89,23: "... sperandum est ei (sc. animae) post mortem omnia ista incommoda (sc. corporis) non futura ... Sed cum post hanc vitam tota se in Deum conlegerit, caritas restat, qua ibi teneatur". Concerning the theme that only love remains in eternity, see ib. I,6,12-13. ib. 20-22. This idea occurs frequently in Augustine's later works; see my article: *Il primato dell'amore in Agostino*, in: *Ripensare Agostino: Interiorità e intenzionalità* (Atti del IV Sem. internaz. del Centro di Studi Agostiniani di Perugia). Roma, "Augustinianum", 1993, p. 87-98.

⁶⁷ *De quantitate animae* 33,76. CSEL 89,224-225: "Videbimus etiam naturae huius corporeae tantas commutationes et vicissitudines, dum divinis legibus servit, ut ipsam etiam resurrectionem carnis, quae partim tardius, partim omnino non creditur, ita certam teneamus, ut certius nobis non sit solem, cum occiderit, oriturum". M.R. MILES, o. c., p. 108: "His thought is ambiguous, if not contradictory". J.K. COYLE, o. c., p. 372 referring to *De quantitate animae* 33,76, contends that Augustine "explicitly says that he does not understand it". But Augustine does not say this explicitly; he affirms only his absolute certainty regarding his belief in the resurrection of the body. COYLE hardens here the standpoint of R.J. O'CONNELL, o. c., p. 204: "The Dialogues of Cassiciacum regularly refer to death as the moment when the soul is liberated from the toils of the body. The *De Quantitate Animae* still refers to it as the soul's 'complete escape and acquittal from this body' ... Little wonder, then, that the same paragraph shows Augustine boggling at the first mention of the body's resurrection ... yet he cannot offer a shred of 'understanding' of it. A study of Augustine's resurrection theory ... would be far more sharply focused if it started from the difficulties that belief presented to his Plotinian 'understanding' of Christian truth, rather than beginning with the faintly anachronistic assumption that ... he must have understood the body's resurrection exactly as we today find it necessary to understand (however, be it quickly added, *that* may be)". But does Augustine contradict himself so flatly, if one lays more stress on the word *hoc* in the expression *ab hoc corpore omnimoda fuga*, i.e. the body like it is now with all its toils? Nevertheless, I admit that Augustine had at this moment no clear idea of the continuity of the body in the resurrected state.

the body well and prudently⁶⁸. We notice that Augustine quotes in this book two Pauline texts: "All human beings die in Adam and all will be resurrected in Christ" (1 Cor. 15:22) and "The body is not meant for fornication, but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body. God, however, raised the Lord from the dead, and will by his power raise us up too" (1 Cor. 6:13-14)⁶⁹. In *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* Augustine speaks of "heavenly bodies" in which no acts of the soul are hidden⁷⁰. By this he means not only the bodies of Adam and Eve before the Fall, but also our bodies in their future resurrected state. Those who hate lying will merit (*merebuntur*) that dwelling and transformation in *angelicam formam* (cf. Mt. 22:30) for there will come a time that everything now hidden will be made manifest (Mt. 10:26). Changing into an angelical form is a description of the resurrection in the earlier works of Augustine. At this moment, he holds a too spiritualized concept of the resurrected body, for he finds it necessary to give a more detailed explanation in his *Retractationes* in order to avoid any misinterpretation⁷¹.

⁶⁸ *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* 22,40. CSEL 90,45-46: "Hoc ergo vinculum ne concutiat atque vexetur, laboris et doloris; ne auferatur autem atque perimatur, mortis terrore animam quatit. Amat enim illud vi consuetudinis, non intelligens, si eo bene atque scienter utatur, resurrectionem reformationemque eius ope ac lege divina sine ulla molestia iuri suo subditam fore". Cf. *De Genesi c. Manichaeos* I,20,31. PL 34,188: "De quibus (sc. concupiscentiis malis) jam nobis praecipitur, ut eas cum quanto possumus labore crucifigamus in nobis, donec absorbeatur mors in victoriam (1 Cor. 15:54)".

⁶⁹ *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* 19,35. 35,78. CSEL 90,40. 83-84.

⁷⁰ See R.J. O'CONNELL, o.c., p. 163-166.

⁷¹ *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* II,21,32. PL 34,213: "Neque enim in illis corporibus coelestibus sic latere posse cogitationes credendum est, quemadmodum in his corporibus latent ... in illa perspicuitate ac simplicitate coelestium corporum omnes omnino motus animi latere non arbitror. Itaque illi merebuntur habitationem illam et commutationem in angelicam formam, qui etiam in hac vita ... mendacia oderunt ...". *De div. quaestionibus* 83, q. 47. CCL 44/A, 74: "... angelica corpora, qualia nos speramus habituros, lucidissima atque aetherea esse credendum est ... nullus motus animi latebit, cum totum fuerit corpus aethereum, in cuius comparatione isti oculi caro sunt". *Retract.* I,26. CCL 57,80: "... si hoc sine membris quae nunc habemus et sine substantia quamvis incorruptibilis tamen carnis accipitur, erratur". The expression *angelica forma* is still found in *De Genesi ad litteram* IX,10,(17) and XII,35,(68). CSEL 28/1,279. 433. See also the remark in *Retract.* I,17. CCL 57,53 with regard to *De fide et symbolo* 10,24. CSEL 41,30, in which he nuances the expression *commutatio in angelicam formam*: "... corpus terrenum, quale nunc habemus, in corpus caeleste resurrectione mutari, ut nec membra ista nec carnis sit futura substantia, procul dubio corrigendus est". However, in *De fide et symbolo* 10,23. ib. 29-30 Augustine expresses his belief that this body will be resurrected, but he does not know how: "et ideo credimus et in carnis resurrectionem ... sed haec etiam visibilis caro, quae naturaliter est caro ... haec ergo visibilis quae proprie dicitur caro sine dubitatione credenda est resurgere. Videtur enim Paulus apostolus eam tamquam digito ostendere, cum dicit: Oportet corruptibile hoc induere incorruptionem (1 Cor. 15:53)". We have here a clear

Regarding love of neighbour, we find very intellectualist texts of Augustine. He asserts that he does not love his friends because they are living beings (*animalia*), but because they are human beings, that is, because they have rational souls. The better they use their rational soul, the more he loves them. They will be his friends more intensely when love of wisdom is shared in common⁷². In *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* as well as in *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae*, Augustine connects already more intimately wisdom with love; we can adhere to God only through love (*dilectione, amore, caritate*), and the four cardinal virtues are nothing other than forms of love, each with its own character⁷³. In *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, he mentions for the first time the double commandment of love of God and of neighbour (Mt. 22:37-40)⁷⁴, referring to the Pauline texts that charity is the fullness of the Law (Rom. 13:10) and that the human being without charity is nothing (1 Cor. 13:2). Therefore, love is the fullness of knowledge (*plenitudo scientiae caritas*)⁷⁵. In Adam we all received the commandment to enjoy the fruits of every tree in Paradise, except from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, because each Christian bears quite appropriately the person of Christ, according to Jesus' saying: "What you did to one of the least of mine, you did it to me" (Mt. 25:40). These spiritual fruits are: charity, joy, peace, tolerance, kind-

affirmation of the identity of our earthly body with the resurrected body. See E.P. MEIJERING, *Augustine: De fide et symbolo. Introduction, translation, commentary*. Amsterdam, Gieben, 1987, p. 147-158. G. BARDY, *Le corps des anges*, in: *Bibliothèque Aug.* 10, Paris 1952, p. 728.

⁷² *Soliloquia* I,2,7. CSEL 89,12. I,3,8. Ib. 14: "Sensu quidem quod in eo (sc. amico) novi, si tamen sensu aliquid noscitur, et vile est et satis est. Illam vero partem, qua mihi amicus est, id est ipsum animum, intellectu adsequi cupio". Ib. I,12,20. ib. 31. I,13,22. ib. 34: "Ego autem solam propter se amo sapientiam, cetera vero vel adesse mihi volo vel deesse timeo propter ipsam: vitam, quietem, amicos". Wisdom entails for Augustine knowledge of the highest reality: God and the human soul. Moreover, Augustine identifies the Son of God with the divine Wisdom (1 Cor. 1:24): J.K. COYLE, o.c., p. 341-342. O. DU ROY, o.c., p. 154-155.

⁷³ *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* II,23,36. II,10,13-14. PL 34,214-215. 203-204. *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* 14,24-18,34. PL 32,1321-1326. See J. DOIGNON, *La problématique des quatre vertus dans les premiers traités de Saint Augustin*, in: *L'umanesimo di Sant'Agostino* (Atti del Congresso Internaz. Bari 28-30 ottobre 1986). Bari, Levante ed., 1988, p. 169-191. Already in *De immortalitate animae* 11,18. CSEL 89,120 Augustine wrote: "animus veritati divino amore coniunctus".

⁷⁴ Although Augustine elaborated both books at the same time, he published *De Genesi c. Manich.* before the *De mor. eccl. cath.*: see J.K. COYLE, o.c., 66-76. This is also the opinion of P. ABULESZ, *S. Aurelii Augustini De Genesi contra Manichaeos libri duo. De octo quaestionibus ex Veteri Testamento*. Dissertation Universität Wien, 1972, p. II.

⁷⁵ *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* II,23,36. II,27,41. PL 34,214-215. 218.

ness, goodness, faith, gentleness and continence (Gal. 5:22-23)⁷⁶. One can compare the expression *Christi personam sustinere* with the quotation of 1 Cor. 6:15-20 in *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae*: "Do you not know that your bodies are members of Christ?...Bear God in your body"⁷⁷.

In *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae*, Augustine investigates more closely the meaning of love for neighbour (*vinculum amoris*) for nothing is nearer to a human being than another human being. To do no harm to the neighbour and to help him or her as much as possible are for the recently baptised Augustine "a cradle" of the love of God⁷⁸. At this moment, the role of the body comes more into prominence, because love of neighbour encompasses not only care for the soul of the neighbour but also for his or her body. Care for the body can be termed *medicina*⁷⁹, care for the soul *disciplina*⁸⁰ (in the sense of instruction or education). To the care for the body belongs anything that preserves or restores the health of the body, like food and drink, clothing and shelter, liberation of the oppressed, burying the dead, in short: all those things that preserve the body from external blows or spills; anything that protects it against threats caused by hunger and thirst, cold and heat, or any injury inflicted from without. Persons who love others in this way are called merciful, for the term mercy implies heart-felt distress over the suffering of another⁸¹. Hence, it is no surprise that Augustine reproaches the Manichaeans that they show more compassion for a cucumber than for a fellow human being, or that they are more concerned about the preservation of a melon than of a human person ruined by a burden of debt⁸².

⁷⁶ ib. II,25,38. ib. 216: "Nam praeceptum quod accepit, nos accepimus in illo, quia unusquisque christianus non incongrue sustinet personam Christi, dicente ipso Domino: *Quod fecistis uni ex minimis meis, mihi fecistis*".

⁷⁷ *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* 35,78. CSEL 90,84.

⁷⁸ Ib. 26,48-51. ib. 55-57.

⁷⁹ With the use of the term *medicina* Augustine is asserting the basic goodness of the body against Manichaeism, which denied the use of medicine to its *electi*, see J.K. COYLE, o.c., p. 390-391.

⁸⁰ *De quantitate animae* 34,78. CSEL 89,227: "Errantibus vero cognatis animis et laborantibus, quantum licet atque praeceptum est, opem ferendam esse sciamus ita, ut hoc ipsum, cum bene agitur, deum per nos agere intellegamus".

⁸¹ *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* 27,52-54. CSEL 90,55-57: "Homo igitur, ut homini apparet, anima rationalis est mortali atque terreno utens corpore. Partim ergo corpori, partim vero animae hominis benefacit qui proximum diligit. Ad corpus quod pertinet, medicina nominata est, ad animam autem disciplina". Cf. ib. 28,56. ib. 59: "Qui ergo diligit proximum, agit quantum potest ut salvus corpore salvusque animo sit, sed cura corporis ad sanitatem animi referenda est".

⁸² *De moribus Manichaeorum* 16,53. 17,62. CSEL 90,135. 144.

II. THE FIRST ALLUSION TO EPH. 5:29

In *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* II,12,17 Augustine comments on Gen. 2,21 how God made the woman from one of the ribs of Adam, and filled the place of the rib with flesh. He writes: "God rightly filled the place of the rib with flesh so that this term might convey the affection of love by which each one loves his own soul and is not so insensitive as to despise it. For each one loves that over which he presides"⁸³. R. Teske rightly considers the words "the affection of love by which each one loves his own soul" as a first allusion to Eph. 5:29 "Nobody ever hated his own flesh", a text that was already familiar to Augustine at that moment (the years 388/389), for later in this booklet he quotes the subsequent verses Eph. 5:31-32⁸⁴.

Augustine himself points out that he uses the term "flesh", that fills the place of the rib, in the way in which the prophet says that a heart of stone is taken away and a heart of flesh is given to the people (Ezek. 11:19. 36:26. 2 Cor. 3:3). He does not give here a deeper explanation of what he means by "a heart of flesh", but he does so in his later works in which he combines the texts of Ezekiel and Paul. He explains there that a heart of stone is a heart without sensitivity or feeling, whereas a heart of flesh is a heart gifted with sensory life that is needed in order to understand something⁸⁵.

But there is still another obscure element in this text. By reason of

⁸³ *De Genesi c. Manich.* II,12,17. PL 34,205: "Sane in locum illius costae carnem adimplevit, ut hoc nomine insinuaretur dilectionis affectus, quo diligit unusquisque animam suam, et non est durus ut eam contemnat; quod diligit quisque cui praeest. Non enim sic nominata est caro isto loco, ut carnalem concupiscentiam significet; sed isto modo potius quo propheta dicit auferri populo cor lapideum, et dari cor carneum. Hoc modo enim dicit et apostolus: *Non in tabulis lapideis, sed in tabulis cordis carnalibus*. Aliud est quippe propria locutio, aliud figurata, qualis ista est quam tractamus modo".

⁸⁴ R.J. TESKE, *Saint Augustine on Genesis: Two Books on Genesis Against the Manichees and On the Literal Interpretation of Genesis: an Unfinished Book*. Washington D.C., The Catholic University Press, 1991, p. 113.

⁸⁵ *Contra Faustum* XV,4. CSEL 25/1,421-422: "... sed quia in comparatione lapidis, qui sine sensu est, caro sentit, per lapidis insensualitatem significatum est cor non intellegens et per carnis sensualitatem significatum est cor intellegens". The same interpretation: ib. XVIII,4. ib. 493. *Quaest. in Heptateuchum* V,11. CCL 33,282. *De doctrina christiana* III,34,48. CCL 32,108-109. *De gratia et libero arbitrio* 14,29. PL 44,898. Cf. *De Genesi ad litt.* VII,16(22). CSEL 28/1, 213-214: "Non mihi ergo videtur dictum: *factus est homo in animam vivam* (Gen. 1,21), nisi quia sentire coepit in corpore.

the fact that the word "flesh" occurs no less than four times in the context⁸⁶, one would expect in Augustine's commentary rather the words "the love by which each one loves his own flesh". This would correspond better to Eph. 5:29. Then arises the question: Why does Augustine speak here of soul, and not of flesh? And how do we have to interpret the word "soul"? L. Carrozzi, in his Italian translation, gives *anima* the meaning of "life". Although Augustine is acquainted with this meaning through the Bible and the philosophy, Carrozzi's translation does not seem appropriate to me. It is not in Augustine's line to assert that the human being presides over life in the strict sense. For this reason Carrozzi translates the verb *praeest* in the following way: "the human being *protects* his life", though the first meaning of *praeesse* is "to take the lead, to rule over"⁸⁷. *Anima* cannot have the meaning of carnal lust (*concupiscentia carnalis*) because this is explicitly denied by Augustine: *non enim sic nominata est caro isto loco, ut carnalem concupiscentiam significet*. Seen from a moral point of view, carnal lust has too negative a meaning.

Nevertheless, something higher that rules over something lower within the human being must be the issue at stake, namely the rational part that rules over the animal part which is ruled, corresponding to the distinction between *rationale* and *animale*⁸⁸. Teske believes that Augustine "avoids the word 'flesh' and substitutes 'soul', (because) Augustine's attitude toward the body was quite negative"⁸⁹. This is not excluded as we have

⁸⁶ "carnem adimplevit"; "non enim sic nominata est caro"; "carnalem concupiscentiam"; "cor carneum". P. ABULESZ, o.c., p. 78 knows only one manuscript which has the reading *diligit carnem suam*: Firenze Biblioteca Laurenziana XII, XXVI, saec. XI.

⁸⁷ *Opere di Sant' Agostino IX/1, La Genesi difesa contro i Manichei*. Roma, Città Nuova Editrice, 1988, p. 145: "... il sentimento dell'amore con cui ciascuno ama la propria vita e non è talmente insensibile da disprezzarla, poiché ciascuno ama ciò che protegge". Cf. *De beata vita* 2,7. CCL 29,69: "Ergo iam scis te constare ex corpore et vita". *De immortalitate animae* 16,25. CSEL 89,127: "Hoc et de irrationali anima vel vita ... dici potest". See J. PÉPIN, a.c., p. 76-80.

⁸⁸ *De Genesi c. Man.* II,11,16. PL 34,205: "... in seipso aliud esse rationale quod regit, aliud animale quod regitur".

⁸⁹ R.J. TESKE, o.c., p. 113, n. 81. However, I wonder whether Augustine excludes radically love for the body. In *Epist.* 3,4. CSEL 34/1,8 we read: "Unde constamus? Ex animo et corpore. Quid horum melius? Videlicet animus ... Animus igitur *magis* amandus est quam corpus". *Soliloquia* I,9,16. CSEL 89,25: "Amas ergo ... vitam ipsam tuam in hoc corpore. Fateor, ita est". ib. II,1,1. ib. 46: "Vivere igitur amas? Fateor". In *De Genesi c. Manich.* I,20,31. PL 34,188 Augustine asserts: when we hold in subjection all the affections and emotions of the soul and of the flesh that we have in common with the animals, and they will be in harmony with our reason, then they are called "gaudia, et amores sancti, et casti et boni". ib. II,26,38-39. ib.,217 Augustine reproaches the Manichees: "... etiam corpora sua *displicent*, non propter poenalem mortalitatem, quam peccando merui-

seen already. However, I think that there can be another reason, namely the context itself. From chapter 11,15 on, Augustine deals with the creation of the woman. She is made as helper of the man so that she might bring forth spiritual offspring, that is, good works, while the man rules and she obeys (cf. 1 Cor. 11:3). It is not enough to demonstrate that the soul has to rule over the body (*ut non solum anima corpori dominaretur*: Augustine supposes the subordination of the body as something self-evident!), but it has to be demonstrated that the virile reason (*ratio*) holds subject to itself also its *pars animalis*, for by the help of this animal part reason commands the body⁹⁰. We have here clearly a tripartite distinction: *ratio*, *pars animalis*, *corpus*. The *pars animalis* is that part which is nearest to the body⁹¹. The relationship between man and woman is an

mus; sed ita ut negent Deum esse corporum conditorem ...; cum sibi displicet caro quasi nuditas sua". In a rather negative sense we read in *De moribus eccl. cath.* 22,40. CSEL 90,46: "*Amat* (sc. anima) enim illud (sc. corpus) vi consuetudinis ...". Ib. 24,48. ib. 52-53 Augustine treats the theme of self-love. Moreover, he does not hesitate to use in his christological texts the words *caro* and *corpus*.

⁹⁰ *De Genesi c. Man.* II,11,15. PL 34,204: "Adhuc enim erat quod fieret, ut non solum anima corpori dominaretur, quia corpus servilem locum obtinet, sed etiam virilis ratio subjugaret sibi animale partem suam, per quod adiutorium imperaret corpori. Ad huius rei exemplum femina facta est, quam rerum ordo subjugat viro". Do we find here a certain influence of the allegorical explanation of Origen (*Hom. in Gen.* 1,15. S.C. 7bis, p. 66-68) who identifies the male with the higher reason and the female with the soul: "Interior homo noster ex spiritu et anima constat. Masculus spiritus dicitur, femina potest anima nuncupari. Haec si concordiam inter se habeant et consensum, convenientia inter se ipsa crescent et multiplicantur generantque filios sensus bonos et intellectus vel cogitationes utiles ... Iam vero si anima coniuncta spiritui atque eius, ut ita dixerim, coniugio copulata declinet aliquando ad corporeas voluptates sensumque suum delectationi carnis inclinet ... talis anima velut adulterio corporis maculata neque crescere neque multiplicari legitime dicitur ..."? H. CROUZEL, *Théologie de l'image de Dieu chez Origène*. Paris, Aubier, 1956, p. 152-153 explains that Origen speaks of male and female with regard to the first creation, and of man and woman with regard to the second. See R.J. TESKE, *Origen and St. Augustine's First Commentaries on Genesis*, in: *Origenista Quinta*. Leuven, Peeters, 1992, p. 180-186. B. STUDER, *Zur Frage des westlichen Origenismus*, in: *Studia Patristica IX* (Berlin 1966), p. 270-287. Cf. Marius Victorinus, *In Ep. Pauli ad Ephesios*, verses 29. 32. PL 8,1288-1289: "Confirmat, quod secundum naturam est hic amor, ut carnem nostram diligamus. Si autem caro nostra foemina est, et prima foemina de carne viri, et ... cum nemo suam carnem oderit ... debet ergo et uxorem sic diligere, ut suam carnem, sicut et Christus Ecclesiam ... Sed quoniam magnum mysterium dixit altius intelligendum ... Ego arbitror accipi istud, ut vir et uxor sint sibi invicem juncti spiritus et anima. Hoc enim Adam et Eva, ut spiritus sit Christus, Ecclesia sit anima".

⁹¹ *Partes animae* in Augustine's writings do not mean two independent realities, but two different capacities or activities of one and the same reality. See R. FERWERDA, *Two Souls. Origen's and Augustine's Attitude towards the Two Souls Doctrine. Its Place in Greek and Christian Philosophy*, in: *Vigiliae Christianae* 37(1983), 360-378, p. 366: "For,

illustration of a process that takes place in each single human being: the impulse of the soul (*appetitus animae*)⁹² which is operating through the bodily limbs, should be subject to the interior mind (*mens interior*). In 12,16 Augustine argues that we need perfect wisdom to rule correctly the *pars animalis* and should have with it a marital bond, as it were, so that the flesh does not lust against the spirit (Gal. 5:7)⁹³. In that case, the *concupiscentia carnalis* ceases to be *carnalis* by obeying. The marital union between reason and lower part of the soul is symbolized by the fact that the woman is made from the rib of the man. In 12,17-13,19 we read that each one loves his own soul, which is applied in a figurative sense to Gen.

from the meaning the word 'image' has in his (=Plotinus') philosophy we may infer that this does not mean that there are really two independent entities called soul; rather there is only one soul whose image or reflexion is simply the intermediary between higher and lower entities which has no existence of its own". According to D. DOUCET, *Soliloques II, 13,23 et les magni philosophi*, in: *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 39(1993), 109-128, Augustine's distinction between *anima rationalis* and *anima irrationalis* or *vita* is dependent on Plato, Plotinus and especially on Porphyry, but he interprets it nevertheless in a personal way: "Les interrogations et les distinctions antérieurement établies par Augustin se retrouvent donc bien. Le fait de considérer que l'âme apporte la vie est insuffisant pour assurer son immortalité, car la vie peut être considérée comme liée à la partie inférieure de l'âme qui est transmise par les parents, mais se distingue de l'âme rationnelle qui advient de l'extérieur, et dont l'union avec le corps réalise un 'mélange total'" (p. 125).

⁹² *De Genesi c. Man.* II,11,15. PL 34,204: "Ad hujus rei exemplum femina facta est, quam rerum ordo subjugat viro; ut quod in duobus hominibus evidentius apparet, id est in masculo et femina, etiam in uno homine considerari possit: ut appetitum animae, per quem de membris corporis operamur, habeat mens interior tanquam virilis ratio subjugatum". Ib. 12,16. ib. 205: "... ut caro non concupiscat adversus spiritum ... id est concupiscentia carnalis non adversetur rationi". Ib. 14,21. ib. 207: "... si autem (sc. cupiditas nostra) mota fuerit, quasi mulieri jam persuasum erit". I think that the three expressions *appetitus animae*, *concupiscentia*, *cupiditas* designate the striving function of the soul, which as such are not negative. See W.S. BABCOCK, *Cupiditas and Caritas: The Early Augustine on Love and Fulfillment*, in: *Augustine Today*, ed. by R.J. Neuhaus, Grand Rapids (Mich.), Eerdmans, 1993, p. 1-34: "Cupiditas is for Augustine also a form of love; therefore it is not to be translated as passion, lust or desire". We find the same idea of *De Genesi c. Man.* also in *De opere monachorum* (dating from 401) 32,40. CSEL 41,594: "Illam quippe significant partem eo ipso, quo mulieres sunt, quae concupiscentialis dici potest, cui mens dominatur ... Quod ergo est in uno homine mens et concupiscentia ... hoc in duobus hominibus, viro et muliere, secundum sexum corporis figuratur ... Tanto enim gloriosius mens ad superiora promovetur, quanto diligentius ab inferioribus concupiscentia cohibetur; donec totus homo cum ipso etiam mortali nunc et fragili corpore in resurrectione novissima incorruptione atque immortalitate induatur ...".

⁹³ *De Genesi c. Man.* II,12,16. PL 34,205: "Ipsa enim cognitio, qua intelligitur in nobis aliud esse quod ratione dominetur, aliud quod rationi obtemperet; ipsa ergo cognitio veluti effectio mulieris est de costa viri, propter conjunctionem significandam. Deinde, ut quisque huic suae parti recte dominetur, et fiat quasi conjugalitatis in seipso, ut caro non concupiscat adversus spiritum, sed spiritui subjugetur ... opus habet perfecta sapientia".

2:23 "Now this is bone from my bones, and flesh from my flesh". Augustine sees in "bone" a symbol of fortitude, and in "flesh" a symbol of temperance which both belong to the lower part of the soul. Notice that the text of Gen. 2:23 "Bone from my bones, and flesh from my flesh" occurs also in Eph. 5:30, just as Gen. 2:24 "They will be two in one flesh" occurs in Eph. 5:31, where they are used to describe the union between Christ and the Church. The conclusion of this section of *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* follows in 14,21. Seen from a moral point of view, the following process takes place in each human being:

- a) First there is the bad suggestion through thought or through the bodily senses, but we are able to resist this suggestion. The serpent functions as symbol of such suggestions⁹⁴.
- b) If the desire toward sinning is aroused, it is as if the woman were already persuaded, but even then the reason can resist sinning. The woman functions here as symbol.
- c) However, if the *ratio* consents to evil, then there is sin, in the full sense of the word, by which the human being is expelled from paradise. Here the man functions as symbol.

In the text *dilectionis affectus, quo diligit unusquisque animam suam*, *anima* has definitely the meaning of *pars animae* or *animi*, term which elsewhere in *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* is used still five more times by Augustine⁹⁵. The lower part of the soul is the part that can be tempted and can fall under the spell of carnal joys⁹⁶, but it is also that part which is the basis of our good works. This is the reason why Adam

⁹⁴ Augustine refuses to consider the woman as *figura* of the senses, for bodily sense does not express the spiritual equality between male and female; the serpent is a much more appropriate symbol for bodily sense. See *De Trinitate* XII,13,20-15,25. CCL 50,373-380. *De Genesi ad litt.* III,20(34) and VI,7(12). CSEL 28/1,88-89. 178. ib. XI,42(58). ib. 377: "propterea mulier addita est, quae ... adhuc fortasse secundum sensum carnis ... viveret" is no exception, because it is the description of a possible concrete situation. See T.J. VAN BAVEL, *Woman as the Image of God in Augustine's "De Trinitate XII"*, in: *Signum Pietatis*, Festgabe für C.P. Mayer. Würzburg, Augustinus-Verlag, 1989, 267-288, and: *Augustine's View on Women*, in: *Augustiniana* 39(1989), 5-53.

⁹⁵ *De Genesi c. Man.* I,25,43 (here in an implicit way). II,10,14. II,18,28. II,19,29. II, 21,31. II,26,40. PL 34,194. 204. 210. 211. 212. 218. Even before this book Augustine had used the expression *pars animi*: *C. Academicos* I,2,5. III,12,28. CCL 29,6. 51. *De ordine* II,2,6-2,7. CCL 29,109-110. *Soliloquia* I,3,8. CSEL 89,14. *Epist.* 3,4. CSEL 34/1,8.

⁹⁶ *De Genesi c. Manich.* II,18,28. PL 34,210: "... non posse nos a diabolo tentari, nisi per illam animale partem, quae quasi mulieris imaginem vel exemplum in uno ipso homine ostendit". Augustine observes that this applies also to men.: "Numquid quia viros non decipit et tentat?". Ib. II,19,29. ib. 211: "... illa pars animae, quae carnalibus gaudiis tenetur".

calls his woman "Life" and "The mother of the living"⁹⁷. Thus the woman is the image of action, an idea that we find also in Augustine's later works⁹⁸. If we take into account the wish of Augustine to present a figurative explanation of the book Genesis, we understand better that he considers the woman as an image of the subordination of the *animalis pars* to the *virilis ratio* as something that takes place within the psyche of each human being. This does not mean Manichaean dualism, for Augustine stresses that there must be love for the lower part. Precisely, against the Manichaeans he maintains that each part of the human person, the body as well as the *pars animalis*, has God as its creator; there is no part that is originating from the power of darkness, and he quotes 1 Cor. 11:7-12: "As the woman is from the man, so the man is through the woman, but all things are from God". He rejects the Manichaean question: Why did God make the woman?; he answers with the words of Paul: The woman is so great a good that she is called the glory of the man (1 Cor. 11:7)⁹⁹.

That Eph. 5:29 plays an important part in this whole section appears from the context, though there is not yet question of a literal citation. We will examine how Augustine explains Eph. 5:29 in his later works, paying attention as much as possible to their chronological order¹⁰⁰.

⁹⁷ Ib. II,21,31. ib. 212: "Quem autem non moveat, quod post peccatum et sententiam iudicis Dei vocat Adam mulierem suam *Vitam* ... ? ... Quare ergo non animalis illa pars nostra, quae tamquam viro debet obtemperare rationi ... appelletur vita et ... mater vivorum vocetur, id est recte factorum?". Cf. ib. II,10,14. ib. 204: "... iustitia enim ad omnes partes animae pertinet".

⁹⁸ Ib. I,25,43. ib. 194: "... homo ... masculus et femina, id est intellectus et actio, quorum copulatione spiritualis fetus terram impleat, id est carnem subiciat ...". This idea is elaborated by Augustine in *Confessiones* XIII,32,47 and 34,49. CCL 27,270-272: "... corporaliter feminam, quae haberet quidem in mente rationalis intellegentiae parem naturam, sexu tamen corporis ita masculino sexui subiceretur, quemadmodum subicitur appetitus actionis ad concipiendam de ratione mentis recte agendi sollertiam". In *De Trinitate* XII, 13,20-15,25 (CCL 50,373-380) he describes the functions of the soul as action and contemplation, or as science and wisdom. The woman is the symbol of action and science.

⁹⁹ *De Genesi c. Man.* II,26,40. PL 34,217-218: "Tunc enim potest cognosci non aliam partem in nobis pertinere ad auctorem Deum, et aliam ad gentem tenebrarum, sicut isti dicunt, sed potius et illud quod regendi habet potestatem in homine, et illud inferius quod regendum est, ex Deo esse, sicut dicit apostolus ...". See also II,28,42. ib. 219: "... quia et ipsa utique aliquod bonum est, et tantum bonum, ut apostolus eam gloriam viri esse dicat".

¹⁰⁰ R.J. TESKE, *Love of Neighbour in St. Augustine*, in: *Congresso Internaz. su S. Agostino nel XVI Centenario della Conversione*. Atti III. Roma, Institut. Patristicum "Augustinianum", 1987, p. 81-102 has dealt with the following texts: *De sermone Domini in monte*, *De continentia*, *De utilitate ieiunii* and *De doctrina christiana*.

III. THE FIRST LITERAL QUOTATION

The first literal citation is found in *De sermone Domini in monte*, written in between 392 and 396. Eph. 5:29 is quoted within the ascetic context of fasting: "But when you fast, anoint your head and wash your face" (Mt. 6:17). Washing the face was still a daily custom in Augustine's time, but not the anointing of the head. This is one of the reasons why he gives a figurative interpretation of this text. Both actions, anointing and washing, are regarded as said of the interior human being. "Head" means in the first place that what is the highest in the soul. What is highest should guide and govern all the rest. Consequently, the flesh should be held subject, for it is not the "head" of the whole human nature. After this statement, the text takes an unexpected turn: Augustine asserts that this does not mean that one has to hate one's own flesh, for no one ever hated his own flesh. If he wished to stress only the subjection of the flesh, he needed not to quote Eph. 5:29. The reason of the quotation is that he understands it in the literal sense attached to these words by Paul when the latter commands that the husband should love his wife. Augustine does not yet speak of love for the own body as such.

This leads him immediately to the second meaning of the word "Head", namely Christ, according to the text "A woman's head is man, a man has Christ for his Head" (1 Cor. 11:3). To find an interior joy in fasting means to turn away from the pleasures of this world in order to be subject to Christ, because the anointing of the head consists in that submission to Christ, and this makes our heart and our love of neighbour pure¹⁰¹.

IV. THE TEXTS BETWEEN 397-401

In 397/398, Augustine contends against the Manichaean Faustus that the higher things are better than the lower things, but that the lower are also good. He illustrates this with the example of the animals: there is no animal, not even the most insignificant little animal, that hates its own flesh, but it feeds and cherishes it, gives it vitality and guidance. In the

¹⁰¹ *De sermone domini in monte* II,12,42. CCL 35,133: "Caro enim, quae subiecta esse debet, nullo modo est totius naturae humanae caput. Nemo quidem umquam carnem suam odio habuit, sicut apostolus dicit, cum de diligendo uxore praecipit; sed caput mulieris vir, cui viro caput est Christus". In II,11,38. ib. 129 Augustine states that there is no reason for grief if there is peace between body and spirit; a deplorable conflict arises only when the body resists the law of the spirit. See also the continuation of this text in II,12,43. ib. 134 about the theme that authentic love of neighbour should not be egocentric.

same way, the soul chastises its body in order to control the unrestrained desires for earthly things (otherwise the soul cannot acquire wisdom), but in spite of this it loves its flesh. Even a Manichaean cannot but love his flesh; he cares for the health and the integrity of his body, he avoids blows, spills and mishaps which can injure him. Such is the law of nature¹⁰². A bit further Augustine quotes Eph. 5:28-29: "He who loves his wife, loves himself. No one ever hates his own body; on the contrary he feeds and cherishes it. And that is the way Christ treats the Church". To show that there has to be a holy love of the men for their wives, Paul referred to the example of a lover's soul. Human beings should display harmony with their bodies and affection for them by curbing the carnal impulses and by submitting them to the good use by the *ratio*. A similar process takes place in animals; they too flee pain and death, they flee the dissolution of the union between flesh and soul. This is the power that the creature received from its Creator¹⁰³.

In *De doctrina christiana* (397), we meet Eph. 5:29 within the context of morally good behavior, that is, in the context of *frui-uti*. There also Augustine treats the theme of restraining the body by continence. We should not love all the things which we use, but only those which, on the basis of a certain affinity with us, have a relationship with God such as the human being, or like those things which, in intimate union with us, need God's blessing through our mediation, like the body. Consequently, there are four objects that we should love: God, ourselves, the neighbour, and

¹⁰² *Contra Faustum* XXI,5. CSEL 25/1,574-575: "Verumtamen adtendite et date mihi unum quamlibet abiectissimum animal, cuius anima oderit carnem suam, ac non potius nutriat et foveat eam motuque vitali vegetet et regat et quodam modo administret pro sui generis exiguitate quoddam universum suum ad incolumitatem tuendam ... Quod enim rationalis anima castigat corpus suum et servituti subicit, ne immoderate adpetitu terreno inpediatur perceptio sapientiae, etiam sic utique diligit carnem suam, quam sibi ad obediendum legitime subdit atque ordinat. Postremo vos ipsi quamvis carnali errore carnem detestemini, non potestis nisi diligere carnem vestram eiusque saluti et incolumitate consilere, omnes ictus et casus et intemperiem, qua laeditur, devitare ... ita ostenditis praevalere naturae legem contra erroris vestri opinionem".

¹⁰³ *Ib.* XXI,7. *ib.* 575-576: "Apostolus enim cum de sancta dilectione praeciperet, qualis esse debeat virorum in uxores, ex anima amantis sumpsit exemplum. *Qui diligit, inquit, uxorem suam, se ipsum diligit; nemo enim unquam carnem suam odio habet, sed nutrit et fovet eam tamquam Christus ecclesiam.* Ecce in conspectu vestro est carnalis universa substantia! Videte quemadmodum in omne animal sibi ad salutem conciliatum portendat naturae ista communio, ut diligit carnem suam; neque enim hoc in hominibus tantum est, qui cum recte vivunt, non solum consulunt saluti carnis suae, verum etiam carnales motus ad usum rationis edomant et refrenant, sed etiam bestiae fugiunt dolorem, formidant interitum ... nutriendas etiam ipsae ac fovendas carnem suam. *Nemo enim unquam carnem suam odio habet ...*".

the body. Love of ourselves and of our body are so natural that there is no need to give explicit commandments about them¹⁰⁴. No one hates himself or his own body, and the statement "No one ever hated his own body" is beyond any discussion. When some say that they would prefer to be without body, they deceive themselves profoundly. They do not hate their bodies as such, but they hate the corruptibility and the toils of the body. One can train the body and restrain it by continence and exertion, but those who do this in the right way, do it not in order to be without body, but to have the body subject and ready to perform the necessary activities. They combat the bad desires, but do not kill themselves; on the contrary, they care for their health¹⁰⁵. A bit further in this book, Augustine draws the conclusion: "If you understand yourself as a whole, that is, your mind and body, and also your neighbour as a whole, that is, his mind and body (for the human being consists of mind and body), not one category of things we should love is left out in these two commandments"¹⁰⁶.

Between 401-403, during the Donatist controversy, Petilian reproaches Augustine that the Catholics seek peace in a hypocritical way through crime and war. Augustine responds that their war is based on Mt. 5:43 "Love your neighbour as yourself" and on Eph. 5:29 "No one ever hated his own flesh". But this does not prevent the flesh lusting against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh (Gal. 5,17). Augustine applies this last text to the conflict with the Donatists: the restoration of unity is sought by war, so that the chastised body be brought to subservience. However, that what the spirit does against the body is waging war, not out of hatred, but out of love. Human beings who live according to the spirit,

¹⁰⁴ *De doctrina christiana* I,23,22. CCL 32,18: "Non autem omnia, quibus utendum est, diligenda sunt, sed ea sola, quae aut nobiscum societate quadam referuntur in deum, sicut est homo, vel angelus, aut ad nos relata, beneficio dei per nos indigent, sicuti est corpus ... Cum ergo quattuor sint diligenda, unum quod supra nos est, alterum quod nos sumus, tertium quod iuxta nos est, quartum quod infra nos est, de secundo et quarto nulla praecepta danda erant".

¹⁰⁵ *Ib.* I,24,24. *ib.* 19: "Nemo ergo se odit. Et hinc quidem nulla cum aliqua secta quaestio fuit. Sed neque corpus suum quisquam odit; verum est enim quod ait apostolus: *Nemo unquam carnem suam odio habuit*. Et quod nonnulli dicunt, malle se esse sine corpore omnino, falluntur; non enim corpus suum, sed corruptiones eius et pondus oderunt ... Quod autem continentia quadam et laboribus quasi persequi videntur corpora sua, qui hoc recte faciunt, non id agunt, ut non habeant corpus, sed ut habeant subiugatum et paratum ad opera necessaria. Libidines ... per ipsius corporis laboriosam quandam militiam extinguere adfectant. Nam non se interimunt et curam suae valetudinis gerunt". This text is probably meant as a refutation of some Neoplatonici.

¹⁰⁶ *Ib.* I,26,27. *ib.* 21: "Quod si te totum intelligas, id est animum et corpus, et proximum totum, id est animum et corpus eius - homo enim ex animo constat et corpore -, nullum rerum diligendarum genus in his duobus praeceptis praetermissum est".

do not only wage war against themselves out of love, but also against others who live according to the flesh, because all who live according to the spirit love their neighbours as themselves. The war of spiritual persons is an admonition inspired by love, and their sword is the Word of God¹⁰⁷.

V. THE TEXTS BETWEEN 406-413

In 406/407, explaining the verse of John 1:13 "They are not born out of blood, or out of the desire of the flesh, or out of the will of man, but of God himself", Augustine says that John used the word "flesh" to designate the woman. Because she was made from the rib of the man, Adam exclaimed: "This is bone from my bones, and flesh from my flesh" (Gen. 2:23). For the same reason Paul writes: "Who loves his wife, loves himself", for no one ever hates his own flesh" (Eph. 5:28-29). Then Augustine gives his usual figurative explanation: the man is the image of the mind (*spiritus*) and the woman of the flesh (*caro*). The first has to govern and to command, the latter to be ruled and to serve. Otherwise the householding will be upside down¹⁰⁸.

In 412, Augustine comments on Gen. 3:15 "The brood of the woman shall threaten your head, and you shall threaten their heel". The brood of the woman are all who live righteously. But why did God say this to the woman? The reason for this is the fact that the human being is unstable because of the flesh. The flesh is our interior Eve. The apostle Paul says: "Who loves his wife, loves himself", and "himself" means: "No one ever hated his own flesh" (Eph. 5:28-29). Like the devil was the cause of Adam's Fall through the mediation of Eve, so the devil wishes our Fall through the mediation of the flesh. But we have the power to avoid

¹⁰⁷ *Contra litteras Petiliani* II,68,154. CSEL 52,100: "Quodsi nemo carnem suam odio habet et tamen adversus carnem suam concupiscit, ecce bello unitas quaeritur, ut corpus servituti subiciatur. Quod autem spiritus facit adversus carnem non odio, sed dilectione belligerans, hoc spiritales faciunt adversus carnales, ut, quod agunt erga se, agant et erga illos, quia diligunt proximos tamquam se ipsos".

¹⁰⁸ *In Johannis evangelium* tr. 2,14. CCL 36,18: "Carnem pro femina posuit, quia de costa cum facta esset, Adam dixit: *Hoc nunc os de ossibus meis, et caro de carne mea*; et apostolus ait: *Qui diligit uxorem suam, seipsum diligit; nemo enim unquam carnem suam odio habet*. Ponitur ergo caro pro uxore, quomodo et aliquando spiritus pro marito. Quare? Quia ille regit, haec regitur: ille imperare debet, ista servire. Nam ubi caro imperat, et spiritus servit, perversa domus est".

iniquity through Christ¹⁰⁹.

In *De utilitate ieiunii* (about 411), Augustine contends against the Manichaeans that one cannot conclude from the opposition between spirit and flesh that the flesh as such is inimical to the spirit as though there would be one Creator of the spirit and another Creator of the flesh. They base their opinion on Gal. 5:17: "The flesh desires against the spirit, and the spirit desires against the flesh". Augustine responds with the question: Why do you not pay attention to that other text: "Nobody ever hates his own flesh" (Eph. 5:29), in which as it were a marital union is expressed? How to handle then the opposition between both texts? Augustine declares that he accepts both, and sees no opposition between them. We should not undervalue Eph. 5:29, for the attitude of the feeding and cherishing human being towards his flesh is the image of Christ's attitude towards the Church. One cannot love truly the body, if one considers it as a prison or a fetter, for everyone hates a chain or a punishment. Just as there is only one and the same Creator of the mind and of the body, so there is not one Father of the Church and another Father of Christ, as the Manichaeans believe¹¹⁰. Consequently, everyone loves his flesh. Not only Paul says this, but also daily experience testifies to it, for who does not close his eyes when he or she sees a blow coming along. In the next section Augustine stresses again that the flesh has to obey the mind like the woman the man. But obedience does not mean that they do not love one another. Nevertheless, by renouncing the pleasures of the flesh, one acquires the joys of the spirit¹¹¹.

¹⁰⁹ *En. in psalmum* 48, s.1,6. CCL 38,556: "Quare autem Evae hoc dixit? Quia per carnem labitur homo. Eva nobis interior caro nostra est. *Qui diligit*, inquit, *uxorem suam, seipsum diligit*. Quid est: *seipsum*? Sequitur, et dicit: *Nemo enim umquam carnem suam odio habuit*. Quia ergo quomodo illum hominem Adam per Evam supplantavit, sic diabolus per carnem vult nos supplantare; praeceptum est Evae ut observet caput diaboli, quia diabolus calcaneum ipsius observat".

¹¹⁰ Compare this idea with that in *De continentia* 9,23. CSEL 41,170: "Quid est ergo, quod vos vera dementia et christianos esse iactatis ... et Christum asserentes in falsa carne apparuisse mortalibus et ecclesiam in anima ad Christum, in corpore ad diabolum pertinere et sexum virilem atque muliebrem diaboli opera esse, non dei et spiritui carnem tamquam malam substantiam bonae substantiae cohaerere?"

¹¹¹ *De utilitate ieiunii* 4,4-5,6. CCL 46,234-236: "Ne ergo arbitretur dilectio vestra, quod inimica sit caro spiritui, quasi alter sit auctor carnis, alter sit auctor spiritus ... Utuntur autem quasi testimonio apostolico, quod non intelligunt: *Caro concupiscit adversus spiritum, et spiritus adversus carnem*. Hoc verum est; sed quare et aliud non adtendis: *Nemo enim umquam carnem suam odio habet; sed nutrit et fovet eam, sicut et Christus ecclesiam*? ... Interim ego ambas (sc. sententias) accipio ... Tu autem ... de illa quid agis? *Nemo enim umquam carnem suam odio habet, sed nutrit et fovet eam, sicut Christus ecclesiam* ... Compedem putas carnem. Quis amat compedem suam? Carcerem putas car-

In letter 130, Augustine quotes Paul: "Do not care for the flesh by lusts" (Rom. 13:14). He interprets the Pauline text as follows: we have to care for the flesh, but on the condition "as far as the care for our health urges us to do so", for no one ever hated his own flesh. He refers also to the example of Paul who advises Timothy to drink a little wine for the sake of his digestion and his frequent ailments (1 Tim. 5:23)¹¹².

In another letter, written about 412, Augustine speaks of the fact that hardly anyone wishes death. He attributes this to the great power of the sweet union between flesh and soul. Eph. 5:29 is a proof of this. Therefore, the soul does not want to be separated from the weakness of the flesh, not even for a little while, although the soul trusts in God that it will get back from Him the body without any weakness for eternity. Though the human being who serves God wishes to die and to be with Christ (Phil. 1:23), everyone refuses and flees this because of the affection (*sensu*) for the flesh¹¹³.

In a sermon (preached about 412), Augustine addresses people who do not believe in the resurrection of the flesh. They feel an aversion to their bodies in spite of Paul's assertion that no one ever hated his own flesh. Augustine wonders what the reason is for that aversion. It is clearly due to the corruptibility and mortality of the flesh which, however, will be taken away in the resurrected state; one should trust in God's promise (1 Cor. 15:42-53). Those who feel an aversion to the coming resurrection of the body, should, strictly speaking, feel such an aversion already in this life, but they contradict themselves for they cherish, protect, feed and

nem. Quis amat carcerem suum? *Nemo enim unquam carnem suam odio habet*. Quis non oderit vinculum suum? Quis non oderit poenam suam? ... Tu ergo qui alium auctorem ponis carni, alium auctorem spiritui, alium positurus es ecclesiae, alium Christo ... Diligit ergo unusquisque carnem suam. Apostolus dicit, et praeter apostoli dictum unusquisque in se probat ... nescio utrum non claudes oculum, si aliquis ictus immineat ... Est ergo quasi quoddam coniugium spiritus et carnis ... Numquid ergo odimus, quem nobis cupimus obedire?"

¹¹² *Epist.* 130,3,7. CSEL 44,48: "Omnino haec (sc. delicias) in te despice atque contemne, ne in his quicquam requiras praeter integram corporis valetudinem ... Nam et ipse apostolus: *Carnis*, inquit, *providentiam ne feceritis in concupiscentiis*, quia gerimus curam carnis, sed ad necessitatem salutis, *Nemo enim unquam carnem suam odio habuit*".

¹¹³ *Epist.* 140,6,16. CSEL 44,167: "Ideo mortis diem ... omnes aut paene omnes differre conantur ... tantam habet vim carnis et animae dulce consortium. *Nemo enim unquam carnem suam odio habuit* et propterea non vult anima vel ad tempus ab eius etiam infirmitate discedere, quamvis eam se sine infirmitate in aeternum recepturam esse confidat ... mentis quidem ratione concupiscit homo pius *dissolvi et esse cum Christo*, sed id sensu carnis recusat et refugit ...".

preserve the integrity of their bodies. Who would do all these things for something he hates?¹¹⁴

VI. A CRUCIAL TEXT FROM *DE CONTINENTIA*

We call this text crucial because Augustine treats here our theme in the most profound and extensive way. The date of this book, however, is very controversial. Mostly it is dated in 395, but recent research has shown that it is of a much later date, namely the years 416-418¹¹⁵. I agree with a later date; it seems certainly written after 412. The purpose of this treatise is to show that continence is needed not only with regard to the lower parts of the body, but also with regard to the *libidines* of the interior human being, specifically the *motus et perturbationes animi*. *Carnalis concupiscentia* has a much wider meaning than only the sexual domain. Besides fornication, impurity, indecency, we find mentioned idolatry, sorcery, quarrels, contentious temper, envy, fits of rage, selfish ambitions, dissensions, party intrigues, jealousies, drinking bouts, orgies, and the like (Gal. 5:19-21)¹¹⁶. The peculiar thing about this passage is that Augustine considers talking about flesh and mind as *partes hominis* rather as a theme for philosophical schools; he himself prefers to follow biblical language in which "flesh" designates the whole human being. In Holy Scripture *secundum carnem vivere* means: *secundum hominem vivere*.

¹¹⁴ *Sermo Mai* 87,3. MA I,329: "Quid enim, obsecro te, qui non vis credere futuram carnis resurrectionem, quid te movet? quid tibi in corpore displicet? Quis unquam carnem suam odio habuit? dicit apostolus ... Quid tibi in corpore displicet? Ego dico, corruptio, mortalitas ... Si displicet tibi resuscitari corpus, displiceat tibi et modo corpus. Quid foves quod displicet? quid tueris quod displicet? quid nutris quod displicet? cur optas incolume? An placet?"

¹¹⁵ See A. M. LA BONNARDIÈRE, *La date du "De Continentia" de saint Augustin*, in: *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 5(1959), 121-127 adduces good arguments for a later date than usually accepted. The date circa 426, proposed by D. FAUL, *The Date of the De Continentia of St. Augustine*, in: *Studia Patristica* VI (Berlin, 1962), 374-382 seems to me exaggerated.

¹¹⁶ *De continentia* 1,2-3,9. CSEL 41,142-151: "Et ne in sola inferiorum partium carnis libidine continentia necessaria videatur ... Ac per hoc illa, quae in genitalibus membris pudicitia refrenatis solet maxime ac proprie continentia nominari, nulla transgressione violatur, si superior continentia, de qua iam diu loquimur, in corde servetur ... audiamus scribentem ad Galatas et dicentem: manifesta autem sunt opera carnis, quae sunt fornicationes, immunditiae, luxuriae, idolorum servitus, veneficia, inimicitiae, contentiones, aemulationes, animositates, dissensiones, haereses, invidiae, ebrietates, comestiones et his similia ...".

Therefore, we may never blame the nature of the flesh¹¹⁷; the flesh as such is good and it does not lust for something except through the soul¹¹⁸. We ourselves are a unit of flesh and spirit. At the moment of our death we do not relinquish our flesh by escaping from it, but we abandon it in order to get it back. This is the reason why Paul calls his flesh "himself". The flesh itself cannot be hostile to us. Precisely by resisting to the shortcomings of the flesh we love it, because then we are healing it, and no one ever hated his own flesh. It is true that Paul declares in Rom. 7:25 that he serves the law of sin with his flesh, but this does not mean that he consents to carnal concupiscence; it means that he experiences involuntary impulses and desires¹¹⁹. The tension between flesh and spirit should not be considered as a tension between two natures originated from two opposite principles, as the Manichaeans believe, but it is to be seen as a consequence of sin. Our body is dead because of sin (Rom. 8:10). Not one single substance is bad in itself. Therefore, Paul says that no one ever hated his own flesh¹²⁰. The Manichaean contempt of the flesh and their denial that the flesh of Christ was real flesh, means at the same time the negation of the union between Christ and the Church, for they contend that the Church belongs to Christ only as regards the human souls; as regards

¹¹⁷ Ib. 4,11. ib. 152-154: "... caro autem est infirma et terrena pars hominis ... propter quod ille, qui secundum hominem vivit, non utique secundum carnem, sed potius secundum eam partem hominis vivit, qua homo est, hoc est secundum spiritum mentis ... Verum haec disputatio valet fortassis aliquid in scholis philosophorum; nos autem ... libri christiani ... debemus advertere ... Noli carnis accusare naturam, quando audis: *si secundum carnem vixeritis, moriemini*. Sic enim dici potuit ...: si secundum vos vixeritis, moriemini".

¹¹⁸ Ib. 8,19. ib. 163: "Caro enim nihil nisi per animam concupiscit".

¹¹⁹ Ib. 8,19-20. ib. 163-164: "Totum hoc nos sumus. Et caro ipsa, quae discedente anima moritur ... non fugienda dimittitur, sed recipienda reponitur ... Non enim alterum eorum putare debemus inimicum, sed vitium, quo caro concupiscit adversus spiritum ... Audiamus apostolum, *scio*, inquit, *quia non habitat in me, hoc est in carne mea, bonum* ... Se itaque dicit (sc. apostolus) esse carnem suam. Non ergo ipsa est inimica nostra; et quando eius vitii resistitur, ipsa amatur, quia ipsa curatur. *Nemo enim umquam carnem suam odio habuit*". ib. 8,20. ib. 164: "... neque hic dicit (sc. apostolus): *concupiscentias carnis* ne habueritis, sed *ne perfeceritis*".

¹²⁰ Ib. 7,18. ib. 161: "Absit, ut credamus, quod Manichaeorum credit insania, duas hic demonstratas esse naturas ex contrariis inter se principiis confligentes, unam mali, alteram boni. Prorsus ista duo ambo sunt bona: et spiritus bonum est et caro bonum. Et homo, qui ex utroque constat, uno imperante, alio serviente, utique bonum est ... Verum in hac bona hominis ... natura nunc bellum est". Cf. ib. 9,22. ib. 167-168: "Deinde subiunxit, quod iam commemoravimus: *Nemo enim umquam carnem suam odio habuit, sed nutrit et fovet eam sicut Christus ecclesiam* ... quid ad haec dicitis, Manichaei?".

the human bodies the Church belongs to the devil¹²¹.

Thus, we can distinguish three unions: that between Christ and the Church, that between man and woman, and that between spirit and flesh. Christ cares for the Church, the man cares for the woman, and the spirit cares for the flesh. This is also true in the following way: the Church is the model and the rule of conduct for women; Christ is the model for men. Moreover, the lower thing, that is, the body is also a rule of conduct for men: they have to love their wives as their own bodies (*corpora*), for the higher things as well as the lower things are good. But Paul does not prescribe the body as a rule of conduct for the woman, because she should be subject to the man like the flesh to the spirit. Why does Paul not prescribe the body or the flesh as rule of conduct for the woman? Is there for her no obligation to love her body? Augustine answers this question in the following way: either Paul takes it for granted that she loves her flesh, or he does not want to mention the flesh as rule of subservience for the woman, because the flesh lusts against the spirit during this mortal life (Gal. 5:17). Augustine finds that Paul could hardly prescribe something so ambiguous as the flesh as rule of conduct for the woman. On the other hand, he prescribes the flesh as rule of conduct for the man, because the spirit ought to lust against the flesh and, in doing so, to care for the flesh. This is made possible by the fact that the spirit as well as the flesh, the virile sex as well as the female sex have God as their Creator. Sexuality is not the work of the devil¹²². Although the concupiscence of the flesh in a Christian is not yet healed, he feeds and cherishes nonetheless the good nature of his flesh, for no one ever hates his own flesh. The same does Christ for the Church¹²³. God will save the whole human being, spirit and flesh, at the end of time¹²⁴.

¹²¹ Ib. 10,24. ib. 171: "De ecclesia quid dicit deceptor hominum in mortifero errore? Quod ex parte animarum pertineat ad Christum, ex parte corporum ad diabolum".

¹²² Ib. 9,23. ib. 169: "*Viri debent diligere uxores suas sicut sua corpora*, quod est ab inferiore: quia et superiora et inferiora bona sunt omnia. Nec tamen mulier a corpore vel carne accepit exemplum, ut ita esset subdita viro, sicut spiritui caro; sed aut consequenter apostolus intellegi voluit, quod dicere praetermisit, aut forte quia caro concupiscit adversus spiritum in huius vitae mortalitate atque languore, ideo de illa noluit mulieri exemplum subiectionis adhibere".

¹²³ Ib. 11,25. ib. 172-175: "Tunc finem accipiet omnis haec pugna, tunc ambarum substantiarum erit summa concordia, tunc usque adeo ibi nullus erit carnalis, ut etiam ipsa caro sit spiritalis. Quod ergo nunc agit cum carne sua quisque secundum Christum vivens, cum et concupiscit adversus eius malam concupiscentiam, quoniam sanandam continet, quam nondum sanatam tenet, et tamen eius bonam nutrit fovetque naturam, quoniam *nemo unquam carnem suam odio habet*".

¹²⁴ Ib. 12,26. ib. 175.

VII. TEXTS FROM THE PERIOD BETWEEN 414-421

In 414/415, we find again an ascetic line of thought. Someone who chastises his body does not necessarily hate his body. Our flesh is so intimately united with us like a husband with his wife: your flesh is like your wife, for no one ever hated his own flesh, but feeds and cherishes it like Christ feeds and cherishes the Church. Nevertheless, the apostle Paul says elsewhere that the flesh lusts against the spirit (Gal. 5:17). Bear your flesh, educate it, chastise it; at the end of time it will be restored. Because no one ever hated his own flesh, it, too, will be raised up¹²⁵.

In *De patientia* (about 417), Augustine refers to the promise of Jesus to the martyrs that not a hair of their head will be lost (Luke 21:18). Then Augustine quotes Eph. 5:29 to teach that the believer should keep watch over the situation of his flesh with patience rather than with impatience. Thus the believer will outweigh the present sufferings by the invaluable boon of the coming incorruptibility¹²⁶.

Also the following text from a sermon preached about 415 concerns martyrdom. The martyrs of Christ did very wisely not despise their bodies, for contempt for the body is part of a perverse and profane philosophy of people who do not believe in the resurrection of the body. These nonbelievers consider their bodies as prisons in which their souls are thrown down because they have sinned previously elsewhere. Our God, however, created both body and spirit, and He is the Creator as well as the Re-creator of both. This is the reason why the martyrs did not despise their bodies as something inimical. Indeed, no one ever hated his own body. That what is a burden now, will be a honour at the resurrection¹²⁷.

¹²⁵ *En. in psalmum* 140,16. CCL 40,2037: "Numquid qui castigat corpus, odit corpus? ... Si quis verberat filium, odit filium? Et ut aliquid coniunctius eloquamur, caro tamquam coniux tua est. Hoc ipse apostolus dicit: *Nemo umquam carnem suam odio habuit; sed nutrit et fovet eam, sicut et Christus ecclesiam*. Certe caro tamquam coniux est, et nemo carnem suam odio habet. Tamen quid alio loco? *Caro concupiscit adversus spiritum* ... Non te deponat, non te abrumpat; porta, erudi, castiga; reparabitur in fine. Et quia *nemo umquam carnem suam odio habuit*, resurget et caro. Sed quomodo?"

¹²⁶ *De patientia* 8,7. CSEL 41,669: "Unde dominus Iesus ad patientiam exhortans martyres suos etiam ipsius corporis integritatem futuram sine cuiusquam ... membri ... amissione promisit ... ut quoniam *nemo umquam*, sicut apostolus dicit, *carnem suam odio habuit*, magis homo fidelis per patientiam quam per impatientiam pro stratu suae carnis invigilet ...".

¹²⁷ *Sermo* 277,3,3-4,4. PL 38,1259: "Ergo prudenter martyres Christi non sua corpora contempserunt. Perversa est ista, et mundana philosophia, eorum qui non credunt corporum resurrectionem. Videntur enim sibi quasi magni corporis contemptores, quia ipsa corpora quasi pro carceribus se habere arbitrantur, quo detrusas putant animas, quod alibi ante peccaverunt. Deus autem noster et corpus fecit et spiritum; et utriusque creator est, et

In another sermon from 418/419, Augustine argues with reference to Rom. 7:24 "I, miserable human being! Who will rescue me out of this body doomed to death?", that there is at present mournfulness because of our mortal body, but also that no one ever hated his own flesh. We would prefer that our bodies were mere life, but this is impossible on earth. Therefore, let us take care that our mind or soul dwell in Him who is Life. Then, the Holy Spirit will give life to our mortal bodies at the resurrection, for the resurrection will not take place without the body neither in another body. It is a human error to think that God wishes that we should be without body. Though Paul says that our body is dead (Rom. 8:10), take death away and the body will be entirely good. When death is eliminated as our last enemy, my flesh will be for ever my friend, for no one ever hated his own flesh¹²⁸.

About 418-419 in *De civitate Dei*, Augustine rejects the opinion of Plato¹²⁹ that the souls of the deceased begin again to long for bodies, because they have forgotten their previous miserable situation. The deceased saints, on the contrary, long for their bodies because they remember God's promise. They did not hate their flesh when it resisted in its weakness the spirit, and when they still had to restrain their flesh. How much more must they now love it, since itself is to become spiritual and

utriusque recreator ... Non ergo tanquam inimicam, vel contempserunt, vel persecuti sunt martyres. *Nemo enim unquam carnem suam odio habuit* ... Quod nunc est onus, erit honor". Ib. 8,8. ib. 1261 Augustine says: "et tamen mori nolumus". This text belongs to the period in which Augustine rejects explicitly the opinion that human souls have fallen or been cast down from heaven, and thrust into these mortal bodies (*carceres*) by reason of their sins committed in a previous life without bodies, as taught by some Neoplatonists, Origen and Priscillian. See R.J. O'CONNELL, *The Origin of the Soul in St. Augustine's Later Works*. New York, Fordham University Press, 1987. For Origen see H. CROUZEL, *Origène*. Paris-Namur, Lethielleux-Culture et Vérité, 1985, p. 267-284. Cf. notes 10 and 143-144.

¹²⁸ *Sermo* 155,13,14-14,15. PL 38,848-849: "Quid de illo gemitu, *Miser ego homo?* ... Remansit tristitia de nostro corpore. *Nemo autem carnem suam odio habuit* ... Vellem quidem et corpus meum esset in vita: sed quia non potest, sit vel spiritus meus, sit vel anima mea. Exspecta, noli esse sollicitus ... Si enim non adderet (sc. apostolus), *mortis hujus*, et diceret, *Quis me liberabit de corpore?* forte suggeretur error cogitationi humanae, et diceretur: Vides quia non vult Deus nos esse cum corpore? ... Mortem tolle, et bonum est corpus. Detrahatur mors novissima inimica, et erit mihi in aeternum caro mea amica. *Nemo enim unquam carnem suam odio habuit* ... Absit, fratres mei, absit ut spiritus concupiscendo contra carnem oderit carnem. Vitia carnis odit, prudentiam carnis odit, contentionem mortis odit".

¹²⁹ *Phaedrus* 248A ss.

will be better than the bodies of Adam and Eve¹³⁰.

In another section of the same work, written after 420, Augustine, explaining the story of Cain and Abel, repeats the thesis that sin should not lord it over the human being, that is, the carnal part should be ruled by the mind. Augustine's arguments are based on Paul's description of the inner struggle in the human being (Gal. 5:17. Rom. 7:17. Rom. 6:13). At the same time he refers to philosophers who, too, hold that the carnal part of the soul is depraved and thus should not drag the mind after it, otherwise one will fall into evil. He reads the words of Gen. 3:16 spoken to Eve: "And you shall turn yourself to your husband and he shall be your master" as an image of the subjection of the carnal part. These words are to be understood in this way: the man, in order to rule his wife, should resemble the mind that rules the flesh. This is why Paul says: "He who loves his wife, loves himself. For no one ever hated his own flesh". We should cure the faults of the flesh as being our own, and not condemn them as though they were foreign to us¹³¹.

During the Pelagian controversy in the years 418/419, Augustine deals again with the text of Paul "I, miserable human being!" (Rom. 7:24). Both the mind and the flesh constitute the one human ego, and do not form two opposite natures. But a human being is more ego in his mind than in his flesh, because the mind rules and the flesh is ruled. The flesh is always my flesh. The flesh is not brought about by another substance or by another principle. It is not true that the soul is created by God, but the

¹³⁰ *De civitate Dei* XIII,20. CCL 48,403: "Non enim, sicut Platoni visum est, corpora oblivione desiderant, sed potius, quia meminerunt (sc. sanctorum animae defunctorum) quid sibi ab eo sit promissum, qui neminem fallit ... Si enim *carnem suam non oderant*, quando eam suae menti infirmitate resistentem spiritali iure cohercebant, quanto magis eam diligunt etiam ipsam spiritalem futuram! Sicut enim spiritus carni serviens non incongrue carnalis, ita caro spiritui serviens recte appellabitur spiritalis, non quia in spiritum convertetur, sicut nonnulli putant ... Non solum enim non erit tale, quale nunc est ... sed nec tale quidem, quale fuit in primis hominibus ante peccatum ...".

¹³¹ *Ib.* XV,7. *ib.* 461-462: "Cum enim commota fuerit pars ipsa carnalis, quam peccatum appellat apostolus, ubi dicit: *Non ego operor illud, sed quod habitat in me peccatum* (quam partem animi etiam philosophi dicunt esse vitiosam, non quae mentem debeat trahere, sed cui mens debeat imperare eamque ab illicitis operibus ratione cohibere) ... ad mentem domita et victa convertitur, ut subditae ratio dominetur ... Quod dictum est ad Cain de peccato vel de vitiosa carnis concupiscentia, hoc isto loco de peccatrice femina; ubi intellegendum est virum ad regendam uxorem animo carnem regenti similem esse oportere. Propter quod dicit apostolus: *Qui diligit uxorem suam, se ipsum diligit; nemo enim umquam carnem suam odio habuit*. Sananda sunt enim haec sicut nostra, non sicut aliena damnanda".

flesh by the powers of darkness¹³². Even though Paul is not miserable in his mind, he is miserable in his flesh. However, we should not think that Paul was a human being only in his mind and not in his flesh. One cannot split up the human being in this way, for "whoever hated his own flesh?". Although Paul sighs "I, miserable human being! Who will rescue me out of this body doomed to death?" he does not at all wish to be without his body. These considerations of Augustine form an introduction to the theme of the resurrection, in which he emphasizes that each one will get back his body, either as punishment or as eternal bliss¹³³.

In 421, the Pelagian Julian of Eclanum uses the text "No one ever hated his own flesh" against the proposition found in Gal. 5:17 that the flesh lusts against the spirit, a viewpoint fully subscribed to by Augustine. Julian thinks to gain an advantage from the fact that no one ever hated his own flesh, for his opinion that human nature in itself is good. But Augustine responds: "Who is denying this? But even you are asserting that the flesh should be kept under control by hard discipline. Again you tell the truth, but you do not wish to listen to yourself". Even after baptism control of the flesh is necessary for the faithful, according to Augustine. By this answer he intends to undermine the Pelagian thesis of the natural goodness of the human being¹³⁴.

VIII. TEXTS FROM AUGUSTINE'S LAST YEARS OF LIFE

In his writing on the care for the burial of the deceased (424/425), Augustine argues that this care is based on natural love (*affectus*) for our own body. Because of the love which makes that no one ever hates his own flesh, people are sad when they know that something which is

¹³² *Sermo* 154,7,9-9,12. PL 38,837-839: "Non enim ego in mente, et alius in carne ... Non enim duae naturae contrariae, sed ex utraque unus homo: quia unus Deus, a quo factus est homo ... Sed quia ego sum in carne, ego sum in mente; sed magis ego sum in mente, quam in carne ... mens enim regit, caro regitur ... Non enim caro non mea, aut de alia substantia caro, aut de alio principio caro, aut anima ex Deo, et caro de gente tenebrarum".

¹³³ *Ib.* 10,15. PL 38,839: "*Miser ego homo*: etsi non in mente, tamen in carne miser homo. Non enim in mente homo, et in carne non homo. *Quis enim unquam carnem suam odio habuit?*". Cf. *ib.* 12,17. *ib.* 840: "Habebis (sc. corpus), sed jam non mortis hujus. Ipsum erit, sed non ipsum erit. Ipsum erit, quia ipsa caro erit: non ipsum erit, quia mortale non erit".

¹³⁴ *Contra Julianum* VI,15,47. PL 44,849: "Iterum dicis: quod *carnem suam nullus oderit*. Quis enim hoc negat? Sed tamen disciplinae rigore asseris conterendam. Iterum ergo pro veritate loqueris, et audire te non vis. Cur enim caro conteritur a fidelibus, si nihil remansit in baptismo quod adversus spiritum concupiscat?".

required by the ceremony of burial will lack to their bodies. Love of the own body is natural, although the martyrs overcame this love¹³⁵. Burying the dead is a praiseworthy work; it is a work of mercy. The hearts of those who show compassion, are deeply impressed and deplore it, when they see bad things done to dead bodies of others; things that they do not wish to happen to their own bodies, for no one ever hates his own body¹³⁶. All that one spends on the burial of a body, is no aid to obtain salvation, but it is a duty of humanity, corresponding to the state of mind through which no one ever hates his own body. This is especially true of persons who believe in the resurrection of the flesh and bear witness to their faith in this way¹³⁷.

In a sermon that is to be dated in 428 at earliest, Augustine discusses at length the resurrection of the body with references to 2 Cor. 5:1-4 and John 5:28-29. After having dealt with Jesus' fear of death at Gethsemane (Mt. 26:39), he addresses the faithful in the following way: "I know it: you want to live, you do not want to die...It is the soul itself that wants and desires this; how, I do not know. Because the soul loves life, it hates death. And because of the fact that it does not hate its flesh, it does not want that happens to the flesh what it hates, for no one ever hated his own flesh". This text shows clearly how natural human love for the body is¹³⁸.

A last quotation that has to be mentioned, occurs in the *Retractationes* (about 427). Augustine corrects there a text from *De diversis quaesti-*

¹³⁵ *De cura pro mortuis gerenda* 7,9. CSEL 41,634-636: "Et tamen ex illo humani cordis affectu, quo *nemo unquam carnem suam odio habet*, si cognoscant homines aliquid post mortem suam suis corporibus defuturum, quod in sua cuiusque gente vel patria poscit sollemnitas sepulturae, contristantur ut homines et quod ad eos post mortem non pertinet, ante mortem suis corporibus timent ... ex hoc igitur, quod carnem suam quisque naturaliter diligit ...".

¹³⁶ Ib. 9,11. ib. 639: "... cur ergo illi, qui Saulem et filium eius sepelierunt, misericordiam fecisse dicuntur ... nisi quia bene afficiuntur corda miserantium, quando ea dolent in mortuorum corporibus alienis, quae illo affectu, quo *nemo unquam carnem suam odio habet*, nolunt fieri post mortem suam corporibus suis".

¹³⁷ Ib. 18,22. ib. 658-659: "Corpori autem humano quidquid inpenditur, non est praesidium salutis, sed humanitatis officium secundum affectum, quo *nemo unquam carnem suam odio habet* ... Et si haec faciunt, qui carnis resurrectionem non credunt, quanto magis debent facere qui credunt ...".

¹³⁸ *Sermo* 344,3-4. PL 39,1513-1514: "Et ipse tibi Salvator tuus, quamvis in carne Deus, quamvis cum carne Deus, humanum tamen demonstravit affectum, ubi ait: *Pater, si possibile est, transeat a me calix iste* ... Scio, vivere amas, mori non vis ... Hoc velles, hoc habet humanus affectus; hoc ipsa anima nescio quo modo habet in voluntate et cupiditate. Quoniam diligendo vitam, odit mortem: et quoniam carnem suam non odit, nec ipsi vult accidere quod odit. *Nemo enim unquam carnem suam odio habuit*".

onibus 83, q. 36,1 in which he pointed out that love (*caritas-dilectio*) consists in loving those things which one should not value inferior than the person who loves. In that case only eternal objects remain as objects of our love, namely God and the human mind through which we are able to love the eternal God. If we love nothing else than these two, our love can be called totally pure and perfect in the true sense of the word. But in his *Retractationes* he makes the following remark: "If this were true, how can the apostle Paul say 'No one ever hated his own flesh' (Eph. 5:29), by which the apostle exhorts husbands to love their wives?". Consequently, there are more objects that we ought to love. Augustine justifies himself by saying that he had added "in the true sense of the word", for one has to love the own flesh, but not for its own sake; one should love the flesh for the sake of the soul to which it is submitted and by which it is used. Moreover, it is wrong to consider the beauty of the flesh as something independent; its beauty has to be seen in relation to the source of all beauty, that is, to God¹³⁹.

IX. CONCLUSION: FROM SUBJECTION TO LOVE

Augustine's evolution is sometimes described as having taken place especially in two respects. In his earliest writings Augustine held that beatitude is in principle accessible for the human being in this life, and that this beatitude consists in the realization of wisdom. Later he abandons these views: longing for beatitude can only be satisfied after this life, and it is achieved not in a disembodied mental state, but also in a resurrected body. However, Augustine's evolution has more facets; also with respect to our topic we find an undeniable evolution in Augustine's attitude towards the sensible and corporeal reality. I would like to describe this evolution as a decrease of 'concrete dualism'. Dualism is a very complicated notion. L. Hölscher mentions no less than eight meanings of dualism¹⁴⁰. I consider duality not identical with dualism. Duality originates from the power of discernment of the human mind and is part of the great-

¹³⁹ *Retract.* I,26. CCL 57,78: "Quod si verum est, quomodo ergo apostolus ait: *Nemo unquam carnem suam odio habuit*, et ex hoc admonet ut diligantur uxores? Sed ideo dictum est *proprie dilectio dicitur*, quoniam caro diligitur quidem, nec tamen proprie sed propter animam cui subiacet ad usum. Nam et si propter se ipsam videtur diligi, cum eam nolumus esse deformem, ad aliud referendum est decus eius, ad illud scilicet a quo decora sunt omnia".

¹⁴⁰ L. HÖLSCHER, o.c., p. 321, n. 6. S. PÉTREMENT, *Dualisme*, in: *Encyclopedia Universalis* Corpus 6, Paris 1984, p. 444-447. She does not consider Augustine as a dualist in the strict sense.

ness of the human being. On the contrary, dualism supposes a certain exclusivity and hostility between two principles. Regarding Augustine's view on the relationship between soul and body, one brings up an ontological, an epistemological and a moral dualism. With respect, however, to an ontological dualism between soul and body, everyone will agree that this cannot be attributed to Augustine in the sense of Manichaean dualism. One can dispute about the question whether Augustine's concept of the union between soul and body is to be qualified as accidental¹⁴¹, semi-accidental or substantial, but one thing is certain: from the very beginning on of his writings, he describes the human being as consisting in soul and body, even though his insights are not to be compared with our modern ones. In any way his thought on this theme has undergone an important development. I cannot pass judgement on his dualism in the epistemological sphere; this would require a study in itself, but it is quite possible that here, too, we come across a certain development¹⁴². Augustine's evolution in the moral sphere is much more clear. Not without reason he saw a resemblance between the Neoplatonic and the Christian thought on the duality of soul and body. Nonetheless, we see here a strong Christianization of his earlier ideas that I like to describe as an evolution from subjection to love. Subjection of the body remains always necessary, but it is less and less based on philosophical arguments and more and

¹⁴¹ H.R. DROBNER, *Person-Exegese und Christologie bei Augustinus. Zur Herkunft der Formel una persona*. Leiden, Brill, 1986, p. 117 writes: "In seinem Frühwerk lehrt er, wie dargestellt, eine (neuplatonisch begründete) akzidentelle Einheit von Leib und Seele im Menschen. Vor dem Jahre 411 ist in den Werken Augustins keine Stelle nachzuweisen, die dieser Auffassung widersprechen würde. Mit dem Jahr 411 setzt die zweite Periode im anthropologischen Denken Augustins ein". I think that this evolution took place earlier. E. MASUTTI, *Il problema del corpo in S. Agostino*. Roma, Borla, 1989, p. 213 and 218 attributes even a nihilistic concept of the body to Augustine: "La riduzione dell'essenzialità dell'uomo all'anima fa sì che il corpo non sia visto come parte costitutiva dell'essenza dell'uomo ... La strumentalità del corpo, così come è stata elaborata da Agostino, rivela una concezione del corpo prettamente nichilista". For a diverging view, see J. PÉPIN, *Idées grecques sur l'homme et sur Dieu*. Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1971, p. 65-69. 183, n. 4. 198.

¹⁴² L. HÖLSCHER, o.c., p. 270-271, n. 210 thinks that Augustine rejected in the beginning any witness of the senses, but that he changed his mind since *De Genesi ad litt.* See also his exposition about sense-perception, p. 91-103. C.P. MAYER, *Die Zeichen in der geistigen Entwicklung und in der Theologie des jungen Augustinus I-II*. Würzburg, Augustinus-Verlag, 1969. 1974. J. PÉPIN, *Une curieuse déclaration idéaliste du "De Genesi ad litteram" (XII,10,21) de saint Augustin, et ses origines plotiniennes ("Ennéade" 5,3,1 et 5, 5,1-2)*, in: *Ex Platonicorum persona* (o.c.), p. 183-210, esp. 191-199, shows the strong influence of Plotinus on Augustine. Cf. G. VERBEKE, *L'évolution de la doctrine du pneuma du stoïcisme à s. Augustin*. Paris, Desclée De Brouwer - Louvain, Inst. Sup. de Philosophie, 1945, p. 489-510.

more on Christian, especially Pauline, ideas.

A diagonal reading of the texts related to Eph. 5:29 yields the following analysis. In order not to repeat myself too much, I refer to the quotations of the texts in the notes.

1) *The human being as one unit*

In his earliest works Augustine emphasizes strongly the distinction between mind and body, even with dualistic terms such as *alia creatura* (n. 35), and also the necessity to break away from sensible and bodily reality. He talks about *ista sensibilia fugienda* so long as we are in this body (n. 41. 42). But later he will say that we leave our flesh at the moment of death *non fugienda* (n. 119) and that the wish to be without body is nothing other than self-deception (n. 105. 128). From 397 on, the dichotomy between mind and body is taken up in the awareness of the oneness of the human being: mind and body form one unit, one *totum*; we ourselves are that unit of mind and body, for our *ego* consists in flesh and mind (n. 106. 119. 132. 133). The expression "to love oneself" is even used to demonstrate that bad desires are our own and are not foreign to us. Talking about the flesh as *pars hominis* is, according to Augustine, fit for philosophers (n. 117), although he, after 420, still appeals to the philosophical distinction of *partes hominis* in order to support his conviction that the mind has to rule the lower part of the human being (n. 131). Neither in his earlier nor in his later works, Augustine considers the body as *carcer*. He avoids this Manichaean term always¹⁴³. Where he speaks of the body as a *carcer*, he does not mean the body as such, but *ignorantiae tenebrae*, *umbra mortis*, and *corruptio corporis*¹⁴⁴. In the beginning he

¹⁴³ See P. COURCELLE, *Gefängnis (der Seele)*, in: *Reallexikon f. Antike u. Christentum* IX (1973), 294-318. ID., *Connais-toi toi-même de Socrate à saint Bernard*. Paris, Etudes Augustiniennes, 1975, p. 345-370. *Carcer* occurs only in the mouth of Licentius in *C. Academicos* I,3,9. CCL 29,8. That the body is not a *carcer* as the result of a sin committed by the soul in another life, is stressed in: *Sermo* 240,4,4. 165,5,6. PL 38, 1132. 905-906. *Epist.* 164,7,20. 166,9,27. CSEL 44,539. 583. See other references in R.J. O'CONNELL, *The Origin of the Soul in St. Augustine's Later Works*, o.c.

¹⁴⁴ *Epist.* 164,5,16. CSEL 44,535. *De civitate dei* XIV,3,2. CCL 47,417. *En. in psalmum* 141,17-19. CCL 40,2057-2058, commenting on the verse of ps. 141(142),8 "Educ de carcere animam meam": "... id est, de laboribus et de pressuris huius saeculi. Non enim caro quam tu fecisti, sed corruptela carnis, et pressurae, et tentationes carcer mihi sunt. Aliqui autem dixerunt carcerem istum et speluncam corpus hoc esse ... Sed et iste intellectus vacillat aliquantum ... Posset dici et corpus nostrum carcer, non quia carcer est quod fecit Deus, sed quia poenale et mortale ... Ergo si caro tibi carcer est, non corpus est carcer tuus, sed corruptio corporis tui ... Si sic intellegamus, non est blasphemia". Therefore, Augustine prefers the explanation: "Educ ab angustia". *Sermo* 256,2. PL 38,1191-1192: "Alius dicit: Corpus mortis huius non ad me pertinet: carcer meus est ad tempus,

considered the body as *gravissimum vinculum* (n. 43. 68); later, with reference to Eph. 5:29, he rejects that the body would be a *compes*, *vinculum* or *carcer* (n. 111. 127), in which the soul would be shut up because of a sin committed elsewhere (n. 127).

2) *The subjection of the body in a moral-ascetic context*

From his earliest works on, Augustine states that the body must be subject to the mind. Even though already there a certain influence of Pauline texts is undeniable (n. 39-41), this statement gets from 392 on a strong Christian character, in particular there where Augustine speaks about the Christian practices of fasting and continence (n. 101. 111. 116). Since subjection of the flesh is also an element of Christian ethics, we find till the end of Augustine's life terms like *belligerans* (n. 107: the only quotation of Eph. 5:29 in an anti-donatist context)¹⁴⁵, *edomare*, *refrenare* (n. 103), *castigare* (n. 125), *cohercere* (n. 130), *conterere* (n. 134), *cohibere*, *domare* (n. 131).

3) *The body is not created by the powers of darkness*

It has been always Augustine's conviction, after having left the Manichaean sect, that the body is created by God and that it is beautiful (n. 48. 49). From 388/389 on, we find passages in which he rejects the Manichaean opinion that the higher part of the human being is created by God, but the lower part by the race of darkness (n. 89). This theme is repeated regularly (n. 111. 120. 127. 132). Moreover, Augustine points out the pernicious consequences of this Manichaean standpoint for the ecclesiology: he denies explicitly that the Father of the Church is another than the Father of Christ (n. 111) and that the souls of the faithful within the Church belong to Christ, but their bodies to the devil (n. 110. 121).

catena mea est ad tempus: in corpore mortis sum ego; non corpus mortis sum ego ... Non sum ego caro, sed spiritus sum. In carcere meo gemo: quando fuerit hoc vinculum et hoc ergastulum dissolutum, ego liber abscedo ... Sed non es tu ipse corpus mortis hujus? ... Redeo quidem ad corpus, sed jam non mortis hujus ... Non quia aliud erit corpus, sed quia oportet corruptibile hoc induere incorruptionem ... Non, inquit (sc.Paulus), pono corpus terrenum, et accipio corpus aereum, aut accipio corpus aethereum. Ipsum accipio, sed non jam mortis hujus". Already in *De Genesi c. Man.* II,7,8. PL 34,200 Augustine made a distinction between *corpus de limo* and *corpus mortalitatis*: "... potuit ab omnipotente artifice tale fieri, ut nulla molestia, nulla indigentia cruciaret hominem ante peccatum, et nulla corruptione tabesceret".

¹⁴⁵ *Bellum* as indicating the inner war within the human person occurs in n. 120, and later e.g. in *En. in ps.* 75,4. CCL 39,1039-1040: "Adhuc enim habes adversum te bellum".

4) *Love for one's own flesh as love of the husband for his wife*

Augustine uses in his earliest writings the relationship between man and woman in a figurative sense. It is an image of the ruling reason vis-à-vis the lower part of the human being. Nonetheless, both live in union and the *coniunctio* between man and woman is an image of the union between the reason and the lower functions of the mind (n. 93). But, shortly after the year 392, Augustine reads Eph. 5:29 as an explicit commandment that the husband ought to love his wife (n. 101), though this idea was already present implicitly in *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* 30,63. From 397 on, we see that Augustine adds Eph. 5:28 "Who loves his wife, loves himself" to Eph. 5:29 (n. 103. 108. 109. 131). A radical statement like *concubitum fugiendum* (n. 45) is no longer found in Augustine's later works.

5) *Love for the own flesh as a natural phenomenon*

In Augustine's earliest writings care for the own body (n. 52. 53) and for the bodies of others (n. 79. 81) are mentioned a few times. Although care for the body is in itself an aspect of love for the body, it is only from 397 on that Augustine speaks explicitly of love for the own body or flesh (n. 102. 104). He considers this love as a natural phenomenon that is also found in animals (n. 102. 135). The example he gives of such a natural love, is the fact that everyone tries to avoid a blow or a mishap (n. 102. 111). Even the presence in us of *concupiscentiae*, understood in a negative sense, is something "natural" (n. 119). Because nature in itself is something good, one should never accuse the flesh of evil (n. 117. 123).

6) *Eph. 5:29 in the context of death and resurrection*

Whereas Augustine in his earliest treatises considered the absence of fear of death as an ideal (n. 25. 26. 27. 30. 31), he changed his mind about the year 397 - after some timid affirmations in 387/388 (n. 31. 68) - and was convinced, from then on, that fear of death is a natural feeling¹⁴⁶. Ani-

¹⁴⁶ For later texts see H.-G. SURMUND, "Factus eram ipse mihi magna quaestio" (*Conf. IV,4*). *Untersuchungen zu Erfahrung des Todes bei Augustinus, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Problems der "mors immatura"*. Münster 1977, p. 362-383. E. REBILLARD, *La détresse du mourant: sa valeur dans les sermons de saint Augustin*, in: *Revue des Études Latines* 69(1991), 147-165. J.-M. GIRARD, *La mort chez saint Augustin. Grandes lignes de l'évolution de sa pensée, telle qu'elle apparaît dans ses traités*. Fribourg S., Ed. Universitaires, 1992. In my *Recherches sur la christologie de saint Augustin*. Fribourg S., Éd. Universitaires, 1954, p. 137, I thought that this evolution regarding the fear of death took place about 415, but I see now that it happened much earlier. The strongest text is found in *De civitate dei* XIII,6. CCL 48,389: "Quapropter quod adinet ad corporis mortem, id est separationem animae a corpore, cum eam patiuntur, qui morientes

mals, too, do not want to die (n. 103). From 412 on, he repeats often that no one wishes death (n. 113. 138, with a reference to Christ's agony). The death of the martyrs is not to be aligned with contempt for their bodies (n. 127).

Belief in the resurrection of the flesh is already expressed in the earlier works (n. 66-71). But this theme was not yet elaborated there. Augustine had not yet reflected upon the question how the flesh would rise. This is not surprising, for even in his later works he confesses his ignorance about the how of the resurrection¹⁴⁷. In his later texts he formulates two insights: a) the flesh will be restored without any loss of its limbs (n. 125. 126); and b) we will get back our flesh without any weakness, that is, without corruptibility and mortality (n. 113. 114. 128), for the struggle between spirit and flesh will be over (n. 123). Consequently, we have to affirm two things regarding the resurrection of the body: it is the same body that will be resurrected, and at the same time it is not the same body. The resurrected body will no longer need any food and no longer be mortal, and thus it will be better than the body of Adam and Eve in paradise (n. 133. 130). The philosophy of this world does not believe in the resurrection of the body (n. 127), but the Christians do, and because of their faith they take more care for the deceased (n. 137).

7) *The coming of Christ in the body*

The earlier texts of Augustine regarding the Incarnation are situated within a context that has been called an "intellectual moralism"¹⁴⁸. I think that this expression has to be nuanced. It is true that Augustine emphasizes particularly the authority and the example of the incarnate Christ. Christ teaches us through his words and deeds the moral way to attain God himself. One should, however, not underestimate Jesus' authority neither his example. C. Walter reproaches me, that I, in my article on the humanity of Christ as *lac parvulorum* and as *via*, start from Augustine's early christology as genuine Christian, which does not allow me anymore to clarify the

appellantur, nulli bona est. Habet enim asperum sensum et contra naturam vis ipsa, quod utrumque divellitur, quod fuerat in vivente coniunctum atque consertum, quamdiu moratur, donec omnis adimatur sensus, qui ex ipso inerat animae carnisque complexu".

¹⁴⁷ *Sermo* 277,13,13. PL 38,1264: "Quales erimus, sciemus cum fuerimus. Antequam simus, temerarii non simus, ne illud non simus". *Sermo* 362,25,27. PL 39,1630: "Jam ergo, fratres, nemo quaerat perversa subtilitate cuiusmodi figura erit corporum in resurrectione mortuorum ...". See also *De civitate dei* XXII,30 en 21. CCL 48,862. 841.

¹⁴⁸ J.-A. BECKAERT, *Un moralisme intellectueliste*, in *Bibl. August.* 10, Paris 1952, p. 704.

positive influence of the philosophical tradition¹⁴⁹. But even now, after forty years of enormous progress in Neoplatonic studies, I believe that Augustine's early christology is orthodox. It is good to remember that Augustine, shortly before his conversion, believed that Christ was only a man of an extraordinary wisdom who by God's caring for us seemed to have merited such a great authority as teacher (Conf. VII,19,25). Is this still the case in his earliest works? I don't think so. According to O. du Roy, after his conversion Augustine holds firmly: a) the reality of the Incarnation; b) the divinity of Christ sent to us by the Father; c) the Father as origin of the Son who is the truth and wisdom born from Him, and also the Father as origin of all things; d) the divinity of the Holy Spirit as admonition for us¹⁵⁰. That Augustine was convinced of the divinity of Christ at that moment, is also the opinion of O'Connell, but he finds that Augustine does not know how to cope with Christ's humanity: "The man Jesus falls readily into the Plotinian matrix, and substantially under the indictments leveled in the *Confessions*"¹⁵¹. According to this author, Augustine makes a Plotinian distinction between Christ as divine truth or wisdom and Christ as man; the authority of Jesus transcends the wisdom of other people only through a greater participation in God's wisdom and has only a provisional character. Authority is here no more than an external admonition.

I think, nevertheless, that for Augustine Jesus' authority is the norm according to which he judges his Neoplatonic insights. He asserts clearly: "In order to learn there is a twofold force, that of authority and that of reason. I, therefore, am resolved in nothing whatever to depart from the authority of Christ, for I do not find a stronger authority"¹⁵². Authority is partly divine and partly human, but divine authority is the true, the firm and the highest¹⁵³. When Augustine compares the incarnate Christ with a cloud, he calls the Gospel a most abundant torrent (*imber*) distinct

¹⁴⁹ C. WALTER, *Der Ertrag der Auseinandersetzung mit den Manichäern für das hermeneutische Problem bei Augustin*. Inaugural-Dissertation. München, Schön, 1972, p. 112, n. 13. (Otherwise a very good study). T.J. VAN BAVEL, *L'Humanité du Christ comme "lac parvulorum" et comme "via" dans la spiritualité de saint Augustin*, in: *Augustiniana* 7(1957), 245-281.

¹⁵⁰ O. DU ROY, o.c., p. 112-113.

¹⁵¹ R.J. O'CONNELL, *St. Augustine's Early Theory* ... o.c., p. 267.

¹⁵² *Contra Academicos* III,20,43. CCL 29,60-61. See G. MADEC, *Une lecture de Confessions* ... a.c., p. 123-130.

¹⁵³ *De ordine* II,9,27. CCL 29,122: "... sed vera firma summa ea est, quae divina nominatur".

from human teaching that is only like rain (*pluvia*)¹⁵⁴. The most subtle reasoning, that is, the Neoplatonic philosophy, would never recall the blinded souls of the masses to the spiritual world, if God had not bent the authority of the divine Intellect to the human body¹⁵⁵.

The expression *populari quadam clementia* of the last text leads us to Augustine's statement that the Incarnation is necessary for the little ones (*parvuli*), because philosophy frees scarcely a very few; therefore, it is not permitted to despise the Christian mysteries¹⁵⁶. From this it appears that Augustine still believes that a small elite is able to see the divine Word. Consequently, he explains the words "He emptied himself" (Phil. 2:7) in the sense that the Word of God did not appear in his divine dignity, but treated courteously (*blandiens*) the weakness of those who did not yet have a clean heart whereby they might see the Word¹⁵⁷. Once we see the Truth, we will realize how full of truth are the things we are commanded to believe, how excellently and healthy we were nourished by Mother Church, and how valuable is that "milk" which Paul declared he gave as drink to the *parvuli* (1 Cor. 3:2)¹⁵⁸. R. Teske rightly draws attention to the fact that *parvulus* is a term of endearment¹⁵⁹. It looses more and more its intellectual overtones in Augustine's writings. But even in his earliest texts Augustine admits that the *intellegentes*, too, need some faith (*fides*) as long as they are in this body, and a bit later he declares that nobody can say with certainty whether or not he belongs to the *intellegentes*¹⁶⁰. Afterwards, we see that Augustine counts himself more and more

¹⁵⁴ *De Genesi c. Man.* II,5,6. PL 34, 199: "Nam propter illam Dominus noster nubilum carnis nostrae dignatus assumere, imbrem sancti Evangelii largissimum infudit, promittens etiam quod si quis biberit de aqua ejus, rediet ad illum intimum fontem, ut forinsecus non quaerat pluviam".

¹⁵⁵ *C. Academicos* III,19,42. See text, note 59. O. DU ROY, o.c., p. 117-119.

¹⁵⁶ *De ordine* II,5,16. CCL 29,115: "Philosophia rationem promittit et vix paucissimos liberat, quos tamen non modo non contemnere illa mysteria ... cogit ... veneranda mysteria, quae fide sincera et inconcussa populos liberant ...".

¹⁵⁷ See text, note 63, and A. VERWILGHEN, *Christologie et spiritualité selon saint Augustin. L'hymne aux Philippiens*. Paris, Beauchesne, 1985, p. 253.

¹⁵⁸ *De quantitate animae* 33,76. CSEL 89,224.

¹⁵⁹ R. J. TESKE, *A Decisive Admonition for St. Augustine?*, in: *Augustinian Studies* 19 (1988), 85-92. ID., *Spirituals and Spiritual Interpretation in Augustine*, in: ib. 15(1984), 65-81. He corrects my opinion (*L'humanité du Christ ...*, a.c., p.267-276) that *stulti* is replaced by *parvuli* from 391 on. Indeed, one finds *parvuli* already in 388: *De quantitate animae* 33,76 and *De Genesi c. Manichaeos* I,23,40. I agree also with J. DOIGNON, *État des questions ...*, a.c., p. 75-76 that I did not enough stress the Incarnation as giving access to the intelligible world through the true philosophy.

¹⁶⁰ *Soliloquia* I,7,14. CSEL 89,22. *De utilitate credendi* 10,24. CSEL 25/1,29-31.

as one of the *parvuli*¹⁶¹. Let us not forget that the adaptation of Christ to the weakness of the masses is an expression of the universality of salvation, and that the Christian message is substantially the same for all human beings.

The notion *exemplum* is intimately connected with authority. Jesus must be an authoritative teacher before he can be an example¹⁶². Augustine speaks of the incarnate Son of God as *exemplum, primitiae* and *via* (n. 64). *Exemplum* has not only an educational dimension, but also the dimension of invitation to imitate the model. The question is: is Jesus as model only an exterior admonition without any spiritual effectiveness; is he only one human model among many others? If we take into account Augustine's references to certain New Testament texts around 388, we cannot but accept that the man Jesus is a very special model¹⁶³. His resurrection of the flesh, his birth of the Virgin and his miracles are considered as elements of Jesus' history, and presented as the milk for the little ones. But at the same time these are also examples and first-fruits (*primitiae*) of our salvation¹⁶⁴. Augustine joins also together the spiritual Adam, that is our Lord Jesus Christ, and the man Jesus who committed no sin (1 Pet. 2:22); re-created and brought to life by Him, we will be restored to paradise¹⁶⁵. Even if we are re-created by Christ as God, "He who committed no sin" can only be said of Jesus as man. The same process of joining together Jesus' humanity and divinity appears when Augustine says that the new man (cf. Col. 3:9-10) is assumed in a holy mystery by the Son of God in order to liberate us. Here too we have a clear reference to the

¹⁶¹ In Joh. evang. tr. 23,11. CCL 36,241. *Sermo* 53,15,16 and *Sermo* 117,5,7-8. PL 38,372 and 665-666.

¹⁶² See W. GEERLINGS, *Christus Exemplum. Studien zur Christologie und Christusverkündigung Augustins*. Mainz, Matthias-Grünwald, 1978, p. 155-158 and B. STUDER, "Sacramentum et exemplum" chez saint Augustin, in: *Recherches Augustiniennes* X, 1975, p. 87-141, esp. p. 108-109 and 127-129.

¹⁶³ In an early text, which is difficult to date, *De div. quaestionibus* 83, q. 36,2. CCL 44A,56, we read: "Hic praestantissimum illud et unicum exemplum dominici hominis proponendum est ...".

¹⁶⁴ *De quantitate animae* 33,76 (see text, n. 64). J. PÉPIN, "Primitiae spiritus". *Remarques sur une citation paulinienne des "Confessions" de saint Augustin*, in: *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 140(1951), 155-202, p. 176: "Une page difficile du *De quantitate animae* ... associe *primitiae* et *exemplum* : l'incarnation du Fils de Dieu nous a apporté l'*exemplum* et les *primitiae* de notre salut; emploi obscur de *primitiae*, mais qui ne doit pas être éloigné du sens classique dégagé par les *Locutiones* et les *Quaestiones*, si l'on songe que la signification originelle d'*exemplum* est celle d'échantillon prélevé sur une masse (*eximere*)".

¹⁶⁵ *De Genesi c. Manich.* II,8,10. PL 34,201.

Incarnation¹⁶⁶. Perhaps the same idea lies behind Augustine's statement, speaking about baptism, that the believers have been washed clean, and sanctified, and justified through the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God (1 Cor. 6:11)¹⁶⁷. A clearer reference to the activity of the man Jesus is found in the following text: the meekness of the Lord Jesus Christ has 'put on' the evil of death from which he wished to 'strip' us¹⁶⁸. Finally, two references to the cross should be mentioned: eternal life is recovered by the cross¹⁶⁹; Christ was put to sleep by the sleep of the Passion in order that the Church might be formed as his wife¹⁷⁰.

Therefore, if one asserts that for Augustine Jesus is 'only' an example, as E. Dinkler does¹⁷¹, one gives easily a false impression of Augustine's thought. Seen in the light of faith, according to Augustine, the Lord is the visible apparition of the Invisible Truth¹⁷². It is true that Augustine maintains a transcendental distinction between God and the world, between Christ as the Truth and Wisdom of God and Christ as a human being. But does modern theology not do the same? I admit also without difficulty that the early reflections of Augustine on the man Jesus take place within the Plotinian scheme of the fall and the return of the soul. But is this not also an essential aspect of the Christian doctrine of salvation? Even in his later works, Augustine maintains that Jesus is *luc et via humilitatis*, and when we have attained the vision *facie ad faciem*, we do not need anymore the milk and the way. The visible apparition of Jesus is referring and temporary, for his words and deeds refer to God himself, to his and our Father. This is in itself not in contradiction with Christian doctrine; the transcendence of God and the Christian eschatological hope form the background of Augustine's theological view. To be sure, this view is elaborated with the help of the Neoplatonic philosophy, just as our modern theological reflections are based upon modern philosophical and cultural insights. No wonder, then, that also Augustine's texts reflect his ontology, his gnoseology, and his conception of language and of the world of the senses. One can call the christology of his earliest works one-sided.

¹⁶⁶ *De moribus ecclesiae cath.* 19,36. CSEL 90,40.

¹⁶⁷ *Ib.* 35,78. *ib.* 83.

¹⁶⁸ *Ib.* 2,3. *ib.* 6. J.K. COYLE, o.c., p. 307-308 has some doubts about the authenticity of this passage, but his only argument is that it fits badly into the context.

¹⁶⁹ *De Genesi c. Manich.* II,22,34. PL 34,214.

¹⁷⁰ *Ib.* II,24,37. *ib.* 216.

¹⁷¹ E. DINKLER, *Die Anthropologie Augustins*. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1934, p. 176.

¹⁷² *De Genesi c. Manich.* I,25,43. PL 34,194: "... propter quam fidem Dominus visibiliter apparere dignatus est". *Ib.* II,24,37. *ib.* 215: "Non loco reliquit, quia Deus loco non continetur ... sed apparendo hominibus in homine, cum Verbum caro factum est".

Indeed, themes like Christ as our brother, as physician, mediator, priest, or those of the personal unity of the divine and the human in Christ¹⁷³, of justification and salvation are not yet worked out. The further development of Augustine's christology owes certainly, among other factors, to his higher appreciation of the body, as appears from his explanation of Eph. 5:29. It is also obvious that the Incarnation drew his attention more and more to the value of the body¹⁷⁴.

Leuven

Tarsicius Jan VAN BAVEL O.S.A.

¹⁷³ W. GEERLINGS, o.c., p. 84 is opposed to my interpretation of the expression *hominem agere* as a description of the Incarnation; it should simply be translated: "Christ as human being". But even in this way I consider it as describing the Incarnation, for it makes no sense to say that a human person speaks "as human being". When Jesus speaks "as human being", it indicates that he is more than merely human. *Corpus agere* occurs about ten times in Augustine's earlier works, and even in *De praedestinatione sanctorum* 17,34. PL 44,985, from the year 428 or 429, he writes: "Elegit (sc. Dominus) ergo eos de mundo cum hic ageret carnem". One can translate these difficult formulations with *agere* as "living in the flesh or the body", but one should not forget its literal meaning: "activating the flesh or the body".

¹⁷⁴ R. J. TESKE, *Love of Neighbour in St. Augustine*, a.c., p. 98: "My suggestion is that Augustine came to realize that the authority of Christ demanded a much more positive view of the body ... Specifically, I want to suggest that it may have been his reading of Eph. 5,29 that triggered the change of mind and heart".