

The Influence of Origen on the Young Augustine



Gorgias Eastern Christian Studies

19

Gorgias Eastern Christian Studies brings to the scholarly world the underrepresented field of Christianity as it developed in the Eastern hemisphere. This series consists of monographs, collections of essays, texts and translations of the documents of Eastern Christianity, and studies of topics relevant to the unique world of historic Orthodoxy and early Christianity.

The Influence of Origen on the Young Augustine

A Chapter of the History of Origenism

György Heidl



gorgias press

2009

Gorgias Press LLC, 180 Centennial Ave., Piscataway, NJ, 08854, USA

www.gorgiaspress.com

Copyright © 2009 by Gorgias Press LLC

All rights reserved under International and Pan-American Copyright Conventions. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning or otherwise without the prior written permission of Gorgias Press LLC.

2009



ISBN 978-1-59333-702-5

ISSN 1539-1507

Second Edition.

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication
Data**

Heidl, György.

The influence of Origen on the young Augustine
: a chapter of the history of Origenism / by
György Heidl.

p. cm. -- (Gorgias Eastern Christian studies ;
19)

Rev. ed. of: Origen's influence on the young
Augustine.

Includes bibliographical references (p.
) and index.

1. Augustine, Saint, Bishop of Hippo. 2.
Origen--Influence. I. Heidl, György. Origen's
influence on the young Augustine. II. Title.

BR65.A9H45 2009

270.2092--dc22

2009037572

Printed in the United States of America

PREFACE

Origen and Augustine are two giants – some would say *the* two giants – of the early Christian theological world. Each of them pondered fundamental questions of belief in a world marked by suffering and imperfection. For each the interplay of Divine justice, Providence, grace, human freedom and the love of the Creator for creatures was a problem that demanded a cosmic solution. Both addressed this problem with one eye on the Bible, the other on contemporaneous philosophical discussion. Addressing the most sophisticated critiques of Christianity, each contested the claim that later Platonism was most appropriately melded with traditional Greco-Roman religion rather than with Christianity. Each argued strenuously in intra-ecclesial disputes over correct doctrine – and thus contributed to the determination that certain views fell short and were therefore to be considered heretical. Both were “men of the church” who in the course of their lives dedicated ever-increasing proportions of their prodigious literary output to the explication of the Bible, often in the form of sermons preached to the faithful.

Yet one of them, Augustine, has enjoyed a virtually uninterrupted legacy of admiration (at least in the Western Latin tradition and its modern heirs), while the orthodoxy of the other, Origen, was the subject of a rancorous debate which has tarnished his reputation from the fourth century until the recent past. While the great Alexandrian theologian has always had some admirers, the sustained effort of two generations of scholars in the latter half of the twentieth century has clarified the magnitude of his contribution to early Christian theology, exegesis and spirituality. No longer is he “the hydra of all heresies” as he was to Epiphanius – unless his role as wellspring of all orthodoxies is also recognized!

The question of Origen’s influence on Augustine is complex. The latter’s acquaintance with many of his predecessor’s writings in

translation is clear in his later years; equally clear is his critique of Origen's protology and eschatology, especially in *City of God* 11.23 and 21.17. But the date of Augustine's first encounter with Origen's ideas is more difficult to establish. Recent scholarship on Augustine's early understandings of human nature and of the origin of the soul has intensified awareness of its deeply Platonic coloring and has raised with renewed urgency the question of his earlier knowledge of Origen's written corpus.

In the present volume Dr. Heidl enters into this question with a daring thesis: namely, that Augustine not only read Origen in the months preceding his baptism but that his acquaintance with the Alexandrian theologian's mystical interpretation of the *Song of Songs* constituted a crucial step in his conversion. Specifically, he argues that the *libri pleni* which Augustine mentions in *Contra Academicos* 2.2.5 are not writings of Plotinus or any other non-Christian Platonist, but they are instead the writings of Catholic Christians, including Jerome's translation of Origen's *Homelies on the Song of Songs* and possibly also some passages translated by a member of the Milanese circle from the *Commentary on the Song of Songs*. By a meticulous examination of the primary texts concerning Augustine's conversion against the backdrop of the relevant secondary literature, Dr. Heidl elaborates a new picture of the stages of that famous conversion while systematically addressing the obstacles to his view. Then he proceeds to study the earliest of Augustine's grapplings with the first chapters of Genesis, *de Genesi contra Manichaeos*. Again, painstaking comparison of texts is combined with precise attention to the sequence of events to establish Origen's direct literary influence on the young Augustine. Finally, Dr. Heidl gathers the main strands of protology and eschatology – the Beginning and the End – as envisaged by these two theological pioneers. The result is a surprisingly Origenistic young Augustine.

This provocative book leads the reader to wonder to whom the young Augustine bears a greater resemblance – to Origen or to the old Augustine. The thought is perhaps more welcome to the enthusiasts of the once-maligned presbyter of Caesarea than to the admirers of the bishop of Hippo. Wherever they may stand on the respective merits of these two remarkable thinkers, historians and theologians alike will be challenged and enlightened by this

innovative and learned *tour de force*.

Kathleen E. McVey

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to thank all those who assisted me in completing this work. First of all, I wish to commemorate Katalin Vidrányi, my professor at the University of Pécs (Hungary). When I was graduate student she directed my interest towards Saint Augustine and the Fathers of the Church, and subsequently she kept an eye on my work until her death in August of 1993.

My thanks are also due to Marianne Sággy, Róbert Somos and Gábor Kendeffy, my friends and colleagues who commented on the earlier versions of some chapters. Their criticism inspired and irapelled me to elaborate the arguments.

I give my thanks to the professors of the Department of Medieval Studies at the Central European University. I am indebted to Professor Robert Markus, Lorenzo Perrone and Alain Le Boulluec for their advice and comments on sections and earlier versions of the work. I wish to thank István Perczel for the long and inspiring discussions about various fields of Patristics, including Augustine and Origen. Without his aid and counsel this work would never have been written.

My work was supported financially by the Central European University and the Soros Foundation. I am grateful to the Open Society Institute in Hungary for the opportunity to spend three months in Roman libraries.

The English of some chapters has been revised by Lisa Quinn, Mary-Beth Davis, Julia Voelker and Matthew Suff. Finally, my main debt to my wife. All mistakes are mine!

CONTENTS

Preface.....	V
Acknowledgements	IX
Contents.....	XI
Abbreviations	XIII
 Part I Origen and Augustine's Conversion.....	1
Introduction.....	3
1 The <i>libri pleni</i>	7
2 <i>De beata vita</i> 1.4.....	19
3 Simplicianus and the <i>libri pleni</i>	27
4 The period of hesitation	37
5 St. Paul and Rom. 13:13-14.....	47
6 The reason for the silence.....	63
 Part II Augustine's <i>De Genesi contra manichaeos</i>	75
Introduction.....	77
1 The mystic Beginning (Gen. 1:1)	81
2 Heaven, earth, and firmament (Gen. 1:1-6)	85
3 Waters (Gen. 1:7).....	95
4 Anti-anthropomorphic arguments against the manichees	105
5 The creation of man (Gen. 1:26;Gen. 2:7)	111
Interior and exterior man	112
6 Male, female, and spiritual dominion (Gen. 1:27-28)	125
7 The Papyrus of Giessen: A fragment from a homily on Eden?	135
8 Spiritual Paradise	139
9 The Fall	151

Part III Augustine's Early Protology and Eschatology.....	165
Introduction.....	167
1 The Initial State of Man.....	171
2 The Final State of the Creatures	189
3 The Resurrection of the Body	209
Appendix 1: Canticle images in Confessions 9.2.3.....	219
Appendix 2: The <i>Little Commentaries</i> on Matthew	223
Appendix 3: Some Traces of a Latin Compilation of Origen's Commentary on Genesis.....	237
The Author of the So-Called <i>Tractatus Origenis</i>	237
The Origenian Background of the First <i>Tractatus</i>	244
Does the First <i>Tractatus</i> Directly Depend on a Latin Translation of Origen's Text?.....	250
Does the First <i>Tractatus</i> Depend on Novatian?	253
Does Novatian Directly Depend on Origen?	254
Does the First <i>Tractatus</i> Depend on Origen's Text Translated by Novatian?.....	261
Appendix 4: Hilary and the Latin Compilation of Origen's Commentary on Genesis.....	273
Bibliography	291
Selected Primary Sources	291
Secondary Sources.....	297
Index of Names	325

ABBREVIATIONS

ACO	<i>Acta Concilium Oecumenicorum</i>
AS	<i>Augustinian Studies</i>
AM	<i>Augustinus Magister</i>
ACW	<i>Ancient Christian Writers</i>
BA	<i>Bibliothèque augustinienne: Oeuvres de Saint Augustin</i>
CCSL	<i>Corpus christianorum series latina</i>
CSEL	<i>Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum</i>
Ep	<i>Epistula</i>
FOC	<i>The Fathers of the Church</i>
Frag.	<i>Fragmentum</i>
GCS	<i>Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte</i>
Hom	<i>Homilia</i>
JThSt	<i>The Journal of Theological Studies</i>
Nec timeo mori	<i>Nec timeo mori</i> . Atti del congresso internazionale di studi ambrosiani nel XVI centenario della morte di sant' Ambrogio. Milano, 4-11 Aprile 1997, ed. Luigi F. Pizzolato e Marco Rizzi. Milano: Vita e Pensiero, 1998.
OEPA	<i>Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie</i> . Paris: Cerf
Origeniana Tertia	<i>The third International Colloquium for Origen Studies</i> (University of Manchester September 7-11, 1981) ed. R. Hanson and H. Crouzel, Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1985.
Origeniana Quinta	<i>Papers of the 5th International Origen Congress</i> (Boston College 14-18

	August 14-18, 1989) ed. R. J. Daly. Leuven: Peeters, 1992.
Origeniana Sexta	<i>Origène et la Bible / Origen and the Bible, Actes du Colloquium Origenianum Sextum</i> (Chantilly, 30 August - 3 September 1993) ed. G. Dorival and A. Le Boulluec, Leuven: Peeters, 1995.
Origeniana Septima	<i>Origenes in den Auseinandersetzungen des 4. Jahrhunderts.</i> Ed. W.A. Bienert and U. Kühneweg, Leuven: Peeters 1999.
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
PG	<i>Patrologia Graeca</i>
PL	<i>Patrologia Latina</i>
PTS	<i>Patristische Texte und Studien</i>
RA	<i>Recherches augustiniennes</i>
RB	<i>Revue bénédictine</i>
REA	<i>Revue des études augustiniennes</i>
SAEMO	<i>Sancti Ambrosii episcopi mediolanensis opera</i>
SC	<i>Sources chrétiennes</i>
SP	<i>Studia patristica</i>
Tract	<i>Tractatus</i>
VCh	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>

PART I

ORIGEN AND AUGUSTINE'S CONVERSION

INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of the following study is to interpret Augustine's first account of his conversion as it is described in *Contra Academicos* 2.2.5 and to compare this text with the narrative in *De beata vita* 1.4, as well as with the chapters of the *Confessions* in which Augustine explains in more detail the process of his conversion to Catholic Christianity.

Two preliminary remarks are required in order to make my point of view clearer. On the one hand, since Augustine's earliest account of his conversion is strongly condensed, excessively obscure, and therefore difficult to understand in itself, scholars have always felt the need to explain *Contra Academicos* 2.2.5 on the basis of the seventh and eighth books of the *Confessions*. In this case, however, a modern reader of the first dialogue can rightly wonder how Romanianus, the direct addressee of the work, managed to understand the enthusiastic account in chapter 2.2.5 at all. In fact, he was absent when the most important events occurred and, hence, in this respect, his position was similar to that of the modern reader. It might be presumed that Romanianus did not understand the account and that, therefore, our chances are no better. However, it is more advantageous to start the interpretation from the viewpoint that Augustine did in fact want to make his friend understand the event determining his path in life, and for this reason he inserted certain guidelines into the text for his reader.

On the other hand, Augustine used a special language and method of teaching in the dialogues of Cassiciacum, partly in order to accommodate himself to the capacity of his disciples. Augustine made his debut as a philosopher, and this role was in full accordance with the literary genre of the philosophical dialogues. He led the disciples step by step towards "Philosophy," "the face

of which,” as he says, “revealed itself” to him in Milan.¹ Retiring to Cassiciacum, Augustine made his pupils read the *Aeneis* and then Cicero's *Hortensius*, which were offered as an appropriate introduction to this “Philosophy.” In other words, Augustine seems to have led the members of his circle in the direction that he had already gone. From this point of view, the position of Romanianus (and again, the modern reader) does not differ from that of the participants in the dialogues. Augustine wished to show in part the “face of Philosophy” through his writing to his readers.

Thus, Augustine's dialogues have a particular feature which I term an “initiator character.” The author of these works is conscious that he is not allowing his underlying theological and philosophical doctrines to be easily grasped. Opacity in the dialogues, nonetheless, not only serves pedagogical purposes but, as shall be shown with respect to the *Contra Academicos*, is strongly connected with the special doctrines hidden in them as well. A convincing interpretation must be one which can shed light simultaneously on the hidden meaning of the text and the reason why this meaning is hidden.

¹ *Acad.* 2.2.6. Concerning the Dialogues, see Doignon 1989, with the summary of the correct stage of research.

Contra Academicos 2.2.5*

Itaque cum admoto nobis fomite discessisses, numquam cessavimus inbiantes in philosophiam atque illam vitam, quae inter nos placuit atque convenit, prorsus nihil aliud cogitare atque id constanter quidem, sed minus acriter agebamus, putabamus tamen satis nos agere. Et quoniam nondum aderat ea flamma, quae summa nos arreptura erat, illam qualem¹ aestuabamus arbitrabamur esse vel maximam, cum ecce tibi libri quidam pleni, ut ait Celsinus, bonas res Arabicas ubi exhalarent in nos, ubi illi flammulae instillarunt pretiosissimi unguenti guttas paucissimas, incredibile, Romaniane, incredibile, et ultra quam de me fortasse et tu credis - quid amplius dicam? - etiam mihi ipsi de meipso incredibile incendium concitarunt. Quis me tunc

* This text is not entirely identical to the edition by P. Knöll in CSEL vol. 63 that I primarily use here, nor to the edition by W. M. Green in CCSL vol. 29. At three points, I have adopted the variants which I found the most plausible. The arguments for this reconstruction will be shown in the course of the explanation.

O'Meara 1951, 69-70: *When, therefore, the flame had been set to us and you went away, we never ceased to yearn after philosophy. Nor did we think of anything else but that life which commended itself to us as both pleasant and suitable. We were, it is true, constant in this thought; yet we were not so keen as we might have been, though we believed that we were keen enough. For since as yet we were untouched by that great fire which was to consume us, we thought that the slow fire with which we burned was the greatest. But lo! When certain books full to the brim, as Celsinus says, had wafted to us good things of Arabia, when they had let a very few drops of most precious unguent fall upon that meagre flame, they stirred up an incredible conflagration – incredible, Romanianus, incredible, and perhaps beyond even what you would believe of me – what more shall I say? – beyond even what I would believe of myself. What honour, what human pomp, what desire for empty fame, what consolations or attractions of this mortal life could move me then? Swiftly did I begin to return entirely to myself. Actually, all that I did – let me admit it – was to look back from the end of a journey, as it were, to that religion which is implanted in us in our childhood days and bound up in the marrow of our bones. But she indeed was drawing me unknowing to herself. Therefore, stumbling, hastening, yet with hesitation I seized the Apostle Paul. For truly, I say to myself, those men would never have been able to do such great things, nor would they have lived as they evidently did live, if their writings and doctrines were opposed to this so great a good. I read through all of it with the greatest attention and care.*

¹ Green 1970, 20 l. 50 and Fuhrer 1997, 89: *qua lenta*

honor, quae hominum pompa, quae inanis famae cupiditas, quod denique huius mortalis vitae fomentum atque retinaculum commovebat? Prorsus totus in me cursim redibam. Respexi tantum;² confiteor;³ quasi de itinere in illam religionem, quae pueris nobis insita est et medullitus implicata; verum autem ipsa ad se nescientem rapiebat. Itaque titubans, properans, haesitans arripio apostolum Paulum. Neque enim vere, inquam, isti tanta potuissent vixissentque ita ut eos vixisse manifestum est, si eorum litterae atque rationes huic tanto bono adversarentur. Perlegi totum intentissime atque cautissime.⁴

² Green 1970, 21 l. 60 and Knöll 1922, 27 l. 3: *tamen*; Fuhrer 1997, 97-8 and 484: *tandem*

³ Knöll 1922, 27 l. 3: *confitebor*

⁴ Knöll 1922, 27, l. 9. Green 1970, 21, l. 5: *castissime*

1 THE *LIBRI PLENI*

In the second book of the *Contra Academicos*, Augustine mentions certain books, the *libri pleni*, which deeply influenced him. He uses a poetic image in order to describe this effect: the books “exhaled Arabian fragrances” and “instilled very few drops of most precious unguent.” Interpreters of this passage are at a loss to identify the *libri pleni*. It has been the case, however, that the main focus concerning these *libri* has been to determine whether they were Neoplatonic or not.

On the basis of *Confessions* 7.9.13 and *De beata vita* 1.4, the majority of scholars consider the mysterious books in the *Contra Academicos* to be Neoplatonic, but it is a matter of debate whether they contained selections from the works of Plotinus or those of Porphyry, or from both.¹ In 1970, John O’Meara published a paper in which, revising his earlier view, he argued that *Contra Academicos* 2.2.5 referred to certain Christian books which, in his opinion, Augustine had read, though only in part.² The fact that Augustine personifies these books: *libri quidam pleni... exhalarent ... instillarunt*, was explained by O’Meara as a hint that Augustine had not read, but only heard of Athanasius’ *Vita Antonii*.³ The *libri pleni*, therefore, do not appear to be a collection of real books, but rather stand as a collective term for the experience Augustine had gained since the time when he became acquainted with an authentic Christianity. O’Meara’s final conclusion was that the books “are

¹ For the history of the debate, including the problem of the Plotinian and/or Porphyrian influence, see O’Meara 1958; O’Connell 1968, 6-26; 1990/1 and 2; Beatrice 1989; Madec 1989 with an extended bibliography on pp. 23-5, and Fuhrer 1997, 90-92.

² See O’Meara 1970 and 1954, cf. idem 1951, 176-8; 1959, 164 and 173-4.

³ O’Meara 1970, 331.

not so much Neoplatonic as the writings of St. Paul and perhaps Ambrose and the hearing of the Life of Antony.”⁴

One of the great merits of O'Meara's paper is the courage to break with traditional interpretations, even if its conclusions have not been accepted by the *communis opinio* of specialists. Goulven Madec immediately answered the challenge, claiming that O'Meara's earlier interpretations were much more convincing than this latest.⁵ Madec's well-established criticism of O'Meara's new explanation evolved into a scepticism concerning the theoretical value of the characterisation Augustine had given of the books. The parallel text, which O'Meara quoted from *Confessions* 8.6.15 in order to clarify the metaphor used by Augustine, did not convince the French scholar, and with good reason.⁶ O'Meara may have already sensed the fragility of his explanation of the metaphor since he introduced his solution with the words: the phrasing “is so obscure as never to have been satisfactorily explained.”⁷ On the other hand, Madec seems to question Augustine's intention when asking: “l'expression *bonae res arabicae* ne peut-elle être une simple métonymie, dans laquelle la référence géographique ne recouvre pas d'intention particulière?”⁸

In my opinion however, Augustine did not use poetic figures without specific meaning, or merely to colour his style. In contrast

⁴ O'Meara 1970, 337.

⁵ Madec 1971.

⁶ Ibid., 327. The “Arabian unguents” or rather “scents” (*bonae res Arabicae*) called an image from *Conf.* 8.6.15 to O'Meara's mind. Ponticianus told Augustine about the *monasteriorum greges et mores suaveolentiae tuae et ubera deserta heremi, quorum nos nihil sciebamus, et erat monasterium Mediolanii plenum bonis fratribus*. In spite of the fact that the terms *suaveolentiae*, *ubera deserta heremi*, and *plenum* underlined by O'Meara seem to be similar in their meaning or form to certain expressions of the passage in question, this parallelism cannot be accepted as evidence. In fact, the meaning of the adjective *pleni* is quite different in the two texts: in the *Acad.* the adjective is connected with *libri* and not with a place which is full of something or somebody. The other two expressions suggest a closer analogy, but there is no proof for the assumption that the image of Egyptian deserts would have been linked with the image of Arabian scents in Augustine's mind, cf. O'Meara 1970, 331.

⁷ O'Meara 1970, 331.

⁸ Madec 1971, 325.

to Madec's scepticism, I would like to argue that in the whole account of Augustine this very metaphor appears to be the only concrete guide to identify the books:

... cum ecce tibi libri quidam pleni, ut ait Celsinus, bonas res Arabicas ubi exhalant in nos, ubi illi flammulae instillarunt pretiosissimi unguenti guttas paucissimas ... incredibile incendium concitarunt.

The scholars who have attempted to detect the meaning of this image focused on certain elements of the metaphor but failed to account for any coherent understanding of the whole. For instance, the occurrence of the word *paucissimi* in *De beata vita* 1.4, where Augustine says that he read a few books (*paucissimi libri*) of Plotinus, has been considered as an argument for the identification of Plotinus' books with the *libri pleni* since these "instilled very few drops" (*guttas paucissimas*).⁹ Further, O'Meara, who otherwise rejected this parallelism,¹⁰ stressed the significance of the verb *exhalant* and raised the possibility that it refers to the fact that Augustine had only heard of the books, such as the *Vita Antonii*, which "had been passed by word of mouth ('exhalant in nos?') in him."¹¹ Pierre Hadot associated the *libri pleni* with Porphyry's *Sententiae*, for he supposed that the short and concise paragraphs of the work were the 'drops' that Augustine mentioned.¹²

Another approach to the exegesis of the metaphor appears in the investigations of possible prefigurings in the classical literature. Concerning the expression *bonae res Arabicae*, Goulven Madec and Henry Chadwick referred to Plautus' *Persians* 4.3.36 and Apuleius'

⁹ Madec 1971, 326; Doignon 1986, 138; Fuhrer 1997, 95.

¹⁰ The argument runs as follows: "'paucissimus' has been the most misleading word of all. Since in the contemporary *de beata vita* 4 mention is made of the 'Plotini paucissimis libris' the same books are understood to be referred to by the two superlatives, although the superlative refers to 'books' in one case and 'drops' in the other." Then, O'Meara adds: "'paucissimus' is rather a favourite word of Augustine," O'Meara 1970, 330.

¹¹ O'Meara 1970, 331.

¹² Cf. Hadot 1971, 209 n. 39. A similar interpretation had earlier been suggested by O'Meara 1959, 174 n. 3.

Metamorphoses 2.9.¹³ These analogues however, only allow the conclusion that Madec's critical question involved: the expression *bonae res Arabicae* simply means "le parfum par excellence."

Nevertheless, further pieces of evidence can be added to the literary background of the expression in question. Herodotus and Strabo, for instance, describe Arabia as a "fragrant country," "the only country which yields frankincense and myrrh and cassia, cinnamon and gum-mastich."¹⁴ The Ethiopians obtained their treasures and spices from Arabia Felix, that is from the "frankincense-bearing country" and the "myrrh-bearing country," where the "frankincense and myrrh are produced from trees and cassia is produced also from marshes."¹⁵ On the other hand, summarising the botanical knowledge of his age, Pliny the Elder devoted a number of chapters to a detailed description of these "peculiarities of Arabia" (*peculiararia Arabiae*).¹⁶ The description of myrrh deserves particular attention since this seems to have influenced Augustine's report of his reading of the *libri pleni*. Describing the myrrh tree, Pliny says that the trees "spontaneously exude a so-called *stacte*" which is "the most precious myrrh," the drop of myrrh:

The myrrh-producing tree also is tapped twice a year at the same seasons as the frankincense tree, but in its case the incisions are made all the way up from the root to those of the branches that are strong enough to bear it. But before it is tapped the tree exudes of its own accord a juice called stacte, which is the most highly valued of all myrrh. ... For the rest it is bought up all over the district from the common people and packed into leather bags;

¹³ Plautus: *Itaque hic est quod me detinet negotium, Chrysopolim Persae cepere urbem in Arabia, Plenam bonarum rerum atque antiquom oppidum*, in Goetz-Schoell 1900, 103. Apuleius: *vel cum guttis Arabicis obunctus et pectinis arguti dente tenui discriminatus et pone versum coactus amatoris oculis occurrens ad instar speculi reddit imaginem gratiorem*, in Robertson 1940, vol. 1, 36-37. See Madec 1971, 325. n. 5; Chadwick 1991, 45.

¹⁴ Herodotus 3.107 in Godley 1957, 2, 135.

¹⁵ Strabo *Geography* 16.4.25 in Jones 1983, 364-5.

¹⁶ Pliny *Natural History* 12.38.78, 62.

*and our perfumiers have no difficulty in distinguishing the different sorts by the evidence of the scent and consistency.*¹⁷

Pliny's *Botany* can throw light on the direct meaning of Augustine's expression "drops of the most precious unguent." Whereas the *bonae res Arabicae*, that is, the *peculiararia Arabiae*, are special plants from which aromas or scents are extracted, the expression *pretiosissimi unguenti guttae*, that is, the *stacte, cui nulla praefertur*, refers to an individual drop of myrrh. Since Pliny's work was widely read in Augustine's time, the contemporary reader, such as Romanianus, could easily identify the two basic elements of Augustine's metaphor.

This identification, however, might have helped Romanianus to recognise only the literary components of the image Augustine had created for describing the books. Being familiar with Pliny's work, Romanianus would have been able to deduce that the books which inflamed his friend were somehow connected with such Arabian aromatics as cassia, ledanon, myrrh, and, especially, the *stacte*. Apparently, those who wanted to understand the precise significance of Augustine's image had to read the same books. Conversely, those who knew the books understood the metaphor. Romanianus was supposed to convert to Christianity,¹⁸ that is to say, to follow Augustine's example, and, therefore, the author of the *Contra Academicos* aroused his friend's interest in the books which, I assume, were Christian.

The Old and the New Testament both mention precious unguents and aromatics. The Song of Songs, however, is the Biblical book *par excellence* which is "full" of these "Arabian good things." In addition, Origen's interpretation of certain verses of the Song of Songs appears to be the key to the exact meaning of the Augustinian metaphor.

In Origen's allegorical exegesis, perfumes and unguents are endowed with a special significance. For instance, the "sweetness

¹⁷ Rackham 1968, 49-51. Pliny *Natural History* 12.35.68, 54-6: *Inciduntur bis et ipsae iisdemque temporibus, sed a radice usque ad ramos, qui valent. Sudant autem sponte prius, quam incidantur, stacte dicta, cui nulla praefertur. ... Cetero passim a vulgo coemptam in folles conferviunt, nostrique unguentarii digerunt haud difficulter odoris atque pinguedinis argumentis.*

¹⁸ See *Acad.* 1.1.1; 2.1.2; 2.3.8 For this aspect of Augustine's relationship with Romanianus, see Kevane 1986, 48-50.

of scents" that the queen of Sheba gives to Solomon means the good deeds with which pagans come to Christ (*ComCant.* 2.1.28). The unguent of nard has the same meaning in Origen's second homily on the Song of Songs (*HomCant.* 2.2). Explaining the verse "my nard gave forth its fragrance" (Song. 1:12), Origen cites Matth. 26:6 which depicts a woman who poured a "highly precious unguent of nard" (*unguentum nardi pisticum pretiosum*) on Jesus' head. Origen stresses that this woman was a saintly person whose example we should follow if we too want to acquire a holy reputation: the unguent of nard symbolises our good deeds.¹⁹

Moreover, the "fragrance of the unguents" of the Bridegroom, the Saviour, "surpasses all fragrances" (*Odor unguentorum tuorum super omnia aromata*, Song. 1:2) because He is anointed with the sacerdotal unguent which symbolises His divinity:

*Many people have had spices: the queen of the South brought spices to Solomon, and many others possessed them; but no matter what any man had, his treasures could not be compared with the odours of Christ, of which the Bride says here: 'The odour of Thy perfumes is above all spices.' I think myself that Moses had spices too, and Aaron, and each one of the prophets; but if I have once seen Christ and have perceived the sweetness of His perfumes by their smell, forthwith I give my judgement in the words: 'The odour of Thy perfumes is above all spices.'*²⁰

On the other hand, according to Origen, Exodus 30:34 enumerates the components of Christ's sacerdotal unguent among which, Origen stresses, there are myrrh (*stacte*) and nard.²¹ Later, he explains this thought in more detail with respect to Song. 1:13. In

¹⁹ Cf. *HomCant.* 2.2, 106-8.

²⁰ Lawson 1956, 272. *HomCant.* 1.3, 78-80: *Multi habuerunt aromata. Regina Austri detulit aromata Solomoni et plures alii aromata possederunt, sed habuerit quis quantalibet, non possunt Christi odoribus comparari, de quo nunc sponsa ait: 'Odor unguentorum tuorum super omnia aromata' (Song. 1:2). Ego arbitror quia et Moyses habuerit aromata et Aaron et singuli prophetarum, verum, si videro Christum et suavitatem unguentorum eius odore percepero, statim sententiam fero dicens: 'Odor unguentorum tuorum super omnia aromata.'*

²¹ Origen *HomCant.* 1.2, 74: *Invenies quippe et ibi stacten, onycha, galbanen et reliqua. Et haec quidem in incensum: deinde ad opus unguentarii varia sumuntur unguenta, in quibus est nardus et stacte.* A more detailed exegesis of the components of this unguent can be read in *ComCant.* 1.3.5-11.

this verse, the term *stacte* recurs, enabling Origen to speak about the Incarnation:

*'A sachet of stacte' – that is, of a drop or trickle of myrrh – 'is my Nephew to me.' We read in Exodus that myrrh, onycha, cassia, and galbanum were at God's command compounded into incense, into the chrism for priests. If you, therefore, see my Saviour descending to earthly and lowly things, you will see how one small drop flowed down to us from mighty power and majesty divine. The prophet also sang about this drop: 'And it shall be that, from the drop of this people, Jacob that is to be gathered shall be gathered together.'*²²

Jerome specifies the translation of the Greek term *στακτή* (*stactes* – *id est guttae sive stillae*): it means not simply myrrh but, as we have seen, the most precious myrrh which exudes drop by drop from the tree. This passage of the *HomCant.* proves that both Origen and his translator alluded to this special drop of myrrh mentioned also by Pliny.²³

In *HomCant.* 2.3, Origen interprets the Scriptural verse in question as an allegory of the Saviour's descent. He became a "tiny drop" since "our fragility" was not able to accept Him in His divine form. Then, referring to Is. 40:15 and Ps. 44:9-10, Origen adds:

*So, because all the nations 'are as a drop of a bucket and are counted as the smallest grain of a balance,' He too became a drop, so that through Him the odour of stacte might distil from our garments, according to that which is said to the Bride in the forty-fourth Psalm.*²⁴

²² Lawson 1956, 286. *HomCant.* 2.3, 108-10: *'Fasciculus stactes' – id est guttae sive stillae – 'fratnelis meus mihi' (Song. 1:13). Guttam, unguem, casiam, galbanum in Exodo legimus praecepto Dei in thymiamam, in sacerdotale chrisma, confecta. Si ergo videris Salvatorem meum ad terrena et humilia descendentem, videbis, quomodo a virtute magna et maiestate divina ad nos modica quaedam stilla defluxerit. De hac stilla et propheta cecinit dicens: 'Et erit de stilla populi huius congregandus congregabitur Iacob'.*

²³ Cf. Brésard-Crouzel-Borret 1992, 773. Rufinus' translation in *ComCant.* 2.10.4, 448: *Alligamentum guttae fraternus meus mihi.*

²⁴ Lawson 1956, 287. *HomCant.* 2.3, 110: *Quia igitur universae gentes ut stilla situlae et ut momentum staterae reputatae sunt, idcirco factus est stilla, ut per eum a vestimentis nostris odor stillae, procederet iuxta illud: 'Myrrha et stilla et casia a*

If we compare the Origenian explanation of Song. 1:2 and 1:13 with the description that Augustine gives of the *libri pleni* in the *Contra Academicos*, we come closer to the meaning of the metaphor. These books “exhaling Arabian scents” on Augustine warned him to live a life of chastity and of self-restraint. This lifestyle can be realised once our “garments,” that is, our body and bodily actions, in their purity and honesty reflect the virtues of the embodied Christ. Accordingly, the books which fascinated Augustine “instilled a few drops of the most precious unguent,” that is to say, they included the doctrine of the Incarnation. Christ’s divinity is allegorically symbolised by the most precious sacerdotal unguent, and His Incarnation, by its drops.²⁵

There is, nevertheless, a slight difference between the “drops” in the *Contra Academicos* and in the *HomCant*. Contrary to Origen, Augustine uses the term *guttae*, a plural construction. This is not surprising if we take into account that the authors allude to the same doctrine but within different contexts. While Origen disentangles an allegorical interpretation from the occurrences of the term *stacte* in the Song of Songs and emphasises the significance of the “drop” with regard to Christ’s incarnation, Augustine highlights the impact the books had on him: these books repeatedly instilled the mystery of the Incarnation into his mind. It was enough for him to read about the Incarnation several times so that the books would excite “an incredible conflagration” within him.

The similarities between Augustine’s metaphor and Origen’s allegorical interpretation are remarkable and should not be considered a mere coincidence. Consequently, my hypothesis is that when Augustine composed this short account of his conversion, he deliberately telescoped images that he had known from the work of Pliny the Elder, on the one hand, and from Origen’s *Homilies on the Song of Songs*, on the other. Thus, the first half of the image (*bonas res Arabicas ubi exhalarunt in nos*) can be considered to be an allusion to the chapters of Pliny’s *Botany* where various Arabian scents are described, as well as to the allegorical

vestimentis tuis a domibus elephantinis, ex quibus laetificaverunt te filiae regum honore tuo, quae in quadregesimo quarto psalmo dicuntur ad sponsam.

²⁵ Jerome’s addition, *stactes – id est guttae sive stillae*, seems to influence Augustine’s description of the books which *guttas ... instillarunt*.

meaning of these scents in Origen. The second half of the image (*ubi illi flammulae instillarunt pretiosissimi unguenti guttas paucissimas*) is, again, a simultaneous allusion to the botanical description of the *stacte* and to its Origenian interpretation.

It is only through Origen's work that we can assign a well-defined meaning to the mysterious metaphor. Moreover, this meaning is theological and, therefore, is in accordance with the broader context of *Contra Academicos* 2.2.5, which is a narrative of Augustine's conversion to Christ. If this explanation is correct, the first conclusion would be that the *libri pleni* were, indeed, Christian works, because they taught not only the necessity of moral purity but also the Incarnation of Christ.²⁶ In addition, there is one work which was probably in the collection of *libri pleni*: Origen's *Homilies on the Song of Songs*. Augustine's metaphor indicates that the author of the *Contra Academicos* had read these homilies. By 386, the copies of the translation by Jerome had very possibly reached Milan, where Origen was a highly esteemed authority.²⁷

The Milanese reputation brings us to Ambrose. The bishop of Milan composed two important homilies that Augustine possibly heard before his conversion.²⁸ These works of Ambrose were influenced by Origen's exegesis of the *Song of Songs*.

Pierre Courcelle called the sermons *De bono mortis* and *De Isaac vel anima* "sermons plotiniens."²⁹ He detected strong Plotinian reminiscences and paraphrases in both works and concluded that, through them, the bishop of Milan "initiait [Augustine] en même temps au spiritualisme chrétien et aux doctrines plotiniennes."³⁰ Yet

²⁶ Mallard 1980, 98: "The conversion of Augustine significantly involved the doctrine of the Incarnation, not only in that he accepted it, but in the manner of his conceiving of it."

²⁷ Jerome had translated the two homilies during his sojourn in Rome in 383 AD, three years before Augustine's conversion. This date has been generally accepted since Cavallera's monograph. See Cavallera 1922, 1, 26.

²⁸ The final redaction of *De Isaac* and *De bono mortis* should be dated after 389 AD. See Zelzer 1998, 92. Paredi 1960, 533 dates it to 391 AD; Pasini, 1996, 218 dates it to either 395 or 396 AD.

²⁹ See Courcelle 1968, 106-38; Solignac 1962, 205 ff.

³⁰ Courcelle, 1968, 138.

it is not at all clear how and when this initiation happened.³¹ Moreover, despite the undeniable influence of a number of Plotinian *Enneads* on Ambrose's works, the presence of "Plotinian doctrines" in these homilies is highly questionable.

In fact, Ambrose's ideas substantially differ from Plotinus' metaphysics.³² It seems that the main source of *De Isaac* was not only Philo of Alexandria³³ but also Origen, especially his *Homilies on Genesis*, *Homilies on the Song of Songs*, and *Commentary on the Song of Songs*. There is no need to demonstrate Ambrose's obvious and widely-known exegetical dependence on Origen. It is highly significant, however, that Ambrose does not provide any explanation of the important *stacte* motif. Yet the bishop of Milan does interpret Song. 1:2-3; 4:16; 5:1, verses in which the "unguents" and the "myrrh" appear.³⁴ His exegesis of Song. 1:2 in *De Isaac* echoes Origen's *Commentary on the Song of Songs*,³⁵ and presumably his remarks in *De bono mortis* on Song. 4:16 and 5:1 are not independent from the second part of Origen's *Commentary*, that did not survive.³⁶ However, in spite of the strong presence of *Canticle* exegesis in Ambrose's works, there are no passages in them

³¹ See Taormina, 1953; Courcelle 1956; Solignac 1956; Hadot 1956; Moreschini 1982, 15-27. An excellent analysis of the problem of Ambrose's "Plotinian sermons" can be found in Madec 1974, 61-71.

³² It is an open question whether Ambrose used Plotinus' treatises directly, or whether he simply copied a Greek model (perhaps a writing of a Cappadocian father), as he often did, which already contained the passages of *Enn.* 1.6; 1.7; 1.8; 3.5 in a "Christianized" form. If this was the case, Ambrose probably was not conscious of using Plotinus' texts, cf. Madec 1974, 71.

³³ See the references in Schenkl's edition 1897, 641-700.

³⁴ Song. 1:2 in *De Isaac vel anima* 3.9, 648; Song. 4:16 in *De bono mortis* 5.19, 721; Song. 5:1 in *De bono mortis* 5.20, 722.

³⁵ Origen *ComCant.* 1.2.8, 196 and Ambrose *De Isaac vel anima* 3.9, 648.

³⁶ Origen cited these verses neither in the homilies nor in the surviving parts of his *Commentary*. He presumably interpreted them in the *Commentary*, but what we have now from the work ends with the explanation of Song. 2:15. According to Jerome (*Ep.* 33; *Ep.* 37.3; *Prol. in HomCant.*), the *Commentary* included ten books. Moreover, the dependence of the author of *De Isaac* on Origen's *Commentary* can also be demonstrated by the parallels between *De Isaac* 8.64 and *Excerpta Procopiana*, PG 13, 209C-211A. See Madec 1974, 123-127.

which could have directly served as a starting point for Augustine's description of the *libri pleni* in the *Contra Academicos* 2.2.5.

2 *DE BEATA VITA* 1.4

On the basis of *Contra Academicos* 2.2.5, three stages of Augustine's conversion can be distinguished. The first stage was when Augustine and his friends were stirred by Romanianus to live a philosophical life. The beginning of this period is symbolised in the text through the "placing of tinder" by Romanianus, and the philosophical self-education is referred to as the "slow burning fire." The second stage was Augustine's encounter with the books. The symbol of this event is the "incredible conflagration." The third and final stage is considered to be the enthusiastic reading of Apostle Paul, which was foreshadowed in the text by the metaphor, "greatest flame."

However, before the analysis of these important stages of the process, an examination of another early narrative in *De beata vita* 1.4 cannot be avoided. Concerning the *Confessions*, I shall consult this relatively late work, not to look for help in understanding the early writings, but to supplement the information deriving from the two dialogues.

De beata vita was dedicated to Manlius Theodorus, who, unlike Romanianus, was a Christian and could have followed attentively Augustine's path towards the final conversion. This is plausible because, in contrast to the spiritual disciple Romanianus, the new acquaintance and respected Christian philosopher (as Theodorus appears in the early dialogues) was staying in Milan at the moment of the conversion and was in contact with the young orator.¹ Augustine was addressing his words to one of his masters in *De beata vita*. These differences in Augustine's relationships with the two persons must be considered in explaining the divergence in the two narratives.

¹ *B. vita* 1.4; 2.16. Cf. Courcelle 1948, 122-28; idem 1968, 153-6; Doignon 1991.

Theodorus may have already known about Augustine's conversion when in the preface of the work he was reading about the long way Augustine had gone towards Christianity. Augustine enumerated the most important intellectual experiences he had gathered since the school of rhetoric. The first three determining experiences were the *Hortensius* by Cicero, Manicheism, and the philosophy of the Academics.² Later, he heard the speeches of Ambrose and Theodorus in Milan and learnt of the incorporeity of God and the proximity of the soul to Him.³ After that Augustine

² B. *vita* 1.4, 91.

³ B. *vita* 1.4-5, 91-2: *Deinde veni in has terras; hic septentrionem cui me crederem didici. 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. Sed ne in philosophiae gremium celeriter advolare, fateor, uxoris honorisque inlecebra detinebar, ut, cum haec essem consecutus, tum demum me, quod paucis felicissimis licuit, totis velis, omnibus remis in illum sinum raperem ibique conquiescerem. Lectis autem Plotini paucissimis libris, cuius te esse studiosissimum accepi, conlataque cum eis, quantum potui, etiam illorum auctoritate, qui divina mysteria tradiderunt, sic excarsi, ut omnes illas vellem ancoras rumpere, nisi me nonnullorum hominum existimatio commoveret. Quid ergo restabat aliud, nisi ut inmoranti mihi superfluis tempestas, quae putatur adversa, succurreret? Itaque tantum me arripuit pectoris dolor, ut illius professionis onus sustinere non valens, qua mihi velificabam fortasse ad Sirenas, abicerem omnia et optatae tranquillitati vel quassatam navem fessamque perducerem. Ergo vides, in qua philosophia quasi in portu navigem. Schopp 1948, 47-9: And now I have come to this land; here I have learned to know the North Star, to which to entrust myself. For I have noticed frequently in the sermons of our priest, and sometimes in yours, that, when speaking of God, no one should think of Him as something corporeal; nor yet of the soul, for of all things the soul is nearest to God. I acknowledge that I did not fly quickly to the bosom of Philosophy, because I was detained by woman's charm and the lure of honours, so that only after their attainment I finally, as occurs only to a few of the most fortunate, rushed with sails full set and all oars bent to that bosom where I found rest. For, after I had read only a few books of Plotinus [corrected by Gy. H.], of whom, as I learned, you are particularly fond, I compared them as well as I could with the authority of those who have given us the tradition of the divine mysteries, and I was so inflamed that I would have broken away from all anchors, had not the counsel of certain men stayed me. What else was left, then, except to find aid in my dilemma from an apparently adverse tempest. Thus, I was seized by such a pain of the chest that, not being able to keep up my onerous profession, through which I might have sailed to the Sirens, I threw off all ballast and brought my ship, shattered and leaking though it*

read “a few books of Plotinus” and compared Holy Scripture with them. Then, Augustine was influenced by the opinion of some people: “*I would have weighed all of my anchors unless the opinion of some people influenced me.*” Finally, an illness, a “tempest” sent by providence, made his sailing to the “port of Philosophy” possible. The illness in fact assisted him, who had “wasted his time with superfluities” (*inmoranti mihi superfluis*), that is with the obligations of his secular profession, in giving up his position as a rhetor.⁴

The main difference between this non-enthusiastic narrative and the enthusiastic account in *Contra Academicos* 2.2.5 is that *De beata vita* does not disclose exactly what happened during the period between the comparative reading of Scripture with Plotinus and the arrival at the port. Therefore, if we regard *Contra Academicos* 2.2.5 as an account of Augustine’s conversion, then *De beata vita* 1.4 can not be taken as such. What was directly followed by the “illness” and the “arrival” is missing from the narrative or is, at least, limited to the remarks concerning the “opinion of some people.” On the contrary, *Contra Academicos* focuses on demonstrating to Romanianus the significance of the final events: the influence of the *libri pleni*, the power of the exemplary life of some people, and the reading of St. Paul. Therefore, the connection between the two early accounts can be summarised as follows: *Contra Academicos* begins to tell the same story in more detail from the point at which *De beata vita* suddenly stops.

The reason for this difference is clear: just as Romanianus needed to hear neither about the experience with the *Hortensius* and Manicheism nor about the impression which the Academics’ philosophy and Ambrose’s speeches had made on Augustine because he must have already known about them, so Theodorus did not need to hear the story of the final conversion.

What the two narratives have in common is the reference to the books. Their identification by specialists as one and the same set of works seems to be corroborated by two similarities in the texts. On the one hand, both Plotinus’ books and the *libri pleni* “fired” Augustine (see *B. Vita: sic exarsi...ut* and *Acad.: incredibile incendium concitarunt*). On the other hand, in each case the encounter

was, to the desired resting place. You see, therefore, the philosophy in which, as in a port, I am now sailing.

⁴ Cf. *Conf.* 9.2.4; *Acad.* 1.1.3; *Ord.* 1.2.5.

with these books was followed by the reading of Holy Scripture. These similarities, however, require careful examination.

Firstly, the verb *exardere* represents one of Augustine's most frequently used words to express enthusiasm (in harmony with the general usage of the Latin term).⁵ Accordingly, when a book or an event caused excitement, Augustine described this with the metaphor "blazing." Concerning the *Hortensius*, he wrote *concupiscebam aestu cordis incredibili*, and, in the next chapter, he returns to the image: *Quomodo ardebam, deus meus, quomodo ardebam...* (*Conf.* 3.4.7-8). When Ponticianus told the story about the conversion of the two men at Trier who were reading the *Life of St. Antony*, Augustine retold it as the following: *Quam legere coepit unus eorum et mirari et accendi...* (*Conf.* 8.6.15). When Augustine heard about Victorinus' conversion, he "was fired to follow him" (*exarsi ad imitandum*-- 8.5.10). Reading the fourth Psalm, he "was inflamed by the words" (*inflammabar ex eis* - 9.4.8).

In contrast to the well-elaborated "blazing" image of *Contra Academicos* 2.2.5, the expression *exarsi* in *De beata vita* 1.4 is thus nothing more than an ordinary phrase: after having read Plotinus' books and Scripture, Augustine became excited. It is very important that this excitement followed not the reading of the books, but that of the books and Scripture together.⁶ In contrast to this, the extraordinary enthusiasm which can be noticed in the *Contra Academicos* was the consequence of the encounter with the *libri pleni*, solely. Therefore, the effect of the latter books, which "excited an incredible conflagration," far surpasses not only that of the reading of Plotinus but also the enthusiasm excited by the

⁵ See e.g. *Conf.* 2.1.1; 6.8.13; 8.5.10; 10.27.38; 11.22.28. *Acad.* 3.4.7. Cf. O'Donnell 1992, 2, 107, noting some rare exceptions where Augustine uses the term in a negative sense. In the dialogues, Augustine often uses the verb *inflammare* in the same sense: *Acad.* 2.2.4; 2.4.10; *Ord.* 1.8.24; 1.10.28; 2.1.1.

⁶ The extent of the effect that books of the Platonists had on Augustine seems to have been overemphasized. Even O'Meara 1970, 333 wrote: "It is incontrovertible that according to his *Confessions* Augustine was inflamed by the reading of Neoplatonist Books (Book VII)." Such a conclusion is controvertible at least from the point of view that, interestingly, Augustine never used the metaphor "blazing" in relation to the Platonic books.

comparative reading of Plotinus and Scripture. This fact indicates that Augustine was speaking about different books in the two early works in question.

Secondly, it was St. Paul's writings which Augustine read after the *libri pleni*; however, Plotinus' books were compared not simply with St. Paul, but with Holy Scripture (*libri ... qui divina mysteria tradiderunt*). This difference, which might seem to be insignificant, gains importance if one takes into consideration the difficulties of a comparison of this sort. Although, to a certain extent, the Epistles are appropriate for such a comparison, the theology of the Prologue of St. John's Gospel is much more comparable with Neoplatonic metaphysics. Marius Victorinus, the translator of the Platonic books that Augustine read, had already elaborated the parallels between the Neoplatonic principles and the concepts of the Prologue.⁷ By working on the same issue, Augustine was only following an established tradition. In addition, the *Confessions* confirm the assumption that the author of *De beata vita* deliberately refers not only to the Pauline Epistles but also to other books of Scripture. In chapter 7.9, the comparison of Platonic and Christian teachings (*legi ibi ... non ibi legi*) is primarily based on the Prologue. It is true that, after reading the Platonic books, Augustine *prae ceteris* read St. Paul, as he says in *Confessions* 7.21.27.⁸ However, even in those days he did not study the Epistles exclusively. Rather, this was the period in which he realised the harmony of the two Testaments. This means that Augustine rejected his earlier Manichean reading of the Bible and accepted its Catholic version, including also the "testimonies of the Law and Prophets" which St. Paul no longer appeared to oppose. How would it have been possible to detect the concordance of Paul and the Old Testament without examining some books of the latter?

In the *Contra Academicos*, Augustine emphasises the role of St. Paul in his conversion. There is no allusion to any other Scriptural book in the text, and unlike *De beata vita*, where the reading of Scripture and Plotinus is manifestly regarded as one of the stages of

⁷ Hadot 1971, 239-40. See also Augustine's *Civ. Dei* 10.29.2.

⁸ *Conf.* 7.21.27, 110: *Itaque avidissime arripui venerabilem stilum spiritus tui et prae ceteris apostolum Paulum, et perierunt illae quaestiones, in quibus mihi aliquando visus est adversari sibi et non congruere testimoniis legis et prophetarum textus sermonis eius et apparuit mihi una facies aliquorum castorum, et exultare cum tremore didici.*

the progress, in the *Contra Academicos* the reading of St. Paul appears as the climax of the conversion. This fact also demonstrates that in the two early dialogues Augustine referred to different periods when mentioning the examination of Scripture as well as the reading of St. Paul. It follows from this that the encounter with Plotinus' books, on the one hand, and with the *libri pleni*, on the other, also happened at different times.

A piece of indirect evidence serves to illustrate this point. In fact, an encounter of Augustine with books, undeniably Christian, can also be traced in his third Cassiciacum dialogue.

In *De ordine* 1.11.31, Augustine calls Monica's attention to *maiores nostri*, *quorum libros tibi nobis legentibus notos esse video*. This remark, of crucial importance, obviously refers to non-contemporary Christian authorities.⁹ Given the fact that *De ordine* was written in November of 386 at Cassiciacum, it is logical that Augustine had received the manuscript containing the Christian works while still in Milan, and it may be assumed that he had first read the books of *maiores nostri* before his conversion. The silence of the seventh and eighth books of the *Confessions* about these Christian works does not disprove this assumption. For, it is an astonishing feature of the *Confessions* that it does not mention any of the Christian writings that Augustine had read at all.¹⁰ It cannot be maintained that the young Augustine, who always looked for wisdom in books, converted to Christianity without being familiar with any Christian theological or exegetical works. The remark in *De ordine* reveals that not only the speeches of Ambrose and Theodorus transmitted the ideas of Christianity to Augustine but also books of his contemporaries and, especially, of earlier Christian authors.¹¹ If it is accepted that the metaphor Augustine

⁹ *Ord.* 1.10.31, 143: *satis eis fecerunt et maiores nostri, quorum libros tibi nobis legentibus notos esse video, et his temporibus - ut mittam ceteros - ... Theodorus, quem bene ipsa nosti, id agit, ut et nunc et apud posteros nullum genus hominum de litteris nostrorum temporum iure conqueratur.*

¹⁰ He "heard" Ambrose's sermons, see *Conf.* 5.13-14; 6.4, and "heard" about the *Vita Antonii*, see *Conf.* 8.6.14; 8.12.29.

¹¹ Concerning the writings of contemporary Christians, Augustine's reference to Theodorus in *Ord.* 1.11.31 seems to have a parallel in *Sol.* 2.14.26 in which mention is made of an absent friend of Augustine's who had composed a philosophical poem. Courcelle 1968, 207-9 and Madec

used in characterising the *libri pleni* refers to books which also contained Origenian works, then the *libri maiorum nostri* mentioned in *De ordine* were identical, at least partly, to certain books by Origen.

The dialogues of Cassiciacum thus attest that there was an important episode during Augustine's stay in Milan in which he came across certain Christian books. This event can be dated between the reading of a few books by Plotinus and a decisive reading of St. Paul. The most important stages of the Milanese period, therefore, are as follows:

1. Listening to the sermons of Ambrose, the "Pole Star":

Hic septentrionem cui me crederem didici. 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. (B. Vita 1.4)

2. The self-education in philosophy suggested by Romanianus, who subsequently, however, left Milan:

Itaque cum admoto nobis fomite discessisses numquam cessavimus inbiantes in philosophiam atque illam vitam, quae inter nos placuit atque convenit, prorsus nihil aliud cogitare atque id constanter quidem, sed minus acriter agebamus, putabamus tamen satis nos agere. (Acad. 2.2.5.)

3. Reading Plotinus' treatises and Scripture:

Lectis autem Plotini paucissimis libris... conlataque cum eis... etiam illorum auctoritate, qui divina mysteria tradiderunt sic excarsi, ut omnes illas vellem ancoras rumpere, nisi me nonnullorum hominum existimatio commoveret. (B. Vita 1.4.)

Et quoniam nondum aderat ea flamma, quae summa nos arreptura erat, illam qualem aestuabamus arbitrabamur esse vel maximam, (Acad. 2.2.5.)

4. Reading Christian works:

1974, 252-56 identify this person as Manlius Theodorus. Watson 1990, 193-4 convincingly argued for the possibility that Augustine is referring to Zenobius, who is mentioned in *Ord.* 1.7.20 as a poet.

Cum ecce tibi libri quidam pleni.... incredibile incendium concitarunt. (*Acad.* 2.2.5.)

5. Reading St. Paul:

Itaque tibubans properans haesitans arripio apostolum Paulum.
(*Acad.* 2.2.5.)

In this overview, the reference to the “flame” that Augustine and his friends believed “the greatest possible” is identified with Augustine’s experience of Plotinus’ books. This identification is justified by the fact that in the *Contra Academicos* the concise summary of all that preceded the encounter with the *libri pleni* embraces a period of uncertain length which undoubtedly began after the departure of Romanianus. During this period, Augustine and his friends philosophised and considered the philosophy “by which [they] got heated” to be the most eminent. An important stylistic feature of Augustine’s wording is his use of an intransitive verb *aestuabamus* when referring to the period in question. In this connection, the “flame” that he describes appears not as a metaphor for their efforts to put a philosophical life into practice but rather as the image of a certain philosophy which for a while influenced Augustine and other members of the small company. This philosophy was not identical to the scepticism of the Academics, which had made an impression on Augustine when he was still in Rome.¹² Aside from the Plotinian or Platonic books and the comparative reading of Scripture alongside them, neither the early dialogues nor the *Confessions* reveal any other possible candidate for the “flame” by which Augustine was “heated” in Milan and which he considered “the greatest possible.”

There is still an element of the narrative in *De beata vita* 1.4 which merits further examination. It is not yet clear at which event Augustine was hinting when he said that after having read Plotinus and Scripture, he was “influenced by the opinion of some people.”

¹² See *B. vita* 1.4; *Conf.* 5.10.19.

3 SIMPLICIANUS AND THE *LIBRI PLENI*

Reflecting on the clause, *nisi me nonnullorum hominum existimatio commoveret*, in *De beata vita* 1.4, Pierre Courcelle remarked that this is “volontairement peu clair.”¹ While the phrase is obscure, one can ask why “*volontairement*”? It appears reasonable that Augustine alluded to an event that Theodorus had already witnessed, and therefore it did not require a clearer elucidation.

Courcelle’s explanation of the phrase was that it referred to the moment of Augustine’s hesitation about following the path towards full continence. For, as Courcelle argued, Augustine had known Christians, such as Theodorus, who were married. This explanation, however, is not in accordance with Augustine’s texts. Firstly, the passage on which Courcelle’s view is based is *Confessions* 6.12.21, in which Augustine does indeed mention the period when he was influenced by the examples of married Christians. This period, nevertheless, preceded the reading of the Platonic books referred to in the seventh book of the *Confessions*.²

Secondly, Courcelle implicitly supposed that the expression *nonnullorum hominum existimatio* grammatically represented a *genitivus objectivus*; that is to say, Augustine had a certain opinion about married Christians which hindered him from giving up his marriage plans. It is more likely, however, that the expression involves a *genitivus subjectivus*: it was someone else whose opinion or judgement (*existimatio*) made a strong impression on Augustine.³ In this case,

¹ Courcelle 1968, 286.

² *Conf.* 6.12.21, 87-88: *Ego autem resistebam illi (Alypio) exemplis eorum, qui coniugati coluissent sapientiam et promeruissent Deum et habuissent fideliter ac dilexissent amicos.* Cf. Courcelle 1968, 286, n. 2.

³ In Augustine’s use, the expression “*nonnulli*” can refer to only one person. See Altaner 1967 (= 1952), 166-7.

two natural questions arise: about whom is Augustine speaking, and on what was this man expressing his opinion?

It is necessary to consult the *Confessions* at this point since there is a definite parallel between the event alluded to in *De beata vita* and Augustine's meeting with Simplicianus as narrated in *Confessions* 8.1-2.

According to the *Confessions*, Augustine visited the experienced and philosophically well-educated Simplicianus immediately after the reading of the *libri platoniorum* and Scripture.⁴ The old master was "glad" that Augustine "*had not fallen in with the writings of other philosophers which had been full of frauds and deceits according to the elements of this world*" (cf. Col. 2:8).⁵ He then told Augustine the story of Marius Victorinus' conversion "in order to exhort me," Augustine says, "*to Christ's humility which is hidden from the wise and revealed to the little ones.*"⁶ This remark thus reveals that Simplicianus taught Augustine to evaluate Platonism or Neoplatonism properly and to recognize its subordinate position in relation to Christianity. In

⁴ Concerning Simplicianus' education see Augustine's remark in *Conf.* 8.1.1, 113: *Audieram etiam, quod a iuventute sua* [Simplicianus] *devotissime tibi viveret; iam vero tunc senuerat et longa aetate in tam bono studio sectandae vitae tuae multa expertus, multa edoctus mihi videbatur: et vere erat;* and Ambrose's letter to Simplicianus, *Ep.* 2.1, 15: *Sed quid est quod ipse dubites et a nobis requiras, cum fidei et acquirendae cognitionis divinae gratia totum orbem peragraveris et cottidianae lectioni nocturnis ac diurnis vicibus omne vitae huius tempus deputaveris, acri praesertim ingenio etiam intellegibilia complectens, utpote qui etiam philosophiae libros, quam a vero sint devii, demonstrare soleas et plerosque tam inanes esse, ut prius scribentum in suis scriptis sermo quam vita earum defecerit.* According to Leo Ferrari (1991), the Augustine of the *Confessions* inverted the order of the events, and the visit with Simplicianus *de facto* preceded the encounter with the Platonic books. I will not repeat my arguments against this assumption: see my paper 1999/2 68-70.

⁵ *Conf.* 8.2.3, 114: *Perrexi ergo ad Simplicianum, patrem in accipienda gratia tunc episcopi Ambrosii et quem vere ut patrem diligebat.* *Narravi ei circuitus erroris mei. Ubi autem commemoravi legisse me quosdam libros Platoniorum, quos Victorinus quondam, rhetor urbis Romae, quem christianum defunctum esse audieram, in latinam linguam transtulisset, gratulatus est mihi, quod non in aliorum philosophorum scripta incidissem plena fallaciarum et deceptionum secundum elementa huius mundi, in istis autem omnibus modis insinuari deum et eius Verbum.*

⁶ *Ibid.* *Deinde, ut me exhortaretur ad humilitatem Christi sapientibus absconditam et revelatam parvulis, Victorinum ipsum recordatus est ...*

other words, Simplicianus expressed his opinion or passed judgement on the Platonic books, which included writings by Plotinus and Porphyry.

According to *De beata vita*, the *nonnullorum hominum existimatio* caused a change in Augustine's attitude towards both Neoplatonism and Scripture. It is important that when Augustine recalled the encounter with Plotinus' books, he wrote that "*after having compared with those (sc. Plotinus' books), as far as I could, also the authority of the books which bequeathed divine mysteries, I became fired ...*" These words were those of a neophyte who had already accepted the authority of Scripture but who, at that point, was recalling the moment when he had believed that Plotinus' ideas could be justified by Scripture.

There was, nevertheless, an essential difference between the teachings of the Plotinian books and those of Scripture, namely, the doctrine of the Incarnation. Augustine must have disregarded this contrast in order to become enthusiastic about the concordance of Neoplatonism and Christianity. Accordingly, in *Confessions* 7.19.25, Augustine reflects on his early "Plotinianism" as he defines this Christological heterodoxy. The view (also held by Porphyry)⁷ that Christ was no more than an excellent and extremely wise man rendered such eclecticism possible for him.

Therefore, when Simplicianus directed Augustine's attention to the "humility of Christ" (see Philipp. 2:7), he pointed to the most important demarcation line between Christianity and Neoplatonism. Their conversation turned Augustine's focus towards the Catholic faith. Victorinus, whose conversion was detailed by Simplicianus, studied Scripture and Christian literature until the pagan rhetor and translator of the books of Platonists accepted the teachings of the Catholic Church and its seemingly formal rites. Simplicianus sensed Augustine's needs and thus narrated a story about a man who originally interpreted Scripture in a Neoplatonic way but after converting understood the Neoplatonic doctrines from the viewpoint of Christianity. This was also the case for Augustine.

If, as I propose, in *De beata vita* 1.4 the phrase *nonnullorum hominum existimatio commoveret* is an allusion to the conversation with Simplicianus, then it follows that, influenced by the *existimatio* of

⁷ *Civ. Dei* 19.23. See O'Meara 1958, 109; O'Connell 1968, 258-261.

Simplicianus, Augustine rejected the possibility of being simultaneously a Neoplatonic and a Christian thinker, without the *parietes* of Christianity. The impossibility of such a position was the point that Simplicianus made Augustine understand through the example of Victorinus. It is important to stress that while in *De beata vita* Augustine mentioned his intention to “weigh all of his anchors,” he did not declare in any way that the direction in which he wanted to sail was correct. Rather, the next sentence clarifies that as the result (*ergo*) of the influence of the judgement, Augustine already needed nothing other than the “tempest,” the illness, in order to at last give up his profession and retire from public life.

To demonstrate the importance of the meeting with Simplicianus, the remarks of the respected master on the Platonic books must be re-examined. In fact, despite its brevity, Simplicianus' interpretation of Col. 2:8 discloses some remarkable features of the Milanese Christian community in which Augustine happened to find himself in 386.

First of all, Simplicianus drew a distinction within the pagan philosophical tradition. On the one hand, there are philosophers whose writings are “according to the elements of this world.” Platonists, on the other hand, represent another sort of philosophy in which “God and his word, in any case, were intimated” (*Conf.* 8.2.3).

This high estimation of Platonic philosophy differed from the view of the bishop of Milan. Although Simplicianus was the spiritual “father” of Ambrose (see *Conf.* 8.2.3), the “son” rejected pagan philosophy in its entirety.⁸ Moreover, this rejection was based on Col. 2:8.⁹ The attitude of Ambrose can be illustrated with a passage of his *De Abraham*, where concerning Plato's theory on the music of the spheres, he reproaches Origen for being “too lenient with the tradition of philosophers to which the majority of his writings testify.”¹⁰ Then Ambrose quotes the crucial verse of

⁸ The only occurrence of the term *philosophia* in the positive sense that the Greek Fathers attributed to this word is found in Ambrose's *De virginitate* 8.48, cf. Madec 1974, 91 n. 387.

⁹ See the passages mentioned by Madec 1974, 402.

¹⁰ Ambrose *Abr.* 2.8.54, 608: *Nam licet Origenes quoque noster, hoc est ecclesiastico vir officio deditus, planetarum stellarum quandam inenarrabilem motu armoniam esse suavissimi illius soni caelestis adserat, tamen etiam ipsum plurimum indulgere philosophorum traditioni pleraque eius scripta testantur. Quod eo scripsi, ut*

Col. 2:8 and introduces it with the words: “I want to be seen as a coward rather than as a learned one.”

The Christians in Milan who, like Simplicianus, were as indulgent with the Platonic tradition as Origen was, would have been stung by Ambrose’s remark when reading or hearing their bishop’s work. The mention of Origen’s name in this context was, moreover, intentional on Ambrose’s part. It was Origen who, following Clement of Alexandria, had interpreted the Scriptural verse in question in the same way as Simplicianus.¹¹ In the preface to *Contra Celsum*, Origen insisted that Celsus’ writings (representing an eclectic Middle Platonism, as a modern reader was to add)¹² were not “according to the elements of this world.” As the pages of the *Contra Celsum* illustrate, the philosophy that Origen regarded as that of the intelligible world occurred primarily as Plato’s teaching.

Consequently, Ambrose’s reference to Origen’s exaggerated indulgence with regard to pagan philosophy, as well as his use of the quotation of Col. 2:8 in the same context, can be considered a hidden criticism of the attitude of some educated Christians in his circle. The bishop of Milan was gingerly questioning the Alexandrian’s authority in this respect, the authority which could have justified the efforts of Simplicianus and, probably, Manlius Theodorus to harmonise Christianity and Platonism.¹³

Since *De Abraham* had been composed before 386,¹⁴ that is, before Augustine’s conversation with Simplicianus, Simplicianus’ remark on the Platonic books indicates that Ambrose’s admonition had not shaken the old master in his conviction: philosophy and

et ab aruspinae et a philosophiae traditione sacrificii istius interpretationem secernerem. Velint alii doctrinam probare suam, ego iuxta apostolum timidus malo quam doctus videri, qui ait: Videte ne quis vos depraedetur per philosophiam et inanem seductionem secundum traditionem hominum, secundum elementum huius mundi et non secundum Christum (Col. 2:8). This passage represents Ambrose’s general attitude in regard to Origen. See Savon 1998, especially 234.

¹¹ See Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* 1.11.50.5-51.2; 6.8.62; Origen *CCels.* Preface 5; cf. *ibid.* 1.13; 3.47. See Madec 1974, 203-4 and Holte 1962, 146.

¹² Chadwick 1980, 25-26.

¹³ For Theodorus’ philosophical erudition, see Augustine’s *Ord.* 1.10.31 and Claudianus’ *Panegyricus*.

¹⁴ Madec 1974, 52 n.162.

Christianity are not opponents. It is not without significance that the Episcopal authority was being called into question on such an important point.

At the same time, Simplicianus did not overestimate the role of the Platonists. He was "glad" that Augustine read their books because Simplicianus conceived Platonic philosophy as proper preparation for or preliminary study of Christianity. In fact, it also represents an Alexandrian idea that the study of the liberal arts (ἐγκύκλια μαθήματα) and philosophy serves as preparation for Christianity, which therefore often appears as the "true philosophy" (*vera philosophia*) or the "true philosophy of Christ" (*vera philosophia Christi*) as referred to by Origen.¹⁵

With regard to these issues, Augustine followed Simplicianus and the Alexandrians. Moreover, a passage of *De ordine* where the special interpretation of Col. 2:8 emerges testifies to the fact that Simplicianus was initiating Augustine into a Christianity which was largely determined by Origen's ideas. Augustine admonishes Monica:

Therefore, the divine Scripture that you ardently love does not ordain that all philosophers are to be avoided and derided, but only philosophers of this world (cf. Col. 2:8). The fact, moreover, that another world exists which is hidden far from the bodily eyes and which a few healthy minds behold, is sufficiently signified by Christ, who does not say that "My kingship is not of the world," but: My kingship is not of this world (Jn. 18:36). In

¹⁵ Origen *ComCant. Prol.* 3.8, 132 and *HomGen.* 13.2, 284. See also Justin *Apologia* 1.20; Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* 5.141.4; Gregory Thaumaturgus *Oratio panegyrica* 6.73-80; 13-15. Cf. Crouzel, 1962, 22-55; Brésard-Crouzel-Borret 1991, 2, 756-7; DuRoy 1966, 111. For the Alexandrian theme of ἐγκύκλια μαθήματα, see Ilsetraut Hadot, 1984, 263-293, and Philo *De congressu eruditionis gratia* 14, 71-80; Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* 1.28-32; Origen *Epistle to Gregory* (= *Philocalia* 13). Concerning the latter work, Origen's exegesis of "the Egyptian gold" of Ex. 3:22 and 11:2, recurs in Augustine's *Conf.* 7.9.15, *Doctr. chr.* 2.40.60 and *C. Faustum* 22.91. Altaner 1967 (=1949), 194-203 argued for the influence of Irenaeus *Haer.* 4.30 on Augustine. On this see O'Donnell 1992, 2, 432. An exhaustive analysis of the topic can be found in Holte 1962, 111-24 and 177-90.

*fact, anyone who believes that all philosophy must be avoided, wants no less of us than not to love wisdom.*¹⁶

A very close parallel of this idea can be found in Origen's commentary on St. John:

*However, another world also exists outside the apparent and sensible world composed of heaven and earth or heavens and earth; where things exist that are unseen (cf. 2 Cor. 4:18); and this world is invisible in its whole, an unseen world, an intelligible world, whose vision and beauty the pure in heart will behold (cf. Matth. 5:8). ... Consider, nevertheless, if in a certain sense the first-born of all creation (Col. 1:15) could be a world, and mainly, inasmuch as he is manifold wisdom (cf. Eph. 3:10). And see, if it is possible that the one who says "I am not of this world" (Jn. 8:23) is Jesus' soul which entirely dwells in that world, and pervades it while leading his disciples there.*¹⁷

¹⁶ Ord. 1.11.32, 143-4: *Unde etiam divinae scripturae, quas vehementer amplecteris, non omnino philosophos, sed philosophos hujus mundi (cf. Col. 2:8) vitandos atque invidendos esse praecipunt. 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' (Jn. 18:36). Nam quisquis omnem philosophiam fugiendam putat, nihil nos vult aliud quam non amare sapientiam.*

¹⁷ *ComJn.* 19.146-148, 134-138: πλήν ἐστὶν τις καὶ ἕτερος παρὰ τὸν δεικνύμενον καὶ αἰσθητὸν κόσμον τὸν συνεστῶτα ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς ἢ οὐρανῶν καὶ γῆς κόσμος, ἐν ᾧ ἐστὶν τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα· καὶ ὅλον τοῦτο κόσμος ἀόρατος, κόσμος οὐ βλεπόμενος, καὶ νοητὸς κόσμος, οὗ τῇ θεᾷ καὶ τῷ κάλλει ἐνόησαν οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ, ... Ζητήσεις δὲ εἰ κατὰ τι τῶν σημαινόμενων δύναται ὁ πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως εἶναι κόσμος, καὶ μάλιστα καθ' ὃ σοφία ἐστὶν ἡ πολυποίκιλος· ... καὶ ὅρα εἰ δύναται ὁ λέγων· Οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἢ ψυχὴ εἶναι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐμπολιτευομένη τῷ ὄλῳ κόσμῳ ἐκεῖνῳ καὶ πάντα αὐτὸν ἐμπεριερχομένη καὶ χειραγωγούσα ἐπ' αὐτὸν τοὺς μαθητευομένους. In *Princ.* 2.3.6, 264-6, Origen similarly writes: *Designat sane et alium quendam mundum praeter hunc visibilem etiam dominus et Salvator noster, quem re vera describere ac designare difficile est; ait namque: Ego non sum ex hoc mundo (Jn. 8:23). Tamquam enim qui ex alio quodam esset mundo, ita dixit quia non sum ex hoc mundo.*

Hinting at Col. 2:8, Augustine makes a distinction between the philosophers and, accordingly, between two worlds.¹⁸ The reasoning is strongly Origenian both in form and content. The two thinkers claim that there is another world (*alius mundus* – ἕτερος κόσμος) which is intelligible (*intellectus intuetur* – νοητὸς κόσμος), which cannot be reached by sensation (*ab istis oculis remotissimus* – ὁράτος ... οὐ βλέπόμενος), which only those who are pure (*sanorum intellectus* – οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ) can behold (*intuetur* – ἐνόησονται), which Christ speaks about in St. John's Gospel (*regnum meum non est de hoc mundo* – Οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου),¹⁹ and, finally, which is identical to divine Wisdom itself (*sapientia* – σοφία).²⁰

According to Augustine, the philosophy of the other world is not merely Platonism or Neoplatonism but also Christianity. In addition, it is only the latter which is capable of calling sinful souls back to the intelligible world.²¹ Therefore, Christianity is considered the “true” or “truest philosophy” (*verissima philosophia*)²² which

¹⁸ For the quotations of Col. 2:8 in Augustine's later works see Holte 1962, 146-7; Madec 1974, 207 n.142.

¹⁹ Both in *De principiis* 2.3.6 and in *De ordine* 1.11.32, the stress on Jesus wording *hoc mundo* serves as the argument for the existence of another world.

²⁰ For the Augustine of Cassiciacum, the true philosophy, as the *amor sapientiae* meant the love of the divine Wisdom. See *Acad.* 2.3.7, cf. *ibid.* 2.1.1 and *B. vita* 4.34.

²¹ *Acad.* 3.19.42, 79: *multis quidem saeculis multique contentionibus, sed tamen eliquata est, ut opinor, una verissimae philosophiae disciplina. Non enim est ista huius mundi philosophia* (cf. Col. 2:8), *quam sacra nostra meritissime detestantur, sed alterius intelligibilis, cui animas multifformibus erroris tenebris caecatas et altissimis a corpore sordibus oblitae numquam ista ratio subtilissima revocaret, nisi summus deus populari quadam clementia divini intellectus auctoritatem usque ad ipsum corpus humanum declinaret atque summitteret, cuius non solum praeceptis sed etiam factis excitatae animae redire in semet ipsas et respicere patriam etiam sine disputationum concertatione potuissent.*

²² Cf. *una verissimae philosophiae disciplina* in *Acad.* 3.19.42; *vera philosophia* in *Acad.* 3.17.38, *Ord.* 2.1.1 and 2.5.16; *vera et divina philosophia* in *Ep.* 2. See Holte 1962, 97-109; 150-8. The term *divina philosophia* occurs in Origen's *ComCant*, *Prol.* 3.14, 136; 3.17, 138; 3.20, 141-2.

teaches the unity of the Trinity and the Incarnation of the Divine Intellect.²³

Is it possible that Augustine had not merely heard about Origenian ideas from Simplicianus but that the respected master and possible admirer of Origen had also given the young man some writings by the Alexandrian? On the one hand, reconstructing the stages of the conversion, I have pointed out that the encounter with the *libri pleni* followed the reading of Plotinus' books and Scripture. On the other hand, the meeting with Simplicianus can be dated between the two events, since both *De beata vita* and the *Confessions* place it immediately after the comparative reading of the Plotinian/Platonic books and the Scripture. After conferring with Simplicianus, Augustine may not have left empty-handed. Presumably, either Simplicianus or someone else from the master's circle gave Augustine a collection from Origen's writings which a certain Celsinus termed *libri pleni*.

The difficulty of identifying this Celsinus must be highlighted. The cognomen Celsinus was widespread in the time of Augustine. The attempts of both Courcelle and Solignac to identify him were based on the assumption that the books were Neoplatonic.²⁴ Unfortunately, nothing is known about Celsinus, mainly because Augustine omitted his name from the *Confessions*. Strikingly, he did not mention Celsinus in the chapters about the conversion, although Celsinus seems to have played an important role in this: his name was somehow connected with the important *libri pleni*. In any case, the one valid piece of information concerning Celsinus is limited to two words: *libri pleni*. Augustine must have found the adjective *pleni* apposite with reference to the books since he repeated it in *Contra Academicos* 2.2.5. What is the exact meaning of this mysterious remark? I suggest translating the adjective *pleni* simply as "complete." This qualification is to be regarded as a reference to the teachings contained in the books. If there are "complete books," one can suppose that "incomplete" or

²³ *Acad.* 3.19.42, quoted above; *Ord.* 2.5.16; *B. vita* 4.34-35.

²⁴ Courcelle (1948, 179-81 and 1968, 158. n. 5) thought of Kelsinus of Castabala. According to Solignac (1962, 2, 535), Augustine might have been referring either to Celsinus Tatianus, the brother of Symmachus, or to Clodius Celsinus Adelphius, the father of Hermogenianus. Cf. Fuhrer 1997, 93-4.

“imperfect” books also exist, such as those of the Platonists, who did not teach the Incarnation of the Logos. In contrast to them, the books of Christians, for instance, those of Origen, are “complete” because these writings not only contain every useful doctrine that the Platonists or Neoplatonists held but also, through the addition of the teaching of Incarnation, complete those doctrines. This understanding of the phrase “complete books” is in harmony with the meaning of the metaphor which Augustine used to describe the books. Although Plotinus’ books also “exhaled Arabian fragrances” since the requirement of moral purification and good deeds is a common theme in Plotinus and Origen, what makes Origen’s books complete however, are the “drops of the most precious unguent.”

4 THE PERIOD OF HESITATION

After telling of the “incredible conflagration” that the “complete books” excited in him, Augustine continues the account in *Contra Adademicos* 2.2.5 as follows:

Quis me tunc honor, quae hominum pompa, quae inanis famae cupiditas, quod denique huius mortalis vitae fomentum atque retinaculum commovebat? Prorsus totus in me cursim redibam. Respexi tantum, confiteor, quasi de itinere in illam religionem, quae pueris nobis insita est et medullitus implicata; verum autem ipsa ad se nescientem rapiebat. Itaque titubans, properans, haesitans arripio apostolum Paulum.

The books reminded Augustine of the necessity to abandon worldly pleasures and career ambitions and to escape from “the net of this mortal life” (*huius mortalis vitae ... retinaculum*¹) in which he was entangled. According to Origen’s interpretation of Song. 2:9, souls can flee because Christ “subjected himself to the nets of the world” (*subiecit se retibus mundi*) in order to tear those apart.² Therefore, as Augustine says, “*I was hastily returning into myself in my entirety.*” This awareness may be connected with the idea of self-knowledge which had become commonplace in the philosophical tradition by the time of Augustine.³ The influence of Plotinus on

¹ Cf. *Ep.* 1.3.

² Origen *HomCant.* 2.12, 144: *Eminet igitur sponsus per retia; viam tibi fecit Iesus, descendit ad terras, subiecit se retibus mundi; videns magnum hominum gregem retibus impeditum nec ea ab alio nisi a se posse conscindi, venit ad retia, assumens corpus humanum quod inimicarum fortitudinum laqueis tenebatur, ea tibi dirupit et loqueris: Ecce hic retro post parietem nostrum, prospiciens per fenestra, eminens per retia.* Cf. Ambrose *De Isaac* 4.33-35 and *De bono mortis* 7.24-25; 9.41

³ For this topic, see Courcelle 1974, 1, *passim*. Fuhrer (1997, 96-97) is thinking of Neoplatonic philosophy alone.

Augustine in this respect has often been overrated, since this idea occurred over and over in such Christian works as those of Origen and Ambrose.⁴ Although the most important explanation of the theme of "self-knowledge" can be read in Origen's *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, his first homily on the same Scriptural book also offers a concise summary of his view:

After these words the Bridegroom warns her, saying: 'Either know thyself, that thou art' the Bride of the King and beautiful, and made beautiful by me because I have presented to myself 'a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle'; or understand that if thou hast not known thyself or grasped thy dignity, thou must endure the things that follow. What may these be? 'If thou have not known thyself, o fair one among women, go forth in the steps of the flocks and feed' – not the flocks of sheep, nor of lambs, but – 'thy goats.'⁵

According to Origen, we have to know ourselves, our original, prelapsarian dignity and beauty, and to purify the image of God in us from the obscuring vices.

On the other hand, the "return" of Augustine to his inner self meant his turning away from worldly pleasures and desires. In Origen's writings this idea plays a central role: we have to disdain all that is temporary, for instance, riches and all the transient corporeal-sensible world; we have to recede from the bodily things to the spiritual, that is to say, to the divine Logos on whom our heart, the leading part of the soul, rests:

If you have despised all bodily things – I do not mean flesh and blood, but money and property and the very earth and heaven, for

⁴ Origen, *ComCant.* 2.5.1-40. and the fragment in Procopius (PG 17, 256D-257C, or in the edition of Baehrens in GCS 8, Leipzig 1925, 141-6). For the literature see Brésard-Crouzel-Borret 1991, 2, 770-2. Concerning Ambrose, see, for instance, *Hex.* 6.6.39; *De bono mortis* 3.11; 6.23; *De Isaac* 2.3; 4.11; 4.15-16.

⁵ Lawson 1956, 281. *HomCant.* 1.9, 98: *Post haec verba sponsus ei comminatur et dicit: aut cognosces temet ipsam, quoniam regis es sponsa et formosa et a me facta formosa, ego siquidem exhibui mihi gloriosam ecclesiam non habentem maculam neque rugam* (Eph. 5:27) *aut scito quia si te non cognoveris et tuam nescieris dignitatem, patieris haec quae sequuntur. Quenam ista sunt? Si non cognoveris temet ipsam, o pulchra in mulieribus, egredere tu in vestigiis gregum, et pasce non greges ovium, non agnorum, sed haedos tuos* (Song. 1:8).

these will pass away – if you have set all these at nought and your soul is not attached to any of them, nor are you held back by any love of sinful practices, then you can acquire spiritual love.⁶

And it is significant that the expression used concerning the bride-soul and the Bridegroom-Word is 'lying upon His breast,' because there is the seat of our heart. Forsaking carnal things, therefore, we must perceive those of the spirit and understand that it is much better to love after this manner than to refrain from love.⁷

On the other hand, Augustine wanted to return to himself, to the religion of his childhood which was "implanted" into him and was "implicated in the bottom of the heart." How would he start towards Christianity while reading the books, unless they were Christian?

There are two meaningful imperfect tenses in the quoted passage of the *Contra Academicos*: Augustine "was returning" (*redibam*) to himself; and the religion "was drawing him to itself" (*rapiebat*). In the case of "*redibam*," with using the *praeteritum imperfectum de conatu*, Augustine emphasized the point that, however great "conflagration" the books had excited in him, this did not yet represent the climax of the process. After reading the books, he "looked back on the childhood religion"; consequently, he had not yet arrived. This was the period of hesitation.

A number of records of this period can be traced in the *Confessions*. After Simplicianus told him of the conversion of Victorinus, "convinced by truth," that is, by Christ, Augustine struggled against "*consuetudo*" like the one who began to wake from sleep but was held back by "grave torpor": "Just a minute," "One more minute," "Let me have a little longer." The Augustine of the *Confessions*, however, adds: *But these "minutes" never diminished, and my "little longer"*

⁶ Lawson 1956, 270. *HomCant.* 1.2, 74-6: *Si omnia corporalia despexisti, non dico carnem et sanguinem, sed argentum et possessiones et ipsam terram ipsumque caelum - haec quippe pertransibunt (Matth. 24:35) -, si ista omnia contempsisti et ad nullum horum tua anima colligata est neque quoquam vitiorum amore retineris, potes amorem capere spiritalem.*

⁷ Lawson 1956, 276. *HomCant.* 1.6, 88: *De anima sponsa et sermone dicitur sponso: super pectus illius recumbens, quia ibi principale cordis est nostri. Unde a carnalibus recedentis spiritalia sentire debemus et intelligere multo melius esse sic amare quam ab amore desistere.*

*lasted inordinately long.*⁸ The permanent problem for Augustine was his inability to free himself from lust. Although he was fascinated by Ponticianus' story about the chaste life of Antony and the Milanese monks, he felt unable, at that moment, to follow these examples: *Grant me chastity and self-control, but please not yet.*⁹ In the Milanese garden, confused and desperate, he repeated the words: *Why must I go on saying, "tomorrow ... tomorrow?" Why not now? Why not put an end to my depravity this very hour?" (Quare non hac hora finis turpitudinis meae?)*¹⁰

Augustine's hesitation, which is particularly emphasised in the *Confessions* as well as in the *Contra Academicos*, must be considered in order to clarify the point in the text of the *Contra Academicos* which undermined the integrity of O'Meara's interpretation and which served as a basis for Madec's arguments against the Christianity of the *libri pleni*.¹¹ I quote the sentence in question.

*Respexi tantum (tamen or tandem), confiteor, quasi de itinere in
illam religionem...*

⁸ Boulding 1997, 194. *Conf.* 8.5.12, 120-21: *Ita sarcina saeculi, velut somno assolet, dulciter premebar, et cogitationes, quibus meditabar in te, similes erant conatibus expergisci volentium, qui tamen superati soporis altitudine remerguntur. Et sicut nemo est, qui dormire semper velit, omniumque sano iudicio vigilare praestat, difert tamen plerumque homo somnum excutere, cum gravis torpor in membris est, eumque iam displicentem carpit libentius, quamvis surgendi tempus advenerit: ita certum habebam esse melius tuae caritati me dedere quam meae cupiditati cedere; sed illud placebat et vincebat, hoc libebat et vincebat. Non enim erat quod tibi responderem dicenti mihi: Surge qui dormis et exurge a mortuis, et inluminabit te Christus (Eph. 5:41), et undique ostendenti vera te dicere, non erat omnino, quid responderem veritate convictus, nisi tantum verba lenta et somnolenta: 'Modo', 'Ecce modo', 'Sine paululum'. Sed 'modo et modo' non habebat modum et 'sine paululum' in longum ibat. Frustra condelectabar legi tuae secundum interiorem hominem, cum alia lex in membris meis repugnaret legi mentis meae et captivum me duceret in lege peccati, quae in membris meis erat. Lex enim peccati est violentia consuetudinis, qua trahitur et tenetur etiam invitus animus eo merito, quo in eam volens inlabitur. Miserum ergo me quis liberaret de corpore mortis huius nisi gratia tua per Iesum Christum, dominum nostrum?*

⁹ Boulding 1997, 198. *Conf.* 8.7.17, 124.

¹⁰ Boulding 1997, 206. *Conf.* 8.12.28, 131.

¹¹ O'Meara 1970, 336; Madec 1971, 327.

First of all, a philological difficulty arises concerning the connectives *tamen*, *tantum* and *tandem*. The term *tamen* appears in the edition of P. Knöll and that of W. Green.¹² G. Madec has also adopted it. The Maurists' edition chooses *tantum*, the reading which is based on the *Codex Monacensis no 14330*. J. O'Meara and W. Theiler followed this version.¹³ Th. Fuhrer reads *tandem*.¹⁴ Although it is remarkable that the *Codex Monacensis* contains the most reliable manuscript of the text of the *Contra Academicos*,¹⁵ the final decision among the variants depends upon the interpretation. Basically, three types of translations are possible:

1. I looked back, however, I confess, as if it were on a road, on the religion which ...
2. I only looked back, I confess, as if it were on a road, on the religion which ...
3. I looked back at last, I confess, as if it were on a road, on the religion which ...

If we accept the reading *tamen*, it is not clear what Augustine has to "confess" to Romanianus, or why he should do so. Did the Christian Augustine feel the need to confess that when reading the extraordinary books (whatever type they may have been), he had looked back on Christianity? In other words, if one accepts *tamen*, the interpretation becomes nonsensical, since *Contra Academicos* 2.2.5 is a passionate narrative of the very fact that Augustine converted to Christ's "true philosophy."

On the other hand, when O'Meara adopted the *tantum* he seems to have overlooked the meaning which is defined by the expressions *confiteor* and *quasi de itinere*:

¹² Knöll 1922, 27, l. 3; W. M. Green *Stromata patristica et mediaevalia* 2, 31, l. 7; idem, 1970, 21, l. 60. Cf. Madec 1971, 324 n. 3. In the preface to his edition (p.8), Green remarks on the Maurists' work that "I frequently find myself in agreement with them against later editors."

¹³ O'Meara 1954, 55 n.1; Theiler 1953.

¹⁴ Fuhrer 1997, 97-8.

¹⁵ See, Knöll 1922, 6-7. It is interesting that both Green and Madec prudently adopted the reading *confiteor* of the *Monacensis no. 14330* and *Trecensis no. 1085* instead of the *confitebor* that Knöll had put into the body of his edition. The future tense has no meaning in the context, cf. Green 1970, 21, l. 60; Madec 1971, 327.

The 'confiteor' makes the point to Romanianus that in being affected by the books of St. Paul and the lives [sic!] of Antony - the 'libri pleni' and the 'bonae res Arabicae' - he was doing no more ('tantum') - he has to admit ('confiteor') - than returning to the environment of his childhood.¹⁶

One can object to this interpretation by noting that the term *tantum* follows the verb *respexi* in the sentence, and hence that it simply means that Augustine "was doing no more" than "looking back." Moreover, the use of the verb *confiteor* indicates the attitude of regret; that is to say, while recalling this moment, the neophyte confesses his mistake in "doing no more" than "looking back" on Christianity. My objection against the reading *tandem* is the same. Why did Augustine confess that he at last looked back on the religion? Finally, O'Meara does not even mention in the above-quoted passage the expression *quasi de itinere*, although this is evidently an explanatory phrase for the verb *respexi*.

Consequently, what Augustine "confesses" is that he *only* looked back on his childhood religion as a wanderer on the road looks back at the home he has left. The image is that of a journey.¹⁷ Augustine had gradually left the Catholic religion (*religio*) behind and was moving away from the Christianity of his childhood, but at a certain moment, when confronted by the Christian books, he "looked back" and recognised its truth. At this moment, he awoke to the fact that the Catholic faith which he believed that he had left far behind was incessantly "drawing him to itself" (*verum autem ipsa ad se ... rapiebat*)¹⁸ – since this religion was implanted into his "marrow" (*medullitus*) – even if he was not aware of this fact (*nescientem*).¹⁹ At this time, stimulated by the books of Catholics, he

¹⁶ O'Meara 1970, 336 criticised by Madec 1971, 327.

¹⁷ Cf. O'Meara 1970, 335; Madec 1971, 327; Fuhrer 1997, 98.

¹⁸ The remark in *Conf.* 3.4.8, according to which Augustine regretted that in the *Hortensius* he did not find the name of Christ, attests to the same experience. In fact, the *Hortensius* was the only stage in Augustine's intellectual progress where he, naturally, did not meet Christ's name.

¹⁹ Ferrari 1991, 47-48 emphasises, with reason, the significance of the childhood Catholic religion for Augustine. He refers to the passages of Augustine's works which demonstrate that "Augustine considered himself to have never ceased being a Christian catechumen." It should be added to this that Augustine became aware of his original and indelible Catholicism

“hastily” started towards himself (*cursim ... in me redibam*), that is to say, towards his centre where the religion had established itself. Furthermore, the mention of childhood may refer not merely to one’s age but also to the original Christianity of souls in the sense considered by Tertullian, another North African theologian.²⁰

The state of mind of Augustine, who wavered between doubts, on the one hand, and the discovered certainty of the Catholic religion, on the other, is expressed by the paradoxical verbs of the next sentence:

Itaque titubans properans haesitans arripio apostolum Paulum.

“Therefore, wavering and hastening and hesitating, I seize the Apostle Paul.”

The three participles naturally refer not to gestures but to the tempest in his mind; the *arripio*, however, is a reference to the reading of a concrete codex which included the Epistles. Augustine “seized” Paul’s writings because he expected them to be of assistance.²¹ The reading of Paul is explained as a result (*enim ... inquam*) of Augustine’s encounter with both the exemplary life of Christians (*isti tanta potuissent vixissentque ita, ut eos vixisse manifestum est*) and their “writings and arguments” (*eorum litterae atque rationes*):

Neque enim vere, inquam, isti tanta potuissent vixissentque ita, ut eos vixisse manifestum est, si eorum litterae atque rationes huic tanto bono adversarentur.

Isti and *eorum* must be correlated with the persons whose religion “was drawing” Augustine and whose writings and lifestyle he encountered within the period when reading the “complete books.” The point of view of the narrator, it should be stressed, has been changed. In using the verbs in the *praesens historicum* (*titubans properans haesitans arripio ...; inquam*), Augustine can present his state of mind *before* the conversion. At that time, he could not yet refer to Christians as “we” but only as “they.” In this way, moreover, Augustine also took the position of his friend, Romanianus, who was not a Christian even while reading the *Contra Academicos*.

when reading the *libri pleni*. The “*nescientem*” in *Acad.* 2.2.5 reveals this. See also Fuhrer, 1997, 99.

²⁰ See Tertullian *Apol.* 17.6: *anima naturaliter christiana*.

²¹ For this, see Fuhrer’s detailed analysis and summary of the current interpretations in her commentary, 1997, 100-104.

Moreover, when Romanianus read these lines of *Contra Academicos* 2.2.5, he had to associate the terms *litterae* and *rationes* with the *libri pleni*: no other possible reference occurs in the text.

What the absent friend thus learned from Augustine's text can be summarised as the following: After he left, Augustine and their friends continued philosophising. At a particular point, Augustine came across certain Catholic books which were associated with images of various Arabian fragrances and the *stacte*, the drop of myrrh. The effect of these books surpassed all previous experiences, and under their influence Augustine approached the Catholic religion with great impetus. At the same time, Augustine also became acquainted with the Catholic life and, fascinated by its chastity as well as convinced by the teachings of the books, he accepted the truth of Catholic Christianity. However, this was a period when Augustine was still hesitating about re-integrating into the Catholic Church. Therefore, suffering under the pressure of his conflicting sentiments, he read the Apostle Paul.

In *De beata vita* 1.4, nothing is recorded about the events which happened during the period between the philosophizing and Augustine's final retirement. Everything that Augustine mentioned in the preface preceded the reading of the *libri pleni* and followed the reading of St. Paul. The two early dialogues thus report the following events of Augustine's stay in Milan:

1. Augustine's listening to the sermons of Ambrose;
2. the endeavour of a couple of friends, on Romanianus' initiative, to live a life devoted to philosophy;
3. the reading of Plotinus and the Scripture;
4. the influence of certain people on Augustine;
5. the encounter with Christian books;
6. the influence of the exemplary life of Christians on Augustine;
7. the "hesitation";
8. the reading of the Apostle Paul;
9. an illness and Augustine's retirement from public life to Cassiciacum.

This sequence of events appears in the *Confessions* as the following: the first period is narrated in the chapters 5.13-6.5; the second in 6.14-7.7; the third in 7.9-21; the fourth in 8.1-2; the fifth is omitted;

the sixth in 8.2-7; the seventh in 8.7-11; the eighth in 8.12; and the ninth in 9.2-4.

5 ST. PAUL AND ROM. 13:13-14

Recounting his conversion to Romanianus, Augustine says that after reading certain writings of Catholics and witnessing their exemplary life, he “seized the Apostle Paul.” In fact, Augustine no longer believed that the Christian “*writings and arguments* [or teachings] *would oppose this great good*”:

Itaque titubans properans haesitans arripio apostolum Paulum. Neque enim vere, inquam, isti tanta potuissent vixissentque ita, ut eos vixisse manifestum est, si eorum litterae atque rationes huic tanto bono adversarentur. Perlegi totum intentissime atque cautissime.

Attention should be drawn to the position of the narrator: the Augustine who “says to himself” that the Catholic “*writings could not oppose this great good*” has not yet been converted. Before the conversion, he had already regarded St. Paul’s Epistles as a “great good.”¹ During his long Manichean epoch, he must have devoted himself to studying these writings, since for the Manichees, Paul represented one of the four highest esteemed exegetic authorities, Jesus, Paul, Mani, Adda-Adimantus.² Both Augustine’s anti-Manichean works and the discovered Manichean texts

¹ According to O’Meara 1970, 333, the *tantum bonum* refers to the “great good of Neoplatonic philosophy.” Madec 1971, 326 rejected this interpretation and conceived of the expression as meaning the “great good” of the heroic life of Christians. In my opinion, the grammatical structure of the passage in question makes the reference of *huic* evident: “I ... seize Apostle Paul,” “for (*enim*) those people, I say to myself, could not really live in the way they manifestly lived if their writings and arguments would have opposed this great good.”

² Tardieu 1987, 132-3; 136-37; 140-43; Ferrari 1991, 52-4.

unquestionably illustrate the high reputation of St. Paul in the eyes of the North African Manichees.³

Moreover, there is an important parallel to the expression *tantum bonum* in the *Confessions*. Immediately before the narrative of the garden scene, an anti-Manichean outburst occurs concerning the theory of "two wills" or "two natures." Augustine interrogates Manichees:

*I would put these questions to them: Is it good to find delight in a reading from the apostle? To enjoy the serenity of a psalm? To discuss the gospel? To each point they will reply, 'Yes, that is good.'*⁴

The reading of St. Paul was good also for Romanianus, Augustine's former fellow-Manichee who had been converted to the sect by Augustine himself.⁵ However, after one has been captivated by the Catholic *litterae atque rationes*, the reading of St. Paul must have radically differed from the Manichean understanding of the Epistles. Augustine, therefore, did not need to "discover" Paul: he needed to discover the Catholic Paul.⁶ The problem for him had never been whether the writings of St. Paul represented a "great good," but in what way one had to interpret these texts and what the correct understanding would be. This point can be illustrated, as Ferrari stresses, with the *Contra Faustum*, the work in which Augustine had to refute, among others, the Manichean

³ Ries 1963 and 1964; Decret 1970, esp. 171-74; Ferrari 1991, 53; Fuhrer 1997, 101 n. 76.

⁴ Boulding 1997, 203. *Conf.* 8.10.24, 128: *Nam quaero ab eis, utrum bonum sit delectari lectione apostoli et utrum bonum sit delectari psalmo sobrio et utrum bonum sit evangelium disserere. Respondebunt ad singula: "Bonum".* Cf. Ferrari 1991, 52.

⁵ *Acad.* 1.1.3.

⁶ At this point I am in agreement with the interpretation of Leo Ferrari, who says (1991, 52) that the name of Paul "seems to have first become best known to Augustine from the Manichees, a factor which could also help explain the excitement with which he seized upon the writings of Paul, in that, thanks to the discovery of the Platonists and the concept of immateriality, he suddenly saw the possibility of the Catholics and not the Manichees, being the rightful interpreters of Paul."

interpretation of Paul, since Faustus also regarded the Apostle as an absolute authority.⁷

After reading the Catholic books, the main problems of Augustine were moral in nature. It was a clear message of the books that the one who wanted to follow Christ had to abandon worldly pleasures and obligations, despise everything that is perishable and, ultimately, live a life of continence. The authentic life of Catholics substantiated the Catholic writings for Augustine even more, and hence, the final step that he took before his full acceptance of Catholic Christianity was the measuring of the validity of the Catholic exegesis, which he found in the “complete books,” against the yardstick of St. Paul. Augustine thus read Paul again, and, finally, he accepted the Catholic understanding of the Pauline Epistles. The last sentence of *Contra Academicos* 2.2.5, *Perlegi totum intentissime et cautissime*, refers to this intensive study of the Epistles.⁸ “And then,” as the next sentence reveals, “a small light after having already shone upon me, the face of Philosophy revealed itself so much to me ... that I could have shown it” to Romanianus.⁹ This was the moment of illumination when Augustine, after reading the Catholic Paul, caught sight of the “face of Philosophy.”

It is of extreme importance that the dominant metaphor of the next chapters of the *Contra Academicos* is a Cantic image. In fact, according to Augustine, if Romanianus or even the “adversary” of

⁷ *C. Faustum* 11.1. Cf. Ferrari 1991, 53.

⁸ I argued earlier (1999/2, 83) that “*perlegi totum*” refers to the *libri pleni*, that is to say there were “two readings” of the books. It seems to me to be more probable that “*perlegi totum*” refers to an intensive re-reading of the Pauline Epistles, cf. Fuhrer 1997, 105. *Conf.* 8.6.14 and 12.29 also confirm that immediately before the climax of the conversion, which Augustine describes as the reading of one single verse, he continuously inquired into the Epistles. For the reading *cautissime*, instead of *castissime* that I earlier adopted, see Fuhrer 1997, 106.

⁹ *Acad.* 2.2.6, 27: *Tunc vero quantulocumque iam lumine adperso tanta se mihi philosophiae facies aperuit, ut non dicam tibi, qui eius incognitae fame semper arsisisti, sed si ipsi adversario tuo, quo nescio utrum plus exercearis quam impediaris, eam demonstrare potuissem, ne ille et Baias et amoena pomeria et delicata nitidaque convivia et domesticos histriones, postremo quicquid eum acriter commovet in quasculumque delicias abiciens et reliquens ad huius pulchritudinem blandus amator et sanctus mirans anhelans aestuans advolaret.*

Romanianus were to glimpse Philosophy, which had enchanted Augustine, then:

*throwing away and rejecting everything that forced him into various delights; admiring, sighing and blazing he would soar towards the beauty of this Philosophy, as its devoted and saintly lover.*¹⁰

This "Philosophy," at the same time, is identical to the "most beautiful bridegroom" of the Song of Songs, whom Augustine mentions in the contemporaneous *De ordine*:

*The best and most beautiful bridegroom looks for other men or, to be more precise, other souls [animae] who while living in this body are already worthy of His chamber and who confine themselves not to living but to living happily.*¹¹

Although *Philosophia*, being a feminine word, appears in the *Contra Academicos* as the bride of souls, She undoubtedly represents one and the same person as the Bridegroom of *De ordine*.¹² The Christ whom these two concepts personify is beyond gender, and, therefore, "men" or "souls" unite with Her or Him in an angelic, genderless state. Another "female" manifestation of Christ appears as Temperance whom Augustine mentions in the *Contra Academicos* also in the framework of a Cantic image:

¹⁰ In the next chapter (*Acad.* 2.3.7, 28) Augustine returns to this image: *Ergo ille, si veram pulchritudinem, cuius falsae amator est, sanatis renudatisque paululum oculis possit intueri, quanta voluptate philosophiae gremio se involveret?*

¹¹ *Ord.* 1.8.24, 137: *Alios autem viros vel, ut verius loquamur, alias animas, dum hoc corpus agunt, iam thalamo suo dignas coniux ille optimus ac pulcherrimus quaerit, quibus non vivere sed beate vivere satis est.* This chapter of *De ordine* is examined by Doucet 1995, who hypothesises that Augustine's passage was inspired not by Ambrose's works but rather, by Porphyry's lost *De regressu animae*. It is important however, that in *Conf.* 7.21.27 Augustine says about the *libri platoniorum* that *Non habent illae paginae ... sponsam civitatem, arram spiritus sancti.* This means that the Platonic books contained no mention of the spiritual wedding of Christ and the heavenly Church of souls.

¹² Cf. Origen *HomGen.* 14.1, 334: *Sponsus tamquam Verbum dei ipse appellatur, et tamquam sapientia ipse rursus sponsa nominatur, sicut et propheta dicit ex persona ipsius: Tamquam sponso posuit mihi mitram, et tamquam sponsam adornavit me ornamento* (Is. 61:10).

*The point is our life, morals and intellect; the intellect who, in order to reenter heaven with greater assurance, hopes that, prevailing over the enmity of every deceptive thing and grasping truth, he will return to his birth-place, will triumph over lust and, therefore, engaged to Temperance as his fiancée, will reign.*¹³

In this passage, Augustine uses the masculine term “*animus*,” instead of the feminine “*anima*” since *temperantia* also represents a feminine word. The cited texts emphasise the point that, in a spiritual wedding, souls can or should unify with Christ, *Philosophia* and *Temperantia*. The “complete books,” which may have included Origen’s *Homilies on the Song of Songs* translated by Jerome and, presumably, some passages from the *Commentary on the Song of Songs* – in the translation by one of the members of the Milanese circle – made Augustine understand the need for moral purification so that he could catch sight of Christ, the spiritual Bridegroom.

The famous narrative of the garden scene in *Confessions* 8.12 seems to provide the only assistance in clarifying Paul’s role in the conversion of Augustine. The chapter in question, however, raises numerous difficulties. Interpreters of the conversion scene form basically two groups: “fictionalists” and “historicists,” as they are often labelled.¹⁴ In fact, with regard to the narrative, the crucial question is whether or not it is a historical fact that Augustine read Rom. 13:13-14 in the garden and that, influenced by this particular verse, he converted.

On the one hand, the absence of this verse from Augustine’s early writings,¹⁵ the apparent parallels between the conversion narratives in the *Confessions* (including the story of the conversion of the two men at Trier); the “constructedness” of the garden scene and, finally, Augustine’s keen interest in the late 390s in Paul’s teachings on divine grace, seem to compel us to regard the

¹³ *Acad.* 2.9.22, 39: *De vita nostra de moribus de animo res agitur, qui se superaturum inimicitias omnium fallaciarum et veritate comprehensa quasi in regionem suae originis rediens triumphaturum de libidinibus atque ita temperantia velut coniuge accepta regnaturum esse praesumit securior rediturus in caelum.* Cf. *Musica* 6.25.50 and Fuhrer 1997, 196-203.

¹⁴ Ferrari 1982, 154; Fredriksen 1988, 102-103. See also Bucheit 1968; Chadwick 1991; O'Donnell 1992, 3, 59-69 and O'Connell 1994.

¹⁵ The first occurrence of Rom. 13:13-14 can be found in *Ep.* 22.2 written to Aurelius around 392 AD.

conversion scene as literary fiction rather than a document of a historical event.

On the other hand, Augustine's reading of Rom. 13:13-14 is presented as the central theme of the narrative, and the author obviously wants his readers to believe in the "historicity" of the event and the truthfulness of his account, since he produces a witness, namely, Alypius. Augustine's friend was present in the garden and he also read the verse; moreover, he read further in the chapter. Therefore, if the narrative was literary fiction, then reading the *Confessions*, Alypius, the bishop of Thagaste, would have been rightly indignant at being invoked as an eyewitness of an event which never occurred.

First, I will argue that the strong influence of Rom. 13:13-14 on the young Augustine can be traced through an examination of a significant passage of *De ordine*. Second, I will argue that the narrative of the garden scene is no more and no less than an allegory probably inspired by a passage of Origen's *Commentary on Song of Songs*.

"Historicists" have not convincingly answered the question of why did Augustine not quote Rom. 13:13-14 in his early writings if this particular verse was as important for him as the *Confessions* propounds. In order to answer this, one should take into account that in his early writings Augustine preferred to paraphrase the Scriptural verses.

The passionate paraphrasing attitude of Augustine was motivated by the initiating character of his teaching activity in Cassiciacum, as well as by, as I will argue, an Origenian idea that he probably had learnt among the Milanese Christians. There is a remarkable paragraph in the *Confessions* which sheds light on a special feature of the Christianity that Augustine and Alypius accepted in Milan. Recalling the period of Cassiciacum, Augustine introduces Alypius as a participant in the discussions who "showed disdain" for inserting the name of Jesus Christ into the dialogues:

...and how you also brought my heart's brother, Alypius, to submit to the name of your only begotten Son, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. At first he disdained to admit it into our writings, for he wanted them to give off the tang of those lofty cedars of Lebanon, felled though these now were by the Lord,

*rather than the scent of plants grown in your Church and efficacious against snakebite.*¹⁶

The object of Alypius' "disdain" or "reluctance" was not the name of Jesus Christ, one should stress, but the occurrence of this name in the writings of Augustine. In fact, together with Augustine, Alypius also converted, as *Confessions* 8.12.29 attests, after reading the remainder of the text of *Rom.* 14.¹⁷ In the light of this narrative of conversion, Augustine's later remark in chapter 9.4.7 is surprising, since it is not clear why Alypius did not want to have the name of Christ inserted in the dialogues. In addition, Alypius missed a significant part of the conversations at Cassiciacum.¹⁸ The name *Christus* (not *Iesus Christus*) occurs seven times in the six books of the three dialogues, once when Alypius also takes part in the discussion (*Acad.* 3.20.43).¹⁹ Interestingly, Augustine pronounces the name of Christ only twice during the recorded conversations. However, he often uses code-names in reference to Christ: the Bridegroom, Philosophy, Temperance, as previously

¹⁶ Boulding 1997, 214. *Conf.* 9.4.7, 137: *Ipsum etiam Alypium, fratrem cordis mei, subegeris nomini unigeniti tui, domini et salvatoris nostri Iesu Christi, quod primo dedignabatur inseri litteris nostris. Magis enim eas volebat redolere gymnasiorum cedros, quas iam contrivit dominus, quam salubres herbas ecclesiasticas adversas serpentibus.*

¹⁷ *Conf.* 8.12.30, 132: *At ille (Alypius) quid in se ageretur - quod ego nesciebam - sic indicavit. Petit videre quid legissem: ostendi, et attendit etiam ultra quam ego legeram. Et ignorabam quid sequeretur. Sequebatur vero: Infirmum autem in fide recipite (Rom. 14:1). Quod ille ad se rettulit mihiq[ue] aperuit. Sed tali admonitione firmatus est placitoque ac proposito bono et congruentissimo suis moribus, quibus a me in melius iam olim valde longeque distabat, sine ulla turbulenta cunctatione coniunctus est.*

¹⁸ O'Donnell 1992, 3, 90: "Alypius was present in a purely neutral role on 10 November, then away in the city on business until 20 November (missing all of *beata v.*, half of *c.acad.*I, half of *ord.*(covering every occurrence of the *nomen Christi* in that work))."

¹⁹ In *Ord.* 1.8.21, Licentius pronounces this name. In *Ord.* 1.10.29 it appears four times: Licentius pronounces three times, and Trygetius once. In *Ord.* 1.11.32 and *Acad.* 3.20.43 Augustine refers to Him by name. O'Donnell 1992, 3, 89. See also Lods 1976.

outlined, or Proteus, Hercules, etc.²⁰ Moreover, the two passages in which Augustine himself mentions Christ by name occupy a central place in the structure of the works.²¹ This means that at the most important points of the discussions, Augustine discloses that the doctrines he has expounded are Christian.²² As a master, he wants to gradually lead his disciples (including Romanianus and Zenobius, the addressees of the *Contra Academicos* and *De ordine*) towards Philosophy.

This technique used by Augustine in Cassiciacum seems to have been based on the Origenian idea that the preacher should not rashly divulge the Christian origin of his teaching for pagans and uninitiated audiences:

*And we ourselves do such things [sc. deceptions] when it appears useful. Whenever we address words to pagans in order to lead them to the faith, if we see that they have been prejudiced against Christianity and despise the name and hate to hear it, just because it is the teaching of Christians, we act as if we were presenting a useful teaching that is not Christian, but when the teaching has been established according to the best of our ability, and we deem it possible to acquire the listener for our party, since he has not just been listening indifferently to what has been said to him, then we confess that our praiseworthy teaching is Christian doctrine. In that case we do something similar to what Jeremiah did when he said "Hear my words, those of Jeremiah," instead of "Thus saith the Lord."*²³

In this passage, Origen suggests using the same method of teaching that Augustine applies in his early writings. In fact, according to *Confessions* 9.4.7, Alypius wanted Augustine to avoid mentioning the name of Christ and to enshroud the Christian doctrines in the

²⁰ Proteus in *Acad.* 3.5.11; 6.13 and Hercules in *Acad.* 3.10.22. O'Connell 1994, 71.

²¹ *Ord.* 1.11.31: at the end of the first book; *Acad.* 3.20.43: at the end of the work.

²² In *Ord.* 2.8.25, Augustine hints at the Incarnation and emphatically repeats the word *religiose* that Alypius used. See further the famous passages in *B. vita* 4.34-35, *Ord.* 2.4.16; 2. 9.26-27. For the structure of the dialogues, see Madec 1986 and O'Donnell 1992, 3, 85-86.

²³ *HomJer.* 20.5. The whole passage is quoted and translated by Trigg 1988, 158. For this topic, see Castagno 1987, 73; 85 and 226-232.

gown of Philosophy. It can be stated that this effort of Alypius was successful. The following example also illustrates this point.

As *De ordine* 2.6.19-7.23 describes, the members of Augustine's company gathered to dispute the problem of evil and theodicy. Once, Augustine felt the need to give impetus to a discussion which seemed to have reached a hopeless deadlock. He claimed that there was a *disciplina*:

*which promises to manifest so clearly for souls who are studious and love only God and souls, that the things that we consider to be false are not outside the divine order, that even the two-times tables cannot be more certain for us than this knowledge.*²⁴

Disciplina is one of the code-names used by Augustine for Son of God.²⁵ As *Logos*, He is the "Law of God," remaining with God.²⁶ As *Logos* incarnated in Christ, He gives promises and commands. The promise which Augustine paraphrased included the twofold commandment of love:²⁷ souls have to love God and each other in order to achieve contemplation of the reasons of beings, hidden in the *Logos-Ordo. Christus-Disciplina*, therefore, prescribes that his disciples shall follow a twofold order:

Haec igitur disciplina eis, qui illam nosse desiderant, simul geminum ordinem sequi iubet, cuius una pars vitae, altera eruditionis est. Adolescentibus ergo studiosis eius ita vivendum est, ut a veneriis rebus, ab inlecebris ventris et gutturis, ab inmodesto corporis cultu et ornatu, ab inanibus negotiis ludorum ac torpore somni atque pigritiae, ab aemulatione obtreccatione invidentia, ab honorum

²⁴ Ord. 2.7.24, 163-4: *et tamen etiam ista omnia, quae fatemur esse perversa, non esse praeter divinum ordinem alta quaedam et a multitudinis vel suspitione remotissima disciplina se ita studiosis et deum atque animas tantum amantibus animis manifestaturam esse promittit, ut non nobis summae numerorum possint esse certiore.*

²⁵ A few years later, explaining the ideas of Ep. 11.4, Augustine makes this reference evident in Ep. 12: *Quod ut hic breviter attingam, disciplina ipsa et forma Dei, per quam facta sunt omnia quae facta sunt, Filius nuncupatur.* The reference to Jn. 1:3 is obvious.

²⁶ Ord. 2.8.25, 164: *Haec autem disciplina ipsa dei lex est, quae apud eum fixa et inconcussa semper manens ...* . This also includes a hidden allusion to the phrase of the Prologue of St. John: *Verbum apud Deum* which seems to have been the leitmotif of the discussion on that day.

²⁷ Cf. Matth. 22:37 and Sol. 1.2.3.

*potestatumque ambitionibus, ab ipsius etiam laudis immodica cupiditate se abstineant, amorem autem pecuniae totius suae spei certissimum venenum esse credant.*²⁸

All the elements of this moral prescription can be found in Augustine's accounts of his conversion. Disapproval toward games (*ab inanibus negotiis ludorum*), the attitude of the converted Augustine, is recorded in the *Confessions*.²⁹ Furthermore, both the early dialogues (*B. vita* 1.4; *Acad.* 2.2.5) and the *Confessions* mention Augustine's struggle against his secular ambitions and the desire to win the honour of people. These are the vices which in *De ordine* Augustine refers to as *ab honorum potestatumque ambitionibus, ab ipsius etiam laudis immodica cupiditate se abstineant*. However, most of the moral prescriptions in *De ordine* 2.8.25 derive from Rom. 13:13-14:

*Non in comessationibus et ebrietatibus, non in cubilibus et impudiciis, non in contentione et aemulatione, sed induite Dominum Iesum Christum et carnis providentiam ne feceritis in concupiscentiis.*³⁰

Augustine enumerates all the moral faults that Rom. 13:13-14 mentioned. The parallels between the two texts are as follows (first Augustine, then St. Paul): *veneriae res* – *cubiles et impudicitiae*; *inlecebra ventris ac gutturis* – *comessationes et ebrietates*; *immodestus corporis cultus et*

²⁸ *Ord.*2.8.25, 164. Russell 1948, 301: *Accordingly, this science imposes a twofold order of procedure on those who desire to know it, of which order one part pertains to the regulating of life, and the other pertains to the directing of studies. Youths devoted to this science ought so to live as to refrain from all wantonness, from the enticements of gluttony, from excessive care and adornment of the body, from silly practices of games, from the dullness of sleep and sloth, from jealousy, detraction, and envy, from the ambition for honor and power, and also from the unrestrained desire for praise. Let them be convinced that love for money is an unfailing poison for all their hopes.*

²⁹ *Conf.* 1.10.16; 3.2.2. Cf. O'Donnell 1992, 3, 38.

³⁰ Quotation from *Conf.* 8.12.29, 131. Boulding 1997, 207: *Not in dissipation and drunkenness, nor in debauchery and lewdness, nor in arguing and jealousy; but put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for the flesh or the gratification of your desires.* In *Ep.* 22.2 Augustine used another Latin translation of the verse: *Non in comessationibus et ebrietatibus, non in cubilibus et impudiciis, non in contentione et zelo; sed induite vos dominum Iesum Christum et carnis curam ne feceritis in concupiscentiis.*

ornatus – carnis providentia in concupiscentiis; aemulatio, obtreectatio, invidentia – aemulatio, contentio.

In addition, Augustine started the paraphrase of Rom. 13:13-14 with a reference to the twofold commandment of love (*deum atque animas tantum amantibus animis*) and the Law of God (*Dei lex*); that is to say, he alluded to Rom. 13:10: *You shall love your neighbour as yourself. Love does no wrong to a neighbour; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.* The verse Rom. 13:11, *Besides this you know what hour it is, how it is full time now for you to wake from sleep* (*Et hoc scientes tempus: quia hora est iam somno resurgere*), has a counterpart in the Augustinian expression: *torpor somni atque pigritiae*.³¹ The next verse of the Epistle, *Our salvation is nearer to us now than when we first believed; the night is far gone, the day is at hand. Let us then cast off the words of darkness and put on the armour of light*, is in accordance with the nature of the promise of *Disciplina*, which, from Augustine's point of view, promises the revelation and contemplation of God to souls who live chaste lives.

After Augustine outlined the *ordo vitae* and the *ordo eruditionis* in *De ordine* 2.8.25-9.27, Alypius began to speak. He praised, with a covert irony it seems to me, the "image of life" that Augustine had depicted, and objected that those who were able to live in such way "are either divine men or are not without divine assistance." Augustine's answer is extremely interesting:

*You know very well, Alypius, that those rules of life – which now, as always, you receive with delight – are not of my invention, although they have been expressed in my words here and now in keeping with the circumstances. Indeed, the books of men illustrious and almost divine are completely full of them. Not on your account, however, have I thought it necessary to make this observation, but for the sake of these boys, lest they condemn the authority in those precepts as if it were mine.*³²

³¹ Although the expression *gravis torpor* echoes Ambrose's hymn *Consors paterni luminis* (cf. O'Connell, 1994, 72), its occurrences in *Conf.* 8.5.12 and 9.2.3, describing Augustine's state of mind before the conversion, can also be connected with Rom. 13:11.

³² Russell 1948, 306 with slight modification. *Ord.* 2.10.28, 167: *Haec praecepta vivendi, quae tibi, ut semper, plurimum placent, Alypi, quamvis hic meis verbis pro tempore expressa sint, non tamen a me inventa esse optime scis. His enim magnorum hominum et paene divinatorum libri plenissimi sunt, quod non propter te mihi*

Augustine explicitly says that the doctrines he explained are not his own inventions. The expression *libri plenissimi sunt* seems to be an echo of the *libri pleni* and the *libri magnorum hominum* of the books of *maiores nostri* mentioned in *De ordine* 1.11.31.³³ These books “are completely full of” the teachings which Augustine repeated with his own words (*meis verbis...expressa sint*) and which Alypius already knew. Consequently, Augustine refers not simply to the teachings of St. Paul, whom he regarded as a “nearly divine man,” but to those of Origen who often formulated the necessity of moral purification so that souls could participate in the vision of God.

In a passage of his *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, Origen explains the allegorical meaning of “noon,” that is, the time when the Bridegroom pastures his flock (Song. 1:7) and when, as Origen highlights, the Lord appeared to Abraham (cf. Gen. 18:1-2):

As we believe that these things were written by the Holy Spirit, I take it that it was not for nothing that the Divine Spirit saw fit to commit to the pages of Scripture even the time and hour of the vision; the detail of that hour and time was to add something to the knowledge of ‘the children of Abraham’ – of those, that is, whose duty it is to do the works of Abraham, and also to hope for those visitations. For he who can say: ‘The night is passed and the day is at hand; let us walk honestly as in the day: not in rioting and drunkenness, not chambering and impurities, not in contention and envy,’ having gone through all these experiences, will have stepped over this time when the night is passed and the day is at hand, and will be hastening on, not to the beginning of the day, but to midday; so that he too may attain the grace of Abraham. For, if the light of the mind that is in him and the purity of his heart shall be bright and shining, he will have this midday time within himself; and, being set as it were in the noon through this purity of heart, he will see God as he sits by the oak of Mambre, which means From Seeing.³⁴

dicendum putavi sed propter istos adolescentes, ne in eis quasi auctoritatem meam iure contemnant.

³³ Cf. O’Meara 1970, 333-4.

³⁴ Lawson 1956, 125-6. *ComCant.* 2.4.28-30, 344-6: *Quod si credimus haec per Spiritum sanctum scripta, non puto frustra placuisse divino Spiritui ut etiam tempus et hora visionis Scripturae paginis mandaretur, nisi et horae istius et temporis ratio aliquid conferret ad scientiam filii Abrahae, quibus utique sicut opera Abrahae*

Abraham's children have to do what Abraham did, as Origen quotes Jn. 8:39. In other words, they have to follow the example of Abraham, who was sitting outside his tent by the oaks of Mambre, the Vision; they have to obey the command of Rom. 13:13, and, after having been purified, that is to say, after the light has shone in their hearts, they will deserve the vision of God.

According to the story of the conversion in *Confessions* 8.12, Augustine was sitting outside his house in a garden, under a fig-tree; then, obeying a divine command, he left the fig-tree and took up the Apostle Paul. His eye happened to land on Rom. 13:13-14 and, at that moment, his heart was flooded with light:

*I snatched it up, opened it and read in silence the passage on which my eyes first lighted: 'Not in dissipation and drunkenness, nor in debauchery and lewdness, nor in arguing and jealousy; but put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for the flesh or the gratification of your desires.' I had no wish to read further, nor was there need. No sooner had I reached the end of the verse than the light of certainty flooded my heart and all dark shades of doubt fled away.*³⁵

facienda (cf. Jn. 8:39), *ita et visitationes istae sperandae sunt. Qui enim potest dicere: 'Nox praecessit, dies autem appropinquavit; sicut in die honeste ambulemus, non in comessionibus et ebrietatibus, non in cubilibus et impudiciis, non in contentione et aemulatione'* (Rom. 13:12-13), *cum haec omnia transierit, supergressus videbitur tempus hoc, quod 'nox praecessit et dies appropinquavit,' et festinare non ad initium diei, sed ad meridiem, ut et ipse ad gratiam perveniat Abrahae. Si enim lux, quae in ipso est, mentis et puritas cordis clara fuerit et splendida, iste meridianum tempus in semet ipso habere videbitur; et per hanc puritatem cordis quasi in meridie positus Deum videbit sedens ad quercum Mambre (Gen. 18:1), quod interpretatur a visione. Apud visionem ergo sedet in meridie, qui vacat ad videndum Deum. Inde denique non dicitur intra tabernaculum, sed foris ad ostium sedere tabernaculi. Foris enim est et extra corpus posita mens eius qui longe est a corporalibus cogitationibus, longe a carnalibus desideriis, et ideo ab his omnibus foris positum visitat Deus.*

³⁵ Boulding 1997, 207. Conf. 8.12.29, 131: *Arripui, aperui et legi in silentio capitulum, quo primum coniectu sunt oculi mei: Non in comessionibus et ebrietatibus, non in cubilibus et impudiciis, non in contentione et aemulatione, sed induite dominum Iesum Christum et carnis providentiam ne feceritis in concupiscentiis* (Rom. 13:13-14). *Nec ultra volui legere nec opus erat. Statim quippe cum fine huiusce sententiae quasi luce securitatis infusa cordi meo omnes dubitationis tenebrae diffugerunt.*

The two scenes are amazingly similar. Augustine, however, transformed the image according to his own purposes: he himself is sitting under a fig-tree, like Nathanael whose story Jn. 1:47-48 tells. In fact, Augustine's explanations of this verse of St. John's Gospel reveal that the fig-tree is the symbol of the human state after original sin.³⁶ Before his conversion, Augustine had been "under the condition of flesh" (*sub conditione carnis erat*, cf. *En. Ps.* 31.2.9) and, therefore, he was not able to sit by the oaks of Vision. He was called back by the angelic voices (*quasi pueri an puellae, nescio*) to the state of paradise. Obeying the command of *tolle, lege*, he rose (*surrexi nihil aliud interpretans divinitus mihi iuberi*) and left behind the fig-tree, that is, the carnal condition and his earthly thoughts. Therefore, the illumination which suddenly followed the reading of Rom. 13:13-14 can be considered as Augustine's return to original purity. This was the *hora* for which he was longing while sitting under the fig-tree, when the "end of his shame" finally arrived: *Quandiu, quandiu "cras et cras"? Quare non modo? Quare non hac hora finis turpitudinis meae?* The moment of the reading of Rom. 13:13-14 was the "noon of vision."

The metaphor of light appears both in the *Contra Academicos*, *Tunc vero quantulumcumque iam lumine adperso*,³⁷ and in the *Confessions*, *quasi luce securitatis infusa cordi meo omnes dubitationis tenebrae diffugerunt*. The two sentences, especially the latter, can be regarded as an interpretation of Rom. 13:12: *Nox praecessit, dies autem appropinquavit. Abiiciamus ergo opera tenebrarum, et induamur arma lucis*. Augustine, like Origen, understood this verse as the firing of the inner light of the heart and the disappearing of the nights of carnal thought. This is the moment when Abraham's children catch sight of the "face of Philosophy."

What then happened in the garden of Milan? The parallels between Origen's explanation of Abraham's vision and Augustine's narrative seemingly encourage the "fictionalist interpretation." However, if one assumes that before his conversion Augustine read this passage of Origen's *Commentary* as a piece of the "complete books" and that sometime later, withdrawing to a garden in Milan

³⁶ See *En. Ps.* 31.2.9 and *Tract. Jn.* 7.21-22, 79-80. Cf. O'Donnell 1992, 3, 57; McGowan 1996.

³⁷ O'Meara 1951, 70: *And then, indeed, whatever had been the little radiance that had surrounded . . .*

and suffering doubts, he took up the codex of Paul, which happened to open at Rom. 13:13, then this harmony of events would have created a unique experience for him.

6 THE REASON FOR THE SILENCE

In relation to the main thesis of the present work, the most crucial question arises as to why Augustine does not mention in the *Confessions* his encounter with Origen's books.

First of all, in order to answer this question, the odd phenomenon must be borne in mind that there is no mention in the *Confessions* of any Christian books which Augustine had read. In addition, it is also true that the two persons whose names were connected with books that Augustine had read in Milan, Manlius Theodorus and Celsinus, do not appear in the pages of the *Confessions*.

Furthermore, according to the *Confessions*, the topic of the conversation with Simplicianus is no more than a detailed narrative of Victorinus' conversion. However, a paragraph of *De civitate Dei* 10.29 sheds light not only on the intellectual side of the conversation but also on the fact that there were a number of conversations between them. "*As we used to hear from Simplicianus,*" Augustine remembers, according to a certain Platonist, "*the Prologue of St. John should be written down with golden letters and located in the most eminent place in each church.*"¹ Was the contribution of Simplicianus originally a comparison between the Platonic books and the Prologue?² Two queries logically follow: why Augustine does not make this point clearer in the *Confessions* and why he does not speak

¹ *Civ. Dei* 10.29, 450-51: *Quod initium sancti evangelii, cui nomen est secundum Iohannem, quidam Platonicus, sicut a sancto sene Simpliciano, qui postea Mediolanensi ecclesiae praesedit episcopus, solebamus audire, aureis litteris conscribendum et per omnes ecclesias in locis eminentissimis proponendum esse dicebat. Sed ideo viluit superbis Deus ille magister, quia Verbum caro factum est et habitavit in nobis; ut parum sit miseris quod aegrotant, nisi se etiam in ipsa aegritudine extollant et de medicina, qua sanari poterant, erubescant.*

² Doignon 1986, 139 suggests a positive answer.

about the theoretical side of their conversation(s). Is it realistic to suppose that Victorinus' conversion was the only topic between them and that they did not discuss the contributions of the Christian writers (first of all those of Victorinus himself³) regarding the Prologue and the Platonic principles? Unfortunately, the *Confessions* is not a reliable document for investigating the intellectual focus of Augustine's conversion. The bishop who had become more and more celebrated by the time of the composition of the *Confessions* (397-401) placed emphases on the moral part of his conversion and on the effect that the exemplary lives of certain Christians had had on him.

This is not the only case, moreover in which Augustine leaves an important episode of his spiritual life unmentioned in the *Confessions*. Neither the books from which he learned the Catholic Paul nor an early and highly important stage of his life,- namely, his experience with the Manichean Paul,- is mentioned. It was the Manichean understanding of the Epistles, which, after spending ten years in the sect, Augustine gradually managed to reject by virtue of the Neoplatonic books and, importantly, of the Catholic exegesis. The silence of the *Confessions* on the Manichean Paul may be ascribed to Augustine's proposal that the *Confessions* is a "script for a dramatic reading," focusing on "the irresistible nature of divine predestination."⁴

However, the omission of the Manichean Paul and of the Christian books from the *Confessions* may be connected. A survey in the *Confessions* of the Manichean Augustine's understanding of Paul would have required an account of how this understanding changed at the moment when the reading of a particular Pauline verse (no doubt already well-known to the Manichean Augustine) resulted in his conversion to Catholic Christianity. The process, about which the Augustine of the *Confessions* betrays too little, began with a Platonic approach to Scripture and culminated in the

³ According to Cipriani (1994 and 1998), Victorinus is one of the most important sources for Augustine's early theology and the interpretation of Paul. Bastiaensen (1996) argues for a determining influence of Ambrosiaster on Augustine's exegesis of Paul. Victorinus' influence on the young Augustine should not be undervalued. This is an important topic for further research.

⁴ Ferrari 1991, 54.

encounter with the Catholic exegetical writings. In Origen's books, Augustine could have found not only a captivating allegorical exegesis of the Catholic Scripture but also the "Egyptian gold" of the useful teachings of Platonism.

At the same time, simply because it was Origen's books which had enabled Augustine to discover the Catholic Paul and the Catholic understanding of Scripture, the author of the *Confessions* was compelled by an external factor to conceal his decisive encounter with the Origenian theology.

The Origenist controversy, which had risen in the second half of 393 in Palestine, reached the Latin West in the very years when Augustine was working on his *Confessions*.⁵ In 397 at the latest, the Christians in Rome would have been informed about the controversy, since at that time Rufinus, an admirer of Origen, returned from Jerusalem and Vincentius, a monk from the opponents' camp, also arrived in Rome.⁶ After his return Rufinus translated Origen's *De principiis* in 398, provoking Jerome's anger mainly because of the preface to the work. In this section, Rufinus alluded to Jerome's translations of Origen and praised the method of the unnamed translator who modified and purified the teachings unusual for "Latin ears."⁷ Jerome, who had already written his first anti-Origenist work, *Contra Iohannem*, in 397 and was involved in the anti-Origenist strife, attacked Rufinus, and he undertook a literal translation of the same Origenian work. Jerome's goal was to point out the falsifications of the translation by his former friend. Rufinus, in return, asserted that Eusebius of Cremona, a monk of Jerome's circle, had obtained and circulated a false copy of the translation.⁸ Jerome sent Eusebius to Rome in 399 – and before long, the latter continued his journey to Milan. He met Rufinus and Simplicianus, who was already the bishop of Milan. Eusebius gave the letter of Anastasius of Rome containing the condemnation of Origen's works to Simplicianus,⁹ and, in the presence of the bishop

⁵ For the chronology of the controversy, see Nautin 1973 and Hammond 1977. For the controversy, see Clark 1992.

⁶ Clark 1992, 31.

⁷ Cf. Rufinus' Preface to *De principiis* (SC 252, 68).

⁸ Rufinus *Apologia* 1.21, 55.

⁹ Anastasius *Epistula ad Simplicianum* (= Jerome *Ep.* 95)

and Rufinus, he read out the version of Rufinus' translation he possessed.¹⁰

Augustine was informed about the events in Rome and Milan. In a letter written about 404, he refers to the sorrowful fact that a Christian friendship like that of Jerome and Rufinus could have turned to enmity.¹¹ At this time, Augustine read some anti-Origenist works by Jerome.¹² The bishop of Hippo probably maintained his relationship with Simplicianus, whose questions on certain difficult passages of the Epistle to the Romans he attempted to answer in *De diversis questionibus ad Simplicianum* in 396.¹³ From 395 on, Augustine was in correspondence with Paulinus of Nola,¹⁴ a potential go-between for Augustine and Rufinus' circle, since Paulinus had a very close relationship with Melania the Elder (they were probably relatives) and also with Rufinus.¹⁵ Paulinus was also in contact with Jerome and his circle when the controversy broke out in the West.¹⁶

On the other hand, in the 390s, Augustine was aware of the change in Jerome's view with regard to Origen. Although his first

¹⁰ Rufinus *Apologia* 1.19, 54. Cf. Clark 1992, 32; Hammond 1977, 374.

¹¹ Augustine *Ep.* 73 (= Jerome *Ep.* 110), 6-8. cf. Augustine *Ep.* 82 (= Jerome *Ep.* 116), 1.

¹² Augustine *Ep.* 82.23, 376: *Origenem vero ac Didymum reprehensos abs te lego in recentioribus opusculis tuis et non mediocriter nec de mediocribus quaestionibus, quamvis Origenem mirabiliter ante laudaveris.* The epistle was written about 405 AD. Two or three years earlier Augustine received Jerome's second Apology but at this time he already had a short version of the first, see *Ep.* 68 (=Jerome 102), 3. Cf. Bammell 1992, 344.

¹³ See also Augustine *Ep.* 37, 63-4.

¹⁴ See Paulinus of Nola *Ep.* 4 and 6 (= Augustine *Ep.* 30); Augustine *Ep.* 27 and 31. Although we do not have evidence of correspondence between Augustine and Paulinus from the long period between 397 and 408, the date of the *Ep.* 45 by Paulinus, it can be assumed that the documents have been lost. Moreover in *Ep.* 45.1, 379 Paulinus refers to the long delay of Quintus, the deacon who carried Augustine's letter to him. Cf. Courcelle 1951 and Clark 1992, 35

¹⁵ See Paulinus of Nola *Ep.* 46 and 47 to Rufinus. An exhaustive account of Paulinus' relationship with Melania the Elder and Rufinus can be read in Clark 1992, 24-25; 32-34, and *passim*; see also Bammell 1992, 343 and 345.

¹⁶ Clark 1992, 34-35; 42.

letters addressed to Jerome have been considered in general by specialists as the documents which reveal Augustine's ignorance of the eruption of the Origenist controversy in Palestine, a more thorough examination, however, of the letters will demonstrate the very opposite view.¹⁷

In the first letter written to the monk of Bethlehem (*Ep.* 28, written in 394 or 395), Augustine asked Jerome to send some translations of Origen's exegetical works to the African Christian communities. Augustine does not mention Origen by name, yet the reference is evident: *You can put us in possession of those notable commentators and of one in particular, whose name you utter in your writings with more than usual pleasure.*¹⁸ At the same time, Augustine reacts to Jerome's translation of Scripture and, interestingly, reminds him to follow the method he used in his version of Job, *namely, by applying signs to show wherein your translation differs from that of the Seventy, whose authority is of the weightiest.*¹⁹ Clearly, Augustine wanted Jerome to stay true to Origen's principles of textual criticism. The third topic of the letter is also directly related to Origen. Augustine challenges Jerome's interpretation of Gal. 2:11-14, the view which he found in Jerome's *Commentary on Galatians* and which goes back to Origen, that Peter and Paul had deliberately simulated a confrontation. This would become the crucial subject of Augustine and Jerome's debate in the early 400s.

However, neither *Ep.* 28 nor the second surviving letter, *Ep.* 40, reached Jerome until 403 when Augustine sent copies of them to Bethlehem.²⁰ Between 395 and 398 (most likely in 396), Jerome received another letter from Africa, probably from Alypius, to

¹⁷ Augustine *Ep.* 28 (=Jerome *Ep.* 56) and *Ep.* 40 (=Jerome *Ep.* 67). Cf. Bonnardière 1974, 44.

¹⁸ Baxter 1993, 59. *Ep.* 28.2.2, 105: *Petimus ergo et nobiscum petit omnis Africanarum ecclesiarum studiosa societas, ut interpretandis eorum libris, qui graece scripturas nostras quam optime tractaverunt, curam atque operam impendere non graveris. Potes enim efficere, ut nos quoque habeamus tales illos viros et unum potissimum, quem tu libentius in tuis litteris sonas.*

¹⁹ Baxter 1993, 59.

²⁰ Cf. Augustine *Ep.* 40.8 and 71.2. Jerome *Ep.* 72.1.1, and Kelly 1975, 218. For the reconstruction of the early correspondence see Hennings 1993 and 1994; Gasparro 1998, 123-130.

which Augustine had written a postscript.²¹ Both the content of this lost letter and Jerome's reply to Augustine can be reconstructed on the basis of *Ep.* 40.²² Augustine asked Jerome to make the alleged errors of Origen known, but Jerome passed over this request with the platitude that everything that is true and correct in ecclesiastical literature should be accepted, but what is false is to be rejected.

It is understandable why Augustine reformulated his question in *Ep.* 40 with irony: Jerome's advice was valid for everything in life. If Augustine himself considered it important to add a postscript to a letter of Alypius enquiring after Origen's errors, then Jerome's brief and patronising answer may have been insulting for him.

It is highly important to take into consideration the fact that Jerome did not receive Augustine's first letter (*Ep.* 28) and therefore, naturally, he could not reply to it. This means that when Augustine sent his second message as a postscript, he was informed about the change in Jerome's attitude towards Origen not by Jerome but by somebody else. Who informed Augustine of the attacks against Origen in the years when the controversy was still localised in Palestine? Alypius, first of all, comes to mind as a source of information about the events in the Holy Land. Around 393, he stayed there and visited Jerome.²³ Even if one accepts the version that Augustine's closest friend left Bethlehem before the outbreak of the controversy, it seems plausible and the lost letter indicates that Alypius maintained his relationship with the monks of Bethlehem, especially with Jerome, after his return to Africa.

²¹ See *Ep.* 40.1.1, 69-70: *Habeo gratiam, quod pro subscripta salutatione plenam mihi epistulam reddidisti sed breviorum multo, quam ex te vellem sumere tali viro, a quo tempora quanta libet occupet nullus sermo prolixus est.* The fact that Augustine and Jerome exchanged letters in about 395 in itself indicates that Augustine was informed about the Origenist controversy, at least by the courier.

²² Augustine *Ep.* 40.6.9, 79. *De Origene autem quod rescribere dignatus es, iam sciebam non tantum in ecclesiasticis litteris sed in omnibus recta et vera, quae invenerimus, adprobare atque laudare, falsa vero et prava inprobare atque reprehendere. Sed illud de prudentia doctrinae tuae desiderabam et adhuc desidero, ut nota nobis facias ea ipsa eius errata, quibus a fide veritatis ille vir tantus recessisse convincitur.*

²³ Augustine *Ep.* 28.1.1, 104, cf. Mandouze 1982, 55-6.

Another document can also illustrate the direct communication between the North-African Christians and the monks in the Holy Land. Among Augustine's letters discovered recently by J. Divjak there is a letter from Jerome to Aurelius of Carthage, dating from 392 or 393.²⁴ It should be noted that Augustine and Alypius became acquainted with Aurelius in 388, immediately after their return to Carthage, when they were entertained by the very ill Innocentius whom Aurelius, still a deacon at that time, often visited.²⁵

Jerome's letter was an answer to the recently elevated bishop, Aurelius, who, like Augustine later, asked Jerome to send copies of certain writings. Aurelius mentioned the fact that he already possessed copies of Jerome's two translations of Origen: the homilies on Jeremiah and the two homilies on the Song of Songs.²⁶ He also had a commentary on Matthew that he believed to be Jerome's, but actually it was the work of someone else.²⁷ Jerome suggested to Aurelius that, as the bishops of Gallia and Italy had done, Aurelius should also send someone to Bethlehem to stay there for a year and to copy the desired, probably Origenian works.²⁸ Alypius' journey to Bethlehem may have been connected with Jerome's proposal. For a hitherto unknown reason, Aurelius wanted to tear him from the fellowship in Thagaste in 392, but at Augustine's request Alypius was allowed to remain there "as an

²⁴ *Ep.* 27* ed. J. Divjak 1981, 130-133. For the date, *ibid.* 56-57; Duval 1987, 561. On the letter, see Duval 1987; Opelt 1990.

²⁵ Cf. *Civ. Dei* 22.8, 569.

²⁶ *Ep.* 27*. 2, 131: *Scribis te quaedam nostrae parvitatatis habere opuscula, id est paucas in Ieremiam homelias et duas cantici canticorum; dum essem adolescentulus, cuiusdam fratris rogatu in huiusmodi exercitationem lusi exceptis duabus homeliis cantici canticorum quas ammonitu beati Damasi Romae transtuli.*

²⁷ *Ep.* 27*. 2, 132: *Praeterea quod addis habere te et commentariolos meos in Mattheum, hoc ego opus edidisse me penitus ignoro, nisi forte caritate qua me diligis quidquid praeclarum videris meum putas.*

²⁸ *Ep.* 27*. 2, 132: *... fac quod alii de Gallia et alii de Italia fratres tui, sancti episcopi, fecerunt, id est mitte aliquem fidum tibi qui unum annum hic faciat me exemplaria tribuente et deferat ad te cuncta que scripsimus.*

example to the brethren who wish to withdraw from the cares of this world."²⁹ Some months later however, Alypius left Africa.

The events outlined above can be placed into a broader framework. In 388, Augustine and Alypius arrived from Italy with some codices and stayed in Carthage where they made friends with Aurelius, the deacon. They presented him with copies of Origen's homilies on Jeremiah and the Song of Songs, both translated by Jerome. In 391 or 392, when Aurelius was elected bishop, he immediately sent a letter to Jerome requesting further translations and Jerome's own writings. Jerome was glad that some of the works of his youth had reached Africa, but because he had only two scribes, Jerome offered the possibility of copying his more recent writings in Bethlehem.³⁰ Aurelius selected Alypius for this purpose, who was, however, reluctant to leave the monastic community in Thagaste. Yet, not long later, Alypius travelled to Bethlehem. His stay in the Holy Land coincided with the outbreak of the Origenist controversy, and, therefore, this was the time when Jerome, who had just denied Origen, did not wish to popularise Origen's works. Perhaps, Alypius gathered some works but arrived back in Africa without the translations. For this reason, in 395 Augustine had to repeat the passionate entreaty of "*all the studious communities in the African churches*" that Jerome not "*refuse to devote toil and trouble to translating the works of those who have so excellently expounded our Scriptures in Greek.*"³¹ Augustine was courteous and highly diplomatic: he indicated to Jerome that despite the controversy, which, one should add, at this early phase was not as heated as after 397, they were still waiting for the translations of the works by the "notable man" whom Jerome had praised in his writings.³² Augustine thus sent the letter but the answer was

²⁹ Baxter 1993, 40-41. Augustine *Ep.* 22.1, 55: *quod fratrem Alypium in nostra coniunctione mansisse, ut exemplo sit fratribus curas mundi huius vitare cupientibus, beneuolentissime accepisti, ago gratias, quas nullis uerbis explicare possim; deus hoc rependat in animam tuam.*

³⁰ *Ep.* 27*.3, 133.

³¹ Baxter 1993, 59, with slight modification. Augustine *Ep.* 28.2, 105.

³² It is not clear which writings Augustine refers to as the works in which Jerome praised Origen, since in the *Commentary on Galatians*, Jerome speaks about Origen objectively. Augustine probably knew Jerome's Hebrew Questions on Genesis and the explanations of Psalms that

delayed. He may not have known that the courier had died when, together with Alypius, Augustine dispatched another letter in which the question was put point blank: at which points did Origen deviate from the orthodox faith? This letter, amazingly, reached Jerome, whose reply, however, was too haughty to evoke Augustine's irony. In the next letter, Augustine provoked Jerome. On the one hand, he repeated and reinforced his arguments against Jerome's Origenian understanding of Paul's "simulation" and, on the other hand, pointed out the peculiar feature of *De viris illustribus* that in this work Jerome had praised many Christian authors whom he finally condemned as heretics. Ultimately, Augustine asked the seemingly naive, but devastating request that Jerome mark those ecclesiastical writers in *De viris illustribus* whose teachings were heretical.³³

It is not the aim of the present study to examine the later developments of the correspondence concerning the interpretation of Galatians. Two points, however, should be highlighted which are closely related to my topic. First, scholars hesitate as to whether Augustine was aware that by arguing with Jerome about the problematic passage of Galatians, he, after all, was debating with Origen. Second, when Jerome revealed that a long exegetical tradition supported his understanding, Augustine then claims that he had "read none of the authors" whom Jerome mentioned.³⁴

Jerome sent to Aurelius of Carthage via Felicissimus, the courier of Ep. 27*. In the Hebrew Questions, there is one short praise of the Adamantius, but Augustine uses the plural when hinting at certain writings by Jerome. Noteworthy is the fact that in the prologue to his translations of the *Homilies on the Song of Songs*, Jerome glorifies Origen who *cum in ceteris libris omnes vicerit, in Cantico Canticorum se vicit*.

³³ Augustine Ep. 40.6.9, 79-80: *In libro etiam, quo cunctos, quorum meminisse potuisti, scriptores ecclesiasticos et eorum scripta commemorasti, commodius, ut arbitror, fieret, si nominatis eis, quos haeresiotas esse nosti, quando ne ipsos quidem praetermittere volueris, subiungeres etiam, in quibus cavendi essent, quamquam nonnullos etiam praeterieris.*

³⁴ Augustine Ep. 82 (= Jerome Ep. 116), 23, 375-6: *Flagitas a me, ut aliquem saltem unum ostendam, cuius in hac re sententiam sim secutus, cum tu tam plures nominatim commemoraveris, qui te in eo, quod adstruis, praecesserunt, petens, ut in eo si te reprehendo errantem, patiar te errare cum talibus, quorum ego, fateor, neminem legi. Sed cum sint ferme sex vel septem, horum quattuor auctoritatem tu quoque infringis.*

In the preface to his *Commentary on Galatians*, Jerome insisted that he was going to follow Origen's explanations of the Galatians.³⁵ In *Ep.* 28 Augustine seemingly vacillates over whether or not Jerome is the author of the *Commentary*³⁶ although he had read some works by Jerome in which he found, moreover, praises of Origen; that is, Augustine could have identified an anonymous work of Jerome. Furthermore, he must have known that Paula and Eustochium, who are mentioned in the *Commentary*, belonged to Jerome's circle.³⁷ It seems to be reasonable, therefore, that Augustine's vacillation about the authorship of the work was merely ironic since, if Jerome strictly followed Origen, then the *Commentary* can be regarded as that of Origen rather than Jerome. Augustine was not as naïve as he seemed: he could have deduced that the interpretation in question came also from Origen.

In *Ep.* 82, however, Augustine stated that he had not read the authors whom Jerome listed and whose authenticity Jerome himself, otherwise, had questioned. This remark simply means, as the larger context elucidates, that Augustine read neither Origen's *Commentary on the Galatians* nor those works by other authors in which the interpretation favoured by Jerome could have been found.³⁸ If one only considers the pure facts that there were, at least, two Origenian works in the library of Aurelius, a close friend of Augustine, and that Augustine was interested in Origen so much that he requested his exegetical writings from Jerome, then it cannot be assumed that before 405, Augustine had not read Origen at all.

³⁵ Jerome *ComGal.* Prol. PL. 26 332C-333A: *Quin potius in eo, ut mihi videor, cautior atque timidior, quod imbecillitatem virium mearum sentiens, Origenis Commentarios sum secutus. Scripsit enim ille vir in Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas, quinque proprie volumina, et decimum Stromatum suorum librum commatico super explanatione ejus sermone complevit.*

³⁶ Augustine *Ep.* 28.3.3, 107: *Legi etiam quaedam scripta, quae tua dicerentur, in epistulas apostoli Pauli ... Ibi patrocinium mendacii susceptum esse vel abs te tali viro vel a quopiam, si alius illa scripsit ...*

³⁷ Jerome *ComGal.* PL 26, col. 331; 381; 425. In 387, Augustine encountered with the Roman circles which, probably, Paula and Eustochium also belonged to, cf. *Moribus* 1.23.70

³⁸ Similar views in Lubac 1959 I.1, 213. n. 8; Bonnardière 1974, 43.

Consequently, the silence of the *Confessions* about Origen and the Origenian books which made a great influence on Augustine in Milan is understandable. Augustine was cautious and wanted to avoid accusations of being an Origenist.

PART II

AUGUSTINE'S *DE GENESI CONTRA* *MANICHAEOS*

INTRODUCTION

Jerome's letter to Aurelius of Carthage (= Augustine Ep. 27*) reveals that in 393 at the latest, Origen's two homilies on the Song of Songs and his fourteen homilies on Jeremiah were available for the North African Christians who belonged to Aurelius and Augustine's circle. I have argued that the influence of Origen's Canticle exegesis on Augustine's early writings can be rightly assumed in the case of such allegories and images as the Arabian unguents and scents in *Contra Academicos* 2.2.5; the spiritual love of Philosophy in 2.3.6-3.7; the spiritual wedding with Temperance in 2.9.22, and the wedding of the souls with the Bridegroom in *De ordine* 1.8.24. However, Augustine had never written a commentary on the Song of Songs, and his sporadic remarks are insufficient to the task of mapping the exact relationship between his and Origen's interpretations.¹ For the same reason, it is equally ambiguous to examine the possible influence of the Jeremiah-homilies on Augustine's early works. We should trade, therefore, in what we have, namely, Augustine's first exegetical writing, *De genesi contra manichaeos*. I assume that working on the commentary, Augustine, like anybody else, attempted to utilise the interpretations of his predecessors and if he had access to some Origenian works, he did make use of them.

The commentary written in 388/389, immediately after Augustine's return to Africa,² lends itself to such an investigation for various reasons. Firstly, its two books contain the allegorical exegesis of the first three chapters of Genesis, and several interpretations have already aroused the suspicion that Origen

¹ Bonnardière 1955; Brésard-Crouzel-Borret 1991, 1, 60.

² Cf. Augustine *Retr.* 1.10.

“lurked in the background” of the work.³ Secondly, by its literary genre, Augustine's commentary more apparently discloses its possible theological roots and the links with the Christian tradition than the early dialogues and treatises encoded with philosophical terminology. Thirdly, this work provides the underlying theological principles of the young Augustine, since any interpretation of Genesis 1-3 naturally requires a coherent understanding of faith and such crucial theological issues as protology, eschatology, anthropology, and the Fall and Salvation.

The thesis that Augustine's allegorical interpretation of Genesis was directly influenced by Origen, runs counter to the scholarly *communis opinio*. Specialists uniformly exclude the possibility of a direct influence of either Origen's Homilies or Commentary upon *De genesi contra manichaeos*. For in the first period of his activity, Augustine's Greek seems to have been insufficient for reading such works in the original language.⁴ At the same time, Rufinus did not translate any writing before 397, his return to Italy,⁵ that is to say, the homilies on Genesis were not available for Augustine in 388 or 389. We do not know about other translations of Origen's explanations of Genesis. The textual parallels between Augustine and Origen's interpretations, therefore, should be accounted for by such intermediary texts as Ambrose's homilies on Hexaemeron; his homily on paradise; Hilary's treatises on Psalms, Commentary on Psalm 118 and Gregory of Elvira's treatise on the creation of man: all influenced by Origen's exegesis. Moreover, in Milan, Augustine listened to Ambrose's sermons and was in close touch with Manlius Theodorus and Simplicianus, all well educated in Greek ecclesiastical literature. Consequently, the

³ Altaner 1967 (=1951); Pépin 1954; 1987, 137-165; Vannier 1987; Teske 1991/1, 29; 38; 75; 103-104; 127; idem 1992. For the commentary, see Maher 1947; Zacher 1962; Abulesz 1972. For the late Augustine's attitude to Origen, see Gasparro 1998, 123-150.

⁴ Altaner 1967 (=1939).

⁵ Hammond 1977, 393 n.1. The argument for this date is solid: “I have assumed, following Rufinus' statement in Apology against Jerome, i.11: ‘Nullum ... me usum huiusmodi operis habuisse, et ad Latinum sermonem tricennali iam pene incuria torpuisse’ (... cf. also Preface to De Principiis, Book I), that all his surviving writings are to be dated after his return to Italy.”

occurrences of Origenian explanations in Augustine's works may be due to a Milanese oral tradition.

As opposed to these arguments, I refer to the possibility that a Latin compilation of Origen's understanding of Genesis existed and was used by Latin authors of the fourth century.⁶ In what follows I compare the interpretations of Augustine, Hilary, Ambrose, Gregory of Elvira and Origen in order to ponder the extent to which Latin theologians and/or the Alexandrian master exerted influence on Augustine's commentary against the Manichees.

The question arises: how to justify an influence?⁷ The most appropriate way seems to be the textual and doctrinal comparison. If an idea appears in Augustine's work in the same or obviously similar terminology, expressions or wording as his supposed model contains it, then one can legitimately speak about "influence." If the parallel, in addition, cannot be deduced from other possible sources, and it can be also excluded that the idea, in our case: the interpretation of a given verse of Genesis, "was in the air,"⁸ or was passed on through "oral tradition,"⁹ then the fact of "direct influence," that is, the "reading" of the model text, is proved.

The surmise that in the late fourth-century Milan, an oral tradition existed transmitting Origenian ideas and the Alexandrian type of Christianity¹⁰ to the young Augustine, seems to be as irrefutable as it is non-demonstrable, and is thereby beyond the scope of the present study. One point, however, is taken for granted: a series of textual parallels can be scarcely traced back to oral traditions if one does not concede that someone memorised a lot of texts and recited them word for word to those interested.

⁶ See Appendix 2.

⁷ Cf. O'Connell 1968, 10-15.

⁸ Teske 1992, 183; cf. Studer 1966, 279.

⁹ Cf. Agaësse and Solignac 1972, 1, 627-8; 682-685.

¹⁰ Holte 1962, 141; 147; 189-90.

1 THE MYSTIC BEGINNING (GEN. 1:1)

Origen

*Quod est omnium principium, nisi Dominus noster et Salvator omnium (1 Tim. 4:10), Iesus Christus, primogenitus omnis creaturae (Col. 1:15)? In hoc ergo principio, hoc est in Verbo suo, Deus caelum et terram fecit, sicut et Euangelista Iohannes in initio Euangelii sui ait dicens: In principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat Verbum. Hoc erat in principio apud Deum. Omnia per ipsum facta sunt et sine ipso factum est nihil (Jn. 1:1-3). Non ergo hic temporale aliquod principium dicit, sed in principio, id est in Salvatore, factum esse dicit caelum et terram et omnia quae facta sunt.*¹

Ambrose

Est etiam initium mysticum, ut illud est: ego sum primus et novissimus, initium et finis (Apoc. 1:8) et illud in Evangelio praecipue, quod interrogatus Dominus quis esset respondit: initium quod et loquor vobis (Jn. 8:25). [...] In hoc ergo principio, id est in Christo fecit Deus caelum et terram, quia per ipsum omnia facta sunt et sine ipso factum est nihil quod factum est (Jn. 1:3): in ipso, quia in ipso constant omnia (Col. 1:17) et ipse est primogenitus totius

¹ HomGen 1.1, 24. Heine 1982, 47: *What is the beginning of all things except our Lord and 'Savior of all,' Jesus Christ 'the firstborn of every creature'? In this beginning, therefore, that is, in his Word, 'God made heaven and earth' as the evangelist John also says in the beginning of his Gospel: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him and without him nothing was made.'* Scripture is not speaking here of any temporal beginning, but it says that the heaven and the earth and all things which were made were made 'in the beginning,' that is, in the Savior.

creaturae (Col. 1:15), *sive quia ante omnem creaturam, sive quia sanctus, quia primogeniti sancti sunt* (cf. Ex. 4:22) ...² Possumus etiam intellegere **in principio** fecit deus caelum et terram, **id est ante tempus**, sicut initium viae nondum via est et initium domus nondum domus.³

Augustine

His respondemus deum fecisse coelum et terram non in principio temporis, sed in Christo, cum verbum esset apud patrem, per quod facta et in quo facta sunt omnia (Jn. 1:2-3). *Dominus enim noster Iesus Christus cum eum Iudaei quis esset interrogassent, respondit: principium quod et loquor vobis* (Jn. 8:25). **Sed etsi in principio temporis deum fecisse coelum et terram credamus, debemus utique intelligere quod ante principium temporis non erat tempus.**⁴

The three explanations of *in principio* are very similar.⁵ The ἀρχή of creatures is considered to be identical to Christ, the Logos of St. John's Prologue, and the Firstborn mentioned by Paul in Col. 1:15. God made creatures in Christ through a non-temporal act, since

² Hex. 1.4.15, 13. Cf. *ibid.* 2.8.29. Savage 1961, 14-15: *A beginning in a mystical sense is denoted by the statement: 'I am the first and last, the beginning and the end.' The words of the Gospel are significant in this connection, especially wherein the Lord, when asked who He was, replied: 'I am the beginning, I who speak with you.' [...] Therefore, in this beginning, that is, in Christ, God created heaven and earth, because 'All things were made through him and without him was made nothing that was made.' Again: 'In him all things hold together and he is the firstborn of every creature.' Moreover, He was before every creature because He is holy. The firstborn indeed are holy, as 'the firstborn of Israel.'*

³ Hex. 1.4.16, 13. Cf. *ibid.* 1.6.20; 1.7.29. *We can also understand that 'God made heaven and earth in the beginning,' that is, before time, just as the beginning of a way is not yet way and the beginning of a house is not yet house.*

⁴ *Gen. man.* 1.2.3, 69. Teske 1991/1, 49-50: *We answer them that God made heaven and earth in the beginning, not in the beginning of time, but in Christ. For he was the Word with the Father, through whom and in whom all things were made. For, when the Jews asked him who he was, our Lord Jesus Christ answers, 'The beginning; that is why I am speaking to you.'* This translation of Jn. 8:25 is based on the reading "*principium quia et loquor vobis.*" This latter version is more typical of Augustine.

⁵ Altaner 1967, 243-5; Carozzi 1988, 32. For detailed analysis of Ambrose's interpretation of Gen 1:1, see Van Winden 1963; Pépin 1976, 1, 427-82. For Augustine, see Pelland 1972, 20 ff.

time and temporality belong to creation. A long exegetical tradition establishes this interpretation.⁶ Christian authors often connected Gen. 1:1, John 1:1 and Col. 1:15 being aware of the possible meanings of the Hebrew “bresith” and “reshit,” beginning and firstborn son.⁷

Interpreting the “mystic beginning,” Ambrose follows this exegetical tradition. Importantly, his interpretation does not occur in Basil’s *Homilies on Hexaemeron*, which otherwise served as the primary source for Ambrose’s work.⁸ Like Origen, Ambrose quotes Jn. 1:3 and Col. 1:15 to argue that the “Beginning” of Gen. 1:1 is identical to Christ. The close textual parallel suggests that Ambrose used Origen’s first homily on Genesis, but we cannot compare the passage with the interpretation expounded in Origen’s *Commentary on Genesis* since the latter does not survive.

Augustine’s text seems to depend upon that of Ambrose. He follows Ambrose when connecting Jn. 8:25 to Gen. 1:1. The verse as an argument for identifying Christ as the mystic Beginning does not occur in the Greek fathers. Although the sentence (τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅτι [cf. *quia*] ὁ ἰ [cf. *quod*] καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν) is to some extent intricate, the accusative τὴν ἀρχὴν can simply mean “from the beginning.” This fact does not mean, however, that a few Greek exegetes, like Origen, who sometimes used the Scriptural expressions with great freedom if in the course of the allegorical interpretation he could benefit from them, may not have occasionally interpreted Jn. 8:25 in connection with Gen. 1:1.⁹

⁶ Theophilus of Antioch *Ad Autol.* 2.10; Tatian *Or.* 5; Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* 6.7.58.1; Tertullian *Adv. Hermog.* 19 and 20; Marius Victorinus *Ad Cand.* 27; Hilary *Tract. in Ps.* 2.2. Pelland 1972, 20. n. 17.

⁷ Irenaeus *Dem.* 43; Tertullian *Adv. Prax.* 5; Hilary *Tract. in Ps.* 2.2; Jerome *Quaest. Hebr.* in Gen. 1:1. Daniélou 1969, 143.

⁸ See the passages referred to by Schenkl (1897) in CSEL 32.1. and by Banterle 1979 (*SAEMO* 1). Cf. Swift 1980, 317-28. For other sources of Ambrose’s *Homilies on Hexaemeron*, see Banterle 1979; Bona 1998, 549-559; Moretti 1998, 649-662.

⁹ The 19th book of his *Commentary on Saint John’s Gospel* interrupts just before this verse, but the short remark on the question “Who are you?” in Jn. 8:25a, represents an introduction to an emphatic statement. Heine 1993, 204: “It follows that those who heard what the Lord said with great authority should ask who he is who says these things. For when the Savior declares, ‘If

Possibly, Ambrose, an expert in Greek, may have followed the authority of Origen when taking this τὴν ἀρχὴν to refer to the mystic beginning. Both the bishop of Milan and Augustine often cite the verse in a similar context.¹⁰

One can assume that Augustine relied exclusively upon Ambrose's homily and that he was not even conscious of taking up a passage from Origen. Even if it is so, Augustine's interpretation of *in principio* in *Gen. man.* 1.2.3 does not include specifically Ambrosian or Basilian ideas. This fact deserves particular attention since using Basil's writings, Ambrose prefers to follow the model text word for word, but as far as Origen is concerned, his method of adaptation is much less servile.¹¹ For instance, the above-quoted Origenian passage in Ambrose's homily is followed by a series of quotations from Basil.¹² None of them appears in *De genesi contra manichaeos*. Assuming that Augustine read or heard Ambrose's homily, we might expect some influence of Basil concerning Gen. 1:1. However, Augustine seems to have been susceptible to the Alexandrian's interpretation more than to the Cappadocian's.

you do not believe that I am he, you will die in your sins' (Jn. 8:24), he appeared to be greater than man, and to be some more divine nature. Therefore, they ask, 'Who are you?' as if there would be an answer when they ask, such as, 'I am the Christ,' or 'I am the prophet,' or 'I am Elias,' or perhaps to be any one of these or even someone similar to them he would not have spoken such words legitimately."

¹⁰ Ambrose *Hex.* 1.2.5; *Fide* 3.7.49; 5.10.121; *Exp. Luc.* 10.112; *De Tobia* 19.66; Augustine, *Serm.* 1.2.2; *Gen. litt. imp.* 3; *Gen. litt.* 1.5.10; *Conf.* 11.8.10; 12.28.39; *Trin.* 1.12.24; 5.13.14. Cf. O'Donnell 1992, 3, 269.

¹¹ Savon 1998, 221-234.

¹² Basil *Hex.* 1.6, 113. See also Banterle 1979, 41-42.

2 HEAVEN, EARTH, AND FIRMAMENT

(GEN. 1:1-6)

Origen

1.

*Cum enim omnia quae facturus erat Deus ex spiritu constarent et corpore, ista de causa in principio et ante omnia **caelum** dicitur factum, id est **omnis spiritualis substantia** super quam velut in throno quodam et sede Deus requiescit. **Istud autem caelum, id est firmamentum, corporeum est.***¹

2.

*Omnis igitur haec ratio hoc continet, quod duas generales naturas condiderit deus: **naturam visibilem**, id est **corpoream**, et **naturam invisibilem**, quae est **incorporea**.*²

3.

*Non enim deerat omnipotenti manui tuae, quae **creaverat mundum ex informi materia**, immitere eis multitudinem ursorum vel feroces leones (Sap 11:18). **Quam plurimi sane putant ipsam rerum materiam significari in eo, quod in principio Genesis scriptum est a Moyse: In principio fecit deus caelum et terram, terra autem erat invisibilis et incomposita** (Gen 1:1); **invisibilem namque et incompositam terram non***

¹ *HomGen.* 1.2, 28. Heine 1982, 49: For since everything which God was to make would consist of spirit and body, for that reason heaven, that is, all spiritual substance upon which God rests as on a kind of throne or seat, is said to be made 'in the beginning' and before everything. But this heaven, that is, the firmament, is corporeal.

² *Princ.* 3.6.7, 250. Butterworth 1966, 253: The whole argument, then, comes to this, that God has created two universal natures, a visible, that is, a bodily one, and an invisible one, which is incorporeal.

*aliud eis Moyses quam informem materiam visus est indicare.*³

Augustine

1.

*credo firmamento coeli materiam corporalem rerum visibilium ab illa incorporali rerum invisibilium fuisse discretam. Cum enim sit caelum corpus pulcherrimum, omnis invisibilis creatura excedit etiam pulchritudinem coeli.*⁴

2.

*nec terra, quae invisibilis et incompressa dicta est, talis erat qualis ista quae iam videri et tractari potest; sed illud quod dictum est: in principio fecit deus caelum et terram (Gen. 1:1) caeli et terrae nomine universa creatura significata est quam fecit et condidit deus. ... Primo ergo materia facta est confusa et informis, unde omnia fierent quae distincta atque formata sunt, quod credo a Graecis chaos appellari. Sic enim et alio loco legimus dictum in laudibus dei: qui fecisti mundum de materia informi, quod aliqui codices habent "de materia invisita" (Sap. 11:18).*⁵

³ Princ. 4.4.6, 414. Butterworth 1966, 321: 'For thine all-power hand that created the world out of formless matter, lacked not means to send upon them a multitude of bears, or fierce lions'. Very many, indeed, think that the actual matter of which things are made is referred to in the passage written by Moses in the beginning of Genesis: 'In the beginning God made the heaven and the earth, and the earth was invisible and without order'; for by the phrase, 'an earth invisible and without order,' it seems to them that Moses was alluding to nothing else but formless matter.

⁴ Gen. man. 1.11.17, 83. Teske 1991/1, 64-5: I believe that the firmament of heaven separated the corporeal matter of visible things from the incorporeal matter of invisible things. For though heaven is a very beautiful body, every invisible creature surpasses even the beauty of heaven.

⁵ Gen. man. 1.5.9, 75-76. Teske 1991/1, 57: ... the earth which is said to be formless and invisible is not such as we can see or touch. It said, 'In the beginning God made heaven and earth,' and the expression 'heaven and earth' signified the whole of creation which God made and established. ... First there was made confused and formless matter so that out of it there might be made all the things that God distinguished and formed. I believe the Greeks call this chaos. For in another passage we read the words spoken in praise of God, 'who made the world from unformed matter,' for which some manuscripts have 'from invisible matter.' Cf. Gen. man. 1.6.10; 7.11-12.

The firmament of the heaven distinguishes the two realms of creation: the spiritual-invisible things (Origen: *omnis spiritalis substantia; natura invisibilis ... incorporea* – Augustine: *omnis invisibilis creatura; res invisibiles*) and the corporeal-visible ones (Origen: *natura visibilis .. corporea* – Augustine: *res visibiles*). In contrast to the firmament of Gen. 1:6, which is taken to be corporeal (*firmamentum, corporeum est – coelum sit corpus*), the heaven of Gen. 1:1 is thus spiritual. The “formless and invisible earth” represents the formless matter (Origen: *rerum materia; informis materia* – Augustine: *materia ... confusa et informis; materia invisa*) that Wisdom 11:18 also mentions: “God made the world out of formless matter.” Since the term “world” (κόσμος) refers to both the formed spiritual and the formed corporeal creatures, one must say that every creature was made out of formless matter.

In the first homily on Genesis, Origen does not link a clear ontological-cosmological explanation to the term “earth” of Gen. 1:1. It is logical, in any circumstance, that “earth” is to be understood as the counterpart of “heaven.” If “heaven” represents *omnis spiritalis substantia* (quotation 1), then “earth” must refer to every corporeal substance. *Princ.* 3.6.7 indicates that Origen found in the word “earth” of Gen. 1:1 a reference to the totality of corporeal creatures. In the Beginning God created the heaven and earth, “two general natures,” as termed by Origen, the invisible and visible ones (quotation 2). Invisible nature more precisely means the whole of rational or intellectual beings, the community of pure minds, while “visible” is a term applied to corporeal nature composed of corporeal matter.⁶

⁶ *Princ.* 3.6.7, 250: *Istae vero duae naturae diversas sui recipiunt permutationes. Illa quidem invisibilis, quae et rationabilis est, animo propositoque mutatur pro eo quod arbitrii sui libertate donata est; et per hoc aliquando in bonis aliquando in contrariis invenitur. Haec vero natura corporea substantialem recipit permutationem; unde et ad omne quodcumque moliri vel fabricari vel retractare voluerit artifex omnium deus, materiae huius habet in omnibus famulatur, ut in quascumque vult formas vel species, prout rerum merita deprecant, naturam corpoream transmutat et transferat.* For this, see Crouzel-Simonetti 1980, 144-145 and *Princ.* 2.9.1. Origen usually makes a distinction between things that are invisible and “that are not seen.” “Invisible” is a Scriptural term (e.g. Col. 1:16) for incorporeal and intelligible things. “That are not seen” is also a Scriptural term (2 Cor. 4:18) for beings whose nature lies outside the realm of sense-perception

In *De principiis* a mention is made of the opinion of 'many' (*quam plurimi .. putant*) that through the expression of "invisible and formless earth," Moses wanted to indicate formless matter, but in the passage Origen's own view remains unexplained (quotation 3). It is certain, however, that he conceived of creation that God is the creator of both the imperfect matter and qualities and forms added to it.⁷ It is the Father who brought matter into existence out of nothing and the perfect Intellect (*teleios nous*), the Craftsman-Son, who ordered qualities to the matter.⁸

The interpretation mentioned by Origen also appears in Calcidius. After the display of Philo's understanding of Gen. 1:1-2,⁹ Calcidius presents an alternative interpretation which is similar to that of Origen's *plurimi*:

Others take it that the prophet, knowing that all things have a double feature, viz., an intelligible and a sensible one, indicated the qualities of the two natures by the terms 'heaven' and 'earth', by 'heaven' the incorporeal nature, by 'earth' that which is the substance of bodies and which the Greeks call ὕλη. This interpretation is supported by the text which follows immediately: 'the earth, however, was invisible and shapeless'. This must refer to corporeal matter, the primary substance of the world before it assumed various forms shaped by the skill of the divine Maker. During this phase it was still without colour or quality, and that what is in such a condition is certainly invisible and shapeless. It is also called 'empty' because, as it seems, it can never be filled up. It is called 'nothing' because of itself it is devoid of anything.¹⁰

(e.g. ethereal bodies), *CCels.* 7.46; *Princ.* 1.7.1; 4.3.15. *ComJn.* frag. 13. In the quoted passage "invisible" is used in the former sense.

⁷ *Princ.* 4.4.8.

⁸ *CCels.* 4.54; 4.57; 6.77; *ComJn.* 13.21. The distinction between κτίστης and δημιουργός is found in Philo, *Somm.* 176, see Bostock 1989, 259.

⁹ For Philo (*Opif.* 3.15-4.16), Gen. 1:1 refers to the creation of the intelligible world. The immaterial, incorporeal heaven and earth are the archetypes and models of the visible heaven and earth. Cf. Calcidius, *Com. in Tim.* 278, 282.

¹⁰ Van Winden 1959, 61 with slight modification of terminology. Calcidius *Com. in Tim.* 278, 282: *Alii non ita, sed scientem prophetam duas esse species rerum omnium, alteram intellegibilem, alteram sensibilem, eas uirtutes quae*

This concise interpretation of Gen. 1:1-2 differs from Philo's teaching on the intelligible archetypes and, at many points, resembles Origen's doctrine.¹¹ In addition, there is good reason to suppose that Calcidius' main source was Origen's *Commentary on Genesis*.¹² Heaven of Gen. 1:1 stands for the incorporeal nature (*incorporea natura*), and the "earth" for the matter (*hyle*), the essence of the bodies (*substantia corporum*). In Gen. 1:2, earth is said to be invisible and formless, because the corporeal matter, that is the prime substance of the whole world, has no qualities in itself. The matter is, in fact, the receptacle of the qualities.

In Augustine's commentary, the term "heaven" has three well-defined meanings:¹³

1. In Gen. 1:1, the expression "heaven and earth" means the entirety of creatures: *the expression 'heaven and earth' signified the whole of creation (universa creatura) which God made and established (Gen. man. 1.5.9).*
2. In Gen. 1:6, the "firmament of heaven" signifies the corporeal heaven: *God called the firmament heaven ... For though heaven is a very beautiful body, every invisible creature surpasses even the beauty of heaven,*

utramque naturam circumplexae contineant caelum et terram cognominasse, caelum quidem incorpoream naturam, terram uero, quae substantia est corporum, quam Graeci hylon uocant. Astipulantur his ea quae sequuntur, terra autem erat inuisibilis et informis, hoc est silua corporea, uetus mundi substantia, prius quam efficta dei opificis sollertia sumeret formas, etiam tunc decolor et omni carens qualitate. Quod uero tale est, inuisibile certe habetur et informe; inanis porro et nihil propterea dicta, quia, cum sit omnium qualitatuum receptrix, propriam nullam habet ex natura. Silua ergo, ut quae cuncta quae accidunt recipiat in se, inanis appellata est, ut quae compleri numquam posse uideatur; porro quia sit expers omnium, nihil dicta ...

¹¹ Van Winden 1959, 63-64. Theophilus of Antioch also identifies the invisible earth with the formless matter of the world and he makes a distinction between the heaven of Gen. 1:1 and the firmament of Gen. 1:6, see *Ad. Autol.* 2.10 and 2.13.

¹² Van Winden 1959, 62-64. Beatrice (1999) argues for Origen's *Stromateis* as the probable source of chapters 276-278 in Calcidius. I cannot see why the interpretation of Gen. 1:1-2 preserved by Calcidius does not come from Origen's Commentary. In any case, it is unequivocal that Calcidius reproduces an Origenian text.

¹³ According to Pépin 1953, 204-5, in *Gen. man.* Augustine still took the "heaven" of Gen. 1:1 to refer to only the corporeal heaven. This conclusion, in my view, should be modified.

and perhaps for that reason the invisible waters are said to be above the heaven (*Gen. man.* 1.11.17, see quotation 1.).

3. In *Gen.* 2:5, the expression "heaven and earth" stands for the visible, corporeal creatures: *For God made all of time along with all temporal creatures, and heaven and earth signify these visible creatures* (*Gen. man.* 2.3.4.).

These three different meanings of the word "heaven" are thus linked to three different verses of the Scriptures. Augustine is always careful not to confuse them. What he definitely teaches in *De genesi contra manichaeos* is that in *Gen.* 1:1, the "heaven-and-earth" is an expression for the whole created world. This *universa creatura* is not limited to the visible, corporeal world at all. The expression simultaneously refers to the realms of the corporeal and incorporeal beings. Therefore, when in *Gen.* 1:1, the phrase "heaven-and-earth" signifies "the whole of creation," then the term "earth" must refer to the visible creation, the "heaven" to the invisible one. Augustine does not make this reference explicit in the allegorical commentary, because he always mentions "heaven" in close connection with "earth" and never separately speaks about "heaven," except for the case of *Gen.* 1:6 in which "heaven" is said to be identical to the corporeal firmament.

The explicit reference to the interpretation that the "heaven" of *Gen.* 1:1 may signify "every invisible creature" appears in Augustine's unfinished literal commentary on Genesis written in 393/394:

*Or is every sublime and invisible creature (omnis creatura sublimis atque invisibilis) called heaven and everything visible the earth, so that by the expression 'In the beginning God made heaven and earth' one might understand the whole of creation (universa creatura)?*¹⁴

The allegorical interpretation which in this *ad litteram* commentary is referred to, is implied in *De genesi contra manichaeos*. For in chapter 1.5.9 the "heaven-and-earth" is, indeed, understood to be the whole of creation (*universa creatura*) and in chapter 1.11.17 the expression *omnis invisibilis creatura* does occur. In this latter passage,

¹⁴ Teske 1991/1, 150. *Gen. litt. imp.* 3, 461: *An caelum omnis creatura sublimis atque invisibilis dicta est, terra uero omne uisibile, ut etiam sic possit hoc, quod dictum est: 'in principio fecit deus caelum et terram,' uniuersa creatura intellegi?*

Augustine mentions two kinds of matter signified by the higher and lower waters of Gen. 1:6. One is said to be the “corporeal matter of visible things,” the other the “incorporeal matter of invisible things.” If higher waters signify the incorporeal matter of the invisible, incorporeal beings, as Augustine maintains, then the question arises: which Scriptural verse or expression may refer to the invisible, incorporeal beings in their formed state? Surprisingly, Augustine uses the expression *omnis invisibilis creatura* without defining its Scriptural reference. This procedure is rather unusual in the commentary. In this case, the reference must be taken as being to the “heaven” of Gen. 1:1, as distinguished from the “earth.”

Augustine also affirms in *De genesi contra Manichaeos* that the expression “*caelum et terra*” stands for the prime, formless matter: *all these expressions, whether heaven and earth, or the earth invisible and without order, and abyss with darkness, or the water over which was borne the Spirit of God, are names for unformed matter.*¹⁵ The expression “heaven and earth” refers to both the universe which was formed and arranged by God’s Word and the prime, formless matter, the “seed” of the universe.¹⁶ Arguing against the Manichees, Augustine places a strong emphasis on the doctrine that everything was formed out of the formless matter which was made itself out of nothing.¹⁷ The formless matter is in particular symbolised by the invisible and formless earth of Gen. 1:2. In order to support this identification Augustine cites Wisdom 11:18, *Quia fecisti mundum de materia informi, or invisa* (*Gen. man.* 1.5.9.see, quotation 2).

Commenting on Gen. 1:1-2, Ambrose combines, or confuses, two contrasting exegetical traditions.¹⁸ On the one hand, he follows Basil who declares that Gen. 1:1 merely refers to the visible heaven and earth since Moses narrated neither the creation of the

¹⁵ Teske 1991/1, 60. *Gen. man.* 1.7.12, 78: *Haec ergo nomina, sive caelum et terra sive terra invisibilis et incompressa et abyssus cum tenebris, sive aqua, super quam Spiritus ferebatur, nomina sunt informis materiae.* For Augustine’s interpretation, see Pelland 1972, 22-24.

¹⁶ *Gen. man.* 1.7.11, 77.

¹⁷ Cf. *Fid. symb.* 2.2 where ‘the heaven and earth’ also refers to “the world and all that is in it.” This world was made out of formless matter mentioned in Sap. 11: 18.

¹⁸ Van Winden 1962, 205-215.

intelligible light nor that of the rational and invisible natures whose creation preceded that of our world.¹⁹ Basil starts his first homily with the words:

*It is a worthy beginning of him who is to narrate the construction of the world, to put the beginning of ordering of the visible things on the beginning of his speech.*²⁰

Ambrose adopts this starting point and observes that heaven, earth, air, and water represent the four basic elements of our visible world. Angelic orders already existed when this world was made.²¹ Like Basil, he is sceptical about the physical speculations of philosophers and appeals to Isaiah who spoke about heaven as smoke (Is. 51:6). Taking the Scriptures as a basis, one can at most say that heaven has some fine nature, that is, some fine corporeal nature.²² Ambrose also agrees with Basil's interpretation about the earth of Gen. 1:2, which was unseen because waters covered its surface and there was not yet a sun to illuminate the corporeal world, or man to see its forms.²³

On the other hand, the explanation that the "heaven and earth" of Gen. 1:1 represents the prime matter emerges in Ambrose's *Homilies on Hexaemeron*.²⁴ In addition, a short remark in *Hex.* 1.2.7 reveals the modest influence of Origen's interpretation on Ambrose's argumentation. Ambrose observes that unlike

¹⁹ Basil *Hex.* 1.5.

²⁰ Basil *Hex.* 1.1, 86: Πρέπουσα ἀρχὴ τῷ περὶ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου συστάσεως μέλλοντι διηγεῖσθαι, ἀρχὴν τῆς τῶν ὁρωμένων διακοσμήσεως προθεῖναι τοῦ λόγου.

²¹ Ambrose *Hex.* 1.5.19, 15: *Sed etiam angeli, dominationes et potestates etsi aliquando coeperunt, erant tamen iam, quando hic mundus est factus.* Cf. Pépin 1976, 438.

²² Ambrose *Hex.* 1.6.21.

²³ Ambrose *Hex.* 1.7.26, cf. Basil *Hex.* 2.1.

²⁴ Ambrose *Hex.* 1.2.5, 4: *Vnde diuino spiritu praeuidens sanctus Moyses hos hominum errores fore et iam forte coepisse in exordio sermonis sui sic ait: In principio fecit deus caelum et terram, initium rerum, auctorem mundi, creationem materiae comprehendens, ut deum cognosceres ante initium mundi esse uel ipsum esse initium uniuersorum, sicut in euangelio dei filius dicentibus: tu quis es? respondit: Initium quod et loquor uobis (Jn. 8:25), et ipsum dedisse gignendi rebus initium et ipsum esse creatorem mundi, non idea quadam duce imitatore materiae, ex qua non ad arbitrium suum, sed ad speciem propositam sua opera conformaret.*

philosophers, Moses teaches that “it is the divine mind alone which contains the substance of visible and invisible things and the causes of beings,” that is to say, there is only one ἀρχή of both the spiritual and corporeal creation.²⁵ Behind this idea may lie the identification of the heaven as every invisible substance and the earth as every visible substance.²⁶ Nevertheless, this identification is obscure and it does not play any role in Ambrose’s interpretation, for he prefers Basil’s literal interpretation over Origen’s allegorical understanding, and takes the heaven of Gen. 1:1 and the firmament of Gen. 1:6 to refer to the same corporeal heaven. However, Ambrose’s interpretation may indicate that he did make use of Origen’s Commentary on Genesis for his *Hexaemeron*. Jerome thus seems to have been right when he coolly observed: *Nuper Ambrosius sic Exaemeron illius conpilanit, ut magis Hippolyti sententias Basilique sequeretur.*²⁷

The traces of the Origenian interpretation of Gen. 1:1 which appears in Ambrose’s *Hexaemeron* cannot be considered as an intermediary source for Augustine’s explanation. In *De genesi contra manichaeos*, the Origenian distinction between the spiritual heaven and the corporeal firmament is of crucial importance, whereas in Ambrose’s work this distinction disappears. Augustine’s interpretation probably independently derives from an exegetical work which contained the allegorical exegesis of Gen. 1:1 and in which Gen. 1:2 was explained in relation with Wisdom 11:18.

²⁵ Ambrose *Hex.* 1.2.7, 6: *Aduertit enim uir plenus prudentiae quod uisibilium atque inuisibilium substantiam et causas rerum mens sola diuina contineat, non ut philosophi disputant ualidiorem atomorum complexionem persenerantiae iugis praestare causam: iudicanit quod telam aranae texerent qui sic minuta et insubstantia principia caelo ac terris darent, quae ut fortuito coniungerentur ita fortuito ac temere dissoluerentur, nisi in sui gubernatoris diuina uirtute constarent.*

²⁶ Van Winden 1962, 211-212.

²⁷ Jerome *Ep.* 84.7, 130.

3 WATERS (GEN. 1:7)

Origen in Calcidius

1.

*Quod si facta est a deo **silua corporea quondam informis**, quam Scriptura terram uocat, non est, opinor, desperandum **incorporei** quoque **generis** fore **intelligibilem siluam**, quae caeli nomine sit nuncupata; factam uero et ita factam, ut sit quae non fuerit, sic probant, quod opificibus mortalibus apparata ab aliis opificibus silua praebeatur his quae ipsis natura suppeditet, naturae deus, deo nemo apparauerit, quia nihil deo sit antiquius; ipse igitur siluestres impensas mundi fabricae sufficientes utiles quae constituit.*¹

Origen

2.

*Cum enim omnia quae facturus erat Deus ex **spiritu constarent et corpore**, ista de causa in principio et ante omnia caelum dicitur factum, id est **omnis spiritalis substantia** super quam velut in throno quodam et sede Deus requiescit. Istud autem caelum, id est firmamentum, corporeum est.*²

¹ Calcidius *Com. in Tim.* 278, 283. Van Winden 1959, 61: But if God made a corporeal matter which once was shapeless and which the Bible calls 'earth', there is seemingly no reason for doubting that there is also an intelligible matter of incorporeal nature, which is indicated by the name 'heaven'. It is made and made in such a way that now exists what did not exist. This is posed by them in this way: A mortal workman obtains his material from another workman, the latter receives it from nature, nature from God, but God from nobody, for there is nothing before God. He, therefore, made sufficient material for the making of the world.

² *HomGen.* 1.2, 28. Heine 1982, 49: For since everything which God was to make would consist of spirit and body, for that reason heaven, that is, all spiritual substance upon which God rests as on a kind of throne or seat, is said to be made 'in

3.

*Studeat ergo unusquisque vestrum divisor effici aquae eius quae est supra et quae est subtus, quo scilicet **spiritalis aquae** intellectum et participium capiens eius quae est supra firmamentum flumina de ventre suo educat aquae vivae salientis in vitam aeternam (Jn. 7:38; 4:14), segregatus sine dubio et separatus ab ea aqua quae subtus est, id est aqua abyssi in qua princeps huius mundi (Jn. 12:31) et adversarius draco et angeli eius (Apoc. 12:7) habitant, sicut superius indicatum est.³*

Augustine

1.

*Hoc non memini Manichaeos solere reprehendere. Tamen quod divisaе sunt aquae, ut aliae essent super firmamentum et aliae sub firmamento, quoniam materiam illam dicebamus nomine aquae appellatam, credo firmamento caeli **materiam corporalem** rerum visibilium **ab illa incorporali** rerum invisibilium fuisse discretam. Cum enim sit caelum corpus pulcherrimum, **omnis invisibilis creatura** excedit etiam pulchritudinem caeli; **et ideo fortasse super caelum esse dicuntur aquae invisibiles, quae a paucis intelleguntur non locorum sedibus, sed dignitate naturae superare coelum**; quanquam nihil temere de hac re affirmandum est: obscura est enim, et remota a sensibus hominum; sed quoquo modo se habeat, antequam intellegatur, credenda est.⁴*

the beginning' and before everything. But this heaven, that is, the firmament, is corporeal.

³ *HomGen. 1.2, 30. Heine 1982, 49-50: Let each of you, therefore, be zealous to become a divider of that water which is above and that which is below. The purpose, of course, is that, attaining an understanding and participation in that spiritual water which is above the firmament one may draw forth 'from within himself rivers of living water springing up into life eternal, removed without doubt and separated from that water which is below, that is, the water of the abyss in which darkness is said to be, in which 'the prince of this world' and the adversary, 'the dragon and his angels' dwell, as was indicated above.*

⁴ *Gen. man. 1.11.17, 83. Teske 1991/1, 64-5: I do not recall that the Manichees are accustomed to find fault with this. The waters were divided so that some were above the firmament and others below the firmament. Since we said that matter was called water, I believe that the firmament of heaven separated the corporeal matter of visible things from the incorporeal matter of invisible things. For though heaven is a very beautiful body, every invisible creature surpasses even the beauty of heaven, and perhaps for that reason the invisible waters are said to be above the heaven. For few understand that they surpass the heaven, not by the places they occupy, but by the dignity of their nature, although we should not rashly affirm anything about this, for it*

2.

*Secundo die tanquam firmamentum disciplinae, quo **discernit inter carnalia et spiritualia, sicut inter aquas inferiores et superiores.***⁵

The interpretations of Gen. 1:1 and 1:6-7 are closely linked. Origen and Augustine explain these verses in a twofold way. On the one hand, they assume that the book of Genesis reports on the creation not only of the visible but also of the invisible world. This assumption enables them to expound some principal elements of their metaphysics. On the other hand, both regard the Scriptural phrase as a moral teaching to the believers. In spite of their close relationship, the spiritual and moral exegeses are to be methodologically distinguished.

As Van Winden pointed out, in paragraph 278 of the *Commentary on Timaeus*, Calcidius quotes Origen, even though the expression “*opinor*” may suggest that the explanation is inserted by Calcidius himself (quotation 1). In fact, Calcidius uses this same “*opinor*” in paragraph 280 as well, although he reproduces Aristotle’s opinion. The distinction between the shapeless, corporeal matter (*silva corporea quondam informis*) and intelligible matter (*intelligibilis silva*) is probably taken up from Origen’s *Commentary on Genesis*.⁶ Such a distinction is implied in Origen’s account in *Princ.* 2.9.1 that in the beginning the corporeal matter was formed “according to measure,” while *creaturae rationabiles vel mentes* “according to number.”⁷ No doubt, the formless state of

is obscure and remote from the sense of men. Whatever the case may be, before we understand it, we should believe.

⁵ *Gen. man.* 1.25.43, 112. Teske 1991/1, 89: *On the second day he has the firmament, so to speak, of learning by which he discerns between carnal and spiritual things, as between the lower and the higher waters.*

⁶ Van Winden 1959, 64-66, cf. Waszink 1975, 284 note *ad locum*.

⁷ *Princ.* 2.9.1, 352-354: *In illo ergo initio putandum est tantum numerum rationabilium creaturarum vel intellectualium, vel quomodo appellandae sunt quas mentes superius diximus, fecisse deum, quantum sufficere posse prospexit. Certum est enim quod praedefinito aliquo apud se numero eas fecit; ... Porro autem sicut et scriptura dicit, numero et mensura universa condidit deus (cf. Sap. 11:20), et ideo numerus quidem recte aptabitur rationabilibus creaturis vel mentibus, ut tantae sint, quantae a providentia dei et dispensari et regi et contineri possint. Mensura vero materiae corporali consequenter aptabitur; utique tantam a deo creatam esse credendum*

rational creatures or minds is identical to the *intelligibilis silva* of the incorporeal nature (*incorporei ... generis*).⁸

A similar distinction between the corporeal and spiritual matter can be found in Origen's first homily on Genesis (quotation 2). However, Origen shares the widespread philosophical principle that matter and qualities can be distinguished only conceptually because they never subsist separately.⁹ This insight is crucial for clarifying the meaning of *spiritus* and *corpus* in the homily. Origen does not distinguish sharply between the matter of the body and the body itself, and tends to use such terms as "corporeal matter," "corporeal nature," and "body" as synonyms.

Given the fact that the "heaven" and the "earth" of Gen. 1:1 signify "the whole of the spiritual substance" (*omnis spiritualis substantia*) and the "corporeal nature" (*natura corporea*, see *Princ.* 3.6.7.), the "spirit" and "body," of which all consist, may refer to the substrate of the two general natures. In addition, Origen seems to identify the higher waters of Gen. 1:7 as the spirit-matter in which the community of incorporeal creatures subsists, and the

est, quantam sibi sciret ad ornatum mundi posse sufficere. Haec ergo sunt, quae in initio, quod Moyses latentius introducit, indicari putamus, cum dicit: In principio fecit deus caelum et terram. Certum est enim quia non de firmamento neque de arida sed de illo caelo ac terra dicatur, quorum caelum hoc et terra quam videmus vocabula mutuata sunt. Cf. Princ. 4.4.8.

⁸ The parallel terminology of *Princ.* 2.1.1-2 and *Com. in Tim.* 278 also supports the thesis that in the passage Calcidius quotes Origen. Origen (or Rufinus) refers to the incorporeal creatures as *rationabiles creaturae vel intellectuales vel ... mentes*, Calcidius speaks about the *intelligibilis silva* of *incorporeum genus*. In Origen, the corporeal creatures consist of *materia corporalis*, in Calcidius, of *silva corporea*. Both explanations represent exegeses of Gen. 1:1. Origen (*Princ.* 2.9.2, 354) adds to the argumentation that *Verum quoniam rationabiles istae naturae, quas in initio factas supra diximus, factae sunt cum ante non essent ...*, which also appears in Calcidius: *factam uero et ita factam, ut sit quae non fuerit, sic probant*

⁹ *Princ.* 4.4.7, 416: *Verumtamen illud scire oportet, quoniam numquam substantia sine qualitate substistit, sed intellectu solo discernitur hoc, quod subiaceat corporibus et capax est qualitatis, esse materia. Ibid. 4.4.7, 418: simulata quodammodo cogitatione his omnibus qualitibus nudam videbitur intueri materiam.* The phrase "*simulata quodammodo cogitatione*" is an allusion to Plato's *Timaens* 52B, cf. Alcinous *Epitome* 8.2. Crouzel 1991, 427.

lower waters as the matter of corporeal creatures.¹⁰ This classification is not obvious in the homily, mainly because of the focus on the moral interpretation of the waters (quotation 3). The term “matter” does emerge in the course of the moral exegesis and it is indeed coupled with the term “water.” However, water denotes the “vices of the body,” that is “the matters of sins” (*materiae peccatorum*), which are to be separated from us as waters below the firmament.¹¹ Another indication that lower waters can signify the corporeal matter could be that the abyss of lower waters appears as the region “where the devil and its angels will dwell.”¹² The devil reigns in the waters, as the one first attached to body and matter.¹³

Augustine offers a moral exegesis in *De genesi contra manicheos* 1.25.43 in which the six days emerge as six grades of the spiritual progress. The interpretation, therefore, is very similar to Origen’s moral exegesis. Augustine interprets the first two days as follows:

On the first day each of us has the light of faith, when he first believes in visible things. Because of such faith the Lord has deigned to appear visibly. On the second day he has the firmament, so to speak, of learning by which he discerns between

¹⁰ Bostock 1992, 255: “the higher waters represent [...] the pure substance of the Spirit, while the lower waters represent the substance of mere matter. They are, however, both similar, both primal water so to speak, in that the term ‘substance’ is predicated of the matter in the same way that it is predicated of Spirit. The waters of matter, however chaotic, rank as substance.” My interpretation differs from that of Bostock in that I do not think that Origen identified the Holy Spirit with the spiritual matter. The spiritual matter represented for him a creature, as it is clear from Calcidius *Com. in Tim.* 278. There is, however, an intimate relationship between the Holy Spirit and the spiritual matter, insofar as the ‘*Spirit bestows the matter of gifts on those who are called saints because of the Spirit and participation in the Spirit,*’ *ComJn.* 2.77.

¹¹ *HomGen.* 1.2, 30-32: *Si enim aquas istas quae sunt sub caelo non separaverimus a nobis, id est peccata et vitia corporis nostri, arida nostra non poterit apparere nec habere fiduciam procedendi ad lucem. ... Quae utique fiducia non dabitur, nisi si velut aquas abiciamus a nobis et segregemus vitia corporis, quae sunt materiae peccatorum.* Cf. *Princ.* 4.4.6.

¹² *HomGen.* 1.1, 26; 1.2, 32.

¹³ *Princ.* 2.8.3, 344; *ComJn.* 1.17.37. Origen denies, of course, that matter would be responsible for evil. See e.g. *CCels.* 4.66.

*carnal and spiritual things, as between the lower and the higher waters.*¹⁴

The starting point is the fact that man is established in a body. This is why the Lord, who came to teach us, appeared in a visible body. According to Origen's moral interpretation the task of "man, who is established in a body," is to discern between the higher and lower waters.¹⁵ *Each of believers becomes heavenly, when ... thinking altogether of heavenly things.*¹⁶ Augustine's *spiritalia* correspond to these *caelestia* just as *carnalia* do to *peccata et vitia corporis nostri*.¹⁷

From another angle, "water" designates matter (quotation 1). Above the matter the Spirit of God moved, but not *through stretches of space ...*, but by the power of its invisible grandeur.¹⁸ The movement of God's Spirit above the waters, should not be understood literally: it means that the prime matter was in the Creator's Power.¹⁹ This matter is divided into two inasmuch as the whole invisible creature subsists in incorporeal matter (*materia incorporalis rerum invisibilium*), while the visible creature subsists in corporeal matter (*materia*

¹⁴ Teske 1991/1, 89.

¹⁵ *HomGen.* 1.2, 28: *homo, qui in corpore positus est, si dividere potuerit et discernere quae sint aquae quae sunt superiores super firmamentum et quae sint quae sunt sub firmamento, etiam ipse caelum, id est caelestis homo appellabitur ...*

¹⁶ *HomGen.* 1.2, 30: *Illius ergo aquae supernae participio, quae supra caelos esse dicitur, unusquisque fidelium caelestis efficitur, id est cum sensum suum habet in arduis et excelsis, nihil de terra sed totum de caelestibus cogitans.*

¹⁷ *HomGen.* 1.2, 30: *Si enim aquas istas quae sunt sub caelo non separavimus a nobis, id est peccata et vitia corporis nostri.*

¹⁸ Teske 1991/1, 56. *Gen. man.* 1.5.8, 75: *Et tamen non sic spiritus dei superferebatur super aquam, sicut superfertur sol super terram, sed alio modo quem pauci intelligunt. Non enim per spatia locorum superferebatur aquae ille Spiritus, sicut terrae sol superfertur, sed per potentiam invisibilis sublimitatis suae. Gen. man.* 1.7.12, 78: *Eandem ipsam materiam [sc. informem materiam] etiam aquam appellavit, super quam ferebatur spiritus dei, sicut superfertur rebus fabricandis voluntas artificis.*

¹⁹ Compare with Origen's remark in *Princ.* 1.3.3, 148: *Spiritus igitur dei, qui super aquas ferebatur, sicut scriptum est, in principio facturae mundi, puto quod non sit alius quam spiritus sanctus, secundum quod ego intellegere possum, sicut et cum ipsa loca exponeremus, ostendimus, non tamen secundum historiam, sed secundum intellegentiam spiritalem.* Cf. Pelland 1972, 25. n. 38.

corporalis rerum visibilium). As higher and lower waters, they are separated by the firmament, the most beautiful body.

There are, thus, incontestable parallels between Origen and Augustine's interpretations of Gen. 1:1 and 1:6. In Origen's homily the heaven is understood as *omnis spiritalis substantia*, in Augustine's commentary, as *omnis invisibilis creatura*, in contrast to the firmament which is considered by both authors to be the corporeal heaven. In the Origen fragment preserved in Calcidius' *Commentary*, the heaven stands for the *incorporei ... generis intellegibilis silva*, the intelligible matter of the incorporeal nature, which appears in Augustine as *materia incorporealis rerum invisibilium*, the incorporeal matter of invisible things symbolised by the higher waters. Both authors refer to the two aspects, the formless and formed state, of the incorporeal creatures. They compare this spiritual matter to the corporeal matter of the visible, corporeal things.

It is an insignificant difference between the two explanations that it is "higher and lower waters" that Augustine identifies as the incorporeal and corporeal matter, whereas Origen-Calcidius explains the "heaven" and "earth" of Gen. 1.1 in such a manner. When explaining the Scriptural terms "heaven," "earth," and "waters," in the *Commentary on Genesis*, Origen presumably offered alternatives, as Augustine did in his commentary without changing the underlying metaphysical doctrine he wanted to expound from Scripture. "Heaven" can stand for the spiritual matter but if heaven is interpreted as the whole of spiritual essence formed by God, just as it happens in the first homily on Genesis, then the spiritual matter, the spirit, is signified by the higher waters.²⁰

Ambrose's second homily on *Hexaemeron* contains an allusion to the allegorical interpretation of "heaven," "firmament" and "waters":

And I am not unware that some refer 'the heaven of heavens' to the intelligible powers, the firmament to the efficient powers. And they say that this is the reason why the heavens praise and 'shine forth the glory of God and the firmament declareth it' – yet, as we have said above, they declare them as creatures of the world. Others also interpreted that waters which are above the heaven mean the purificatory powers. We accept this interpretation as a

²⁰ In Didymus' commentary the water indicate the rational creatures in their potentiality of becoming either good or evil, *ComGen.* 20.62.

*simple adornment to a treatise. To us, however, it does not appear to be inappropriate nor absurd, if we understand these to be real waters for the reason given above.*²¹

Ambrose's remark on the allegorical understanding of the heaven of heavens, firmament and waters go back to Basil.²² Neither Ambrose nor Basil mentions the author of the interpretation by name.²³ According to their reports the allegorist, or allegorists,

²¹ Savage 1961, 62 with modifications. Ambrose *Hex.* 2.4.17, 56: *Nec praeterit rettulisse aliquos caelos caelorum ad intelligibiles virtutes, firmamentum ad operatorias. Et ideo laudare caelos vel enarrare gloriam Dei (cf. Ps. 148:4), annuntiare firmamentum; sed quasi opera mundi enarrant, quemadmodum supra diximus. Alii quoque purificatorias virtutes interpretati sunt aquas, quae super caelos sunt. accipimus haec quasi ad tractatus decorem, nobis tamen non alienum videtur atque absurdum, si aquas veras propter illam causam quam diximus intellegamus.*

²² Basil *Hex.* 3.9, 236-238: τοῦτο δὴ, φασὶ, καὶ τὰ ἐπάνω τῶν οὐρανῶν ὕδατα αἰνεῖν τὸν Θεόν· τουτέστι, τὰς ἀγαθὰς δυνάμεις ἀξίας οὐσας, διὰ καθαρότητα τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ, τὸν πρέποντα αἶνον ἀποδιδόναι τῷ κτίσαντι· τὰ δὲ ὑποκάτω τῶν οὐρανῶν ὕδατα τὰ πνευματικὰ εἶναι τῆς πονηρίας, ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν ὕψους εἰς τὸ τῆς κακίας βάθος καταπεσόντα· (...) Ἐὰν λέγῃ τις οὐρανοὺς μὲν εἶναι τὰς θεωρητικὰς δυνάμεις, στερέωμα δὲ τὰς πρακτικὰς καὶ ποιητικὰς τῶν καθηκόντων, ὥς κεκομψευμένον μὲν τὸν λόγον ἀποδεχόμεθα, ἀληθὴ δὲ εἶναι οὐ πάνυ τι δώσομεν.

²³ According to Pépin (1964, 390-417), Ambrose and Basil draw on Origen's *Commentary on Genesis*. The terminology attributed by Basil to the unnamed author(s) also connotes a gnostic cosmology, see Pasquier 1995. Epiphanius, who sharply criticized Origen's Genesis interpretation including the allegory of waters, observes that Origen considered the higher waters as angelic powers and the lower ones as demoniac: *illas uero praestigias quis non statim abiciat atque contemnat dicente origene de aquis, quae super firmamentum sunt, non esse aquas, sed fortitudines quasdam angelicae potestatis, et rursum aquas, quae super terram sunt, hoc est sub firmamento, esse uirtutes contrarias, id est daemones?* Jerome-Epiphanius *Ep.* 51.5. Jerome similarly says *aquas, quae super coelos in scripturis esse dicuntur, sanctas supernasque uirtutes, quae super terram et infra terram, contrarias et daemónicas esse arbitretur* [sc. Origenes], *C. Ioan.* 7, 376. These reports do not harmonise, in a strict sense, with Basil and Ambrose's remarks, except the lower waters that Basil's summary describes as demoniac. Ambrose, at the same time, does not refer to this interpretation in *Hex.* 2.4.17. He mentions it in paragraphs 1.8.30-31, and rejects it as gnostic (Marcionite, Valentinian, Manichean) blasphemy.

interprets the heaven as “contemplating” or “intelligible powers,” the firmament as “operating powers,” the waters above the firmament as ‘good powers’ or ‘purificatory powers,’ and finally, the lower waters as ‘evil spirits.’ Basil definitely rejects this interpretation and argues for a literal understanding of Gen. 1:1-6. Ambrose reproduces Basil’s arguments but he also allows certain allegories ‘*quasi ad tractatus decorem*,’ as ‘an adornment to a treatise.’

The terminology preserved by Basil and Ambrose is independent of Origen’s first homily on Genesis and the passage preserved by Calcidius. In the first homily, the heaven is said to be *omnis spiritalis substantia* which does not correspond to contemplating powers or purificatory powers. Moreover, the firmament stands either for the outer man or for the human heart,²⁴ and there is no mention of ‘operating’ or ‘active powers.’ Neither is it self-evident that the higher waters signify the good and angelic powers and the lower ones the demoniac. It is the abyss which appears in the homily as a kind of region ‘where the devil and his angels will be’ in the future.²⁵ This interpretation is based on Luke 8:31 that Origen cites in the homily: *And the demons begged him not to command them to depart into the abyss.*

It is significant that the Origenian interpretation of this verse has an echo in Ambrose’s first sermon, where the bishop cites Luke 8:31 as an argument for the literal understanding of the abyss: it simply refers to the depths of real waters.²⁶ The statement appears to be a hidden censure on the part of Ambrose, who must have been conscious of setting himself against Origen’s version.

Augustine’s remark in *Gen. man.* 1.11.17, ‘*quae a paucis intelleguntur*,’ reveals that he is indebted to some exegetes for the allegorical interpretation of waters. Although he may have known

²⁴ *HomGen.* 1.2, 28. and 1.7, 40.

²⁵ *HomGen.* 1.1, 26: *Quae est abyssus? Illa nimirum in qua erit diabolus et angeli eius. Denique hoc manifestissime et in Evangelio designatur, cum dicitur de Salvatore: Et rogabant eum daemonia quae eiciebat ne iuberet ea ire in abyssum* (Lk. 8:31).

²⁶ Ambrose *Hex.* 1.8.32, 34: *Istae ergo tenebrae super aquarum abyssos erant. Nam abyssum multitudinem et profundum aquarum dici lectio evangelii docet, ubi rogabant salvatorem daemonia, ne iuberet illis ut in abyssum irent.*

Plotinus' concept of spiritual matter,²⁷ the remark concerns interpreters of Genesis. Therefore, we must take into account Origen, especially his *Commentary on Genesis* as Augustine's source. It is certain that the term '*pauci*' does not refer to Calcidius, who did not even mention the waters of Genesis in the passage, or Ambrose, whose critical remarks in *Hex.* 2.4.17 did not exercise any influence on Augustine's explanation. The bishop of Milan wanted the allegories, in which the underlying principles of Origen's metaphysics were veiled, to be transformed into rhetorical figures and artistic adornments. We have already detected an opposition between Simplicianus and Ambrose concerning Origen and his interpretation of Col. 2:8.²⁸ At this point another indication of this disagreement occurs. Ambrose seems to have admonished such people as Simplicianus and all other educated Milanese Christians who preferred Origen's theology that Adamantius' metaphysics should be accepted with reservations.

Unlike Ambrose, Augustine adopted some determining presumptions of Origen's exegesis of Genesis. First, Gen. 1:1 reports on the creation of both the corporeal and incorporeal world. Second, the waters of Gen. 1:6-7 represent not physical, but metaphysical entities. Third, as corporeal beings subsist in corporeal matter, so do invisible-incorporeal beings in spiritual, incorporeal matter.

²⁷ In the Plotinian universe the intelligible matter represents the unformed element of a lower hypostasis (Nous, or Soul) deriving from the higher (One or Nous). In fact, to claim that a lower hypostasis derives or emanates from a higher one through a timeless generation is to say that the lower hypostasis is still formless and indefinite until turning toward its source. This formless state, the emanation, is termed by Plotinus as intelligible matter. See e.g. *Enn.* 1.8.9; 2.4.3; 2.7.2; 3.5.6; 5.1.5; 6.9.7. For Augustine's concept of spiritual matter see e.g. *Conf.* 12.17.25; 12.20.29; 12.21.30; *Gen. litt.* 1.4.9; 5.5.13; 7.27.39; *Gen. litt. imp.* 4, 470; 8, 479. Armstrong 1955, 277-283; Teske 1991, 64. n. 57; Van Winden 1990.

²⁸ See above, chapter I.3.

4 ANTI-ANTHROPOMORPHITE

ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE MANICHEES

In *Ep.* 148.4, Augustine mentions some Catholic authors who countered the Anthropomorphites. He quotes a passage from Jerome in which the arguments are summed up. The human members and emotions that Scripture so frequently ascribes to God stand for various spiritual powers through which God takes care of the creatures. The argument Augustine cites goes back, after all, to Origen. Augustine seems to be aware of Origen's role in elaborating the argumentation, since the mention of "praiseworthy and Catholic" exegetes whose ideas sometimes deviate from truth, can be detected as a hint at Origen.¹ When writing the letter, a wide range of texts containing similar arguments against anthropomorphism was at the bishop's disposal, but he quoted a section reminiscent of Origen from the anti-Origenist Jerome's *Tractatus in Psalmos*. This may be one of Augustine's jokes against the monk of Bethlehem. Augustine also observes in the letter that he read - *legere potui* - the anti-Anthropomorphite arguments not merely in the authors he

¹ *Ep.* 148.4, 344: *Neque enim quorumlibet disputationes quamvis catholicorum et laudatorum hominum uelut scripturas canonicas habere debemus, ut nobis non liceat salua honorificentia, quae illis debetur hominibus, aliquid in eorum scriptis improbare atque respuere, si forte inuenerimus, quod aliter senserint, quam ueritas habet diuino adiutorio uel ab aliis intellecta uel a nobis. Talis ego sum in scriptis aliorum, tales uolo esse intellectores meorum.* Jerome's admonition addressed to Augustine, when this latter asked the monk of Bethlehem to send Origenian translations, may have been similar to these words. For Augustine writes in *Ep.* 40.6.9, 79, *De Origene autem quod rescribere dignatus es, iam sciebam non tantum in ecclesiasticis litteris sed in omnibus recta et uera, quae invenerimus, adprobare atque laudare, falsa uero et prava improbare atque reprehendere.*

mentioned by name.² Importantly, he must have read them before 389, since the arguments appear in the early *De vera religione* and *De genesi contra manichaeos*.³

However, it is ridiculous, even wicked [impium], to believe that there are such things in God, and so they deny that man was made to the image and likeness of God. We answer them that the Scriptures generally mention these members in presenting God to an audience of the little ones, and this is true, not only of the books of the Old Testament, but also of the New Testament. For the New Testament mentions God's eyes and ears and lips and feet, and the gospel proclaims that the Son is seated at the right hand of God the Father (cf. Matth. 22:44; Mk. 16:19). The Lord himself says, 'Do not swear by heaven, for it is the throne of God, nor by the earth, for it is his footstool' (Matth. 5:34-35). Likewise he says that he was casting out demons by the finger of God (Lk. 11:20). All who understand the Scriptures spiritually have learned to understand by those terms, not bodily members, but spiritual powers, as they do in the case of helmets and shield and sword and many other things (cf. Eph. 6:16-17 cf. Ps. 90:4-5; Sap. 5:20-21).⁴

On the one hand, at three points this text perfectly agrees with Origen's argumentation in the first homily on Genesis:⁵ any

² Ep. 148.4, 345: *Denique in his omnibus, quae de opusculis sanctorum atque doctorum commemoravi, Ambrosii, Hieronymi, Athanasii, Gregorii, et si qua aliorum talia legere potui, quae commemorare longum putavi ...*

³ *Ver. rel.* 277, 71: *quid prosit tanta loquendi humilitas ut non solum ira dei et tristitia et a somno expergefatio et memoria et oblivio et alia nonnulla quae in bonos homines cadere possunt, sed etiam paenitentiae xeli crapulae nomina et alia huius modi in sacris libris inveniuntur; et utrum oculi dei et manus et pedes et alia huius generis membra quae in scripturis nominantur ad visibilem formam humani corporis referenda sint, an ad significationes intellegibilium et spiritalium potentiarum, sicut alae et scutum et gladius et cingulum et cetera talis.* See also, *Gen. litt.* 6.12.20.

⁴ *Gen. man.* 1.17.27. Teske 1991/1, 74-75.

⁵ Teske 1992, 180 mentions Origen *HomGen.* 1.13 as a parallel interpretation: *But if anyone suppose that this man who is made 'according to the image and likeness of God' is made of flesh, he will appear to represent God himself as made of flesh and in human form. It is most clearly impious [impium] to think this about God. In brief, those carnal men who have no understanding of the meaning of divinity suppose, if they read anywhere in the Scriptures of God that 'heaven is my throne, and the earth my footstool' (Is. 66:1, cf. Matth. 5:34-35), that God has so*

understanding of Gen. 1:26 as a description of an anthropomorphic God is impious (*impium*); such verses as Is. 66:1 and its quotation in Matth. 5:34-35 should not be interpreted literally; Scripture requires a spiritual interpretation. On the other hand, there are close parallels between Augustine's text and the first *Tractatus Origenis*.⁶ In my opinion, the parallels may demonstrate not Augustine's dependence on the Tractator, but their use of a common source, possibly, the Latin translation of the anti-Anthropomorphic section of Origen's Commentary on Genesis.⁷ For each of the common explanations goes back to Origen:

Augustine <i>Gen. man.</i> 1.17.27, 94-95	<i>Tract. Orig.</i> 1.1-3, 5-6:	Origen, <i>Sel. In Gen.</i> PG. 12. 93:
Istam maxime quaestionem solent	Multi sunt ineruditi homines expertes	Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Θεός· Ποιήσωμεν
Manichaei loquaciter agitare et	caelestium litterarum, qui cum	ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ
insultare nobis, quod hominem	audiunt dixisse deum: faciamus	καθ' ὁμοίωσιν. Προδιαληπτέον
credamus factum ad imaginem et	hominem ad imaginem et ad	Πρότερον, ποῦ συνίσταται τὸ κατ'
similitudinem dei. Attendant enim	similitudinem nostram putant	εἰκόνα, ἐν σώματι ἢ ἐν ψυχῇ.
figuram	corporeum deum et	Ἰδωμεν δὲ πρότερον

large a body that they think he sits in heaven and stretches out his feet to the earth. But they think this because they do not have those ears which can worthily hear the words of God about God which are related by the Scripture," Heine 1982, 63-64.

⁶ Weber 1998, 26-27.

⁷ See Appendix 2.

corporis nostri et infeliciter	membrorum	οἷς χρῶνται οἱ
quaerunt, utrum habeat deus nares et	compositione constructum intellegi	τὸ πρῶτον λέγοντες· ὧν ἐστὶ καὶ
dentes et barbam et membra etiam	oportere, praesertim cum et	Μελίτων συγγράμματα
inferiora et cetera quae in nobis sunt	prophetae caput et capillos domini	Καταλελοιπῶς περὶ τοῦ ἐνσώματου
necessaria. In deo autem talia	nominant et oculos et aures et nares	εἶναι τὸν Θεόν. Μέλη γὰρ Θεοῦ
ridiculum est, immo impium credere,	et os et labia et linguam et pedes,	ὀνομαζόμενα εὐρίσκοντες,
et ideo negant hominem factum esse	(...)	ὀφθαλμούς Θεοῦ ἐπιβλέποντας τὴν
ad imaginem et similitudinem dei.		οἰκουμένην, καὶ ὅτα αὐτοῦ εἶναι εἰς
Quibus respondemus membra quidem		Δέησιν δικαίων ἐπινενευκότα, καὶ,
ista in scripturis plerumque nominari,		Ὡσφράνθη Κῶριος ὁσμήν εὐωδίας·
cum deus insinuatur audientibus		καὶ, Τὸ στόμα Κυρίου ἐλάλησε
parvulis, et hoc non		ταῦτα, καὶ βραχίονα Θεοῦ, καὶ

solum in veteris		
testamenti libris, sed etiam in novi:		χεῖρας, καὶ πόδας, καὶ δακτύλους,
nam et oculi dei commemora ntur et		ἄντικρυς φάσκουσι ταῦτα οὐχ
aures et labia et pedes , et ad		ἕτερόν τι διδάσκειν ἢ τὴν μορφήν
dexteram dei patris sedere filius		τοῦ Θεοῦ. (...)καὶ συνάγουσι μυρία
evangelizatur; et ipse dominus dicit:	et:	□ητὰ μέλη ὀνομάζοντα Θεοῦ. (...)
‘nolite per caelum iurare quia sedes	caelum mihi sedis est, terra autem	Πῶς δὲ ὁ σφαιροειδὴς οὐρανὸς καὶ
dei est, neque per terram quia	scabillum pedum meorum,	ἀεὶ κινούμενος θρόνος εἶναι
scabillum est pedum eius.’ Item	(...)	δύναται, ὥς ὑπολαμβάνουσι, τοῦ
ipse dicit quod in digito dei eiciebat	ibid. 1.28,11: Verum quod ad membra	Θεοῦ; Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ γῆ πῶς ὑποπόδιον
daemonia. Sed omnes qui spiritaliter	pertinet, quae quasi humana in deo	τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ;
scripturas intelligunt non membra	deputantur, non proprietates	<i>Princ.</i> 2.8.5, 350: Quia sicut omnia,
corporea per	membrorum, sed efficaciae	quae corporaliter de

ista nomina, sed		deo dicuntur, id
spiritalis potentias accipere	divinorum operum indicantur, ut	est vel digiti vel manus vel brachia
didicerunt, sicut alas et scutum et	homines, qui spiritaliter deum	vel oculi vel os vel pedes , dicimus
gladium et alia multa.	verum et vivum videre et intelligere	non haec humana membra, sed
	non poterant , saltem secundum	virtutes eius quasdam in his
	suam naturam aliquid de deo vivo	corporeorum membrorum
	sentirent.	appellationibus indicari.

The literal understanding of Gen. 1:26 leads to anthropomorphism. The Manichees ridicule the Catholics for their acceptance of such texts in the Old Testament. They quote the passages in which God is said to have nose, teeth, beard and so on, and deny that man is made in the image of God. Albeit for different reasons, the Manichees and the Anthropomorphites understand the anthropomorphic descriptions in the same, literal way. Augustine can, therefore, use the traditional counter-arguments, though with slight modifications. He points out that the anthropomorphic descriptions also emerge in the New Testament that even the Manichees accept.⁸

⁸ Augustine's openly undertaken method against the Manichees is to quote the testimonies from the New Testament which have parallels in the Old Testament, see *Moribus* 1.1.2; 1.16.26; *Retr.* 1.7.2.

5 THE CREATION OF MAN

(GEN. 1:26; GEN. 2:7)

The possible sources of Augustine's early theology of the image of God have been thoroughly examined by such distinguished scholars as Herman Somers, Gerald A. McCool and Roland J. Teske.¹ McCool published an elaborate study on the issue and argued that it was via Ambrose that Augustine had encountered a synthesis of the Alexandrian image theology and Plotinus' philosophy. The arguments were based on Augustine's reports both in the *Confession* and *De beata vita*, as well as on the analysis of Augustine's early image theology.

As far the first group of evidence is concerned, in the preface to *De beata vita*, Augustine acknowledged to Manlius Theodorus: *For I have noticed frequently in the sermons of our priest, and sometimes in yours that when speaking of God, no one should think of Him as something corporeal; nor yet of the soul, for of all things the soul is nearest to God.*² Moreover, in the *Confessions* he repeats that it was Ambrose whose sermons revealed the Catholics' understanding of Gen. 1:26 according to which the image made by God is not limited by corporeal shape.³

McCool mentions other possibilities as well. *De beata vita* also testifies to the fact that Augustine listened to Theodorus' sermons on the soul and God, and it cannot be excluded either that Ambrose's master, Simplicianus, whom Augustine consulted about theological issues, rehearsed "*for his new disciple an image theology which he had already communicated to Ambrose.*" But "*we do not know,*"

¹ Somers 1955 and 1961; McCool 1959; Teske 1992.

² *B. vita* 1.4. Schopp 1948, 47-48. Cf. McCool 1959, 66-67; 73; 80.

³ *Conf.* 6.3. McCool 1959, 66; 80.

McCool adds and draws the final conclusion which is worth quoting because it has established the scholarly *communis opinio*:

From the evidence we have presented, however, the following facts emerge. In the Confessions and in De beata vita Augustine claims that he learned the significance of the image and likeness of God in man by listening to the discourses of Ambrose. The texts of Augustine's early works give evidence of the truth of that contention. Their theology of the image and likeness of God is a faithful echo of the Alexandrian-Plotinian image synthesis which is presented in the homilies of Ambrose. Augustine's image theology is clearly in the source from which he claimed to derive it.⁴

The conclusion is logical but should be refined in the light of the recent developments of research. Roland J. Teske has pointed out important elements of Augustine's understanding of Gen. 1:26 which demonstrate a closer relationship with Origen than anyone has hitherto surmised. At the same time, Teske balks at revising the traditional interpretation and takes for granted McCool's conclusions about Augustine's indebtedness to Ambrose for the Origenian image theology.⁵ The inference would be convincing if anyone had pointed out textual parallels between Augustine and Ambrose concerning the theology of image, and had compared them with Origenian passages. However, such a comparison, as I intend to show, results in a different conclusion. Even though Ambrose was, indeed, indebted to Origen for important elements of his concept of image, and although Augustine listened to Ambrose's speeches on the same issue, Origen's influence on Augustine seems to have come independently from Ambrose.

Interior and exterior man

Origen

1.

Et ideo illud quidem primum caelum quod spiritale diximus, mens nostra est, quae et ipsa spiritus est, id est spiritualis homo noster qui videt

⁴ McCool 1959, 80.

⁵ Teske 1991/1, 32 n. 60; 75 n. 83; 127 n. 140; 147 n. 8; idem 1992, 183.

*ac perspicit Deum. Istud autem corporale caelum, quod firmamentum dicitur exterior homo noster est qui corporaliter intuetur.*⁶

2.

*Hunc sane hominem, quem dicit ad imaginem Dei factum (cf. Gen. 1:27), non intelligimus corporalem. Non enim corporis figmentum Dei imaginem continet, neque factus esse corporalis homo dicitur, sed plasmatus, sicut in consequentibus scriptum est. Ait enim: Et plasmavit Deus hominem, id est finxit, de terrae limo.(Gen. 2:7) Is autem qui ad imaginem Dei factus est, interior homo noster est, invisibilis et incorporealis et incorruptus atque immortalis.*⁷

Ambrose

1.

*Quid est Deus? Caro an spiritus? Non caro utique, sed spiritus, cuius similis caro esse non potest, quia ipse incorporeus et invisibilis est, caro autem comprehenditur et videtur.*⁸

2.

*Nos sumus, hoc est anima et mens, nostra sunt corporis membra et sensus ejus, circa nos autem pecunia est, servi sunt et vitae istius adparatus.*⁹

⁶ HomGen. 1.2, 28. Heine 1982, 49: *And, therefore, that first heaven indeed, which we said is spiritual, is our mind, which is also itself spirit, that is, our spiritual man which sees and perceives God. But that corporeal heaven, which is called the firmament, is our outer man which looks at things in a corporeal way.*

⁷ HomGen. 1.13,56. Heine 1982, 63: *We do not understand, however, this man indeed whom Scripture says was made 'according to the image of God' to be corporeal. For the form of the body does not contain the image of God, nor is the corporeal man said to be 'made,' but 'formed,' as is written in the words which follow. For the text says: 'And God formed man,' that is fashioned, from the slime of the earth.*

⁸ Ambrose Hex 6.7.40, 231. *What is God: flesh or spirit? Certainly not flesh, but spirit, to which flesh has no similarity, since the spirit is incorporeal and invisible whereas the flesh can be touched and seen.*

⁹ Ambrose Hex. 6.7.42, 233. *We ourselves are, that is, soul and mind, ours are the limbs of the body and its senses, and what surrounds us is property, slaves and the belongings of this life.* Not only this sentence but the whole paragraph represents a translation of Basil Hom. in illud: Attende temetipsum 3, 26-7: Πρόσεχε οὖν σεαυτῷ, τουτέστι· μήτε τοῖς σοῖς, μήτε τοῖς περὶ σέ, ἀλλὰ σαυτῷ μόνῳ πρόσεχε. Ὑλλο γάρ ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς αὐτοί, καὶ ἄλλο τὰ ἡμέτερα, καὶ ἄλλο τὰ περὶ ἡμῶς. Ἡμεῖς μὲν οὖν ἐσμεν ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ ὁ νοῦς, καθ' ὃν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος γεγενήμεθα· ἡμέτερον

3.

*Anima igitur nostra ad imaginem Dei est.*¹⁰

Augustine

1.

*... quod homo ad imaginem Dei factus dicitur, secundum interiorem hominem dici, ubi est ratio et intellectus.*¹¹

2.

*Sic enim nonnullos nostros intelligere accepi, qui dicunt, posteaquam dictum est, finxit deus hominem de limo terrae (Gen. 2:7), propterea non additum: 'ad imaginem et similitudinem suam', quoniam nunc de corporis formatione dicitur; tunc autem homo interior significabatur, quando dictum est: fecit Deus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem dei (Gen. 1:27).*¹²

The Pauline concept of the “inner man” plays a determining role in Origen's understanding of Gen. 1:26.¹³ In the first homily on Genesis, ‘the first heaven’ of Gen. 1:1 is taken to refer to the mind (*mens*), which is characterised as our spiritual man (*homo spiritalis*, see quotation 1). The counterpart of this spiritual man is the outer man (*homo exterior*) signified by the corporeal firmament, who is fashioned from the soil of the earth (cf. Gen. 2:7 in quotation 2). The ‘inner man’ and ‘spiritual man’ represent one and the same being. The ‘first heaven’ refers not only to the whole spiritual essence (*omnis spiritalis substantia*), but also to the inner man partaking in that essence. Accordingly, Gen. 1:26 narrates not only

δὲ τὸ σῶμα, καὶ αἱ διὰ τοῦτου αἰσθήσεις· περὶ ἡμῶς δὲ χρήματα, τέχναι, καὶ ἡ λοιπὴ τοῦ βίου κατασκευή.

¹⁰ Ambrose Hex. 6.7.43, 234. *It is our soul, therefore, which is made in the image of God.*

¹¹ Gen. man. 1.17.28, 95. Teske 1991/1, 76: *When man is said to have been made to the image of God, these words refer to the interior man, where reason and intellect reside.*

¹² Gen. man. 2.7.9, 128. Teske 1991, 103: *I have heard that some of ours understand it in this way. They say that, after the words ‘God formed man from the mud of the earth’ it did not add ‘To his image and likeness’ precisely because Scripture was here speaking of the formation of the body. Then the words ‘God made man to the image and likeness of God’ signified the interior man.*

¹³ Princ. 4.4.9; ComCant. Prol. 5; HomLev. 14.3; ComRom. 1.19; 7.4.; CCels. 6.63; Dial.12; ComRom. 2.13. See, Crouzel 1956, 147-179; Hamman 1987, 127-152.

the creation of inner man, but also that of every rational and spiritual being.¹⁴ In this respect the term ‘man’ (*homo*, ἄνθρωπος) is understood in a broad sense: it can be predicated of every spiritual creature, including even the angelic nature. This is the reason why in the *Commentary on St. John’s Gospel*, Origen defends the view that the word ‘man’ in Gen. 1:26 also stands for angels. The various denominations of the angelic orders pertain to the variety of their activities, since “their essence does not differ from that of man” (ὧν τὸ ὑποκείμενον οὐκ ἄλλο τί ἐστὶν ἢ ἄνθρωπος).¹⁵

Such terms and expressions used by Origen as ‘spirit,’ ‘spiritual essence,’ and ‘human mind, as spirit,’ refer to three aspects of the same spiritual reality. First, there exists the incorporeal creature subsisting in matter called ‘spirit.’ Second, this creature represents the totality of spiritual essence. Third, through the incorporeal mind, man inseparably belongs to the universal spiritual essence.

Ambrose does not mention the Pauline *homo interior* and *homo exterior* in his homilies on *Hexameron*. Elsewhere¹⁶ he makes it clear that it is the inner man whom God made in His image, but his sermon on Gen. 1:26 lacks the Pauline expression. Furthermore, in spite of his veneration towards the Alexandrian exegete, Ambrose refused to accept and, therefore, disseminate Origen’s central doctrine that all rational creatures derive from a common essence. As he did not follow Origen’s exegesis of the ‘first heaven,’ so he could not see any connection between Gen. 1:1 and Gen. 1:26. He is in agreement with Origen that the created image is entirely incorporeal, invisible (quotation 1), and that man is identical to his soul or mind (quotation 2), especially because such a doctrine is

¹⁴ See *HomEz.* 3.8 in which the term *homo* is taken to refer to the inner man; the Hebraism *homo homo* to the inner and outer man if the latter has been morally purified, and the *homo iumentum* to the sinner. Cf. *HomNum.* 24.2; *HomLev.* 2.2.

¹⁵ *ComJn.* 2.146, 304. Cf. *Princ.* 4.2.7.

¹⁶ Ambrose *Expl. Ps. XII*, In Ps. 37.27.2: *Ut ergo concludamus disputationem, scribae et Pharisei nihil ad interiorem hominem referunt, qui, ut ipse est ad imaginem dei et similitudinem factus, ita in his, quae cogitat et quae meditatur, debet magis quae spiritalia sunt quam quae carnalia cogitare.* cf. *Fide* 5.14; *De virginibus* 3.20.

supported by Scripture.¹⁷ This soul is made in the image of God (quotation 3). However, Ambrose does not teach that the human and angelic souls are ontologically identical. He definitely rejects Philo's interpretation of the plural in Gen. 1:26, "Let us make man", according to which subordinate powers, inferior angels, assisted God in creating man, but Ambrose does not reject the idea that angels had already existed when man was created.¹⁸ This is, in fact, what he himself also thought, adopting the Cappadocians' theory of the double creation of angels and man.¹⁹

Stating that the inner man made in the image of God consists of reason and understanding (quotation 1), Augustine actually refers to the mind and its activities. For the mind (*mens*) manifests itself in the soul as a twofold activity: *ratio*, reason and *intellectus*, understanding. Reason is the 'motion of mind' under the guidance of which man can connect and discern things.²⁰ This motion is metaphorically called 'sight' (*aspectus*), because *mens* is traditionally likened to the eye. *Intellectus* represents, according to this same metaphor, 'seeing' (*visio*) which comes into being from the one who can see and who is seen, that is, who understands and who is understood.²¹

¹⁷ In Ambrose's *Hex.* 6.8.46, Gen. 46:27 is quoted to support the man-soul identification. The influence of Origen's *HomGen.* 13.4 on Ambrose's moral explanation in *Hex.* 6.7.42 is clear, cf. McCool 1959, 67.

¹⁸ Ambrose *Hex.* 6.7.40. Philo *Opif.* 73-75; *De conf.* 179; *Abr.* 143; *Fuga* 68.

¹⁹ Ambrose *Hex.* 3.6.25, 75-6: *Nam plerique etiam hoc dicunt esse inuisibile quod speciem non habet et ideo accipiunt terram inuisibilem fuisse, non quia uideri non posset a summo deo uel angelis eius - nam adhuc homines creati non erant uel etiam pecudes -, sed quia sine sua specie erat.* Angels by their dignity surpasses man who is *mutum iumentum* compared to them, *De interp.* 3.9.26. For the Cappadocians' theory, see e.g. Gregory of Nyssa *Oratio catechetica magna* 6.

²⁰ *Ord.* 2.9.30, 168: *Ratio est mentis motio ea, quae discuntur, distinguendi et conectendi potens, qua duce uti ad deum intellegendum vel ipsam quae aut in nobis aut usque quaque est animam rarissimum omnino genus hominum potest non ob aliud, nisi quia in istorum sensuum negotia progressu redire in semet ipsum cuique difficile est. Itaque cum in rebus ipsis fallacibus ratione totum agere homines moliantur, quid sit ipsa ratio et qualis sit, nisi perpauci prorsus ignorant.* Cf. *Ord.* 2.18.48, 180-181.

²¹ *Sol.* 1.6.12-13; 13.23; *Quant. an.* 14.24; 27.53; *Imm. an.* 6.10; *Ver. rel.* 175. The illumination metaphor reveals not only the triadic nature of the created image of God, in which mind may correspond to the Father,

Like Origen, Augustine is convinced of the ontological identity of the rational and incorporeal creatures. He repeatedly claims in his early works that there is nothing among creatures which could be better by nature than the soul.²² Men and angels are rational souls, and are identical in their nature, although the inferior ones differ from the superior in their works.²³ The common essence of rational creatures is invisible and incorporeal,²⁴ and also called *first intellectual creature* (*prima intellectualis creatura*) or *rational essence* (*substantia rationalis*).²⁵ This essence, on the other hand, is in a sense identical to the *purest and happiest mind* (*mens purissima et beatissima*) made to the Son, the Image and Likeness.²⁶

This theory lies behind an expression that Augustine uses in *De genesi contra manichaeos*. Explaining Gen. 2:5, he speaks of the soul, *anima* as one member of the spiritual and invisible creature: *spiritual and invisible creature like the soul*.²⁷ What Gen. 2:5 describes as the ‘green of the field’ signifies for Augustine the *invisibilis creatura*; the same invisible creature as what the term ‘heaven’ of Gen. 1:1

reason to the Holy Spirit, and understanding to the Son, but also its indivisible unity. See also *Mag.* 2 and 40.

²² See e.g. *Quant. an.* 34. 78; *Musica* 6.1.1; *Vera rel.* 310, 80; *Gen. litt. imp.* 16, 500.

²³ *Lib. arb.* 3.114.

²⁴ *Gen. man.* 1.11.17.

²⁵ *Ver. rel.* 191, cf. *Gen. litt. imp.* 3, 462.

²⁶ *Gen. litt. imp.* 16, 500: *ad ipsam tamen similitudinem omnia non facta sint, sed sola substantia rationalis: quare omnia per ipsam, sed ad ipsam non omnia. Rationalis itaque substantia et per ipsam facta est et ad ipsam; non enim est ulla natura interposita, quandoquidem mens humana - quod non sentit, nisi cum purissima et beatissima est - nulli cohaeret nisi ipsi veritati, quae similitudo et imago patris et sapientiae dicitur. Recte igitur secundum hoc, quod interius et principale hominis est, id est secundum mentem accipitur: faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram.* This passage clearly indicates that the early Augustine regarded the “*ad imaginem et similitudinem*” as “*ad Filium*”: For Origen, see e.g. *HomLk.* 8; *HomGen.* 1.13; *CCels.* 4.85; 6.63.

²⁷ *Gen. man.* 2.3.4, 122: *viride agri invisibilem creaturam vult intelligi sicut est anima. ... viride ergo agri spiritalem atque invisibilem creaturam dicit. Ibid.* 2.3.5, 123: *cum viride agri et pabulum fecisset deus, quo nomine invisibilem creaturam significari diximus. Ibid.* 2.6.7, 126: *et nomine viridum et pabuli agri creatura invisibilis ... viride et pabulum agri, quo nomine invisibilem creaturam propter vigorem et vitam significari diximus, sicuti est anima.*

signifies (see, *omnis invisibilis creatura* in *Gen. man.* 1.11.17). It is clear that the soul (*sicuti est anima*) represents the inner man of *Gen.* 1:26.²⁸ The invisible creature, including the soul, subsists in an incorporeal matter; that is to say, the soul is invisible, incorporeal, incorruptible and immortal, but it is not immutable: *it is subject to change in time from the great variety of its loves*; it fell down, became wretched and will be restored to happiness.²⁹ 'Soul' and 'invisible creature' are interchangeable terms. Sometimes we read that *the flood of truth satisfied the soul before sin*,³⁰ sometimes that *before sin, after God had made the green of the field and food, which we said to be signified by the expression invisible creature, God watered it by an interior spring, speaking in its intellect, ... the invisible creature was satisfied from its own spring, that is, by the truth flowing from its interior*.³¹ The term 'man' does

²⁸ In *Gen. man.* 2.7.9-8.10, the term 'soul' designates an existent which lives among the incorporeal creatures, but turns into man who consists of body as well. In other words, it is not its ontological status but its destiny which distinguishes the soul from the spiritual creatures. Initially, the soul was made in the image of God as incorporeal *inner man*, that is, reason and understanding (*ratio et intellectus*), but it became corporeal man when it began to use the body. "Soul" (*anima*) represents the most general term that Augustine prefers to use in referring to the spiritual and incorporeal nature of the rational beings. However, since animals also have souls, the higher faculty of the rational beings are often called *animus*, *anima rationalis*, *mens*, *spiritus*. These terms are more or less interchangeable, but their usage and meaning depends upon the given context. *Mens* and *spiritus*, for instance, refer to the same faculty, but spirit is rather a Scriptural term, while mind is more philosophical, see, *Fid. symb.* 10.23; *Lib. arb.* 1.61; 65; 68; *Gen. man.* 2.8.11. In a stricter sense *anima* means the lower faculty in us which is in direct contact with the bodily nature. In this case the soul can be called 'life' whereas mind or spirit appears the rational faculty of the living creature, the ruling part, that is the Stoic *hegemonikon*, see *Gen. man.* 2.8.11; *Fid. symb.* 10.23. The ruling part, whether it is generally called soul or, specifically, mind, is that in which the *ratio* and *intellectus* resides. For a more detailed analysis of Augustine's terminology, see O'Daly 1987, 7-79.

²⁹ Teske 1991/1, 101. *Gen. man.* 2.6.7.

³⁰ *Gen. man.* 2.6.7, 126: *et nomine fontis ascenditis et irrigantis omnem faciem terrae inundatio veritatis animam satians ante peccatum* [significata est].

³¹ Teske 1991/1, 99 with slight modifications. *Gen. man.* 2.4.5, 123-4: *ante peccatum vero, cum viride agri et pabulum fecisset deus, quo nomine invisibilem*

not emerge in this connection. Augustine emphasises that the Scriptural teachings about man start with Gen. 2:7.³² Whereas Gen. 2:5 says that *there was no man on the earth to work on it*, that is the soul was not yet joined to earthly body, Gen. 2:7 reports on the creation of man consisting of body and soul.³³

In *De genesi contra manichaeos*, Augustine propounds two possible interpretations of the first clause of Gen. 2:7, *and God formed man from the mud of the earth*. This can mean either the formation of the earthly body, the exterior man (see above, quotation 2), or the creation of the man who consists of soul and body.³⁴ The first interpretation is found in Philo,³⁵ Tertullian³⁶ and Origen. Moreover, Origen's interpretation exercised an important influence on such Latin authors as Hilary,³⁷ Ambrose³⁸ and the redactor of the first *Tractatus Origenis*.

creaturam significari diximus, irrigabat eam fonte interiore loquens in intellectu eius, ut ... fonte suo, hoc est de intimis suis manante veritate satiaretur.

³² See, *Gen. man.* 2.7.8. Teske 1991/1, 102: *After mentioning all creation both visible and invisible and the universal gift of the divine spring with regard to the invisible creature, let us see what it says of man in particular, for this especially pertains to us. First of all, the fact that God formed man from the mud of the earth usually raises a question about the sort of mud it was or the kind of material the term 'mud' signifies.*

³³ A human being, by definition, is composed of soul and body, *Doctr. chr.* 1.26.27; For the body-soul relationship in Augustine, see Van Bavel 1974; Lawless 1990.

³⁴ Cf. *Gen. man.* 2.7.9.

³⁵ Philo *Opif.* 46; *Quaest. Gen.* 1.4.

³⁶ Tertullian *Resurr.* 5.6-9, 927.

³⁷ Hilary *Tract. in Ps.* 129.6; *Com. in Ps.* 118, 10.6-7, 32-34; 4.1; 13.10. For the Origenian background of Hilary's interpretation, see the Palestine catena on Ps. 118, 5.102 in Harl 1972, 1, 355.

³⁸ Ambrose adopted the Origenian distinction of the two men of Genesis e.g. in his *Exp. Ps.* 118 10.18; *Ob. Theod.* 30. I found the most relevant passage in his *Ep.* 69.19: *Quoniam cum sint in uno homine duo homines, de quibus dictum est: Et si qui foris est homo noster corrumpitur - secundum desideria erroris -, sed qui intus est renovatur de die in diem, et alibi: Condelector enim legi dei secundum interiorem hominem, interior est homo noster qui est ad imaginem et similitudinem dei factus, exterior qui figuratus e limo.* All these works were written later than Augustine's first commentary, see Zelzer 1998, 92; Pizzolato 1987, 12-15; Pasini 1996, 217.

It is not Augustine's custom, unfortunately, to refer to his sources by name. In the commentary he simply observes: *Sic enim nonnullos nostros intelligere accepi* (see above, quotation 2). Through the expression "*nonnullos nostros*" Augustine definitely claims that the interpretation in question is found in some Catholic author(s), that is to say, he does not think of Philo. On the other hand, the Latin "*accipere*" can mean in this context that someone learnt something either from oral or written report. '*Accepi*,' therefore, can be rendered not only as 'I have heard,'³⁹ but also as 'I have come to know,' 'to my knowledge,' 'as far as I know,' etc. Augustine uses the phrase in this broader sense in other passages as well.⁴⁰

Who is then the most probable source of the interpretation? The concise summary, which represents only one of two acceptable interpretations of Gen. 2:7, is similar to the comments by Hilary and Gregory of Elvira on the double creation of man. They follow Origen in distinguishing between the creation of the soul, the inner man, and the fashioning of the body, the outer man.⁴¹ However, if Hilary and Gregory used a Latin compilation of Origen's *Commentary on Genesis*, in which they found this interpretation, as is probable,⁴² then there is no obstacle to assuming that Augustine also read the same Latin compilation. In addition, there is a solid argument establishing the view that Augustine alludes to Origen and not to Hilary or Gregory of Elvira. In *De genesi ad litteram*, he would repeat the same interpretation of the double creation of man, while also attributing

³⁹ See Teske 1991/1, 103. This translation of "accepi" is determined by the presumption that Augustine may have learnt the Origenian explanation from Ambrose's *Hexaemeron* that he "heard" in Milan, see Teske 1991/1, 103. n. 41 and idem 1992, 183. Teske refers to McCool 1959, 66-68, but McCool does not discuss the passages in question.

⁴⁰ *C. acad.* 3.11.26, 67: *quare illud, quod me scire dixi, nulla confundit similitudo falsorum et epicureus uel cyrenaici et alia multa fortasse pro sensibus dicant, contra quae nihil dictum esse ab academicis accepi.* *B. vita* 1.4, 92: *lectis autem plotini paucissimis libris, cuius te esse studiosissimum accepi...*

⁴¹ Origen *HomGen.* 1.13; Hilary *Tract. in Ps.* 129.6; *Com. in Ps.* 118, 10.6-7; *Tractatus Origenis* 1. 13-15.

⁴² See Appendix 4.

it to *nonnulli*.⁴³ He rejects the interpretation and criticises the complementary understanding according to which the male-female differentiation should be taken allegorically. This allegory does not occur in Hilary or Gregory. Augustine may think of Origen, who understood the male-female differentiation as a spiritual one within the soul. Moreover, this same idea is emphatically present and copiously explained in *De genesi contra Manichaeos*. Consequently, in the *ad litteram* commentary, Augustine was later to reject an Origenian interpretation that he himself accepted as a possible exegesis of Gen. 1:26 and 2:7.

There is another indication of Augustine's dependence on Origen's interpretation. It has been pointed out that the three verses of Genesis: 1:1; 1:26 and 2:5 are in close connection in Augustine's commentary. The heaven of Gen. 1:1 is understood as *omnis invisibilis creatura*; man made in the image of God as the *homo interior*, and the green of the field as *spiritalis atque invisibilis creatura*, like the *anima*. This spiritual and incorporeal inner man is set against the corporeal man of Gen. 2:7. Importantly, the first *Tractatus Origenis*, attributed to Gregory of Elvira, also contains an explanation in which Gen. 1:26 and 2:5 are connected and, at the same time, are contrasted with Gen. 2:7.⁴⁴ According to the author of the *Tractatus*, Gen. 2:5 includes a reference to the inner man,

⁴³ Gen. litt. 3.22.34, 266: *Nonnulli autem etiam hoc suspicati sunt, tunc interiorem hominem factum, corpus autem hominis postea, cum ait scriptura: 'et finxit Deus hominem de limo terrae': ut quod dictum est, 'fecit,' ad spiritum pertineat, quod autem: 'finxit,' ad corpus, nec adtenderunt masculum et feminam nonnisi secundum corpus fieri potuisse. Cf. Agaësse-Solignac 1972, 1, 682. Cf. ibid. 1, 625-627; Teske 1991/1, 103 n. 40; Somers 1961, 116.*

⁴⁴ *Tractatus* 1.13-15, 8. *Et quia ex humo homo dicitur, ideo anima corpori coniuncta vocabulum hominis traxit, ut et ipsa homo diceretur. Denique advertite quid scriptura pronuntiet: 'Et dixit', inquit, 'deus: Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram. Et fecit deus hominem, ad imaginem dei fecit illum' (cf. Gen. 1:26-27). Et postea repetit dicens: 'nondum', inquit, 'pluerat deus super terram et homo non erat qui operaret terram' (Gen. 2:5). Et ubi est quod supra iam dixerat: 'Fecit deus hominem ad imaginem dei', cum postea subiungat: 'Et finxit deus hominem de limo terrae et inspiravit in faciem eius spiritum vitae et factus est homo in animam viventem' (Gen. 2:7)? Videtis ergo, dilectissimi fratres, quomodo naturam nunc interioris et exterioris hominis quodam inspirationis foedere copulatam insinuat.*

because this verse somehow repeats (*repetit*) Gen. 1:26.⁴⁵ Man by definition is a composite of soul and body, but Gen. 2:5 indicates that such a man had not yet existed before the divine breathing forth: *and there was no man on the earth to work on it*. Through the spiritual breath, God joined the inner man, the soul, to the exterior man, the body fashioned from the mud. In Gen. 2:5 Gregory thus finds a corroboration of the fact that the soul exists without an earthly body. This is remarkably similar to Augustine's comments on the same verse.

It seems that both Gregory and Augustine drew this interpretation of Gen. 2:5 on Origen. In fact, Augustine's explanations of the first part of the verse, *God had not yet made it rain upon the earth* indicate a very close connection with Origen's allegories of rains. According to Augustine, rains signify the words through which God waters the soul. For God enveloped his words in the cloud of allegories and human words and the divine Word also assumed the cloud of flesh in order to water the dry land of our souls.⁴⁶ Scripture appears therefore as cloud, and the words of the prophets and apostles as the rains of truth.

*And this is why Scripture added, 'For God had not yet made it rain upon the earth,' because now God also makes the green of the field, but by raining upon the earth; that is, he makes souls become green again by his word. But he waters them from the clouds, that is, from the writings of the prophets and apostles. They are correctly called clouds, because these words which sound and pass away after they strike the air become like clouds when there is added the obscurity of allegories like a fog that has been drawn over them. When they are pressed by study, the rain of truth, so to speak, is poured out on those who understand well.*⁴⁷

⁴⁵ Gen. 2:4-5 summarises the seven day creation; see e.g. Theophilus of Antioch *Ad Autol.* 2.19; Irenaeus *Dem.* 32. The verb "*repetit*" expresses this summary. The Tractator considers that since in the previous section the book of Genesis does not mention the creation of the human body but only the creation of the inner man, Gen. 2:5 must also mean that a body-soul composite, called man, did not yet exist.

⁴⁶ *Gen.man.* 2.5.6. The distinction between *arida* and *terra* is found in *Gen. man.* 1.25.43 and *HomGen.* 1.2.

⁴⁷ Teske 1991, 98. *Gen.man.* 2.4.5, 123: *Ideoque addidit: 'nondum enim pluerat Deus supra terram' (Gen. 2:5), quia et nunc viride agri Deus facit, sed*

This allegory of rains is very characteristic of Origen. He frequently expounds there are rational clouds, that is, the saints and prophets.⁴⁸ Christ comes everyday to the soul of believers in prophetic clouds, that is in the writings of the prophets and apostles.⁴⁹ From these prophetic clouds God watered the earth of the soul, but in the soul of believers the external rains of the Word were to be replaced with the inner fountain of the living water.⁵⁰ In the sixteenth homily on Leviticus, Origen argues that

*also each one of the Prophets when he could open his mouth brings a rain storm 'upon the face of the earth,' that is, upon the ears and hearts of the hearers. ... But our earth, that is, our heart, receives blessings if it receives 'the rain' of the doctrine of the Law 'which frequently comes upon it' and brings forth the fruit of works. ... For that reason, each one of the hearers when he assembles to hear, receives 'the shower' of the word of God; and if he indeed brings forth the fruit of a good work, he will obtain 'a blessing.'*⁵¹

What in these lines Origen explains about Lev. 26:4, *I will give you your rains in their season*, Augustine expounds concerning Gen. 2:5. Having received God's words, the soul may *become green again*

pluendo super terram, id est facit animas revirescere per verbum suum, sed de nubibus eas irrigat, id est de scripturis prophetarum et apostolorum. Recte autem appellantur nubes, quia verba ista, quae sonant et percusso aëre transeunt, addita etiam obscuritate allegoriarum quasi aliqua caligine obducta velut nubes fiunt; quae dum tractando exprimuntur, bene intelligentibus tamquam imber veritatis infunditur.

⁴⁸ Cf. *HomJer.* 8 3-5; *HomPs.* 36 3.10; *ComCant.* 3.14.23-25; *ComMat.* ser. 50; *HomLev.* 16.2. For the Scriptural basis, see e.g. Deut. 32:2-3.

⁴⁹ Origen *ComMatth.* ser. 50, 112: *cum multa autem virtute venit cottidie ad animam omnis credentis secundus verbi <dei> adventus in nubibus prophetis <et apostolicis>, id est in scripturis prophetarum et apostolorum, quae manifestant eum et in omnibus verbis suis veritatis lumen ostendunt et exorientem eum divinis et super humanam naturam intellectibus suis declarant.*

⁵⁰ *ComCant.* 3.14.23-25.

⁵¹ Barkley 1990, 264-5. *HomLev.* 16.2, 270-2: *Sed et unusquisque prophetarum cum aperuerit os, imbres deducit super faciem terrae, hoc est auribus et cordibus auditorum. ... Sed nostra terra, id est nostrum cor, si suscipiat frequenter venientem super se pluviam doctrinae legis et attulerit fructum operum, accipit benedictiones. ... Propterea unusquisque auditorum cum convenit ad audiendum, suscipit imbrem verbi Dei; et si quidem fructum attulerit operis boni, benedictionem consequetur.*

(*revirescere*), as Augustine puts it, because it can return to its original spiritual state. In that state the soul as spiritual and invisible creature was *satisfied from its own spring, that is, by the truth flowing from its interior (fonte suo, hoc est de intimis suis manante veritate, satiaretur)*.⁵² According to Origen, souls poured out by God's Word receive a spiritual blessing: *You shall eat your bread to the full (et manducabitis panem vestrum in satietate, Lev. 26:5)*.⁵³ The spiritual state of man is considered the state of the souls' *satietas*.

⁵² Teske 1991/1, 99. *Gen. man.* 2.4.5, 123.

⁵³ *HomLev.* 16.5, 284: *Magis ergo si respiciamus ad eum, qui dixit : Ego sum panis vivus, qui de caelo descendit; et qui manducaverit hunc panem, vivet in aeternum (Jn. 6:51) et advertamus quia, qui haec dicabat Verbum erat, quo animae pascuntur, intelligimus, de quo pane dictum sit in benedictionibus a Deo: et manducabitis panem vestrum in satietate (Lev. 26:5).* For Origen's satiety-image, see Harl 1966.

6 MALE, FEMALE, AND SPIRITUAL DOMINION (GEN. 1:27-28)

The allegorical understanding of Gen. 1:27-28 is another theme common to Origen and the young Augustine.¹ It is disputed whether Augustine directly or indirectly was familiar with the Origenian interpretation, especially with the first homily on Genesis. For Augustine's spiritual interpretation of the male and female and their dominion over the beasts bears close similarities to Origen's homily, although its Latin version was not available to him in 388-389. Therefore, one may think that the influence of Origen came via Ambrose.

Origen

1.

*Interior homo noster ex spiritu et anima constat. Masculus spiritus dicitur, femina potest anima nuncupari.*²

2.

*Alioquin adscendamus ad altiore intelligentiae gradum et dicamus **virum in nobis esse rationabilem sensum et mulierem, quae ei velut viro sociata est, carnem nostram. Sequatur ergo semper caro rationabilem sensum** nec in id umquam desidia veniatur, ut carni in luxuria et voluptatibus fluitanti in dicionem redactus obsequatur **rationabilis sensus.***³

¹ Carozzi 1988, 30; Teske, 1992, 180-181; Heidl 1997, 133-137; Weber 1998, 25-26.

² *HomGen.* 1.15, 66. Heine 1982, 68: *Our inner man consists of spirit and soul. The spirit is said to be male; the soul can be called female.*

³ *HomGen.* 4.4, 152. Heine 1982, 107: *For the rest, let us ascend to a higher step of understanding and let us say that the man is the rational sense in us and the woman our flesh which, like her, has been united with a man. Therefore, let the flesh always follow the rational sense nor let it ever come into any slothfulness to that the*

3.

... videamus ne forte Lot, qui non respexit post se, **rationabilis** est **sensus et animus virilis**, uxor autem hic **carnis** imaginem teneat.⁴

Ambrose

... in specie serpentis figuram accipiens delectationis, in figura mulieris **sensum animi mentisque** constituens, quam **αἴσθησιν** vocant Graeci, decepto autem **sensu** praevariatricem secundum historiam **mentem** adseruit, quam Graeci **νοῦν** vocant. Recte igitur in Graeco **νοῦς** viri figuram accepit, **αἴσθησιν** mulieris. Unde et quidam Adam **νοῦν** terreneum interpretati sunt.⁵

Augustine

1.

Ita fiat etiam homo ad imaginem et similitudinem dei, **masculus et femina, id est intellectus et actio ...**⁶

2.

Adbuc enim erat, quod fieret, ut non solum **anima** corpori dominaretur, quia corpus servilem locum obtinet, sed etiam **virilis ratio** subiugaret sibi **animalem partem suam**, per quod adiutorium imperaret corpori.⁷

rational sense, reduced in authority, should yield to the flesh wallowing in luxury and pleasures.

⁴ *HomGen.* 5.2, 166. Heine 1982, 114: ... let us see if perhaps Lot, who did not look back, is not the rational understanding and the manly soul, and his wife here represents the flesh.

⁵ *Parad.* 2.11, 271. Savage 1961, 293-4 with modifications: We maintain that the figure of the serpent stands for enjoyment and the figure of the woman for the sensation of the soul and mind which is called by the Greeks **αἴσθησις**. When according to this story, sensation is deceived, the mind, which the Greeks call **νοῦς**, falls into error. Hence, not without reason the author to whom I refer accepts the Greek word **νοῦς** as a figure of a man and **αἴσθησις** as that of a woman. Hence, some have interpreted Adam to mean an earthly **νοῦς**. Cf. *ibid.* 11.51.308.

⁶ *Gen. man.* 1.25.43, 113. Teske 1991/1, 90: Thus let man be made to the image and likeness of God, male and female, that is, intellect and action. Instead of 'intellect' I would translate 'understanding,' because in this passage Augustine draws a parallel between the activity of intellect and the practical action.

⁷ *Gen. man.* 2.11.15, 136. Teske 1991/1, 111: For there was still need to bring it about not only that the soul rule over the body, because the body has the

3.

... 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 tamquam virilis ratio subjugatum**.⁸

4.

Deinde, ut quisque huic suae parti recte dominetur et fiat quasi coniugalis in seipso, ut **caro** non concupiscat adversus **spiritum** (cf. Gal. 5:17), sed **spiritui** subiungatur, id est **concupiscentia carnalis** non adversetur **rationi**, sed potius obtemperando desinat esse carnalis, opus habet perfecta sapientia.⁹

Origen's statement 'our inner man consists of spirit and soul' (quotation 1) raises some problems. For he also states in the same homily that our mind (*mens nostra*) is also itself spirit (*spiritus*), a spiritual man (*homo spiritualis*) where this spiritual man is clearly understood in the sense of inner man.¹⁰ In a strict sense, it is the νοῦς or *mens* which is made in the image of God,¹¹ and not the soul (*anima*; ψυχή), which represents a lower hypostasis, the lower "part" of the mind, so to speak. The soul came into existence when the mind departed from God and 'cooled down' (*refrigescere*; ψύχεσθαι).¹² Why does then Origen maintain in the first homily on Genesis that the soul represents one component of our inner man? The answer may be that in the sentence the emphasis is put on the possessive pronoun 'our,' because Origen is now speaking about our present, bodily

position of a servant, but also that virile reason hold subject to itself its animal part, by the help of which it governs the body.

⁸ Gen. man. 2.11.15, 136-7. Teske 1991/1, 111: Thus we can also come to see in one human what we can see more clearly in two humans, that is, in the male and the female. The interior mind, like virile reason, should hold subject the soul's appetite by means of which we control the members of the body.

⁹ Gen. man. 2.12.16, 138. Teske 1991/1, 113: Secondly, there is need of perfect wisdom if anyone is correctly to rule this part of himself, and preside over the marriage in himself so that the flesh does not lust against the spirit, but is subject to the spirit, that is, so that carnal desire is not opposed to reason, but rather ceases, by obeying, to be carnal.

¹⁰ HomGen. 1.2, 28.

¹¹ See e.g. Princ. 1.1.7; CCels. 8.33; 8. 38. In HomEx. 2.2, the inner man is identical to the male in us. See, Crouzel 1956, 158-9.

¹² Cf. Princ. 2.8.3.

condition. In the fallen state, our inner man lives together with the outer, bodily man thereby appears not merely as mind or spirit, but also as a lower faculty called soul, which on obeying the spirit, vivifies and rules the body. The soul can lose, however, the control over the body and come under the influence of bodily desires. Such a soul, therefore, can also be called 'flesh' (*caro*; σάρξ) because of the carnal thoughts and desires.

In Origen's fourth homily on Genesis, Sarah symbolises our flesh and Abraham the rational mind (*rationabilis sensus*, see quotation 2). Similarly, in the fifth homily, Lot represents rational mind and virile mind (*rationabilis sensus*; *animus virilis*, quotation 3). These moral interpretations derive from the allegorical understanding of the male-female relationships appearing in Scripture.¹³ Explaining them, Origen always sets out from our fallen, carnal state whence we must rise up and progress to spiritual chastity.

Importantly, Origen divides Gen. 1:27 into two parts and definitely distinguishes between man who is made in the image of God and man who is made male and female.¹⁴ The former is the entirely incorporeal, pure mind, the inner man, while the latter is a composite of spirit, soul and body, that is, 'earth' that the spirit-soul should fill with spiritual offspring.¹⁵

In the homilies on the *Hexaemeron*, Ambrose does not interpret the terms 'male' and 'female.' In *De paradiso* he touches upon the issue in relation to the Fall of Adam and Eve. The explanation does not concern Gen. 1:27.¹⁶ Ambrose identifies Adam as the mind (*mens*; νοῦς) and Eve as sensation (*sensus*; αἴσθησις). This allegory comes from Philo¹⁷ and differs from Origen's version. The first and principal difference is that the

¹³ *HomEx.* 13.5; *Princ.* 4.3.12; *HomNum.* 20.3. Cf. Crouzel 1956, 152-3.

¹⁴ Origen makes another distinction, namely, between male and female of Gen. 1:27 and man and woman of Gen. 2:22, cf. *ComMatth.* 14.16.

¹⁵ See *HomGen.* 1.15, 66.

¹⁶ See also Ambrose *Abr.* 2.1.1, 565: *Adam etenim mentem diximus, Evam sensum esse significavimus, serpentis specie delectationem expressimus. Abr.* 2.1.2, 566: *Dividitur enim in duo anima nostra, in id quod rationabile et in id quod est irracionabile. In eo autem quod est irracionabile sensus sunt; ergo cognati sunt partis rationabilis, hoc est mentis.*

¹⁷ See e.g. Philo *Leg. alleg.* 1.29.

mind-sensation is not made in the image of God. Secondly, the sensation which Ambrose and Philo speak of is by no means identical to the 'soul' or 'flesh.' Origen's categories do not imply that the first male-female creature used sense-perception, even if this man lived in some kind of body.

The most general classification that Augustine carries out concerning Gen. 1:27 is that male and female signify understanding and action (see quotation 1). Action pertains to the lower faculty called either soul (*anima*) or the animal part (*animalis pars*), since this is what humans and animals have in common (see quotation 2). Understanding is considered to be the activity, or rather a state of the virile reason (*virilis ratio*, see quotation 2 and 3), which is also characterised as the manifestation of the inner mind (*mens interior*) within the soul joined to the body. According to the moral interpretation, the first man exemplifies the principle that our reason should hold subject the soul's appetite to itself (see quotation 3). In Pauline terms, the spirit (*spiritus*) should rule the flesh (*caro*) which lusts against it (see, quotation 4). What in Gal. 5:17 Paul calls spirit is interpreted by Origen and Augustine to mean the male made in the image of God. Accordingly, the flesh is understood as the female. When the lower part of the soul is chaste, and no longer is flesh but soul obeying the spirit, her husband, then through harmony they increase and multiply and generate. Augustine and Origen interpret this spiritual generation and dominion in the same way:

Origen

*If these have concord and agreement among themselves, they increase and multiply by the very accord among themselves and they produce sons, good inclinations and understandings or useful thoughts, by which they fill the earth and have dominion over it. This means they turn the inclination of the flesh, which has been subjected to themselves, to better purposes and have dominion over it, while the flesh, of course, becomes insolent in nothing against the will of the spirit.*¹⁸

¹⁸ Heine 1982, 68. *HomGen.* 1.15, 66-68: *Haec [sc. spiritus et anima] si concordiam inter se habeant et consensum, convenientia inter se ipsa crescunt et multiplicantur generantque filios sensus bonos et intellectus vel cogitationes utiles, per quae repleant terram et dominantur in ea; hoc est subiectum sibi sensum carnis ad meliora instituta convertunt et dominantur ei, scilicet cum in nullo caro contra*

Augustine

*Thus let man be made to the image and likeness of God, male and female, that is, understanding and action. From their union let spiritual offspring fill the earth, that is, let him hold the flesh in subjection.*¹⁹

*For there was first the chaste union of male and female, of the former to rule, of the latter to obey, and there was the spiritual offspring of intelligible and immortal joys filling the earth, that is, giving life to the body and ruling it. That is, man so held [the body] subject that he experienced from it no opposition or trouble.*²⁰

The parallels can be expanded far more and clarified by taking into consideration a papyrus fragment in which Origen explains Gen. 1:28.²¹

In the fragment, Origen claims that Gen. 1:28 includes a spiritual blessing (εὐλογία πνευματική – frag. 56 f). Augustine also argues that the blessing should be understood spiritually (*benedictio ... spiritualiter accipienda* – *Gen. man.* 1.19.30). Both agree that the ‘earth’ represents the body (σῶμα - corpus – frag. 27 f. *Gen. man.* 1.19.30) that the first man and, analogously, the righteous by virtue of the divine blessing rules and subdues himself. *God wants the man*, as Origen says, *to rule his body and not to be ruled by it* (frag. 28). In Augustine’s version the first man *so held subject the body that*

voluntatem spiritus insolescit (cf. Gal. 5:17). Cf. *ComMatth.* 14.16: καὶ ὅπου γε ὁμόνοια καὶ συμφωνία καὶ ἁρμονία ἀνδρὸς ἐστὶ πρὸς γυναῖκα καὶ γυναικὸς πρὸς ἄνδρα, τοῦ μὲν ὡς ἄρχοντος, τῆς δὲ ὡς πειθομένης τῷ αὐτὸς σου κυριεύσει, ἀληθῶς ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων τὸ οὐκέτι εἰσὶ δύο.

¹⁹ Teske 1991/1, 90 with slight modification. *Gen. man.* 1.25.43, 113: *Ita fiat etiam homo ad imaginem et similitudinem dei, masculus et femina, id est intellectus et actio, quorum copulatione spiritalis fetus terram impleat, id est carnem subiiciat.*

²⁰ Teske 1991/1, 77-78. *Gen. man.* 1.19.30, 97-98: *Erat enim prius casta coniunctio masculi et feminae, huius ad regendum, illius ad obtemperandum accomodata, et spiritalis fetus intellegibilium et immortalium gaudiorum replens terram, id est vivificans corpus, et dominans ejus, id est, ita subiectum habens, ut nullam ex eo adversitatem, nullam molestiam pateretur.*

²¹ *Ein Bruchstück des Origenes über Genesis 1, 28*, Ed. P. Glaue, *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek*, Giessen: Töpelmann, 1928. Cf. Heidl 1999/1, 600-602.

he experienced from it no opposition or trouble (Gen. man. 1.19.30). The beasts symbolise, as Origen asserts, the irrational and animal nature of the man (ἐν αὐτῷ ἄλογον καὶ κτηνώδες – frag. 31; 53; 56) that also is to be ruled. Similarly, Augustine speaks about our animal part (*in seipso animale* - Gen. man. 2.11.16; *animalis pars* - 2.11.15 and *passim*) which the virile reason (*virilis ratio*) must also hold subject to itself in order that this part assist the reason to govern the body (Gen. man. 2.11.15). When this happens, Augustine refers to the beasts as the *affections and inclinations of mind* (*affectiones et motus animi* – Gen. man. 1.20.31), and Origen as *inclinations and thoughts of mind* (*motus et cogitationes mentis* – HomGen. 1.11.16-17 cf. *ibid.* 1.16.9-10). If the beasts are not ruled, Augustine adds (Gen. man. 1.20.31), they *carry us away through the pleasures* (*per delectationes nos rapiunt*) and hence, they turn into passions (*perturbationes*). In Origen's fragment we read that in contrast to the righteous, the wicked is ruled by his body and animal part, being *carried away towards the pleasures and passions* coming from the earth, the body (ἀγόμενος ἐπὶ τὰς ἡδονὰς καὶ τὰ πάθη ὑπ' αὐτῆς – frag. 32-33).

Similarities emerge in even the slightest details. According to Origen, the cattle and reptiles symbolise our bodily actions (σωματικοὶ πράξεις – frag. 51-52) and the birds the *word in us* (ἐν ἡμῖν λόγος) that we have to hold back but, in proper time, *to utter for the profit of others* (πρὸς τὴν ἐτέρων ὠφέλειαν), as *λόγον προφορικόν* (frag. 46-50). In Augustine's commentary, the reptiles are produced from the bodily actions (*de corporalibus actionibus*) and represent those of our works which profit living souls (*quae prosint animis vivis*), and the birds are to be identified with the uttered words which preach heavenly things (*voces coelestia praedicantes* - Gen. man. 1.25.43). The one who is able to rule his body and animal nature receives back the image-likeness of God, as Origen says (frag. 54-55), and similarly, Augustine states that in this way man becomes image and likeness made in God (Gen. man. 1.25.43). This man appears therefore, as male and female, that is, *intellectus* and *actio*, whose lower part is obedient to reason and justice (*rationi et iustitiae serviens* – Gen. man. 1.25.43). In Origen, the righteous man fills his body with action according to justice (κατὰ δικαιοσύνην πράξεις – frag. 38) and increases his mind (νοῦς) in thoughts, and multiplies reason (λόγος), wisdom and justice and every virtue in himself (frag. 78-80 and *passim*). Both Origen and Augustine

mention the generation of spiritual offspring, although Gen. 1:28 does not contain a specific command of generation. Origen considers the sons of the spirit and soul as good inclinations and useful understandings or thoughts (*sensus boni; intellectus vel cogitationes utiles* - *HomGen.* 1.15); Augustine describes the offspring of the spirit and soul as the intelligible and immortal joys (*spiritualis fetus intelligibilium et immortalium gaudiorum* - *Gen. man.* 1.19.30).

It is important to observe from a doctrinal point of view that when Origen and Augustine refer to the first man as historical man, they describe the chaste concord of his spirit, soul and body. Accordingly, this man, who lives in paradise, did make use of a body, even if this body was totally subjected to the soul and spirit. The first man, whom God moulded from the soil of the earth and into whom He breathed the breath of life (Gen 2:7), received a spiritual blessing whereby he was established in paradise, where he dominated over his irrational nature and body.²² Regarded historically, Gen. 1:28 narrates an event that chronologically followed the moulding of the earthly body, and the divine breathing forth mentioned in Gen. 2:7. Gen. 1:26 reports on the creation of the inner man, the mind who belongs to the spiritual substance symbolised by the heaven of Gen. 1:1. Gen. 1:27 includes a teaching about the man who consists of spirit, soul and spiritual body. Gen. 2:7 describes the creation of the outer man,

²² Frag. lines 57-63 and 66-71: *Thus, if we, who were neglectful, have been made worthy of spiritual blessing, then how much more the first man, whom God fashioned by his hands, established in paradise, ordered to have dominion over the things subjected to him and whom God breathed into. ... For if we received back the image-likeness today that we might become the one who he was and that we might participate in the food in paradise, and being established in the place where he was, according to this, 'You will be with me in Paradise' (Lk. 23:43), then it certainly follows from this that we receive a blessing with regard to increasing and multiplication, equal to that which the first man received. Cf. Augustine Gen. man. 2.8.10. Teske 1991/1, 105: We should not yet think of the man who was made into a living soul as spiritual, but as still animal. For he was made spiritual, when he was established in paradise, that is, in the happy life, and received the commandment of perfection so that he might then be made perfect by the word of God. ... And so all of us who were born from him after sin first bear the animal man until we attain the spiritual Adam, that is, our Lord Jesus Christ, who committed no sin (cf. 1Pet. 2:22). Then, recreated and brought to life by him, we will be restored to paradise, where the thief merited to be with him on that very day on which he ended this life (cf. Lk. 23:43).*

the earthly body or the man who has an earthly body. This scheme suggests a gradual descent from a pure spiritual state down to a choic state.²³ Gen. 1:28 however, is understood a blessing that the choic man received and so became a spiritual one.

Augustine regards the blessing of Gen. 1:28 and the commandment of Gen. 2:16 ('From every tree which is in paradise, you shall eat for food') as one and the same divine operation. On the one hand, the male and female received a blessing so that the virile reason and the appetite of the soul might fill the earth, the body, with 'spiritual offspring of intelligible and immortal joys.'²⁴ On the other hand, man in paradise was fed by 'spiritual joys signified by every tree beautiful to the gaze of the intelligence,' to the virile reason.²⁵ Origen's interpretation in the Giessen-fragment also involves this strong connection of Gen. 1:28 and 2:16. In addition, it seems that the fragment preserved a portion of Origen's explanation of Gen. 2:16. An overview of the structure of his explanation can confirm this inference.

²³ See Origen's *Princ.* 1.3.8; 2.2.2, cf. Bammel 1989, 65-6.

²⁴ *Gen. man.* 1.19.30.

²⁵ *Gen. man.* 2.9.12. Reason is the gaze of mind in *Sol.* 1.6.12-13; 13.23; *Quant. an.* 14.24; 27.53; *Imm. an.* 6.10; *Ver. rel.* 175.

7 THE PAPYRUS OF GIESSEN: A

FRAGMENT FROM A HOMILY ON EDEN?

The first sentence of the fragment is an allusion to the parable of the pounds in Luke 19:11 ff. The Lord is glad when the servants invest their pound, the image of God in them, and do not hide it in the earth. For man's task is to increase and multiply the goods given by God, the seeds of reason, wisdom and justice.

θέλει γὰρ μὴ ἀργεῖν τὰ ἐν ἡμῖν καλὰ, ἀλλὰ
αὖξειν καὶ πληθύνειν, καθὼς ἐν τῇ τοῦ
Σολομῶνος σοφίᾳ δηλοῦται λέγοντος οὕτως ὡς
πρὸς θεόν· “θέλεις δὲ μὴ ἀργὰ εἶναι τὰ τῆς
σοφίας ἔργα” (Sap. 14:5). οὕτως ἐγὼ ἀκούω καὶ
τοῦ πρὸς τὸν πρῶτον ἄνθρωπον τεθέντος λόγου
κατ’ εὐλογίαν πρέπουσαν καὶ τῷ εὐλογοῦντι
θεῷ καὶ τῷ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ εὐλογηθέντι ἀνθρώπῳ·
κάκει γὰρ κτίσας τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ κατ’
εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ ποιήσας καὶ ἄρχοντα
καταστήσας ὧν ὑπέταξεν αὐτῷ εὐλογεῖ αὐτὸν
εἰπών· “αὖξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε καὶ
πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν καὶ κατακυριεύσατε
αὐτῆς” (Gen. 1:28)· ποιήσας γὰρ αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς
ἐνέθηκεν σπέρματα λόγου καὶ σπερματικὰ
σοφίας καὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἀρετῆς.¹

The sentence introduced with the adverb *κάκει* makes it evident that the continuation of the text will include the explanation of a Scriptural verse already cited in the previous section, which is now lost. At this point Origen refers back to Gen. 1:28, which he is quoting because it is connected to his actual message. He is speaking about a blessing which also the first man received from

¹ Frag. Giessen, lines 9-21.

God and the understanding of which requires the interpretation of Gen. 1:28. It is also clear that Origen is explaining a verse which includes a less than obvious blessing. His proposal is to expound this verse, and the reference to the parable of pounds also served for this purpose. Consequently, in the quoted passage Origen alludes to the verse originally proposed to explain: *I also understand in this way the words addressed to the first man, as blessing...* . The audience of the explanation must remember the Scriptural words in question, hence Origen does not repeat them. This verse cannot be Gen. 1:28, because in this case the expression '*I also understand*' would have been a superfluous and illogical addition. Gen. 1:28 represents an obvious blessing: "And God blessed them" (καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός). The phrase *καὶ ἐπεὶ γὰρ* has any sense only if it introduces a verse, namely, Gen. 1:28, which to some extent is similar to the verse that Origen is actually interpreting and which also can be understood as a blessing. The fragment reveals that the addressee of this verse is the man moulded from the earth; the man into whom God breathed the breath of life; and, he whom put into the garden of Eden so that he might share in the foods of paradise. This means that Origen passed over the explanation of Gen. 2:15.² Consequently, the verse in question must be Gen. 2:16: *You may eat of every tree of the garden*. If this is the case, then the fragment of Giessen comes from an exegesis of Eden.

Whether the fragment comes from Origen's lost *Commentary on Genesis* or from a homily on Eden is a matter open for discussion.³ There is at least one indication of the homiletic origin. In lines 66-67, Origen observes: today we received back being

² *ibid.* lines 59-63 and 66-71: εἰ οὖν ἡμεῖς οἱ πλημμεληκότες καταξιούμεθα εὐλογίας πνευματικῆς, οὐ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ὁ ὑπὸ χειρῶν θεοῦ πλασθεὶς καὶ ἐν παραδείσῳ τεθεὶς καὶ ἄρχων τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κατασταθεὶς καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐμπνευσθεὶς ... ὥς γὰρ ἡμεῖς σήμερον τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα ἀναλαμβάνομεν ἵνα γενώμεθα ὅπερ ἦν ἐκεῖνος καὶ τῆς ἐν παραδείσῳ τροφῆς μεταλαμβάνωμεν εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου χωρίον μετατιθέμενοι κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον 'μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ' (Lk. 23:43), καὶ πῶς οὐκ ἀκόλουθον τῆς ἴσης εὐλογίας μετασχεῖν τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἀυξάνεσθαι καὶ πληθύνεσθαι τῷ πρῶτῳ ἀνθρώπῳ;

³ Glaue 1928, 27-32.

made in the image (ἡμεῖς σήμερον τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα ἀναλαμβάνομεν). This may suggest that we have a fragment from a homily, which was delivered on the day of Baptism.

The manuscript-tradition of Origen's homilies on Genesis is contradictory.⁴ Jerome claimed in *Ep.* 33 that Origen had written seventeen homilies on Genesis. Sixteen homilies have survived in the translation of Rufinus and some manuscripts add as seventeenth a compilation of Rufinus' *De benedictionibus patriarcharum*. W. A. Baehrens recognised that the manuscripts include sometimes sixteen, sometimes seventeen homilies and that these latter ones, which also include the pseudo-Origenian homily, constitute one group going back to the same model. On the other hand, Jerome's letter has survived in five codices which, at the same time, also bring the additional homily. This group, the so-called C group, also goes back to that same model. According to Baehrens, the over-zealous copyist of the model emended Jerome's letter. Jerome originally mentioned sixteen homilies on Genesis, Baehrens argues, but the copyist found seventeen homilies. Baehrens dates the model before the first half of the seventh century.⁵

As an excellent philologist, Baehrens brought the facts to light, but his conclusion was only one of two possibilities. The unquestionable facts are as follows:

1. In his *Ep.* 33. Jerome mentions seventeen homilies on Genesis.
2. The codices that include *Ep.* 33 go back to one model.
3. The C group of the manuscripts, which also contains the pseudo-Origenian homily, goes back to this same model.

Another likely interpretation of the facts could be that nobody corrected the data in Jerome's *Ep.* 33, but someone added the falsified *Benedictiones patriarcharum* to the series in order to

⁴ Eugene TeSelle already raised the possibility that "if the later manuscript tradition [of Origen's homilies on Genesis] ... is a truncated one, a homily on Eden and the serpent might well have been included," TeSelle, 1990, 357 n.18.

⁵ Preface to *Origenes Werke* 6. Bd. Homilien zu Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung, 1. Teil. Leipzig, 1920, 28-30. The hypothesis is accurately reproduced by L. Doutreleau in the introduction to the Homilies on Genesis, *SC* 7bis, 1985, 14-16.

harmonise the number of the homilies and Jerome's remark. In fact, the question is why a false homily was added to the series. The probable answer is that after the Origenist controversies, Origen's hotly attacked interpretation of Eden was not encouraged to be passed on, and the homily was made to disappear. This phenomenon is called *damnatio memoriae*. However, the homily must have been replaced by another work, because in his Ep. 33 Jerome reported the exact number of the homilies. The *De benedictionibus* appeared to be appropriate for this purpose because it is strongly influenced by Origen both in its content and exegetical method.⁶

⁶ According to R. Somos (2000) the *De benedictionibus patriarcharum* may represent the Latin translation or compilation of an Origenian work.

8 SPIRITUAL PARADISE

Origen's interpretation of the second and third chapters of Genesis does not survive. A number of sporadic remarks in his extant writings, some paraphrased or cited sentences in later, anti-Origenist authors, and, finally, some likely Origenian explanations in Didymus' fragmentary commentary on Genesis, could provide some aid in creating a cautious and approximate image of his understanding of the stories written in Gen. 2:5-3:24.¹ Any comparison between such texts and Augustine's interpretation of Eden remains hopelessly hazardous. I will outline, therefore, only three characteristics of Augustine's first commentary which indicate the Origenian influence on his explanation of paradise: the exegetical method; the interpretations of the Hebrew words; and the Adam-Christ allegory.

First of all, Augustine understands the story of paradise allegorically. He emphasises that the story of the creation of man and all that follows Gen. 2:5 is narrated in figures: *the whole narrative unfolds, not clearly, but in figures (non aperte, sed figurate) so that it might exercise the minds of those seeking the truth and call them from carnal labors to spiritual.*² For this reason, interpreters of the text should avoid blasphemies, and if there were no way whatsoever to understand

¹ E.g. *Sel. Gen.* PG 12 c.100 A; *Princ.* 4.3.1; Epiphanius *Anchoratus* 54.2; *Panarion* 64.4.11; Epiphanius-Jerome *Ep.* 51.5; Jerome *C. Ioan.* 7 and passim. One of the best reconstructions of Origen's interpretation of Eden is published by Bammel in 1989.

² Teske 1991/1, 91. *Gen. man.* 2.1.1, 115: *Deinde incipit de homine diligentius narrari; quae omnis narratio non aperte, sed figurate explicatur, ut exercent mentes quaerentium veritatem et spiritali negotio a negotiis carnalibus avocet.*

the narrative literally, they should take it figuratively.³ This is what Augustine does in the commentary and what he would reject some years later in *De genesi ad litteram*. In the monumental commentary, he admits he is already able to explain the Biblical stories of the creation of man and paradise in a proper sense, not allegorically (*secundum propriam non secundum allegoricam locutionem*).⁴

The exegetical starting point Augustine adopts and exploits in the first, allegorical commentary is in full accordance with Origen's view about the story of paradise and its allegorical interpretation. He also thought of the narrative as a story which *in figures signifies certain mysteries* (τροπικῶς ... μὴνύειν τινὰ μυστήρια), for one should not believe that God like a farmer planted a garden, or that the first man tasted the fruits of the trees with his bodily teeth, or God walked in paradise.⁵ When using the figurative mode of speech, the aim of the Holy Spirit

*was, pre-eminently, concerned with the unspeakable mysteries connected with the affairs of men ... his purpose being that the man who is capable of being taught might by searching out and devoting himself to the deep things revealed in the spiritual meaning of the words become partaker of all the doctrines of the Spirit's counsel.*⁶

Both refer to St. Paul's words in 2 Cor. 3:16-17 to justify the contention that truth veiled by allegory can be known if one asks the aid of Christ.⁷ The underlying principle, that in Scripture the divine Word accommodated itself to the human capacity, involves the classification of the audience of Scripture. The carnal believer, the little one in Christ (*carnalis, id est parvulus in Christo*) does not understand but simply believes what he reads. This man cannot ascend to contemplation of invisible, spiritual things. Spirituals however, understand the same text and its spiritual teachings.⁸ They are not misled by the anthropomorphic expressions, holding

³ Cf. *Gen. man.* 2.2.3, 121: *Si autem nullus exitus datur, ut pie et digne deo quae scripta sunt intellegantur, nisi figurate atque in aenigmatibus proposita ista credamus ...*

⁴ *Gen. litt.* 8.2.5, 16.

⁵ *Princ.* 4.3.1, 342-44, cf. *CCels.* 4.39.

⁶ Butterworth 1966, 282, *Princ.* 4.2.7.

⁷ Augustine *Gen. man.* 1.23.33; Origen *HomGen.* 2.3; 6.1; 7.6; 13.3.

⁸ *Gen. man.* 1.23.40; 1.5.9. Cf. Teske 1992, 180.

the right view of God and interpreting Scripture spiritually. Augustine comes to the characteristic Origenian conclusion that the spiritual believers are allowed to conceal the higher truth from the simple ones and from pagans.

Men will merit that dwelling and transformation into angelic form (1 Cor. 15:51) if even in this life, when they could hide lies under the garments of skin, they hate and avoid them out of a burning love of the truth, hiding only what their hearers cannot bear, but not telling any lies.⁹

This idea emerges in a section containing the interpretation of the garments of skin spoken of in Gen. 3:21. The garments symbolise the mortal flesh received after sin. In our bodily condition, thoughts are hidden in the heart and do not appear unless we utter them. Spirituals have the possibility to hide truth under the garments of skin when they judge their hearers not being able to bear it. However, concealing is not lying.¹⁰ The same idea occurs in Origen's sixth homily on Leviticus in which, otherwise, the same interpretation of Gen. 3:21 is found.

Therefore, these teachers of the Church, in procreating such generations, sometimes use the binding of the thighs and abstain from begetting, since they find such hearers in whom they know they could not have fruit. Finally, also in the Acts of the Apostles, it is related concerning some of these that 'we could not speak the word of God in Asia' (Cf. Acts 16:6). That is, they had put on the thigh covering and preserved themselves that they not beget sons, for certainly these were such hearers in whom both the seed would die and could not have offspring. Thus therefore, the priests of the Church, when they see incapable ears or when

⁹ Teske 1991/1, 128. *Gen. man.* 2.21.32, 155: *Itaque illi merebuntur habitationem illam et commutationem in angelicam formam, qui etiam in hac vita, cum possint sub tunicis pellicis occultare mendacia, oderunt ea tamen et cavent flagrantissimo amore veritatis et hoc solum tegunt, quod hi qui audiunt ferre non possunt, sed nulla mentiuntur.*

¹⁰ The method of teaching that spirituals use is considered as the imitation of the divine method that God's Word applied when teaching people. God also concealed his words by the cloud of allegories and human words, and the divine Word, too, assumed the cloud of our flesh. *Gen. man.* 2.5.6, see e.g. Origen *HomLev.* 1.1, cf. *Princ.* 4.2.8. The initiating character of Augustine's early dialogues can be connected with this idea.

they encounter counterfeit and hypocritical bearers, let them put on 'the apron,' let them use 'the thigh covering' (cf. Ex. 28:42) let not the seed of the word of the Lord perish because the Lord commands and says the same things. 'Do not give what is holy to the dogs or cast your pearls before swine lest they trample them under foot and turning they break you to pieces' (Mt. 7:6).¹¹

Origen does not explicitly state that the possibility of concealing truth is the result of the original sin. This inference is self-evident in the broader context since Origen started his exegesis on the pontifical and sacerdotal clothes with the interpretation of the garments of skin.¹² The sacerdotal apron (*campestre*) and thigh covering (*femoralia*), by which truth can be veiled, correspond to the apron and the skin garment of the first man.

The second remarkable feature of Augustine's interpretation of Eden appears in his understanding of the Hebrew names and words. Even if he had read Ambrose's *De paradiso*, which is not at all obvious,¹³ he did not follow the etymological explanations

¹¹ Barkley 1990, 127-8, *HomLev.* 6.6, 294: *Isti ergo doctores Ecclesiae in huiusmodi generationibus procreandis aliquando constrictis femoralibus utuntur et abstinent a generando, cum tales invenerint auditores, in quibus sciant se fructum habere non posse. Denique et in Actibus Apostolorum refertur de quibusdam quod 'non potuimus' inquit 'in Asia verbum Dei loqui' (Acts 16:6), hoc est impostia habuisse femoralia et continuisse se, ne filios generarent, quia scilicet tales erant auditores, in quibus et semen periret et non posset haberi successio. Sic ergo Ecclesiae sacerdotes, cum incapaces aures viderint aut cum simulatos inspexerint et hypocritas auditores, imponant 'campestre', utantur 'femoralibus' (cf. Ex. 28:42), non pereat semen verbi Dei, quia et Dominus eadem mandat et dicit: 'Nolite mittere sanctum canibus neque margaritas vestras ante porcos, ne forte conculcent eas pedibus et conversi dirumpant vos' (Matth. 7:6).*

¹² *HomLev.* 6.2, 276-8.

¹³ Carozzi (1998, 32) and Weber (*CSEL* 91. 1998, pp. 121; 132; 144 and *passim*) refer to some parallels between Augustine and Ambrose which do not prove, in my view, Augustine's dependence on Ambrose: 1. Ambrose *Par.* 1.3-6 and Augustine *Gen. man.* 2.9.12, 10.13: Eden means *voluptas*. 2. Ambrose *Par.* 12.54 and Augustine *Gen. man.* 2.14.20: the serpent symbolises the devil. 3. Ambrose *Par.* 2.11 and Augustine *Gen. man.* 2.14.20: How did the serpent get into Paradise? 4. Ambrose *Exp. Luc.* 7, 222 and Augustine *Gen. man.* 2.3.4: interpretation of Gen. 2.4. 5. Ambrose *Exp. Luc.* 7.223 and Augustine *Gen. man.* 1.23.35-41: the ages of the world. These are not textual parallels, and they may be due to

occurring in the work. For instance, Augustine's translation of the term 'Eden' is closer to Philo and Origen's Greek version than to Ambrose's Latin.¹⁴ For Augustine Eden means *delights, or pleasure, or a feast (deliciae, vel voluptas, vel epulum)* which are translations of both *τροφή* and *ἡδύ*.¹⁵

Moreover, it seems to be Philo and not Ambrose whom Augustine follows when interpreting the rivers of paradise as the four spiritual virtues (Phison - Prudence; Gihon - Fortitude; Tigris - Temperance; Euphrates - Justice).¹⁶ Interestingly, Ambrose

common sources, especially in the case of Ambrose's *Exp. Luc.* which was published 389-390, see Pasini 1996, 186 and Zelzer 1998, 87-88. The interpretations of Gen. 3:7 and 3:8 bear closer resemblance:

Augustin *Gen. man.* 2.15.23, 144: *Cum enim quisque ceciderit ab illa intima et secretissima luce veritatis, nihil est unde velit placere superbia nisi fraudulentis simulationibus.* ... *'et tunc viderunt quod nudi essent,' sed oculis perversis, quibus illa simplicitas, quae nuditatis nomine significata est, erubescenda videbatur.*

Ambrose *Par.* 13.63, 322: *Nudi erant propter morum simplicitatem et quod amictum fraudis natura nesciret; nunc autem multis simulationum involucris mens humana velatur.*

Augustine *Gen. man.* 2.16.24, 145: *Itaque cum deambulare deus 'in paradiso vesperam,' id est cum ad eos iam iudicandos veniret – adhuc ante poenam eorum deambulabat in paradiso, id est quasi movebatur in eis praesentia dei, quando iam stabiles in eius praecepto non erant.*

Ambrose *Par.* 14.68, 352: *Quae est ambulatio dei, qui ubique semper est? Sed puto deambulationem quandam esse dei per divinarum seriem scripturarum, in quibus ei quaedam versatur praesentia.* In this case, again, one can take into account the common source, most probably Origen's Commentary on Genesis, see *Orat.* 23.3-4; *CCels.* 4.39; *HomJer.* 16:4.

¹⁴ Philo *Leg. alleg.* 1.45: Ἐδέμ, τοῦτο δέ ἐστι τροφή, cf. *De cherubim* 12; *De plantatione* 38. Origen *Sel.Gen.* PG 12 c. 100: Ὅστι μὲν οὖν ἐρμηνεία τοῦ Ἐδέμ κυρίως ἡδύ. Ambrose *De Paradiso* 3.12, 272: *In Edem plantata, hoc est in voluptate quadam vel exercitata terra, in qua animae sit delectatio.*

¹⁵ Augustine *Gen. man.* 2.9.12, 132: ... *in Eden, id est in deliciis...* . *Nam deliciae, vel voluptas, vel epulum hoc verbo significari dicitur, si ex hebraeo in latinum interpretetur.* Ibid. 2.10.13, 133-4: ... *ex Eden, id est ex deliciis et voluptate et epulis ... hoc est enim Eden, quod latine voluptas dicitur...* .

¹⁶ Phison in Philo *Leg. alleg.* 1.66: φρόνησις; Ambrose *Parad.* 3.15: *prudentia*; Augustine *Gen. man.* 2.10.14: *prudentia*. Gihon in Philo *op. cit.* 1.68: ἀνδρεία; Ambrose *op. cit.* 3.16: *temperantia*; Augustine *op. cit.* 2.10.14: *fortitudo*. Tigris in Philo *op. cit.* 1.69: σωφροσύνη; Ambrose *op. cit.* 3.17: *fortitudo*; Augustine *op. cit.* 2.10.14: *temperantia*. Euphrates in Philo *op. cit.*

changed the standard order and linked Tigris with Fortitude and Gihon with Temperance. This change does not appear in Augustine's work, in which, otherwise, he gives a coherent reasoning in favour of the interpretation.¹⁷

Another resemblance between Philo and Augustine is that Justice does not pertain to a particular part of the soul, just as Euphrates does not encircle any place, but it represents the harmony of the whole soul. As Philo understands, Prudence is the virtue of the rational part, Fortitude is that of the irascible, and Sobriety pertains to the concupiscent part. Justice, however, is not connected to one single part of the soul because it represents the harmony of the three other faculties and virtues.¹⁸ Augustine was familiar with this kind of interpretation:

*We are not told in which direction the fourth river flows or which land it encircles. For justice pertains to all the parts of the soul, because it is the order and balance of the soul by which these three are joined to one another in harmony.*¹⁹

The parallels thus seemingly strengthen B. Altaner's hypothesis according to which the ancient Latin version of Philo's *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim* was available for Augustine no later than 398,

1.72: δικαιοσύνη; Ambrose *op. cit.* 3.18: *iustitia*; Augustine *op. cit.* 2.10.14: *iustitia*.

¹⁷ *Gen. man.* 2.10.14, 135: *Fluvius autem ille, qui 'circuit terram Aethiopiam' multum calidam atque ferventem, significat fortitudinem calore actionis alacrem atque impigram. Tertius autem Tigris 'vadit contra Assyrios' et significat temperantiam, quae resistit libidini multum adversanti consiliis prudentiae; unde plerumque in scripturis Assyrii adversariorum loco ponuntur.*

¹⁸ *Quaest. Gen.* 1.13, 76: *non enim certa sua pars data fuit animae, sed omnino possidetur harmonia quaedam trium animae partium, et totidem virtutum.* This work of Philo survived in Armenian translation that was translated by J. B. Aucher into Latin.

¹⁹ Teske 1991/1, 110. *Gen. man.* 2.10.14, 135: *Quartus fluvius non est dictum contra quid vadat aut quam terram circumeat; iustitia enim ad omnes partes animae pertinet, quia ipsa ordo et aequitas animae est, qua sibi tria ista concorditer copulantur, prima prudentia, secunda fortitudo, tertia temperantia, et in ista tota copulatione atque ordinatione iustitia.* See also *ibid.* 2.13.18, 139: *Hae namque duae virtutes [sc. fortitudo and temperantia] ad inferiorem animi partem, quam prudentia rationalis regit, docentur pertinere.*

the date of *Contra Faustum*.²⁰ However, the parallels like these do not prove, I think, that Augustine used the translation of Philo's work. It is more probable that Augustine encountered these allegorical explanations of the rivers in a Latin compilation or translation of Origen's exegesis of Eden. In fact, there are further etymologies in the commentary which cannot be deduced from Philo or Ambrose, and which, at the same time, appear in Origen.

For Augustine the name 'Cherub' means *plenitudo scientiae*,²¹ whereas for Philo it means ἐπίγνωσις καὶ ἐπιστήμη πολλή.²² In Jerome's *De nominibus hebraicis*, which was written later than Augustine's commentary,²³ Cherubim is rendered as *scientia multiplicata vel quasi plures*.²⁴ This harmonises with Philo's version and differs from that of Augustine. Nevertheless, *plenitudo scientiae* or *plenitudo cognitionis* (depending on the manuscripts) occurs in Origen's first homily on Ezekiel translated by Jerome around 380.²⁵ The Greek version of the etymology appears in Didymus'

²⁰ Altaner 1967 (=1941), 181-193; Runia 1995, 5-6. The arguments for Augustine's direct use of Philo's *Quaestiones in Genesim* seem to me to be weak, because the parallels between them can always be explained by Augustine's use of an Origenian text. For instance, Altaner points out a textual parallel between Augustine and Philo concerning the exegesis of Noah's ark which in my view clearly comes via Origen's second homily on Genesis. Philo *Quaest. Gen. 2.2: Primum quidem quadrati figura ubique collocata constanter se habet, angulis constans rectis*. Augustine *C. Faustum* 12.14 (cf. *Civ. dei* 15.26): *Quod de lignis quadratis eadem arca fabricatur sicut ecclesia de sanctis construitur ...; quadratum enim quacunque verteris firmiter stat*. Origen *HomGen. 2.4, 94: Quadratum est quod nulla vacillat ex parte, sed quocumque verteris, fida et solida stabilitate consistit ... Quos ego arbitror doctores esse in Ecclesia et magistros atque aemulatores fidei*. Cf. Altaner 1967 (=1941), 189. This can suggest that Rufinus translated the homilies on Genesis as early as 397/398.

²¹ *Gen. man. 2.23.35, 158: Sicut illi volunt, qui Hebraea verba in scripturis interpretati sunt, Cherubim Latine scientiae plenitudo esse dicitur*.

²² *V. Mos. 2.97*.

²³ In the preface to the work Jerome mentions that he has already completed his *Quaestiones hebraicae (libros enim hebraicarum quaestionum nunc in manibus habeo)* which cannot be dated before 391.

²⁴ *PL 23. c. 820, cf. Teske 1991/1, 131*.

²⁵ *HomEz. 1.15, 92: Cherubin interpretatur plenitudo cognitionis [or scientiae] et quicunque scientia plenus est efficitur cherubin, quem regit Deus*. In *HomNum. 5.3* Rufinus translates Cherubin as *multitudo scientiae*.

commentary influenced by Origen: *πλήθος γνώσεως*,²⁶ which confirms that Augustine was familiar with the etymology going back to the Adamantius.

Augustine was aware of the Hebrew pun in Gen. 2:23. *This now is bone from my bones and flesh from my flesh: this one shall be called woman, because she was taken from man.* Contrary to the English, neither the Latin nor the Greek is able to successfully convey the important etymological connection between the terms 'man' (*ā*) and 'woman' (*issah*). Augustine recognises the difficulty of the rendering and he attempts to translate the pun into Latin as *vir-virago* (man - female warrior, manlike woman) or *vir-virgo* (maiden, virgin):

This derivation and interpretation of the name is not apparent in the Latin language. For we do not find any similarity between the word, "woman" (mulier) and the word "man" (vir). But in Hebrew language the expression is said to sound just as if one said: "She is called a virago because she was taken from her vir." For virago or rather virgo has some similarity with the word, vir, while mulier does not, but this is caused by the difference of languages.²⁷

The same is suggested in Jerome's *Quaestiones hebraicae in Genesim* written some years after Augustine's work. In the *quaestio* on Gen. 2:23, Jerome applauds the solution reached by Symmachus: *This one shall be called 'andris, poti apo andros éléphthé'* and he himself attempts to reproduce it in Latin: *This one shall be called 'virago,' because she was taken from 'vir.'* Another possible Greek translation of this verse is, as Jerome adds, that of Theodotion who wished to translate *issah* as 'taking up.'

For chronological reasons the possibility can be excluded that Augustine learnt this pun and its Latin translation from Jerome's work. The *Quaestiones* were composed before the first half of 393,

²⁶ Didymus *ComGen.* 113.

²⁷ Teske 1991/1, 114. *Gen. man.* 2.13.18, 139-140: 'haec vocabitur mulier, quoniam de viro suo sumpta est, ista origo nominis et interpretatio in Latina lingua non apparet. Quid enim simile habeat mulieris nomen ad viri nomen, non invenitur. Sed in Hebraea locutione dicitur sic sonare, quasi dictum sit: haec vocabitur virago, quoniam de viro suo sumpta est. Nam virago vel virgo potius habet aliquam similitudinem cum viri nomine, mulier autem non habet; sed hoc, ut dixi, linguae diversitas facit.

since the *De viris illustribus* already lists it among the completed works of Jerome.²⁸ In his preface to the translation of Origen's homilies on *Luke*, Jerome notes that he suspended work on 'the books of *Hebrew Questions* for a short time,' while translating the homilies. Even if the exact date of this translation is disputed it is undoubted that the work cannot be dated before 391.²⁹ Jerome may have begun to work on *Hebrew Questions* shortly after his settling in Bethlehem in 386, but it is unlikely that Augustine already knew the first and unpublished fruits of this activity in 389. Jerome's Epistle to Aurelius of Carthage reveals that the North African Christians had not had this work before 393, when Jerome sent a copy to the bishop of Carthage.³⁰

Origen seems to be the only Christian precursor of Augustine who mentioned this pun.³¹ In his surviving works two mentions are made of it, but one can assume that an explanation of Eden may have included reference to the Hebrew pun. If Augustine read such work by Origen, he came across this problem involved in Gen. 2:23. In addition, a section of *De genesi contra manichaeos* indicates Augustine's knowledge of the Origenian explanation of Gen. 2:22-24. On the ground of Paul's remark in Eph 5:31-32, '*for this reason a husband shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh. This mystery is a profound one, and I am saying that it refers to Christ and the Church*,' Origen expounds the allegory of Adam-Christ and Eve-Church. For the sake of the Church, his wife, Christ, the husband, left his Father and the state in which he was 'in the form of God' (Phil. 2:6). Christ left also his mother, the heavenly Jerusalem, and was joined to the fallen Church, and these two became one flesh. Because of the Church 'the Word became flesh and dwelt among us' (Jn. 1:14). Christ and the Church are no more two but one flesh, since the wife, the

²⁸ See *Vir. ill.* 135. Cf. Hayward 1995, 23. n. 37.

²⁹ According to Hayward 1995, 26, 'Jerome finished QHG sometime between the later part of 391 and the early months of 393.'

³⁰ *Ep.* 27*.2: *tibi parva misi opuscula, id est in psalmum decimum et quaestionum Hebraicarum in Genesin commentariolos quae legere te volo at quasi amicum, non quasi iudicem.*

³¹ *ComMatth.* 14.16; *Ep. ad Afr.* 12. Cf. Hayward 1995, 113.

Church is told: 'Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it (1Cor. 12:27), since the Church is his body (cf. Col. 1:18).³²

Augustine's explanation in *Gen. man.* 2.24.37 is almost the same:

The Apostle calls it a great sacrament when Scripture says, 'On account of this a man will leave father and mother, and will cling to his wife, and they will be two in one flesh.' He interprets this by adding, 'But I say this of Christ and the Church' (Eph. 5:31-32). Hence, what was fulfilled as history in Adam signifies as prophecy Christ, who left his Father, when he said, 'I went forth from my Father and came into this world' (Jn. 16:28). He left not by place, because God is not contained by place, and not by turning away in sin, as apostates leave God, but by appearing to men in a man, when 'the Words became flesh and dwelled among us' (Jn. 1:14). this does not mean a change in the nature of God, but the assumption of the nature of an inferior, that is, a human person. This is also what is meant when it said, 'He emptied himself' (Phil. 2:7), because he did not appear to men in that dignity which he had with the Father, but took into account the weakness of those who did not yet have a clean heart whereby they might see the Word in the beginning with the Father (Cf. Matth. 5:8; Jn. 1:1). What then do the words, 'he left the Father,' mean but that he left [the Father] to appear to men as he is with the Father? He likewise left his mother, that is, the old and carnal observance of the synagogue, which was a mother to him from the seed of David according to the flesh (cf. Rom. 1:3), and he clung to his wife, that is, the Church, so that they might be two in one flesh (cf. Gen. 2:24). For the Apostle says that he

³² *ComMatth.* 14.17, 325-326: καὶ ὁ κτίσας γε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τὸν κατ' εἰκόνα (ὡς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων ἄρρεν αὐτὸν ἐποίησε καὶ θήλυ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἔν τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα ἀμφοτέροις χαρισάμενος. καὶ καταλέλοιπέ γε διὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν κύριος ὁ ἀνὴρ πρὸς ὃν ἦν πατέρα ὅτε ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπῆρχε, καταλέλοιπε δὲ καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ αὐτὸς υἱὸς ὢν τῆς ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ, καὶ ἐκολλήθη τῇ ἐνταῦθα καταπεσούσῃ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ γεγόνασιν ἐνθάδε οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν. διὰ γὰρ αὐτὴν γέγονε καὶ αὐτὸς σὰρξ, ὅτε ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ οὐκέτι γέ εἰσι δύο, ἀλλὰ νῦν μία γέ ἐστι σὰρξ, ἐπεὶ τῇ γυναικὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ λέγεται τὸ ὑμεῖς δέ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους· οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ τι ἰδίᾳ σῶμα Χριστοῦ ἕτερον παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν οὐσαν σῶμα αὐτοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους· See also *HomJer.* 10.7, 410.

*is the head of the Church and the Church is his body (cf. Col. 1:18).*³³

The explanations are remarkably similar, and three of the Scriptural testimonies, Phil. 2:6, Jn. 1:14 and Col. 1:18 quoted by Origen appear also in Augustine's text. The Augustinian interpretation differs from Origen's in that Augustine identifies the mother of Christ as the synagogue and not as the heavenly Jerusalem, that is to say, Christ left the carnal observance of the synagogue. Nevertheless, even this remark may depend on Origen's interpretation who states that Christ left his former wife, the synagogue, because she committed adultery, and wanted to crucify Him.³⁴ Augustine followed, but also modified, the Origenian

³³ Teske 1991/1, 132-133. *Gen. man.* 2.24.37, 160-161: *Dicit enim apostolus sacramentum magnum esse quod dictum est: 'propter hoc relinquit homo patrem et matrem et adhaerebit uxori suae, et erunt duo in carne una' (Eph. 5:31, cf. Gen. 2:24); quod ipse interpretatur subiciendo: 'ego autem dico in Christo et in ecclesia' (Eph. 5:32). Ergo quod per historiam impletum est in Adam, per prophetiam significat Christum, qui reliquit patrem, cum dicit: 'ego a patre exivi et veni in hunc mundum' (Jn. 16:28). Non loco reliquit, quia deus loco non continetur, neque aversione peccati, sicut apostatae relinquunt deum, sed apparendo hominibus in homine, cum verbum caro factum est et habitavit in nobis. Quod ipsum non commutationem naturae dei significat, sed susceptionem inferioris personae, id est humanae. Ad hoc valet etiam quod dicitur: 'semetipsum excinavit' (Phil. 2:7), quia non in ea dignitate apparuit hominibus, in qua est apud patrem, blandiens eorum infirmitati qui cor mundum nondum habebant, unde videtur verbum in principio deus apud deum. Quid est ergo quod diximus 'reliquit patrem', nisi 'reliquit apparere hominibus, sicut est apud patrem'? Item reliquit et matrem, id est synagogae veterem atque carnalem observationem, quae illi mater erat 'ex semine David secundum carnem' (Rom. 1:3), et adhaesit uxori suae, id est ecclesiae, ut sint 'duo in carne una.' Dicit enim apostolus ipsum esse caput ecclesiae et ecclesiam corpus eius (cf. Col. 1:18). In his *Commentary on Ephesians*, Jerome explains the Christ-Church allegory of Eph. 5:31-32 as the interpretation of Gen. 2:24. This explanation probably goes back to Origen, which is clear from Origen's *ComMatth* 14.17. Importantly, from among the three Scriptural testimonies which are common to Origen and Augustine (Phil. 2:6; Jn 1.14; Col. 1.18) there is only one which also appears in Jerome (Col. 1.18). Jerome's commentary so much depends on Origen's three books on Ephesians that R. E. Heine (2000) used it to detect how Origen interpreted this Pauline letter.*

³⁴ *ComMatth.* 14.17, 325: Ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ ἀπόστολος εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν ἐκλαμβάνει καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὸ καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν

interpretation, and left out the allusion to the Fall of the pre-existent Church.³⁵

(cf. Eph. 5:31-32), λεκτέον ὅτι οὐκ ἀπέλυσεν ὁ Χριστὸς τὴν προτέραν (ἴν' οὕτως ὀνομάσω) γυναικα αὐτοῦ (τὴν προτέραν συναγωγὴν) κατ' ἄλλην αἰτίαν, τηρῶν τὸ ὅ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν, ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω, ἢ ὅτε ἐπόρνευσεν ἐκείνη ἢ γυνὴ μοιχευθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ καὶ μετ' ἐκείνου ἐπιβουλεύσασα τῷ ἀνδρὶ καὶ ἀποκτείνασα αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ λέγειν· αἶρε ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς τὸν τοιοῦτον (Act. 22:22) καὶ σταύρου σταύρου αὐτόν (Lk. 23:21).

³⁵ There may be other elements in Augustine's explanation which go back to Origen, see e.g. the interpretation of Gen. 2:21 in the light of Jn. 19:34. Origen *Exp. in Prov.* PG. 17. c. 252: Τὴν τοῦ σπουδαίου ψυχὴν φησιν ἔχουσαν Ἐκκλησίαν ξύλον γνώσεως καὶ ξύλον ζωῆς· γνώσεως μὲν ὡς νόμου, ζωῆς δὲ ὡς λόγου· αὕτη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἐκ πλευρᾶς Χριστοῦ προελθοῦσα, καὶ νύμφη τούτου εὑρεθεῖσα, ἡ σώφρων καὶ ἀνδρεία γυνὴ, ἡ τὴν πίστιν τούτου τηρήσασα, καὶ τοῦτον νυμφίον ἀπ' οὐρανῶν πάλιν προσδοκῶσα. Augustine *Gen. man.* 2.24.37, 161: *Formata est ergo ei coniunx ecclesia de latere eius, id est de fide passionis et baptismi. Nam percussum latus eius lancea sanguinem et aquam profudit* (Jn. 19:34).

9 THE FALL

Augustine's understanding of Gen. 3:21 and its obvious connection with a passage of Origen's sixth homily on Leviticus already aroused the interest of scholars since the interpretation does not occur in the authors who has been sources for Augustine. At the same time, the parallel is much more meaningful than has been considered.

Augustine

*... illa ergo mors in tunicis pelliciiis figurata est. Ipsi enim sibi fecerunt praecinctoria de foliis fici, et deus illis fecit tunicas pellicias, id est ipsi appetiverunt mentiendi libidinem relicta facie veritatis, et **deus corpora eorum in istam mortalitatem carnis mutavit**, ubi latent corda mendacia. Neque enim in illis corporibus caelestibus sic latere posse cogitationes credendum est, quemadmodum in his corporibus latent; sed sicut nonnulli motus animorum apparent in vultu et maxime in oculis, sic in illa perspicuitate ac simplicitate caelestium corporum omnes omnino animi motus latere non arbitror. Itaque illi merebuntur habitationem illam et **commutationem in angelicam formam** (cf. 1 Cor. 15:51), qui etiam in hac vita, cum possint sub tunicis pelliceis occultare mendacia, oderunt ea tamen et **cavent flagrantissimo amore veritatis et hoc solum tegunt, quod ii qui audiunt, ferre non possunt; sed nulla mentiuntur.** Veniet enim tempus ut nihil etiam contegatur: **'nihil est enim occultum quod non manifestabitur'** (cf. Matth. 10:26). Tamdiu autem in paradiso fuerunt isti, quamvis iam sub sententia damnantis dei, donec ventum esset ad **pellicias tunicas, id est ad huius vitae mortalitatem.** Quo enim maiore indicio potuit **significari mors, quam sentimus in corpore, quam***

*pellibus, quoniam mortuis pecoribus detrahi solent?*¹

Origen

*Illae ergo tunicae de pellibus erant ex animalibus sumptae. Talibus enim oportebat indui peccatorem, pelliciis, inquit tunicis, quae essent mortalitatis, quam pro peccato acceperat, et fragilitatis eius, quae ex carnis corruptione veniebat, indicium. Si vero iam lotus ab his fueris et purificatus per legem Dei, induet te Moyses indumento incorruptionis, ita ut nusquam appareat turpitudine tua (cf. Ex. 20:26) et ut absorbeatur mortale hoc a vita (cf. 2 Cor. 5:4).*²

Plotinus

Οὐδὲ δὴ φωναίς, οἶμαι, χρῆσθαι νομιστέον ἐν μὲν τῷ νοητῷ οὐσας, καὶ πάμπαν σώματα δ' ἐχούσας ἐν οὐρανῷ. Ὅσα μὲν διὰ χρείας ἢ δι' ἀμφοισθητικῆς

¹ *Gen.man.* 2.21.32, 154-155. Teske 1991/1, 127-128: ... *that death was prefigured by the garments of skin. For they made for themselves aprons from the leaves of the fig tree, but God made for them garments of skin. That is, having abandoned the face of truth, they sought the pleasure of lying, and God changed their bodies into this mortal flesh in which deceitful hearts are hidden. For we should not believe that thoughts could be hidden in those heavenly bodies, as they lie hidden in these bodies. Rather as some states of soul are apparent on the countenance, and especially in the eyes, so I think that in the clarity and simplicity of those heavenly bodies absolutely no states of the soul are hidden. Men will merit that dwelling and transformation into angelic form if even in this life, when they could hide lies under the garments of skin, they hate and avoid them out of a burning love of the truth, hiding only what their hearers cannot bear, but not telling any lies. For there will come the time that nothing may even be hidden; for nothing is hidden that will not be made manifest. They were, however, all the while in paradise, although already under the sentence of the condemning God, until it came to the garments of skin, that is, to the mortality of this life. For what could more clearly signify the death that we experience in our body than skins which we get from dead animals?*

² *HomLev* 6.2, 276-8. Barkley 1990, 120: *Therefore, those were tunics of skins taken from animals. For with such as these, it was necessary for the sinner to be dressed. It says, 'with skin tunics,' which are a symbol of the mortality which he received because of his skin and of his frailty which came from the corruption of the flesh. But if you have been already washed from these and purified through the Law of God, then Moses will dress you with a garment of incorruptibility so that 'your shame may never appear' and 'that this mortality may be absorbed by life.'*

διαλέγονται ἐνταῦθα, ἐκεῖ οὐκ ἂν εἴη ποιοῦσαι δὲ
ἐν τάξει καὶ κατὰ φύσιν ἕκαστα οὐδ' ἂν
ἐπιτάττειεν οὐδ' ἂν συμβουλευόιεν, γινώσκοιεν δ'
ἂν καὶ τὰ παρ' ἀλλήλων ἐν συνέσει. Ἐπεὶ καὶ
ἐνταῦθα πολλὰ σιωπώντων γινώσκοιμεν δι'
ὁμμάτων. ἐκεῖ δὲ καθαρὸν πᾶν τὸ σῶμα καὶ οἶον
ὀφθαλμὸς ἕκαστος καὶ οὐδὲν δὲ κρυπτὸν οὐδὲ
πεπλασμένον, ἀλλὰ πρὶν εἰπεῖν ἄλλω ἰδὼν ἐκεῖνος
ἔγνω.³

Considering the special interpretation of the garments of skin, the literary parallels between Augustine and Origen are unquestionable: *pellicius* (δερμάτινος) refers to the skin taken from dead animals (Origen: *ex animalibus sumptae* – Augustine: *mortibus pecoribus detrahi solent*). This skin garment represents, therefore, the mark of mortality (*indicium mortalitatis et fragilitatis* – Augustine: *indicium mortalitatis*), that is to say, the mortality of flesh (Origen: *caro* – Augustine: *caro*). This is the mortal flesh that man received after sin.

At the same time, Augustine surreptitiously introduced a quotation from Plotinus among the Origenian lines (see the underlined sentences in Augustine's text). He seems to have recognised the similarities between the Plotinian and Origenian understanding of the different quality of human bodies in heaven and on earth. Like Origen, who alludes to 2 Cor. 5:4, Augustine also refers to the resurrection as the return to paradise, and he cites 1 Cor. 15:51. Origen makes a distinction between the garments of skin and the 'garment of incorruptibility,' which is identical to the celestial body mentioned by Augustine.⁴ In the resurrection, souls will again don the original garments which Origen also names 'the clothes of manifestation and truth':

*Infelices illos, qui haec legentes omnem intelligentiam suam erga
sensem vestimenti corporalis effundunt; dicant nobis, quale est
vestimentum manifestationis, aut indumentum
quale est veritatis. ... Sed si verum vultis audire, sapientia
est, quae huiusmodi conficit indumenta. Illa
occultorum manifestationem, illa textit rerum*

³ *Enn.* 4.3 (27) 18, 13-22. Armstrong 1984. Cf. O'Connell 1968, 163-4. A still closer parallel of this quotation is found in Augustine's *Div. quaest.* 83, 47.

⁴ According to Origen, the soul will be clothed with the "garment of incorruptibility" through the resurrection, *CCels.* 5.19; 7.32.

*omnium veritatem. ... Tum deinde non ante manifestatio quam rationale, quia non ante alios docere quam nos instructi et rationabiles esse debemus. Super haec autem additur veritas, quia veritas est summa sapientia.*⁵

Interpreting Lev. 8:8-9, Origen added the word *occultorum* (κρυπτῶν or κεκρυμμένων? cf. Rom. 2:16) to the verse and wrote: *Illa occultorum manifestationem, illa texit rerum omnium veritatem.*⁶ Through this addition, Origen's interpretation, especially in its Latin version, calls to mind a saying of Jesus which is found in the synoptic Gospels: in Matth. 10:26, Mk. 4:22, Lk. 8:17 and 12:2. If Augustine read this homily of Origen, then he must have sensed the harmony between the Origenian interpretation of Ex. 8:8 and the idea of Plotinus that in the heavenly state our thoughts are 'neither hidden nor simulated' (οὐδὲν κρυπτὸν οὐδὲ πεπλασμένον). In any circumstances, the saying of Jesus, *nihil est enim occultum quod non manifestabitur* appears at the point of the intersection of the Origenian and Plotinian texts. Plotinus' hint at the 'simulation' made a brief summary of an Origenian idea possible for Augustine. For the idea that the spirituals are allowed to conceal the truth from simple believers and pagans occurs, as it is shown, in the same homily on Leviticus.⁷ Any simulation (cf. πεπλασμένον) is made possible for us, because we have an earthly body fashioned (cf. καὶ ἔπλασεν ὁ θεός) from the earth. Importantly, the interpretation is supported by the linguistic fact that both words derive from the verb πλάσσειν. Augustine seems to have been aware of this.

⁵ *HomLev.* 6.4, 284-286. Barkley 1990, 123-4. Unfortunate are those who, reading these things, pour out all their intelligence towards the understanding of the bodily vestment. Let them tell us what is the vestment 'of communication' or what is the garment 'of truth.' ... But if you want to hear the truth, it is wisdom that makes garments like this. It is she who weaves the communication of the occult things, the truth of all things. ... After these things, however, 'truth' is added because 'truth' is the highest wisdom.

⁶ Rufinus renders Ex. 8:8 as *imposuit super logium manifestationem et veritatem*. The Seventy version is: καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ἐπὶ τὸ λογεῖον τὴν δῆλωσιν καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

⁷ See above, chapter II. 8.

In spite of the close parallel, it is not necessary to assume that it was Origen's sixth homily on Leviticus that Augustine used.⁸ Origen probably explained the same idea and with similar words in his *Commentary on Genesis* as well. It may be too speculative to attribute the orchestration of these texts to Augustine; the quotation of Matth. 10:26 may have appeared in his model.

There are three further indications of the influence of Origen's interpretation of the Fall upon Augustine: the use of the scheme 'suggestion, delight, consent'; the description of the soul's negligence, and the idea that diversity of creatures comes from the Fall of rational souls.

First, interpreting the Fall of the protoplasts, Augustine employs a triple formula *suggestio-delectatio-consensio* in *De genesi contra manichaeos* 2.14.20-21. The serpent, identified with the devil, symbolises suggestion, Eve represents delight or desire (*cupiditas*) and Adam consent. Eugene TeSelle examined the possible sources of the formula and came to the conclusion that Augustine either individually elaborated this special form of the Stoic theory of emotions or adapted it from an exegetical tradition.⁹ The text in question is as follows:

Still be [the serpent] deceives by means of the woman. Nor can our reason be brought to the consent that is sin, except when delight is aroused in that part of the soul which ought to obey reason as its ruling husband. Even now nothing else happens in each of us when one falls into sin than occurred then in those three: the serpent, the woman and the man. For first the suggestion is made, whether by thought or by the senses of the body, by seeing or touching or hearing or tasting or smelling. When this suggestion has been made, if our desire is not aroused toward sinning, the cunning of the serpent will be excluded. If, however, it is aroused, it will be as though the woman were already persuaded. At times reason checks and suppresses in a virile way even desire that has been aroused. When this happens, we do not fall into sin, but we are crowned for our modest struggle. But if reason consents and decides that what desire has stirred up should be carried out, man is expelled from the whole happy life as if from paradise. For the sin already imputed to

⁸ Cf. DuRoy 1966, 477.

⁹ TeSelle 1990.

*him, even if the deed is not carried out, since conscience is held guilty by reason of the consent.*¹⁰

A similar speculation appears in Ambrose's *De paradiso*. Following Philo, Ambrose identifies the serpent as delight (*delectatio* – ἡδονή),¹¹ Eve as sensation (*sensus* – αἴσθησις) and Adam as mind (*mens* – νοῦς).¹² The origin of sin is thus regarded as delight, which has an impact on sensation. Sensation brings forward the passion (*passio*) of delight to the mind, because 'delight usually captures sensation and sensation the mind.'¹³

The contrast between the theory of Augustine and the one of Ambrose and Philo is accurately underlined by TeSelle. The movement described by Philo and Ambrose is just the opposite to that which Augustine speaks of. They move "outward, from the center of the self to that which is not only more contingent but is, at least in principle, avoidable; Augustine, by contrast, moves inward, from the circumstances to which human willing is intrinsically receptive to the definitive act of consent to those preconditions."¹⁴

TeSelle suggests taking into account Origen as the possible source of Augustine, because the theory, in a clearly Origenian context, emerges in the contemporary *De sermone domini in monte*. In chapter 1.12.35, Augustine defines suggestion, delight and consent as three degrees of sin, and derives the theory of the three spiritual deaths.¹⁵ He quotes the same Scriptural verses as those which Origen quoted in *Contra Celsum* 2.48.¹⁶

¹⁰ Teske 1991/1, 117, *Gen. man.* 2.14.21, 142-143.

¹¹ Ambrose *Par.* 15.73; Philo *Leg. alleg.* 2.18; *Quaest. Gen.* 1.47; *Opif.* 157.

¹² Ambrose *Par.* 2.11. and passim; *Abr.* 2.1.1-2; Philo *Leg. alleg.* 1.29; *Quaest. Gen.* 1.37; 1.45-48.

¹³ Ambrose *Par.* 15. 73, 331: *serpentis typum accepit delectatio corporalis. Mulier symbolum sensus est nostri, vir mentis. Delectatio itaque sensum movet, sensus menti transfundit quam acceperit passionem. Delectatio igitur prima est origo peccati, ideoque non mireris cur ante serpens damnetur iudicio dei, secundo mulier, tertio vir. ... Delectatio enim sensum, sensus autem mentem captivam facere consuevit.* Cf. Philo *Quaest. Gen.* 1.47.

¹⁴ TeSelle 1990, 342-43.

¹⁵ Augustine *Serm. monte* 1.12.35, 38-39: *Sicut ergo tribus gradibus ad peccatum pervenitur: suggestione delectatione consensione, ita ipsius peccati tres sunt*

This contribution can be established through a brief comparison of Augustine's terminology influenced, indeed, by the Stoics, and the one that Origen employs in *De principiis* 3.1. Origen defends the freedom of will. He declares that although a suggestion coming from outside (τὸ ἐξωθεν) is independent of our will, yet it cannot be so strong that it could change our intention without the consent of the ruling part of the soul (συγκατάθεσις ... τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ). A remarkable example is proposed to illustrate the thesis: the appearance of a woman in itself is not enough to divert the intention of a man who took a vow of chastity when he does not consent to the *itching and sweetness of delight* (τῷ γαργαλισμῷ καὶ λείῳ τῆς ἡδονῆς).¹⁷ Reason, like a judge (κριτής ... ἐξεταστής), decides how to react to the suggestion aiming to influence the natural emotions (πάθη) and inclination (κίνημα) of the soul, since it is the reason in us (ἐν ἡμῖν λόγος) alone which can direct the appetites (ὀρμαί) of the soul towards good or bad.

Augustine discloses this theory with regard to the temptation, and his Latin terminology strictly corresponds to the Greek terms

*differentiae: in corde in facto in consuetudine, tamquam tres mortes: una quasi in domo (cf. Mk. 5:35-43), id est cum in corde consentitur libidini, altera iam prolata quasi extra portam (cf. Lk. 7:11-17), cum in factum procedit adsensio, tertia, cum ui consuetudinis malae tamquam mole terrena premitur animus, quasi in sepulchro iam putens (Jn. 11:17-44). Quae tria genera mortuorum dominum resuscitasse quisquis euangelium legit agnoscit. et fortasse considerat, quas differentias habeat etiam ipsa uox resuscitantis, cum alibi dicit: puella surge! (Mk. 5:41), alibi: iuuenis, tibi dico, surge! (Lk. 7:14), alibi: infremuit spiritu et fleuit et rursus fremuit, et post deinde uoce magna clamauit: lazare, ueni foras! (Jn. 11:43) See also, *Serm.* 98. 5-6 and 128.14. TeSelle 1990, 356 n. 9.*

¹⁶ Chadwick 1980, 102: *But since it [sc. that Jesus did raise the dead] is not a fiction, those of whom this is recorded may easily be enumerated. There was the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue (of whom for some unknown reason he said 'she is not dead but is asleep' (Lk. 8:52), saying something about her which did not apply to all who died, and the only son of the widow, on whom he had compassion and raised him up, and made the bearers of the corpse stand still (cf. Lk. 7:12-15); thirdly, there was Lazarus, who was four days in the tomb (cf. Jn. 11:39).*

¹⁷ The term γαργαλισμός may echo both Epicurus' terminology and Plato's allegory in which the wings of the soul which glanced the bodily beauty, begin to grow, whereby soul feels itching (γαργαλίζεται – *Phaedrus* 251C).

employed by Origen. The moral interpretation of the story of Adam and Eve is based on the claim that even now nothing else happens in each of us than happened to the protoplasts. The source of every fall is suggestion or persuasion coming from outside (*suggestio, suasio*), which enters into the lower part of the soul by thought or by senses. Suggestion arouses delight (*delectatio* – cf. ἡδονή), for it aims at the lower part of the soul in which there are affections (*affectiones* – cf. πάθη) and inclinations or movements (*motus, Gen. man. 1.20.31* – cf. κίνημα). It is the reason's duty to govern the instinctive appetite of the soul (*appetitus animae, Gen. man. 2.11.15* – cf. ὁρμή),¹⁸ because reason judges (*judicat, Gen. man. 2.11.16* – cf. κριτής) the affections of the lower part of the soul. As reason consents (*consensio* – cf. συγκατάθεσις) to delight aroused by the suggestion, man immediately falls into sin. The historical interpretation differs from the moral in that Augustine excludes the possibility that the suggestion entered into the first man's soul by the senses. The devil approached Adam and Eve not spatially but by thoughts (*Gen. man. 2.14.21*). 'They were persuaded to sin through pride,' because they wanted to be their own power, as if God 'jealously (*invidens*) begrudged them an autonomy' (*Gen. man. 2.15.22*).

Didymus the Blind combines the two traditions, the interpretations of Origen and Philo. In his commentary on Genesis, he plainly follows Origen in understanding male and female as mind (νοῦς) and soul (ψυχή),¹⁹ but he also states that Eve can represent sensation.²⁰ Like Augustine, Didymus interprets the story as meaning that the serpent suggests (ὑποβαλόντος τοῦ διαβόλου) that God is jealous (φθονερός), because He does not allow Adam and Eve to be gods by knowing good and evil.²¹ That which makes Eve taste the fruit is a lie for Gen. 3:6 says that 'the woman saw that the tree was good for food,' though such thing cannot be perceived by seeing. The lying, however, aroused pleasure and

¹⁸ For the *appetitus*, see *Gen. litt.* 12.35.68.

¹⁹ Didymus *ComGen.* 62-63.

²⁰ Didymus *ComGen.* 83. It should be noticed that Origen discerns between "male and female" made in the image of God (Gen. 1:27) and "man and woman," (Gen. 2:23-24), see *ComMatth.* 14.16. This means that Origen may have identified Eve as sensation.

²¹ Didymus *ComGen.* 81.

delight (τέρψις ἡδονή) in the woman who ‘took of its fruit’ through consent (δια συγκαταθέσεως) and completed the action (πρᾶξις) when she ‘also gave to her husband.’²² Didymus, thus, insisted upon the scheme of suggestion, delight, and consent, which may well have been elaborated by Origen and which Augustine also adopted in spite of the fact that Ambrose preferred a different theory.²³

Another indication of Origen’s influence on Augustine’s theory appears in the description of the soul’s negligence as the cause of the Fall. According to Augustine, paradise is identical to the peaceful and happy life which depends on the inner harmony and integrity of the soul. When the movements or inclinations (*motus*) of the soul are in accord with the reason and the divine Truth governing the reason, the soul’s movements

*are called joys and holy, chaste and fair loves. But if they are not in accord [with reason] and are managed with negligence (neglegenter reguntur), they tear the mind apart and dissipate it, making life most miserable. Then they are called perturbations and lusts and evil desires.*²⁴

In *Princ.* 1.5.5, Origen argues that

*it lies with us and with our own movements (in nostris motibus) whether we are to be blessed and holy, or whether through sloth and negligence (per desidiā et neglegentiā) we are to turn away from blessedness into wickedness and loss; the final result of which is, that when too much progress, if I may use the word, has been made in wickedness, a man may descend to such a state (if any shall come to so great a pitch of negligence) as to be changed into what is called an opposing power.*²⁵

²² Didymus *ComGen.* 82-83.

²³ For Origen, see also *ComEph.* frag. 20.

²⁴ Teske 1991/1, 78. *Gen. man.* 1.20.31, 99: *et haec est hominis vita beata atque tranquilla, cum omnes motus eius rationi veritatisque consentiunt, et vocantur gaudia et amores sancti et casti et boni. Si autem non consentiunt, dum neglegenter reguntur, conscindunt et dissipant animum et faciunt vitam miserrimam, et vocantur perturbationes et libidines et concupiscentiae malae.*

²⁵ Butterworth 1966, 51 with slight modification. *Princ.* 1.5.5, 192-94: *Et per hoc consequens est in nobis esse atque in nostris motibus, ut vel beati et sancti simus, vel per desidiā et neglegentiā ex beatitudine in malitiam perditionemque vergamus in tantum, ut nimius profectus (ut ita dixerim) malitiae, si qui eo usque sui*

Just like Origen, Augustine is convinced that negligence and the disordered movements of the rational souls resulted in their Fall, although this concept of negligence does not appear in the Scriptures.²⁶ Nevertheless, it is probable that Augustine relied on an exegetical work when he described the original mid-rank position of the soul (*medietas animae*) and negligence through which the soul leaves this position:

*The tree of life planted in the middle of paradise signifies the wisdom by which the soul should understand that it is ordered in a certain middle range of things. Thus, though it has all corporeal nature subject to itself, it still understands that the nature of God is above it and that it should not turn either to the right by claiming for itself what it is not, or to the left by condemning through negligence (per negligentiam contemnendo) what it is. This is the tree of life planted in the middle of paradise. But the tree of the knowledge of good and evil likewise signifies the mid-rank position of the soul and its ordered integrity.*²⁷

neglexerit, usque in eum deveniat statum, ut ea quae dicitur contraria virtus efficiatur. See also Princ. 2.9.2, 354-56: Verum quoniam rationabiles istae naturae, quas in initio factas supra diximus, factae sunt cum ante non essent, hoc ipso, quia non erant et esse coeperunt, necessario convertibiles et mutabiles substituerunt, quoniam quaecumque illa inerat substantiae earum virtus, non naturaliter inerat sed beneficio conditoris effecta. Quod sunt ergo, non est proprium nec sempiternum, sed a deo datum. Non enim semper fuit, et omne quod datum est, etiam auferri et recedere potest. Recedendi autem causa in eo erit, si non recte et probabiliter dirigatur motus animarum. Voluntarios enim et liberos motus a se conditis mentibus creator induxit, quo scilicet bonum in eis proprium fieret, cum id voluntate propria servaretur; sed desidia et laboris taedium in servando bono et aversio ac negligentia meliorum initium dedit recedendi a bono. Recedere autem a bono non aliud est quam effici in malo. Certum namque est malum esse bono carere. Ex quo accidit, ut in quanta mensura quis devolueretur a bono, in tantam mensuram malitiae deveniret. In quo utique pro motibus suis unaquaeque mens vel amplius vel parcius bonum negligens in contrarium boni, quod sine dubio malum est, traheretur. Cf. Princ. 1.3.8; 2.9.6; CCels. 6.45; Dial. 9; Jerome Ep. 124.3.

²⁶ Kuyama 1997.

²⁷ Teske 1991/1, 108. *Gen. man.* 2.9.12, 132-133: *Lignum autem vitae plantatum in medio paradisi sapientiam illam significat, qua oportet intellegat anima in medio quodam rerum se esse ordinatam, ut, quamvis subiectam sibi habeat omnem naturam corpoream, supra se tamen esse intellegat naturam dei et neque in dexteram*

In contrast to O'Connell, who argued for Plotinus' influence (*Enn.* 4.8.7; 3.2.9), DuRoy already made it probable that Augustine drew the concept of *medietas animae* from an exegetical tradition.²⁸ This can be confirmed by the fact that Augustine's text contains an allusion to and interpretation of Deuteronomy 28:13-4:

*And you shall tend upward only and not downward; if you obey the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you this day, being careful to do them, and if you do not turn aside from any of the words which I command you this day, to the right or to the left, to go after other gods to serve them.*²⁹

Finally, it is intimately tied in with this theory that the diversity and variety of creation is due to the diversity of movements of the fallen minds. Origen often explains that rational creatures departed from goodness and the original unity in proportion to the movements of their mind and will, and hence, angels, humans, demons, the various angelic orders and the different classes of demons came into being.³⁰ The cause of diversity is thus the free

declinet sibi arrogando, quod non est, neque ad sinistram per negligentiam contemnendo, quod est; et hoc est lignum vitae plantatum in medio paradisi. Ligno autem scientiae boni et mali ipsa item medietas animae et ordinata integritas significatur. Paradise and its trees are planted in our heart, soul, or mind: *HomLev.* 16.4; *HomJer.* 1.16; *HomJesu.* 13.4. Cf. Ambrose *Par.* 11.51. The tree of life, which surpasses every tree in paradise, is identical to Wisdom: *HomLev.* 16.4, where Prov. 3:18 is quoted. Cf. Ambrose *Par.* 1.6.

²⁸ See Philo *Leg. alleg.* 1.60-62; *Plant.* 44-45 which influenced Ambrose *Par.* 2.7, cf. DuRoy 1966, 476-8.

²⁹ In *HomNum.* 3.2.4, 82, Origen connects Deut. 28:13-4 and Lev. 3:12: *Levitae sunt enim qui non cognoverunt dextram et sinistram suam, sed sequentes Moysen, id est sequentes legem Dei, non pepercerunt patri nec matri. Et tu ergo si veniente tentatione, si veniente ira peccati 'non inclineris ad dexteram neque ad sinistram' nec praevariceris legem Dei, sed stes medius fixus et stabilis et non inclineris neque 'curves genua tua' peccato nec pecudis caput, id est stultitiae sequaris imaginem, 'assumeris de medio filiorum Israel,' et in primitivorum numero collocaberis (cf. Num. 3:12).*

³⁰ *Princ.* 1.6.2, 198: *Et quoniam ... casus iste vel lapsus, quo de statu suo unusquisque declinat, quam plurimam in se habet diversitatem pro mentis ac propositi motibus, quod alius levius, alius vero gravius ad inferiora declinat: in hoc iam iustum iudicium dei providentiae est, ut unicuique secundum diversitatem motuum pro merito sui decessus et commotionis accurrat.* *Princ.* 2.1.1, 236: *quam aliam ... causam*

choice of the rational creatures. God however, arranged them and 'gathered the diversities of minds into the harmony of a single world,' and 'placed everyone in a position proportionate to his merit.'³¹

In a work contemporaneous with *De genesi contra manichaeos*, Augustine formulates this same idea in a strikingly similar way:

But the goodness of God does not permit a thing to be brought to this point. It disposes all things that fall away so that they occupy the place most suited to them until, by an ordered movement, they return to that from which they fell away. And even the rational souls that fall away from Him, although they possess that immense power of free choice, are placed in the lower ranks of creatures where such souls ought to be. And thus, by the divine judgement, they are made to suffer since they are ranked in accordance with their merits. ... For it has been said that, owing to the Divine Providence, nothing is permitted to reach a state of non-being.³²

Diversity and multiplicity of the rational souls are consequences of the Fall, since the souls abandoned the original unity and obtained their proper places in the hierarchy of beings according to their merits. Their primordial unity with each other and with God was

putabimus tantae huius mundi diversitatis, nisi diversitatem ac varietatem motuum atque prolapsuum eorum, qui ab illa initii unitate atque concordia, in qua a deo primitus procreati sunt, deciderunt et ab illo bonitatis statu commoti atque distracti, diversis debinc animorum motibus ac desideriis agitati, unum illud et indiscretum naturae suae bonum pro intentionis suae diversitate in varias deduxerunt mentium qualitates?

³¹ Butterworth 1966, 134. *Princ.* 2.9.6, 364: *Et haec extitit, sicut et antea iam diximus, inter rationabiles creaturas causa diversitatis, non ex conditoris voluntate vel iudicio originem trahens sed propriae libertatis arbitrio. Deus vero, cui iam creaturam suam pro merito dispensare iustum videbatur, diversitates mentium in unius mundi consonantiam traxit.*

³² Gallagher 1966, 71-2. *Moribus* 2.7.9, 95: *Sed dei bonitas eo [sc. ut non sit] rem perducere non sinit et omnia deficientia sic ordinat, ut ibi sint ubi congruentissime possint esse, donec ordinatibus motibus ad id recurrant unde defecerunt. Itaque etiam animas rationales, in quibus est potentissimum liberum arbitrium, deficientes a se in inferioribus creaturae gradibus ordinat, ubi tales esse decet. Fiunt ergo miserae divino iudicio, dum convenienter pro meritis ordinantur. ... Dictum est enim: nihil per divinam providentiam, ad id ut non sit pervenire permittitur. Cf. Chadwick 1985, 228-229.*

dissolved and the rational nature was multiplied. This doctrine is very characteristic of the young Augustine. For instance, this lies beyond the statement in *Contra Academicos* that in the fallen state, human ‘souls are made blind by the manifold darkness of error’ (*animas multiformibus erroris tenebris caecatas*)³³ where the expression ‘manifold darkness’ corresponds, as I. Perczel has pointed out, to the ‘manifold fall’ mentioned among the Origenist anathemas: *Christ had mercy on the manifold fall of those who belonged to the same unity*.³⁴ Similarly, in *De vera religione* Augustine states that through bodily sensation man was split and through the mutable variety, his disposition was multiplied.³⁵ This is analogous to the Origenian thought that whereas the immutable nature always is one, and the righteous becomes similar to it, the fallen and wicked man is diversified by the variety of sins.³⁶

³³ *Acad.* 3.19.42, 79: *Non enim est ista huius mundi philosophia, quam sacra nostra meritissime detestantur, sed alterius intelligibilis, cui animas multiformibus erroris tenebris caecatas et altissimis a corpore sordibus oblitae numquam ista ratio subtilissima revocaret, nisi summus deus populari quadam clementia divini intellectus auctoritatem usque ad ipsum corpus humanum declinaret atque summitteret, cuius non solum praeceptis sed etiam factis excitatae animae redire in semet ipsas et resipiscere patriam etiam sine disputationum concertatione potuissent.*

³⁴ The seventh canon against the Origenists in *ACO* IV. 1, 249. Perczel 1999, 116-117.

³⁵ *Ver. rel.* 112, 29: *Temporalium enim specierum multiformitas ab unitate dei hominem lapsum per carnales sensus diverberavit et mutabili varietate multiplicavit eius affectum.* Cf. Perczel 1999, 116. See also, *Ord.* 1.2.3; *Conf.* 2.1.1; 11.29.39.

³⁶ Origen *HomReg.* 1.4, 106: *Immutabilis ergo est Deus et per hoc unus dicitur quod non mutatur. Sic ergo et imitator Dei iustus, qui ad imaginem eius factus est, unus etiam ipse, cum ad perfectum venerit, appellatur, quia et ipse, cum in virtutis summa constiterit, non mutatur, sed unus permanet semper; nam dum in malitia est unusquisque, per multa dividitur et in diversa dispergitur et, dum in multis est malitiae generibus, dici non potest unus.* Cf. *HomGen.* 2.6, 108-110.

PART III

AUGUSTINE'S EARLY PROTOLOGY AND ESCHATOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

In the fourth and fifth centuries, the label ‘origenist’ (*origenistes*, *origenastes*, *origenianus*) was used to mean the imitator of Origen’s ‘heresy,’ ‘error,’ ‘poison,’ or ‘madness.’¹ This ‘madness’ represented an amalgam of doctrines, some of which definitely went back to Origen, but some may have derived from exaggeration or misunderstanding of Origenian teachings.² The heretical doctrines attributed to the Adamantius and his followers were summarised by Jerome and his contemporaries as the following items: 1. The Son is subordinated to the Father, and the Holy Spirit to the Son; both are creatures.³ 2. Before the creation of man, souls lived in the heavens among the rational creatures.⁴ 3. The waters above the heaven signify celestial, the lower waters demoniac powers (cf. Gen. 1:6-7).⁵ 4. Souls received bodies of different quality according to their previous merits or faults.⁶ 5. Paradise is fully allegorised at the expense of the historical truth.⁷ 6. Paradise was a spiritual state in which man did not have bodily members.⁸ 7. When man was expelled from paradise, he lost the image and likeness in which

¹ Jerome *Adv. Ruf.* 1.11; 1.12; 1.18; 1.31; 3.17; *Ep.* 84.3 and 133.3. Augustine *Haer.* 43; *Ad Orosium*; *Gest. Pel.* 3.10. See also the anonymously published *Praedestinatus* 1.43.

² For the problem of Origenism, see e.g. Guillaumont 1962; Bienert 1978, 6-25; Clark 1992, 85-158; Daley, 1995.

³ Jerome *Ep.* 124.2; *C. Ioan.* 7; *Adv. Ruf.* 2.12. Cf. Augustine *Haer.* 43; *Praedestinatus* 1.43. For the following catalogue, see Clark 1992, 11-12.

⁴ Jerome *Ep.* 124.3. *C. Ioan.* 7.

⁵ Jerome *C. Ioan.* 7.

⁶ Jerome *Adv. Ruf.* 2.10. and 12; Augustine *Ep.* 202A. 4; *Civ. dei* 11.23.

⁷ Jerome *C. Ioan.* 7; Augustine *Haer.* 43; *Praedestinatus* 1.43.

⁸ Jerome *C. Ioan.* 7.

God made him.⁹ 8. The garments of skin in Gen. 3:21 symbolise the human bodies.¹⁰ 9. Our flesh and the bodily substance will not rise up.¹¹ 10. Angels, demons, humans can be transformed into one another depending upon merits or wickedness.¹² 11. Innumerable worlds have existed in the past and will exist in the future.¹³ 12. Christ had often suffered and will also suffer for demons.¹⁴ 13. In the last days the devil and demons will be purified and saved, and they will reign together with saints.¹⁵

All these ideas outline the fundamental structure of a daringly optimistic, or, just the reverse, a quite despairing theology. According to this, the initial and final state of universe are identical. Everything that departed from God will return to Him, the ultimate source and goal of existents. However, rational creatures are damned to go an inconceivably long way until gaining rest from all their vicissitudes. At the beginning, they by no means used bodies, enjoying a purely spiritual happiness; however, neglecting the goodness of God, they gradually departed from it and donned coarser and coarser bodies. In the course of this descent, the three classes of angels, demons and humans were shaped. Before the life in paradise, man had existed as soul, and in paradise he was still spiritual man, who needed no bodily members. After sin, man received the mortal flesh which will be taken off in the future and will not rise up. Since the souls' place in the hierarchy of existents depends on their merits or faults, that is, free choice, then just as humans can be transformed either into angels or demons, so demons also can be transformed into humans and then, angels. This permanent re-arrangement of rational beings results in the succession of different worlds. There have already existed worlds in which Christ appeared and suffered for humans and in a future world He comes to redeem demons as well. When the devil and his

⁹ Jerome *C. Ioan.* 7.

¹⁰ Jerome *Ep.* 124.3; *C. Ioan.* 7.

¹¹ Jerome *Ep.* 124.4; 5; 9; 10; *C. Ioan.* 7; *Adv. Ruf.* 2.12; *Praedestinatus* 1.43.

¹² Jerome *Ep.* 124.3; *Adv. Ruf.* 1.20.

¹³ Jerome *Ep.* 124.5. *Adv. Ruf.* 1.20 and 2.12; Augustine *Civ. dei* 21.17.

¹⁴ Jerome *Ep.* 124.12; *Adv. Ruf.* 1.20; Sulpicius Severus *Dial.* 1.7.1.

¹⁵ Jerome *Ep.* 61.4; 124.3; *C. Ioan.* 7; Augustine *Gest. Pel.* 3.10; *Civ. dei* 21.17; *Haer.* 43; *C. Inl.* 6, 1518; *Retr.* 1.7.6.

angels at last convert to Christ, the initial spiritual union of every rational creature will be restored.

This is thus the outline of the theological 'system' that, following the anti-Origenist authors of the fourth and fifth century, I will refer to as 'Origenism.' This use of the term is strongly limited even in the light of the items listed above, since it does not comprise the theory about subordination within the Trinity. Apart from subordinationism, the scheme is intimately connected to the interpretation of the first three chapters of Genesis. This is the reason why Augustine's indebtedness to Origen's interpretation of Genesis deserves particular attention. In fact, Augustine adopted the most determining elements of Origen's teaching about the initial and final state of the creatures, and therefore, his early protology and eschatology may be termed 'Origenist.'

1 THE INITIAL STATE OF MAN

It is a disputed question how Origen connected his interpretations of Gen. 1:26, 2:7, and 3:21.¹ It is not quite clear whether he believed that the creation of the inner man (Gen.1:26) and the formation of the body (Gen. 2:7) happened simultaneously or not. If it happened in such a way, then it would be logical that the book of Genesis reports no more than one Fall, symbolised by the putting on of the garments of skin (Gen. 3:21). However, if the man of Gen. 2:7 were identical to the man of Gen. 3:21, that is to say, if both verses refer to one and the same Fall, then Gen. 1:26 should be taken to mean the creation of the incorporeal and so-called pre-existent soul or mind, which for some reason had departed from God and fell into a mortal body. This possibility implies that the Fall of Adam and Eve in an analogous way represents the universal Fall of the rational creatures. The third possibility is that Gen. 2:7 and 3:21 may signify two chronologically distinct falls. In this case Gen. 2:7 would refer to the universal Fall of the rational creatures, but from the angle of man, inasmuch as it is man alone in whom the pre-existent mind is connected to an earthly body. According to this version, Gen. 3:21 would signify the Fall of man.

Augustine's early interpretation of these three verses of Genesis, that is, his concept of man and theory about the origin of the soul, also raises difficulties. According to O'Connell and his disciples, Augustine believed that the soul "is fallen and yet not fully fallen, that memory and illumination are identical, that souls are diversely fallen and differ in their way of return."² O'Connell grounds his conclusions upon detailed analyses of Augustine's early

¹ Bammel 1989, 68-69.

² I borrowed this concise summary of O'Connell's position from Penaskovic 1986, 135.

works, above all, *De genesi contra manichaeos*.³ The other thesis he insistently formulates in his writings is closely linked to the fallen soul theory, namely, that Augustine believed in the souls' pre-existence. In the first commentary "the preexistence of the soul must have been so obviously an implicit to the moderately cultivated reader of his time that Augustine does not feel the slightest need to 'unequivocally assert' it."⁴

These conclusions have been criticised by many specialists of Augustine.⁵ However, it is common to all opponents, except Roland J. Teske, whose standpoint is not so far from O'Connell's, that they do not pay particular attention to *De genesi contra manichaeos*, the work which O'Connell regarded as the most relevant to the issue.⁶ I shall continue to focus on this commentary.

The key passage of the work, which seems to me to be the source of permanent misunderstandings, includes one thesis, two hypotheses, and three sub-hypotheses concerning the initial state of man or the soul. All possibilities derive from an exegetical puzzle raised by Gen. 2:7.

Scripture says, 'And he breathed into him the breath of life, and man became a living soul.' If up to this point there was only the body, we should understand that the soul was at this point joined to the body. Perhaps the soul had been already made, but was still as if in the mouth of God, that is, in his truth and wisdom. But it did not depart from there as if separated by places, when it was breathed forth. For God is not contained by place, but is present everywhere. Or perhaps the soul was made when God breathed the breath of life into the mud he had formed so that the breathing forth signifies God's activity by which he made the soul in man by the spirit of his power. If the man who had been made

³ O'Connell 1968, 156-183; idem 1993.

⁴ O'Connell 1993, 139; cf. idem 1968, 183.

⁵ See the reviews by Robert P. Russell in *Thought* 44 (1969), Mary T. Clark in *International Philosophical Quarterly* 11 (1971) and Ernest Fortin in *Theological Studies* 30 (1969). More detailed criticisms are formulated by O'Daly 1974; Madec 1970; Van Fleteren 1990; Teske 1991/2; TeSelle 1996. Arguments for O'Connell's thesis are found in Penaskovic 1986 and Beane 1993.

⁶ O'Connell 1980, 178; idem 1993, 139; Penaskovic 1986, 142.

was already body and soul, sensation was added to the soul⁷ by that breath, when man was made a living soul – not that this breath was turned into the living soul, but it acted upon the living soul. We should not yet think of the man who was made into a living soul as spiritual, but as still animal. For he was made spiritual, when he was established in paradise, that is, in the happy life, and received the commandment of perfection so that he might then be made perfect by the word of God. Thus, after he sinned by withdrawing from God's commandment and was dismissed from paradise, he remained in such a state that he was animal.⁸

There are two expressions in this passage which may be unusual for the modern reader who is not familiar with the vocabulary of Scripture. *Homo animalis* and *homo spiritualis* represent Pauline terms, as in 1Cor 2:13 ff.; Rom. 8:5; Gal 6:1. 'Animal man' is considered the one who lives according to the flesh and is ruled by bodily desires. Such man is not capable of the Holy Spirit and is unable to understand and receive the gifts of the Spirit. Contrary to him, spiritual man can judge all things, this man is purified and has subjected himself to God's law.

⁷ Or: 'sensation of the soul was added to him,' viz. to man. Morphologically, '*animae*' might be taken as a genitive, '*sensus*' as the possession of '*anima*' and '*ipsi*' as a dative referring to '*homo*.' I agree with Teske's version.

⁸ Teske 1991/1, 104-105. *Gen. man.* 2.8.10, 129: *Quod autem scriptum est: 'et insufflavit in eum spiritum vitae, et factus est homo in animam viventem,' si adhuc corpus solum erat, animam adiunctam corpori hoc loco intellegere debemus; sive quae iam facta erat, sed tamquam in ore dei erat, id est in eius veritate vel sapientia, unde tamen non recessit quasi locis separata, quando insufflata est – non enim deus loco continetur, sed ubique praesens est – , sive tunc anima facta est, quando in illud figmentum deus insufflavit spiritum vitae, ut illa insufflatio ipsam operationem dei significet, qua fecit animam in homine spiritu potentiae suae (cf. Sap. 11:20). Si autem homo ille, qui factus erat, iam corpus et anima erat, ipsi animae sensus est additus ista insufflatione, cum 'factus est homo in animam viventem,' non quia illa insufflatio conversa est in animam viventem, sed operata est animam viventem. Nondum tamen spiritalem hominem debemus intellegere qui factus est in animam viventem, sed adhuc animale. Tunc enim spiritualis effectus est, cum in paradiso, hoc est in beata vita, constitutus praeceptum etiam perfectionis accepit, ut verbo dei consummaretur. Itaque postquam peccavit recedens a praecepto dei et dimissus est de paradiso, in eo remansit ut animalis esset.*

The classification, moral in its nature, serves as the basis for Augustine's moral interpretation:

*And so all of us who were born from him after sin first bear the animal man until we attain the spiritual Adam, that is our Lord Jesus Christ, who committed no sin.*⁹

This remark can mean that being born from Adam, who committed sin and lost the spiritual life, at first we were not capable of the Spirit, but then, having converted to Christ, we could attain a higher, spiritual state. Augustine, importantly, places this moral interpretation into its historical framework. He conceives of 1 Cor. 15:45, *but what is spiritual is not first, but what is animal, as it has been written: the first Adam was made into a living soul; the last Adam into a lifegiving spirit*, as a reference to the fact that the first Adam, that is the first man, was made into animal man. For this reason, it would be an oversimplification to assert that Adam was merely a symbolic figure for Augustine at the time when he composed *De genesi contra manichaeos*. It is obvious from chapter 2.8.10 that he thinks of a historical Adam, a 'real' Adam, who first was made animal man but whom God established in paradise as spiritual man.

This historical perspective reveals another substantial feature of Augustine's understanding of the Pauline classification. Animal and spiritual man are distinguished not only morally, but also anthropologically. For he makes it clear in the commentary that in paradise spiritual man lived in a heavenly, transparent and fine body, which was identical in its nature to the angelic body of the resurrection.¹⁰ After man transgressed and *'was dismissed from paradise he remained in such a state that he was animal.'* The fallen man received a

⁹ Teske 1991/1, 105. *Gen. man.* 2.8.10, 129-130: *Et ideo animale[m] hominem prius agimus omnes, qui de illo post peccatum nati sumus, donec assequamur spiritalem Adam, id est dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, qui peccatum non fecit* (1 Pet. 2:22).

¹⁰ *Gen. man.* 2.21.32, 155: *Neque enim in illis corporibus caelestibus sic latere posse cogitationes credendum est, quemadmodum in his corporibus latent; sed sicut nonnulli motus animorum apparent in vultu et maxime in oculis, sic in illa perspicuitate ac simplicitate caelestium corporum omnes omnino animi motus latere non arbitror. Itque illi merebuntur habitationem illam et commutationem in angelicam formam, qui etiam in hac vita ... hoc solum tegunt, quod hi qui audiunt ferre non possunt, sed nulla mentiuntur.*

fragile, mortal, and perishable body called flesh.¹¹ Spiritual man lives in a spiritual body, and animal man in an animal body.

The first animal man, thus, lived in an animal body, hence, he was similar to us. This is the point that Augustine takes for granted. At this point, however, two types of questions occur. First: How did this man become spiritual? What does it mean: to be established in paradise? Second: Why is this man still animal? What does it mean: to be made animal? For the present, I shall attempt to answer these latter questions, and in the next chapter I shall consider the first group.

It is worth repeating Augustine's thesis according to which *we should not yet think of the man who was made into a living soul as spiritual, but as still animal*. For Teske and O'Connell this thesis means that the first man "was created as *animal*," that is to say, the so-called animal condition must have been the "initial state" of man.¹² Augustine does not affirm, however, that the animal state necessarily was the initial state of man. His thesis is that after the breathing forth the first Adam was made, or was turned into (*factus est*) animal man. In fact the Latin '*factus est*' can be derived either from '*facere*' or '*fieri*.'

According to Augustine the first part of Gen. 2:7, *God formed man from the mud of the earth*, can be understood in two ways. Firstly, it can refer to the moulding of body. Secondly, it can refer to the creation of the man who is a composite of body and soul.¹³ The

¹¹ *Gen. man.* 2.7.8, 128: *Dicimus enim tabidum et fragile et morti destinatum corpus humanum post peccatum esse coepisse*. Cf. *ibid.* 1.13.19; 2.21.31.

¹² Teske 1991/1, 105. n. 46 and 47: Augustine "claims that Adam was created as animal."... "To say that man was created as 'animal' would imply that man was created in a state such as that he had after the Fall." O'Connell 1993, 140 states "For Augustine makes it plain that man was subsequently elevated from his initial 'animal' to the 'spiritual' state of happiness."

¹³ *Gen. man.* 2.7.9, 129: *Sic enim nonnullos nostros intellegere accepi, qui dicunt, posteaquam dictum est: finxit deus hominem de limo terrae, propterea non additum: 'ad imaginem et similitudinem suam', quoniam nunc de corporis formatione dicitur; tunc autem homo interior significabatur, quando dictum est: 'fecit deus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem dei.' Sed etiam si nunc quoque hominem ex corpore et anima factum intellegamus, ut non alicuius novi operis inchoatio, sed superius breviter insinuati diligentior retractatio isto sermone explicetur, si ergo, ut dixi, hominem hoc loco ex corpore et anima factum intellegamus, non absurde ipsa*

body of this man, moreover, is described as a spiritual body ruled and vivified by the soul so that *it would not be subject to corruption if, in obedience to God's commandment, the man had not willed to sin*.¹⁴

The commentary on the second part of Gen. 2:7, *God breathed into him the breath of life, and man became a living soul*, is the explanation of three sub-possibilities of these two possibilities.

1. First hypothesis: *If up to this point there was only the body,*

1.1. Sub-hypothesis: *we should understand that the soul was at this point joined to the body.*

This sub-hypothesis is divided into two:

1.1.1. First: *Perhaps the soul had been already made, but was still as if in the mouth of God, that is, in his truth and wisdom.*

1.1.2. Second: *Or perhaps the soul was made when God breathed the breath of life into the mud... .*

2. Second hypothesis: *If the man who had been made was already body and soul.*

2.1. Third sub-hypothesis: *sensation was added to the soul by that breath, when man was made a living soul... .*

Let us consider the third sub-hypothesis (2.1) neglected by interpreters. What seems the most remarkable in Augustine's Latin is the chronological and logical distinction between two events. He uses verbs in *praeteritum perfectum* and *praesens perfectum*. The man who consisted of body and soul had already been made (*factus erat*) and after that, he was made (*factus est*) living soul, because sensation was added (*additus est*) to the soul. In this version, the breathing forth is

commixtio limi nomen accepit. Sicut enim aqua terram colligit et conglutinat et content, quando eius commixtione limus efficitur, sic anima corporis materiam vivificando in unitatem concordem conformat et non permittit labi et resolvi.

¹⁴ Gen. man. 2.7.8, 127-128: *Quid autem mirum aut difficile deo, etiamsi de limo istius terrae hominem fecit, tale tamen corpus eius efficere, quod corruptioni non subiaceret, si homo praeceptum dei custodiens peccare noluisse? Si enim speciem caeli ipsius de nihilo vel de informi materia dicimus factam, quia omnipotentem artificem credimus, quid mirum si corpus, quod de limo qualicumque factum est, potuit ab omnipotenti artifice tale fieri, ut nulla molestia, nulla indigentia cruciaret hominem ante peccatum et nulla corruptione tabesceret?* These are characteristics of the spiritual body, as it is also clear from chapter 1.19.30, 97-98: *Erat enim prius casta coniunctio masculi et feminae,... et spiritalis fetus intellegibilium et immortalium gaudiorum replens terram, id est vivificans corpus, et dominans eius, id est ita suietum habens, ut nullam ex eo adversitatem, nullam molestiam pateretur.*

considered not a creative act of God, because man, the composite of the soul and body, already existed. This man, for some reason, received sensation and turned into animal man. In the beginning he was made, according to the second hypothesis, soul and spiritual body which was not yet subjected to corruption and death. Consequently, the third sub-hypothesis, according to which this man turned into animal man, implies the theory of the Fall – but not the fallen-soul-theory! It is man and not the soul who received sensation, that is, man and not the soul was dismissed from a spiritual state of happiness. In the spiritual state, man did not yet use his sense-organs, if he had such at all, sensation was no more than mere potentiality. When God activated sensation, man turned from his spiritual state into a mortal and animal condition and he “was made into living soul.” This is exactly what happened to the spiritual man in paradise. He consisted of virile reason, an animal part, and a heavenly body. There, he did not need bodily eyes to see God.¹⁵ After the Fall, however, *it is necessary that we be admonished about the truth through these eyes and these ears* because of our corruptible body.¹⁶ Just as man received sensation after sin in paradise, so the first man had received sensation and had been made animal man before the life in paradise.

The second sub-hypothesis (1.1.2) predicates that God joined the soul to the body. In this case, ‘connection’ is taken as ‘creation.’ God had moulded the earthly body and created the soul that he immediately joined to the body. This could mean two things. First, the body had already existed when God created the soul, that is to say, the body in a sense predates the soul. Second, if this sequence of events is due to only the natural temporality of the narrative, then Augustine simply means that the body and the soul may have been simultaneously created. Since this man was made into a living soul (*factus est in animam vivam*) as still animal man, the second sub-hypothesis includes that in his initial state, man was created as soul and mortal, corruptible body. In this version, Augustine thus considers the term “*factus est*” a derivative of the verb “*facere*,” “to make.”

In the first sub-hypothesis (1.1), Augustine chronologically differentiates between the creation of the soul and its connection to

¹⁵ Cf. *Gen. man.* 2.11.16-12.16.

¹⁶ Teske 1991/1, 125. *Gen. man.* 2.20.30, 152-153.

the body. His Latin is as much consequent as in the case of the third sub-hypothesis. The soul *had been already made* (*iam facta erat*) and after that, God joined it to the body *when the soul was breathed forth* (*quando insufflata est*). Augustine's main thesis reveals that as the result of the connection, the body and the soul were made animal man. One can say about the soul that it happened to find itself in a mortal, corruptible body. At the same time, it is not evident from the passage whether the soul was sent by God or was fallen *sua sponte* in the body;¹⁷ in other words, this sub-hypothesis may include the fallen soul theory, although Augustine does not make it obvious whether the soul was fallen or sent into the body. It is clear that according to this version, the soul did not use any kind of body at all before God joined it to the animal body. This is an essential difference between the first and the third sub-hypotheses. Unlike the third sub-hypothesis, the first does not imply that the soul was originally joined to a spiritual or celestial body which later turned into an animal or earthly body. The vehicle of the soul is the incorporeal matter of which Augustine speaks in chapter 1.11.17: *The firmament of heaven separated the corporeal matter of visible things from the incorporeal matter of invisible things*.¹⁸

Consequently, as far as the initial state of man or soul is concerned, Augustine offers three possibilities in *De genesi contra manichaeos*.

1. In the beginning there existed the soul alone. It was joined to a mortal body and man thereby came into existence. (This is the first sub-hypothesis.)
2. In the beginning man was created as a composite of soul and immortal, incorruptible body. (This is the second hypothesis.)
3. In the beginning man was created as a composite of soul and mortal, corruptible body. (This is the second sub-hypothesis).

Can we regard these possibilities as being equal in their weight? Considering Augustine's emphatic statement in the contemporary *De moribus* (2.7.9) that the initial state of creatures is identical to their final state, that is, *all things return to that from which they fell away*, one must exclude the third possibility as *suppositum non concessum*. It would be nonsensical and non-Biblical (against, for example, 1 Cor.

¹⁷ Cf. *Lib. arb.* 3.200.

¹⁸ Teske 1991/1, 64.

15:53) to believe that after the resurrection man would live in a mortal and perishable body. In *De genesi contra manichaeos* Augustine unequivocally asserts that the resurrected body is not subjected to corruptibility and death.¹⁹

The question is then whether Augustine chose between the two other possibilities. Did he hold the view that the soul as a member of the spiritual creatures did not initially use a body at all? Or, did he believe that man had been created soul and immortal, spiritual body? In other words: What is man? The rational soul alone, or a composite of soul and body? This is the dilemma which frequently emerges in the early writings. In *De moribus* 1.4.6-5.7 Augustine asks: What do we say is man? The composite of soul and body, the body alone, or the soul alone?²⁰ He excludes, naturally, the possibility that man would be identical to the body, and, finally, defines man as rational soul which uses a mortal and earthly body.²¹ This is a definition for the fallen Adam and his descendants. Following this pattern, we might say that man in paradise was rational soul which used an immortal and heavenly body; however, in this way every difference between angels and humans would disappear, for according to the early Augustine, man in paradise lived an angelic life. It is a more urgent question as to whether Augustine's interpretation in *De genesi contra Manichaeos* implies that in the beginning, before the life in paradise, rational souls did not use any kind of body.

The commentary seemingly does not provide firm ground for an unequivocal answer. A sharp distinction between the incorporeal matter of the invisible things, like the soul, and the corporeal matter of the visible things, like the body, is made in chapter 1.11.17, but the distinction is ontological in its nature and does not cogently imply the theory of the initial incorporeality of the soul (incorporeality in the sense of not using body), especially because the two kinds of matter had been simultaneously created. Possibly, the spiritual creature, however much incorporeal it is, had been inseparably joined to the corporeal matter through the firmament, 'the most beautiful body.' This would mean that the

¹⁹ *Gen. man.* 2.21.32.

²⁰ Cf. *Moribus* 1.4.6-5.7.

²¹ *Moribus* 1.27.52: *Homo igitur, ut homini apparet, anima rationalis est mortali atque terreno utens corpore.*

spiritual creature originally did make use of an ethereal body, since for Augustine the firmament consists of some fine ethereal body.²²

Nevertheless, R. J. O'Connell has pointed out an important characteristic of Augustine's terminology in the commentary, which, in my view, suggests that Augustine gave preference to the hypothesis of the total incorporeality of the soul. Concerning Gen. 2:5-6, Augustine observes that

*the addition, 'before they were upon the earth,' (cf. Gen. 2:5) means: before the soul sinned. For soiled by earthly desires, it is correctly said to have come to be upon the earth or to be upon the earth. [...] After sin man began to labor on the earth and to have need of those clouds. But before sin God had made the green of the field and food, and we said that this expression signified the invisible creature. God watered it by an interior spring, speaking in its intellect, so that it did not receive words from the outside, as rain from the aforementioned clouds. Rather it was satisfied from its own spring, that is, by the truth flowing from its interior.*²³

Importantly, when Augustine uses the term 'man' (*homo*) he thinks of the man who lives in a fallen state.²⁴ It is the 'soul' that initially enjoys and contemplates God while being 'watered' by Truth, the inner fountain. This is the spiritual mode of existence which in the hypothesis of initial incorporeality is also described as the state of the soul which exists 'in the mouth of God, that is in his Truth and

²² *Gen. litt. imp.* 3, 464; 8, 479; 12, 486.

²³ Teske 1991/1, 97-99. *Gen. man.* 2.3.5-4.5, 123-124: *Deinde quod addidit: 'antequam esset super terram,' intellegitur: antequam anima peccaret. Terrenis enim cupiditatibus sordidata tamquam super terram nata vel super terram esse recte dicitur. [...] Post peccatum autem homo laborare coepit in terra et necessarias habere illas nubes; ante peccatum vero cum 'viride agri et pabulum' fecisset deus, quo nomine invisibilem creaturam significari diximus, irrigabat eam fonte interiore loquens in intellectu eius, ut non extrinsecus verba exciperet tamquam de supradictis nubibus pluviam, sed fonte suo, hoc est de intimis suis manante veritate satiaretur.*

²⁴ O'Connell 1968, 158: "Noteworthy here is the fact that the original sin is regularly imputed not to 'man' but to 'soul.' Augustine seems bent on distinguishing the ideal state 'before the soul sinned' (*antequam anima peccaret*) and post-lapsary state where the term 'man' (*homo*) appears for first time to become an entirely appropriate designation. Only after the Fall, he observes, was there 'man laboring upon the earth' (*homo laborans in terra*, 2.5)." Cf. Teske 1991/1, 97-98.

Wisdom.' The claim that after the sin of the soul 'man' appeared upon the earth is also analogous to the hypothesis that after the soul had been joined to an earthly body, animal man came into existence. The consequent terminology indicates that 'man' is a term applied for the one consisting of soul and body, whereas the 'soul' stands for the incorporeal, in every sense incorporeal, and 'interior man' made in the image of God. Therefore, in my opinion, Augustine preferred the theory of initial incorporeality.

What are the implications of this theory? If in the initial state the spiritual creature, like the soul, and the body were not linked at all, then the soul and its substrate, the incorporeal matter, existed before the body and the corporeal matter.²⁵ This composite can be pre-existent in two ways. On the one hand, since all of time is made along with the corporeal creature subsisting in corporeal matter,²⁶ pre-existence cannot mean a temporal priority, but merely the relationship between timelessness and temporality. On the other hand, since the visible world of the corporeal creatures represents the world of spatiality where the soul arrived from the non-spatial, non-extended divine Wisdom, pre-existence can also mean the relation of non-spatiality and spatiality.

Augustine's statement that the soul '*was still as if in the mouth of God, that is, in his truth and wisdom*' echoes Origen.²⁷ Origen's remarks, therefore, may assist in understanding this idea. Since Augustine and Origen place the kingdom of Christ, which they consider to be intelligible, within the divine Wisdom, therefore, both have to face the difficulty of discerning the kingdom of self-conscious existents from the intelligible realm of the Platonic

²⁵ This 'pre-existence' does not involve pre-existence of the individual souls which Augustine would explore in *Lib. arb.* 3.200 and 214 as a possibility. In *Gen. man.* 2.8.10 he is concerned with the origin of the first man. Even if for Augustine the first man was a 'fallen soul,' it does not mean that he believed our individual souls to be pre-existent and fallen souls as well. The theory of pre-existence can be combined with others, like traducianism and creationism. Cf. Rist 1996, 317-320.

²⁶ *Gen. man.* 2.3.4, 121: *Fecit enim deus omne tempus simul cum omnibus temporalibus creaturis; quae visibiles caeli et terrae nomine significantur.*

²⁷ Cf. Teske 1991/1, 104. n. 43.

ideas.²⁸ The problem also emerges in Augustine's *Ad Orosium* written in 415. Orosius reported to the celebrated bishop on some unusual Origenist doctrines and wanted him to explain them. One of the puzzling Origenist teachings is connected with Psalm 103:24, *You have made all things in wisdom*, which they interpret in a way that Augustine finds false.

*unde illud quod aiunt, in eius sapientia iam fuisse facta omnia, antequam in istas formas et modos proprios proferentur atque in suis ordinibus apparent, non sobrie dicitur. facta enim quando essent, antequam facta essent? sed in dei sapientia omnium faciendarum rerum rationes esse potuerunt, non tamen factae.*²⁹

In *De genesi contra manichaeos* 2.8.10, Augustine still stated that the soul had been already made in God's wisdom (*anima ... iam facta erat, sed tamquam in ore dei erat, id est in eius veritate vel sapientia*), and, according to *Ad Orosium* 8.9, Origenists teach that all things had been made in Wisdom (*in eius sapientia iam fuisse facta omnia*). The similarity indicates that Augustine's early interpretation may also depend on the interpretation of Psalm 103:24. Nevertheless, the 'anti-Origenist' Augustine would reject this interpretation by saying that only ideas, *rationes* of the future creatures, existed in Wisdom and not creatures themselves. The Origenist thesis implies that creatures would be co-eternal with God, therefore, Augustine asks: *When were they made before they were made?* In contrast to this position, the 'Origenist Augustine,' so to speak, considered the theory that the incorporeal soul and not its idea existed in Wisdom to be acceptable. The early Augustine's answer to his later question would have been that it makes no sense to speak about the creation as a temporal process, because all things were made in the beginning, that is, in Christ, when time did not yet exist.³⁰

²⁸ Augustine *Ord.* 1.2.32, cf. *Retr.* 1.3.2. Origen *ComJn.* 19.146-148; *Princ.* 2.3.6. See above, chapter I. 3.

²⁹ *Ad Orosium* 8.9, 172. Cf. Teske 1992, 182-183; Crouzel-Simonetti 1978, 80.

³⁰ According to Pépin (1991, 65) Orosius misunderstood the contemporary Origenists' doctrine and did not take into account a distinction that Origen had made and Augustine also followed. Both distinguished the eternal reasons in Wisdom and their substantial realisation in the creation.

Concerning Psalm 103:24, the same problem occurs in *De principiis* 1.4.3-5, where Origen goes on to explicate the difficulty that since God always is benefactor, creator and provider, He always needs creatures to benefit, create and provide for them, and therefore, creatures must always have existed. However, creatures have beginning, and they are not co-eternal with God. How to solve this tension? Origen's answer is that

*certainly if all things have been made in wisdom (cf. Ps. 103:24), then since wisdom has always existed, there have always existed in wisdom, by a pre-figuration and pre-formation, those things which afterwards have received substantial existence. This is, I believe, the thought and meaning of Solomon when he says in Ecclesiastes: 'What is it that hath been made? The same that is to be. And what is it that hath been created? The same that is destined to be created. And there is nothing fresh under the sun. If one should speak of anything and say, Behold, this is new: it already hath been, in the ages that were before us' (Eccl. 1:9 ff). If then particular things which are 'under the sun' have already existed in the ages which were before us – since 'there is nothing fresh under the sun' – then undoubtedly all genera and species have for ever existed, and possibly even individual things; but either way, the fact is made clear that God did not begin at a certain time to be Creator, when he had not been such before.*³¹

Genera and species have always existed in divine eternity, but this existence is that of the ideas and not creatures.³² However, Origen

³¹ Butterworth 1966, 42-43. *Princ.* 1.4.5, 172.: *Et si utique in sapientia omnia facta sunt (cf. Ps. 103:24), cum sapientia semper fuerit, secundum praefigurationem et praeformationem semper erant in sapientia ea, quae protinus etiam substantialiter facta sunt. Et hoc opinor Salomonem sentientem vel intellegendum dicere in Ecclesiaste: quid est quod factum est: hoc ipsum quod futurum est; et quid est quod creatum est: hoc ipsum quod creandum est. Et nihil recens sub sole. Si quis quid loquatur et dicet: ecce novum est hoc, inquam fuit id in saeculis, quae fuerunt ante nos (Eccl. 1:9 ff). Si ergo singula, quae sub sole sunt, fuerunt iam in illis saeculis, quae fuerunt ante nos, cum nihili recens sit sub sole, sine dubio omnia vel genera vel species fuerunt semper, et fortassis etiam per singula.*

³² Crouzel and Simonetti (1980, 106) take the expression 'saecula ante nos' to refer to two words, first, the word of the ideas in God which comes into being through the eternal generation of the Son, and therefore, it is also eternal; and second, the world of the pre-existent minds which does precede the visible word, since the latter was made for

adds the astonishing remark that 'possibly even individual things' (*fortassis etiam per singula*) always existed in wisdom.³³ This note should not be neglected, although it seems to contradict to what Origen argues for, because individuals cannot be identified as ideas, pre-figurations or pre-formations.³⁴ In addition, this thought is not isolated; it is also found in the Commentary of St. John:

... all things have come to be according to the thoughts of what will be, which were prefigured by God in wisdom, "For he made all things in wisdom." And we must say that after God had created living wisdom, if I may put it this way, from the models in her he entrusted to her [to present] to the things which exist and to matter [both] their conformation and forms, but I stop short of saying their essences.³⁵

Origen maintains that not only the models, forms, genera, and species exist in Wisdom, but possibly certain essences (οὐσίαι), or individuals (καθ' ἓν ἀριθμῶ), or the individual reasons (οἱ καθ' ἓνα λόγοι).³⁶ It seems that for the Alexandrian master, the realm of the

the fallen mind. In *Princ.* 3.5.3, Origen cites Eccl. 1:9-10 to establish that our world was preceded by previous worlds. Jerome understood this claim a reference to previous visible worlds, which were similar to ours. According to Crouzel and Simonetti, this is no more than one of Origen's hypotheses proposed in *Princ.* 3.1.3.

³³ Justinian quotes this line from *Princ.* Πάντα τὰ γένη καὶ τὰ εἶδη αἰεὶ ἦν. ἄλλος δέ τις ἐρεῖ καὶ τὸ ἓν ἀριθμῶ (*SC* 253, 81; *Manis* IX, 528). Périen does not take this addition into account, nor the early Augustine's Origenist remark in *Gen. man.* 2.8.10 that the soul was in God's Wisdom, which can authenticate Orosius' report.

³⁴ Crouzel and Simonetti (1978, 81) observes that these individuals represent the Stoic reasons of beings, the seeds of the individuals.

³⁵ Heine 1989, 57. *ComJn.* 1.19.114-115: Πάντα γὰρ ἐν σοφίᾳ ἐποίησε. Καὶ λεκτέον ὅτι κτίσας, ἵν' οὕτως εἴπω, ἔμψυχον σοφίαν ὁ θεός, αὐτῇ ἐπέτρεψε ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ τύπων τοῖς οὖσι καὶ τῇ ὕλῃ παρασχεῖν καὶ τὴν πλάσιν καὶ τὰ εἶδη, ἐγὼ δὲ ἐφίστημι εἰ καὶ τὰς οὐσίας.

³⁶ *ComEph.* frag. 6: οὐ μόνον γὰρ οἱ κατακερματισμοὶ τῶν οἰκονομουμένων καὶ οἱ καθ' ἓνα λόγοι τῶν διοικουμένων εἰσὶν ἐν τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγῳ καὶ τῇ Σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ ἀνακεφαλαίωσις (ὥσάν εἴποι τις) συγκεφαλαίωσις πάντων. I am indebted for this reference to István Perczel.

individual reasons is identical to the kingdom of Christ, the intelligible world or the spiritual 'heaven' whence Christ came in the sensible world in order to drive his disciples back their home.³⁷ This intelligible and incorporeal world differs from the realm of ideas which exists *in the imagination of the mind alone, or in the slippery ground of thoughts*.³⁸ The kingdom of Christ is the fatherland of self-conscious existents, minds, and not Platonic ideas, although they are contained in God's Wisdom. God made a definite number of rational beings, because

*we must not suppose, as some would, that there is no end of created beings, since where there is no end there can neither be any comprehension nor limitation. If there had been no end, then certainly created beings could neither have been controlled nor provided for by God. For by its nature whatever is infinite will also be beyond comprehension.*³⁹

Thus, in this sense, God's power has limits, since He comprehends Himself.⁴⁰ He creates and provides for a certain number of rational beings who always exist in God's wisdom as individual reasons.

³⁷ *ComJn.* 19.(22)148.

³⁸ *Princ.* 2.3.6, 266: 'Ego non sum ex hoc mundo' (Jn. 17:14). *Tamquam enim qui ex alio quodam esset mundo, ita dixit quia non sum ex hoc mundo. Cuius mundi difficilem nobis esse expositionem idcirco praediximus, ne forte aliquibus praebeatur occasio illius intellegentiae, qua putent nos imagines quasdam, quas Graeci ιδέας nominant, adfirmare: quod utique a nostris rationibus alienum est, mundum incorporeum dicere, in sola mentis fantasia vel cogitationum lubrico consistentem.*

³⁹ Butterworth 1966, 128. *Princ.* 2.9.1, 352: *Certum est enim quod praedefinito aliquo apud se numero eas fecit; non enim ut quidam volunt, finem putandum est non habere creaturas, quia ubi finis non est, nec conpraehensio ulla vel circumscriptio esse potest. Quodsi fuerit, utique nec contineri vel dispensari a deo quae facta sunt poterunt. Naturaliter nempe quidquid infinitum fuerit et inconpraehensibile erit.*

⁴⁰ Cf. *Princ.* 4.4.8, 420: 'Fecit autem omnia numero et mensura' (Sap. 11:20); *nihil enim deo vel sine fine vel sine mensura est. Virtute enim sua omnia conpraehendit, et ipse nullius creaturae sensu conpraehensus est. Illa enim natura soli sibi cognita est. Solus enim pater novit filium, et solus filius novit patrem* (cf. Jn. 10:15; 17:25), *et solus spiritus sanctus perscrutatur etiam alta dei* (cf. 1 Cor. 2:10). Justinian reproached this assertion as well, see *Mansi* IX, 525: Μηδεις προσκοπτέτω τῷ λόγῳ, εἰ μέτρα ἐπιτίθεμεν καὶ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμει. ἄπειρα γὰρ περιλαβεῖν τῇ φύσει ἀδύνατον τυγχάνει. ἅπαξ δε πεπερασμένων ὄντων, ὧν περιδράττεται αὐτὸς ὁ θεός, ἀνάγκη ὄρον

In his early writings, Augustine outlines a similar theory. He also regards the heavenly kingdom as an intelligible one existing in divine Wisdom.⁴¹ Wisdom contains not only ideas, that is genera and species, but the various reasons (*ratio*) of individuals also live there.⁴² Augustine also accepted the philosophical principle that every intellect including that of God is limited:

*Everything which understands itself comprehends itself. But what comprehends itself is limited with respect to itself. Now the intellect understands itself. Therefore it is limited in respect to itself. Nor does it wish to be without limits, although it could be, since it wishes to be known to itself, for it loves itself.*⁴³

It follows from this principle that God made a definite number of spiritual and rational creatures. They formed a unity and lived in God's Wisdom. The *anima*, of which Augustine observes in *De genesi contra manichaeos* 2.8.10 that it had been already made in God's Truth and Wisdom, belonged to this unity. It was not substantial with God, because it had its substrate, the incorporeal matter. And for this reason, the soul, even though it is incorporeal, immortal, and incorruptible and lives in the non-spatial divine Wisdom, differs from the immutable God in its nature. The soul is mutable, which means that it has the potentiality of a Fall. Augustine and Origen demarcate creature and creator according to immutability/mutability and not incorporeality/corporeality. It

εἶναι μέχρι πόσων πεπερασμένων διαρκεῖ. Cf. Crouzel-Simonetti 1980, 263.

⁴¹ *Ord.* 1.11.32.

⁴² *Ep.* 14.4, 34: *Item quaeris utrum summa illa veritas et summa sapientia, forma rerum, 'per quam facta sunt omnia,' quem 'Filium Dei unicum' sacra nostra profitentur, generaliter hominis, an etiam uniuscuiusque nostrum rationem contineat. Magna quaestio. Sed mihi videtur, quod ad hominem faciendum adinet, hominis quidem tantum, non meam vel tuam ibi esse rationem; quod autem ad orbem temporis, varias hominum rationes in illa sinceritate vivere.* *Ord.* 2.18.48, 180: *anima ... primo se ipsam inspicit et, cui iam illa eruditio persuasit aut suam aut se ipsam esse rationem, in ratione autem aut nihil esse melius et potentius numeris aut nihil aliud quam numerum esse rationem ...*. See also *Ord.* 2.19.50 and 2.15.43.

⁴³ Mosher 1982, 44. *Div. quaest.* 83, 15, 21: *Omne quod se intellegit comprehendit se; quod autem se comprehendit finitum est sibi; et intellectus intellegit se, ergo finitus est sibi. Nec infinitus esse vult, quamvis possit, quia notus sibi esse vult; amat enim se.* Cf. *Civ. Dei* 12.18-19.

seems that both consider the initial state of the rational creatures to be totally incorporeal in the sense of not using any corporeal vehicle.

2 THE FINAL STATE OF THE CREATURES

In his speech delivered at the gate of the temple of Jerusalem, the Apostle Peter used an expression which sounds in Greek as ἀποκαταστάσις; *heaven must receive Jesus until the time for restoring all (ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων) that God spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old* (Acts 3:21). The idea that at the end of the world all things will be restored was subject of various speculations. Does the term ‘restoring’ mean that the final state of the created world will be perfectly similar to the initial state? Does the term ‘all things’ imply that the devil and the fallen angels will also be restored in terms of being saved at the end of the world?

When examining these questions, Origen usually relies upon 1 Cor. 15:25-28:

For Christ must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy to be destroyed is death. For God has put all things in subjection under his feet (cf. Ps. 8:6). But when it says, All things are put in subjection under him, it is plain that he is excepted who put all things under him. When all things are subjected to him, then the Son himself will also be subjected to him who put all things under him, that God may be everything to every one.

Origen does not hesitate to claim that *the end is always like the beginning*, and as there was one beginning of the creatures, so the goodness of God, which is the central concept of the Origenian theology, will recall all creatures to one consummation.¹ Also, he thinks that ‘subjection to Christ’ indicates salvation through Christ, that is to say, the goodness of God is so irresistible that even the

¹ *Princ.* 1.6.2, 196: *Semper enim similis est finis initii; et ideo sicut unus omnium finis, ita unum omnium intellegi debet initium.* Cf. *Princ.* 2.1.1; *ComJn.* 13.37.

devil and his angels, who lost happiness but not free choice, may be converted and saved.² This restoration should comprise many ages (*saecula*; αἰών) while demons gradually advance from the sufferings to better conditions. During the ages rational creatures decline and progress, but finally, all of them reach the spiritual state of happiness.

But in the meantime, alike in these ages that are 'seen' and 'temporal' and in those that are 'not seen' and eternal', all those things are arranged in a definite order proportionate to the degree and excellence of their merits. And so it happens that some in the first, others in the second, and others even in the last times, through their endurance of greater and more severe punishments of long duration, extending, if I may say so, over many ages, are by these very stern methods of correction renewed and restored, first by the instruction of angels and afterwards by that of powers yet higher in rank, so that they advance through each grade to a higher one, until at length they reach the things that are 'invisible' and 'eternal', having traversed in turn, by some form of instruction, every single office of the heavenly powers. It appears to follow from this, in my opinion, that every rational nature can, in the process of passing from one order to another, travel through each order to all the rest, and from all to each, while undergoing the various movements of progress or the reverse in accordance with its own actions and endeavours and with the use of its power of free will.³

² *Princ.* 1.6.3; *Orat.* 27.15; Justinian in Mansi IX, 529; Jerome *Ep.* 124, 3.

³ Butterworth 1966, 57. *Princ.* 1.6.3, 202-204: *Interim tamen tam in his quae videntur et temporalibus saeculis quam in illis quae non videntur et aeterna sunt omnes isti pro ordine, pro ratione, pro modo et meritorum dignitatibus dispensantur: ut in primis alii, alii in secundis, nonnulli etiam in ultimis temporibus et per maiora ac graviora supplicia nec non et diuturna ac multis ut ita dicam, saeculis tolerata asperioribus emendationibus reparati et restituti eruditionibus primo angelicis tum deinde etiam superiorum graduum virtutibus, ut sic per singula ad superiora propecti usque ad ea quae sunt invisibilia et aeterna perveniant, singulis videlicet quibusque caelestium virtutum officii quadam eruditionum specie peragrat. Ex quo, ut opinor, hoc consequentia ipsa videtur ostendere, unamquamque rationabilem naturam posse ab uno in alterum ordinem transeuntem per singulos in omnes, et ab omnibus in singulos pervenire, dum accessus profectuum defectuumve varios pro motibus vel conatibus propriis unusquisque pro liberi arbitrii facultate perpetitur.*

This is how Origen views the possibility of the return for every fallen soul to God. There are thus three chief elements of the theory: 1. all things return to the state from which they fell away; 2. All rational creatures can pass from one order to another; 3. this process of return comprises many ages.

All these theoretical elements are found in Augustine's early writings. The first appears in *De moribus manichaeorum* 2.7.9, the passage that from another viewpoint I have examined above.⁴

*But the goodness of God does not permit a thing to be brought to this point. It disposes all things that fall away so that they occupy the place most suited to them until, by an ordered movement, they return to that from which they fell away. And even the rational souls that fall away from Him, although they possess that immense power of free choice, are placed in the lower ranks of creatures where such souls ought to be. And thus, by the divine judgement, they are made to suffer since they are ranked in accordance with their merits.*⁵

The passage is full of Origenian reminiscences.⁶ Augustine does not leave any doubt that all things will be restored to the initial state. In

⁴ See above, chapter II. 9.

⁵ Gallagher 1966, 71-2. *Moribus* 2.7.9, 95: *Sed dei bonitas eo rem perducere non sinit et omnia deficientia sic ordinat, ut ibi sint ubi congruentissime possint esse, donec ordinatibus motibus ad id recurrant unde defecerunt. Itaque etiam animas rationales, in quibus est potentissimum liberum arbitrium, deficientes a se in inferioribus creaturae gradibus ordinat, ubi tales esse decet. Fiunt ergo miserae divino iudicio, dum convenienter pro meritis ordinantur.*

⁶ *Princ.* 1.6.1, 194-196: *In unum sane finem putamus quod bonitas dei per Christum suum universam revocet creaturam, subactis ac subditis etiam inimicis.* *Princ.* 1.6.2, 198: *Et quoniam ... casus iste vel lapsus, quo de statu suo unusquisque declinat, quam plurimam in se habet diversitatem pro mentis ac propositi motibus, quod alius levius, alius vero gravius ad inferiora declinat: in hoc iam iustum iudicium dei providentiae est, ut unicuique secundum diversitatem motuum pro merito sui decessus et commotionis accurrat.* *Princ.* 2.1.1, 236: *quam aliam ... causam putabimus tantae huius mundi diversitatis, nisi diversitatem ac varietatem motuum atque prolapsuum eorum, qui ab illa initii unitate atque concordia, in qua a deo primitus procreati sunt, deciderunt et ab illo bonitatis statu commoti atque distracti, diversis dehinc animorum motibus ac desideriis agitati, unum illud et indiscretum naturae suae bonum pro intentionis suae diversitate in varias deduxerunt mentium qualitates?* *Princ.* 2.1.2, 236: *Deus vero per ineffabilem sapientiae suae artem omnia, quae quoquomodo fiunt,*

fact there is no reference to the devil and demons who may represent an exception of this general progress. On the contrary, it was the devil who first “defected (*defecit*) from the highest essence,”⁷ and all things that fall away (*omnia deficiente*) will be re-established in a state such as the prelapsarian condition was. Because of the strong Origenian reminiscence, Augustine would endeavour to re-interpret this claim in *Retractationes*.

*This must not be taken to mean that all things return to that from which they fell away, as Origen held, but only all those that do return. For those who are punished in everlasting fire do not return to God from whom they fell away. Yet all who fall away are so ordered that they are where it is most fitting that they be, those who do not return being, as befits them, in punishment.*⁸

In these lines the author wishes to convince us that the problem his text involves is that of the reader and not of his claim. The re-interpretation is not convincing for two reasons. First, because it is difficult to realise that *omnia* does not mean *omnia*; second, because in *Moribus* 2.7.9, the term ‘*congruentissime*’ refers to the arrangement

ad utile aliquid et ad communem omnium transformans ac reparans profectum, has ipsas creaturas, quae a semet ipsi in tantum animorum varietate distabant, in unum quandam revocat operis studiique consensum, ut diversis licet motibus animorum, unius tamen mundi plenitudinem perfectionemque consumment, atque ad unum perfectionis finem varietas ipsa mentium tendat. Princ. 2.9.6, 364-366: Verum quoniam rationabiles ipsae creaturae, sicut frequenter ostendimus et in loco suo nihilominus ostendimus, arbitrii liberi facultate donatae sunt, libertas unumquemque voluntatis suae vel ad profectum per imitationem dei provocavit vel ad defectum per negligentiam traxit. Et haec extitit, sicut et antea iam diximus, inter rationabiles creaturas causa diversitatis, non ex conditoris voluntate vel iudicio originem trabens sed propriae libertatis arbitrio. ... Et has causas, ut ego arbitror, mundus iste suae diversitatis accepit, dum unumquemque divina providentia pro varietate motuum suorum vel animorum propositique dispensat.

⁷ *Ver. rel.* 71, 19: *Ille autem angelus magis se ipsum quam deum diligendo subditus ei esse noluit et intumuit per superbiam et a summa essentia defecit et lapsus est.*

⁸ *Gallager 1966, 71. Retr. 1.7.6, 21: non sic accipiendum est, tamquam omnia recurrant ad id unde defecerunt, sicut Origeni visum est, sed ea omnia quae recurrunt. Non enim recurrunt ad Deum a quo defecerunt, qui sempiterno igne punientur, quamvis omnia deficiente sic ordinantur, ut ibi sint ubi congruentissime possint esse, quia et illi qui non recurrunt congruentissime in poena sunt.*

of the fallen souls and not to the final state of the demons, as the mature Augustine would like the reader to understand his early text. Nevertheless, it is meaningful that, except for the implication of the salvation of demons, Augustine does not correct, as H. Chadwick observes, the two other Origenian theses that diversity of the rational souls is the result of the fall and that fallen souls obtained their proper grades according to their merits.⁹

If demons will also recover their original, pre-lapsarian condition, the idea that Augustine's claim involves, then the next question is how it will be fulfilled? Is it possible that demons will be transformed into humans and, then, angels? Is there any passing through between the three stages of the hierarchy of rational creatures? A positive answer to these questions could be a logical consequence of Augustine's doctrine about the original ontological unity of rational creatures. For him, like for Origen, angels, humans and demons come from the same intellectual essence, therefore, they differ not in nature but in merits.

In *De libero arbitrio*, Augustine alludes to the possibility that humans can pass to a lower grade of the hierarchy of rational creatures.

*But if ignorance and difficulty are man's natural state, then it is from this condition that the soul begins to progress and advance towards knowledge and a state of rest until the happy life is fully realized in it. If, or its own accord, the soul neglects to make such progress in a knowledge of higher things and in the practice of piety, though it has not been denied the power to do so, then it deserves to be plunged into a worse state of ignorance and difficulty, which is already penal in character, and it takes its place among lower creatures according to a universal governance that is perfectly fitting and proper.*¹⁰

The starting point of the discussion is the question as to whether ignorance is inherent in human nature, or is the consequence of a

⁹ Chadwick 1985, 229.

¹⁰ Russell 1968, 222-3. *Lib. arb.* 3.217, 142: *Ignorantia vero et difficultas si naturalis est, inde incipit anima proficere et ad cognitionem et requiem, donec in ea perficiatur vita beata, promoveri. Quem profectum in studiis optimis atque pietate, quorum facultas ei non negata est, si propria voluntate neglexerit, iuste in graviores quae iam poenalis est ignorantiam difficultatemque praecipitur, decentissimo et convenientissimo rerum moderamine in inferioribus ordinata.*

previous choice, a Fall which resulted in the weakening of our nature. Even if this is something natural in humans, we have free will and, hence, we can progress in knowledge and piety. However, when humans deliberately neglect this progress, they fall into a graver ignorance which deserves punishment, and so they will occupy a lower grade in the chain of rational beings. Since the only stage which is inferior to that of the human beings appears to be the realm of demons, Augustine's statement implies that wicked human souls will be transformed into demons.

Those who deserve to dwell in heavenly bodies and merit transformation into angelic form, will be transformed, indeed, into angels.¹¹ In the next chapter of the present study I will survey Augustine's early theory of resurrection. For the present, it is important to note that he understands Matth. 22:30; and Lk. 20:36 literally:

Your graces should observe what man was made from, and see whether we even want to think about it. He made man from this dirt, and set him over the other animals. Can he make an angel from man? He can and he most certainly does. He made human beings into his friends, won't he be making them angels? ... And what is he going to give his friends? What he manifested in himself as he rose again. They shall be crowned and transfigured into heavenly glory and shall be equal to the angels of God (cf. Lk. 20:36).¹²

Given the fact that Augustine adopted the theses that rational beings can be transformed each into all, and that all things will return to their initial state, one must prove whether he believed that there existed and will exist many worlds. For, if demons have the possibility of returning to God, then this must be accomplished in a future age or world (*saeculum*). At this point, we have arrived at the statement which seems the most puzzling one in *De genesi contra manichaeos*.

¹¹ *Gen. man.* 2.21.32, 155.

¹² Hill 1990, 259. *Sermo* 45.10, 525-526: *attendat enim caritas uestra unde factus est homo, et uidete si uel cogitare illud uolumus. de istis sordibus fecit hominem, et praefecit aliis animalibus. de homine non facit angelum? facit et prorsus. amicos suos sibi fecit homines, non illos facturum est angelos? ... et quid est daturus amicis? quod in se ipse ostendit resurgente. coronabuntur et conuertentur in gloriam caelestem et erunt aequales angelis dei.*

In the previous chapter I inquired into Augustine's thesis in *Gen. man.* 2.8.10 that after the divine breathing forth mentioned in *Gen.* 2:7, man was made as still animal man. Changing the focus, I shall now examine how this animal man, who lived in a mortal, animal body, managed to reach a spiritual state and in what way he was transformed into spiritual man.

We should not yet think of the man who was made into a living soul as spiritual, but as still animal. For he was made spiritual, when he was established in paradise, that is, in the happy life, and received the commandment of perfection so that he might then be made perfect by the word of God. Thus, after he sinned by withdrawing from God's commandment and was dismissed from paradise, he remained in such a state that he was animal. And so all of us who were born from him after sin first bear the animal man until we attain the spiritual Adam, that is, our Lord Jesus Christ, who committed no sin (1 Pet. 2:22). Then, recreated and brought to life by him, we will be restored to paradise, where the thief merited to be with him on that very day on which he ended this life (I.k. 23:43). For the Apostle speaks this way: 'But what is spiritual is not first, but what is animal, as it has been written: The first Adam was made into a living soul; the last Adam into a lifegiving spirit' (1 Cor. 15:44-46).¹³

Augustine holds it as absolute that man who was moulded from the earth and made into a living soul by virtue of God's breathing forth was not yet a spiritual but an animal man. He became spiritual when, having been established in paradise, he received the

¹³ Teske 1991/1, 105-106. *Gen. man.* 2.8.10, 129-130: *Nondum tamen spiritalem hominem debemus intelligere qui factus est in animam viventem, sed adhuc animale. Tunc enim spiritualis effectus est, cum in paradiso, hoc est in beata vita constitutus, praeceptum etiam perfectionis accepit, ut verbo Dei consummaretur. Itaque postquam peccavit recedens a praecepto dei et dimissus est de paradiso, in eo remansit ut animalis esset. Et ideo animale hominem prius agimus omnes, qui de illo post peccatum nati sumus, donec assequamur spiritalem Adam, id est dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, qui peccatum non fecit (1 Pet. 2:22), et ab illo recreati et vivificati restituamur in paradysum, ubi latro ille ipso die meruit esse, quo vitam istam finivit (I.k. 23:43). Sic enim apostolus dicit: sed non prius quod spiritale est, sed quod animale, sicut scriptum est: factus est primus Adam in animam viventem, novissimus Adam in spiritum vivificantem (1 Cor. 15:44-46).*

commandment of perfection symbolised by Gen. 1:28 and 2:16.¹⁴ When the first man transgressed, God changed his body into this mortal flesh (cf. 2.21.32) and so *he remained in such a state that he was animal*.¹⁵ Augustine, therefore, compares the first man to us, who were born from Adam after sin as animal men but were recreated and brought to life by the spiritual Adam, Christ, and who will be restored in paradise.

The explanation is based on St. Paul's teachings in 1 Cor. 15:44-46 and on Augustine's belief in the *renovatio in primum*, which he confirms with reference to Jesus' words in Luke 23:43, *You will be with me in paradise*.

In spite of Scriptural support, in *De genesi ad litteram* Augustine would reject this doctrine without any mention of his first commentary. He simply observes that some (*nonnulli*) who wanted to maintain the Apostle's teachings on the animal body and the idea of *renovatio in primum*, believed that *man had first been in an animal body, but on being established in paradise, he was changed as we will be changed through resurrection*.¹⁶ The author of *De genesi ad litteram* dislikes this solution for two reasons: the book of Genesis does not mention this change, and, if we suppose that man in paradise lived in a spiritual body then the figurative interpretation of Eden and its trees hardly can be avoided.¹⁷

¹⁴ The interpretations of these two verses are closely linked in Augustine's commentary, cf. 1.19.30; 1.20.31; 2.9.12; 2.11.15.

¹⁵ A similar process is described in *Lib. arb.* 217 f. concerning the soul's ascent and descent.

¹⁶ *Gen. litt.* 6.20.31, 494: *Nonnulli his angustiis coartati, ut et illa constet sententia, qua exemplum de animali corpore hinc datum est, ut diceretur: 'factus est primus homo Adam in animam viventem' (1 Cor. 15:45), et ista renovatio receptioque immortalitatis non absurde dicatur in primum futura, in illud scilicet, quod Adam perdidit, putaverunt prius quidem hominem fuisse corporis animalis, sed, dum in paradiso constitutus est, eum fuisse mutatum, sicut nos quoque resurrectione mutabimur.*

¹⁷ *Gen. litt.* 6.20.31-21.32, 494-496: *Hoc quidem liber Geneseos non commemorat; sed ut possint utraque testimonia scripturarum inter se consentire, sive illud, quod de animali corpore dictum est, sive illa, quae de renovatine nostra plurima in sanctis litteris reperiuntur, hoc tamquam necessario consequi crediderunt. Sed si ita est, frustra conamur paradisum et illas arbores earumque fructus praeter figuratam significationem prius accipere ad rerum gestarum proprietatem. Quis enim credat iam*

The source of Augustine's curious interpretation of Gen. 2:15 – *The Lord God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden* – may very well have been Origen.¹⁸ In fact, the papyrus of Giessen attests that Origen draws a historical analogy between us and the first man. It is logical, as Origen explains, that he whom God established in paradise received the same spiritual blessing that we have accepted in Christ, since God esteemed the first man higher than his descendants. In fact, they accepted *the construction of the body from the copulation and desire and passion of father and mother, but he was constructed by God alone, without passion* (lines 59-66). Then Origen changes the argumentation:

*If we received back the image-likeness today that we might become the one who he was and that we might participate in the food in paradise after being established in the place where he was, according to the saying, 'You will be with me in paradise,' (Lk. 23:43) then would it not be logical that we receive the same blessing with regard to increasing and multiplication as the first man did?*¹⁹

This passage can be understood on two levels. The clause, *if we received back our image-likeness today*, can be considered as an allusion to Baptism by which man receives back the lost image. As a Greek catena fragment elucidates, those who are reborn through divine Baptism are established in paradise, in the Church. There they receive the commandment of the spiritual law (which elsewhere is termed by Origen spiritual blessing)²⁰ that they should eat food from every tree. This means, as Origen explains, that they should love all their brethren. In this connection Luke 23:43 has the same

illius modi cibos ex arborum pomis immortalibus et spiritualibus corporibus necessarios esse potuisse. Cf. Origen Princ. 4.3.1.

¹⁸ Cf. Agaësse and Solignac 1972, 1, 495 and 694-5.

¹⁹ Frag. Giessen, lines 66-71: ὥς γὰρ ἡμεῖς σήμερον τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα ἀναλαμβάνομεν ἵνα γενώμεθα ὅπερ ἦν ἐκεῖνος καὶ τῆς ἐν παραδείσῳ τροφῆς μεταλαμβάνομεν εἰς τὸ ἐκεῖνου χωρίον μετατιθέμενοι κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον 'μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ' (Lk. 23:43), καὶ πῶς οὐκ ἀκόλουθον τῆς ἴσης εὐλογίας μετασχεῖν τῆς κατὰ τὸ αὐξάνεσθαι καὶ πληθύνεσθαι τῷ πρώτῳ ἀνθρώπῳ;

²⁰ *HomLev* 16.1, 25-26. cf. *Princ.* 4.2.4, 312; *HomLev.* 4.10. The expression is borrowed from Rom. 7:14 and has particular importance for Origen. Augustine quotes this verse in *Gen. man.* 2.9.29.

meaning as in *HomLev* 9.5.34-39: *for the one who confessed his faith, Christ opened the gates of paradise.*²¹

Secondly, the passage quoted indicates that on being established in paradise, the first man was transformed into such a state as we will attain in resurrection, and this is what Augustine also taught in *De genesi contra manichaeos*, but rejected in *De genesi ad litteram*. The spiritual blessing spoken of in Eph. 1:3 represents for Origen the operation of God which transforms the flesh into a spiritual body.²² If we become the one who the first man was after the blessing, then his body must have been identical in its quality to the resurrected body. From this eschatological perspective, the paradise promised to the thief is interpreted in the way as in *HomNum.* 26.4: the *other world* (*aliud saeculum*) into which the soul will be established when *it leaves the darkness of this world and the blindness of the corporeal nature.*²³ Augustine quotes the verse in this sense.

Paradoxically, Augustine's early interpretation of Gen. 2:15 seems to be untenable precisely because of the historicity of Adam. Augustine thinks that the first, historical man was an animal man living in an animal body and then, having been established in paradise, he was transformed into a spiritual one, and then, again, he was reformed into animal man but his descendants will rise up as spiritual man. This theory, therefore, implies the problem of world-cycles and the reoccurrence of salvation. It should be clarified, however, what Augustine means by *saeculum* in the commentary against the Manichees.

He claims that carnal fecundity was the result of sin through which Adam and Eve became the *children of this world* (Luke 20:34).

They were not yet children of this world (filii saeculi huius) before they sinned. For the children of this world generate and are generated, as the Lord says, when he shows that we should

²¹ According to Augustine paradise can also mean the Catholic faith and truth, *Gen. man.* 2.27.41.

²² Origen, *HomLk.* 39, 218: [Eph. 1:3] *Erunt itaque hae omnes benedictiones spiritualiter, cum a mortuis resurgentes aeternam beatitudinem consequemur.*

²³ *HomNum* 26.4, *Sed et illam figuram esse diximus exeundi de Aegypto, cum relinquit anima mundi huius tenbras, ac naturae corporeae caecitatem, et transfertur ad aliud saeculum: quod vel sinus Abrahae, ut in Lazaro, vel paradisis, ut in latrone qui de cruce creditur, indicatur.*

*contemn this carnal generation in comparison with the future life which is promised us.*²⁴

The text hinted at by Augustine is found in Luke 20:34-36:

The children of this world marry and are given in marriage; but those who are accounted worthy to attain to that world (saeculo illo, τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου) and to the resurrection from the dead neither marry nor are given in marriage, for they cannot die any more, because they are equal to angels and are children of God, being children of resurrection.

Disregarding the rather questionable interpretation that Jesus teaches us to contemn bodily generation, the explanation is consistent. If the condition in Eden is similar to the life of the children of resurrection, a life which is free from generation, then it logically follows from this that the man whom God established in the garden as spiritual man also was free from bodily generation. Consequently, our world, that is, 'this world' is wedged between two *lives (vitae)* of higher rank which are to some extent similar to each other. Augustine however, does not stop at this A B A scheme, but according to the pattern of *this world* introduces a previous world in which man lived, and, while he who was still animal man. His scheme therefore is expanded as A B A B in which A signifies the *saeculum* of the animal man and B the *saeculum* of the spiritual man. Even this scheme must be immediately modified since we know that the animal state of man does not represent the initial state. The initial state is the state of the spiritual creature. This spiritual creature includes the soul which becomes man. For this reason the scheme appears as A B C B C (...) A, in which A means the incorporeal state of the spiritual creatures including the soul; B the mortal, bodily condition of animal man; C the immortal, bodily condition of spiritual man. It follows from this that at least one world (*saeculum*) had already existed before the *saeculum* in which we live – and that, probably, subsequent worlds will exist after our world until all things will return to the initial unity.

²⁴ Teske 1991/1, 78. *Gen.man.* 1.19.30, 98: *Filii enim saeculi huius generant et gerantur, sicut dominus dicit, cum in comparatione futurae vitae quae nobis promittitur carnalem istam generationem contemnendam esse demonstrat.*

There is an allusion to this theory, I think, in *Soliloquia* written in 387:

God, through whose laws which remain for ever the unstable movement of changeable things is not permitted to be thrown into confusion, and is forever recalled to the imitation of stability under the control of the circling worlds (circumeuntium saeculorum).²⁵

In this invocation addressed to the Trinity, Augustine uses the term '*saeculum*' to mean the longest possible interval, or period, of time. This is obvious when one puts the passage back in its context.²⁶ The previous, lengthy sentence is a paean to the great order of the universe governed by divine laws. The order manifests itself in the regular succession and alteration of the parts of the day, months, seasons, lustra, and great cycles. The periods measured by the cyclic movements of sun, moon, and the stars imply some stability of the world. The sentence quoted above occurs as the summit of the enumeration, since the *saeculum*, by its length, surpasses even the great cycle.²⁷ The worlds go around, they return to the starting points; the end of one world represents the beginning of the subsequent world, so the circling movement does not seem to finish. During and via this rotation, the movement (*motus*) of the creatures always return to a state similar to the eternal stability, but immediately departs from it. This movement, however, cannot be confused, since the laws of God do not permit it. The image calls into mind the statement in *De moribus manichaeorum* that the goodness of God does not permit things to reach non-being and they all will return through arranged movements to the state from which they fell away.

²⁵ Watson 1990, 27 with modification: I have replaced the 'course of the centuries' (*circumeuntium saeculorum*) with 'circling worlds.'

²⁶ *Sol.* 1.1.4, 8: <Deus>, cuius legibus rotantur poli, cursus suos sidera peragunt, sol exercet diem, luna temperat noctem omnisque mundus per dies vicissitudine lucis et noctis, per menses incrementis decrementisque lunaribus, per annos veris, aestatis, autumnii et hiemis successionibus, per lustra perfectione cursus solaris, per magnos orbis recursu in ortus suos siderum magnam rerum constantiam, quantum sensibilis materia patitur, temporum ordinibus replicationibusque custodit. Deus, cuius legibus in aëre stantibus motus instabilis rerum mutabilium perturbatus esse non sinitur frenisque circumeuntium saeculorum semper ad similitudinem stabilitatis revocatur.

²⁷ In contrast to this concept of *magnus orbis*, in Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* 22, the great cycle embraces numerous *saecula*, centuries.

What Augustine refers to as *saeculum* is the world of fallen man. He divides our present *saeculum* into six ages (*aetates*).²⁸ The first age extends from Adam to Noah, the second from Noah to Abraham, the third from Abraham to David, the fourth from David to the Babylonian Captivity, the fifth from Captivity to the coming of Jesus, and the sixth, in which we all live, extends from the first coming of Jesus up to His second coming in glory, but the day or hour of the end of this world we do not know.²⁹ The second coming of Jesus and the resurrection of the dead represents the beginning of a new, spiritual 'life' and not that of a seventh age.³⁰ Augustine does not term the rest on the seventh day *aetas* or *saeculum*. Given the fact that the ages of the world and the world itself ends at the second coming of Jesus, therefore, what follows it cannot be termed *aetas*. As far as *saeculum* is concerned, Augustine does not use this term either to refer to the repose because it is reserved for denoting the ages of the world of the fallen mankind. This is why in *Gen. man.* 1.19.30 he replaced Luke's expression 'aion' with *futura vita*. Also, this is why he usually calls paradise *beata vita*.³¹ 'Life' is a less temporal notion than *aion/saeculum* or *aetas*: it can denote the state of the fulfilled existence and not a temporal progression. Consequently, the rest on the seventh day is beyond this world.³² Then

²⁸ *Gen. man.* 1.23.35-23.41.; *Cat. rud.* 22.39. For this, see Rousseau 1958; Luneau 1964, 285-407; Schwarte 1966, 17-61; Ries 1992, 88-93; Ligota 1997. The Fathers generally speak about four ages, see e.g. Ambrose *Par.* 3.18.22; *Exp. Luc.* 7.223. Origen mentions five ages in *ComMatth.* 15.32.

²⁹ *Matth.* 24:36, cf. *Gen. man.* 1.22.34.

³⁰ In *Gen.man.* 1.23.35, 104, Augustine indirectly terms this period *aetas*: *Video enim per totum textum divinarum scripturarum sex quasdam aetates operosas certis quasi limitibus suis esse distinctas, ut in septima speretur requies*, but in this sentence it is simply the grammar that which evokes the notion of *septima aetas*.

³¹ *Gen. man.* 1.20.31; 2.5.6; 2.8.10; 2.9.12; 2.11.15; 2.14.20; 2.14.21; 2.22.34. This identification of paradise as *vita beata* may also be stirred by apologetic proposals and the attempt of bringing revelation closer to philosophical tradition, or in reverse, since the goal of the virtuous and philosophical life was usually considered *beata vita*, see, e.g. Cicero *De finibus* 2.27; Seneca *Dial.* 7. *Ad Gallionem de beata vita*.

³² Cf. *Gen. man.* 1.23.37; 1.23.39; 1.25.43.

*they to whom he said, 'Be perfect as your Father, who is in heaven, is perfect' (Matth. 5:48.), will rest with Christ from all their works. For such men perform works that are very good. After such works one should hope for rest on the seventh day, which has no evening.*³³

The quotation of Matth. 5:48 is the key to understanding the curious idea that the first man *was made spiritual when he was established in paradise, ... and received the commandment of perfection so that he might then be made perfect by the word of God.* The first animal man had received a revelation through the Word of God, as we also received through Christ the Word who 'became flesh and dwelt among us.' Just as in Mt. 5:48, so its parallel, so called 'commandment of perfection' represents the quintessence of God's message to the fallen man that he should be perfect. Consequently, the establishment of the first man in paradise, that is, his would-be resurrection occurred by virtue of a previous remedial action of Christ. As at the end of the sixth age of our world we are promised that we will be transformed into angelic form, so the animal man of a previous world was transformed into spiritual man. True, Augustine does not reveal how the first animal man was saved and resurrected, his remark nevertheless indicates that that man was, indeed, saved and resurrected.

The idea that after the divine breathing forth, man was made into a living soul as still animal man appears in Irenaeus of Lyon.³⁴ For him the animal man consists of body and soul, while the spiritual man is a composite of body, soul and Spirit, the Holy Spirit. This threefold composite is made in the image and likeness of God, whereas the body, or the composite of body and soul symbolised by the breathing forth, is made in the image of God.³⁵

³³ Teske 1991/1, 88. *Gen.man.* 1.23.41, 110: *Post istam vesperam fiet mane, cum ipse dominus in claritate venturus est; tunc requiescunt cum Christo ab omnibus operibus suis hi quibus dictum est: estote perfecti sicut pater vester qui in caelis est (Matth. 5:48). Tales enim faciunt opera bona valde. Post enim talia opera speranda est requies in die septimo qui vesperam non habet.*

³⁴ For this, see Boulnois 1989, 5-9.

³⁵ Irenaeus *Adv. haer.* 5.6.1, 72: *Per manus enim Patris, hoc est per Filium et Spiritum, fit homo secundum similitudinem Dei, sed non pars hominis. Anima autem et Spiritus pars hominis esse possunt, homo autem nequaquam: perfectus autem homo commixtio et adunitio est animae assumptis Spiritum Patris et admixtae ei carni quae*

Following 1 Cor. 15: 45-46, Irenaeus establishes a parallel between us and the first man which is to some extent similar to Augustine's interpretation. The breathing forth made the first man animal, but the lifegiving Spirit makes him spiritual after Christ's arrival.³⁶ However, Irenaeus does not clarify how the first Adam, that is, the animal man became spiritual. He must have become perfect and spiritual man, since Irenaeus' interpretation implies that the first Adam also possessed the likeness and he lost it when he committed sin.³⁷

est plasmata secundum imaginem Dei. Ibid. p. 76: Si enim substantiam tollat aliquis carnis, id est plasmatis, et nude ipsum solum spiritum intellegat, jam non spiritalis homo est quod est tale, sed spiritus hominis aut Spiritus Dei. Cum autem Spiritus hic commixtus animae unitur plasmati, propter effusionem Spiritus spiritalis et perfectus homo factus est: et hic est qui secundum imaginem et similitudinem factus est Dei. Si autem defuerit animae Spiritus, animalis est vere qui est talis et carnalis derelictus imperfectus erit, imaginem quidem habens in plasmate, similitudinem vero non assumens per Spiritum. cf. ibid. 5.1.3, 26-28: quemadmodum ab initio plasmationis nostrae in Adam ea quae fuit a Deo aspiratio vitae unita plasmati animavit hominem et animal rationabile ostendit, sic in fine Verbum Patris et Spiritus Dei adunitus antiquae substantiae plasmationis Adae viventem et perfectum effecit hominem, capientem perfectum Patrem, ut, quemadmodum in animali omnes mortui sumus, sic in spiritali omnes vivificemur. Non enim effugit aliquando Adam manus Dei, ad quas Pater loquens dicit: 'Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram.' Et propter hoc in fine 'non ex voluntate carnis neque ex voluntate viri' (Jn. 1:13), sed ex placito Patris manus ejus vivum perfecit hominem, uti fiat Adam secundum imaginem et similitudinem Dei.

³⁶ Irenaeus *Adv. haer.* 5.12.2, 142-144: *Aliud enim est afflatus vitae, qui et animale efficit hominem, et aliud Spiritus vivificans, qui et spiritalem eum efficit. Ibid. 148-150: 'Sed non primo quod spiritale est,' ait Apostolus, hoc tamquam ad nos homines dicens, 'sed primo quod animale est, deinde quod spiritale' secundum rationem. Oportuerat enim primo plasmari hominem et plasmatum accipere animam, deinde sic communionem Spiritus recipere. Quapropter et 'primus Adam factus est a Domino in animam viventem, secundus Adam in Spiritus vivificantem.' Sicut igitur qui in animam viventem factus est devertens in pejus perdidit vitam, sic rursus idem ipse in melius recurrens <et> assumens vivificantem spiritum, inveniet vitam.*

³⁷ See the note above. Cf. Mattei 1992, 243.

Augustine's interpretation differs from that of Irenaeus on two important points.³⁸ First, for him the created image is not the body, not even the composite of body and soul, but the rational soul, the mind. Therefore, the animal man is not made in the image of God. Quite the reverse, man is considered to be animal man because he has lost the image.³⁹ Second, Augustine's spiritual man is not the one consisting of body, soul and the Holy Spirit. Augustine emphasises that the spirit of man is a creature.⁴⁰ Man is spiritual when his mind follows God and perfectly rules over the animal part and the body.⁴¹ It is a task for the animal man to become spiritual. He has to fulfil the commandment of perfection, and should become like God.⁴²

It is certain that a theology of the image of God, including the distinction between the 'image' and 'likeness,' lies beyond Augustine's interpretation, but this theology may come from

³⁸ The same is the case for Tertullian's understanding of Gen. 2:7 and 1Cor. 15:45-46 which is, basically, influenced by Irenaeus. For Tertullian, see Mattei 1983.

³⁹ Augustine *Div. quaest.* 83, 57.4, 167: '*Quia et ipsa creatura,*' *id est, ipse homo, cum iam signaculo imaginis propter peccatum amisso remansit tantummodo creatura, et ipsa itaque creatura, id est ipsa quae nondum vocatur filiorum forma perfecta, sed tantum vocatur creatura, 'liberabitur a servitute interitus'* (Rom. 8:21). Cf. *Gen. litt.* 6.27.38. Augustine reconsiders this idea in *Retr.* 1.26 and 2.24.2. Epiphanius and Jerome upbraid Origen for teaching that Adam lost the image of God. Jerome *C. Ioan.* 7, 14: *Octavum, quod extremum objicit, imaginem et similitudinem Dei, ad quam homo conditus fuerat, dicit ab eo perditam, et in homine post paradisum non fuisse.* Cf. Epiphanius-Jerome *Ep.* 51.6.

⁴⁰ *Gen. man.* 8.10, 129: *Spiritus autem hominis in scripturis dicitur ipsius animae potentia rationalis, qua distat a pecoribus et eis naturae lege dominatur. De quo dicit apostolus: 'nemo scit quae sunt hominis nisi spiritus hominis qui in ipso est'* (1 Cor. 2:11).

⁴¹ Cf. *Gen. man.* 1.19.30; 2.11.15.

⁴² In *En. Ps.* 94.2, 1332, Augustine interprets Matth. 5:48 to mean the calling back to the likeness of God. On account of the fall, man became dissimilar to Him, but through the likeness, God recalls us: *estote ergo sicut pater uester perfecti. cum dicit: estote sicut ille perfecti, ad similitudinem nos inuitat. si ergo ad similitudinem nos inuitat, constat quia dissimiles existendo recesseramus a deo, et facti eramus longe per dissimilitudinem, et efficimur prope per similitudinem, ut iam fiat in nobis quod scriptum est: accedite ad deum, et illuminamini.*

Origen rather than from Irenaeus.⁴³ Refuting Celsus' criticism that man is not made in the image of God, for God is not like man, Origen asserts that

*that which is made in the image of God is to be understood of the inward man, as we call it, which is renewed and has the power to be formed in the image of the Creator, when a man becomes perfect as his heavenly Father is perfect (cf. Matth. 5:48), and when he hears 'Be holy because I the Lord your God am holy' (Lev. 11:45), and when he learns the saying 'Become imitators of God' (Eph. 5:1) and assumes into his own virtuous soul the characteristics of God.*⁴⁴

This text also sheds light on the meaning of the Augustinian 'commandment of perfection.' Man becomes perfect when the inner man is renewed and the image in the soul is perfectly restored. Matth. 5:48 is the verse that Origen prefers to quote in order to establish this interpretation. He quotes it in *Princ.* 4.4.10⁴⁵ and in the fragment of the *Commentary on Genesis* which influenced the author of the first *Tractatus Origenis*.⁴⁶ All these interpretations

⁴³ Later Augustine rejects the traditional distinction between image and likeness, see Markus 1964.

⁴⁴ Chadwick 1980, 378-379. *CCels.* 6.63, 338: Λείπεται δὴ τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς λεγομένῳ ἔσω ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ ἀνακαινουμένῳ καὶ πεφυκότι γίνεσθαι κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος (Eph. 3, 16; Col. 3, 10) νοεῖσθαι, ὅτε γίνεται τις τέλειος, ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστι (Matth. 5, 48), καὶ ἀκούει ὅτι Ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιος κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν (Lev. 11, 45), καὶ μανθάνων τὸ Μιμηταὶ τοῦ θεοῦ γίνεσθε (Eph. 5, 1) ἀναλαμβάνει εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐνάρετον ψυχὴν τοὺς χαρακτῆρας τοῦ θεοῦ.

⁴⁵ *Princ.* 4.4.10, 426-428. *Aut certe accuset qui haec ita vult scripturae auctoritatem, quae dicit ad imaginem dei factum esse hominem; in quo et manifeste divinae imaginis cognoscuntur indicia, non per effigiem corporis, quae corrumpitur, sed per animi prudentiam, per iustitiam, per moderationem, per virtutem, per sapientiam, per disciplinam, per omnem denique virtutum chorum, quae cum in deo insint per substantiam, in homine possunt esse per industriam et per imitationem dei, sicut et dominus designat in euangelio dicens: 'Estote misericordes, sicut et pater vester misericors est (Luke 6, 36) et Estote perfecti, sicut et pater vester perfectus est' (Matth. 5:48).*

⁴⁶ *Sel. Gen.* PG. 12 c. 96 B: Ὅτι δὲ τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα αἱ πράξεις χαρακτηρίζουσι, καὶ οὐχὶ ἡ τοῦ σώματος μορφή, σαφῶς ὁ Ἀπόστολος

are based upon the distinction, though it is often implicit, that Origen draws between the image and the likeness. In *Princ.* 3.6.1, he explicitly says that

man received the honour of the image in his first creation, whereas the perfection of God's likeness was reserved for him at the consummation. The purpose of this was that man should acquire it for himself by his own earnest efforts to imitate God, so that while the possibility of attaining perfection was given to him in the beginning through the honour of the 'image', he should in the end through the accomplishment of these works obtain for himself the perfect 'likeness'.

However, the perfect likeness cannot be obtained in this world; it is reserved for the future life, as John writes:

More openly and unmistakably the apostle John lays down that such is the case when he makes this declaration: 'Little children, we know not yet what we shall be; but if he shall be revealed' –

ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους φησί· Καθὼς ἐφορέσαμεν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ χοϊκοῦ, οὕτως φορέσωμεν καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανοῦ (1Cor. 15: 49). Εἰκόνα μὲν γὰρ φορεῖ χοϊκὴν ὁ κατὰ σάρκα ζῶν, καὶ ποιῶν τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός· εἰκόνα δὲ τοῦ ἐπουρανοῦ ὁ τῷ πνεύματι τὰς πράξεις τῆς σαρκὸς θανατῶν. Καὶ ἐν ἐτέρᾳ δὲ ἐπιστολῇ διδάσκων ὡς δεῖ βιοῦν, ἐπιφέρει ταῖς ἐντολαῖς τὸ, Ἵνα γένησθε κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος. Κύριος μακρόθυμος, καὶ ὁ μακρόθυμος ἄνθρωπος ἔχει τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα Θεοῦ. Δίκαιος καὶ ὅσιος ὁ Κύριος, καὶ οἰκτίρμων καὶ ἐλεήμων ὁ Κύριος. Οὐκοῦν ὁ ἀγαπῶν δικαιοσύνην καὶ ὁσιότητα, καὶ πράττων καὶ τηρῶν τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Σωτῆρος τὴν, Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες, ὡς καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστὶ (Lk. 6:36) , καὶ Γίνεσθε τέλειοι, ὡς ὁ Πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστιν (Matth. 5:48), εἰκὼν γίνεται κατὰ πάντα τοῦ Θεοῦ. *Tract. Orig.* 1.21, 10: *Et que (quia) aliud est imago, aliud similitudo, ita {etiam} dividenda ratio est, ut quia iam hominem qui ad imaginem dei factus est demonstravimus, nunc de similitudine disseramus. Diximus enim imaginem <in> personam esse, similitudinem vero in factis (facto), sicut apostolus ait: 'Imitatores mei estote sicut et ego Xpisti' (1 Cor. 11:1), et alibi ex voce dei: 'Estote sancti, sicut et ego sanctus sum' (Lev. 11:44). Videtis ergo similitudinem in sanctitate et bonitate deputari.* For the Origenian background, see Vona 1970, 58-60.

*speaking undoubtedly of the Saviour – ‘we shall be like him’ (1 Jn. 3, 2).*⁴⁷

Consequently, in my view, Augustine’s interpretation, influenced by Origen, according to which the first animal man had to become a spiritual one, and did become such when he was established in paradise, is built on a historical analogy: in a previous *saeculum* the first ‘animal man’ had to acquire the perfect likeness as we have to. In the beginning there was no man, but an invisible, spiritual creature made in the image of God. The original unity of the rational creatures was disturbed by the Fall and three classes of them came into being. Gen. 2:7 refers to the universal Fall, but from the viewpoint of man, since the Biblical revelation is given to humans. Man is thus a soul which uses a mortal and earthly body.⁴⁸ The first animal man, however, became spiritual through a previous remedial action of Christ and attained the spiritual life in paradise. In paradise he committed sin and became, again, animal man. He received an earthly, mortal body symbolised by the garments of skin spoken of in Gen. 3:21. In the resurrection this body will be transformed into a spiritual and angelic one.

⁴⁷ Butterworth, 245-246. *Princ.* 3.6.1, 236: *Hoc ergo quod dixit ad ‘imaginem dei fecit eum’ et similitudine siluit, non aliud indicat nisi quod imaginis quidem dignitatem in prima conditione percepit, similitudinis vero ei perfectio in consummatione servata est: scilicet ut ipse sibi eam propriae industriae studiis ex dei imitatione conscisceret, quo possibilitatem sibi perfectionis in initiis datam per imaginis dignitatem, in fine demum per operum expletionem perfectam sibi ipse similitudinem consummaret. Sed apertius haec et evidentius ita se habere Iohannes apostolus definit, hoc modo pronuntians: ‘Filioli, nondum scimus quid futuri sumus’; si vero revelatus nobis fuerit (de salvatore sine dubio dicens) ‘similes illi erimus.’ Cf. Princ. 2.11.4, Crouzel 1956, 219.*

⁴⁸ Cf. *Moribus* 1.27.52.

3 THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY

Origen's two books *On the Resurrection* have not survived, but a lengthy section of his commentary on the first Psalm, preserved by Methodius and Epiphanius, contains an explanation of the resurrection. Beyond this text, some important remarks in such works as *Contra Celsum*, *De oratione* and *De principiis*, assist in mapping the basic elements of his theory.¹

Origen rejected the traditional argument for the resurrection that anything is possible for God.² He also denied that the arguments drawn from Christ's deeds after the resurrection, such as eating, drinking and passing through the locked door, would be appropriate to defining the quality of the resurrected body, for Christ had always accommodated himself to His audience.³ What did Origen teach about the essence of the body? He was familiar with the two definitions of essence: one group of philosophers had affirmed that essence is lasting, but for others it is perishable, something that could be changed into anything.⁴ The perishable body consists of the four elements and will return to them.⁵ Bodily nature admits of a variety of transformations, and its elements can be changed each into all: *water changes into earth or air, and air again into fire, or fire into air or air into water.*⁶ He interprets Saint Paul's

¹ For detailed studies, see Crouzel 1990 and Chadwick's masterpiece (1948) to which I am significantly indebted for the following survey.

² Origen *C. Cels.* 5.23. Cf. Clement of Rome *Ep.* 27.2; Justin *Apol.* 1.19; Athenagoras *Resurr.* 9; Irenaeus *Adv. haer.* 5.3.2-3; Tertullian *Resurr.* 57. See Chadwick 1948, 84.

³ Chadwick 1948, 100.

⁴ *Orat.* 27.8. Chadwick 1948, 87.

⁵ Methodius *Resurr.* 1.14-15; Jerome *C. Ioannem* 25. Chadwick 1948, 88.

⁶ Butterworth 1966, 79. *Princ.* 2.1.4, 240: *Ex rebus ipsis apparet quod diversam variamque permutationem recipiat natura corporea, ita ut possit ex omnibus*

words, *we shall all be changed* (1Cor 15:52), to mean the transformation of the bodily essence into an ethereal condition (*in aetherium statum*) in which bodies are connected with chaste spirits.⁷ For *flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God* (1Cor 15:50), that is to say, flesh, earth and blood should be changed into celestial essences.⁸ The flesh, *the body of humiliation* (Phil. 3:21) differs from the resurrected body which is *like the bodies of angels, ethereal and luminous light* (ὅποιά ἐστι τὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων σώματα, αἰθέρια καὶ αὐγοειδὲς φῶς).⁹ Although in the resurrection the essence of flesh no longer remains, yet every body has something which remains the same in each transformation. This is called form, εἶδος. The form characterises the body of individuals and provides for their personal identity. The form and identity remain after the resurrection, because the soul, wherever it goes, needs a vehicle, a body. When we live in the heavens, we will *necessarily use spiritual bodies* (σώμασι πνευματικοῖς) the *eidos* of which is identical to that of our present earthly bodies. In this way, the earthly body will be

in omnia transformari; sicut, verbi gratia dixerim, lignum in ignem vertitur et ignis in fumum et fumus in aerem; sed et olei liquor in ignem mutatur. Escae quoque ipsae vel hominum vel animalium nonne eandem permutationis causam declarant? Nam quocumque illud est, quod per cibum sumpserimus, in corporis nostri substantiam vertitur. Sed et qualiter aqua mutetur in terram vel in aerem et aer rursus in ignem vel ignis in aerem vel aer in aquam, quamvis non sit difficultas exponere, tamen in praesenti loco sufficit ea tantummodo commemorasse volenti corporalis materiae discutere rationem.

⁷ Princ. 2.3.7, 272: *vel cum nihilominus Christo fuerint universa subiecta et per Christum deo, cum quo et unus spiritus secundum hoc, quod spiritus sunt naturae rationabiles, fiunt, tunc ipsa quoque substantia corporalis optimis ac purissimis spiritibus sociata pro assumentium vel qualitate vel meritis in aetherium statum permutata, secundum quod apostolus dicit: Et nos immutabimur, refulgebit.* In this section Origen expounds the two possibilities of the incorporeal and corporeal *apocatastasis*. When explaining the hypothesis of the final corporeal condition, he describes the body as the body of resurrection. See also *ibid.* 1.6.4, 206: *Alius fortasse dicit quoniam in illo fine omnis substantia corporalis ita pura erit atque purgata, ut aetheris in modum et caelestis cuiusdam puritatis ac sinceritatis possit intellegi.*

⁸ Orat. 26.6, 363: κληρονομεῖν δ' ἂν λεχθησομένων, ἐὰν μεταβάλωσιν ἀπὸ σαρκὸς καὶ γῆς καὶ χοῦ καὶ αἵματος ἐπὶ τὴν οὐράνιον οὐσίαν.

⁹ *ComMatth.* 17.30. Cf. Bammel 1989, 67; Ferrisi 1993, 228.

glorified. An example of this is the Transfiguration when the *eidōs* of Jesus, Moses and Elias remained, although their earthly bodies were transformed.¹⁰

In Augustine's theology, paradise and the future life of the resurrection represent the state of stability (*stabilitas*) which is also itself an imitation of the divine stability.¹¹ Creatures who fall away from God but who are recalled to the primordial stability can attain it through arranged movements (*motus*). This means a cosmic restoring and re-arranging of all things. The psychic and intellectual movements, such as thinking, understanding, willing, and so forth, transform and spiritualise the matter of the body, and through it, the whole material-corporeal universe. As the Fall of man, the microcosm, resulted in the deformation of the macrocosm, so the re-establishment of man results in the reformation of the world.¹² In the course of man's return to paradise, *the earth of stability*,¹³ his body will also be transformed into its *original stability*,¹⁴ that is, the animal body will be transformed into the spiritual. Although through the resurrection, the body will be changed 'in the twinkling of an eye,' (1Cor 15:52), this sudden change is necessarily preceded by long spiritual progress.¹⁵

Augustine's first letter contains the first allusion to the 'heavenly trumpet' (cf. 1Cor 15:52) and the resurrection of the body, but the context, the ironic remark against the Academics, does not reveal anything of the way in which he understood the doctrine.¹⁶

In *De quantitate animae*, Augustine expresses his firm belief in the resurrection of the flesh (*carō*) which is considered to be a great transformation and change of the corporeal nature (*corporea*

¹⁰ *ComPsalm* 1, PG 1093C-1095B. Cf. Chadwick 1948, 98-99.

¹¹ The true stability is divine, see *Serm. monte* 2.25. 86; *Mus.* 6.15.50.

¹² See the interpretation of Rom. 8:22 in *Div. quaest.* 83, 67.5.

¹³ *Serm. monte* 1.2.4 and *En. Ps.* 1.4.

¹⁴ Cf. *Ver. rel.* 67; *Fid. symb.* 6.13; 10.23; *En. Ps.* 83.8.

¹⁵ For this topic, see Meijering 1987, 140-158 and Ferrisi 1993. Both point out Augustine's dependence upon Origen.

¹⁶ *Ep.* 1.2, 2: *si uero etiam aliquantum obnitentes aduersum pigritiam legerint eosdem libros, quibus quasi ostenditur naturae humanae denegata perceptio, tanto torpore indormiscent, ut nec caelesti tuba euigilent.*

natura).¹⁷ At the same time, he states that because of its longing for the pure contemplation of Truth, which is considered the highest degree of spiritual progress, the soul wants to escape and be totally liberated from *this body (ab hoc corpore)*.¹⁸

In *De genesi contra manichaeos*, the body of the resurrection and the body of man in paradise are regarded as identical in nature. This is a transparent, and simple heavenly body in which the movements of mind are as apparent as our thoughts are apparent in our eyes. The image is borrowed from Plotinus. Resurrection means transformation into the original simplicity and angelic form (cf. Matth. 22:30).¹⁹

In the last book of *De musica*, Augustine claims that in its season and order, the body will be restored to its proper nature in terms of original integrity and stability.²⁰ The body will be so subjected and obedient to the soul that it will be transformed according to the intelligible numbers in Wisdom. When *the perishable nature will put on the imperishable and this mortal nature will put on immortality* (cf. 1Cor 15:53), that is, when the Spirit gives life to our mortal bodies (cf. Rom. 8:11), we no longer have need of

¹⁷ *Quant. an.* 33.76, 230: *Videbimus etiam naturae hujus corporeae tantas commutationes et vicissitudines, dum divinis legibus servit, ut etiam ipsam resurrectionem carnis, quae partim tardius, partim omnino non creditur, ita certam teneamus, ut certius nobis non sit, solem, cum occiderit oriturum.*

¹⁸ *Quant. an.* 33.76, 232: *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.* Cf. Ferrisi 1993, 215.

¹⁹ *Gen. man.* 2.21.32, 155: *Neque enim in illis corporibus caelestibus sic latere posse cogitationes credendum est, quemadmodum in his corporibus latent; sed sicut nonnulli motus animorum apparent in vultu, et maxime in oculis, sic 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 ... nulla mentiuntur.* For the simile of eye, see Plotinus, *Enn.* 4.3 (27), 18.

²⁰ *Mus.* 6.5.13, 1170: *Haec autem sanitas tunc firmissima erit atque certissima, cum pristinae stabilitati certo suo tempore atque ordine hoc corpus fuerit restitutum. oportet enim animam et regi a superiore, et regere inferiorem. superior illa solus deus est, inferius illa solum corpus, si ad omnem et totam animam intendas.* Cf. *Ver. rel.* 67, 18-19: *Inde iam erit consequens ut post mortem corporalem, quam debemus primo peccato, tempore suo atque ordine suo hoc corpus restituatur pristinae stabilitati, quam non per se habebit, sed per animam stabilitam in deo.*

phantasms.²¹ The resurrected body will not have the senses through which *the phantasms enter the soul*.²²

In *De diversis quaestionibus*, the Plotinian simile of the eye reoccurs. After the transformation of body promised to the saints, the vehicle of the soul will be the most luminous, ethereal, and angelic body (*angelica corpora ... lucidissima atque aetherea*) in which the movements of mind are not hidden, but appear as in an eye.²³

²¹ *Mus.* 6.4.7, 1167: *Corpora enim tanto meliora sunt quanto numerosiora talibus numeris; anima vero istis, quae per corpus accipit, carendo fit melior, cum sese avertit a carnalibus sensibus et divinis sapientiae numeris reformatur.* Ibid. 6.15.49, 1188-89: *Sed si de rebus incorporeis et eodem modo se semper habentibus, plerumque attentissime cogitantes, si quos forte illo tempore agimus numeros temporales in quolibet corporis motu, facili sane atque usitatissimo, sive deambulantes, sive psallentes, prorsus nobis ignorantibus transeunt, quamvis nobis non agentibus nulli essent: si denique in ipsis nostris inanibus phantasmatis cum occupati sumus, similiter ista praetereunt agentibus nec sentientibus nobis, quanto magis quantoque constatius, cum corruptibile hoc induerit incorruptionem, et mortale hoc induerit immortalitatem (1 Cor. 15:53), id est, ut hoc idem planius eloquar, cum Deus vivificaverit mortalia corpora nostra, sicut Apostolus dicit, propter spiritum manentem in nobis (Rom. 8:11): quanto ergo tunc magis in unum Deum et perspicuam intenti veritatem, ut dictum est, facie ad faciem (1 Cor. 13:12), numeros quibus agimus corpora, nulla inquietudine sentiemus, et gaudebimus?* Cf. Ferrisi 1993, 214-216.

²² Cf. *Gen. man.* 2.20.30, 152: *Et quoniam necessitate jam per hos oculos et per has aures de ipsa veritate admonemur, et difficile est resistere phantasmatis quae per istos sensus intrant in animam ...*

²³ *Div. quaest.* 83, 47, 74: *Quaeri solet, quomodo post resurrectionem atque immutationem corporis, quae sanctis promittitur, cogitationes nostras videre possimus. Coniectura itaque capienda est ex ea parte corporis nostri quae plus habet lucis, quoniam angelica corpora, qualia nos speramus habituros, lucidissima atque aetherea esse credendum est. Si ergo multi motus animi nostri nunc agnoscuntur in oculis, probabile est quod nullus motus animi latebit, cum totum fuerit corpus aetherium, in cuius comparatione isti oculi caro sunt.* Cf. *Retr.* 1.26. Since Origen's characterisation of the resurrected bodies is substantially similar to that of Plotinus, Augustine could easily place Plotinus' simile of eyes into the Origenian framework. Nevertheless, in contrast to Plotinus, they did not affirm that this body would be spherical. Later Origenists may well have held this view, conjecturing from some remarks of Origen. See Plotinus *Enn.* 4.4.5; Origen *Orat.* 31.3; *Princ.* 2.10.1-3; *Mansi* IX, 516.D. On this see, Chadwick 1948, 94-99; Festugière 1975.

Some decades later, Augustine was discontented with his early remarks on the resurrection and in the *Retractationes*, he warned the reader that his remarks should not be understood as meaning that the substance of the body would be changed.²⁴ This is the case for the most systematic explanation in the early works. In a lengthy passage of *De fide et symbolo* written in 393, Augustine explains the formula 'we believe in the resurrection of the flesh.'

The starting point of the explanation is a definition: man consists of three things, namely, spirit or mind (*spiritus, mens*), soul (*anima*), and body (*corpus*). The term 'flesh' (*caro*) can refer either to the soul, in a figurative way, on account of the soul's carnal affections, or to the visible flesh, in a proper sense. The flesh, to which one can point with one's finger, is that which is destined to be raised.²⁵ Nevertheless, the flesh must be changed, since *flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God* (1Cor. 15:50). Augustine distinguishes between flesh and body: *all flesh is also body; but every body is not also flesh*.²⁶ There are basically two kinds of bodies, earthly and heavenly ones. Such an earthly body as wood, for instance, is not flesh, but other earthly things like man and cattle have both body and flesh. Heavenly things do not have flesh but simply body. Therefore, *at that time of angelic transformation there will no longer be flesh and blood, but only body*.²⁷ The transformed bodies are simple (*simplicia*), shining (*lucida*), spiritual (*spiritalia*) or ethereal (*aetherea*).²⁸ How can the flesh be transformed into the ethereal body? Augustine's argument, borrowed from philosophers, is that *any body can be transformed and changed into every body*.²⁹ In *De genesi ad litteram* 3.3.4, Augustine mentions 'some philosophers' who held this view

²⁴ *Retr.* 1.11.3; 1.13.4; 1.17.

²⁵ *Fid. symb.* 10.23, 28.

²⁶ Meijering 1987, 152. *Fid. symb.* 10.24, 31: *Omnis enim caro etiam corpus est, non autem omne corpus etiam caro est.*

²⁷ Meijering 1987, 140. *Fid. symb.* 10.24, 30: *in illo tempore inmutationis angelicae non iam caro erit et sanguis, sed tantum corpus.*

²⁸ *Fid. symb.* 10.24, 31: *in caelestibus vero nulla caro, sed corpora simplicia et lucida, quae appellat apostolus spiritualia, nonnulli autem vocant aetherea.*

²⁹ Meijering 1987, 156. *Fid. symb.* 10.24, 32: *philosophi autem, quorum argumentis saepius resurrectioni carnis resistitur, quibus asserunt nullum esse posse terrenum corpus in caelo, omne corpus in omne corpus converti et mutari posse concedunt.*

while others maintained that there was something proper in the nature of the elements which can not be changed.³⁰ In *De fide et symbolo*, he still prefers the former definition and concludes that earth can be transformed into water, water into air, air into ether. Consequently, earthly body can be changed into ethereal body.³¹ Concerning this interpretation, Augustine is forced to observe in *Retractationes*,

But anyone who interprets this in such a way as to think that the earthly body as we have it now is so changed into a celestial body at the resurrection that there will be neither these members nor the substance of flesh, certainly, without a doubt, it should be reproved, admonished by the body of the Lord who, after the Resurrection, appeared with the same members. He was not only visible to the eyes, but touchable by the hands. Furthermore, He confirmed, also by word, the fact that He had flesh, saying: 'Feel me and see, for a spirit does not have bones and flesh as you see I have' (Lk. 24:39).³²

Here, again, Augustine corrects not his own explanation, but the reader who understands it to imply that the risen body will not have limbs and that the essence of the flesh will disappear. In spite of the warning, Augustine's early theory of the resurrection can scarcely be understood in any other way. In the early works, he never referred to Jesus' appearance to the disciples, which indicates

³⁰ As Agaësse and Solignac observe (1972, 1, 615), the former was the view of the Miletians, Empedocles, and the Stoics, while the latter can be attributed to Plato and, most of all, Aristotle.

³¹ *Fid. symb.* 10.24, 31: *In qualem naturam quisquis hanc carnem converti posse non credit, gradibus ducendus est ad fidem. si enim ab eo quaeras, utrum terra in aquam possit converti, propter vicinitatem non ei videtur incredibile. Rursus si quaeras utrum aqua possit in aerem, neque hoc absurdum esse respondet: vicina enim sunt sibi. Et de aere si quaeras, utrum in aethereum corpus, id est, in caeleste possit mutari, iam ipsa vicinitas persuadet.*

³² Bogan 1968, 74-75. *Retr.* 1.17, 53: *sed quisquis ea sic accipit, ut existimet ita corpus terrenum, quale nunc habemus, in corpus caeleste resurrectione mutari, ut nec membra ista nec carnis sit futura substantia, procul dubio corrigendus est, commonitus de corpore domini, qui post resurrectionem in eisdem membris non solum conspiciendus oculis, uerum etiam manibus tangendus apparuit, carnemque se habere etiam sermone firmavit dicens: palpate et uidete quia spiritus ossa et carnem non habet sicut me uidetis habere.*

not Augustine's ignorance of the argument, but rather the fact that for a long while he did not regard it as relevant to a discussion concerning the quality of heavenly bodies.

What is then the inalienable element in a body which will remain in the resurrection? It is the *species*, the form of the body, since all that exists is contained by *species*. Incorporeal things are determined by intelligible forms, the intelligible numbers in Wisdom, whereas corporeal creatures are determined by sensible forms.³³ The sensible form of the body can be perceived on account of its shape and colour. However, in the resurrection, the form of the body will be changed into its original shape and colour so much that its identity cannot be clearly recognised by sense perception. This was the case, Augustine argues, for the Transfiguration of Christ as well.³⁴

The form (*species*) and the essence (*substantia*) of the body are to be distinguished. The bodily essence consists of the four basic elements, earth, water, fire, and air, which cannot be reduced to further components.³⁵ The elements subsist in corporeal matter, although they are only conceptually distinguished from their formless substrate. If the elements of which the essence of body consists are transformed into a celestial quality, then it means that

³³ *Div. quaest.* 83, 6, 14: *Omne quod est, aut est corporeum, aut incorporeum. Corporeum sensibili, incorporeum autem intelligibili specie continetur. Omne igitur quod est, sine aliqua specie non est.* See also *Div. quaest.* 83, 10, 18: *Omne autem corpus, ut corpus sit, specie aliqua continetur.* Cf. Ferrisi 1993, 222-223.

³⁴ *Ep.* 149.3.31, 377: *sed ego miror, cum duo sint in corpore, quibus cuiusque species agnoscatur, liniamenta et color, cur ante resurrectionem, quod in monte ita transfiguratus est, ut fieret uultus eius splendidus sicut sol, neminem mouet eum usque ad tantam excellentiam fulgoris et lucis colorem sui corporis mutare potuisse et post resurrectionem mouet aliquatenus liniamenta mutasse, ut non posset agnosci, et rursus eadem potentiae facilitate sicut tunc pristinum colorem sic et post resurrectionem pristina liniamenta renouasse.* Cf. Ferrisi 1993, 222.

³⁵ *Quant. an.* 1.2, 46: *sed quemadmodum si ex me quaereres, arbor ista ex quibus constet, notissima ista elementa quatuor nominarem, ex quibus omnia talia constare credendum est; porro si pergeres quaerere, unde ipsa terra, uel aqua, uel aer, uel ignis constant, nihil iam quod dicerem reperirem: sic cum quaeritur ex quibus sit homo compositus, respondere possum, ex anima et corpore; rursus de corpore si quaeras, ad illa elementa quatuor recurram; de anima uero quaerenti tibi, cum simplex quiddam et propriae substantiae uideatur esse, non aliter haeream ac si quaeras, ut dictum est, unde sit terra.*

the essence will be changed.³⁶ In addition, following Paul's distinction, Augustine classifies bodies into two groups: heavenly and earthly bodies. Heavenly bodies consist of ether, whereas earthly bodies consist of the four elements. When the flesh, an earthly body, transforms into ethereal, then it is the essence, no doubt, which disappears. What remains after the resurrection is not the essence of the flesh, but the *species* of the body, which provides for the personal identity of the children of the resurrection. Assuming an absolutely incorporeal state in which even the resurrected body and the corporeal form have disappeared, one should say that the rational souls are not separated from one another as individuals, that is to say, every personal identity comes to an end.

After the resurrection there will be no sexual differentiation, since those who live in angelic form have no need of carnal fecundity, which is the consequence of the Fall.³⁷ As in paradise there were no sexes, so after the return to paradise such things will not exist, and the risen bodies will not have certain limbs. Also, they do have no need of such organs as mouth, ears, eyes, or tongue, and so forth, because the children of the resurrection, whose bodies are transformed into a transparent form, will be engaged in communication without sense-perception.³⁸

Another concern Augustine's early discussions imply is that resurrection seems to be a natural and almost automatic process started by the Incarnation of Christ. Although Augustine notes that God's will assists the body in transforming 'in the twinkling of an eye' and without intermediate degrees, he does not appeal, as did Clement of Rome, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Irenaeus and Tertullian, to divine omnipotence as an argument for the

³⁶ Augustine explicitly says this in *C. Faustum* 22.17, 604: *hic ego de uero sacrificio latius fortasse disserens demonstrarem id non deberi nisi uni uero deo, quod ei unus uerus sacerdos obtulit, mediator dei et hominum: cuius sacrificii promissinas figuras in uictimis animalium celebrari oportebat propter commendationem futurae carnis et sanguinis, per quam unam uictimam fieret remissio peccatorum de carne et sanguine contractorum, quae regnum dei non possidebunt, quia eadem substantia corporis in caelestem conmutabitur qualitatem: quod ignis in sacrificio significabat uelut absorbens mortem in uictoriam.*

³⁷ *Gen. man.* 1.19.30; *Ver. rel.* 247. Cf. *Retr.* 1.10.2; 1.13.8.

³⁸ *Gen. man.* 2.21.32.

resurrection.³⁹ Augustine starts from the fact that through belief in God and good will, man could bring forth the 'first fruits of spirit,' that is, the chaste spirit.⁴⁰ If the spirit is subjected to God, then the lower faculty, the soul, can also be restored to its perfect nature, because it subjects itself to the spirit. In this way, through the perfect soul, the visible body will also be restored to its original nature, even if *not so quickly as the soul, as also the soul is not restituted so quickly as the spirit, but at the right moment, at the last trumpet*.⁴¹ God accelerates the transformation of the body, but the possibility of such change is inherent in the nature of the body. It would be logical, therefore, that the heavenly body in paradise be likewise changed into flesh automatically when the spirit deserted God and lost its control over the soul, which ought to have vivified and governed the body.

In conclusion, Augustine and Origen both teach, concerning the resurrection, that the essence of the earthly body, which is composed of the four elements, will be annulled, and what remains is the form of the body (*species* – εἶδος). Both use the same arguments, work with the same philosophical presumptions and refer to the scene of Transfiguration to confirm their theory. For them, the resurrected bodies are spiritual (*spiritalia* – πνευματικά), angelic, luminous and ethereal (*angelica corpora ... lucidissima atque aetherea* – ὅποιά ἐστι τὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων σώματα, αἰθέρια καὶ ἀύγοειδὲς φῶς)

³⁹ The argument appears in so late a text by Augustine as *Civ. Dei* 21.7; 22.26.

⁴⁰ *Fid. symb.* 10.23. 'primitiae spiritus' represents the spirit offered to God, see. *Div. quaest.* 83 67.6. Cf. Meijering 1987, 142-43.

⁴¹ Meijering 1987, 146. *Fid. symb.* 10.23.

APPENDIX 1: CANTICLE IMAGES IN CONFESSIONS 9.2.3

At the beginning of the ninth book of the *Confessions*, Augustine uses the image of “waking up from sleep” which already had occurred in *Conf.* 8.5.12.¹ After conversion, Augustine and his friends decided to withdraw from public life, even though some people attempted to dissuade them. I quote this illuminating paragraph:

*Sagittaveras tu cor nostrum caritate tua, et gestabamus verba tua transfixa visceribus et exempla servorum tuorum, quos de nigris lucidos et de mortuis vivos feceras, congesta in sinum cogitationis nostrae urebant et absumebant gravem torporem, ne in ima vergeremus, et accendebant nos valide, ut omnis ex lingua subdola contradictionis flatus inflammare nos acrius posset, non extinguere.*²

In the passage, Augustine refers to the period which immediately preceded the climax of the conversion. This is incontestable since he repeats the expression “*gravis torpor*” and mentions the irresistible “divine love” as well. Moreover, the passage also recalls the image “awaking and rising up” used in chapter 8.5.12. The mention of “*exempla*” can be considered a hint at the Christians whose exemplary life Augustine heard about from Simplicianus and Ponticianus.³

¹ The image may be an allusion to Rom. 13:11 (cf. 1 Thess. 5:6-7). This is meaningful especially in an account related to the period previous to the *tolle lege* event when Augustine would read Rom. 13:13-14.

² *Conf.* 9.2.3, 134.

³ Cf. J. J. O'Donnell 1992, 3, 78.

While describing his state of mind in that period, Augustine uses the metaphors of a *Canticle* exegesis. The first of them is the “arrow of the love of God.”⁴

Alius iaculum carnei amoris exceperit, alius terreno cupidine vulneratus est; tu nuda membra tua et praebe te iaculo electo, iaculo formoso, siquidem Deus sagittarius est. Audi Scripturam de hoc eodem iaculo loquentem, immo, ut amplius admireris, audi ipsum iaculum, quid loquatur: Posuit me ut sagittam electam, et in pharetra sua servavit me. Et dixit mihi: Magnum tibi est hoc, vocari puerum meum (Is 49:2,6).⁵

The second metaphor is that of the “words of the Scripture implanted in the human hearts,” while the third is the image of the sleeping and the waking up according to the examples of the saints.

Creator universitatis cum vos conderet, inseruit cordibus vestris semina caritatis. Nunc autem, sicuti alibi dicitur: Iustitia dormivit in ea (Is. 1:21), sic dilectio dormitat in vobis; iuxta quod et alibi: Sponsus requievit ut leo et ut catulus leonis (Num. 24:9). Adhuc in infidelibus et his qui corde sunt dubio, dormitat sermo divinus, vigilat in sanctis; dormit in his qui tempestatibus fluctuant (cf. Matth. 8:23), suscitatur vero eorum vocibus, qui cupiunt sponso vigilante salvari. Statim fit eo vigilante tranquillitas, statim undarum moles conquiescunt, spiritibus contrariis increpatur, fluctuum rabies silet; illo dormiente tempestas, mors et desperatio est.⁶

The fourth *Canticle* image is the “turning into white from black.”

Quaerimus autem, quomodo nigra et sine candore sit pulchra (Cf. Song. 1:5-6). Paenitentiam egit a peccatis, speciem ei est

⁴ As regards the clause “*Sagittaveras tu cor nostrum caritate tua*,” editors refer to Psalm 10 (11): 3, which sounds in the Vulgate as the following: *Quoniam, ecce, peccatores intenderunt arcum, paraverunt sagittas suas in pharetra, ut sagittent in obscuro rectos corde*. The meaning of this verse is just the opposite to what Augustine thinks of. See also Augustine’s En. in Ps. 119. 5, cf. J. J. O’Donnell 1992, 3, 77-78.

⁵ Origen *HomCant.* 2.8, 132. The analogy was discovered by Pierre Courcelle; 1968, 462. n. 1.. His further evidence is also remarkable, *Conf* 10.6.8: *Percussisti cor meum verbo tuo, et amavi te*. Cf. *Civ. Dei* 20.21, 96 and Origen *ComCant* Prol. 2.16-17, 102-4.

⁶ *HomCant.* 2.9, 136.

largita conversio et ideo speciosa cantatur. Quia vero necdum omni peccatorum sorde purgata, necdum lota est in salutem, nigra dicitur, sed in atro colore non permanet; fit et candida. Itaque quando ad maiora consurgit et ab humilibus incipit ad alta conscendere, dicitur de ea: Quae est ista, quae adscendit dealbata (Song, 8:5).⁷

These parallels may confirm that Augustine was familiar with Origen's interpretation of the Song of Songs, at least when he composed the *Confessions*.⁸ It is meaningful that the agglomeration of the allusions to the *Song of Songs* serves as a condensed description of the period when, as I assume, Augustine may well have read Origen's writings, including the homilies on the Song of Songs. Despite his silence about the reading of the works, Augustine did not hesitate subtly to allude to his encounter with the Canticle exegesis.

Finally, in this paragraph Augustine also recalls his "conflagration." As in *Contra Academicos* 2.2.5, in *Confessions* 9.2.3 the image of "conflagration" represents more than a simple phrase of enthusiasm. The words of God were "fixed into our viscera" (*et gestabamus verba tua transfixa visceribus*), Augustine says, as the childhood religion was implanted into their "marrow" (*religio nobis insita est et medullitus implicata*). The religion "drew Augustine to itself" because the books and the examples of Christians excited conflagration in him. In the *Confessions* the examples "fired" the words "gathered together," like a pile of firewood, and inflamed an inextinguishable fire.

⁷ *HomCant.* 1.6, 86.

⁸ Cf. Courcelle 1968, 462, n. 1.

APPENDIX 2: THE *LITTLE* *COMMENTARIES* ON MATTHEW

In *Ep.* 27*, Jerome made it clear that he had not published the Latin commentaries on Matthew which Aurelius of Carthage attributed to him. Five or six years later, Jerome would, indeed, publish a commentary on Matthew, in the Preface of which he lists the works of his predecessors that he had read before. From among the Latin writers he mentions the *opuscula* of Victorinus of Poetovio, Fortunatianus of Aquileia and Hilary of Poitiers.¹ The question is to what work Aurelius and Jerome referred as *commentarioli in Mattheum*.

The works of Victorinus or Fortunatianus may have been regarded as ‘little commentaries,’ or perhaps *scholia* on Matthew,² but there is no other reason for identifying them with the work mentioned by Jerome.³ Jerome’s words, from which the content of Aurelius’ letter can be recovered, may throw light on the nature of these little commentaries:

*Scribis te quaedam nostrae parvitatis habere opuscula, id est
paucas in Ieremiam homelias et duas cantici canticorum; dum
essem adolescentulus, cuiusdam fratris rogatu in huiusmodi
exercitationem lusi exceptis duabus homeliis cantici canticorum
quas ammonitu beati Damasi Romae transtuli. Itaque si qua*

¹ Jerome *In Matth. Praef.* 4-5: *Legisse me fateor ante annos plurimos in Matheum Origenis uiginti quinque uolumina et totidem eius omelias commaticumque interpretationis genus, et Theophili Antiochenae urbis episcopi commentarios, Hippolyti quoque martyris et Theodori Heracleotae Apollinarisque Laodicensi ac Didimi Alexandrini et Latinorum Hilarii, Victorini, Fortunatiani opuscula, e quibus etiam si parua carperem dignum aliquid memoriae scriberetur.*

² Cf. Doignon 1978, 1, 19.

³ Cf. Duval 1987, 563-4.

*nunc scripsimus maturiora et aetati nostrae conuenientia
aestimare debes; praeterea quod addis habere te et commentariolos
meos in Mattheum, hoc ego opus edidisse me penitus ignoro, nisi
forte caritate qua me diligis quidquid praeclarum videris meum
putas.*⁴

It is clear that not only the two homilies on the Song of Songs represent translations, but also the homilies on Jeremiah, although Jerome regards the latter translations, made at the request of Vincentius, as finger exercises.⁵ He played, *lusi*, when working on them. The name of Origen does not occur in the letter, yet the Alexandrian master is the protagonist whose above-mentioned works Jerome had translated and Aurelius possessed, a fact that cannot be overemphasised, in his library at Carthage. It is also clear from Jerome's answer that Aurelius listed the mysterious commentaries on Matthew together with translations. Jerome claims he is absolutely ignorant of having published (*edidisse*) such work. This usage of the verb '*edo*' does not necessary imply that Jerome was considered to be the writer of the work, since the verb has a broader meaning. It can refer to the publication of translations.⁶ Jerome's letter permits the assumption that the North African 'little commentaries on Matthew' were translations, or compilations of certain Origenian work. Jerome mentions three literary genres in which Origen composed exegetical works on Matthew: commentaries (*volumina*), homilies and the so-called *commaticum interpretationis genus*, that is, the scholion.⁷ This *commaticum*, which probably contained brief commentaries on particular verses, may correspond to the *commentarioli*. Moreover,

⁴ *Ep.* 27*. 2, 131-2.

⁵ For these translations, see Kelly 1975, 75-76.

⁶ In *Adv. Ruf.* 3.20, Jerome quotes Rufinus who asserted that Eusebius had stolen his translation of *De principiis*: *aliter ego edidi, immo nec edidi*.

⁷ See above, note 568. In the Preface to the *HomEz.* (pp. 31-32), Jerome also mentions the three kinds of works that Origen had written on Scripture: ... *Origenis opuscula in omnem Scripturam esse triplicia. Primum eius opus Excerpta sunt, quae graece σχόλια nuncupantur, in quibus ea quae sibi videbantur obscura aut habere aliquid difficultatis, summatim breviterque perstrinxit. Secundum homeliticum genus, de quo et praesens interpretatio est. tertium quod ipse inscripsit τόμους, nos volumina possumus nuncupare, in quo opere tota ingenii sui vela spirantibus ventis deid et recedens a terra in medium pelagus aufugit.*

the assumption that an early Latin version of the *commaticum* existed may be established.⁸

In 393 or 394, Augustine, Aurelius' good friend, began to compose his commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, that is, on chapters 5-7 of the Gospel of Matthew.⁹ Origen's surviving commentaries lack the interpretation of these chapters, but a continuous explanation of Matth. 6:1-14, the Lord's Prayer, can be read in *De Oratione*. I will compare some elements of Augustine's and Origen's interpretations of the Prayer, in order to show that Augustine is in agreement with Origen at many points, and, in addition, the majority of the parallels cannot be found in such possible Latin sources of Augustine as Tertullian, Cyprian or Ambrose.¹⁰

1. Before examining the entreaties step by step, Origen and Augustine must answer the question of why we should ask God at all. Origen quotes the argument of the opponents of prayer.¹¹ They

⁸ A Latin version of a relatively long part of Origen's Commentary on Matthew survived, but for chronological reasons it cannot be identical to the commentaries mentioned by Aurelius and Jerome. This is the so-called *Commentioriorum series in Matthaeum* which embraces the interpretation of Matth. 22:34-27:66.

⁹ According to *Retr.* 1.19.1 Augustine wrote *Serm. monte* just when (*per idem tempus*) *Gen. litt. imp.* This latter work is listed in *Retr.* immediately after *Fid. symb.* that Augustine preached on October 8, 393. It seems logical to infer that he composed *Serm. monte* in 393 or 394.

¹⁰ As for other possible sources are concerned, in the Commentary on Matthew, Hilary does not explain the Lord's Prayer, because Cyprian satisfactorily commented on the text: *De orationis autem sacramento necessitate nos commentandi Cyprianus vir sanctae memoriae liberavit. Quamquam et Tertullianus hinc volumen aptissimum scripserit sed consequens error hominis detraxit scriptis probabilibus auctoritatem. ComMatth.* 5.1, 150. Chromatius, the successor of Valerian bishop, also explained the Lord's prayer in the *Tractatus in Mathaeum*. Probably, these were written after 398, because Jerome did not mention his friend's works in the Preface to the Commentary on Matthew.

¹¹ Origen *Orat.* 5.2, 308-9: "ὁ θεὸς οἶδε τὰ πάντα πρὸ γενέσεως αὐτῶν" (Susanna 5:35 = Dan. 13:42), καὶ οὐδὲν ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεστηκέναι ὅτε ἐνέστηκε πρῶτον αὐτῷ γινώσκεται ὡς πρὸ τούτου μὴ γνωσθέν· τίς οὖν χρεῖα ἀναπέμπεσθαι εὐχὴν τῷ καὶ πρὶν εὐξασθαι ἐπιστομένῳ ὦν

cite two verses: the words of Susanna from the appendix of the book of Daniel, the authority of which was highly disputed, *God knows all things before they take place*, as well as Matth. 6:8, the warning of Jesus who teaches his disciples to pray. This latter citation is natural in the context, because there is a seeming tension between the warning and the following entreaties. Why should we ask God who knows what is necessary for us before we ask Him? Susanna also appeals to the divine omniscience, and in this respect the quotation takes its proper place, although it comes from a book that the Fathers quoted rarely. It is noteworthy therefore, that Augustine also quotes both verses.¹² What is important in this case is not simply the fact that in the two commentaries on the Prayer the same question emerge about the function of prayer but that Augustine and Origen quote the same deuterocanonical verse in the same context.

2. According to Origen the man who prays makes himself aware of his standing in the presence of God, and this awareness shields him from sins and urges him to accomplish good deeds.¹³ The greatest benefit of prayer is, Origen insists, ‘the attitude (σχέσις) and preparation (παρασκευή) for prayer of the man who has dedicated himself to God.’ Augustine states that we should pray ‘not by words, but by the ideas that we cherish in our mind, and by the direction of our thought, with pure love and sincere desire.’¹⁴ Both agree that the greatest benefit of prayer is not the fulfilment of verbal requests but the inner direction and disposition with which one turns to God. The terms *παρασκευή* and *intentio* refer to this movement of the mind towards God, the *σχέσις* and *affectus* to the state of the mind which is directed to God. Likewise, both describe

χρήζομεν; "οἶδε γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ὁ οὐράνιος ὧν χρείαν" ἔχομεν "πρὸ τοῦ" ἡμᾶς "αἰτῆσαι αὐτόν"(Matth. 6:8).

¹² Augustine *Serm. monte* 2.3.13, 103: *sed quoniam, quamvis pauca, tamen uerba et ipse dicturus est, quibus nos doceat orare, quaeri potest, cur uel his paucis uerbis opus sit ad eum 'qui scit omnia antequam fiant' (Dan. 13:42), et 'nouit,' ut dictum est, 'quid nobis sit necessarium, antequam petamus ab eo' (Matth. 6: 8).*

¹³ Cf. Origen *Orat.* 8.2, 317.

¹⁴ Augustine *Serm. monte* 2.3.13, 103: *hic primo respondetur non uerbis nos agere debere apud deum, ut impetremus quod uolumus, sed rebus quas animo gerimus et intentione cogitationis cum dilectione pura et simplici affectu.* For the distinction between ‘words’ and ‘things,’ see *Doctr. chr.* 1.2-3.

the process which happens within the soul and evolves into the vision of God.

Origen

The prophet David also has much to say concerning the blessings that the saint has in prayer. And it is not irrelevant to quote the following, so that we may clearly see that the greatest benefits result from the attitude of, and preparation for prayer, considered simply by themselves, of man who has dedicated himself to God. He says, then: 'Unto thee have I lifted up my eyes, O thou that dwellest in the heaven' (Ps. 122:1); and 'Unto thee have I lifted up my soul, O God' (Ps. 24:1). When the eyes of the understanding are lifted up, away from converse with earthly things and occupation with material impressions, and when they are elevated to high that they can transcend created things and fix themselves solely upon the contemplation of God and of reverent and seemly intercourse with him who bears, it must needs be that the eyes themselves derive the greatest benefit, when 'with unveiled face they reflect as a mirror the glory of the Lord, and are transformed into the same image from glory to glory' (2 Cor. 3:18). For they then partake of a kind of divine spiritual effluence, as is indicated in the words: 'the light of thy countenance, O Lord, was signed upon us' (Ps. 4:7). Moreover, when the soul is lifted up and follows the spirit and separates itself from the body – and not only follows the spirit but also dwells in it, as is indicated in the words: 'Unto thee have I lifted up my soul' (Ps. 24:1) – it must needs be that laying aside the nature of a soul it becomes spiritual.¹⁵

¹⁵ Oulton 1954, 256-7. *Orat.* 9.2, 318-19: καὶ ὁ προφήτης δὲ Δαυὶδ πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα φησὶν ἔχειν εὐχόμενον τὸν ἅγιον· καὶ ταῦτα δὲ οὐκ ἀκαίρως παραθετέον, ἵνα φανερὰ ἡμῖν γένηται τὰ μέγιστα ὠφελοῦσα, κὰν μόνῃ νοηθῇ, ἡ σχέσις καὶ εἰς τὸ εὐχεσθαι παρασκευὴ τοῦ ἀναθεοικότες ἑαυτὸν τῷ θεῷ· φησὶν οὖν· "πρὸς σέ ἦρα τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου, τὸν κατοικοῦντα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ," (Ps. 122:1) καὶ "πρὸς σέ ἦρα τὴν ψυχὴν μου, ὁ θεός." (Ps. 24:1.) ἐπαίρόμενοι γὰρ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τοῦ διανοητικοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ προσδιατρίβειν τοῖς γήϊνους καὶ πληροῦσθαι φαντασίας τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ὑλικωτέρων καὶ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ὑψούμενοι, ὥστε καὶ ὑπερκύπτειν τὰ γεννητὰ καὶ πρὸς μόνῳ τῷ ἐννοεῖν τὸν θεὸν ἀκείνῳ σεμνῶς καὶ πρεπόντως τῷ ἀκούοντι ὁμιλεῖν γίνεσθαι, πῶς οὐχὶ τὰ μέγιστα ἤδη ὤνησαν αὐτοὺς τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, "ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου" κατοπτριζομένους καὶ

According to this description, the prayer is an inner ascent. The first step is considered the withdrawal from sensible things in such a way that the mind moves away from the phantasm of the earthly things that enters the mind through the senses. The next step is made when the mind transcends the creatures, not only the sensible ones but all creatures. When this happens, an intelligible light streams out onto the mind, the eye of the soul, which opens to receive the light. In the light the 'unveiled' mind transforms into the image of God whom it sees, because the seer must be similar to what is seen. The transformation results in the change of the soul's nature. The soul separated from the body is no longer in the body, because it does not use sense-perception. The soul is within the spirit, that is, in the Holy Spirit, who is identical to the light which streamed onto the mind so that it could see.

Augustine

But again, it may be asked (whether we are to pray in ideas or in words) what need there is for prayer itself, if God already knows what is necessary for us; unless it be that the very effort involved in prayer calms and purifies our heart, and makes it more capacious for receiving the divine gifts, which are poured into us spiritually. For it is not on account of the urgency of our prayers that God hears us, who is always ready to give us His light, not of a material kind, but that which is intellectual and spiritual: but we are not always ready to receive, since we are inclined towards other things, and are involved in darkness through our desire for temporal things. Hence there is brought about in prayer a turning of the heart to Him, who is ever ready to give, if we will but take what He has given; and in the very act of turning there is effected a purging of the inner eye, inasmuch as those things of a temporal kind which were desired are excluded, so that the vision of the pure heart may be able to bear the pure light, divinely shining, without any setting or change: and not only to bear it,

"τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα" μεταμορφουμένους "ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν" (2 Cor. 3:18); ἀπορῥοῆς γὰρ νοητοῦ τινος θειοτέρου μεταλαμβάνουσι τότε, ὅπερ δηλοῦται ἐκ τοῦ· "ἐσημειώθη ἐφ' ἡμᾶς τὸ φῶς τοῦ προσώπου σου, κύριε" (Ps. 4:7). καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ δὲ ἐπαιρομένη καὶ τῷ πνεύματι ἐπομένη τοῦ τε σώματος χωριζομένη καὶ οὐ μόνον ἐπομένη τῷ πνεύματι ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ γινομένη, ὅπερ δηλοῦται ἐκ τοῦ· "πρὸς σὲ ἦρα τὴν ψυχὴν μου" (Ps. 24:1), πῶς οὐχὶ ἤδη ἀποτιθεμένη τὸ εἶναι ψυχὴ πνευματικὴ γίνεται;

*but also to remain in it; not merely without annoyance, but also with ineffable joy, in which a life truly and sincerely blessed is perfected.*¹⁶

In the quoted passage, Augustine chooses the image of turning to God as the framework, but what he describes is similar to Origen's prose on the ascent to God. In the Augustinian portrayal, the inner eye, the mind, is purified on account of its turning to God. As the eye turns to Him, it immediately turns away from perishable things. The mind becomes pure, as the light is pure which streams onto the mind. Augustine does not leave doubt about the divine nature of the immutable light. The pure eye of the heart regards the light as being not outside itself, that is to say, the eye is able not merely to bear the light, but also to remain in it.

What Origen calls the eyes of the mind (οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τοῦ διανοητικοῦ) Augustine refers to as the inner eye (*oculus interioris*), or the eye of the heart (*acies cordis*). The intelligible or more divine effluence (ἀπορροῆς γὰρ νοητοῦ τινος θειοτέρου) corresponds to the 'intelligible and spiritual light' (*lux ... intelligibilis et spiritalis*) that certainly is identical to the 'divine gifts which are poured into us spiritually' (*divina munera, quae spiritaliter nobis infunduntur*). Finally, according to Origen, the soul contemplating God not only follows the Spirit, but is also in the Spirit (ἐν αὐτῷ γινομένη), while according to Augustine, the pure mind is able 'not only to bear the light but also to remain in it' (*manere in illa*).

3. Jesus warns the disciples not to pray at the street corners as the hypocrites do: 'When you pray, go into your bed-chamber and shut

¹⁶ Findlay 1995, 32. Augustine *Serm. monte* 2.3.14, 103-104: *Sed rursus quaeri potest - siue rebus siue uerbis orandum sit -, quid opus sit ipsa oratione, si deus iam nouit, quid nobis sit necessarium, nisi quia ipsa orationis intentio cor nostrum serenat et purgat capaciousque efficit ad excipienda diuina munera, quae spiritaliter nobis infunduntur. Non enim ambitione precum nos exaudit deus, qui semper paratus est dare suam lucem nobis non uisibilem sed intellegibilem et spiritalem; sed nos non semper parati sumus accipere, cum inclinamur in alia et rerum temporalium cupiditate tenebramur. Fit ergo in oratione conuersio cordis ad eum qui semper dare paratus est, si nos capiamus quod dederit, et in ipsa conuersione purgatio interioris oculi, cum excluduntur ea quae temporaliter cupiebantur, ut acies simplicis cordis ferre possit simplicem lucem diuinitus sine ullo occasu aut inmutatione fulgentem, nec solum ferre sed etiam manere in illa, non tantum sine molestia sed etiam cum ineffabili gaudio, quo uere ac sinceriter beata uita perficitur.*

the door and pray to your Father in secret; and your Father who sees in secret will reward you.' Origen interprets this verse as meaning that he who throws off all foreign masks withdraws into his inner self and seeks treasures in his own soul. This man shuts the door of the senses in order to be with God alone and not to be disturbed by the phantasms coming through the senses.

Origen

But he who is not an actor, and on the contrary puts aside everything that is not his own, and prepares to delight himself in a place that is greater and far surpasses any of the theatres mentioned above, 'enters into' his own 'inner chamber, shutting' (Matth. 6:6) himself in upon the riches laid up in store, 'the treasure of wisdom and knowledge' (Col. 2:3; 1 Tim. 6:18-19). And never bending outside nor gaping at the things outside, he 'shuts' every 'door' of the faculties of sense, so that he may not be enticed by the impressions of sense and their image may not penetrate into his mind. Thus he prays to the Father, who does not flee from or abandon such a secret place, but rather 'dwells' in it, his only begotten being also present with him. For, says he, 'I and the Father will come unto him and make our abode with him' (Jn. 14:23). It is evident that if indeed we pray thus, we shall make intercession not only with the righteous God but also with the Father, as One who is not absent from his sons but is present in our secret place, and watches over it, and increases what is in 'the inner chamber,' if we 'shut the door' of it.¹⁷

¹⁷ Oulton 1954, 278-279. Origen *Orat.* 20.2, 344: ὁ δὲ μὴ ὑποκριτὴς ἀλλὰ πᾶν τὸ ἀλλότριον ἀποθέμενος, ἐν τῷ παντὸς τοῦ προειρημένου θεάτρου καθ' ὑπερβολὴν μείζονι ἑαυτὸν ἀρέσκειν εὐτρεπίζων, εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ "ταμεῖον," (Matth. 6:6) ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐναποτεθησαυρισμένου πλούτου τὸν "τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως" (Col. 2:3; 1 Tim. 6:18-19) θησαυρὸν ἑαυτῷ ἀποκλείσας· καὶ μηδამῶς ἔξω νεύων μηδὲ περὶ τὰ ἔξω κεχηνῶς πᾶσάν τε "τὴν θύραν" (Matth. 6:6) τῶν αἰσθητηρίων ἀποκλείσας, ἵνα μὴ ἔλκηται ὑπὸ τῶν αἰσθήσεων μηδὲ ἐκεῖνων ἢ φαντασίας τῷ νῷ αὐτοῦ ἐπεισκρίνηται, προσεύχεται τῷ τὸ τοιοῦτον κρυπτὸν μὴ φεύγοντι μηδὲ ἐγκαταλείποντι πατρὶ ἄλλ' ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικοῦντι, συμπάροντος αὐτῷ καὶ τοῦ μονογενοῦς. ἐγὼ γάρ, φησὶ, "καὶ ὁ πατήρ" πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλευσόμεθα καὶ μονὴν παρ' αὐτῷ ποιησόμεθα." (Jn. 14:23) δῆλον δὲ ὅτι τῷ δικαίῳ, ἐὰν δὴ οὕτως εὐχόμεθα, οὐ μόνον θεῷ ἀλλὰ καὶ πατρὶ ἐντευξόμεθα, ὥς υἱὼν μὴ ἀπολειπομένῳ ἀλλὰ παρόντι ἡμῶν "τῷ κρυπτῷ" (Matth. 6:6) καὶ

A similar spiritual interpretation of Matth. 6:6 does not occur in Tertullian and Cyprian's commentaries. Augustine, however, explains it as follows:

'But when ye pray,' says He, 'enter into your bed-chambers.' What are those bed-chambers but just our hearts themselves, as is meant also in the Psalm, when it is said, 'What ye say in your hearts, have remorse for even your beds'? 'And when ye have shut the doors,' says He, 'pray to your Father who is in secret.' It is a small matter to enter into our bed-chambers if the door stand open to the unmannerly, through which the things that are outside profanely rush in and assail our inner man. Now we have said that outside are all temporal and visible things, which make their way through the door, i.e. through the fleshly sense into our thoughts, and clamorously interrupt those who are praying by a crowd of vain phantoms. Hence the door is to be shut, i.e. the fleshly sense is to be resisted, so that spiritual prayer may be directed to the Father, which is done in the inmost heart, where prayer is offered to the Father which is in secret. 'And your Father,' says He, 'who seeth in secret, shall reward you.' And this had to be wound up with a closing statement of such a kind; for here at the present stage the admonition is not that we should pray, but as to how we should pray. Nor is what goes before an admonition that we should give alms, but as to the spirit which we should do so, inasmuch as He is giving instructions with regard to the cleansing of the heart, which nothing cleanses but the undivided and single-minded striving after eternal life from the pure love of wisdom alone.¹⁸

ἐφορῶντι αὐτὸ καὶ πλείονα τὰ ἐν τῷ ταμίῳ ποιοῦντι, ἐὰν αὐτοῦ "τὴν θύραν" (Matth. 6:6) ἀποκλείσωμεν.

¹⁸ Findlay 1995, 31. Augustine *Serm. monte* 2.3.11, 101-102: *'Vos autem cum oratis', inquit, 'introite in cubicula uestra'. Quae sunt ista cubicula nisi ipsa corda, quae in psalmo etiam significantur, ubi dicitur: "Quae dicitis in cordibus uestris, et in cubilibus uestris confungimini" (Ps. 4:5)? 'Et claudentes ostia orate,' ait, patrem uestrum in abscondito.' Parum est intrare in cubicula, si ostium pateat inportunis, per quod ostium ea quae foris sunt inprobe se inmergunt et interiora nostra appetunt. Foris autem esse diximus omnia temporalia et uisibilia, quae per ostium, id est per carnalem sensum, cogitationes nostras penetrant et turba uanorum fantasmatum orantibus obstrepunt. Claudendum est ergo ostium, id est carnali sensui resistendum est, ut oratio spiritalis dirigatur ad patrem, quae fit in intimis cordis, ubi oratur pater in abscondito. 'Et pater,' inquit, 'uester, qui uidet in abscondito, reddet uobis.' Et hoc tali clausula*

Chromatius of Aquileia similarly takes the chamber of Matth. 6:6 to refer to the 'secret place of the heart and conscience,' and he also cites Ps. 4:5. However, the other, significantly common element of the Augustinian and Origenian interpretations, namely, that the door signifies the bodily sensation through which phantasms enter the soul, is missing from Chromatius' treatise.¹⁹ Augustine and Origen's interpretation can be clearly distinguished from another tradition according to which the closed door signifies the closed mouth of the man who prays.²⁰

4. Concerning the invocation 'Our Father,' commentators usually emphasise its novelty and freedom. From this point of view Origen and Augustine compare the two Testaments. There is no trace in the Old Testament books of anybody praying to God as to a Father, even though God was regarded as a Father and those 'who had come to His word' (Origen), or 'had not strayed from his commandments' (Augustine), were called his sons.²¹ In order to establish this idea, Augustine quotes Isaiah 1:2; Psalm 81:6 and Malachi 1:6.²² Origen cites three verses of Deuteronomy 32, as well as quoting Isaiah 1:2 and Malachi 1:6.²³ The verse of Isaiah, "*sons have I reared and brought up, but they have rebelled against me,*" occurs in Tertullian and Cyprian's commentaries, but Malachi 1:6, "*if I am a father, where is my honour? and if I am a master, where is my fear?*" is cited only by Origen and Augustine. Similar is the case for the New

terminandum fuit. Non enim hoc monet nunc ut oremus, sed quomodo oremus; neque superius ut faciamus elemosinam, sed quo animo faciamus, quoniam de corde mundando praecipit, quod non mundat nisi una et simplex intentio in aeternam uitam solo et puro amore sapientiae. cf. Mag. 2.

¹⁹ Chromatius of Aquileia *Tract. in Matth.* 27.1.3, 325: *Et ideo clauso ostio, id est intra cordis ac conscientiae ipsius secretum a domino iubemur orare, ut ab eo qui secretorum et occultorum est cognitor, recipiamus orationis occultae mercedem. Religiosae enim mentis est deum non clamore uel sono uocis, sed deuotione animi ac fide cordis orare, secundum quod dauid in psalmo testatur dicens: dicite in cordibus uestris et in cubilibus uestris compungimini (Ps. 4:5). cf. idem Sermo 40; Ambrose De Cain et Abel 1.9.35.*

²⁰ *De sacramentis* 6.3.15; Chromatius of Aquileia *Tract. in Matth.* 27; *Sermo* 40; Jerome *In Matth.* 6.6.; John Cassian *Coll.* 9.35.

²¹ Origen *Orat.* 22.1; Augustine *Serm. monte* 2.4.15.

²² *Serm. monte* 2.4.15, 105-106.

²³ Origen *Orat.* 22.1.

Testament passages that all the commentators quote to argue for Christians who became the sons of God. Augustine refers to John 1:12; Galatians 4:1; Romans 8:15.²⁴ Origen quotes all these verses and 1 John 3:9.²⁵ From among these quotations, the lists of Tertullian and Cyprian do not contain anything but John 1:12.²⁶

5. For Origen and Augustine, the clause "*who art in heaven*" means "who art in the holy men."²⁷ Origen admits also the interpretation that 'heaven' may signify Christ. Augustine delivers this interpretation concerning the third request: "Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven."

6. With regard to the third request, Augustine offers four possible interpretations.

1. Heaven: angels; earth: the holy men,²⁸
2. heaven: Christ; earth: church,²⁹
3. heaven: spirit; earth: flesh,³⁰
4. heaven: the righteous; earth: the wicked.³¹

The first two identifications appear in Origen's work alone,³² the third is only alluded to by Origen,³³ but can be found in Tertullian³⁴ and Cyprian³⁵, the fourth occurs in Origen³⁶ and in Cyprian.³⁷

²⁴ Augustine *Serm. monte* 2.4.15.

²⁵ Origen *Orat.* 22.2.

²⁶ Tertullian *Orat.* 2. Cyprian *Orat.* 9. Chromatius cites, among others, 1 Jn. 3:9 in *Tract. in Matth.* 27.

²⁷ Origen *Orat.* 23.4; Augustine *Serm. monte* 2.5.17.

²⁸ Augustine *Serm. monte* 2.6.21.

²⁹ Augustine *Serm. monte* 2.6.24.

³⁰ Augustine *Serm. monte* 2.6.23.

³¹ Augustine *Serm. monte* 2.6.22.

³² Origen *Orat.* 26.1, cf. *Orat.* 23.4.

³³ Origen *Orat.* 26.6.

³⁴ Tertullian *Orat.* 4.

³⁵ Cyprian *Orat.* 16.

³⁶ Origen *Orat.* 26.6, 362-363: καὶ τάχα λέγων δεῖν εὐχεσθαι ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, ἵνα γένηται "τὸ θέλημα" τοῦ πατρὸς "ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ" οὕτως "καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς," οὐ πάντως περὶ τῶν ἐν τόπῳ τῆς "γῆς" κελεύει γίνεσθαι τὰς εὐχὰς, ὅπως ὁμοιωθῶσι τοῖς ἐν τόπῳ οὖσιν οὐρανίῳ· ἀλλ' ἔστιν αὐτῷ ἡ πρόσταξις τῆς εὐχῆς, βουλομένῳ ὁμοιωθῆναι πάντα τὰ "ἐπὶ γῆς," τουτέστι τὰ χείρονα καὶ τοῖς γηϊνοῖς ὠκειωμένα, τοῖς κρείττοσι καὶ ἔχουσι "τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς" (cf. Phil. 3:20),

Importantly, although the third interpretation emerges in the two African theologians, they do not interpret the request from the eschatological viewpoint that Augustine prefers. In fact, they do not think that in the resurrection, God's will will be done on the flesh in the sense of its being essentially transformed. Origen's short remark expresses the hope for such a change, and in *De fide et symbolo*, which is contemporaneous with the commentary on the Lord's Prayer, Augustine also argued that through the resurrection, the flesh will be essentially transformed into a spiritual body.

7. The 'daily bread' is also subject to different explanations. In Augustine's commentary, three interpretations can be found.

1. Literal interpretation, that is, daily bread represents corporeal bread, or 'all those things that meet the wants of this life.'
2. Eucharistic interpretation, that is, the bread 'is put for the sacrament of the body of Christ.'
3. Spiritual interpretation, that is, daily bread stands for 'the spiritual food.' This can mean, on the one hand, Christ the 'bread of life,' and, on the other, the spiritual commandments of Christ which represent bread for souls.³⁸

In spite of the fact that Cyprian accepted the first of these meanings,³⁹ Augustine rejects it, just as Origen did.⁴⁰ In order to refute the interpretation, Origen quotes the agraphon that heavenly and great things are to be asked, whereas Augustine cites Matth. 6:25 and 6:33. Origen does not mention the eucharistic

πᾶσι γενομένοις οὐρανῷ. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀμαρτάνων, ὅπου ποτ' ἂν ᾦ, ἐστὶ "γῆ," εἰς τὴν συγγενῇ, ἐὰν μὴ μετανοῇ, ἐσόμενός πῃ (cf. Gen. 3:19)· ὁ δὲ ποιῶν "τὸ θέλημα" τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μὴ παρακούων τῶν σωτηρίων πνευματικῶν νόμων οὐρανός ἐστιν. Cf. Augustine *Ag. christ.* 2.2, 103: *quando enim dictum est diabolo: terra manducabis* (Gen 3:14), *dictum est peccatori: terra es, et in terram ibis* (Gen 3:19). In *Ag. christ.* 3.3 and 5.5 he explains that Eph. 6:12 should not be understood that the devil and his angels dwell in heaven, because they had fallen from there. We are, in fact, in heaven whose 'commonwealth is in heaven' (Phil. 3:20). The interpretation bears close resemblance to Origen *Orat.* 22.5-6, cf. Origen *HomJer.* 8 (= Jerome 5) 2.

³⁷ Cyprian *Orat.* 17.

³⁸ Augustine *Serm. monte* 2.7.25.

³⁹ Cyprian *Orat.* 18-19.

⁴⁰ Augustine *Serm. monte* 2.7.25; Origen *Orat.* 27.1.

interpretation. Augustine discards this possibility, which also can be found in Cyprian, because he is reluctant to enter into a controversy with the Christians, mainly those living in Eastern parts, who do not partake of the Eucharist daily. Augustine is more indulgent than the author of *De sacramentis*, who, for this same reason, sharply criticises the Eastern Christians.⁴¹

The third interpretation remains. The daily bread represents, in Augustine's view, the spiritual bread of which God says, 'Labour for the food which does not perish' (Jn. 6:27) and 'I am the bread of life which came down from heaven' (Jn. 6:41; 51). The spiritual bread is thus identical to Christ and is, in the same way, identical to the spiritual commandments of Christ in Holy Scripture.⁴² The interpretation may directly go back to Tertullian's treatise on the prayer where the bread is considered to be Christ.⁴³ However, the strong emphasis on the identification of the daily bread as spiritual precepts relates Augustine's interpretation to that of Origen, who, on the basis of the six chapter of St. John's Gospel, abundantly explains the 'spiritual bread' identified with both Christ and the divine words of Scripture.⁴⁴

In conclusion, we know that in the library of Augustine's friend, certain *commentarioli* on Matthew were found that Aurelius believed to be Jerome's, inasmuch as he believed that the work was written by Origen, which is my assumption, but was translated by Origen's celebrated Latin translator. What is certain, however, is that Jerome had nothing to do with the commentary. It is nevertheless probable that when composing his commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Augustine read this particular commentary on Matthew. This could explain the parallels between Augustine's commentary and Origen's *De oratione*.

⁴¹ *De sacramentis* 5.4.25.

⁴² Augustine *Serm. monte* 2.7.27..

⁴³ Tertullian *Orat.* 6.

⁴⁴ Origen *Orat.* 27.2-6; 9-12.

APPENDIX 3: SOME TRACES OF A LATIN COMPILATION OF ORIGEN'S COMMENTARY ON GENESIS

The Author of the So-Called *Tractatus Origenis*

After P. Batiffol had discovered and, in collaboration with A. Wilmart, published in 1900 twenty Latin homilies which were passed on under the name of Origen (*Tractatus Origenis de libris sacrarum scripturarum*),¹ a heated scholarly debate ensued for years concerning the authorship of the work. Some believed that the *Tractatus*, or homilies, represented a work of Origen translated by Victorinus of Poetovio; some argued for their Latin origin. One group of the most eminent scholars of the age attributed the work to Novatian, the famous Roman schismatic of the third century, while the other group was convinced that it must have been written in the fifth or even at the beginning of the sixth century.² It seems that in 1957 the question of authorship was solved. In a Visigothic codex, A.C. Vega found a reference by an author of the ninth century to an interpretation occurring in the sixth "Origenian" *Tractatus*. The reference begins with the words: *Sanctus Gregorius Eliberritanus episcopus dicit* and then some sentences occur which are undoubtedly taken from the "Origenian" treatise.³ This finding reaffirmed G. Morin's suggestion that the work was written by

¹ Batiffol-Wilmart 1900. The *Tractatus* were preserved in two manuscripts, both of which bear this same title.

² For a summary of the controversy, see Butler 1905.

³ Vega 1957, 145.

Gregory of Elvira, a Spanish bishop of the fourth century.⁴ V. Bulhart regarded the arguments as satisfactory for identifying the author, and edited the text in the series of *Corpus Christianorum* as an authentic work of Gregory.⁵ Since that time the authorship of the *Tractatus* has not been questioned.

Nevertheless, when one looks for a more or less exact date of the treatises, some doubts may arise as to whether Gregory of Elvira could have been their author. One of the most crucial problems is that of the relationship between the third *Tractatus* and Rufinus' translation of Origen's seventh homily on Genesis. In the treatise, quite a long passage occurs which is in evident literal agreement with Rufinus' translation of Origen's interpretation of the story of Sarah and Hagar, especially that of the game of Isaac and Ishmael (Gen. 21:9-10).⁶ Naturally, questions arise regarding which text depends on the other or whether both texts go back to a common model. H. Jordan, who attributed the twenty homilies to Novatian, assumed that Rufinus and the author of the *Tractatus* used a common homiletic source.⁷ According to P. Batiffol, the Tractator had translated the passage from Origen, and Rufinus incorporated this early Latin translation into his version.⁸ The same thing happened, argued Battifol, to a paragraph of the ninth *Tractatus* which reoccurred in a sermon of Gaudentius of Brescia (see, *Serm.* 3.21 and *Tract.* 9.10-12). Taking an opposing view to Jordan and Batiffol, Butler summarised the most solid arguments for the view that the writer of the *Tractatus* was the plagiariser of Gaudentius and Rufinus.⁹ This position was accepted by D. de Bruyne who re-examined the parallels and, on firm grounds, rejected both Jordan and Batiffol's hypotheses.¹⁰ He also scrutinised other pieces of the *Tractatus* and came to the conclusion that since it was the author of the *Tractatus* who depended on Gaudentius and Rufinus, and since the *Tractatus* were used by

⁴ Morin 1902; Lejay 1908.

⁵ *Gregorii Iliberritani episcopi quae supersunt*. Edidit Vincentius Bulhart, CCSL 69. Turnholt: Brepols, 1967, 1-146.

⁶ Gregory *Tract.* 3.7,21 and 13-16, 22; Origen *HomGen.* 7,2 and 7,3.

⁷ Jordan 1902, 206.

⁸ Batiffol 1905, 322.

⁹ Butler 1905, 590-594.

¹⁰ De Bruyne 1906, 171-173.

Caesarius of Arles, the work must have been composed later than 400 or even 410, but earlier than 542 or even 525. De Bruyne hypothesised that the *Tractatus* were written in North-Italy.¹¹ Some years later P. Lejay stated that the *Tractatus* were written by Gregory, the Spanish bishop. The dependence of Gregory on Rufinus' translation did not seem conclusive for Lejay, who assumed that both authors may have used an early Latin translation of Origen's homily.¹²

Concerning the authorship of the *Tractatus Origenis*, one can cautiously formulate the following hypothesis: if the *post quem* of the twenty *Tractatus* is dependent on the date of Rufinus' translation, then their author must have been someone other than Gregory of Elvira. According to the generally accepted chronology, Rufinus translated the homilies on Genesis around 404. While this date is rather hypothetical, it is certain that all of his translations must be dated after 397¹³; consequently, the *Tractatus*, too, should be dated after 397. However, although we know almost nothing about the life of Gregory of Elvira, it is certain that in 397 he was in his late eighties, if he was still alive at all. In *De viris illustribus*, written in 393,¹⁴ Jerome tells of Gregory: *Gregorius. Baeticus, Eliberi episcopus usque ad extremam senectutem diversos mediocri sermone tractatus composuit et de fide elegantem librum hodieque superesse dicitur*.¹⁵

Gregory was "extremely old" in 393. What do we know about his biographical data? He is said by Faustinus to have been *rudis episcopus* when Ossius of Cordova died.¹⁶ The exact date of Ossius'

¹¹ De Bruyne 1906, 188.

¹² Lejay 1908, 444-445.

¹³ Hammond 1977, 393 n.1. Hammond's argument for this date is solid: "I have assumed, following Rufinus' statement in Apology against Jerome, i.11: 'Nullum ... me usum huiusmodi operis habuisse, et ad Latinum sermonem tricennali iam pene incuria torpuisse' (... cf. also Preface to De Principiis, Book I), that all his surviving writings are to be dated after his return to Italy."

¹⁴ Nautin 1961.

¹⁵ *Vir. ill.* 105, *PL*. 23. c. 742.

¹⁶ Faustinus *De confessione verae fidei*. 10.34, 368-369: *Interea fama in cognitionem rei cunctos inquietat et frequens sermo populorum est "quinam est ille Gregorius, qui audet Osio resistere?" Plurimi enim et Osii praevaricationem adhuc ignorabant <et>, quinam esset sanctus Gregorius, nondum bene compertum habebant.*

death is unknown; he probably died before the spring of 359, possibly in the winter of 357-358.¹⁷ At the same time, the epithet “*rudis*” does not give specific information about Gregory’s age of life. He is said to have been a freshly elected and inexperienced bishop, who had courage to resist the powerful and extremely old Ossius. Our source, Faustinus, does not mention the fact that Gregory was a young man at the time of his controversy with Ossius, although such a motif could have coloured his amazing narrative on the Spanish “David and Goliath.” It is, therefore, mere speculation to date Gregory’s birth to about 330.¹⁸ The only reliable

Erat enim etiam apud eos, qui illum forte noverant, rudis adhuc episcopus, licet apud Christum non rudis vindex fidei pro merito sanctitatis. When Ossius of Corduba wanted to depose Gregory from the bishopric so that Clemens, the pagan *vicarius Hispaniarum* could pronounce the sentence of exile against him, the bishop of Corduba suddenly died: *Et cum multo invidiosius et sanctius Deum verbis fidelibus interpellat, ecce repente Ossius, cum sententiam conatus exprimere os vertit, distortuens pariter et cervicem de sessu in terram eliditur atque illic expirat vel, ut quidam volunt, obmutuit, inde tamen effertur ut mortuus, ibid.* 10.38, 369-70. It belongs to this legendary story, which is clearly without historical value, that in that time Ossius must have been roughly 100 years old. Gregory, at all events, evaded the exile.

¹⁷ De Clercq 1954, 529. For the possible date of birth of Ossius, c. 256, see *ibid.* 52.

¹⁸ Cf. Simonetti 1975, 10: “... Gregorio ancora *rudis* intorno agli anni 357-359: egli allora doveva essere sulla trentina, età minima per essere eletto vescovo, sì che intorno al 405 potrà avere avuto circa 76-77 anni ...”; Schulz-Flügel 1994, 21: “Gregor um das Jahr 360 herum nicht viel älter als dreissig Jahre war; vor erreichung dieses Alters hätte er nicht Bischof werden können.” *Ibid.* 22: “Als Summe dieser knappen Notizen ergibt sich, daß Gregor um das Jahr 330 geboren wurde und im Jahr 393, also über sechzigjährig, noch am Leben war.” That a person who was appointed bishop must have reached the age of thirty was by no means a general rule in the first five centuries. The *Constitutiones apostolicae* 2.1.1, 144 mandates 50 years of age; Siricius 45 years, *Epistolae et decreta* 9.13. *PL.* 13. c. 1142-1143. This same was rigorously followed by Caesarius of Arles who did not appoint even a deacon who was not thirty years old, cf. Hefele 1908, 2, 989. Pope Zosimus (417-418) also followed Siricius’ prescriptions, see *Ep.* 9.3 *PL.* 20. c. 672-673. The age of a possible bishop was often between 45 and 50 years. These canons however, do not betray anything of the practice of the local Churches, partly because their leaders

piece of information is the expression used by Jerome: *extrema senectus*. This expression “designates 90, 86, 85, 78, 77 and seldom 70 years of age” in such authors as Cicero, Tacitus, Cornelius Nepos and Jerome himself.¹⁹ The date of Gregory’s birth therefore should be put before 323. In addition, Jerome’s account reveals that Gregory was “extremely old” not in the time when Jerome composed his *De viris illustribus*, but when Gregory was working on treatises which Jerome later judged to be poor in style. These *Tractatus* thus must have been written years before 393. All these indicate that Gregory may well have been born in the first decade of the fourth century. Since his name does not appear in the list of the bishops who were present at the Council of Toledo in 400, one may date Gregory’s death before 400.²⁰ This would mean that the *Tractatus Origenis* has been erroneously ascribed to Gregory of Elvira.

It also contradicts the attribution of the *Tractatus* to the bishop of Elvira that the author does not use the term *substantia*, or *essentia*, in the sense of divine essence. He does make use of the term *substantia*, but in a different meaning: the term refers to the nature of a being.²¹ By contrast, Gregory of Elvira, a rigorous defender of the Nicene Creed, applied an accurate post-Nicene Latin terminology in his *De fide orthodoxa contra Arianos*.²² He repeatedly

sometimes did not know the canons, and partly because they also followed local traditions. The Canon 17 of the *Concilium Agathense* (held in 506) prescribes 30 years for a bishop. This became, indeed, a general practice from the sixth century on, cf. *Dictionnaire de droit canonique*, vol. 1. col. 321. The canons thus do not assist in determining the age of a fourth century bishop.

¹⁹ Hadot 1971, 24, references in his footnote no. 11. As for Jerome, see e.g. his *Vir. ill.* 101, on Victorinus, and 80, on Lactantius.

²⁰ *Mansi* III, 998 and 1002; Simonetti 1975, 8.

²¹ *Tract.* 2.22, 17; 14.21, 111; 16.14, 119; 17.11, 125; 17.16, 126; 17.17, 126; 17.18, 126; 17.21, 127; 17.24, 128; 17.30, 129; 19.18, 141.

²² In the course of the centuries the variants of *De fide* were attributed to Ambrose, Gregory of Nazianzus, as one of his treatises translated by Rufinus, and Phoebadius. Its attribution to Gregory of Elvira depends to a great extent on the difficult question of Gregory’s corpus. Gregory is nowadays considered to be the author of the *Tractatus in cantica canticorum*, a *Tractatus de arca Noe*, a brief *Expositio de psalmo XCI*, and two fragments

used such expressions as the Greek *homoousion*, or the Latin *trinitas unius substantiae*, *tres personae unius substantiae*, *substantiae unitas*, *pater et filius unius substantiae* etc.²³ None of these expressions appears in the *Tractatus*, even though there are some allusions to the Nicene dogma.²⁴

Most recently, Eva Schulz-Flügel has attempted to re-establish the hypothesis that the parallels between the third *Tractatus* and Rufinus' translation of the seventh homily on Genesis may be accounted for by a common source. The new factor in her assumption is that the common source may have been a Latin compilation of Origen's *Commentary on Galatians*,²⁵ for the parallel texts include the interpretation of the game of Isaac and Ishmael, which Origen explains on the basis of Saint Paul's comment in Gal. 4:22-31, principally in 4:29. Some elements of the interpretation appear in Jerome's *Commentary on Galatians* that he professed to compose under the influence of Origen's commentary on the same Epistle. Schulz-Flügel stresses the well-known fact that while translating Origen's works, Rufinus occasionally inserted particular passages from other Origenian writings so that the explanation might be more complete. The same may have been the case for the homilies on Genesis.

This hypothesis seems to be fragile for at least three reasons:

1. There is no indication in Rufinus' translation of the seventh homily on Genesis that the passage in question is an interpolation.

on Gen. 3:22 and 15:9-11. A comparative study of *De fide*, *In Canticum* and *Tractatus Origenis*, may provide surprising conclusions.

²³ See, Simonetti 1975, 26-28; 219; 223; 226.

²⁴ For instance, *Tract.* 3.34, 27: *Ac proinde et angelus propter obedientiam paternae uoluntatis dicitur et deus secundum naturam patris, quia uere deus est, nuncupatur; filius etenim dei, deus uerus de deo uero, unigenitus ab ingenito non potest alius esse quam deus. Tract.* 6.35, 50: *Sicuti enim ex leone leo nascitur, ita deus de deo et lumen ex lumine procedere dicitur.* See also, Lejay 1908, 448-450. One may assume, however, that the expressions "deus uerus de deo uero" and "lumen ex lumine" are either later interpolations or comes from such pre-Nicene authors as Hippolytus, for instance.

²⁵ Schulz-Flügel 1994, 256-267.

2. It is not demonstrated that any other Latin author of the fourth or fifth century would have used a Latin compilation of Origen's Commentary on Galatians. *Unus testis non est testis*.
3. Jerome and Augustine were eager to cite authorities in favour of their interpretation of Gal. 2:11-14. Augustine admitted his ignorance of Origen's *Commentary on Galatians* and Jerome did not call his attention to a Latin version: neither of them was aware of such a compilation.²⁶

One can assume that Rufinus used Latin translations if such existed, but it is not necessary to think of a translation, or compilation, of the Commentary on Galatians. I would not exclude the possibility that Rufinus may have incorporated an ancient Latin version of Origen's seventh homily on Genesis into his own. Possibly, the Tractator also used this early translation.²⁷ In this case there is no chronological obstacle to attributing the work to Gregory of Elvira. The question however, remains: why don't the *Tractatus* reveal the well-elaborated post-Nicene terminology which is so characteristic of Gregory's *De fide*?

Whoever composed the *Tractatus Origenis*, and wherever he did so, the author of the work definitely relied on Latin sources.²⁸ He does not seem to have known Greek.²⁹ In addition, he sometimes followed his sources almost slavishly. This fact facilitates looking for traces of the *Origenes latinus* in the work.

²⁶ Cf. Augustine *Ep.* 82.23, 375.

²⁷ Cf. Vona 1970, 31 and 89. An *argumentum ex silentio* for this surmise may be the fact that there are no further textual parallels between the twenty *Tractatus* and the Latin Homilies on Genesis, although not only the third, but also the second, fourth and fifth *Tractatus* deal with topics exactly those commented by Origen in *HomGen.* 4; 3 and 15. Even though the Tractator preferred Origen's exegesis, as is clear from the parallel between *Tract.* 3 and *HomGen.* 7 and from other indications, for these three tractates he did not use the *Homilies on Genesis*, probably because they were not available for him.

²⁸ Vona 1970, 26-35; Dulaey 1997.

²⁹ Hippolytus' influence, for instance, on the *Tractatus* comes via Victorinus of Poetovio, as Dulaey 1993/1 has demonstrated.

The Origenian Background of the First *Tractatus*

The scope of the present inquiry will be limited to the first *Tractatus*. I will argue for the assumption that its author did make use of an ancient Latin compilation of Origen's Commentary on Genesis.

The first section of the first *Tractatus* includes an interpretation of Gen. 1:26. The author quotes the verse and makes known a false understanding of it. The so-called Anthropomorphites believe that Gen. 1:26 involves the corporeality of God. They cite a series of verses from the Old Testament to prove that God looks like a man. This portion of the homily can be paralleled with two texts which could have been served as models for the Tractator.³⁰ I quote Origen, Novatian and the Tractator's texts in their integrity. The sentences printed in boldface indicate the parallels between *Tractatus* 1. and Novatian's *De Trinitate*, whereas the underlined sections aim to contour the relationship of the *Tractatus* and a catena-fragment from Origen's Commentary on Genesis.

Origen <i>Sel. Gen.</i> ³¹	<i>Tractatus Origenis</i> 1 ³²	Novatian <i>Trin.</i> ³³
	1. Multi sunt <u>ineruditi homines</u>	6.1. Et licet scriptura
	<u>expertes caelestium litterarum, qui</u>	caelestis ad humanam formam faciem
Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Θεός: Ποιήσωμεν	<u>cum audiunt dixisse Deum: faciamus</u>	divinam saepe convertat, dum dicit:
<u>ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ</u>	<u>hominem ad imaginem et ad</u>	
<u>καθ' ὁμοίωσιν</u> (Gen. 1:26).	<u>similitudinem nostram</u> (Gen. 1:26),	
Προδιαληπτέον πρότερον, ποῦ		

³⁰ The parallels were disclosed and explained by Butler, 1900 and 1901. A more recent *Quellenforschung* of the *Tractatus* is found in Vona 1970, 41-67.

³¹ PG. 12. c. 93-95. The fragment comes from the *Catena Romana*, manuscript Mosq 385. Vat. Barb. Gr. 569.

³² *Corpus Christianorum* 69. V. Bulhart, 1967.

³³ *Corpus Christianorum* 4. Novatiani opera, ed. G.F. Diercks, 1972.

συνίσταται τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα, ἐν σώματι		
ἢ ἐν ψυχῇ. Ἰδωμεν δὲ πρότερον οἷς	<u>putant corporeum</u> <u>Deum et</u>	
χρῶνται οἱ τὸ πρῶτον λέγοντες: ὧν	<u>membrorum</u> <u>compositione</u>	
ἔστι καὶ Μελίτων συγγράμματα	<u>constructum intellegi</u> <u>oportere,</u>	
καταλελοιπώς περὶ τοῦ ἐνσώματον	praesertim cum et prophetae caput et	
εἶναι τὸν Θεόν. Μέλη γὰρ Θεοῦ	capillos domini nominant et oculos et	
	aures et nares et os et labia et linguam	
	et pedes, cum dicitur: caput eius et	
	capilli ut lana alba tamquam nix (Dan.	
ὀνομαζόμενα εὐρίσκοντες, ὀφθαλμοὺς	7:9), et: oculi domini super iustos	oculi Domini super iustos (Ps.
Θεοῦ ἐπιβλέποντας τὴν οἰκουμένην		33:16),
(cf. Zach. 4:10), καὶ ὥτα αὐτοῦ	<u>et aures eius ad preces</u> <u>eorum</u> (Ps.	
εἶναι εἰς δέησιν δικαίων (Psalm	33:16),	
33:16) ἐπινενευκότα, καὶ. Ὡσφρόνθη	et: odoratus est dominus	aut dum odoratus est Dominus
Κῶριος ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας: (Gen. 8:21)	odorem suauitatis (Gen. 8:21),	Deus odorem bonae fragrantiae
καὶ. Τὸ στόμα Κυρίου ἐλάλησε	et: os domini locutum est	(Gen. 8:21),
ταῦτα (Is. 1:20),	ista (Is. 1:20 cf. 58:14);	
	et: quae procedunt de <u>labia</u>	
	mea non faciam irrita (Ps. 88:35),	
	et: <u>lingua</u> mea calamus acutus (cf.	
	Ps. 44:2), et: sabbata uestra odiuit	

	<u>anima</u> mea (cf. Is. 1:14), et: conuerte	
	domine <u>faciem</u> tuam et salui erimus	
	(Ps. 79:4, 8, 20),	
	et: <u>dextera</u> domini fecit uirtutem	
καὶ βραχίονα Θεοῦ,	(Ps. 117:16),	
καὶ χεῖρας,	et: nonne <u>manus</u> mea fecit haec	
καὶ πόδας,	omnia? (Is. 66:2; Acts 7:50) et:	
καὶ δακτύλους,	<u>digito</u> Dei tabulae legis lapideae	aut dum traduntur Moysi tabulae
	scriptae moysi traduntur (Deut. 9:10, cf. Ex. 31:18),	scriptae digito Dei (Deut. 9:10, cf. Ex. 31:18), aut
	et: <u>caelum mihi sedis</u>	
	est, <u>terra autem scabillum pedum</u>	
	<u>meorum</u> (Is. 66:1), et: <u>manu</u> ualida	dum populus filiorum Israel de terra
	et excelso <u>brachio</u> domini populus	aegypti manu valida et brachio
	liberatur (Ps. 135:12; cf. Sap. 5:17)	excelso (Ps. 135:12; cf. Sap. 5:17)
	et: caelum <u>palmo</u> mensus est et	liberatur , aut dum dicit: Os enim
	terram omnem <u>pugillo</u> concludit (Is. 40:12). 2. <u>Haec ergo membra corporis</u>	Domini locutum est haec (Is. 1:20),
ἀντικρυς φάσκουσι		aut dum terra scabellum pedum Dei
ταῦτα οὐχ ἕτερόν τι διδάσκειν ἢ τὴν	<u>cum legunt uel audiunt, ita credunt, ut</u>	esse perhibetur (Is. 66:1), aut dum
μορφὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Πῶς δὲ, φασι, καὶ	<u>iam dixi, quasi corporeum Deum et</u>	dicit: Inclina aurem tuam et audi
ᾤφθη ὁ Θεὸς τῷ Ἀβραάμ, καὶ Μωσῇ,	<u>membrorum esse distinctione</u>	(4 Reg. 19:16), sed nos qui dicimus
καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις, μὴ μεμορφωμένος;	<u>compositum</u> . Denique haeresis ipsius	quia lex spiritalis est (Rom. 7:14),

	homines graeco uocabulo	non intra haec nostri corporis
	antropomorφiani dicuntur, <u>eo quod</u>	lineamenta modum aut figuram
Μεμορφωμένος δέ, κατὰ ποῖον	<u>Deum ad uicem hominis compactum</u>	divinae maiestatis includimus , sed
χαρακτῆρα ἢ τὸν ἀνθρώπινον;	<u>atque formatum adserunt.</u>	suis illam interminatae magnitudinis,
	Proinde admonenda fuit dilectio	ut ita dixerim, campis sine ullo fine
	uestra, ne aliquis uestrum horum	diffundimus. 2. Scriptum est enim: Si
	uerborum subtilitate capiatur.	<i>ascendero in caelum tu ibi es; si</i>
	3. Aiunt enim: 'si haec membra, quae	descendero ad inferos, ades; et si
	in deo diuinae scripturae	assumpsero alas meas et abiero trans
	commemorant, non ita essent	mare, ibi manus tua apprehendet me
	credenda, ergo fefellerunt nos	et dextera tua detinebit me (Ps. 138:
	prophetae, qui et caput et capillos et	8-10.)
	oculos et aures et nares et os et labia et	
καὶ συνάγουσι μυρία ἡτὰ μέλη	linguam et <u>manus et pedes et cetera</u>	
ὀνομάζοντα Θεοῦ. Πρὸς οὓς	<u>membra domini nominarunt</u> , quem	
ἀγωνιστέον πρῶτον ἀπὸ τῆς λέξεως·	hiscirent incorporeum Deum et nihil	
ἀντιπαραβαλοῦμεν δὲ ἡτὰ τοῖς	horum penitus indigere, sed et ipse	
πλέον τοῦ γράμματος μὴδὲν	Moyse, qui hoc in loco refert dixisse	
ἐπισταμένοις, ἐναντιούμενα αὐτῶν τῇ	deum: faciamus hominem ad	
ὑπολήψει·	imaginem et ad similitudinem nostram	
	(Gen. 1:27). (...)	

ἐκ μὲν τοῦ Ζαχαρίου, ὅτι	11. <u>Quid, quod septem oculi</u>	
ἑπτὰ ὀφθαλμοὶ Κυρίου οἱ	<u>domini leguntur</u> (Zach. 4:10 cf. ibid.	
ἐπιβλέποντες ἐπὶ πάσαν τὴν γῆν	3:9; Apoc. 5:6.) <u>et homo duos oculos</u>	
(Zach. 4:10). Εἰ δὲ ἑπτὰ ἔχει	<u>habet? Et ubi est haec imago et</u>	
ὀφθαλμοὺς ὁ Θεός, ἡμεῖς δὲ δύο, οὐ	<u>similitudo Dei in homine? Non enim</u>	
κατ' εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ γεγόναμεν. Ἀλλὰ	<u>ulla similitudo est eius qui duos oculos</u>	
καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν οὐκ ἐπτερυγώμεθα,	<u>habet et eius qui septem habere</u>	
περὶ δὲ Θεοῦ λέγει ἐν ἐννενηκοστῷ	<u>perhibetur.</u>	
ψαλμῷ, ὅτι ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας αὐτοῦ		
ἐλπιεῖς (Ps. 90:4). Εἰ δὲ ἐκεῖνος		
μὲν πτέρυγας ἔχει, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐσμεν		
ζῶον ἄπτερον, οὐ κατ' εἰκόνα Θεοῦ		
γένονεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος. Πῶς δὲ ὁ		
σφαιροειδὴς οὐρανὸς καὶ αἰὶ		
κινούμενος θρόνος εἶναι δύναται, ὥς		
ὑπολαμβάνουσι, τοῦ Θεοῦ; Ἀλλὰ καὶ		
ἡ γῆ πῶς ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ		
(Is. 66:1; Matth. 5:34- 35);		

Two general hypotheses have been proposed concerning the relationship of the three texts quoted above:

1. The *Tractatus* was written by Novatian, who in *De Trinitate* used Origen's text and later, in the *Tractatus*, quoted himself, or, in reverse, he used his *Tractatus* for this passage of *De Trinitate*.

2. The author of the *Tractatus* relied on both Novatian and Origen, but Novatian was independent of Origen, because he used some work of Melito (which is lost today) in which the anthropomorphic passages were collected.

There are still more possible explanations.

3. Novatian and the Tractator used Origen's text. This can be divided into further sub-possibilities:
 - A. Both independently used the Greek text of Origen.
 - B. Both independently used a Latin translation of Origen's text.
 - C. The Tractator used Novatian's *De Trinitate* and Origen's Greek text.
 - D. The Tractator used Novatian's *De Trinitate* and the Latin translation of Origen's text.

The first possibility can be excluded. The assumption that Novatian was the author of the *Tractatus Origenis* has been refuted by Butler, Bruyne, and Lejay. As noted, the series of the *Tractatus* were written after the Nicene Council. Pointing out Novatian's dependence on Origen's anti-anthropomorphic arguments, one can refute the second possibility, according to which Novatian was independent of Origen.³⁴ Sub-possibilities A. and C. of the third hypothesis, including the surmise that the Tractator could have worked on Greek texts, also can be eliminated. The author of the *Tractatus* demonstrably did not know Greek.

Two reasonable possibilities remain and both include the assumption that a Latin translation of the Origenian explanation must have existed. Since the topic is of crucial importance, I am gathering some arguments for this thesis. It is necessary, therefore, to re-examine the relationship between the first *Tractatus* and the Origen fragment, on the one hand, and that between Novatian's text and the *Tractatus*, on the other.

³⁴ Butler 1900, 116: "there is no reason in the nature of things why Novatian should not have directly depended on Origen." Since Butler did not find common points in the refutations of Origen and Novatian, he assumed that they independently used Melito's text and quoted the array of verses from that.

Does the First *Tractatus* Directly Depend on a Latin Translation of Origen's Text?

For Butler, the *Tractatus*' dependence on the Origen fragment is clear from the common use of Scriptural quotations:

*whereas the order of the Scripture texts in Novatian and in the Tractate is different, the second, third and fourth in Tractate are precisely those given by Origen, and in the same sequence. Moreover Origen's grotesque argument based on Zach. iv. 20 is reproduced by the Tractator, but is not found in Novatian. These traces suffice, I think, to establish the fact that the first Tractate goes back quite independently to the Origen fragment, as well as to Novatian's de Trinitate.*³⁵

The first part of Butler's conclusion can be confirmed: "the first Tractate goes back quite independently to the Origen fragment."

The logic and the structure of the Origen fragment and the first section of the *Tractatus* is the same: Gen. 1:26 reveals that man is made in the image of God. Does it mean that God has human shape? There are those who think so and believe in a corporeal God composed of human limbs. They believe they can glean arguments from the Scriptures. Importantly, Novatian's explanation in *De Trinitate* is not connected to Gen. 1:26. He does not even explicitly refer to Anthropomorphites.

Consider, first of all, the Scriptural quotations and allusions in the Tractator and Origen:

Tractator: **Gen. 1:26**; Dan. 7:9; **Ps. 33:16**; **Gen. 8:21**; **Is. 1:20**; lips (Ps. 88: 35); tongue (Ps. 44:2); soul (Is. 1:14); face (Ps. 79:4); right hand (Ps. 117:16); **hand** (Is. 66:2); **finger** (Deut. 9:10); **feet Is. 66:1**; **arms** Ps. 135:12; Is. 40:12.

Origen: **Gen. 1:26**; Zach. 4:10; **Ps. 33:16**; **Gen. 8:21**; **Is. 1:20**; **arms, hands, feet, fingers**; Zach. 4:10; wings (Ps. 90:4); **feet Is. 66:1**.

Except for Dan. 7:9 and Zach. 4:10, the very first citations by the Tractator and Origen, both authors start their explanation with the same Scriptural verses and quote them in the same order. The sequence is the following: Ps. 33:16; Gen. 8:21; Is. 1:20. The Tractator quotes a series of the verses which also refer to God as if He has human features: lips, tongue, soul, face, hands, fingers,

³⁵ Butler 1900, 117.

arms. Finally, like Origen, he summarises the Anthropomorphites' argument: the prophets enumerate God's features: head, hairs, eyes, ears, nose, mouth, lips, tongue, hands and feet (*caput et capillos et oculos et aures et nares et os et labia et linguam et manus et pedes et cetera membra domini nominarunt*).

In the Origen fragment, there are no mentions of lips and face, but there are those of arms, hands, feet, fingers (καὶ βραχίονα Θεοῦ, καὶ χεῖρας, καὶ πόδας, καὶ δακτύλους).

Novatian cites the Scriptural verses in the following order: Ps. 33:16; Gen. 8:21; Deut. 9:10; Ps. 135:12; Is. 1:20; Is. 66:1; 4 Reg. 19:16, that is to say, he also quotes Ps. 33:16; Gen. 8:2 and Is. 1:20, but this latter quote is preceded by Deut. 9:10 and Ps. 135:12. Both verses appear in the *Tractatus* as well, but in a different order. Moreover, Novatian cites the first clause of Psalm 33:16, whereas Origen, or the Catenist, cites the second clause, and Gregory the whole sentence.

The parallel sentences between *Tractatus* 1.1-3 and the Origen fragment are thus as follows:

Ineruditi homines expertes caelestium litterarum,
· ἡτὰ τοῖς πλέον τοῦ γράμματος μηδὲν
ἐπισταμένους
qui cum audiunt dixisse deum: faciamus hominem ad imaginem
et ad similitudinem nostram (Gen. 1:26), *putant corporeum*
deum et membrorum compositione constructum intellegi oportere,
Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Θεός· Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα
ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν (Gen. 1:26). ...
συγγράμματα καταλελοιπώς περὶ τοῦ ἐνσώματον
εἶναι τὸν Θεόν. Μέλη γάρ Θεοῦ ὀνομαζόμενα
εὐρίσκοντες ... φάσκουσι ταῦτα οὐχ ἕτερόν τι
διδάσκειν ἢ τὴν μορφήν τοῦ Θεοῦ.
oculi domini super iustos et aures eius ad preces eorum (Ps.
33:16), *et: odoratus est dominus odorem suavitatis* (Gen.
8:21), *et: os domini locutum est ista* (Is. 1:20; cf. Is. 58:14)
ὀφθαλμοὺς Θεοῦ ἐπιβλέποντας τὴν οἰκουμένην (cf.
Zach. 4, 10), καὶ ὅσα αὐτοῦ εἶναι εἰς δέησιν
δικαίων (Ps. 33:16) ἐπινενευκότα, καὶ, Ὡσφράνθη
Κύριος ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας· (cf. Gen. 8:21) καὶ, Τὸ στόμα
Κυρίου ἐλάλησε ταῦτα (Is. 1:20)
et: caelum mihi sedis est, terra autem scabillum pedum meorum
(Is. 66:1)

Πῶς δὲ ὁ ... οὐρανὸς ... θρόνος εἶναι δύναται ... τοῦ Θεοῦ; Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ γῆ πῶς ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ (Is. 66:1; Matth. 5:34-35);³⁶

Haec ergo membra corporis cum legunt uel audiunt, ita credunt, ut iam dixi, quasi corporeum deum et membrorum esse distinctione compositum.

Μέλη γὰρ Θεοῦ ὀνομαζόμενα εὐρίσκοντες ... φάσκουσι ταῦτα οὐχ ἕτερόν τι διδάσκειν ἢ τὴν μορφήν τοῦ Θεοῦ.

eo quod deum ad uicem hominis compactum atque formatum adserunt.

φασί, ... μὴ μεμορφωμένος; μεμορφωμένος δὲ, κατὰ ποῖον χαρακτήρα ἢ τὸν ἀνθρώπινον

manus et pedes et cetera membra domini nominarunt

χεῖρας, καὶ πόδας, καὶ δακτύλους ... φάσκουσι ...

καὶ συνάγουσι μυρία ἡτὰ μέλη ὀνομάζοντα Θεοῦ.

Quid, quod septem oculi domini leguntur (Zach. 4:10 cf. ibid. 3:9; Apoc. 5:6) *et homo duos oculos habet? et ubi est haec imago et similitudo dei in homine? non enim ulla similitudo est eius qui duos oculos habet et eius qui septem habere perhibetur.*

ἐναντιούμενα αὐτῶν τῇ ὑπολήψει· ἐκ μὲν τοῦ Ζαχαρίου, ὅτι Ἑπτὰ ὀφθαλμοὶ Κυρίου οἱ ἐπιβλέποντες ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν (Zach. 4:10). Εἰ δὲ ἑπτὰ ἔχει ὀφθαλμοὺς ὁ Θεός, ἡμεῖς δὲ δύο, οὐ κατ' εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ γεγόναμεν.

The parallels clearly indicate that the author of the *Tractatus* depends on Origen's text. In addition, we have to take into consideration the lamentable fact that the Origen fragment is preserved in a catena. It is probable that the editor of the catena simplified and abbreviated the original explanation, as well as omitting a couple of Scriptural quotations from the long passage that Origen probably cited from one of Melito's works. The traces of this method are visible in the section after the quotation of Is. 1:20 where the list suddenly interrupts and the editor replaces the verses with a brief summary (καὶ βραχίονα Θεοῦ, καὶ χεῖρας, καὶ πόδας, καὶ δακτύλους). It seems also reasonable that the clause, "Μέλη γὰρ Θεοῦ ὀνομαζόμενα εὐρίσκοντες" also represents an abbreviation. The word μέλη may have been inserted in the place of that list of human limbs which appears in the parallel text in the *Tractatus*. This means that in the paragraph the *Tractatus* may have conserved the original version better than the catena. We will see

³⁶ Cf. Origen *ComJn.* 6.202, 280.

instances where the Tractator almost slavishly follows a model text. He seems to proceed in this manner while quoting the Scriptural testimonies referred to by the Anthropomorphites. The most remarkable evidence of the direct relationship between Origen and the Tractator's texts is the citation of Zach. 4:10 as an ironic counter-argument. The verse appears in the section of the *Tractatus* in which the arguments are collected against the Anthropomorphites. This section is preceded by another one (Tract. 1.5-8) in which the author argues that man consists of three parts, spirit, soul and body; that is to say, man is considered to be composite whereas God is elemental. After having stated this, the Tractator comes to refute the anthropomorphite understanding of the Scriptural verses.

Does the First *Tractatus* Depend on Novatian?

As Butler observed,

*there is in this place a very intimate connexion between the Tractator and Novatian. This is shown by the words 'traduntur' and 'populus liberatur,' used in connexion with Ex. xxxi 18 and Psalm cxxxv (cxxxvi) 12 respectively, by both writers, though the actual wording of either phrase is not to be found in the Bible anywhere near in the contexts; and by the changes in construction they involve.'*³⁷

It is plausible that the Tractator depends on Novatian, but it is less certain that he relied on Novatian's *De trinitate*.³⁸ The connection between Novatian and *Tractatus* 1.1-3 is indicated by two facts: the use of the similar expressions: "*caelestes litterae*" and "*scriptura caelestis*," and the Scripture version they quote. Firstly, the expression "*scriptura caelestis*" is very typical of Novatian.³⁹ Secondly,

³⁷ Butler 1900, 116.

³⁸ Butler 1900, 117: The Tractator "first reproduced the Scripture texts from Origen, and then he copied out the additional ones found in Novatian, inserting on his own account various other texts of the same kind; unless, indeed, it be supposed in regard to these latter texts that the Tractator also was directly using Melito – a possible but not very likely alternative."

³⁹ The expression "*scriptura caelestis*" occurs in Cyprian of Carthage, *De lapsis*, 23.; Novatian *Spect.* 1.; 2.; *Trin.* 19; 21; 23; 24;30 and later in Ambrose, *Hex.* 2.2.7; *De Cain et Abel*, 2.6; *De Noe* 19.70; *De bono mortis*

the Scriptural verses appearing in the two Latin texts are quoted or slightly paraphrased from the same Latin version of the Bible, possibly from the *Vetus Romana*.⁴⁰ The only exception seems to be Gen. 8:21, which Novatian cites according to his Bible version (*odoratus est Dominus Deus odorem bonae fragrantiae*), whereas the Tractator's version is different (*odoratus est dominus odorem suavitatis*). Here, the expression ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας is thus rendered as *odorem suavitatis*. Nevertheless, at the end of the treatise (1.30, 12) the author uses the same Latin expression as Novatian: *quia orationes sanctorum in Apocalipsi timiama comparantur esse, quae per manum angeli in odorem bonae fragrantiae ut scriptum est domino offeruntur*. The expression “*odorem bonae fragrantiae*” does not occur in Apocalypse 8:4. This suggests that the passage of the treatise depends on Novatian.⁴¹ There is no need, however, to assume that in the first chapter of the *Tractatus* the author replaced the expression in Gen. 8:21 “*odorem bonae fragrantiae*” with “*odorem suavitatis*.” Why would have been it important for him? The European version of the *Vetus Latina* renders Gen. 8:21 as *Odoratus dominus odorem suavitatis*. The version was used in the age of Cyprian and Novatian,⁴² that is to say, in another work, Novatian may have quoted the verse in the same form that the Tractator cites. So far one point has been clarified: regarding its style and Scriptural background, the Origenian passage of the *Tractatus* seems to depend on Novatian.

Does Novatian Directly Depend on Origen?

The *De trinitate* demonstrates that Novatian was familiar not merely with the Anthropomorphite's argumentation, but also with its Origenian refutation, as well as with Origen's allegorical interpretation of the verses quoted by Melito and his supporters. The following set of parallels is cited from *De Trinitate*, Theodoret's *Quaestiones in Genesim*, in which he probably reproduces a passage

5.20; *Expl. Ps.* 38, 15.3, etc. The “*caelestis littera*” appears e.g. in Chromatius of Aquileia *Tract. in Matth.* 9; Cassiodorus *Exp. Ps. Praef.*; *Ps.* 148; *Ps.* 150.

⁴⁰ D'Alès 1924, 44-76; DeSimone 1970, 44-46; Lupieri 1982; Mattei 1995.

⁴¹ Vona 1970, 43.

⁴² *Vetus Latina*, vol. 2, 17. The Vulgate version is similar: *Odoratusque est Dominus odorem suavitatis*.

from Origen's Commentary on Genesis, and Origen's *De principiis*. The parallels are indicated by the underlined sentences.

Novatian <i>Trin.</i>	Origen in Theodoret <i>Quaestiones in Genesim</i> 1.20 ⁴³
	τινὲς δὲ ὑπὸ πολλῆς εὐηθείας τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἀνθρώπινον
	κατ' εἰκόνα Θεοῦ γεγενῆσθαι (Gen. 1:26) <u>φασιν· ἐπειδὴ</u>
6.1. Et licet <u>scriptura caelestis ad humanam</u>	<u>τῆς θείας λεγούσης ἐπακούουσι γραφῆς·</u> ἀνοιξον τοὺς
<u>formam faciem divinam saepe convertat</u> , dum dicit: <i>Oculi</i>	<u>ὀφθαλμοὺς σου καὶ ἴδε, καὶ κλῖνον τὸ οὖς σου καὶ</u>
<i>Domini super iustos</i> (Ps. 33:16), aut dum <u>odoratus</u>	<u>ἄκουσον</u> (4 Reg. 19:16), καὶ ὡσφράνθη Κύριος ὁσμὴν
<u>est Dominus Deus odorem bonae fragrantiae</u> (Gen. 8:21),	<u>εὐωδίας</u> (Gen. 8:21),
aut dum tranduntur Moysi <i>tabulae scriptae digito Dei</i>	
(Deut. 9:10, cf. Ex. 31:18), aut dum populus filiorum	
Israel de terra Aegypti <i>manu valida et brachio excelso</i> (Ps.	
135:12; cf. Sap. 5:17) liberatur, aut dum dicit: <u><i>Os enim</i></u>	<u>καὶ τὸ στόμα Κυρίου ἐλάλησε ταῦτα</u>
<u><i>Domini locutum est haec</i></u> (Is. 1, 20), aut dum <i>terra</i>	(Is. 1:20), καὶ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς, καὶ
<i>scabellum pedum</i> Dei esse perhibetur (Is. 66:1), aut dum	ἔσα τοιαῦτα (Ps. 94:4).
dicit: <u><i>Inclina aurem tuam et audi</i></u> (4 Reg. 19:16).	
6.2. Sriptum est enim: <u><i>Si ascendero in caelum, tu ibi</i></u>	
<u><i>es; si descendero ad infero, ades; et si assumpsero alas</i></u>	
<i>meas et abiero trans mare, ibi manus tua apprehendet me et</i>	
<i>dextera tua detinebit me</i> (Ps. 138, 8:10).	

⁴³ Ed. by N.F. Marcos and A. Sáenz-Badillos, 23-24.

Rationem enim divinae scripturae de temperamento	
<u>dispositionis cognoscimus. Parabolis enim adhuc</u>	καὶ οὐ συνειδὸν οἱ ἄγαν ἡλίθιοι, ὡς ἀνθρώποις
<u>secundum fidei tempus de Deo prophetae tunc loquebatur,</u>	δι' ἀνθρώπων διαλεγόμενος ὁ δεσπότης Θεός, τῇ τῶν
<u>non quomodo Deus erat, sed quomodo populus capere</u>	ἀκουόντων ἀσθενεῖα τοὺς λόγους μετρεῖ· καὶ ἐπειδὴ δι'
<u>poterat. Ut igitur haec sic de Deo dicantur, non Deo, sed</u>	ὀφθαλμῶν ὁρῶμεν ἡμεῖς, τὴν ὀπτικήν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν
<u>populo potius imputetur.</u>	ὀφθαλμοὺς ὀνομάζει· καὶ αὖ πάλιν τὴν ἀκουστικὴν ὦτα,
6.5.	ἐπειδὴ διὰ τούτων τῶν μορίων ἀκούομεν· καὶ τὸ
<u>Et causas reddidit dicens: spiritus est deus; et eos ergo qui adorant in spiritu et ueritate adorare oportet (Jn. 4:24).</u>	
<u>Efficaciae igitur ibi divinae per membra monstrantur, non</u>	πρόσταγμα, στόμα. ἔδει δὲ αὐτοὺς μὴ τούτων μόνον
<u>habitus Dei nec corporalia lineamenta</u> ponuntur. Nam et	ἀκούειν τῶν λόγων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν τὸ ἀπερίγραφον τοῦ
<u>cum oculi describuntur, quod omnia videat exprimitur. Et</u>	Θεοῦ διδασκόντων· ποῦ, γάρ φησι, πορευθῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ
<u>quando auris, quod omnia audiat proponitur.</u>	πνεύματός σου, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου σου ποῦ φύγω;
	ἐὰν ἀναβῶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, σὺ ἐκεῖ εἶ, ἐὰν καταβῶ εἰς
	τὸν ὄδην, πάρει, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς (Ps. 138:7-8). καὶ τῇ
	σαμαρείτιδι ὁ Κύριος ἔφη· πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός, καὶ τοὺς
	προσκυνούντας αὐτὸν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ
5.6. <u>Est enim simplex et sine ulla corporea concretionē,</u>	προσκυνεῖν. (Jn. 4:24) εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός, ἀπλοῦς ἄρα
<u>quicquid illud est totus quod se solus scit esse,</u>	καὶ ἀσύνθετος καὶ ἄσχημάτιστος.
<u>quandoquidem spiritus sit dictus.</u>	
	Origen <i>Princ.</i> 1.1.1, 90
7.1. <u>Sed illud quod dicit Dominus spiritum Deum</u> (cf Jn. 4:24), puto ego sic locutum	Scio quoniam conabuntur quidam etiam secundum scripturas nostras dicere deum

Christum de Patre, ut adhuc	corpus esse, quoniam
aliquid plus intellegi velit quam spiritum Deum.	<u>inveniunt scriptum esse apud Moysen quidem: <i>Deus noster</i></u>
Hominibus enim licet in evangelio suo intellegendi	<u><i>ignis consumens est</i></u> (Deut. 4:24), <u>in evangelio vero</u>
incrementa faciens disputet, sed tamen et ipse sic adhuc de	<u>secundum Iohannem: <i>Deus spiritus est, et eos qui adorant</i></u>
Deo loquitur hominibus quomodo possunt adhuc audire	<u><i>eum, in spiritu et veritate oportet adorare</i></u> (Jn. 4:24). Ignis
vel capere, licet, ut diximus, in agnitionem Dei religiosa	vero et spiritus non aliud apud eos quam corpus esse
iam facere incrementa nitatur. 7.2. Invenimus enim	putabitur. Quos interrogare volo, quid dicant de eo quod
scriptum esse quod Deus caritas dictus sit (1 Jn. 4:8), nec	scriptum est, quia <u><i>deus lux est</i></u> , sicut Ioannes in epistola
ex hoc tamen Dei substantia caritas expressa est, et quod	sua dicit: <u><i>Deus lux est, et tenebrae non sunt in eo.</i></u> (1Jn. 1,5)
<u>lux dictus est</u> (1Jn. 1, 5), nec tamen in hoc substantia Dei	(...)
est, sed totum hoc de Deo dictum est quantum dici potest,	
ut merito et quando spiritus dictus est, non omne id quod	
est dictus sit, sed ut, dum mens hominum intellegendo	
usque ad ipsum proficit spiritum, conversa iam ipsa in	1.1.5, 96-98: Omni igitur sensu, qui corporeum aliquid
spiritu aliud quid amplius per spiritum conicere Deum esse	de deo intellegi suggerit, prout potuimus, confutato,
possit. 7.3. Id enim quod est secundum id quod est nec	<u>dicimus secundum veritatem quidem deum</u>
<u>humano sermone edici nec humanis auribus percipi nec</u>	<u>inconprehensibilem esse atque inaeestimabilem. Si quid</u>
<u>humanis sensibus colligi potest.</u> Nam si <u><i>quae praeparavit</i></u>	<u>enim illud est, quod sentire vel intellegere de deo</u>
<u><i>Deus his qui diligunt illum nec oculus vidit nec auris</i></u>	<u>potuerimus, multis longe modis cum meliorem esse ab eo</u>
<u><i>audivit nec cor hominis aut mens ipsa percepit</i></u> (1Cor. 2,9),	<u>quod sensimus necesse est credi.</u> ... Quid autem in
qualis et quantus est ille ipse qui haec repromittit <u>ad quae</u>	omnibus intellectualibus, id est incorporeis, tam praestans
<u>intellegenda et mens hominis et</u>	omnibus, tam ineffabiliter atque

<u>natura defecit?</u> 7.4.	inaestimabiliter
Denique si acceperis spiritum substantiam Dei, creaturam	praecellens quam deus? cuius utique natura acie humanae
feceris Deum. Omnis enim spiritus creatura est. Erit ergo	<u>Mentis intendi atque intueri, quamvis ea sit purissima</u>
iam factus Deus. <u>Quomodo et si secundum Moysen ignem</u>	<u>mens ac limpidissima, non potest.</u>
<u>acceperis Deum</u> (cf. Deut. 4, 24), creaturam illum esse	
dicendo institutum expresseris, non institutorem docueris.	
7.5. Sed haec figurantur potius quam ita sunt. Nam et in	
veteri testamento ideo Deus ignis dicitur, ut peccatori	
populo metus incutiatur, dum iudex ostenditur, et in novo	
testamento spiritus esse profertur, ut rector et creator in	
delictis suis mortuorum per hanc bonitatem collatae	
credentibus indulgentiae comprobetur.	

Novatian and Theodoret of Cyrrhus seem to have drawn on the passage of Origen's commentary on Genesis from which the above-quoted Catena-fragment also comes. In Theodoret, three verses appear which are omitted from the Catena-fragment, but are quoted by Novatian: 4 Reg. 19:16, Ps. 138:7-8 (in Novatian, Ps. 138:8-10) and Jn. 4:24. The first two belong to the Anthropomorphites' arguments, but Jn. 4:24 already represents the core of a counter-argument. This counter-argument undoubtedly goes back to Origen. Both Novatian and Origen (Theodoret) cite the whole verse of Jn. 4:24 to prove that God is elemental, not composite in nature. The Greek sentence (εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα ὁ θεός, ἀπλοῦς ἄρα καὶ ἀσύνθετος καὶ ἀσχημάτιστος) is almost translated by Novatian in chapter 5.6 (*Est enim simplex et sine ulla corporea concreione, quicquid illud est totus quod se solus scit esse, quandoquidem spiritus sit dictus.*). The term ἀπλοῦς is rendered as "simplex;" the ἀσύνθετος is circumscribed as "sine ulla corporea

concretione,” and ἀσχημάτιστος is explained in 6.5 as “*nec corporalia lineamenta ponuntur*.”⁴⁴

On the other hand, Novatian emphasises the point that Jn. 4:24 should not be taken to refer to God's being corporeal. God is spirit, but if the word *spiritus* signifies some corporeal creature, then God is more than spirit. Similarly, God is said to be love (1 Jn. 4:8); light (1 Jn. 1:5) and fire (Deut. 4:24), but statements like these are to be understood allegorically (*sed haec figurantur potius quam ita sunt.*). In the Scriptures God measured his words to the human capacity. He addressed humans with human words in order to lead them to the knowledge of God. The passage is full of echoes of Origen: Novatian

Parabolis enim adhuc secundum fidei tempus de Deo prophetae tunc loquebatur, non quomodo Deus erat, sed quomodo populus capere poterat. Ut igitur haec sic de Deo dicantur, non Deo, sed populo potius imputetur. ...

Hominibus enim licet in evangelio suo intellegendi incrementa faciens disputet, sed tamen et ipse sic adhuc de Deo loquitur hominibus quomodo possunt adhuc audire vel capere, licet, ut diximus, in agnitionem Dei religiosa iam facere incrementa nitatur.

Origen in Theodoret

καὶ οὐ συνειδὼν οἱ ἄγαν ἡλίθιοι, ὥς ἀνθρώποις δι' ἀνθρώπων διαλεγόμενος ὁ δεσπότης Θεός, τῇ τῶν ἀκουόντων ἀσθενείᾳ τοὺς λόγους μετρεῖ⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Cf. *Tractatus Origenis* 1.10-11, 7: *Et quia spiritus dictus sit, sicut scriptum est: deus inquit Spiritus est* (Jn. 4:24), *qui ergo spiritus est, simplex et uniformis est. Alioquin si in membrorum diversitate constructus esset, iam immensus et infinitus non est, quia metiri et definiri poterit aestimatione membrorum.* Origen, *HomGen.* 3.2, 118. *Simplex namque est illa substantia et neque membris ullis neque compagibus affectibusque composita, sed quidquid divinis virtutibus geritur, hoc ut homines possint intelligere aut humanorum membrorum appellatione profertur aut communibus et notis enuntiatur affectibus.*

⁴⁵ Cf. Philo *Somm.* 1.234-237 and Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* 2.16.72.4: οὐ γὰρ ὥς ἔχει τὸ θεῖον, οὕτως οἶόν τε ἦν λέγεσθαι· ἀλλ' ὥς οἶόν τε ἦν ἐπαίτειν ἡμᾶς σαρκὶ πεπεδημένους, οὕτως ἡμῖν ἐλάλησαν οἱ προφῆται συμπεριφερομένου σωτηρίως τῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀσθενείᾳ τοῦ κυρίου.

In fact, the human limbs attributed to God stand for divine powers:

Novatian

*Efficaciae igitur ibi divinae per membra monstrantur...*⁴⁶

Origen in Theodoret

καὶ ἐπειδὴ δι' ὀφθαλμῶν ὁρῶμεν ἡμεῖς, τὴν ὀπτικήν
αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ὀφθαλμοῦς ὀνομάζει· καὶ αὐτὸ πάλιν
τὴν ἀκουστικήν ὠτα, ἐπειδὴ διὰ τούτων τῶν μορίων
ἀκούομεν· κ.τ.λ.

No one can grasp the divine essence in itself, argues Novatian, since it is beyond human words, human concepts and understanding (*id enim quod est secundum id quod est nec humano sermone edici nec humanis auribus percipi nec humanis sensibus colligi potest*). This is what the Apostle teaches: *quae praeeparavit Deus his qui diligunt illum nec oculus vidit nec auris audivit nec cor hominis aut mens ipsa percepit* (1 Cor. 2:9).⁴⁷

Parallel explanations occur in Origen's extant writings, of which I have quoted two paragraphs of *De principiis* 1.1.⁴⁸ Here Origen is concerned with the literal and spiritual understanding of Jn. 4:24, 1 Jn. 1:5 and Deut. 4:24, the three verses that also appear in Novatian's work. Explaining them, Origen argues against any corporeal conception with regard to God's substance. It is *ineffabilis*, *inaestimabilis* and *incomprehensibilis* who and what God is in Himself. In the passage Origen does not quote 1 Cor. 2:9, but the threefold negation does call to mind the verse.

The fragments show that the interpretation of Gen. 1:26 and the refutation of anthropomorphic ideas were closely linked. Moreover, it is capable of proof that in the Commentary, Origen

⁴⁶ Cf. *Princ.* 2.8.5, 350. *Quia sicut omnia, quae corporaliter de deo dicuntur, id est vel digiti vel manus vel brachia vel oculi vel os vel pedes, dicimus non haec humana membra, sed virtutes eius quasdam in his corporeorum membrorum appellationibus indicari.*

⁴⁷ Importantly, Novatian's explanation of 1 Cor. 2:9 involves that the "things that God has prepared for them who love him" is the vision of the divine substance. This anticipates Augustine's teaching.

⁴⁸ Loi (1975, 226) noticed the similarity between Novatian's *De Trinitate* 7. and Origen's *Princ.* 1.1.1; *ComJn.* 13. (21) 123 ff.; *CCels.* 6.70. Cf. Weyer 1962, 28; Mattei 1992, 239. n. 22; 242. n. 37.

completed the argumentation with an explanation of Jn. 4:24, 1 Jn. 1:5 and Deut. 4:24, and that the argumentation could have been similar to that of *De principiis* 1.1. In a section of *ComJn.* 13, the anti-Anthropomorphite arguments are, indeed, connected with the explanations of the three celebrated verses.⁴⁹ There are good reasons, therefore, to assume that Novatian borrowed his explanation, including that of 1 Cor 2:9, from Origen's Commentary on the Genesis, although it cannot be excluded that he used *De principiis* as well.

Does the First *Tractatus* Depend on Origen's Text Translated by Novatian?

In the last section of the *Tractatus*, the author re-examines the problem raised by the anthropomorphic and anthropopathic

⁴⁹ *ComJn.* 13.123-131, 355-357. Heine 1993, 93-95: *Many have produced lengthy discussions of God and his essence. Some have even said that he has a bodily nature which is composed of fine particles and is like ether. Others have said that he is incorporeal and is of a different essence which transcends bodies in dignity and power. For this reason it is worthwhile for us to see if we have resources from the divine Scriptures to say something about God's essence. In this passage it is stated as if his essence were spirit, for it says, "God is spirit." But in the law, it is stated as if his essence were fire, for it is written, "Our God is a consuming fire." In John, however, it is stated as if he were light, for John says, "God is light, and there is no darkness in him." If, then, we should listen to these words literally, making no inquiry beyond the letter, we would have to say that God is a body. ... But because we do not see the consequences if we attribute a body to God when we say, even on the basis of Scripture, that he is some such body as spirit, or consuming fire, or light, unless we accept the conclusions that necessarily follow these assertions, we will disgrace ourselves as foolish and contradicting the obvious. For every fire is subject to extinction because it needs fuel, and every spirit, even if we take the spirit to be simple, because it is a body, admits of change to what is coarser in its own nature. In these matters, then, we must either accept so many absurd and blasphemous things about God in preserving the literal meanings, or, as we also do in many other cases, examine and inquire what can be meant when it is said that God is spirit, or fire, or light. First we must say that just as when we find it written that God has eyes, eyelids, ears, hands, arms, feet, and even wings, we change what is written into an allegory, despising those who bestow on God a form resembling men, and we do this with good reason, so also must we act consistently with our practice in the case of the names mentioned above. Now, this is clear indeed from the following assertion that seems more drastic to us. "For God is light," according to John, "and there is no darkness in him." Cf. *CCels.* 6.70.*

descriptions of God and discloses the spiritual meaning of the verses he quoted at the very beginning of the work. It is worth juxtaposing this whole passage and a selection from Novatian's *De Trinitate*.⁵⁰

<i>Tractatus Origenis 1</i>	<i>Novatian De Trinitate</i>
<u>28. Verum quod ad membra pertinet, quae quasi humana in Deo deputantur, non proprietates membrorum, sed efficaciae divinorum operum indicantur</u> , ut homines, qui	<u>6.5. Efficaciae igitur ibi diuinae per membra monstrantur, non habitus dei nec corporalia lineamenta ponuntur.</u>
spiritaliter deum verum et vivum videre et intellegere non	
poterant, saltem secundum suam naturam aliquid de deo	
vivo sentirent.	
<u>29. Non enim lex et prophetae sic de deo loquebantur</u>	<u>7.1. Hominibus enim licet in evangelio suo intellegendi</u>
<u>quomodo deus erat, sed quomodo homo capere poterat,</u>	<u>incrementa faciens disputet, sed tamen et ipse sic adhuc de</u>
<u>ut proinde secundum suum sensum unusquisque deum</u>	<u>Deo loquitur hominibus quomodo possunt adhuc audire</u>
<u>vivum possed (sic!) agnoscere,</u>	<u>vel capere, licet, ut diximus, in agnitionem Dei religiosa</u>
	<u>iam facere incrementa nitatur.</u>
quod et oculos haberet unde videret et	
os unde loqueretur et animam unde neomenias	
et sabbata Iudaeorum odiret, et manus unde operaretur.	
<u>30. Ceterum quoniam adhuc spiritalem sensum</u>	
<u>expectatis: cum caput dei dicitur, quod ipse initium rerum</u>	
<u>omnium sit indicatur; cum autem capilli ut lana alba</u>	

⁵⁰ Cf. Vona 1970, 61-67.

tamquam nix, quod semper antiquus sit nominatur;	
<u>cum oculi dicuntur, quod omnia videat,</u>	<u>6.5. Nam et cum oculi describuntur, quod omnia uideat</u>
	exprimitur. Et quando auris, quod omnia audiat proponitur.
	<u>Et cum digitus, significantia quaedam uoluntatis aperitur.</u>
<u>cum nares, quod orationes sanctorum quasi boni odoris perceptio sit aperitur,</u>	<u>Et cum nares, precum quasi odorum perceptio ostenditur.</u>
quia orationes sanctorum in Apocalipsi timiama	
comparantur esse, quae per manum angeli in odorem	
bonae flagrantiae ut scriptum est domnio offeruntur.	
31. Cum vero os domini dicitur, quod ipse totus sermo sit explicatur; cum vero lingua ipsius ut calamus acutus	
scribitur, quo per spiritum, quem calamum dixit, bipertita	
priscæ legis et evangeliorum praecepta perscripta sunt	
Indicatur; <u>cum manus nominatur, quod omnia ipse sit</u>	<u>Et cum manus, quod creaturae sit omnis auctor probatur.</u>
<u>operatus, cum brachium, quod universa ipse contineat,</u>	<u>Et quando brachium, quod nulla natura contra robur</u>
	<u>ipsius repugnare possit edicitur.</u>
<u>cum digitus dei, quia per ipsum omnis significatio divinae uoluntatis aperitur.</u>	
	Et quando pedes, quod impleat omnia nec sit quicquam ubi non sit deus explicatur. ⁵¹ 6.6. Neque enim

⁵¹ Cf. Origen *Frag. lib. I. reg. PG. 12. c. 992*: "Ὡς περ ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων μὲν χεὶρ καὶ ποὺς καὶ ὀφθαλμὸς καὶ οὖς καὶ εἴ τι τοιοῦτον ὀνομάζεται σημαντικὰ τῶν μελῶν τοῦ ἡμετέρου σώματος ἐστίν, ἐπὶ δὲ θεοῦ χεὶρ μὲν τὸ δημιουργικόν, ὀφθαλμὸς δὲ τὸ ἐποπτικόν, καὶ οὖς μὲν τὸ ἀκουστικόν, ποὺς δὲ τὸ τῆς παρουσίας ὅταν ἐνεργῇ τι·

	<p>sunt ei aut membra aut membrorum officia necessaria, ad cuius solum etiam tacitum arbitrium et seruiunt et adsunt omnia. Cur enim requirat oculos, qui lux est? Aut cur quaerat pedes, qui ubique est? aut cur ingredi uelit, cum non sit quo extra se progredi possit? Aut cur manus expetat, cuius ad omnia instituenda artifex est et silens uoluntas? Nec auribus eget, qui etiam tacitas nouit uoluntates. Aut propter quam causam linguam quaerat, cui cogitare iussisse est? Necessaria enim haec membra hominibus fuerunt, non deo, quia inefficax hominis consilium fuisset, nisi cogitamen corpus implesset, deo autem non necessaria, cuius uoluntatem non tantum sine aliqua molitione opera subsequuntur, sed ipsa statim opera cum uoluntate procedunt. 6.8.</p>
32. <u>Totus enim oculus est, quia totus uidit, totus auris,</u>	<u>Ceterum ipse totus oculus, quia totus uidet, et totus auris,</u>
<u>quia totus audit, totus os, quia totus sermo, totus lingua,</u>	<u>quia totus audit, et totus manus, quia totus operatur, et</u>
<u>quia totus loquitur, totus pes, quia totus ubique est, totus</u>	<u>totus pes, quia totus ubique est.</u>
<u>manus, quia totus ubique operatur, totus brachius, quia</u>	Idem enim, quicquid illud est, totus aequalis est et totus ubique est. Non enim habet in se diuersitatem sui quicquid est simplex.
totus omnia continet et universa gubernat.	...
Et quidquid de eo dixeris, efficientiam operum suorum et	6.2. Rationem enim diuinae scripturae <u>de</u>
<u>dispensationes sacramentorum ipsius nominabis, non</u>	<u>temperamento dispositionis cognoscimus.</u> ...
	7.3. <u>Id enim quod est secundum id quod est nec</u>

<u>tamen ipsum qualis et quantus sit poteris explicare.</u>	<u>humano sermone edici nec humanis auribus percipi nec</u>
<u>33. Tunc enim existimatur (aestimatur) deus, cum</u>	<u>humanis sensibus colligi potest.</u> Nam si quae praeparauit
<u>inaestimabilis, incomprehensibilis et inenarrabilis</u> ubique	Deus his qui diligunt illum nec oculus uidit nec auris
totus et unus est, <u>quantum humana mens aetimare,</u>	audiuit nec cor hominis aut mens ipsa percepit (1Cor. 2:9),
<u>comprehendere et definire non sufficit.</u>	<u>qualis et quantus est ille ipse qui haec repromittit ad quae</u>
	<u>intellegenda et mens hominis et natura defecit?</u>

The obvious parallels between the *Tractatus* and *De Trinitate* seem to confirm the assumption that although the Tractator used a translation of Origen's anti-Anthropomorphite argumentation in the Commentary on Genesis, he also had before him Novatian's *De Trinitate*. However, the close relationship can be elucidated with another assumption as well: both authors independently used the same Latin translation of the Origen passage.

The arguments for this solution are as follows:

1. I take it to be proven, as the result of the previous analysis, that Novatian's explanations in *De Trinitate* 6.5, on the spiritual powers and the spiritual meanings of the limbs, and in 7.1, on God's adjustment to human capacity, are directly influenced by Origen's Commentary on Genesis.
2. *Tractatus* 1.28-29 also goes back, directly or indirectly, to Origen (see Origen in Theodoret, quoted above).
3. *Tractatus* 1.30-32 contains integral explanations of limbs which do not occur in *De trinitate*.
4. Although *Tractatus* 1.31-32 contains sentences in literal harmony with *De trinitate*, this paragraph includes independent spiritual interpretations as well: *os domini ... totus sermo sit; lingua ipsius ... evangeliorum praecepta* (cf. Origen in Theodoret: καὶ τὸ πρὸς τὰ γμᾶ, στόμα); *totus os, quia totus sermo, totus lingua, quia totus loquitur; totus brachius, quia totus omnia continet et universa gubernat.*

However clear the verbatim dependence of some passages on *De Trinitate*, one has to be careful with the conclusion that the

Tractator took *De Trinitate* and then completed the missing spiritual interpretations from other Latin sources, or from his own.⁵² I would not like to underestimate the Tractator's potential of making compilations, but in the above-quoted passage, his text is so consistent and integral that one might suppose the author is copying a model, rather than combining different sources.

In fact, the closing section of the *Tractatus* (30-32) includes the interpretations of the verses quoted in the opening section (1). In this way, the author confers an amazingly well-elaborated framework on his work.⁵³ After having laid down the principle of the spiritual exegesis, highly Origenian in its nature and wording (cf. *quomodo homo capere poterat; spiritalem sensum expectatis*), the Tractator reiterates the features he has already listed in the opening paragraph in connection with particular Scriptural verses. He reiterates and briefly comments on *caput, capilli, oculi, nares, os, lingua, manus, brachium, digitus*. The opening and closing sections are thus mutually and closely dependent. As pointed out, the opening section – that is, the array of the Scriptural verses – is much richer in quotations than its parallel in Novatian's *De Trinitate*, and, in addition, it stands closer to the catena fragment of Origen's *Commentary on Genesis* than to Novatian's work. We do not know how Origen explained the anthropomorphic verses he quoted in the Commentary, but it is certain that Novatian and the Tractator

⁵² It is unlikely that the Tractator invented such spiritual explanation of the limbs attributed to God. For example, Zeno of Verona, *Tract. lib. 1, Tract. 37*, also comments on Psalm 44:2 in this way: *Sed et David hanc calamum nuncupavit, dicens: lingua mea calamus scribae uelociter scribentis. Calamus fissus est, fratres, duosque uertices gerit in unius acuminis tenuitate digestos, unam litteram utroque conficiens; cui si unum adimas, alterius inanis est usus. Vnde recte testamenta sunt duo, quae similiter duobus capitibus unam litteram fingunt, id est sacrae legis duobus edictis unum christum dei filium spirituali temperamento conscribunt*. It is not necessary to infer a direct relationship between the Tractator and Zeno. The arguments in Vona 1970, 102-103 for Gregory's dependence on Zeno are not convincing, both authors may well have drawn on common sources, Dulaey 1993/2, 1, 351 and 2, 181 n. 97.

⁵³ See also, chapter 1 with the Anthropomorphites arguments: *Prophetae caput et capillos domini nominant et oculos et aures et nares et os et labia et linguam et pedes etc.*, and chapter 29, which starts with the answer: *Non enim lex et prophetae sic deo loquebantur etc.*

follow his explanations.⁵⁴ However, the Tractator, like Origen, quoted many more verses referring to God's limbs than did Novatian, so he offers a more extended spiritual interpretation of these limbs. Consequently, if the opening section of the *Tractatus* independently goes back to a Latin translation of the Origen passage, which is probable, then this is also true of the closing section.

Finally, the surmise that in *De Trinitate* 7.3 Novatian may have rephrased a passage which contained Origen's interpretation of 1 Cor. 2:9 can be corroborated. The Tractator is also familiar with the interpretation; moreover, his terminology is identical to that which Origen (Rufinus) also used. In contrast to Novatian, the Tractator does not cite 1 Cor. 2:9, the Scriptural evidence for the interpretation, but he applies the three apophatic adjectives which appear in *De principiis*. The Tractator and Origen say that God's essence is inestimable, incomprehensible and unspeakable. Novatian delivers the same teaching (*nec humano sermone edici nec humanis auribus percipi nec humanis sensibus colligi potest*), but his terminology derives directly from the Pauline verse. All three authors agree that the human mind is not able to comprehend the divine nature.⁵⁵ The *Tractatus* and *De trinitate* thus partly diverge and partly converge at these points. As for the common point, the expression *ipsum qualis et quantus sit* seems to have been taken up from *De trinitate* (*qualis et quantus est ille ipse*), and even the expression *ubique totus est* is found in Novatian (see: *De Trinitate* 6.8, 21, quoted above).⁵⁶ Can we regard this fact as an argument for the Tractator's direct dependence on the passage of *De Trinitate*? Not if

⁵⁴ Origen *Frag. lib. I. reg.* PG. 12. c. 992: "Ὡςπερ ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων μὲν χεὶρ καὶ ποὺς καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ οὖς καὶ εἴ τι τοιοῦτον ὀνομάζεται σημαντικὰ τῶν μελῶν τοῦ ἡμετέρου σώματος ἐστίν, ἐπὶ δὲ θεοῦ χεὶρ μὲν τὸ δημιουργικόν, ὀφθαλμοὺς δὲ τὸ ἐποπτικόν, καὶ οὖς μὲν τὸ ἀκουστικόν, ποὺς δὲ τὸ τῆς παρουσίας ὅταν ἐνεργῇ τι· Origen in Theodoret *Quaestiones in Genesim* 1.20, 24: καὶ ἐπειδὴ δι' ὀφθαλμῶν ὁρώμεν ἡμεῖς, τὴν ὀπτικήν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ὀφθαλμοὺς ὀνομάζει· καὶ αὐτὸς πάλιν τὴν ἀκουστικὴν ὠτα, ἐπειδὴ διὰ τούτων τῶν μορίων ἀκούομεν· καὶ τὸ πρόσταγμα, στόμα.

⁵⁵ See also *Princ.* 1.1.6, 98 some lines below the passage quoted above: *Quia ergo mens nostra ipsum per se ipsam deum sicut est non potest intueri . . .*

⁵⁶ Cf. Vona 1970, 65-67.

we accept that Origen's text, and its Latin translation, may well have contained the expression *quantus et qualis*:

Novatian <i>Trin.</i> 7.3, 22	<i>Tractatus</i> <i>Origenis</i> 1.33, 12	Origen, <i>Princ.</i> 1.1.5, 96-98	Origen, <i>HomNum.</i> 8.2, 258-260
Id enim quod est secundum			
id quod est <u>nec</u> <u>humano</u>			
<u>sermone edici</u> <u>nec humanis</u>			
<u>auribus percipi</u> <u>nec humanis</u>			
<u>sensibus colligi</u> <u>potest.</u> Nam			Oculus non vidit nec auris
si quae praeparavit deus his			audivit nec in cor hominis
qui diligunt illum nec oculus			adscendit quae praeparavit
vidit nec auris audiuit nec			Deus his qui diligunt eum
cor hominis aut mens ipsa			(1 Cor. 2: 9). Vide ergo
percepit (1 Cor. 2:9), qualis	Non tamen ipsum qualis et		quanta sint et qualia quae
et quantus est ille ipse qui	quantus sit poteris		non solum videre et audire
haec repromittit ad quae	explicare. Tunc enim	Dicimus secundum	nemini licuit, sed “ne in cor
intellegenda et mens	existimatur (aestimatur)	veritatem quidem deum	quidem”, <u>id est</u> <u>ad</u>
hominis et natura defecit?	Deus, cum <u>inaestimabilis,</u>	<u>inconprehensibil</u> <u>em esse</u>	<u>cogitationem</u> <u>humanam,</u>
	<u>inconprehensibi</u> <u>lis et</u>	<u>atque</u> <u>inaestimabilem.</u>	<u>potuit</u> “adscendere”. ⁵⁷

⁵⁷ *HomJesu.* 6.1, 184: *Certum namque est quod quantacumque illa sunt, quae nunc in lege Dei vel divinis litteris intelligere possumus aut sentire, multo sublimiora et excelsiora erunt illa, quae cessante aenigmate facie ad faciem* (1 Cor. 13, 12) *sancti*

		Si	
	<u>inenarrabilis</u> ubique totus et	quid enim illud est, quod	
	unus est, quantum <u>humana</u>	sentire vel intellegere de deo	
	<u>mens aestimare.</u>	potuerimus, multis longe	
	<u>comprehender</u> <u>e et definire</u>	modis eum meliorem esse	
	<u>non sufficit.</u>	ab eo quod sensimus	
		necesse est credi. ... Quid	
		autem in omnibus	
		intellectualibus, id est	
		incorporeis, tam praestans	
		omnibus, tam <u>ineffabiliter</u>	
		<u>atque</u> <u>inaestimabiliter</u>	
		praececellens quam deus?	
		<u>cuius utique</u> <u>natura acie</u>	
		<u>humanae mentis</u> <u>intendi</u>	
		<u>atque intueri,</u> <u>quamvis ea sit</u>	
		<u>purissima mens</u> <u>ac</u>	
		<u>limpidissima,</u> <u>non potest.</u>	

Origen's remarks in the homily on Numbers and *De principiis* make it probable that his explanation of 1 Cor. 2:9, followed by

quique videre merebuntur, quia quae oculus non vidit nec auris audit nec in cor hominis adscendit, etc.

Novatian in *De trinitate*, may well have contained the Greek counterparts of such expressions as *qualis* and *quanta* (viz. “*quae praeparavit*”); *inaestimabilis* (viz. “*oculus non vidit*”); *inenarrabilis* (viz. “*nec auris audit*”), and *incomprehensibilis* (viz. “*nec in cor hominis ascendit*”).⁵⁸ That the Tractator amended Novatian’s text on the basis of Rufinus’ translation of *De principiis* does not seem a convincing surmise. On the contrary, it is much more plausible that he found the terms and the whole passage in the Latin translation of the anti-Anthropomorphite section of the Commentary on Genesis, in which Origen offered a well-elaborated concept of the incorporeal God against the Anthropomorphites’ theory.⁵⁹ In the Commentary Origen again expounded the doctrine with a terminology and arguments similar to those in *De principiis* 1.1.⁶⁰

The final conclusion of the present analysis is that the intimate connection between Novatian’s *De trinitate* and the first *Tractatus Origenis* may be due to a common source. Possibly, the parallel passages independently go back to Origen’s Commentary on Genesis in so far as the Tractator and Novatian used the same Latin compilation of Origen’s Commentary. But who translated Origenian texts into Latin? Who could make a compilation of the Commentary on Genesis as early as the middle of the 3rd century? Two candidates appear: Victorinus of Poetovio and Novatian. According to Jerome, Victorinus, who did not know Latin as well as Greek, abundantly profited from Origen’s exegetical works.⁶¹

⁵⁸ Cf. Origen’s *HomNum.* 17.4, : *Eorum vero, qui sapientiae et scientiae operam dant, quoniam finis nullus est - quis enim terminus Dei sapientiae erit? ubi quanto amplius quis accesserit, tanto profundiora inveniet, et quanto quis scrutatus fuerit, tanto ea ineffabilia et incomprehensibilia deprehendet; incomprehensibilis enim et inaestimabilis est Dei sapientia.*

⁵⁹ The phrase “*Tunc enim existimatur (aestimatur) Deus, cum inaestimabilis*” echos Minucius Felix 18.8: *sic eum digne aestimamus, dum inaestimabilem dicimus* which may have been inserted in the text either by the Translator or by the Tractator.

⁶⁰ In *Princ.* 1.2.6, 120, Origen alludes to the fact that he just began to write his Commentary on Genesis: *Puto ergo posse priori quidem exemplo aptari eum, qui ad imaginem et similitudinem dei factus est, hominem, de quo diligentius deo favente, cum locum ipsum in Genesi exponere coeperimus, videbimus.* The two works were written simultaneously, Crouzel-Simonetti 1978, 40. n. 33.

⁶¹ Victorinus’ Latin was weak: Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 74; *Ep.* 58.10; *Ep.* 70.5; *In Is. Prol.* (CCSL 73, 3). He followed Origen’s exegesis: Jerome, *In Eccl.*

However, it is not logical to suppose any dependence on the part of Novatian upon Victorinus. Certainly, the Pannonian bishop was a younger contemporary of the Roman presbyter,⁶² and his Latin was far less eloquent than the celebrated rhetor's. Novatian spoke Greek as well as Latin; he was not reduced to using Latin translations or compilations. It can be hypothesised, therefore, that Novatian, the first Roman theologian writing in Latin, was also the first Latin "translator" of Origen. Presumably, he had made a compilation of Origenian texts he found to be important and useful for the exegesis of difficult passages, and when composing *De Trinitate*, he used, with the typical freedom of the author, his own translation. Later on, the compilation was used by the author of the *Tractatus Origenis*, who, according to his custom, closely followed his source. This may explain why the first *Tractatus* indicates, in certain cases, closer relationship with Origen's texts than with Novatian's *De trinitate*, in spite of the fact that, even in these cases, there is connection between Novatian's work and the *Tractatus*.

Very little is known about the Latin translations of the 3rd, 4th and 5th centuries. If Augustine had not devoted a half-sentence to the fact that Marius Victorinus had translated certain *libri platonicorum*,⁶³ we could only guess about the source of some Plotinian and Porphyrian ideas occurring in Augustine's writings. But even in this case, the make-up of the collection remains obscure. Why did Victorinus translate Plotinus, if he did so at all?⁶⁴ Why did not anybody else refer to Victorinus' translation?

4.13-16 (CCSL 72, 290); *Ep.* 61.2; *Adv. Ruf.* 3.14.8. Jerome's remarks do not indicate that Victorinus would have translated Origenian works, Dulaey 1993/2, 1, 16-18.

⁶² The *De Trinitate* was probably composed between 240 and 250. See Weyer 1962, 14-15; DeSimone 1970, 43-44; *idem* 1974, 14. For the date of Victorinus' activity, the second half of the third century, see Dulaey 1993/2, 1, 11-13.

⁶³ Conf. 8.2.3 cf. *ibid.* 7.9.13.

⁶⁴ Plotinus' book mentioned in *B. vita* 1.4. are to be distinguished from the books of Platonists. The latter may contained treatises of both Plotinus and Porphyry. According to Hadot, Victorinus' theology reveal a strong influence of Porphyry, not Plotinus, Hadot 1968, 1, 79-143 and 1971, 203-204.

Moreover, Augustine's *De civitate Dei* is the only source for identifying a Latin version of one work by Porphyry, called *De regressu animae*.⁶⁵ Was this also translated by Marius Victorinus? Further questions: who translated Philo's *Quaestiones in Genesin* into Latin, and when? And Origen's *Series in Matthaeum*, Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses*; the first version of the *Vita Antonii*? On the other hand, we are informed about translations which did not survive: Hilary translated Origen's explanations of Psalms⁶⁶ and homilies on Job;⁶⁷ and Eusebius of Vercelli translated the Psalm-commentaries of Eusebius of Caesarea.⁶⁸

Let us return to Victorinus, the translator. His mysterious *libri platoniorum* unexpectedly emerge in Milan in the 380s and later no trace is found of them. Jerome, who otherwise knew even those of Victorinus' works which had been written by the still-pagan orator,⁶⁹ nowhere mentioned his translations. Considering these circumstances, it is not surprising if a compilation or translation of Origenian works made by a man who became schismatic, and who for this reason was neglected by the most influential theologians of the Church, has never been mentioned. Nevertheless, this is no more than a hypothesis.

⁶⁵ *Civ. dei.* 10.32, 455.

⁶⁶ Jerome *Ep.* 61.2; 75.6

⁶⁷ Jerome *Adv. Rufinum* 1.2; *Vir. ill.* 100.

⁶⁸ Jerome *Ep.* 61.2; 75.6; *De viris illustribus* 96

⁶⁹ Jerome *Adv. Ruf.* 1.16; *In Ez.* 13. praef.; *ComGal. Prol.* col. 332.

APPENDIX 4: HILARY AND THE LATIN COMPILATION OF ORIGEN'S COMMENTARY ON GENESIS

If a compilation of Origen's commentary existed, then it may have exercised influence not only on the Tractator but also on other Latin authors. The influence of Origen's exegesis on Victorinus of Poetovio, Hilary of Poitiers and Ambrose is attested by Jerome.¹ Even Jerome frequently admits his own indebtedness to Origen, the exegete. However, whereas Victorinus, Ambrose and Jerome were able to read any work in Greek, Hilary could not read Origen's Greek writings for a long while.² Hence, it is worth

¹ Jerome *Adv. Ruf.* 1.2; 2.14; 3.14; 84.7; *Ep.* 84.7; *Vir. ill.* 100.

² Concerning the alleged misunderstanding of the words “*excutientes*” and “*excussi*” in Hilary's *Tract. in Ps.* (126.19, 626), Jerome (*Ep.* 34.4, 262) observes that Hilary's Greek was poor and therefore Heliodorus assisted him in translating Origen. The mistake is thus made by Heliodorus and not by Hilary: *Quid igitur faciam? Tantum virum et suis temporibus disertissimum reprehendere non audeo, qui et confessionis suae merito et vitae industria et eloquentiae claritate, ubicumque Romanum nomen est, praedicatur; nisi quod non eius culpa adscribendum est, qui Hebraei sermonis ignarus fuit, Graecarum quoque litterarum quandam aurulam ceperat, sed Heliodori presbyteri, quo ille familiariter usus ea, quae intellegere non poterat, quomodo ab Origene essent dicta, quaerebat. Qui, quia in hoc psalmo commentarium Origenis invenire non potuit, opinionem magis insinuare suam quam inscientiam voluit confiteri, quam ille sumptam claro sermone disseruit et alienum errorem disertius exsecutus est.* The verse in question is Ps. 126:4. In the same Epistle (5, 264.), Jerome reproached, again, Heliodorus for a similar mistake. Jean Doignon's research corroborates Jerome's remark that Hilary needed the aid of an interpreter for using Origen's texts, see Doignon 1971, 531-543,

examining a portion of Hilary's *Tractatus* on Psalm 129 which includes the exegesis of Gen. 1:26 and 2:7. Paragraphs 3-6 of Hilary's work reveal close textual parallels with the first *Tractatus Origenis* which, in fact, is devoted to the topic of the double creation of man.

Hilary <i>Tract. in Ps. 129</i>	<i>Tractatus Origenis</i> 1
3. Ac primum intellegendum est deum incorporalem	10. Et quia spiritus dictus sit, sicut scriptum est: <u>deus</u>
esse neque ex partibus quibusdam atque officiis	<u>inquit Spiritus est</u> (Jn. 4:24), qui ergo spiritus est,
membrorum, ex quibus unum corpus efficitur,	simplex et uniformis est. 11. Alioquin si in membrorum
consistere. Legimus enim in evangelio: <u>quoniam Deus</u>	diversitate constructus esset, iam <u>imensus</u> et infinitus non
<u>spiritus est</u> (Jn. 4:24), ³ invisibilis scilicet et <u>imensa</u>	est, quia metiri et definiri poterit aestimatione
atque intra se manens ⁴ et aeterna natura. Scriptum	membrorum. ... 12. ... <u>deus autem qui spiritus est,</u>
quoque est; <u>quoniam spiritus carnem et ossa non habet.</u>	<u>ossa inquit non habet</u> (Lk. 24:39)...
Ex his enim corporis membra consistunt, quibus	
substantia dei non eget. Deus autem, qui et <u>ubique</u> et in	
omnibus <u>est</u> , ⁵ <u>totus audit, totus videt</u> , totus efficit, totus	32. Totus enim oculus est, quia <u>totus videt</u> , totus auris

especially 543: "Hilaire, même après son exil en Phrygie, n'avait pas la pratique des textes grecs."

³ For the interpretation of Jn. 4:24, see Origen in Theodoret *Quaestiones in Genesim* 1.20 and Novatian *Trin.* 5.29 quoted above.

⁴ Cf. Sap. 7:27: *In se ipsa manens innovat omnia*. Origen *ComJn.* 6.188, 268: ταῦτα διαληπτέον περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ λόγου, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα γέγονεν, ὑφρεσθηκότος οὐσιωδῶς κατὰ τὸ ὑποκείμενον, τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὄντος τῇ σοφίᾳ.

⁵ Cf. Origen *Princ.* 4.4.3, 406-8: *sed inter utrumque cauta pietatis debet esse confessio, ut neque aliquid deitatis in Christo defuisse credatur, et nulla penitus a paterna substantia, quae ubique est, facta putetur esse divulsio. ... Unde ostenditur quia et in corpore totus et ubique totus aderat filius dei*. The omnipresence of the

incedit. Et hoc ex scripturis docemur, cum dicitur: <i>ego sum</i>	quia <u>totus audit</u> , totus os, quia totus sermo, totus lingua,
<i>deus adpropians, et non de longe</i> (Jer. 23:23), et	quia totus loquitur, totus pes, quia totus <u>ubique est</u> , totus
rursum: <i>quoniam in ipso et vivimus et movemur et sumus</i>	manus, quia totus ubique operatur, totus brachius, quia
(Acts 27:28). <u>Virtus</u> ergo <u>dei</u> , quae aequalis et indiscreta	tota omnia continet et universa gubernat. Et quidquid de
est, <u>officiorum ac membrorum habet nomina</u> , ut virtus, qua	eo dixeris, <u>efficientiam operum suorum et dispensationes</u>
videt, oculi sint; virtus, qua audit, aures sint; virtus, qua	<u>sacramentorum ipsius nominabis</u> , non tamen qualis et
efficit, manus sint; virtus, qua adest, pedes sint, officiorum	quantus sit poteris explicare. ⁶
diversitates virtutis huius potestate peragente. Deus ergo	
ubique est et ubicumque adest, audit, videt efficit ⁷ ; sed	
orandus a nobis est, ut secundum precem nostram adsit,	
audiat, videat, efficiat. Naturae suae est, ut audiat; sed fidei nostrae est ut precemur audiri. Audit conciantes, audit	
maledicentes, audit etiam intra secreta cordis loquentes;	
sed fides officium suum exsequitur, ut dei auditionem	
roget, ut, qui per naturam suam audit, per orantis precem	
dignetur audire.	
4. Quod si qui forte corporeum deum et conformabilem et	
membris diversum, quia non idem oculus quod et manus	

Logos is explained in connection with Jn. 1:26, see also *ComJn.* 6.188 ff. See also C. Blanc's note in *SC* 157 (1970), 46-7.

⁶ Cf. Novatian *Trin.* 6.5.

⁷ For the whole passage, see Origen *HomGen.* 3.2; *Princ.* 2.8.5; *ComJn.* 1.282; *HomJer.* 18.6; *Frag. lib. I. reg. PG.* 12. c. 992; Theodoret *Quaestiones in Genesim* 1.20. *PG.* 80 104B; Novatian *Trin.* 6.5.

est, ob id esse existimabit, quod dictum est: <i>faciamus</i>	
<i>hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram</i> (Gen. 1:26), primum <u>meminisse debet hominum institutionem</u>	
<u>naturis duabus contineri, animae scilicet et corporis,</u> <u>quarum alia spiritalis, alia terrena est,</u> et inferiorem hanc materiam ad efficientiam atque operationem naturae illius	4. Sed qui haec dicunt, <u>meminisse debent hominis institutionem</u> longe aliam esse dei natura.
<u>naturis duabus contineri, animae scilicet et corporis,</u> <u>quarum alia spiritalis, alia terrena est,</u> et inferiorem hanc materiam ad efficientiam atque operationem naturae illius	9. <u>Cum ergo ex duabus ut dixi naturis homo constet,</u> <u>quarum aliam spiritalem diximus, aliam esse terrenam</u>
	quomodo tu putas deum, incorporeum, simplicem, purum spiritum, imaginem et similitudinem hominis habere?
fuisse potioris aptatam. Ergo <u>quisquis ita vult credere, ut corporalis deus sit, quia ad imaginem eius homo factus est,</u> conpositum esse deum statuet, ex potiore scilicet inferioremque natura, quia de talibus homo constat. ⁸	<u>Qui enim ita vult credere, ut corporalem deum intellegat, cum nemo qui corporalis est, ad imaginem et similitudinem dei factus non sit, hic conpositum deum ex potiore et inferiore natura esse statuat, quia talibus hominem constare manifestum est. Quidquid autem</u>
<u>Quidquid autem conpositum est, necesse est non fuerit aeternum; qui conpositio habet initium, quo comparatur, ut maneat.</u> ⁹ Sed haec infidelitatis deliramenta sunt, dum per caelestis naturae	<u>compositum est, necesse est ut non fuerit sempiternum, quia conpositio habet initium quo componitur ut maneat;</u>

⁸ Cf. Origen *CCels.* 6.63, 336. Εἰ γὰρ τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι ἐστὶ μόνον, ἐστέρηται τὸ κρεῖττον, ἢ ψυχὴ, τοῦ κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ φθαρτῷ σώματι, ὅπερ οὐδεὶς ἡμῶν λέγει. Εἰ δ' ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ συναμφοτέρῳ τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀνάγκη σύνθετον εἶναι τὸν θεὸν καὶ οἶονεὶ συνεστῶτα καὶ αὐτὸν ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος, ἵνα τὸ μὲν κατ' εἰκόνα τὸ κρεῖττον ἢ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ, τὸ δ' ἔλαττον καὶ κατὰ τὸ σῶμα ἐν τῷ σώματι, ὅπερ οὐδεὶς ἡμῶν φησι. Cf. *Dial.* 12.

⁹ Cf. *Princ.* 1.1.6, 102: *Deum vero, qui omnium initium est, compositum esse non est putandum; ne forte priora ipso principio esse inveniantur elementa, ex quibus compositum est omne quicquid illud est quod compositum dicitur.*

ignorationem intra has opinionis	
angustias vitio ingenii degeneris coartatur.	
5. <u>Deus autem, qui semper et in omnibus manens</u>	<u>Deus autem semper et in omnibus manens ubique idem et</u>
<u>ubicumque idem et nusquam ipse non totus est,</u> ¹⁰ cum	<u>nusquam non totus est, sicut scriptum est: <i>Caelum et</i></u>
pulcherrimum opus perfecto iam mundo inchoaret,	<i>terram ego impleo</i> (Jer. 23:24), quia nec locus est aliquis
	ubi deus absit, nec locus deo maior sit. ¹¹
	13. Deus enim cum
<u>hominem scilicet ad imaginem sui faciens, eum ex humili</u>	<u>hominem ad imaginem suam faceret duplici eum natura</u>
<u>natura caelestique composuit, anima videlicet et corpore.</u> ¹²	<u>composuit, anima scilicet et corpore.</u>
<u>Et prius quidem animam divino illo et incomprehensibili</u>	<u>Et quidem animam divino illo et incomprehensibili</u>
<u>nobis virtutis suae opere constituit.</u> Non enim, cum ad	<u>nobis virtutis suae opere constituit,</u> corpus vero de limo
imaginem dei hominem fecit, tunc et corpus effecit.	terrae plasmavit. Et quia ex humo homo dicitur, ideo
Genesis docet longe postea, quam ad imaginem dei homo	anima corpori coniuncta vocabulum hominis traxit, ut
erat factus, pulverem sumptum formatumque corpus, ¹³	et ipsa homo diceretur. ¹⁴ 14. Denique advertite quid

¹⁰ See above, note 687.

¹¹ Cf. *CCels.* 7.34, 90: 'ἄλλ' οὐδ' ὥς ἐν τόπῳ ὄντος τοῦ θεοῦ πευσόμεθ' αἰνός καὶ ἐροῦμεν· Πῶς ἴωμεν πρὸς αὐτόν; Κρείττων γὰρ ὁ θεὸς παντὸς τόπου καὶ περιεκτικὸς παντὸς οὐτινοσοῦν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἐστὶ τὸ περιέχον τὸν θεόν. See also *ComJn.* 6.202; *Orat.* 23.1 and 3 with the quotation of Jer. 23:24. A similar argument appears in Theophilus of Antioch *Ad Autol.* 2.3.

¹² Cf. *Princ.* 1.1.6, 102: *nos homines animal sumus compositum ex corporis animaeque concursu*, cf. *CCels.* 6.63; 7.24. This dichotomy does not contradict the more frequent body-soul-spirit trichotomy in Origen's anthropology. Dupuis 1967, 29-42; Crouzel-Simonetti 1978, 26. n. 27.

¹³ Cf. *HomGen.* 1.13, 56: *Hunc sane hominem, quem dicit ad 'imaginem Dei' factum, non intelligimus corporalem. Non enim corporis figmentum Dei imaginem continet, neque factus esse corporalis homo dicitur, sed plasmatus, sicut in*

	Scriptura pronuntiet: <i>Et dixit, inquit Deus: Faciamus</i>
	<i>hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram. Et fecit</i>
	<i>Deus hominem, ad imaginem dei fecit illum. Et postea</i>
	repetit dicens: <i>Nondum, inquit, pluerat deus super terram</i>
	<i>et homo non erat qui operaret terram. Et ubi est quod</i>
	supra iam dixerat: <i>Fecit deus hominem ad imaginem dei,</i>
	cum postea suiungat: <i>Et finxit deus hominem de limo</i>
	<i>terrae et inspiravit in faciem eius spiritum vitae et factus</i>
	<i>est homo in animam viventem?</i>
dehinc rursum in animam viventem per inspirationem dei	15. Videtis ergo, dilectissimi fratres, quomodo <u>naturam</u>
factum, <u>naturam hanc</u> scilicet terrenam atque caelestem	<u>nunc (hanc)</u> interioris et exterioris hominis
<u>quodam inspirationis foedere copulatam.</u>	<u>quodam inspirationis foedere copulatam insinuat.</u>
6. <u>Scit se beatus apostolus Paulus per interiorem et</u>	<u>denique et beatus Paulus apostolus hoc sciens adserit in</u>
<u>exteriorem hominem dissidere. Per interiorem quidem</u>	<u>semetipso exteriorem cum interiore homine dissidere;</u>
<u>hominem delectatur lege, per exteriorem vero hoc, quod</u>	<u><Con>gaudeo enim, inquit, legi dei secundum interiorem</u>
<u>non vult, agit</u> (cf. Rom. 7:22):	<u>hominem</u> (Rom. 7:22); <u>sed {prius} dixerat: Video aliam</u>
	<u>legem in membris meis repugnantem et captivum me</u>
	<u>ducentem</u> (Rom. 7:23), <u>id est per exteriorem hominem</u>
	<u>invitum cogi et interiorem et id agere quod non vult. (...)</u>

consequentibus scriptum est. Ait enim: 'Et plasmavit Deus hominem,' id est finxit, 'de terra limo.'

¹⁴ Cf. *Princ.* 4.2.7, 328: ἀνθρώπους δὲ νῦν λέγω τὰς χρωμένους ψυχὰς σώμασιν.

<u>cum interior homo spiritus opera desiderat, exterior</u>	19. Videtis ergo alium esse hominem <u>qui opera spiritus</u>
<u>voluptates corporis concupiscit.</u>	<u>desiderat, alium, qui carnalia concupiscit, alium, qui</u>
	semper vivit, alium, qui moritus. Ille invisibilis est, qui ad
	imaginem dei factus est, quem secundum deum apostolus
	dicit creatum, hic visibilis est, qui de limo terrae plasmatus
	est; ille <u>mobilis</u> est, hic non movetur et a semetipso
Ergo ad imaginem dei homo interior effectus est	motum habere non potest; ille immortalis, hic mortalis; ille
<u>rationabilis, mobilis, movens, citus, incorporeus, subtilis,</u>	<u>rationabilis, incorporeus, subtilis, aeternus.</u>
<u>aeternus.</u> ¹⁵ Quantum in se est, speciem naturae principalis	
imitatur, dum transcurrit, dum circumvolat et dicto citius	
nunc ultra oceanum est, nunc in caelos evolat, nunc in	
abyssis est, nunc orientem occidentemque perlustrat, dum	
numquam, ut non sit, aboletur – natura quidem dei	20. Et ideo imago dei in his omnibus est, in invisibilitate,
in his omnibus est – neque, ut alibi adsit, decedit	in immortalitate, in rationabilitate, <u>in mobilitate</u> , in quibus

¹⁵ Cf. Sap. 7:22: Ἦστιν γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ πνεῦμα νοερόν, ἅγιον, μονογενές, πολυμερές, λεπτόν, εὐκίνητον... . Origen, *HomGen.* 1.13, 56: *Is autem qui 'ad imaginem Dei' factus est, interior homo noster est, invisibilis et incorporealis et incorruptus atque immortalis. ComRom.* 7.4, 50: *Nam ille interior homo qui secundum Deum creatus est et ad imaginem Dei factus, incorruptibilis est et invisibilis et secundum propriam sui rationem etiam incorporeus dici potest.* In *CCels.* 4:85 a distinction is made between rational mind which is moved by reasoning and irrational mind moved by instinct and unreasoning. This movement seems to be identical to the reason (logos) which is made in the image of God's Logos, see also *Frag. ComJn.* 18. As God's nature never ceases to move (cf. *Princ.* 3.5.3, so the mind or soul cannot exist without a permanent movement, see *Princ.* 2.11.1; 3.3.5. Origen's explanation of Sap. 7:22 did not survive.

aliunde. ¹⁶ <u>Sed anima humana in hac sensus sui mobilitate</u>	<u>anima humana formata est, dum naturam dei mobilem</u>
<u>ad imaginem dei opificis sui facta est, dum naturam dei</u>	<u>anima perennis imitatur, nihil in se habens corporale, nihil</u>
<u>mobilitas animae perennis imitatur, nihil in se habens</u>	<u>grave, nihil caducum.</u>
<u>corporale, nihil terrenum, nihil grave, nihil caducum.</u> ¹⁷	(...)
Et audiamus adhuc Paulum ita docentem: <i>expoliantes</i>	
<u>veterem hominem cum gestis eius et induentes novum, qui</u>	
<u>renovatur in cognitionem secundum imaginem creatoris</u>	
(Col. 3:9). Numquid aliquid corporale induimus, cum in	
agnitionem renovamur? Nihil, ut opinor. Induimus autem	
agnitionem dei, fidem aeternitatis, innocentiae	17. Hic est ergo homo interior, secundum deum asserit
sinceritatem, bonitatis mores. Haec enim animae magis	esse creatum. (cf. Col. 3:9; Eph. 4:24) Videtis ergo alium
sunt indumenta quam corporis, quae omnia deo propria	esse hominem qui de terrae limo factus est, alium
sunt. Haec in agnitionem novi induimus, <u>ut in omni</u>	qui secundum deum creatus est, <u>ut in omni misterio</u>
<u>ministerio animae nostrae simus secundum imaginem</u>	interioris hominis <u>secundum imaginem creatoris</u>
<u>creatoris bonitatis et sanctitatis et caritatis</u> agnitione	<u>bonitate, caritate, sanctitate perfecti</u> esse possumus.
<u>perfecti.</u> ¹⁸	Denique idem apostolus repetit

¹⁶ Cf. Ambrose *Hex.* 6.8.45, 235-36: *Non ergo caro potest esse ad imaginem dei, sed anima nostra, quae libera est et diffusis cogitationibus atque consiliis huc atque illud vagatur, quae considerando spectat omnia. Ecce nunc sumus in Italia et cogitamus quae ad orientales aut ad occidentales partes spectare videantur ... Ea igitur est ad imaginem dei quae non corporeo aestimatur, sed mentis vigore, quae absentes videt, transmarina visu obit, transcurrit aspectu, scrutatur abdita, huc atque illuc uno momento sensus suos per totius orbis finis et mundi secreta circumfert: quae deo iungitur, Christo adhaeret, descendit in infernum atque ascendit, libera versatur in caelo.* Cf. Vona 1970, 56-57. and Origen *Princ.* 1.1.6, 100-102.

¹⁷ Cf. *Princ.* 1.1.7.

	dicens: <i>Etsi exterior homo</i>
	<i>noster corrumpitur, interior renovatur.</i> (2 Cor. 4:16)

It would be natural to infer that the Tractator directly depends on Hilary.¹⁹ Two facts, however, warn against such a reduced conclusion. 1. The above-quoted section of Hilary's commentary is strongly influenced by Origen, as I have attempted to demonstrate by referring to the parallel passages. 2. When Hilary composed this *Tractatus* he was not able to work on Origen's texts and leant on the assistance of his secretary, Heliodorus, in understanding Origen's interpretations. Therefore, if a Latin translation of the Origenian explanation in which Hilary was interested was available for him, he certainly used it.

There are, indeed, similarities between *In Psalm* 129.3. and *Tractatus* 1.10-12 and 32, even though they are not as close as the textual parallels in the remainder of the texts. Moreover, each one of them can be traced back to Origen. Since in the case of the spiritual powers, the Tractator's interpretation reveals a stronger relationship with the Origen paraphrases in Novatian's *De trinitate* than with Hilary's work, the dependence of the Tractator on Hilary, in this regard, can be questioned. The resemblance is probably due to an independent use of the Latin compilation of Origen's Commentary. Hilary thus seems to be one of the Latin theologians who derived benefit from the Latin version of the Origenian text which contained the elaborated argumentation with

¹⁸ Cf. *Sel. Gen. PG.* 12 c. 96 B: Οὐκοῦν ὁ ἀγαπῶν δικαιοσύνην καὶ ὁσιότητα, καὶ πράττων καὶ τηρῶν τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Σωτῆρος τὴν, Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες, ὡς καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστὶ (Luc. 6:36), καὶ Γίνεσθε τέλειοι, ὡς ὁ Πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστιν (Matth. 5:48), εἰκὼν γίνεται κατὰ πάντα τοῦ Θεοῦ. *CCels.* 6.63, 338: Λείπεται δὴ τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς λεγομένῳ ἔσω ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ ἀνακαινουμένῳ καὶ πεφυκότι γίνεσθαι κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος (Eph. 3:16; Col. 3:10) νοεῖσθαι, ὅτε γίνεται τις τέλειος, ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστι (Matth. 5:48), καὶ ἀκούει ὅτι Ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιος κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν (Lev. 11:45), καὶ μανθάνων τὸ Μιμηταὶ τοῦ θεοῦ γίνεσθε (Eph. 5:1) ἀναλαμβάνει εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐνάρετον ψυχὴν τοὺς χαρακτῆρας τοῦ θεοῦ. See also *Princ.* 4.4.10.

¹⁹ Vona 1970, 47-57, especially 49.

regard to the various human limbs attributed to God which represented divine powers. Such work, in fact, had a remarkable career in the West.²⁰ The Latin sources enable us to conclude with

²⁰ Butler 1900, 120 n. 1; Vona 1970, 63-64. In *Ep.* 148.4, 343-345 Augustine writes to Fortunatianus: *nam de membris dei, quae assidue scriptura commemorat, ne quisquam secundum carnis huius formam et figuram nos esse crederet similes deo, propterea eadem scriptura et alas habere deum dixit, quas nos utique non habemus.* [cf. Origen *Sel. in Gen.*: καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν οὐκ ἐπτερυγώμεθα, περὶ δὲ Θεοῦ λέγει ἐν ἐννενηκοστῷ ψαλμῷ, ὅτι ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας αὐτοῦ ἐλπιεῖς (Ps. 90:4). Εἰ δὲ ἐκεῖνος μὲν πτέρυγας ἔχει, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐσμεν ζῶον ἄπτερον, οὐ κατ' εἰκόνα Θεοῦ γέγονεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, cf. *ComJn.* 13.131.] *Sicut ergo, alas cum audimus, protectionem intellegimus, sic et, cum audimus manus, operationem intellegere debemus et, cum audimus pedes, praesentationem et, cum audimus oculos, uisionem, qua cognoscit, et, cum audimus faciem, notitiam, qua innotescit; et si quid aliud eadem scriptura tale commemorat, puto spiritaliter intellegendum neque hoc ego tantum aut ego prior sed omnes, qui qualicumque spiritali intellegentia resistunt eis, qui ob hoc anthropomorphi nominantur.* Then, Augustine quotes Jerome:

Ex quorum litteris ne multa commemorando maiores moras faciam, hoc unum sancti Hieronymi interpono, ut nouerit iste frater non se de hac re mecum magis quam cum prioribus agere debere, si quid eum contra permouet. Cum ergo ille uir in scripturis doctissimus psalmum exponeret, ubi dictum est: intellegite ergo, qui insipientes estis in populo, et stulti aliquando sapite. qui plantauit aurem, non audiet? aut, qui finxit oculum, non considerat? inter cetera: “iste locus,” inquit, “aduersus eos maxime facit, qui anthropomorphi sunt, qui dicunt deum habere membra, quae etiam nos habemus. uerbi causa dicitur deus habere oculos: oculi domini respiciunt omnia; manus domini facit omnia; et audiuit, inquit, adam sonum pedum domini deambulantis in paradiso. haec simpliciter audiunt et humanas inbecillitates ad dei magnificentiam referunt. ego autem dico, quod deus totus oculus est, totus manus est, totus pes est. totus oculus est, quia omnia uidet; totus manus est, quia omnia operatur; totus pes est, quia ubique est. membra tulit, efficientias dedit,” quotation from Jerome's *Tractatus in Psalm.* 93. Augustine refers to Greek authors as well:

Haec omnia de litteris eorum et latinorum et graecorum, qui priores nobis in catholica ecclesia uiuentes diuina eloquia tractauerunt ... The following sentence may contain a hint at Origen:

Neque enim quorumlibet disputationes quamuis catholicorum et laudatorum hominum uelut scripturas canonicas habere debemus, ut nobis non liceat salua honorificentia, quae illis debetur hominibus, aliquid in eorum scriptis improbare atque respuere, si forte inuenerimus, quod aliter senserint, quam ueritas habet diuino adiutorio uel ab aliis intellecta uel a nobis. Talis ego sum in scriptis aliorum, tales uolo

great certainty that Novatian, Hilary, the Tractator, Augustine and Jerome all quote Origen²¹:

Origen *Frag. lib. I. reg. PG. 12. c. 992*:

Ὡςπερ ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων μὲν χεὶρ καὶ ποὺς καὶ
ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ οὖς καὶ εἴ τι τοιοῦτον ὀνομάζεται
σημαντικὰ τῶν μελῶν τοῦ ἡμετέρου σώματος ἐστίν,
ἐπὶ δὲ θεοῦ χεὶρ μὲν τὸ δημιουργικόν, ὀφθαλμοὺς δὲ
τὸ ἐποπτικόν, καὶ οὖς μὲν τὸ ἀκουστικόν, ποὺς δὲ
τὸ τῆς παρουσίας ὅταν ἐνεργῇ τι·

Origen in Theodoret *Quaestiones in Genesim* 1.20:

καὶ ἐπειδὴ δι' ὀφθαλμῶν ὁρῶμεν ἡμεῖς, τὴν ὀπτικὴν
αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ὀφθαλμοὺς ὀνομάζει· καὶ αὐτὸν πάντων
τῶν ἀκουστικῶν ὅσα, ἐπειδὴ διὰ τούτων τῶν μορίων
ἀκούομεν· καὶ τὸ πρόσταγμα, στόμα.

Novatian *Trin.* 6.5:

*Nam et cum oculi describuntur, quod omnia uideat exprimitur.
Et quando auris, quod omnia audiat proponitur. Et cum
digitus, significantia quaedam uoluntatis aperitur. Et cum nares,
precum quasi odorum perceptio ostenditur. Et cum manus, quod
creaturae sit omnis auctor probatur. Et quando brachium, quod
nulla natura contra robur ipsius repugnare possit edicitur. Et
quando pedes, quod impleat omnia nec sit quicquam ubi non sit
deus explicatur. 6.8: Ceterum ipse totus oculus, quia totus uidet,
et totus auris, quia totus audit, et totus manus, quia totus
operatur, et totus pes, quia totus ubique est.*

esse intellectores meorum. After this, Augustine mentions four authors by name whose authority is beyond any doubt:

Denique in his omnibus, quae de opusculis sanctorum atque doctorum commemoravi, Ambrosii, Hieronymi, Athanasii, Gregorii, et si qua aliorum talia legere potui, quae commemorare longum putavi, deum non esse corpus nec formae humanae habere membra nec eum esse per locorum spatia diuisibilem et esse natura incommutabiliter inuisibilem nec per eandem naturam atque substantiam sed adsumpta uisibili specie, sicut uoluit, apparuisse, quibus apparuit, quando per corporis oculos in scripturis sanctis uisus esse narratur, in adiutorio domini inconcusse credo et, quantum ipse donat, intellego. The list indicates that Augustine refers to two Latin and two Greek authors. Gregory must be one of the two Cappadocians.

²¹ The anti-Anthropomorphite argumentation also appears in Tertullian. Importantly, he does not say that the limbs symbolise spiritual powers, see *Adv. Marc.* 2.16.3-7, 493-4.

Hilary *Tract. In Ps.* 129.3:

Deus autem, qui et ubique et in omnibus est, totus audit, totus videt, totus efficit, totus incedit. ... Virtus ergo dei, quae aequalis et indiscreta est, officiorum ac membrorum habet nomina, ut virtus, qua videt, oculi sint; virtus, qua audit, aures sint; virtus, qua efficit, manus sint; virtus, qua adest, pedes sint, officiorum diversitates virtutis huius potestate peragente.

Tractatus Origenis 1.30-32:

Cum oculi dicuntur, quod omnia videat, cum nares, quod orationes sanctorum quasi boni odoris perceptio sit aperitur, Cum vero os domini dicitur, quod ipse totus sermo sit explicatur; cum vero lingua ipsius ut calamus acutus scribitur, quo per spiritum, quem calamus dixit, bipertita praeae legis et evangeliorum praecepta perscripta sunt indicatur; cum manus nominatur, quod omnia ipse sit operatus, cum brachium, quod universa ipse contineat, cum digitus dei, quia per ipsum omnis significatio divinae voluntatis aperitur. Totus enim oculus est, quia totus vidit, totus auris, quia totus audit, totus os, quia totus sermo, totus lingua, quia totus loquitur, totus pes, quia totus ubique est, totus manus, quia totus ubique operatur, totus brachius, quia totus omnia continet et universa gubernat.

Jerome *Tractatus LIX in Psalmos*, in *Ps.* 93:

ego autem dico, quod deus totus oculus est, totus manus est, totus pes est. totus oculus est, quia omnia uidet; totus manus est, quia omnia operatur; totus pes est, quia ubique est.

Augustine *Ep.* 148.4:

*Sicut ergo, alas cum audimus, protectionem intellegimus, sic et, cum audimus manus, operationem intellegere debemus et, cum audimus pedes, praesentationem et, cum audimus oculos, uisionem, qua cognoscit, et, cum audimus faciem, notitiam, qua innotescit.*²²

Paragraphs 4-6 of Hilary's commentary contain the explanation of the double creation of man. Man consists of an inferior and a superior part, body and soul. If this composite represents the image of the creator, then even God must be a

²² For other occurrences of the doctrine, see e.g. Hilary *Trin.* 12.9-10; Jerome *In Amos* 3.6; John Cassian *Institutis* 8.4.

composite, which would be absurd to believe. The argument has clear parallels in Origen's *Contra Celsum* and *Dialogue with Heraclides*. Similarly, it also may be Origen who set the concept of an omnipresent and incorporeal God against this view.

In paragraph 5, Hilary reproduces Origen's typical distinction when stating that Gen. 1:26 reports on the creation of the soul and Gen. 2:7 on the fashioning of the body.²³ The interpretation of the breathing forth – viz. through the alliance of inspiration the soul and body were joined together – may also come from Origen, although the idea does not appear in his extant writings.²⁴

In paragraph 6, Hilary quotes Saint Paul in order to establish the distinction between the two natures in us, the inner and outer man. He characterises the created image as being rational, incorporeal, simple and eternal or immortal. It is also said to be mobile and quick in its motion in that the incorporeal mind is able to fly around the Ocean, fly up to the heavens, descend into the abyss and wander through East and West. In this respect the human soul is made in the image of God who is not limited by corporeal shape or space. However, Saint Paul also teaches that we should be renewed in knowledge after the image of the creator (Col. 3:9). To be made in that image is not merely our natural endowment but a task of progress. We have to be perfect through knowledge of goodness, sanctity and love.

In this case, again, Hilary's explanation is influenced by the Alexandrian master. It is very characteristic of Origen to identify the two men of Gen. 1:26 and 2:7 as the Pauline inner and outer man. In fact, he was convinced that St. Paul's terminology derives from the two Genesis accounts.²⁵ Origen also described the inner man, the mind as rational, invisible, incorporeal, incorruptible and immortal. The equality of the arguments in Ambrose's *Hexaemeron* 6.8.45 and Hilary's text for the mobility of mind indicates their use of a common source, most probably, Origen, in whose works similar statements can be found. One can think of his *Commentary*

²³ For a list of the passages, see Crouzel 1956, 148. On the double creation, see Gasparro 1984, 101-155.

²⁴ Origen's position is not quite clear. The surprisingly few remarks on Gen. 2:7b represent alternative interpretations, see *Princ.* 1.3.6; 2.8.1; *ComJn.* 13.140; 142; *CCels.* 4.37; *HomPs.* 38 1. Boulnois 1989, 11-14; 27-29.

²⁵ Cf. *Dial.* 12; *ComRom.* 2.13.

on *Genesis*, which Ambrose utilised for the sermons of *Hexaemeron*.²⁶ Hilary's interpretation of Col. 3:9 is based, after all, on the distinction between the image and likeness, typical of the Alexandrian theologians. Origen, however, does not always make this sharp distinction between the two concepts.²⁷ Similarly to the explanation in Hilary, he regards the "image-likeness" as dynamism, a continuous progress towards the state of perfection.²⁸ In the *Commentary on the Epistle to Romans*, for instance, Col. 3:9 is quoted in the same context and is coupled with Rom. 7:22 and 2Cor. 4:16, just like in the first *Tractatus Origenis*:

Origen <i>ComRom</i> . 1.19, 162-164. Non est sane praetereundus ne iste		
quidem apostolicus sermo, in quo		
dicens, quoniam "commutaverunt		
gloriam incorruptibilis Dei in		
similitudinem imaginis hominis",		
non solum eos, qui idola colunt,		
arguere, sed et Anthropomorphitas		
intelligendus est confutare, qui in		
ecclesia positi imaginem corpoream		
hominis Dei esse imaginem dicunt,		
ignorantes illud, quod		

²⁶ See Jerome Ep. 84.7

²⁷ Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* 2.22.131; 5.94.4; *Excerpta* 54.2. Cf. Origen *Princ.* 2.11.3; *HomGen.* 1.13; 13.4; *HomLev.* 2.2; *HomLk.* 39; *ComJn.* 2.144-145 where the distinction between image and likeness is not emphatic, or simply disappears, Crouzel 1956, 217-8.

²⁸ Crouzel 1956, 156-7.

in Genesi		
scriptum est ad imaginem Dei		
factum esse hominem; de quo homine		
quid sentiendum sit, ab apostolo		<i>Tractatus Origenis</i>
interpretatur, cum dicit: "Deponentes		
veterem hominem cum actibus suis et		17. Hic est ergo homo interior,
induentes novum, <u>qui</u> <u>secundum</u>		<u>secundum deum</u> <u>asserit esse creatum.</u>
<u>Deum creatus est</u> " (Col. 3:9). <u>Audis,</u>		(cf. Col. 3:9) <u>Videtis</u> <u>ergo</u> alium
<u>quia novum hominem</u> <u>dicit secundum</u>		esse <u>hominem</u> qui de terrae limo
<u>Deum creatum. Hunc</u> <u>autem eundem</u>		<u>factus est, alium qui</u> <u>secundum deum</u>
<u>novum hominem alibi</u> <u>"interiorem</u>		<u>creatus est, ut in omni</u> <u>misterio</u>
<u>hominem"</u> (Rom 7:22) <u>vocat;</u>		<u>interioris hominis</u> (Rom. 7: 22)
Corruptibilem vero hunc, cuius hic		secundum imaginem creatoris
Imaginem respuit,exteriorem nominat,		bonitate, caritate, sanctitate perfecti
cum dicit: " <u>Nam et si</u> <u>is, qui foris est,</u>		esse possimus. Denique idem
<u>homo noster</u> <u>corrumpatur, sed qui</u>		<u>apostolus repetit</u> <u>dicens: Etsi exterior</u>
<u>intus est, renovatur."</u> (2 Cor. 4:16). Et		<u>homo noster corrumpitur,</u> <u>interior</u>
ut planius adhuc eius sententiam sciant	Hilary <i>Tract. in Ps.</i> 129	<u>renovatur</u> (2 Cor. 4:16).
isti, qui de imagine Dei errant,		
<u>audiant, quem dicat</u> <u>esse apostolus</u>	6. Et audiamus adhuc Paulum ita	
Hominem, qui ad imaginem Dei	docentem: <i>expoliantes</i> Veterem	

<u>creatus est, cum ad Colossenses hoc</u>	<u>hominem cum gestis eius et</u>	
<u>modo scribit: “Nolite mentiri”, inquit,</u>	<u>induentes novum, qui renovatur in</u>	
<u>“spoliantes vos veterem hominem cum</u>	<u>cognitionem secundum imaginem</u>	
<u>actibus suis et induentes novum, qui</u>	<u>creatoris</u> (Col. 3:9). Numquid aliquid	
<u>renovatur in agnitione secundum</u>	corporale induimus, cum in	
<u>imaginem eius, qui creavit eum.”</u>	agnitionem renovamur? Nihil, ut	
(Col. 3:9.) <u>Ex quibus evidenter</u>	opinor. Induimus autem agnitionem	
<u>ostendit, quod interior homo, qui per</u>	Dei, fidem aeternitatis, innocentiae	
<u>agnitionem renovatur, ipse ad</u>	sinceritatem, bonitatis mores. Haec	
<u>imaginem Dei creatus.</u> ²⁹	enim animae magis sunt indumenta	
	quam corporis, quae omnia deo	
	propria sunt. <u>Haec in agnitionem novi</u>	
	<u>induimus, ut</u> in omni ministerio	
	animae nostrae <u>simus secundum</u>	
	<u>imaginem creatoris</u> bonitatis et	
	sanctitatis et caritatis <u>agnitione</u>	
	perfecti.	

Butler, who first disclosed these parallels, propounded three hypotheses: “1. Even if the Tractator obtained most of the Origenistic element of this passage ... mediately through Hilary, still he also made direct use of some piece of Origen ... 2. On the other hand, if Hilary derived the common matter from the

²⁹ Cf. *ComRom.* 7.4.

Tractator, then the latter's indebtedness to Origen must have been very considerable. 3. ... Hilary and the Tractator may both have made independent use of some lost Latin translation of an anti-anthropomorphic passage of Origen."³⁰

It is clear that both Hilary and the Tractator are indebted to Origen for their interpretation of the double creation of man. It is also clear that neither Hilary nor the Tractator was able to read Origen's Greek text. Whereas Hilary's dependence on the *Tractatus* seems to be unlikely, it cannot be excluded that the Tractator was familiar with Hilary's work. My conclusion is, thus, similar to the first of Butler's hypotheses: Hilary and the Tractor both used the Latin compilation of Origen's text not only in the case of the anti-anthropomorphic arguments but also in interpreting the double creation of man.

³⁰ Butler 1900, 119-120.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Selected Primary Sources

Ambrose

- De Abraham.* Ed. C. Schenkl. *CSEL* 32.1 (1897): 499-638.
De bono mortis. Ed. C. Schenkl. *CSEL* 32.1 (1897): 701-735.
De Cain et Abel. Ed. C. Schenkl. *CSEL* 32.1 (1897): 339-409.
De fide libri V ad Gratianum Augustum. O. Faller. *CSEL* 78 (1962): 3-307.
De interpellatione Iob et David. Ed. C. Schenkl. *CSEL* 32.2 (1897): 211-296.
De Isaac vel anima. Ed. C. Schenkl. *CSEL* 32.1 (1897): 639-700.
De Noe. Ed. C. Schenkl. *CSEL* 32.1 (1897): 413-497.
De obitu Theodosii. Ed. O. Faller. *CSEL* 73 (1955): 371-401.
De paradiso. Ed. C. Schenkl. *CSEL* 32.1 (1897): 263-336.
De Tobia. C. Schenkl. *CSEL* 32.2 (1897): 519-573.
De uirginibus. Ed. F. Gori. *Biblioteca Ambrosiana* 14.1 (1989): 100-240.
De virginitate. Ed. F. Gori. *Biblioteca Ambrosiana* 14.2 (1989): 16-106.
Epistulae. Ed. O. Faller. *CSEL* 82 (1968).
Exameron. Ed. C. Schenkl. *CSEL* 32.1 (1897): 1-291.
Explanatio psalmorum xii. Ed. M. Petschenig. *CSEL* 64 (1919).
Expositio euangelii secundum Lucam. M. Adriaen. *CCSL* 14 (1957), 1-400.
Expositio psalmi cxuiii. Ed. M. Petschenig. *CSEL* 62 (1913).

Ambrose (dubium)

- De sacramentis.* Ed. O. Faller. *CSEL* 73 (1955): 15-85.

Apuleius

- Metamorphoses.* Ed. D. S. Robertson. *Les métamorphoses.* Paris: Belles lettres, 1940.

Augustine

- Confessiones*. Ed. L. Verheijen. *CCSL* 27 (1981).
- Contra Academicos*. Ed. P. Knöll. *CSEL* 63 (1922): 3-81; Ed. W. M. Green. *CCSL* 29 (1970): 3-61.
- Contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas*. Ed. K.D. Daur. *CCSL* 49 (1985): 165-178.
- Contra Faustum*. Ed. J. Zycha. *CSEL* 25.1 (1891): 251-797.
- Contra Iulianum*. *PL* 44. col. 641-874.
- De agone christiano*. Ed. J. Zycha. *CSEL* 41 (1900): 101-138.
- De beata vita*. Ed. P. Knöll. *CSEL* 63 (1922): 89-116.
- De catechizandis rudibus*. Ed. J.B. Bauer *CCSL* 46 (1969): 121-178.
- De civitate Dei*. Ed. B. Dombart, A. Kalb. 2 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1928, 1929.
- De diuersis quaestionibus octoginta tribus*. Ed. A. Mutzenbecher. *CCSL* 44A (1975): 11-249.
- De doctrina christiana*. Ed. I. Martin. *CCSL* 32 (1962): 1-167.
- De fide et symbolo*. Ed. J. Zycha *CSEL* 41 (1900): 3-32.
- De Genesi ad litteram*. Ed. P. Agaësse and A. Solignac. 2 vols. *BA* 48 and 49. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1972.
- De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber*. Ed. J. Zycha. *CSEL* 28.1 (1894): 459-503.
- De Genesi contra Manichaeos*. Ed. D. Weber. *CSEL* 91 (1998).
- De gestis Pelagii*. Ed. C.F. Vrba, J. Zycha. *CSEL* 42 (1902): 51-122.
- De haeresibus*. Ed. R. Vander Plaetse, C. Beukers. *CCSL* 46 (1969): 286-345.
- De immortalitate animae*. Ed. W. Hörmann. *CSEL* 89 (1986): 101-128.
- De libero arbitrio*. Ed. G. Green. *CSEL* 74 (1956).
- De magistro*. Ed. G. Weigel. *CSEL* 77 (1961): 4-55.
- De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus manichaeorum libri duo*. Ed. J. B. Bauer. *CSEL* 90 (1992).
- De musica*. *PL* 32. col. 1081-1194.
- De ordine*. Ed. P. Knöll. *CSEL* 63 (1922): 121-185.
- De quantitate animae*. In Augustine, *De quantitate animae*, *De magistro*. Augustine Philosophische Spätdialoge. Latin text and German translation by K. H. Lütze and G. Weigel. Zurich, Artemis Verlag, 1973.
- De sermone Domini in monte*. Ed. Almut Mutzenbecher. *CCSL* 35 (1967).
- De trinitate*. Ed. W.J. Mountain. *CCSL* 50-50A (1968).
- De vera religione*. Ed. G.M. Green. *CSEL* 77 (1961): 1-81.

Enarrationes in Psalmos. Ed. E. Dekkers, J. Fraipont. *CCSL* 38, 39, 40 (1956).

Epistulae. Ed. A. Goldbacher. *CSEL* 34, 44, 57, 58 (1895, 1904, 1911, 1923).

Epistulae ex duobus codicibus nuper lucem prolatae. Ed. J. Divjak. *CSEL* 88 (1981).

In Iohannis Evangelium tractatus CXXIV. Ed. D.R. Willems. *CCSL* 36 (1954).

Retractationes. Ed. A. Mutzenbecher. *CCSL* 57 (1984).

Soliloquiorum libri duo. Ed. W. Hörmann. *CSEL* 89 (1986): 3-98.

Sermones de Vetere Testamento. I-L. Ed. C. Lambot. *CCSL* 41 (1961).

Basil of Caesarea

Homiliae in Hexaemeron. Ed. S. Giet. *SC* 26 (1968).

Calcidius

Commentarius in Platonis Timaeum. Ed. J.H. WASZINK. *Plato latinus* 4. London: Brill, 1975.

Cassiodorus

Expositio psalmorum. Ed. M. Adriaen. *CCSL* 97, 98 (1958).

Clement of Alexandria

Stromata. Ed. O. Stählin. *GCS* 15, 17 (1906, 1909).

Excerpta ex Theodoto. Ed. F. Sagnard. *SC* 23 (1970, 2nd edition).

Chromatius of Aquileia

Sermones. Ed. J. Lemarié. *CCSL* 9A (1974): 3-182; *CCSL* 9A Supplementum (1974): 616-617.

Tractatus in Matthaeum. Ed. R. Étaix and J. Lemarié. *CCSL* 9A (1974): 185-489; *CCSL* 9A Supplementum (1974): 624-636.

Constitutiones apostolicae. Ed. M. Mezger. *SC* 320 (1985).

Cyprian of Carthage

De lapsis. Ed. M. Bévenot. *CCSL* 3 (1972): 221-242.

De dominica oratione. Ed. C. Moreschini. *CCSL* 3A (1976): 90-113.

Didymus the Blind

In Genesim. Ed. P. Nautin. *SC* 233 (1976); *SC* 244 (1978).

Epiphanius

Anchoratus. Ed. K. Holl. *GCS* 25 (1915).

Panarion. Ed. K. Holl. *GCS* 25 (1915); *GCS* 31 (1922); *GCS* 37 (1933).

Faustinus

De confessione verae fidei. Ed. M. Simonetti. *CCSL* 69 (1967): 359-391.

Gregory Thaumaturgus

Oratio panegyrica. Ed. H. Crouzel. *SC* 148 (1969).

Gregory of Elvira

Tractatus Origenis de libris Sanctarum Scripturarum. Ed. V. Bulhart. *CCSL* 69 (1967): 1-146.

Hilary of Poitiers

Tractatus in Psalmum cxxix. Ed. A. Zingerle. *CSEL* 22 (1891).

Commentarius in Matthaeum. Ed. J. Doignon. *SC* 254 (1978); *SC* 258 (1979).

Commentarius in Psalmum cxviii. Ed. M. Milhau. *SC* 344, 347 (1988).

Irenaeus of Lyon

Démonstration de la prédication apostolique. Ed. A. Rousseau. *SC* 406 (1995).

Adversus haereses. A. Rousseau, L. Doutreleau et alii. *SC* 263, 264 (1979); *SC* 293, 294 (1982); *SC* 210-211 (1974); *SC* 100 (1965); *SC* 152-153 (1969).

Jerome

Apologia aduersus libros Rufini. Ed. P. Lardet. *CCSL* 79 (1982): 1-72; *SC* 303 (1983).

Commentarii in euangelium Matthaei. Ed. D. Hurst, M. Adriaen. *CCSL* 77 (1969).

Commentarius in Ecclesiasten. Ed. M. Adriae. *CCSL* 72 (1959): 249-361.

Commentarii in Ezechielem. Ed. F. Glorie. *CCSL* 75 (1964): 3-743.

Commentarius in Galatam. *PL* 26 col. 331-468.

Contra Ioannem Hierosolymitanum. *PL* 23. c. 371-412

Commentarii in Isaiam. Ed. M. Adriaen. *CCSL* 73-73A (1963).

De viris illustribus. Ed. E. Richardson. *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur* 14 1a (1896): 1-56.

Epistulae. Ed. I. Hilberg. *CSEL* 54-56 (1910, 1912).

In Amos. Ed. M. Adriaen. *CCSL* 76 (1969): 211-348.

Liber quaestionum hebraicarum in Genesim. Ed. P. de Lagarde. *CCSL* 72 (1959): 1-56.

Tractatus LIX in psalmos. Ed. G. Morin. *CCSL* 78 (1958): 3-352.

John Cassian

Collationes XXIV. Ed. M. Petschenig. *CSEL* 13 (1886).

De institutis coenobiorum et de octo principalium uitiorum remediis. Ed. M. Petschenig. *CSEL* 17 (1888): 3-231.

Justin Martyr

Apologia. Ed. Goodspeed. *Die ältesten Apologeten.* Göttingen, 1914.

Dialogus com Tryphone. Ed. M. Marcovich. *PTS* 47 (1997).

Marius Victorinus

Aduersus Arium. Ed. P. Henry, P. Hadot. *CSEL* 83,1 (1971): 54-277.

Novatian

Opera. Ed. G.F. Diercks *CCSL* 4 (1972).

Origen

Commentarii in Canticum Canticorum. Ed. L. Brésard, H. Crouzel, M. Borret *SC* 375, 376 (1991).

Commentarii in epistulam ad Romanos. Ed. Th. Heither. 5 vols. Freiburg: Herder, 1990-1996.

Commentarii in evangelium Iohannis. Ed. C. Blanc. *SC* 120bis (1996); 157 (1970); 222 (1975); 290 (1982); 385 (1992).

Commentariorum series in Matthaeum. Ed. E. Klostermann. *GCS* 11. (1976, 2nd edition).

Commentarium in evangelium Matthaei. Ed. E. Klostermann. *GCS* 10. (1935).

Contra Celsum. Ed. M. Borret *SC* 132 (1967); 136 (1968); 147, 150 (1969); 227 (1976).

De oratione. Ed. P. Koetschau. *GCS* 2 (1899): 297-403.

De principiis. Ed. H. Crouzel, M. Simonetti. *SC* 252, 253 (1978); 268, 269 (1980); 312 (1984).

Dialogus cum Heraclide. Ed. J. Scherer. *SC* 67 (1960).

Epistula ad Africanum. Ed. M. Harl, N. de Lange. *SC* 302 (1983): 514-573.

Epistula ad Gregorium Thaumaturgum. Ed. H. Crouzel. *SC* 148 (1969): 186-195.

Exhortatio ad martyrium. Ed. P. Koetschau. *GCS* 2 (1899): 3-47.

Fragmenta in librum primum Regnorum. *PG* 12. 991-996.

Homiliae in Canticum Canticorum. Ed. O. Rousseau. *SC* 37bis (1966).

Homiliae in Exodum. Ed. M. Borret. *SC* 321 (1985).

Homiliae in Ezechielem. Ed. M. Borret. *SC* 352 (1989).

Homiliae in Genesim. Ed. L. Doutreleau. *SC* 7bis (1985).

- Homiliae in Jeremiam*. Ed. P. Nautin. *SC* 232, 238 (1976, 1977).
Homiliae in Jesu Nave. Ed. A. Jaubert. *SC* 71 (1960).
Homiliae in Leviticum. Ed. M. Boret *SC* 286, 287 (1981).
Homiliae in librum primum Regnorum (in Samuelem). Ed. P. Nautin, M.-T. Nautin. *SC* 328 (1986).
Homiliae in Lucam. Ed. M. Rauer. *GCS* 9 (1959).
Homiliae in Numeros. Ed. L. Doutreleau. *SC* 415. (1996); *SC* 442 (1999).
Homiliae in Psalmos 36-38. Ed. H. Crouzel, L. Brésard and E. Prinzivalli. *SC* 411 (1995).
Selecta in Genesim. *PG* 12. 91-146.

Paulinus of Nola

- Epistolae*. Ed. W. Hartel. *CSEL* 29 (1894).

Philo

- De Abrahamo*. Ed. J. Gorez. *OEPA* 20 (1966).
De cherubim. Ed. J. Gorez. *OEPA* 3 (1963).
De confusione linguarum. Ed. J.-G. Kahn. *OEPA* 13 (1963).
De fuga et inventione. Ed. E. Starobinski-Safran *OEPA* 17 (1970).
De opificio mundi. Ed. R. Arnaldez. *OEPA* 1 (1961).
De plantatione. Ed. J. Pouilloux. *OEPA* 10 (1963).
De somniis. Ed. P. Savinel. *OEPA* 19 (1962).
Legum allegoriae. Ed. C. Mondésert. *OEPA* 2 (1962).
Quaestiones in Genesim I-II. Ed. J.B. Aucher. *OEPA* 34 (1972).
De vita Mosis. Ed. R. Arnaldez, C. Mondésert, J. Pouilloux, P. Savinel. *OEPA* 22 (1967).

Plautus

- Comoediae*. Ed. G. Goetz, F. Schoell. *T. Macci Plauti Comoediae*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1900.

Pliny the Elder

- Naturalis Historia: Botanica*. Ed. R. König, G. Winkler. *C. Plinius Secundus d. Ä.: Naturkunde*. Latin-German, Books 12-13. Munich: Heimeran Verlag, 1977.

Plotinus

- Opera*. Ed. P. Henry, H.-R. Schwyzer. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991 (6th impression); 1977; 1992 (4th impression).

Praedestinatus

- PL* 53. c. 583-586; 587-672

Rufinus

Apologia contra Hieronymum I. Ed. M. Simonetti. *CC* 20 (1961).

Sulpicius Severus

Dialogorum libri 2. Ed. C. Halm. *CSEL* 1 (1866): 152-216.

Tatian

Oratio ad Graecos. Ed. M. Marcovich. *PTS* 43 (1995): 7-75.

Tertullian

Adversus Hermogenem. Ed. E. Kroymann. *CCSL* 1 (1954): 397-435.

Adversus Marcionem. Ed. E. Kroymann. *CCSL* 1 (1954): 441-726.

Adversus Praxean. Ed. E. Kroymann, E. Evans. *CCSL* 2 (1954): 1159-1205.

De resurrectione mortuorum. Ed. J.G.Borleffs. *CCSL* 2. (1954): 921-1012.

De oratione. Ed. G.F. Diercks. *CCSL* 1 (1954): 257-274.

Theodoret of Cyrrhus

Quaestiones in Octateuchum. Ed. N.F. Marcos and A. Sáenz-Badillos.

Textos y estudios „Cardenal Cisneros” Madrid, 1979.

Theophilus of Antioch

Ad Autolyicum. Ed. M. Marcovich. *PTS* 43 (1995): 15-137.

Zeno of Verona

Tractatus. Ed. B. Löfstedt *CCSL* 22 (1971).

Secondary Sources

Abulesz, Peter

1972

S. Aurelii Augustini De genesi contra Manichaeos libri duo, De octo quaestionibus ex veteri testamento. Dissertation manuscript, Vienna, 1972.

Agaësse – Solignac

1972

(ed., tr., commentary) *La Genèse au sens littéral en douze livres.* *BA* 48 and 49. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1972.

Altaner, Berthold.

1967

Kleine patristische Schriften. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1967.

1967=1951

"Augustinus und Origenes." In *Kleine patristische Schriften*. 224-252. First publication: *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 70 (1951): 15-41.

1967=1952

"Augustins Methode der Quellenbenützung." In *Kleine patristische Schriften*. 164-173. First publication: *Sacris erudiri* 4, 1952, 5-17. *Uitgave van de Sint Pietersabdij, Steenbrugge*.

1967=1949

"Augustinus und Irenäus." In *Kleine patristische Schriften*. 194-203. First publication: *Theologische Quartalschrift* 129 (1949): 162-172.

1967=1939

"Augustinus und die griechische Sprache." In *Kleine patristische Schriften*. 129-153. First publication: *Pisciculi. Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums F.J.Dölger zum 60. Geburtstage dargeboten*. Ed. Th. Klauser and A.Rücker, Münster in Westfalen: Aschendorf, 1939.

1967=1941

"Augustinus und Philo von Alexandrien." In *Kleine patristische Schriften*. 181-193. First publication: *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 65 (1941): 81-90.

Armstrong, A. Hilary

1955

"Spiritual or Intelligible Matter in Plotinus and St. Augustine." *AM* 1 (1955): 277-283.

1984

(tr.) *Plotinus, Ennead IV*. in *Loeb Classical Library* vol. 443. 1984 (2nd printing).

Bammel, Caroline (See also Hammond, C.)

1989

"Adam in Origen," in *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in honour of Henry Chadwick*, ed. R. Williams, 62-93. Cambridge: University Press, 1989.

1992

"Augustine, Origen and the Exegesis of St. Paul." *Augustinianum* 32/2 (1992): 340-368.

Banterle, Gabriele

1979

(intro. tr. notes and indexes). *Ambrosius Exameron. SAEMO 1.* Milano-Roma: Biblioteca Ambrosiana-Città Nuova Editrice, 1979.

Barkley, Gary Wayne

1990

(tr.) *Origen, Homilies on Leviticus 1-16. FOC 83.* Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1990.

Bastiaensen, A.A.R.

1996

“Augustin commentateur de saint Paul et l’Ambrosiaster.” *Sacris Erudiri* 36 (1996): 37-65.

Batiffol, Pierre

1900

(ed. with Wilmart, André) *Tractatus Origenis de libris S.S. Scripturarum.* Paris: Picard, 1900.

1905

“Où en est la question des ‘Tractatus Origenis?’” *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique de Toulouse* (1905): 307-323.

Baxter, J.H.

(tr.) *Saint Augustine, Select Letters.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1993 (repr.).

Beane, Jon T.

1993

“Augustine’s Silence on the Fallenness of the Soul.” *Augustiniana* 1993 (43/1-2): 77-84.

Beatrice, Pier Franco

1989

“Quosdam platoniorum libros: The Platonic Readings of Augustine in Milan.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 43 (1989): 248-281.

1999

“Ein Origenes zitat im Timaioskommentar des Calcidius.” In *Origeniana septima* (1999): 75-90.

Bienert, Wolfgang

1978

Dionysius von Alexandrien. Zur Frage des Origenismus im dritten Jahrhundert. PTS 21. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1978.

Bogan, Sister Mary Inez

1968

(tr.) *Saint Augustine, The Retractations.* FOC 60. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1968.

Boissier, Gaston.

1888

"La Conversion de Saint Augustin." *Revue des Deux Mondes* 85 (1888): 43-69.

Bona, Isabella

1998

"Appunti sulle fonti naturalistiche dell'*Esamerone* ambrosiano." In: *Nec timeo mori*, 549-559. Milano: Vita e Pensiero, 1998.

la Bonnardière, Anne-Marie.

1955

"Le Cantique des Cantiques dans l'oeuvre de saint Augustin." *REA* 1 (1955): 225-237.

1974

"Jérôme 'informateur' d'Augustine au sujet d'Origène," *REA* 20 (1974): 42-54.

Bonner, Gerhard,

1983

"Some Remarks on Letters 4* and 6*." in *Les Lettres de Saint Augustine découvertes par Johannes Divjak. Communications présentées au colloque des 20 et 21 Septembre 1982.* 155-164. Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes, 1983.

Bostock, Gerard.

1992

"Origen's Philosophy of Creation." in *Origeniana quinta* (1992): 253-269.

Boulding, Maria

1997

(tr.) *Saint Augustine, The Confessions.* New York: New City Press, 1997

Boulnois, Marie-Odile
1989

“Le souffle et l’Esprit. Exégèses patristiques de l’insufflation originelle de *Gn* 2, 7 en lien avec celle de *Jn* 20, 22.” *RA* 24 (1989): 3-37.

Boyle, M. O’Rourke
1990

“Augustine in the Garden of Zeus: Lust, Love, and Language.” *HTR* 83.2 (1990): 117-139.

Brésard, Luc - Crouzel, Henri – Borret, Marcel
1991, 1992

(ed. tr. and notes) Origène, *Commentaire sur le Cantique des Cantiques*. *SC* 375 and 376 (1991, 1992).

Bucheit, V.
1968

“Augustinus unter dem Feigenbaum.” *VCh* 22 (1968): 257-71.

Butler, E.C.
1900

“The New Tractatus Origenis” *JThSt* 1900 (October): 113-121.

1901

“The New Tractatus Origenis” *JThSt* 1901 (January): 254-262.

1905

“The so-called *Tractatus Origenis* and Other Writings Attributed to Novatian.” *JThSt* 1905 (July): 587-598.

Butterworth, G.W.
1966

(tr. notes) Origen, *On First Principles*. New York: Harp and Row, 1966.

Carrozzi L.
1998

(intro. tr. and notes) Sant Agostino: *La Genesi I. La Genesi difesa contro i Manichei, Libro incompiuto su la Genesi. Opere di San’Agostino* 9.1 Roma: Città Nuova Editrice, 1988.

Castagno, Adele Monaci
1987

Origene predicatore. Milano: Franco Angeli, 1987.

Cavallera, F.
1922

Saint Jérôme: Sa vie et son oeuvre. 2 vols. Etudes et documents 2. Louvain: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense Bureaux; Paris: H. and E. Champion, 1922.

Chadwick, Henry
1948

"Origen, Celsus, and the Resurrection of the Body." *HTR* 41 (1948): 83-102.

1980

(intro. tr. and notes). *Origen: Contra Celsum.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980 (3).

1985

"Christian Platonism in Origen and in Augustine." *Origeniana tertia* (1985): 217-230.

1991

"History and Symbolism in the Garden at Milan." In *From Augustine to Eriugena: Essays on Neoplatonism and Christianity in Honor of John O'Meara.* Ed. F. X. Martin and J. A. Richmond, 42-55. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1991.

Cipriani, Nello
1994

"Le fonti cristiane della dottrina trinitaria nei primi Dialoghi de S. Agostino." *Augustinianum* 34 (1994): 253-312.

1998

"Agostino lettore dei commentari paolini di Mario Vittorino." *Augustinianum* 38 (1998): 413-428.

Clark, Elisabeth
1992

The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Courcelle, Pierre
1948

Les Lettres grecques en Occident, de Macrobie à Cassiodore. Paris: Editions E. De Boccard, 1948.

1951

“Les lacunes de la correspondance entre saint Augustine et Paulin de Nole.” *Revue des Etudes Anciennes* 53 (1951): 253-300.

1956

“Nouveaux aspects du platonisme chez Saint Ambroise” *Revue des Etudes Latines* 34 (1956): 220-239.

1968

Recherches sur les Confessions de Saint Augustin. New, augmented edition with illustrations. Paris: Editions E. De Boccard, 1968 (First publication: 1950).

1974 and 1975

Connais-toi toi même: de Socrate à Saint Bernard. 3 vols. Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes, 1974-1975.

Crouzel, Henri

1956

Théologie de l'image de dieu chez Origène. Paris: Editions Montaigne, 1956.

1962

Origène et la philosophie. Paris: Editions de Montaigne, 1962.

1990

Les fins dernières selon Origène. London: Variorum Reprints, 1990.

1991

Origène et Plotin: Comparisons doctrinales, Paris: Téqui, 1991.

Crouzel, Henri – Simonetti, Manlio

1978

(commentary). *Origène, Traité des Principes.* SC 253 (1978).

1980

(commentary). *Origène, Traité des Principes.* SC 269 (1980).

D'Alès, A.

1924

Novatien. Études sur la théologie romaine au milieu du IIIe siècle. Études de Théologie Historique. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1924.

Daley, Brian E.

1995

"What did 'Origenism' Mean in the Sixth Century?" *Origeniana sexta* (1995): 627-638.

Daniélou, Jean

1969

"Hilaire et ses sources juives." In *Hilaire et son temps. Actes du Colloque de Poitiers 29 septembre – 3 octobre 1968 à l'occasion du XV^e Centenaire de la mort de saint Hilaire*. 143-147. Paris: Etudes augustiniennes, 1969.

De Bruyne, D. Donatien

1906

"Encore les „Tractatus Origenis”,” *RB* 23 (1906):165-188.

De Clercq, Victor C.

1954

Ossius of Cordova: A Contribution to the History of the Constantinian Period. Washington, D.C., The Catholic University of America, 1954.

Decret, François.

1970

Aspects du manichéisme dans l'Afrique romaine. Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes, 1970.

1978

L'Afrique manichéenne (IV-V. siècles): Etude historique et doctrinale. 2 vols. Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes, 1978.

DeSimone, Russell J.

1970

The Treatise of Novatian the Roman Presbyter on the Trinity: A Study of the Text and the Doctrine. Rome: Augustinianum, 1970.

1974

(intro. tr. and notes). *Novatian, The Trinity, The Spectacles, Jewish Foods, in Praise of Purity, Letters*. FOC 67. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1974.

Doignon, Jean.

1971

Hilaire de Poitiers avant l'exil, Recherches sur la naissance, l'enseignement et l'épreuve d'une épiscopale en Gaule au milieu du IV^e siècle. Paris: Etudes augustinienes, 1971.

1978

(intro. tr. and notes). *Hilaire de Poitiers Sur Matthieu.* 1 vol. SC 254.

1979

(intro. tr. and notes). *Hilaire de Poitiers Sur Matthieu.* 2 vol. SC 258.

1986

(intro., tr. and notes). *Augustinus, De beata vita.* BA 4.1. Paris: Desclée de Brouver, 1986.

1989

"Etat des question relatives aux premiers Dialogues de saint Augustin." In *Internationales Symposium über den Stand der Augustinus-Forschung* (12-16. April 1987). Ed. Cornelius Mayer and Karl Heinz Chelius, 47-86. Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1989.

1991

"Augustin *versus homo* à Cassiciacum: la marque morale de Mallius Theodorus." *L'Antiquité Classique* 60 (1991): 193-200.

Doucet, Dominique

1995

"L'époux des âmes. Pophyre, Ambroise et Augustin: *De bono mortis* 14-20; *De ordine* I, 8, 24." *REA* 41 (1995): 231-252.

Dulaey, Martine.

1993/1

"Grégoire d'Elvire et le commentaire sur le Genèse de Victorin de Poetovio." *Augustinus* (1993): 203-219.

1993/2

Victorin de Poetovio: Premier exégète latin. 2 vols. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1993

1997

"Grégoire d'Elvire pasteur: La pédagogie du prédicateur dans le sermond sur l'hospitalité de Mambré (*Gen.* 18)" *Studia*

Ephemeridis Augustinianum 58. *Vescovi e pastori in epoca teodosiana*. 1997 vol. 2: 743-762.

Dupuis, Jacques

1967

"L'Esprit de l'homme." *Étude sur l'anthropologie religieuse d'Origène*. *Museum Lessianum section théologique* 62. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1967

Du Roy, Olivier

1966

L'intelligence de la foi en la Trinité selon Saint Augustin. Genèse de sa théologie trinitaire jusque'en 391. Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes, 1966.

Duval, Yves-Marie

1987

(tr. commentary) *Augustin, Lettres* 27*. in *BA* 46B (1987): 560-68.

Ferrari, Leo C.

1982

"Saint Augustine on the Road to Damascus." *AS* 13 (1982): 151-70.

1984

The Conversions of Saint Augustine. Villanova, PA: Villanova University Press, 1984.

1991

"Augustine's 'Discovery' of Paul (Confessions 7.21.27)." *AS* 22 (1991): 37-61.

Ferrisi, Pietro Antonio

1993

"La resurrezione della carne nel *De fide et symbolo* di S. Agostino." *Augustinianum* 23 (1993): 213-232.

Festugière, A.J.

1975

"De la doctrine origéniste des corps glorieux sphéroïdes." *Etudes d'Histoire et de Philologie*, Paris, 1975, 177-182.

Finan, Thomas

1991

"A Mystic in Milan." In *From Augustine to Eriugena: Essays on Neoplatonism and Christianity in Honor of John O'Meara*. Ed. F. X. Martin and J. A. Richmond, 77-91. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1991.

Findlay, William

1995

(tr. notes) *Augustine, Our Lord's Sermon on the Mount*. In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* vol. 6. Ed. by Philip Schaff, 3-63. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1995 (second printing).

Fredriksen, Paula

1988

"Beyond the Body/Soul Dichotomy: Augustine on Paul against the Manichees and the Pelagians." *R4* 23 (1988): 87-114.

Fuhrer, Therese

1997

(intro. commentary). *Augustin: Contra Academicos, Bücher 2 und 3*. PTS 46. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.

Gallagher, Donald A.-Gallagher Idella J.

1966

(tr. notes). *Saint Augustine, The Catholic and Manichaeian Ways of Life*. FOC 56. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1966.

Glaue, Paul

1928

(ed.) *Ein Bruchstück des Origenes über Genesis 1, 28. Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek*, Giessen: Töpelmann, 1928.

Godley, A.D.

1957

(tr.) *Herodotus. Loeb Classical Library*. 2 vols. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Guillaumont, Antoine

1962

Les "Kephalalaia Gnostica" d'Evagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'Origenisme chez les Grecs et chez les Syriens. Patristica Sorbonensia 5. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1962.

Hadot, Ilsetraut
1984

Art libéraux et philosophie antique. Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes
1984.

Hadot, Pierre
1956

"Platon et Plotin dans trois sermons de Saint Ambroise." *Revue des Etudes Latines* 34 (1956): 202-220.

1968

Pophyre et Victorinus. Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes 1968, 2 vols.

1971

Marius Victorinus. Recherches sur sa vie et ses oeuvres. Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes, 1971.

Hamman, A.-G.
1987

L'homme, image de Dieu: Essai d'une anthropologie chrétienne dans l'Église des cinq premiers siècles. Paris: Desclée, 1987.

Hammond, Caroline P. (See also Bammel, C. Hammond.)
1977

"The Last Ten Years of Rufinus' Life and the Date of his Move South from Aquileia." *JThSt* 28 (1977): 372-427.

Harl, Marguerite
1966

"Recherches sur l'origénisme d'Origène: la 'satiété' (κόπος) de la contemplation comme motif de la chute des âmes," *SP* 8 (1966): 373-405.

1972

(ed. commentary). "La chaîne palestinienne sur le Psaume 118 (Origène, Eusèbe, Didyme, Apollinaire, Athanase, Théodoret). *SC* 189 and 190 (1972).

von Harnack, Adolf
1888

Augustins Confessionen. Giessen, 1888.

Hayward, C.T.R.
1995

(intro. tr. and commentary). *Saint Jerome's Hebrew Questions on Genesis*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

Hefele, Charles Joseph

1908

(ed.). *Histoire des Conciles*. Paris:Letouzey, 1908.

Heidl, György

1997

“Órigenés és Ágoston a *Hexaemeron*-ról.” (Origen and Augustine on *Hexaemeron*) *Magyar Filozófiai Szemle* 44.1-2 (1997): 115-151.

1999/1

“Did the Young Augustine Read Origen’s Homily on Paradise?” *Origeniana septima* (1999): 597-604.

1999/2

“Augustine, *Contra Academicos* 2.2.5: Origen in the Background?” *Adamantius* 5 (1999): 53-91.

Heine, Ronald E.

1982

(tr.) *Origen, Homilies on Genesis and Exodus*. FOC 71. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1982.

1989

(tr.) *Origen, Commentary on the Gospel According to John*. Books 1-10. FOC 80. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1989.

1993

(tr.) *Origen, Commentary on the Gospel according to John*. Books 13-32. FOC 89. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1993.

2000

“Evidence for the Date of Origen’s Commentary on Ephesians.” *Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum* 4 (2000): 149-157.

Hennings, Ralph.

1993

“The Correspondence between Augustine and Jerome” *SP* 27 (1993): 303-10.

1994

Der Briefwechsel zwischen Augustinus und Hieronymus und ihr Streit um den Kanon des Alten Testaments und die Auslegung von Gal. 2, 11-14. Leiden-New York-Köln: Brill, 1994.

Hill, Edmund

1990

(tr. notes). *The Works of Saint Augustine: Sermons. II (20-50) on the Old Testament.* Ed. John E. Rotelle. Brooklyn, New York: New City Press, 1990.

Holte, Ragnar

1962

Béatitude et sagesse. Saint Augustin et le problème de la fin de l'homme dans la philosophie ancienne. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1962.

Jones, H.L.

1983

(tr.) *Strabo Geographia.* Vol. 7. *Loeb Classical Library*, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1983.

Jordan, Hermann.

1902

Die Theologie der neuentdeckten Predigten Novatians, eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung; Leipzig: Deichert, 1902.

Kendeffy, Gábor

1999

Az egyházatyák és a szkepticizmus. (The Church Fathers and the Scepticism) Budapest: Aron, 1999.

Kellner, J. M.

Der hl. Ambrosius, Bischof von Mailand, als Erklärer der Alten Testamente, Regensburg, 1893.

Kelly, J.N.D.

1975

Jerome: His Life, Writings and Controversies. London: Duckworth, 1975.

Kevane, Eugene

1986

"Christian Philosophy: The Intellectual side of Augustine's Conversion." *AS* 17 (1986): 47-83.

Knauer, G. N.

1965

Psalmenzitate in Augustins Konfessionen. Göttingen, 1965.

Kuyama, Michihiko

1997

“The Neglegentia (ἁμέλεια) Motive in Early Christianity.” *The Meiji Gakuin Review* 602 (1997 October): 1-25.

1998/1

“The Meaning of Diversity in Origen’s *De principiis*.” *The Meiji Gakuin Review* 606 (1998 January): 35-56.

1998/2

“Nature and Createdness in Origen’s *De principiis*.” *Journal of Christian Studies* 18 (1998 December): 1-20.

Lawless, George

1990

“Augustine and Human Embodiment.” *Collectanea Augustiniana, Mélanges T. J. van Bavel*. Ed. B. Bruning, M. Lamberigts and J. van Houtem. 1. 167-186. Leuven: Peteers, 1990.

Lawson, R.P.

1956

(tr.) *Origen, The Song of Songs, Commentary and Homilies*. ACW 26. New York: Newman Press, 1956.

Lejay, Paul

1908

“L’héritage de Grégoire d’Elvire.” *RB* 25 (1908): 435-457.

Ligota, Christophe.

1997

“La foi historique: histoire et connaissance de l’histoire chez s. Augustin.” *REA* 43 (1997): 111-171.

Lods, Marc

1976

“La personne du Christ dans la ‘conversion’ de saint Augustin.” *RA* 11 (1976): 3-34.

Lubac, Henri de.

1959

Exégèse médiévale. Les quatre sens de l'écriture. 4 vols Paris: Aubier, 1959-1964.

Luneau, A.

1964

L'histoire du salut chez les Pères de l'Eglise. La doctrine des âges du monde. Paris: Beauchesne, 1964.

Lupieri, Edmondo

1982

"Contributo per un' analisi delle citazioni veterotesamentarie nel *De Trinitate* di Novaziano." *Augustinianum* 22 (1982): 211-227

Madec, Goulven

1970

"Une lecture de Confessions VII IX, 13 - XXI, 27: Notes critiques à propos d'une thèse de R.J.O'Connell." *REA* 16 (1970): 79-137.

1971

"Pour l'interprétation de *Contra Academicos* II, II, 5." *REA* 17 (1971): 322-28.

1974

Saint Ambroise et la philosophie. Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes, 1974.

1986

"L'historicité des Dialogues de Cassiciacum." *REA* 32 (1986): 207-31.

1987

"Le milieu Milanais." *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 88 (1987): 194-205.

1989

"Le néoplatonisme dans la conversion d'Augustin. Etat d'une question centenaire (depuis Harnack et Boissier, 1888)." *Internationales Symposium über den Stand der Augustinus-Forschung.* (12 - 16. April 1987) Ed. Cornelius Mayer and Karl Heinz Chelius, 9-25. Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag Würzburg, 1989.

Maher, J.P.

1947

Saint Augustine's Defense of the Hexaemeron against the Manichaeans.
Dissertation Pontif. Gregor. Univ. Roma, 1947

Mandouze, André

1982

Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire: I. Afrique (303-533). Paris:
Edition du CNRS, 1982.

Mallard, William

1980

"The Incarnation in Augustine's Conversion." *RA* 15 (1980):
80-98.

Markus, Robert A.

1964

"*Imago* and *similitudo* in Augustine." *REA* 10 (1964): 125-143.

Mattei, Paul

1983

"Adam posséda-t-il l'Esprit? Remarques sur l'état primitif de
l'homme et le progrès de l'histoire selon Tertullien." *REA* 29
(1983): 27-38.

1995

"Recherches sur la Bible à Rome vers le milieu du IIIe S.:
Novatien et la Vetus Latina." *RB* 105 (1995): 255-279.

McCool, Gerald A.

1959

"The Ambrosian Origin of St. Augustine's Theology of the
Image of God in Man." *Theological Studies* 20 (1959): 62-81.

McGowan, Andrew

1987

"Augustine's Spiritual Equality: the Allegory of Man and
Woman with Regard to *Imago Dei*." *REA* 33 (1987): 255-64

1996

"Ecstasy and Charity: Augustine with Nathanael under the Fig
Tree." *AS* 1996 (21.1): 27-38.

McLynn, Neil B.

1994

Ambrose of Milan. Church and Court in a Christian Capital. Berkeley:
University of California Press, 1994.

Meijering, E.P.

1987

(intro. tr. and commentary). *Augustine: De fide et symbolo*. Amsterdam: J.C.Gieben, 1987.

Mosher, David L.

1982

(tr. notes). *Saint Augustine, Eighty-three Different Questions*. FOC 70. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1982.

Moreschini, Claudio

1982

(intro. tr. notes and indexes). *Ambrosius De Isaac vel anima; De bono mortis*. SAEMO 3. Milano-Roma: Biblioteca Ambrosiana-Città Nuova Editrice, 1982.

Moretti, Paola F.

1998

“Ambrogio e Secondo filosofo: Su una presunta fonte delle descrizioni di mare, sole e luna nell’*Exameron* (*Exam.*, III,4, 22; IV,6,2; III,5,38 e IV, 6, 29),” in: *Nec timeo mori*, 1998. 649-662.

Morin, D.G.

1902

“Autour des Tractatus Origenis,” *RB* 19 (1902): 225-245.

Nautin, Pierre.

1972, 1973 and 1974.

“Etudes de chronologie hiéronymienne (393-397).” *REA* 18 (1972): 209-18; *REA* 19 (1973): 69-86; *REA* 20 (1974): 251-84.

1961

“La Date du ‘De Viris Illustribus’ de Jérôme, de la mort de Cyrille de Jérusalem et de celle de Grégoire de Nazianze.” *Revue d'Histoire ecclésiastique* 56 (1961): 33-5.

O'Connell, Robert J.

1968

St. Augustine's Early Theory of Man, A.D. 386-391. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1968.

1969

St. Augustine's Confessions: The Odyssey of Soul. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1969.

1980

"Pre-Existence in the Early Augustine," *REA* 26 (1980): 176-188.

1986

"On Augustine's 'First Conversion' *Factus Erectior* (De Beata Vita 4)." *AS* 17 (1986): 15-29.

1990/1

"Faith, Reason, and Ascent to Vision in St. Augustine." *AS* 21 (1990): 83-126.

1990/2

"Where the Difference Still Lies." *AS* 21 (1990): 139-152.

1993

"The *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* and the Origin of the Soul." *REA* 39 (1993): 129-141.

1994

"The Visage of Philosophy at Cassiciacum." *AS* 25 (1994): 65-76.

O'Daly, Gerard

1987

Augustine's Philosophy of Mind, Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987.

1974

"Did Augustine ever Believe in the Soul's Pre-existence?" *AS* 5 (1974): 227-235.

O'Donnell, James J.

1992

Augustine Confessions. Vol. 2. *Commentary on Books 1-7*; Vol. 3. *Commentary on Books 8-13, Indexes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992

O'Meara, John

1951

(intro. tr. and commentary). Saint Augustine, *Against the Academics*. Ancient Christian Writer 12. London-Westminster, Maryland: Longmans, Green and Co.- Newman Press, 1951.

1954

"Arripui, aperui, et legi." *AM* 1 (1954): 59-65.

1958

"Augustine and Neoplatonism." *RA* 1 (1958): 93-111.

1959

Porphyry's Philosophy from Oracles in Augustine. Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes, 1959.

1969

"Porphyry's Philosophy from Oracles in Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica* and Augustine's Dialogues of Cassiciacum." *RA* 6 (1969): 103-39.

1970

"Plotinus and Augustine: Exegesis of *Contra Academicos* II.5." *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 24 (1970): 321-37.

1982

"The Neoplatonism of Saint Augustine." In *Neoplatonism and Christian Thought*. Ed. Dominic J. O'Meara, 34-41. Norfolk, Virginia: International Society for Neoplatonic Studies, 1982.

Opelt, Ilona

1990

"Aug. *Epist.* 27* Divjak: Ein Schreiben des Hieronymus and Bischof Aurelius von Karthago." In: *Collectanea augustiniana: Mélanges T.J. van Bavel*. Ed. B.Bruning, M.Lamberigts and J. van Houtem 19-25. Leuven: Peeters, 1990.

Oulton, John Ernest Leonard

1954

(tr., intro. and notes) *Origen, On the Prayer*. In *Alexandrian Christianity: Selected Translations of Clement and Origen*. The Library of Christian Classics vol. 2. Introductions and notes by J. E. L. Oulton and H. Chadwick. London/Philadelphia: SCM Press/ Westminster Press, (first published in) 1954.

Palanque, Jean-Rémy

1933

Saint Ambroise et l'Empire romain. Paris, E. de Boccard, 1933.

Paredi, Angelo

1994

S. Ambrogio e la sua età. Milano: Ulrico Hoepli, 1960.

Pasini, Cesare

1996

Ambrogio di Milano: Azione e pensiero di un vescovo. Milano: San Paolo, 1996.

Pasquier, A.

1995

“L’allégorie du ciel et du firmament chez Origène et dans un traité gnostique de Nag Hammadi.” *Origeniana sexta* (1995): 37-52.

Pasteris, E.

1937

San Ambrogio: L'Esamerone. Torino, 1937.

Pelland, Gilles

1972

Cinq études d'Augustin sur le début de la Genèse. Tournai-Montréal: Desclée et Cie-Bellarmin, 1972.

Penaskovic, Richard

1986

“The Fall of the Soul in Saint Augustine: A *Quaestio Disputata*.” *AS* 17 (1986): 135-145.

Pépin, Jean

1953

“Recherches sur le sens et les origines de l'expression *caelum caeli* dans le livre XII des Confessions de S. Augustin.” *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 23 (1953): 185-274.

1954

“Saint Augustine et le symbolisme néoplatonicien de la vêtue.” *AM* 1 (1954): 293-306.

1964

Théologie cosmique et théologie chrétienne. (Ambroise, Exam. I 1, 1-4). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1964.

1976

“Exégèse de ‘In principio’ et théorie des principes dans l'Esameron (I 4, 12-16).” *Ambrosius Episcopus*, ed. Giuseppe Lazzati, vol. 1. 427-82, Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1976.

1977

Ex Platoniorum persona. 'Etudes sur les lectures philosophiques de saint Augustin. Amsterdam: A.M.Hakkert, 1977.

1987

La tradition de l'allégorie de Philon d'Alexandrie à Dante. Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes, 1987.

1994

"La doctrine augustinienne des *rationes aeternae*: affinités, origines." in *Ratio VII Colloquio Intenazionale*. pp. 47-68. Ed. M. Fattori and M.L. Bianchi. Rome: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 1994.

Perczel, István

1999

Isten felfoghatatlansága és leereszkedése: Szent Ágoston és Aranyasájú Szent János metafizikája és misztikája. (Incomprehensibility and Descence of God: The Metaphysics and Mystic of Saint Augustine and John Chrysostom) Budapest: Atlantisz, 1999.

Rackham, H.

1968

(tr.) *Pliny, Natural History*. Vol. 4. *The Loeb Classical Library*, Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, William Heinemann Ltd, 1968.

Ries, Julien.

1963 and 1964

"La Bible chez Augustin et chez les manichéens." *REA* 9 (1963): 201-215; *REA* 10 (1964): 309-329.

1992

"La création, l'homme et l'histoire du salut dans le *De genesi contra Manichaeos* de saint Augustin. in *Lectio Augustini, settimana agostiniana pavese. "De Genesi contra Manichaeos", "De Genesi ad litteram liber imperfectus" di Agostino d'Ippona.* Palermo (1992): 65-97.

Rist, John M.

1996

Augustine. Cambridge: University Press, 1996.

Rousseau, Olivier
1958

“La typologie augustinienne de l’Hexaéméron et la théologie du temps.” In: Festgabe Joseph Lortz. Vol. 2. *Glaube und Geschichte*. Ed. E. Iserloh, P. Manus. 47-58. Baden-Baden: B. Grimm, 1958.

Runia, David T.
1995

Philo and the Church Fathers: A Collection of Papers. Leiden, New York, Köln: E.J. Brill, 1995.

Russell, Robert P.
1948

(tr.) *Saint Augustine, Divine Providence and the Problem of Evil*. FOC 1. New York: Cima Publishing Co., Inc, 1948

1968

(tr.) *Saint Augustine, The Teacher, The Free Choice of the Will, Grace and Free Will*. FOC 59. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1968.

Savage, John
1961

(tr.) *Saint Ambrose, Hexaemeron, Paradise, and Cain and Abel*. FOC 42. New York : Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1961

Savon, Hervé
1998

“Ambroise Lecteur d’Origène.” in *Nec timeo mori* (1998): 221-234.

Schopp, Ludwig
1948

(tr.) *Saint Augustine, The Happy Life*. FOC 1. New York: Cima Publishing Co., Inc, 1948

Schulz-Flügel, Eva
1994

(ed. intro. and commentary). *Gregorius Eliberritanus, Epithalamium sive explanatio in Canticis Canticorum. Vetus Latina* 26, Freiburg: Herder, 1994.

Schwarte, Karl-Heinz
1966

Die Vorgeschichte der augustinischen Weltarterlebre. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag, 1966.

Sfameni Gasparro, Giulia

1984

Origene. Studi di antropologia e di storia della tradizione. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1984.

1998

Origene e la tradizione origeniana in occidente. Rome: LAS, 1998.

Simonetti, Manlio

1975

(ed. intro. tr. and commentary) *Gregorio di Elvira, La fede. Corona Patrum* 3., Torino: Società editrice internazionale, 1975.

Solignac, Aimé

1956

“Nouveaux parallèles entre Saint Ambroise et Plotin: le *De Jacob et vita beata* et le *Περὶ ἐνδαιμονίας* (Ennéade I, 4).” *Archives de Philosophie* 19 (1956): 148-156.

1962, 1-2

(intro. notes). *Confessions. BA* 13 and 14, Paris: Desclée de Brouver, 1962.

Somers, Herman

1955

“Image de Dieu et illumination divine. Sources historiques et élaboration augustinienne.” *AM* 1 (1955): 451-62.

1961

“Image de Dieu. Les sources de l'exégèse augustinienne.” *REA* 7 (1961): 105-25.

Somos, Róbert

2000

“Rufinus: *De benedictione patriarcharum*.” (forthcoming)

Studer, Basil

1966

“Zur Frage des westlichen Origenismus.” *SP* 9 (1966): 270-287.

Swift, L. J.

"Basil and Ambrose on the Six Days of Creation." *Angelicum* 57 (1980): 317-28.

Taormina, L.

1953

"Sant' Ambrogio e Plotino." *Miscellanea Studi di Letteratura cristiana antica* 4 (1953): 41-85.

Tardieu, Michel

1987

"Principes de l'exégèse manichéenne du Nouveau Testament." In *Les règles de l'interprétation*. Ed. M. Tardieu. 123-146. Paris: Cerf, 1987.

TeSelle, Eugene

1990

"Serpent, Eve, and Adam: Augustine and the Exegetical Tradition." in *Collectanea Augustiniana: Presbyter Factus Sum*. Ed. J.T. Lienhard, E.C. Müller and R.J. Teske, 341-61. New York, San Francisco etc. 1990.

1996

"Thesis on O'Connell: The Origin and 'proper Life' of the Soul in Augustine's Thought." *AS* 27.2 (1996): 7-19.

Teske, Roland J.

1990

"The Image and Likeness of God in St. Augustine's *De Genesi ad litteram liber imperfectus*." *Augustinianum* 30.2 (1990): 441-451.

1991

"St Augustine's View of the Original Human Condition in *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*." *AS* 22 (1991): 141-155.

1991/1

(tr., intro. notes) *Saint Augustine on Genesis*. FOC 84. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1991.

1991/2

"St. Augustine's View of the Original Human Condition in *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*." *AS* 22 (1991): 141-55.

1992

"Origen and St. Augustine's first Commentaries on Genesis." in *Origeniana quinta* (1992): 179-185.

Theiler, W.

1953

Gnomon 25 (1953): 113-22.

Trigg, Joseph, W.

1988

"Divine Deception and the Truthfulness of Scripture." In *Origen of Alexandria, His World and His Legacy*. Ch. Kannengiesser, W. Petersen, 147-164. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press 1988,

Van Bavel, Tarsicius

1974

"The Anthropology of Augustine." *Louvain Studies* 5.1 (1974): 34-47.

Vannier, Marie-Anne

1987

"Le rôle de l'hexaéméron dans l'interprétation augustinienne de la création." *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 71 (1987): 537-547.

1995

"Origène et Augustin, interprètes de la création." *Origeniana sexta* (1995): 723-736.

Van Fleteren, Frederick

1990

"A Reply to O'Connell," *AS* 21 (1990): 127-137.

Van Winden, Jacobus C.M.

1959

Calcidius on Matter. His doctrine and Sources. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1959.

1962

"St. Ambrose's Interpretation of the Concept of Matter." *VCh* 16 (1962): 205-215.

1963

"In the Beginning: Some Observations on the Patristic Interpretation of *Genesis* 1:1." *VCh* 17 (1963): 105-121.

1990

"Once again *Caelum Caeli*." In: *Collectanea augustiniana: Mélanges T.J. van Bavel*. Ed. B. Bruning, M. Lamberigts, J. van Houtem, vol. 2, 905-11. Leuven: Peteers, 1990.

Vega, A.C.

1957

España Sagrada. Vol. 55. Madrid, 1957.

Verhees, Jacques.

1975

"Augustins Trinitätsverständnis in den Schriften aus Cassiciacum." *RA* 10 (1975): 45-75.

Vona, Constantino

1970

Gregorio di Elvira: I Tractatus De libris sacrarum scripturarum. Fonti e sopravvivenza medievale. Scrinium patristicum lateranense 4. Rome: Libreria editrice della Pontifica Università Lateranense, 1970.

Watson, Gerard

1990

(intro. tr. and commentary). *Saint Augustine: Soliloquies and Immortality of the Soul*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1990.

Weyer, Hans

1962

(ed. intro. tr. and commentary). *Novatianus De Trinitate. Über den Dreifaltigen Gott*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1962

Wilbrand, W

1921

"Zur Chronologie einiger Schriften des hl. Ambrosius," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 41 (1921): 1-19.

Wilson, Anna M.

1990

"Reason and Revelation in the Conversion Accounts of the Cappadocians and Augustine." In *Collectanea Augustiniana: Mélanges T. J. van Bavel*. Ed. B. Bruning, M. Lamberigts and J.

van Houtem, vol. 1, 259-78. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990.

Zacher, A.

1962

De Genesi contra Manichaeos. Ein Versuch Augustinus die ersten drei Kapitel von Genesis zu erklären und zu verteidigen. Dissertation manuscript Pontif. Univ. Gregoriana, Roma, 1962.

Zelzer, Michaela

1998

“Zur chronologie der Werke des Ambrosius: Überblick über die Forschung von 1974 bis 1997.” in *Nec timeo mori*. (1998): 73-92.

INDEX OF NAMES

- "Tractator", 107, 122, 238,
243, 244, 249, 250, 253,
254, 265, 266, 267, 270,
273, 281, 283, 288, 289
- Abraham, 30, 31, 58, 59, 60,
128, 201, 291
- Adam, 126, 128, 132, 139,
147, 148, 149, 155, 156,
158, 171, 174, 175, 179,
195, 196, 198, 201, 203,
204, 298, 313, 321
- Adda, 47
- Aeneis*, 4
- Agaësse, P., 79, 121, 197,
215, 292, 297
- Altaner, Berthold, 27, 32, 78,
82, 144, 145, 297
- Alypius, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58,
67, 68, 69, 70
- Ambrose, 8, 15, 16, 20, 21,
24, 25, 28, 30, 31, 37, 38,
44, 50, 57, 78, 79, 81, 82,
83, 84, 91, 92, 93, 101,
102, 103, 104, 111, 112,
113, 114, 115, 116, 119,
120, 125, 126, 128, 142,
143, 145, 156, 159, 161,
201, 225, 232, 241, 253,
273, 280, 285, 291, 313,
319, 321, 322
- Antony, Saint, 8, 22, 40, 42
- Aurelius, of Carthage, 51, 69,
70, 71, 72, 77, 147, 223,
224, 225, 235, 316
- Baehrens, W. A., 38, 137
- Basil, 83, 84, 91, 92, 93, 102,
103, 113, 293, 320, 321
- Batiffol, Pierre, 237, 238, 299
- Boissier, Gaston, 300, 312
- Bonnardière, la Anne-Marie,
67, 72, 77, 300
- Boulluec, Alain Le, IX, XIV
- Butler, 237, 238, 244, 249,
250, 253, 282, 288, 289,
301
- Caesarius of Arles, 239, 240
- Calcidius, 88, 89, 95, 97, 98,
99, 101, 103, 104, 293,
299, 322
- Cassiciacum, 3, 24, 25, 34,
44, 52, 53, 54, 305, 312,
315, 316, 323
- Cassiodorus, 254, 293
- Celsinus, 5, 9, 35, 63
- Celsus, 31, 205, 302
- Chadwick, Henry, 9, 10, 31,
51, 157, 162, 193, 205,
209, 211, 213, 298, 302,
316

- Christ, 12, 14, 15, 28, 29, 32, 34, 37, 39, 41, 42, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 81, 82, 83, 84, 123, 132, 139, 140, 147, 148, 149, 163, 168, 174, 181, 182, 185, 189, 195, 196, 197, 198, 202, 203, 207, 209, 216, 217, 233, 234, 235, 311
 Chromatius, 225, 232, 233, 254, 293
 Cicero, 4, 20, 200, 201, 241
 Clement of Alexandria, 31, 32, 83, 259, 286, 293
 Courcelle, Pierre, 15, 16, 19, 24, 27, 35, 37, 66, 220, 221, 302
 Crouzel, Henri, XIII, 32, 38, 77, 87, 98, 114, 127, 128, 182, 183, 184, 186, 207, 209, 270, 277, 285, 286, 294, 295, 296, 301, 303
 Cyprian, 225, 231, 232, 233, 234, 253, 254, 293
 De Bruyne, 238, 239, 304
 Didymus the Blind, 158, 293
 Doignon, Jean, 4, 9, 19, 63, 223, 273, 294, 304
 Dulaey, Martine, 243, 266, 271, 305
 DuRoy, Olivier, 32, 155, 161
 Epiphanius, 102, 139, 204, 209, 293
 Eve, 128, 147, 155, 156, 158, 171, 198, 321
 Faustinus, 239, 294
 Fortunatianus, 223, 282
 Gaudentius, 238
 Glaue, Paul, 130, 136, 307
 Gregory of Elvira, 78, 79, 120, 121, 238, 239, 241, 243, 294
 Gregory Thaumaturgus, 32, 294
 Hadot, Pierre, 9, 16, 23, 241, 271, 295, 308
 Heidl, György, 125, 130, 309
 Heliodorus, 273, 281
 Herodotus, 10, 307
 Hilary, 78, 79, 83, 119, 120, 223, 225, 272, 273, 274, 281, 284, 285, 287, 288, 289, 294, 298
 Holte, Ragnar, 31, 32, 34, 79, 310
Hortensius, 4, 20, 21, 22, 42
 Irenaeus, 32, 83, 122, 202, 203, 204, 205, 209, 217, 272, 294
 Jerome, 13, 14, 15, 16, 51, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 77, 78, 83, 93, 102, 105, 137, 139, 145, 146, 147, 149, 160, 167, 168, 184, 190, 204, 209, 223, 224, 225, 232, 234, 235, 239, 241, 242, 243, 270, 272, 273, 282, 283, 284, 286, 294, 309, 310
 Jesus, 12, 33, 34, 47, 52, 53, 56, 59, 81, 82, 132, 154, 157, 174, 189, 195, 196, 199, 201, 211, 215, 226, 229
 John Cassian, 232, 284, 295
 Justin Martyr, 217, 295
 Kendeffy G., IX, 310
 Lejay, 238, 239, 242, 249, 311

- libri pleni, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17,
21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27,
35, 40, 42, 43, 44, 49, 58
- Madec, Goulven, 7, 8, 9, 10,
16, 24, 30, 31, 34, 40, 41,
42, 47, 54, 172, 312
- Mani, 47
- Markus, Robert, IX, 205, 313
- Mattei, Paul, 203, 204, 254,
260, 313
- McCool, Gerald, A., 111,
112, 116, 120, 313
- Melania, the Elder, 66
- Melito, 249, 252, 253, 254
- Monica, 24, 32
- Nathanael, 60, 313
- Nautin, Pierre, 65, 239, 293,
296, 314
- Novatian, 237, 238, 244, 248,
249, 250, 251, 253, 254,
255, 258, 259, 260, 261,
262, 265, 266, 267, 268,
269, 270, 274, 275, 281,
283, 295, 301, 304
- O'Connell, R. J., 161, 171,
172, 175, 180, 321
- O'Donnell, James J., 22, 32,
51, 53, 54, 56, 60, 84, 219,
220, 315
- O'Meara, John, 5, 7, 8, 9, 22,
29, 40, 41, 42, 47, 58, 60,
302, 307, 315, 316
- Origen, IX, XIII, XIV, 1, 11,
12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 25, 30,
31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37,
38, 50, 51, 52, 54, 58, 59,
60, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69,
70, 71, 72, 73, 77, 78, 79,
81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89,
92, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100,
101, 102, 103, 104, 105,
106, 107, 112, 114, 115,
116, 117, 119, 120, 121,
122, 123, 124, 125, 127,
128, 129, 130, 131, 132,
133, 135, 136, 137, 138,
139, 140, 141, 142, 143,
145, 147, 149, 150, 151,
152, 153, 154, 155, 156,
157, 158, 159, 160, 161,
163, 167, 169, 171, 181,
182, 183, 184, 186, 189,
191, 192, 193, 197, 198,
201, 204, 205, 207, 209,
210, 211, 213, 218, 220,
221, 224, 225, 226, 227,
229, 230, 232, 233, 234,
235, 237, 238, 242, 243,
244, 248, 249, 250, 251,
252, 253, 254, 255, 256,
258, 259, 260, 261, 263,
265, 266, 267, 268, 269,
270, 272, 273, 274, 275,
276, 277, 279, 280, 281,
282, 283, 285, 286, 288,
289, 295, 298, 299, 300,
301, 302, 309, 311, 316,
322
- Orosius, 182, 184
- Ossius, 239, 240, 304
- Paul, Apostle, 5, 8, 19, 21,
23, 24, 25, 26, 42, 43, 44,
47, 48, 49, 51, 56, 58, 59,
61, 64, 65, 67, 71, 82, 129,
140, 147, 196, 209, 217,
242, 285, 298, 299, 306,
307, 311, 313
- Paulinus, of Nola, 66, 296
- Pépin, Jean, 78, 82, 89, 92,
102, 182, 184, 317

- Perczel, István, IX, 163, 184, 318
- Perrone, Lorenzo, IX
- Philo, 16, 32, 88, 89, 116, 119, 120, 128, 143, 144, 145, 156, 158, 161, 259, 272, 296, 298, 319
- Plautus, 9, 10, 296
- Pliny
 The Elder, 10, 11, 13, 14, 296, 318
- Plotinus, 7, 9, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 29, 35, 36, 37, 44, 104, 111, 152, 153, 154, 161, 212, 213, 271, 296, 298, 316
- Ponticianus, 8, 22, 40, 219
- Porphyry, 7, 9, 29, 50, 271, 272, 316
- Romanianus, 3, 4, 5, 11, 19, 21, 25, 26, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 54
- Rufinus, 13, 65, 66, 78, 98, 137, 145, 154, 224, 238, 239, 241, 242, 243, 267, 270, 297, 308, 320
- Sághy M., IX
- Sarah, 128, 238
- Schulz-Flügel, Eva, 240, 242, 319
- Sheba, 12
- Simplicianus, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 39, 63, 65, 66, 78, 104, 111, 219
- Solignac, A., 15, 16, 35, 79, 121, 197, 215, 292, 297, 320
- Solomon, 12, 183
- Somers, Herman, 111, 121, 320
- Somos R., IX, 138, 320
- Strabo, 10, 310
- Sulpicius Severus, 168, 297
- Tatian, 83, 297
- Tertullian, 43, 83, 119, 204, 209, 217, 225, 231, 232, 233, 235, 283, 297
- TeSelle, Eugene, 137, 155, 156, 157, 172, 321
- Teske, Roland J., 78, 79, 82, 86, 90, 91, 96, 97, 100, 104, 106, 111, 112, 114, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 124, 125, 126, 127, 130, 132, 139, 140, 141, 144, 145, 146, 149, 152, 156, 159, 160, 172, 173, 174, 175, 177, 178, 180, 181, 182, 195, 199, 202, 321
- Theodoret of Cyrrihus, 254, 255, 258, 259, 260, 265, 267, 274, 275, 283, 297
- Theodorus, 19, 20, 21, 24, 27, 31, 63, 78, 111, 305
- Theophilus of Antioch, 83, 89, 122, 277, 297
- Van Winden, 82, 88, 89, 91, 93, 95, 97, 104, 322
- Victorinus of Poetovio, 223, 237, 273
- Victorinus, Marius, 22, 23, 28, 29, 30, 39, 63, 64, 83, 241, 243, 270, 271, 272, 273, 295, 308
- Vidrányi, IX
- Vincentius, 65, 224, 238
- Voelker, Julia, IX
- Wilmart, A., 237, 299
- Zeno of Verona, 266, 297