

WAS THERE "AUGUSTINIAN" CONCUPISCENCE IN PRE-AUGUSTINIAN NORTH AFRICA?

Introduction.

In his article on *concupiscentia* written for the *Augustinus Lexicon*, Gerald Bonner makes two sweeping assertions: (1) that "the explanation of A[ugustine]'s understanding and use of *c[oncupiscentia]* is to be found in the sense in which it appears in the Latin Bible," and, (2) that "A[ugustine] was within African tradition understanding *c[oncupiscentia]* as a quality which might be good or evil, but which was normally employed in an unfavorable sense."¹

The first of these conclusions is too far reaching due to its unqualified use of the phrase "in the Latin Bible." This oversimplifies the matter in that the Latin biblical text, at least up to the time of Augustine's ordination as bishop, was extremely fluid.² In fact, I would contend that Augustine's adoption and subsequent redefinition of the term *concupiscentia*, though it almost certainly was based on his reading of the Bible, cannot be said to be based upon his having consistently read that term in many passages of the Latin Bible.³

The second assertion, though correct in its particularity, is too sweeping in that it at least implies the existence of an "African tradition" surrounding the theological usage of *concupiscentia* in patristic North Africa. In fact, it is this implication, combined with Bonner's omission of a discussion regarding the particular aspects of Augustine's teachings on *concupiscentia* and how they could have been derived from his North African predecessors, which provides this study with its theme. Is it in fact demonstrable that Augustine drew from the particular theological traditions of Christian North Africa

¹ *Augustinus Lexikon*, ed. Cornelius Mayer (Basel: Schwabe & Co. AG, 1994) cols. 1113-1122, s.v. "*Concupiscentia*," by Gerald Bonner. Note that both of these conclusions are slightly modified forms of what Bonner had written in his "*Libido and Concupiscentia* in St. Augustine", in *Studia Patristica* VI, ed. F. L. CROSS (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1962), 303-314, particularly 305 and 308.

² For the sake of space, a discussion of the state of the biblical text at the times of Cyprian and Tertullian and of Tertullian's ability to provide his own translations, both of which complicate this question exponentially, has been intentionally bypassed.

³ This assertion can be demonstrated by a perusal of the *apparatus* of the Beuron edition and Sabatier's volumes (for the full bibliography see footnote 18 *infra*). Even Augustine himself can occasionally be found substituting variant terms in place of *concupiscentia*. Of course, whether he did this accidentally, i.e., from memory, because he wished to communicate a particular nuance of meaning or because he actually had in front of him at a particular moment a genuine variant text is normally quite difficult to prove.

(i.e., the thought of Tertullian and Cyprian) as he developed his understanding of concupiscence?

Before attempting an answer to this question two preliminary issues seem requisite. First is the issue of delineating the primary features of Augustine's doctrine of concupiscence. Second is the need for a brief explication of the method followed in this investigation.

Augustine's "mature" doctrine of concupiscence.

Whether or not Augustine's understanding of concupiscence evolved significantly over the course of his life,⁴ the published studies on this topic seem to be agreed that the positions he defended in his last twenty years in his battle with the Pelagians (and especially with Julian of Aeclanum) represent Augustine's thoughts at their most developed and most consistent stage.⁵ These views may be summarized as follows:

⁴ For the view that Augustine's teaching did not appreciably evolve, see Mathijs Lamberigts' "A Critical Evaluation of Critiques of Augustine's View of Sexuality", in *Augustine and His Critics*, eds. Robert Dodaro and George Lawless (London: Routledge, 2000), 182-83, where he writes "It ought to be emphasized that Augustine's negative evaluation of sexuality is a constant which runs through his entire written corpus, and cannot, therefore, be seen as a characteristic particular to the late Augustine alone... [t]hroughout his life, Augustine never deviated from his standpoint." Representing a somewhat different point-of-view, Johannes van Oort has noted that "Augustine expounds his doctrines especially in the struggle against the Pelagians. And in this struggle – mainly forced by the sharp opposition of Julian of Aeclanum – he developed them further." For the latter, see Johannes van Oort, "Augustine on Sexual Concupiscence and Original Sin" in *Studia Patristica Vol XXII Papers Presented to the Tenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1987*, ed. Elizabeth A. Livingstone (Leuven: Peeters Press, 1989), 382.

⁵ In spite of this consistency, the significance of the bishop of Hippo's ideas have not failed to generate tension among modern scholars. In fact, some scholars have seen in them an unnecessarily negative and pessimistic streak which has, when wedded to Augustine's general theological dominance within Western Christendom, imparted a dysfunctional legacy to Western Man's sexuality. The negative assessment of Augustine's views and influence with which I am best acquainted is that of Elaine PAGELS in her *Adam, Eve and the Serpent* (New York: Random House, 1988), especially chapters 5 and 6. Others include Uta Ranke-Heinemann in her *Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven. Women, Sexuality and the Catholic Church*, trans. P. Heinegg (New York: Doubleday, 1990) 75-98; and Peter Brown in his *The Body and Society. Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988) 387-427, especially 396 and following. More appreciative assessments and/or rebuttals of Pagels *et al.* have been published by Mathijs Lamberigts, T. J. van Bavel and Gerald Bonner. Lamberigts' copiously footnoted article in the volume by Dodaro and Lawless, also cited *supra*, is a good place to begin. For a response specifically directed at the positions taken by Pagels, see *idem*, "Augustine, Julian of Aeclanum and E. Pagels' *Adam, Eve and the Serpent*," *Augustiniana* 39 (1989) 393-435. For additional discussions of the positive aspects of Augustine's views, see T. J. van Bavel "Augustinus' houding tegenover seksualiteit", *Kleio* 22 (juli-september 1993) 176-185, especially 182-185, and pages 313-314 of Dr. Bonner's "Libido and Concupiscentia" cited *supra*.

- *Concupiscentia* has wounded Adam's natural descendents in that, virus-like, it has entrenched itself within human nature in such a way that it is able to evade the control of the human mind, both rationally and morally.⁶ In short, it "overwhelms the whole intellect."⁷
- One of its chief products is sexual lust (*libido carnalis*), which is *in se* always morally bad or evil. "Our sexuality bears witness to our fallen condition"⁸ via the observable phenomena of the disobedience of the sexual organs, the shame most people feel at nakedness and the privacy and/or darkness most desire when engaging in sexual activities.⁹
- Concupiscence, because it produces this evil lust, is the vehicle by which Original Sin is transferred to all human beings and by which all natural descendants of Adam come under the control of the devil. In fact, ultimate responsibility for it is assigned to the devil in as much as he is the author of sin.¹⁰
- In spite of these aforementioned results, because there remains a residue of freewill in every human being (and thus ethical responsibility), when freewill is combined with the divine grace, *concupiscentia* becomes conquerable. In baptized Christians, *concupiscentia* remains only as an impulse to sin; it cannot force a Christian to commit sin, although complete victory should only be expected in the next life, following the resurrection to complete Christlikeness.¹¹

⁶ See, e.g., *De pecc. meritis et remissione*, I, 57; *ibid.*, II, 36; *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum*, I, 34-35; and *Contra Iulianum*, IV, 57.

⁷ Bonner, "Libido and Concupiscentia", 309.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 310. Recall, however, that this did not mean for Augustine that marriage is evil *in se*.

⁹ See, e.g., *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I, 22,24; II, 33,55 and *Contra Iulianum* IV, 63 where Augustine writes "... the disobedience of the sexual organs is evil; ... it arose as a counterpart to the disobedience which the man committed with the tree." All English translations of Augustine employed herein are the work of Roland J. Teske. See *Answer to the Pelagians*, vols. 24/1; 24/2 and 24/3 in the series *The Works of Saint Augustine. A Translation for the 21st Century*, (New York: New City Press, 1997-1999).

¹⁰ See, e.g., *De natura et gratia* 28; *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I, 21-22; *Contra Iulianum* III, 9; III, 51; IV, 38; IV, 65; V, 3; VI, 22; VI, 27 and *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum* I, 36 and I, 11 where we read that "children of believing spouses are ... born guilty on account of original sin ... and for this reason ... are under the power of the devil ... the author of the sin."

¹¹ See, e.g., *De perfectione iustitiae hominis* 13,31; *De pecc. meritis et remissione*, I, 39,70; II, 4; *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I, 33,38; *Contra Iulianum*, III, 62; IV, 56; IV, 83.

The Method of Investigation.

Assuming the significance of the more than 100 years (to say nothing of other contextual differences) which separate Augustine from his North African predecessors and given the aforementioned fluidity of the text of the Latin Bible, what then remains as a viable methodological "ground zero" for this type of investigation? The soundest footing, though it too has its difficulties,¹² seemed to be that of a return to the original texts of the biblical materials.¹³

Given the fact that "*concupiscentia* is a Christian technical word, generally translating the Greek *epithumia*,"¹⁴ I first looked at the places in which *epithumia*, along with the allied term *hedone*, is employed in the Christian scriptures.¹⁵ Next, I culled from this list the passages which were clearly negative in tone or implication, i.e., those where one of these terms is employed in context with sinful behavior, or, passages in which moral exhortation and/or moral disapproval are/is the goal of the author.¹⁶ This list of passages in hand, I then

¹² The allusion here is of course to the textual problems of the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek originals, not to mention the host of problems associated with the production of the LXX.

¹³ Choosing to confine this investigation to the "biblical materials" should not be viewed as a claim that any of these three writers drew their inspiration for these ideas *exclusively* from the Bible. To varying degrees, all three were unquestionably impacted by other contemporary cultural or intellectual currents. With regard to Tertullian and, to a lesser extent, Cyprian, one of the most often discussed intellectual influences is that of late-antique philosophy, especially Stoic philosophy. A perusal of the recent literature reveals that while most scholars do speak of Stoic ideas as being observable in the writings of these two, there remains considerable disagreement concerning how to quantify that influence. Given the variance of opinion on this and other questions regarding influence, a search confined to the biblical evidence seemed to be the least problematic course since no one doubts that both Tertullian and Cyprian were fundamentally and profoundly influenced by the Bible. For some of the various opinions concerning the degree of Stoic influence on Tertullian and Cyprian see, e. g., Michel Spanneut, *Tertullien et les premiers moralistes africains* (Paris: Gembloux, 1969) 21-31, 78-80 & 95-96 (including footnotes with references to other literature), and Marcia L. Colish, *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages, II Stoicism in Christian Latin Thought through the Sixth Century* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985) 12-35. For a brief discussion of Tertullian's incorporation of Platonic ideas into his doctrine of the human soul, along with selected bibliography, see pages 49-50 and footnote 37 *infra*.

¹⁴ Bonner, "*Concupiscentia*," col. 1114.

¹⁵ That Augustine called upon the biblical usage of *epithumia* and *hedone* as a foundation for his doctrine has been noted by Lamberigts in his article "A Critical Evaluation ..." page 180. For the Old Testament, passages which employed forms of the Hebrew roots *ʾāvāh*, *hāvāh*, *hōvāh* and *hāmāh* were also consulted.

¹⁶ Interestingly, this step of my study has led me to conclude that the New Testament usage of *epithumia* is overwhelmingly negative in that I would classify approximately 85-90% of its 38 uses as negative and approximately 35% of its uses as both negative and overtly sexual. *pace* Lamberigts, whose phrase "frequently negative connotations" regarding the NT's employment of *epithumia* and *hedone* proves to be a bit of an understatement.

referenced the available volumes of the Beuron *Vetus Latina* project¹⁷ and the volumes on the Latin biblical text produced by Petrus Sabatier.¹⁸ It was at this juncture that things became complicated. These resources revealed that in addition to *concupiscentia*, *libido* and their derived forms, the translators of the various Latin versions employed no less than 10 terms or phrases to communicate the aforementioned concepts.¹⁹ In a final step, the CLCLT CD-ROM database²⁰ was used to search the works of Cyprian and Tertullian for the occurrence of these terms in order to produce an exhaustive list of passages in which these two authors discuss their understanding of *concupiscentia* as well as any related doctrines.

Evidence from the Works of St. Cyprian

The significant passages in Cyprian's works pinpointed by this investigation number almost two dozen and encompass seven works and several letters. Most of these may be categorized as affirming just two ideas: (1) the conquerability of *concupiscentia carnis* and (2) the significant role assigned to the devil in the actual commission of sin.

On at least eleven occasions in five different works Cyprian makes it sufficiently clear that he believes the struggle with the flesh, and even the vice of concupiscence, is winnable.²¹ Moreover, it is also the case that Cyprian's teaching normally portrays a *via media* between the extremes of resignation to sin and the possibility of complete Christian perfection. On the one hand, as he unfolds the meaning of the phrase "lead us not into temptation" from The Lord's Prayer, he notes that "we all need help [since] no one is strong in his own strength"²² while, on the other, he writes that though "the struggle

¹⁷ Available to me were about 7 and 1/2 volumes of the Beuron edition, 4 covering the majority of the NT letters and 3 on individual books of the OT. The "1/2" here is used only to indicate that I had access to portions of the book of Sirach in fascicle form.

¹⁸ See Petrus Sabatier, *Biblorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae seu Vetus Italica et Caeterae quaecumque in Codicibus Mss. & antiquorum libris reperiri potuerunt: Quae cum Vulgata Latina & cum Textu Graeco comparatur*, 3 T., Remis: Reginaldus Florentain, 1743, reprint Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1991.

¹⁹ This complication offered tangible proof that Dr. Bonner's previously quote statement about the Latin Bible was far too general. Cf. page 1 *supra*.

²⁰ CLCLT = Cetedoc Library of Christian Latin Texts. The version employed was: CLCLT-4 release 2000, moderante Paul Tombeur, Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis Lovanii Novi, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium.

²¹ See, e.g., *De mortalitate* 4 and 26; *De zelo et liuore* 16; *De bono patientiae* 21; and *De habitu uirginum* 5, 6 and 21.

²² See *De dominica oratione* 14.

with the flesh is the greatest and most obstinate for young maidens," there nevertheless are some of them who "no longer have desires of the flesh and of the body" and who are, apparently with success, "cutting away the desires of the flesh."²³

A search of the occasions in which Cyprian mentions the role of the devil in the context of *concupiscentia* reveals three key passages: *De zelo et liuore* 2, *De dominica oratione* 14, and *De habitu uirginum* 20. In the first of these, Cyprian seems all but certain to have 1 John 2:15-17 in mind as he warns that the devil offers "to the eyes seductive forms and easy pleasures (*faciles voluptates*) so that by sight he may destroy (*destruat*) chastity." Interestingly, these three passages can be equally counterbalanced by three other passages, all drawn from *De habitu uirginum*,²⁴ in which Cyprian warns that inappropriate human conduct such as over-adornment, unchaste conversation, and going to the baths can "enkindle passions" (*libidinum*), can "become an inducement to vice" (*inlecebram vitiis*) or, most clearly, can directly "foster the desire of sexual lust" (*concupiscendi libidinem nutrias*). The fact that the three passages, which assign a lead role to the devil in the process, are so neatly counterbalanced by three which all point to human conduct, though obviously a numerical coincidence, do point to a certain paradoxical quality in Cyprian's thought which, as was noted above, is also present in Augustine's formulations. For Cyprian, the devil is an enemy who deftly employs all the various *concupiscentiae carnis* against the human race. However, Cyprian is also convinced that if these same humans are not watchful, they in themselves can wreak havoc on their neighbor, even when the chosen course of action is not intentional.²⁵

Even more interesting, given the specific topic of this investigation, are two passages taken from Cyprian's letters. The first is from section 5 of *Letter 64*, and the second is an extended passage drawn from sections 26 and 27 of *Letter 55*.

²³ See *De habitu uirginum* 5 and 23 respectively.

²⁴ See chapters 9, 18 and 19 respectively.

²⁵ See also section 25 of *Letter 55* where, in elucidating the difference between an adulterer and one who temporarily disavowed Christianity, Cyprian, following Tertullian, points out that most who have disowned Christ have done so under torture or other pressure whereas an adulterer always commit his sins "of his free will." Less prominent, but also significant is Cyprian's affirmation that the post-lapsarian human has maintained freedom of the will found in *De habitu uirginum* 23. For Cyprian "God does not order [continence], but encourages it; nor does he impose the yoke of necessity, since the choice of the will remains free."

In section 5 of *Letter 64*,²⁶ Cyprian, as he concludes his discussion of his belief that no one, regardless of the number of their sins or degree of their sinfulness, should have their access to grace hindered, rhetorically asks:

... how much more should an infant not be prohibited, who, recently born, has not sinned at all, except that, born carnally according to Adam, he has contracted the contagion of the first death from the first nativity. He approaches more easily from this very fact to receive the remission of sins because those which are remitted are not his own sins, but the sins of another.²⁷

That Cyprian would mention a "contagion" in close proximity with a reference to Adam seems quite straightforward, especially if we allow ourselves to read later (and primarily Augustinian) doctrinal formulations into his words.²⁸ Also significant, for reasons which will

²⁶ According to Duquenne, this letter probably dates from the Spring, i.e., "*post mai*", 252. See Luc Duquenne, *Chronologie des lettres de S. Cyprien* (Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes, 1972), 34. See also G. W. Clarke, *The Letters of St. Cyprian of Carthage Vol. III, Letters 55-66*, Ancient Christian Writers Series, no. 46 (New York: Newman Press, 1986), 302-303, where Clarke, while accepting Duquenne's dating, notes that this date is only a reasonable supposition.

²⁷ All translations of Cyprian used here are from volumes 51 ("Letters" translated by Rose Bernard Donna) and 36 ("Treatises" translated by Roy J. Deferrari, *et al.*) of the series *The Fathers of the Church, A New Translation* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1964 and 1958 respectively). For the Latin text see CCL 3C, 423-425. The relevant lines read: ... quanto magis prohiberi non debet infans qui recens natus nihil peccauit, nisi quod secundum Adam carnaliter natus contagium mortis antiquae prima natiuitate contraxit, qui ad remissam peccatorum accipiendam hoc ipso facilius accedit quod illi remittuntur non propria sed aliena peccata.

²⁸ The fact that Augustine saw this passage as confirming his own teaching logically follows from the number of times he makes explicit reference to it. See, e.g., *De pecc. meritis et remissione* III, 5, 10-11; *Contra Iulianum* I, 6, 22; I, 7, 32; III, 17, 31; *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum* 4, 23 and, especially, *ibid.* 4, 28 where he references Cyprian's *Ad Quirinum* (a.k.a. *Testimonia*) 3, 54 as "proving" that Cyprian held and taught the doctrine of original sin. It is worth noting, however, that in that passage, which is in fact little more than a florilegium, Cyprian offers no explanatory comment or exegesis. He merely cites several biblical passages such as Job 14:4-5 and Psalm 50/51:7 as supporting the idea and moves on to his next topic. See also Julius Gross, *Entstehungsgeschichte des Erbsündendogmas* (München: Ernst Reinhardt Verlag, 1960), 121-123 and Joseph Ziegler, „Iob 14, 4-5a als wichtigster Schriftbeweis für die These 'Neminem sine sorde et sine peccato esse' (Cyprian, test 3,54) bei den lateinischen christlichen Schriftstellern“, *Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-hist. Klasse, Sitzungsberichte* 1985, 3 (München: C.H. Beck, 1985). For a

soon become apparent, is Cyprian's clear assertion that these sins are not the child's in any direct way, but that they are "the sins of another" (*aliena peccata*).

Looking to *Letter 55*,²⁹ we find Cyprian asserting that the ultimate cause of the failings of the flesh is twofold: both the devil and the flesh play a role. He writes that "these evil deeds (i.e. specifically adultery and idolatry, but also the sin catalogues of Eph. 5 and Col. 3) do not come from the Holy Spirit but, from the instigation of the adversary and from the unclean spirit of inborn concupiscence." Indeed, according to Cyprian, it is these two causes combined that "drive men to act against God and to serve the devil."³⁰ Conspicuous by its absence is the lack of a full explanation or elucidation concerning this "unclean spirit of inborn concupiscence." While it is conceivable that Cyprian felt an explanation here would take his readers too far afield in what had already become a long letter, it seems most likely that he was confident that Antonianus, the letter's

second passage which demonstrates Cyprian's views on the effectiveness of baptism as well as a second reference to his belief in the "contagion," see *De habitu uirginum* 23, where, employing Pauline terminology, Cyprian writes that all who are baptized "put off the old man by the grace of the saving waters" and that these same baptized individuals are also "renewed by the Holy Spirit, [and] are cleansed from the impurities of the old contagion by a second birth." (Cf. the Latin: *hominem illic ueterem gratia lauacri salutaris exponunt et innouati Spiritu sancto a sordibus contagionis antiquae iterata natiuitate purgantur*.) The idea that baptism is itself the "second birth" is a more than plausible extrapolation from John's gospel. See John 3, where in his discussion with Nicodemus regarding the necessity of being "born again," Jesus, in verse 5, also includes the necessity of being born of both "the water and the spirit." The idea of the hereditary contagion is, of course, less immediately defensible.

²⁹ This letter probably dates from not more than 12 months before *Letter 64*, having been written between August 251 and May 252. For this date see Clarke, *The Letters of St. Cyprian*, 159-160 as well as Duquenne, *Chronologie*, 32, who assigns it to some point before the end of the Summer of 251.

³⁰ For the Latin of this portion of *Letter 55* see CCL 3C, 290. There we read: *Neque enim mala facta de sancto spiritu ueniunt sed de aduersarii instinctu et de immundo spiritu natae concupiscentiae contra deum facere et diabolo seruire compellunt*. That humanity is culpable for *concupiscentia* is most frequently in *De habitu uirginum*. Here, though Cyprian never explicitly mentions Adam in relationship to *concupiscentia*, he does explicitly say to virgins that, if and when they are not careful about their dress, to say nothing of their frequenting of the public baths, they attract "the eyes of the youth, draw after [themselves] the sighs of young men, foster the desire of concupiscence, enkindle the fire of hope, so that, without perhaps losing your own soul, you nevertheless ruin others and offer yourselves a sword and a poison, as it were, to those who behold you ..." This quote is from chapter 9. For other similar ideas see chapters 6, 18 and 19 where various activities of men and women are claimed to ignite or re-ignite *concupiscentia*.

recipient, as well as anyone with whom he was likely to share it, would not find it problematic and, therefore, would require no further explanation.

More troubling, however, are the words which appear a mere seven lines later (still in *Letter 55*). There, Cyprian is intent on refuting those who would permanently bar anyone who has been guilty of idolatry from ever being re-assimilated into Catholic communion. Cyprian's opponents contend that "the idolatry of the guilty passes over to the one who is not guilty" and that "one person is stained by the sin of another." Cyprian counters this position with the idea that "everyone himself is held responsible for his own sin and one cannot be guilty for another" (*unumquemque in peccato suo ipsum teneri nec posse alium pro altero reum fieri*), and duly supports his view with quotations from Ezekiel 18:20 and from Deuteronomy 24:16.³¹

That there exists a difficulty in these two letters for readers far removed from Cyprian's context is obvious: How could someone who (1) has been infected from birth with an "unclean spirit of inborn concupiscence (*Letter 55*)" and with the ancient "contagion of the first death (*Letter 64*)" and who (2) stands in immediate need of baptism, be, simultaneously, the inheritor of sins which "are not his own, but the sins of another" ([*non propria sed aliena peccata*] *Letter 64*) and yet not "guilty for another" ([*nec posse alium pro altero reum fieri*] *Letter 55*)? The difficulty only increases when it is remembered that these two letters are separated by, at most, only two years of time.

While heeding the caveat against trying to remove Cyprian from his own time and context (e.g., by assuming he felt a need for a high degree of theological systematization), this situation remains puzzling when we recognize: (1) the statements' close proximity to each other within the same letter (*Letter 55*) and, (2) the care with which the letter's argument is laid out. Even more problematic is Cyprian's simultaneous insistence that his opinions concerning the impossibility of sins being commutable were both "according to our faith and the form of divine preaching given to us" (*secundum fidem*

³¹ Ezekiel 18:20 reads in part "The virtuous man's virtue will be his own, and the wicked man's wickedness shall be his." Deuteronomy 24:16 has "Fathers shall not die for their children and the children shall not die for their fathers. Everyone shall die in his own sin." It is possible that Cyprian viewed the last sentence of the Deuteronomy verse as his "out." Perhaps he saw the "contagion" passed on from Adam as immediately becoming the sin of the recipient and therefore not the sin of another. Such a resolution of course remains problematic in that it is both an argument from silence and one that Cyprian, for some reason, did not regard as needing explication.

nostram et diuinae praedicationis datam formam) and in accord with a "rule of truth" (ratio veritatis). Surely, these were not phrases that a 3rd century bishop would carelessly throw around or waste on a trivial discussion. Though it could be that Cyprian felt no tension between declaring that little ones stood in need of baptism (since they are all born with an "unclean spirit of inborn concupiscence" and/or a "contagion"), and that these infections did not amount to inherited sin, it seems necessary, given the dearth of contextual assistance, to admit that any such conclusion would be, at best, a speculation.

Still, the picture of Cyprian which emerges here is one of a Christian teacher who, although sensitive to the problem of concupiscence, (consciously?) refuses to step beyond the general lines of the problem as laid out by Scripture. In these passages he shows himself to be a teacher confident of the necessity and efficacy of baptism as well as of the role the devil plays in the lives of all those who desire to live in obedience to God. However, at no point does one find Cyprian assigning great significance to *concupiscentia*, and nowhere does he betray the belief that it, in a way more distinct than other human struggles, proves the effects of the Fall, or that it is especially diabolical. In fact, in a way which could be labeled as almost anything except "Augustinian," Cyprian seems to be completely at ease with keeping *concupiscentia* and any idea of *aliena peccata* distinctly separate as he goes about his pastoral concerns.

Evidence from the Works of Tertullian³²

Like Cyprian, Tertullian also held positions similar to those Augustine would later adopt concerning the conquerability of *concupiscentia carnis* and of the role of the devil in the commission of sin in general and of sexual sin in particular.³³

³² It goes without saying that assessing Tertullian's theological views, because of his overt and widespread use of polemic and rhetoric, to say nothing of the issues surrounding his Montanist affiliations, can pose significant problems. When, for example, is a particular statement genuinely reflective of his thought and when is it merely *ad hoc* to this particular debate or that particular exhortation?

³³ As was done with Cyprian *supra*, Tertullian's thoughts on the freedom of the will, while certainly significant, are restricted to the footnotes. Given the theological positions of Marcion, it should not be surprising that clear endorsements of the freedom of the will occur quite frequently in Tertullian's work against him. A good example can be found in book II, chapter 9. Here, after declaring that the soul of man is "infirm," goes on to insist that this infirmity is a direct result of "[the soul's] power of the will, as being free, not a slave" and that the soul sinned only through "that which was an addition to its nature, that is through its free-will".

Given Tertullian's ever-present moralism and ethical severity, it is needless to dwell on the former of these; examples may be found virtually *passim*. The few passages in which Tertullian can be found in sympathy with those who are struggling with their lower natures are consistently and thoroughly overwhelmed by his invective against all who persist in lives of sin. For example, in chapter 15 of *De monogamia*, a work dating from 210/211,³⁴ Tertullian, in a somewhat vain attempt to defend himself against the charge of undue harshness regarding his policy of one and only one marriage, writes that "the infirmity of the flesh" should never be admitted as a valid excuse for those who fail. Indeed, for him, the weakness of the flesh exists to be conquered, regardless of the situation the Christian finds himself in. Since this weakness "does not excuse a man whose lapse is the result of torture (defectio); far less does it excuse one whose lapse is the result of lust (impudicam)."³⁵

Chapter 16 of *De anima*, written in either 206 or 207, is a passage which gives a clear picture of the role Tertullian assigns the devil in the commission of sin.³⁶ Interestingly, it is also one of the four most significant for his understanding of concupiscence. Here, Tertullian, synthesizing both the biblical record and the thought of Plato concerning the constitution of the human soul (which he did view as partially acceptable),³⁷ speaks of the human soul as possessing

³⁴ All dates for works referenced in this study have been taken from T. D. Barnes' *Tertullian A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 54-56.

³⁵ See also: *Apologeticum* 9,19; 46,11 (where Tertullian claims (hyperbolically?) that Christians never violate Jesus' injunction found in Matthew 5:28 that they not even lust after another woman); *Ad uxorem* 4 and *De pudicitia* 17. A passage which grants the good glimpse of Tertullian's "soft side" (though even there he is still quite rigorous), is *De uirginibus uelands* 10. Here, he admits that "the struggle to overcome concupiscence" is "great" for those who, by virtue of their having been married, have become "accustomed to such concupiscence".

³⁶ Other good examples are: *De paenitentia* 7; *Aduersus Marcionem* V,17; *De exhortatione castitatis* 13; *De anima* 39; *ibid.* 41; and *Apologeticum* 22,6 where the role of demons and fallen angels play in generating sin within the system of Tertullian is explicitly discussed.

³⁷ As is the case with his relationship to Stoicism (cf. footnote 13 *supra*), Tertullian's relationship to Platonism in general is quite complex. For general comments see Eric Osborn, "Tertullian as Philosopher and Roman", in *Die Weltlichkeit des Glaubens in der Alten Kirche* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997), 231-247 and esp. 233-241 and J. H. Waszink, "Einfluss des Platonismus im frühen Christentum", *Vigiliae Christianae* 19 (1965) 129-162, esp. 145 and 152-154. Waszink is also the best source for a detailed (and an extremely erudite) analysis of specific passages of the *De anima*. See his *Q.S.F. Tertulliani De Anima* (Amsterdam: Muelenhoff, 1947), 230-231 along with 41*-44* of that work's introduction. Also helpful for specific information are: Osborn, *Tertullian, First Theologian of the West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 164-167; Barnes, *Tertullian*, 205-210; and Adhémar d'Alès, "Tertullien Helléniste," *Revue des Études grecques* 50 (1937), 329-362, esp. 334-343 and most especially 338-342.

both a rational and an irrational element. The irrational element, which, *contra* Plato, was not originally present at creation, "came later" and was "imbedded in the soul" from the "suggestion of the serpent" and is the part that has produced "the very act of the first transgression." This attribution of the soul's irrational element to the devil fits well since, when Tertullian couples it with the ideas that "the impulse to sin proceeds from the devil" and that "all sin is irrational," he is then justified in concluding that is also irrational every form of sinful concupiscence. In short, having begun from the axioms (borrowed from Scripture and Plato respectively) that God is the soul's creator and that He is completely rational, Tertullian is able to reject any theories which assign to God or to God's will the genesis of irrationality, and, by extension, sin and/or any of the negative forms of concupiscence.³⁸

In addition to *De anima* 16, there are three other passages which seem helpful for a full elucidation of his teaching regarding *concupiscentia*. In *De anima* 27, 4, Tertullian discusses the question of the means by which the human soul is conceived. In the process of defending his view that both the body and soul are simultaneously generated, he also notes, almost in passing, that

Nature should, for us, be an object of reverence and not the occasion of blushes. It is lust that has befouled the intercourse of the sexes, not the natural use of this function. It is the excess and not the normal activity which is unclean. Thus has natural intercourse been blessed by God: 'increase and multiply.' On the other hand, He has cursed excess as adultery, debauchery and lewdness.³⁹

³⁸ It is also interesting to note that here, Tertullian, much as would Augustine two centuries later (for a brief discussion of this see Lamberigts, "A Critical Evaluation . . .," 179-180 and footnotes), is quite clear that there to exist some good and excellent forms of *concupiscentia*. As examples, he makes reference to Luke 22:15 where Jesus "desired" to eat the Last Supper with his disciples and to I Timothy 3:1 where anyone who "desires" to be a bishop desires a good and a rational thing.

³⁹ No English translation that I checked was able to capture the directness and simplicity of the Latin, which can be found in CCL II, 823: *Natura ueneranda est, non erubescenda. Concubitus libido, non condicio foedauit. Excessus, non status est impudicus, siquidem benedictus status apud deum: crescite et in multitudinem proficite, excessus uero maledictus, adulteria et stupra et lupanaria. Incidentally, further corroboration of this position is found in book V, chapter 16, of *Aduersus Marcionem* where we read one of Tertullian's numerous endorsements of the good of marriage. While not particularly surprising in itself, the fact that he explicitly couples this endorsement with a rejection of the possibility that concupiscence continues to exist within marriage is significant. In the process of exegeting 1 Thessalonians 4:3-5 Tertullian opines that Paul's exhortation that all Christians should learn how to "possess their*

That Tertullian could draw such a line of demarcation between marital or "natural" activity and activities sponsored by lust would seem to indicate that he, at least at this juncture, did not see lust as normally present in marital sexual intercourse.⁴⁰ The third passage is from chapter 6 of *De pudicitia*, a work which dates from 210/211. Here, Tertullian offers still another of his many commentaries on the events of the fall and its results.⁴¹ The most impressive lines read:

Let us grant if the Sensualists wish it, that in the ancient days every kind of impurity was allowed. Let us grant that before Christ the flesh was wanton, even that it was lost before it was

vessels in honor" and not "in the lust of concupiscence, even as the Gentiles" does not apply to married persons since "concupiscence ... is not ascribed to marriage even among the Gentiles, but to extravagant, unnatural and enormous sins" and that "the law of nature ... does not forbid connubial intercourse, but concupiscence." For a discussion of the way the early Latin Christians exegeted verses 4-5 of this passage, see Jean Doignon, "L'exégèse latine ancienne de I Thessaloniens 4,4-5 sur la possession de notre vas," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 83 (juillet-septembre, 1982), 163-177, and esp. pages 163-165. Regarding the repeated assertions of Tertullian concerning what constitutes "natural" sexual activity and the degree to which such activities were or were not a part of the later Roman Empire, see chapter 2 "Pagan' and 'Christian' Marriage Ideology and Practice" of Judith Evans Grubbs', *Law and Family in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995). Especially helpful are pages 54-73 where Grubbs argues that Christian marriages did not adhere to higher standards of morality than did those of the pagans and that, moreover, Roman standards of morality had generally been quite high for some time. She attributes this common (and according to her still current) misconception to the literary techniques of the contemporary satirists and to the fact that they were largely commenting on the mores of the very highest Roman social classes. For a differing take on the evidence, see the multiple publications of French scholar Paul Veyne germane to this issue. Most seminally, see his "La Famille et l'amour sous le haut-empire Romain," *Annales économiques Sociétés Civilisations* 33 (janvier-février 1978), 35-63.

⁴⁰ Note, however, the contrast, if not contradiction, this statement makes with the statement from *De uirginibus uelandis* 10 cited in footnote 35 *supra*. There, in a work which, at the outside, dates from 3 years earlier, Tertullian does attribute concupiscence to married sexual relations in so far as the married have become "accustomed" to it.

⁴¹ Despite the limited parameters of this investigation, no less than 18 passages containing key elements of the doctrine of the fall and of the consequences of the first sin were located. Examples include the ideas that the warped sense of pleasure gained from sin is "inborn" in *Apologeticum* 7; that the soul is now "infirm" *Aduersus Marcionem* II, 9; that for everyone there exists a "veil of former corruption" which must be removed by means of "new birth" in water *De anima* 41 and numerous assertions that we all (or at least the souls of all of us) were "in Adam" *De pudicitia* 6 and *De anima* 27 (both discussed *supra*). Even more clear and detailed is *De anima* 40 where being in Adam is taken as being synonymous with being "sinful", "unclean" and "shameful."

sought out by its Lord. It was not yet worthy of the gift⁴² of salvation; it was not yet ready for the obligation of sanctity. It was still reckoned as being *in Adam* (Le Saint's italics), sinful, quickly lusting for what seemed beautiful, preoccupied with things base, repressing prurience with fig leaves. The poison of lust and the milky stains were everywhere within it, not possessing, that plant (of the donkeys)⁴³ which the waters had not yet cleansed.

But when the Word of God descended into flesh ... which belonged to heaven, not to hell and which was girt with flowers of sanctity and not with leaves of lust, flesh which imparted its own purity to the waters – from this time on, any flesh whatsoever [baptized] into Christ loses its former residual stains.⁴⁴ Now it is something different. Now it emerges new, not

⁴² Here, "gift" replaces Le Saint's choice of "grace" for the Latin "dono." This change represents the first of several emendations to Le Saint's translation. For the full bibliographical information, see footnote 45 *infra*.

⁴³ The translation here, though still not without difficulties, follows vol. 394 of the *Sources Chrétiennes*, page 173, which reads "... et les souillures, laitueses, faute de posséder 'la plante des ânes', que les eaux non plus n'avaient encore lavée." The portion of Le Saint's translation that I have here replaced reads: "... the infecting filth ..., and well were they able to cling to it, since as yet there were no waters which themselves had cleansed it." For the rationale of Micaelli and Munier in support of this reading, which hinges on reading "id onear" in place of "idoneae" see pages 121-122 of their volume. In part, they write "Tertullien s'est empressé de tirer de ces vertus de l'épilobe; mais, pour lui, la plante des ânes, par excellence, c'est le Christ qui, par son baptême, a communiqué à l'eau le pouvoir de laver toutes les souillures de la chair, le Christ, dont les corps est la nourriture des chrétiens accusés d'adorer une tête d'âne et affublés, dès lors, du sobriquet d'*asinarii* (*asini cultores*), forgé tout exprès par Tertullien." Note also that I have included their emended Latin text in footnote 45 *infra*, thus accepting their text over that of the CCL editor Dekkers who, concerning this line, confessed that "locus nondum sanatus."

⁴⁴ The phrase "from this time on, any flesh whatsoever [baptized] into Christ loses its former residual stains" here replaces Le Saint's "all flesh which is in Christ loses its old, residual stains." In my view, the repeated references in this context to waters justify the insertion of the adjective "baptized." Cf. again Munier's translation which also adds "a lavé". Regardless of the view taken on the best way to resolve these difficulties, the fact remains that the most important point for the purposes of this investigation is contained in the final sentence of this paragraph where Tertullian juxtaposes the concupiscent, and therefore filthy, generative relations of fallen human beings with the spiritual, and therefore immaculate, regeneration provided by baptism. Finally, note also that this text is an all but certain adaptation of and allusion to 2 Cor. 5:17. If correct, this observation could offer a new insight into the role of baptism in Tertullian's theology in that, here, he could be equating that sacrament with the Pauline idea of reconciliation.

from the slime of sperm, not from the filth of concupiscence, but from pure water and the Holy Spirit.⁴⁵

Note that in this passage Tertullian draws links between the Fall, the sin of the first couple and their sexual function, or, perhaps better, their sexual dysfunction. Among other ideas, note well that on two occasions in these few lines he makes a direct link between Adam and Eve's leafy coverings and the presence of lust and/or concupiscence.⁴⁶

The fourth and last passage is *De cultu feminarum* I,1,11 where Tertullian writes of "the ignominy, I mean, of the first⁴⁷ sin (primi delicti) and the odium of being the cause of the fall (perditionis) of the human race." This salvo is followed by the accusation that each of the "beloved sisters" of the target audience is also "an Eve" and with the claim that "you are the one who opened the door to the Devil, ... you

⁴⁵ This translation is by William P. Le Saint. See *Tertullian Treatises on Penance* (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1959). For the Latin, see CCL II, 1291 (while noting the addition of some material from SC 394 as mentioned in footnote 43 *supra*) where we read: Habuerint pristina tempora omnis impudicitiae, si uolunt psychici, etiam potestatem. Luserit ante christum caro, immo perierit antequam a domino suo requisita est: nondum erat digna dono salutis, nondum apta officio sanctitatis. Adhuc in adam deputabatur cum suo uitio, facile quod speciosum uiderat concupiscens et ad inferiora respiciens et de ficulneis foliis pruriginem retinens. Inhaerebat usquequaque libidinis uirus et lacteae sordes non habentes, idoneae quod nec ipsae adhuc aquae lauerant. At ubi sermo dei descendit in carnem ... quae non ad inferos, sed ad caelum pertineret, quae non lasciuiae frondibus, sed sanctimoniae floribus praecingeretur, quae munditias suas aquis traderet, exinde caro quaecumque in christo reliquas sordes pristinas soluit, alia iam res est, noua emergit, iam non ex seminis limo, non ex concupiscentiae fimo, sed ex aqua pura et spiritu mundo.

⁴⁶ It is also helpful to recall that the biblical text of Genesis 3:7 explicitly mentions only that Adam and Eve had acquired "shame" (cf. Genesis 2:25) and that their newfound knowledge of their nakedness, according to Genesis 3:10, only made them "afraid." On this point also cf. *De uirginibus uelandis* 11 where, in yet another accommodation of theology to a polemical and exhortatory context, Tertullian notes only that Adam and Eve, after they obtained "intelligence" given them by "the tree of recognition," were "first sensible of nothing more than of their cause for shame" and that, apparently much as all humans normally do by, at the latest, the onset of puberty, "they each marked their intelligence of their own sex by a covering." Conspicuous by its absence is a mention of lust, concupiscence and/or sexual temptation.

⁴⁷ Here, I have again amended the English translation, which reads "original sin," in order to reflect the more ambiguous sense of the Latin "primi delicti." Translating the phrase "primi delicti" as "original sin" seems problematic in that it reads a later and dogma-laden formulation back into the thought of Tertullian. For a view which supports this choice, see Osborn, *Tertullian, First Theologian*, 163 where he writes, "Tertullian, like Paul, wrote a lot about sin. He made the first moves toward a doctrine of original sin ..." (italics added) and page 167 where he notes, even more explicitly, that "[w]hile Tertullian displays the origins of the idea, one cannot attribute the later doctrine of original sin to him."

are the one who persuaded him whom the Devil was not strong enough to attack. All too easily you destroyed (elisisti) the image of God, man. Because of your desert, that is death, even the Son of God had to die." While it is true that Tertullian is probably⁴⁸ employing the precedent of the author of 1 Timothy 2:9-15 (which, incidentally, also has recommendations for the proper way for women to dress) his laying the blame for the fall at the feet of Eve is theologically puzzling, even if it is rhetorically masterful.⁴⁹

This last passage, in addition to pointing us toward the first of our summary observations, highlights a most troubling aspect of Tertullian's thought on this subject: his inconsistency. Though wide latitude must be given to the observation that this work's larger polemical intent, i.e., to heap shame upon his female readers in order to gain their undivided attention and open them up to his correctives, the presence of this passage nevertheless remains problematic for the larger picture. Elsewhere, Tertullian is quite clear in his acceptance of the argument of passages such as Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15 which link the fall to Adam and portray him as the thesis of Christ's "second Adam" anti-thesis.⁵⁰ Here, however, and *unlike* the author of 1 Timothy 2, he explicitly states that it is because of the sin of Eve that Christ had to come and die, thus not only disregarding the masterful Pauline parallel, but also indicating that there are aspects of that first sin which were still in need of expiation. Simply put, the first observation is that, given the general presence of this *ad hoc* theological style, the question of Tertullian's overall place within the North African tradition with regard to the issue of *concupiscentia* cannot be conclusively resolved.

A second, more positive observation surrounds Tertullian's introduction of the idea of "irrationality" into the equation of the fall

⁴⁸ Note well, however, that he makes no explicit reference to Paul and that he employs no introductory formula (as he often does) to make plain to his reader that he has this text in mind.

⁴⁹ In Tertullian's defense, by referencing 2 Corinthians 11:3, one might possibly argue that Paul provided Tertullian with still another authoritative precedent for such rhetorical techniques. On the other hand, it should also be noted that although Paul does make much of Eve's failure in 2 Cor. 11:3, he does not directly link it to culpability for the results of the Fall, as does Tertullian. Also interesting in this regard, although space does not permit a full treatment, is *De pecc. meritis et remissione* 1, 16, 21 where Augustine, explicitly referencing Sir. 25:24, "apologizes" for the places where Scripture accuses Eve of introducing sin into the world. This passage would seem to offer indirect support for the general conclusion that Augustine is more systematic in his theological reasoning than are either Tertullian or Cyprian.

⁵⁰ See, e. g., *De pudicitia* 6; *De anima* 40 and *De monogamia* 17. In the latter, the "first Adam"/"second Adam" parallelism is quite clear.

and its effects. As noted above, irrationality of sinful behavior in general, and of the post-lapsarian sexual function in particular, is a hallmark of Augustine's view.⁵¹ Moreover, when this element of irrationality is added to Tertullian's near syllogistic deduction that all that is irrational proceeds from the devil, it is only a short logical step to seeing anything that is irrational as evil *in se*.

Thirdly, it is also interesting that Tertullian does allege that Adam and Eve's sin immediately affected human sexuality and sexual function. Recall, for example, that in *De pudicitia* 6 the Tertullianic purpose for the fig leaves, a.k.a. "leaves of lust" (*lasciuae frondibus*), was to "repress prurience" (*pruriginem retinens*) and that the flesh of all humanity, which at that time was still "in Adam," was inhabited everywhere with "the poison of lust" (*libidinis virus*) and "milky stains" (*lacteae sordes*).

Fourthly, and still looking back to *De pudicitia* 6, it also seems valid to observe that Tertullian implies that all unregenerate flesh in truth belongs "to hell" (*ad infernos*) and that once this flesh is washed in the "pure water" of baptism, which itself is explicitly opposed to "the slime of sperm and the filth of concupiscence" (*ex seminis limo, non ex concupiscentiae fimo*), it loses its "residual stains" (*reliquas sordes*). Here again one is impressed with how close this language and spirit is to Augustine's picture of concupiscence infecting all parts of the human body.

Finally, recalling the words of *De anima* 27,⁵² and before getting too excited that we have hit upon a real precedent for Augustine's thought in Tertullian, we should recall that he, at least at this stage,⁵³ did not regard "normal activity" between married couples as "unclean." This passage would seem to indicate that married sexual activity, so long as it is practiced in moderation, is not, as it was for Augustine, an evil of which good use is made. On the contrary, although Tertullian does give credit to the evil of lust as having made relations between the sexes problematic, he does seem convinced that it was not harmful, or even sinful, *in se*.

⁵¹ See pages 40-41, including footnote 6, *supra*. Also note that this distinction does give some credence to Augustine's repeated assertions, *contra* Julian of Eclanum, that his views are in consonance with tradition, since, as Lamberigts has clearly shown, Julian believed that there was nothing irrational or even unnatural about *concupiscentia*. See, Lamberigts, "A Critical Evaluation ...", 177 where he writes, "What Julian could not accept, however, was that *concupiscentia* had been characterised as having the power to elude the *rational* (italics added) and moral autonomy of the human person."

⁵² Cf. pages 50-51 and footnote 39 *supra*.

⁵³ I.e., 206 or 207. Recall also the apparent contradiction pointed out between this work and *De uirginibus uelandis* in footnote 40 *supra*.

Conclusion

If asked to judge concerning the relative degree of influence that Cyprian and Tertullian could have had on Augustine, I would have to conclude that there exists a greater affinity, in both quality and quantity, between Tertullian and Augustine than between Cyprian and Augustine. Indeed, while it may be generally true that "Cyprian was the medium through whom Tertullian influenced Augustine,"⁵⁴ when discussing the development of the ideas surrounding *concupiscentia*, it seems more accurate to see Cyprian as a break in the chain from Tertullian to Augustine than as the key link.⁵⁵

This said, we must not forget to re-ask this article's thematic question: Are these affinities strong enough to demonstrate that Augustine drew from the particular theological tradition of Christian North Africa as he developed his understanding of concupiscence? Well, yes and no. On the one hand, Cyprian and Tertullian do seem to prefigure several of Augustine's specific formulations concerning *concupiscentia*, especially in the choice Augustine shared with Tertullian to explicitly link concupiscence and irrationality to the negative characteristics of post-lapsarian sexuality. On the other hand, and largely because of their own (self-imposed?) limitations and contradictions (e.g., recall Tertullian's general willingness to allow polemics and rhetoric to take precedence over theological systematization), at no point do Cyprian or Tertullian provide substantial evidence foreshadowing the considerable edifice Augustine was later to construct. In other words, when studied from the standpoint of shared vocabulary, it seems safe to assert that, while the ideas and attitudes concerning *concupiscentia* and its general semantic domain might have been borrowed from "within African tradition,"⁵⁶ what Augustine did with that Scriptural and traditional data was profoundly, if something less than completely, his own.

Leuven

Jonathan P. YATES

⁵⁴ James Morgan, *The Importance of Tertullian in the Development of Christian Dogma* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd, 1928), 166. Indeed, the huge disparity between the number of times Augustine invoked the names of Cyprian and Tertullian (cf. footnote 55 *infra*), does offer a piece of corroboration to Morgan's assertion.

⁵⁵ Though it can be risky to pay too much attention to purely statistical evidence, it remains interesting to note that, when taken as a whole, Augustine's *corpus operum* contains 589 references to Cyprian by name. Almost 10% (52 references) of these are to be found in just the two works *Contra Iulianum* and *Contra Iulianum (opus imperfectum)*. Curious, but equally interesting, is the fact that in the whole of Augustine there are only 17 references to the name of Tertullian and his name is found only once in the two works specifically directed against Julian.

⁵⁶ Again, these are Bonner's words from col. 1114 of his *Augustinus Lexikon* article. Cf. footnote 1 *supra*.